



Torfichen Wind Farm

Further Environmental Information 2

Renewable Energy Systems Ltd

Prepared by:

SLR Consulting Limited

The Tun, 4 Jackson's Entry, Edinburgh, EH8 8PJ

SLR Project No.: 405.P64791.00001

29 October 2025

Revision: V1

Revision Record

Revision	Date	Prepared By	Checked By	Authorised By
V1	15 October 2025	HB	BG	BG
	Click to enter a date.			
	Click to enter a date.			
	Click to enter a date.			

Basis of Report

This document has been prepared by SLR Consulting Limited (SLR) with reasonable skill, care and diligence, and taking account of the timescales and resources devoted to it by agreement with Renewable Energy Systems Ltd (the Client) as part or all of the services it has been appointed by the Client to carry out. It is subject to the terms and conditions of that appointment.

SLR shall not be liable for the use of or reliance on any information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document for any purpose by any person other than the Client. Reliance may be granted to a third party only in the event that SLR and the third party have executed a reliance agreement or collateral warranty.

Information reported herein may be based on the interpretation of public domain data collected by SLR, and/or information supplied by the Client and/or its other advisors and associates. These data have been accepted in good faith as being accurate and valid.

The copyright and intellectual property in all drawings, reports, specifications, bills of quantities, calculations and other information set out in this report remain vested in SLR unless the terms of appointment state otherwise.

This document may contain information of a specialised and/or highly technical nature and the Client is advised to seek clarification on any elements which may be unclear to it.

Information, advice, recommendations and opinions in this document should only be relied upon in the context of the whole document and any documents referenced explicitly herein and should then only be used within the context of the appointment.



Table of Contents

Basis of Report	i
Acronyms and Abbreviations	iv
1.0 Introduction	1
2.0 Consultation	2
3.0 Updated Baseline and Archaeological Potential	12
3.1 Current Baseline.....	12
3.1.1 Nationally Important Designated Heritage Assets.....	12
3.1.2 Known Heritage Assets	12
3.1.3 Medieval Context.....	13
3.1.4 Post-Medieval	13
3.1.5 Undated Features or Structures	14
3.1.6 Site Walkover	16
3.1.7 Historic Mapping and Historic Land Use Assessment.....	16
3.1.8 Previous surveys	17
3.1.9 Aerial Photography and LiDAR.....	18
3.1.10 Discussion of Site	18
4.0 Assessment of Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation	20
4.1 Construction Effects	20
4.1.1 Construction Impacts.....	20
4.1.2 Proposed Mitigation.....	21
4.2 Operational Effects.....	22
4.2.1 Original Layout	22
4.2.2 Alternative Layout – Removal of T1, T2, and T3.....	22
4.2.3 Cumulative Impacts.....	28
5.0 Residual Effects	30
6.0 Conclusion.....	35

Appendices

Appendix A Updated Gazetteer

Appendix B Letter to Historic Environment Scotland (May 2025)

Figures

Figure 7.1a: Non-Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

Figure 7.1b: Non-Designated Cultural Heritage Assets For Alternative Turbine Layout



Figure 7.2: Designated Cultural Heritage Assets

Figure 7.3: Cultural Heritage Viewpoints

Wirelines

Figure 1 - Viewpoint 1 LB808 Arniston House & GDL00029 Arniston Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape

Figure 2 - Viewpoint 2: LB14633 Gladhouse Villa and LB45811 Gladhouse Reservoir

Figure 3 - Viewpoint 3: CA343 Crichton and Borthwick Conservation Area

Figure 4 - Viewpoint 4: Borthwick Castle



Acronyms and Abbreviations

HES	Historic Environment Scotland
ECU	Energy Consents Unit
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
ELCAS	East Lothian Council Archaeology Service
FEI	Further Environmental Information
DBA	Desk Based Assessment
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
AEI	Additional Environmental Information
HES	Historic Environment Scotland
CIfA	Chartered Institute for Archaeologists
ALGAO	Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers
SEI	Supplementary Environmental Information
SM	Scheduled Monument
LB	Listed Building
GDL	Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape
CA	Conservation Area



1.0 Introduction

Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report presents the findings of the assessment of the potential impacts on cultural heritage assets resulting from the Proposed Development submitted to the Energy Consents Unit (ECU) (ECU00004661) on 03/11/2023.

Further information was submitted to the ECU on 17/03/2025. This is the most updated report and substantiates the advice and responses provided by HES and East Lothian Council Archaeological Service (ELCAS) on behalf of Midlothian Council.

This FEI (Further Environmental Information) Report supplements Chapter 7 of the EIA Report and sets out clarifications, responses and updates to any information provided in the EIA Report as a result of responses from the statutory consultees (**Table 1**).

The following key documents should be read in conjunction with this FEI:

- Torfichen Wind Farm: EIA Scoping Report
- Torfichen Wind Farm EIA Scoping Report Appendix 5.1: Appraisal of Designated Heritage
- Environmental Impact Assessment Report Volume 1 Chapter 7: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage
- Environmental Impact Assessment Report Volume 2: Figures 7.1-7.13
- Environmental Impact Assessment Report Volume 4 Appendix 7.1: Gazetteer Assets
- Environmental Impact Assessment Report Volume 4 Appendix 7.2: Appraisal of Designated Heritage Assets within 10km
- Additional Information Report (March 2025) – Appendix 2 – Revised Archaeology and Cultural Heritage Assessment



2.0 Consultation

Consultee responses to the EIA Application concerning cultural heritage are outlined in **Table 1**.

Table 1: Consultation Responses

Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	29 th February 2024	<p>Arniston House and Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape</p> <p>HES notes that the house and Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape should have been assessed separately as they have separate settings receptors.</p> <p>HES were unable to determine whether the Proposed Development would raise issues of national interest for their remit. This is due to the requirement for further visualisations to understand the potential for potential impacts on Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029). HES requested photomontages looking along the axial view from the principal rooms, produced in winter to show the lowest level of tree coverage. At this point, they object until sufficient information is provided.</p> <p>Impact on Other Assets</p> <p>HES disagrees with the methodology and approach for the assessment of the following assets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middleton Hall (LB806) • Preston Hall A-Listed Buildings and Garden and Designed Landscape (LB775, LB777, LB113, LB746, GDL00320) • Oxenfoord Castle (LB768) • Crichton Castle (SM805) • Borthwick Castle (LB805) • Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area <p>Whilst HES disagree with the methodology and aspects of the assessments for these assets, they agree that the impact from the</p>	<p>Arniston House and Arniston GDL were assessed separately as part of the March 2025 Further Information, supplementing the assessment carried out in the EIA.</p> <p>Three photomontages, showing the requested views through 'The Wilderness' were also appended.</p> <p>The comments of HES regarding the methodology of the assessment are acknowledged and will be taken on board for future applications.</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
		<p>Proposed Development would not be significant in EIA terms.</p> <p>Jeffries Corse Cairn (SM3527)</p> <p>HES disagree with the assessment of the setting proposed for Jeffries Corse cairn within the EIA chapter. HES believe that the Proposed Development has the potential to impact the ability to understand and appreciate the relationship with the South Esk Valley entrance and the nearby Dundreich Cairn (SM2777). However, they are content that the Proposed Development will not have a significant impact on the integrity of the monuments setting and that the impacts would be of such significance that they would object.</p> <p>EIA Report</p> <p>HES note that the wording of the conclusion of Section 7.10 is inconsistent with the methodology proposed in Section 7.4.</p> <p>HES note that the grouping of several assets together in Appendix 7.2 means that they have not been adequately assessed for potential impacts. They suggest that a different approach is taken for future applications.</p> <p>Mitigation</p> <p>If the current proposals are amended or redesigned, HES would encourage further steps to reduce the significant impact on the setting of Jeffries Corse cairn (SM3527).</p>	
East Lothian Council Archaeology Service (ELCAS) on Behalf of Midlothian Council	14 th March 2024	<p>ELCAS note that the assessment does not adequately assess the impacts of the proposals on the historic environment, with further work needed.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>ELCAS presents general comments which are expanded on in later sections of the response, these comments are generally themed on the lack of robustness in the presented methodology and the need for a further assessment of all assets.</p> <p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>ELCAS note that the baseline presented within the EIA chapter is limited and lacking in detail. They also state that a systematic walkover survey should have been carried</p>	<p>General Comments</p> <p>Clarifications in response to comments about methodology were provided in Section 5 of the March 2025 Further Information report.</p> <p>Construction Impacts</p> <p>An update to the EIA baseline has been presented in Section 4.1 of the</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
		<p>out to aid in the design process. They believe that a number of sites and surveys were not included in the DBA and state that the full extent of sites should be shown on figures.</p> <p>ELCAS state that the archaeological potential section does not adequately assess the potential for heritage assets within the site and as such has impacts on the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>ELCAS present general comments about the mitigation presented in the EIA chapter, providing a generalised methodology that may be applicable to similar sites. They note that no mitigation has been proposed for the development footprint where it does not intersect with known heritage assets. They also note that no provision has been made to consider public benefit or enhancement as part of the proposed mitigation.</p> <p>Operational Impacts</p> <p>ELCAS state that overall the EIA chapter and appendices would benefit from clearer language and structure, with further work needed to justify the conclusions reached. They note that in some cases the settings of the assets have not been fully defined.</p> <p>ELCAS note that some assets have been scoped out at appraisal or have been given a lower level of impact than warranted. They highlight the lack of consideration of C Listed Buildings in the assessment and state that cumulative impacts should not just be undertaken for those assets where a significant setting impact is predicted.</p> <p>ELCAS provide a series of specific comments relating to the operational impacts, summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix 7.2 lacks detail in places and doesn't consider the full setting of each asset before scoping out; • ELCAS raise issues with the assessment of Hirendean Castle and Moorfoot Chapel, highlighting the need to assess views to each asset, the contribution of the Moorfoot Hills to a sense of isolation 	<p>March 2025 Further Information report. This includes further description of the targeted walkover, as agreed at scoping, and an updated assessment of the archaeological potential of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>An assessment for the potential for direct impacts as a result of the Proposed Development and proposed mitigation are presented in Section 4.2 of the March 2025 Further Information report. These have been expanded upon and clarified but their conclusions remain the same.</p> <p>Operational Impacts</p> <p>In regard to the assessment of impacts on the setting of heritage assets as a result of the Proposed Development, updated assessments for Arniston House and GDL can be found in Section 2 of the March 2025 Further Information report. and updated assessments for Crichton Castle and Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
		<p>and defence, and the potential for noise impacts;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Middleton Hall's assessment did not fully consider the historic long-distance views to the south and southwest and should have included an estimated wireline. • In reference to Loquhariot fort, intervisibility with other forts and long-distance views to the south should have been considered in the assessment; • A visualisation from Gladhouse Reservoir and Villa would have been helpful in assessing impacts; • In reference to Maudslie Farm, the assessment doesn't take into account the proximity to hill pasture for pastoral farming, nor the assets sense of place at the foot of the hill. ELCAS note that there is a potential for adverse impacts on these elements of the assets setting. • ELCAS note that the assessment of Crichton Castle and Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area should have been assessed separately and fully. • ELCAS note that Arniston House and GDL has not been assessed fully and additional visualisations are needed from key points within the GDL to support this assessment. 	<p>are found in Section 3 of the March 2025 Further Information report.</p> <p>Clarifications in regards to comments about Methodology can be found in Section 5 of the March 2025 Further Information report. Clarification in regards to comments about Category B Listed Buildings can be found in Section 6 the March 2025 Further Information report.</p> <p>Clarifications in regard to Loquhariot Fort and Middleton Hall can be found in Section 7 and Section 8 the March 2025 Further Information report. respectively.</p> <p>Appendix 7.2 of the EIA was originally submitted as Appendix 5.1 of the Scoping report, with the methodology and scope agreed upon by consultees. The appendix was amended in part to reflect changes of design over the application process. As the scope and methodology was agreed at scoping Appendix 7.2 of the EIA Report has not been updated as part of the March 2025 Further Information report.</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
East Lothian Council Archaeology Service (ELCAS) on Behalf of Midlothian Council	12 th May 2025	<p>In response to the FEI submitted in March 2025.</p> <p>Further cultural heritage work they would like carried out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further Baseline assessment for the construction impacts, with the full extent of the effect shown in EIA Figures. • Additional information to the archaeological potential section, with specific attention to peat and the associated preservation of archaeological remains. • Provide an in-depth mitigation section for the known heritage assets affected by the Proposed Development – especially in regards to assets which are understood to be underdeveloped in the baseline section. • Public benefit and engagement integrated into the mitigation plan. • Operational dissatisfaction mostly related to the photomontages and wirelines. Further assessment and wirelines requested for numerous assets as previously mentioned in the prior Council Response. • ELCAS also demonstrated concerns regarding the noise impact on the setting of heritage assets. As well as concerns for the underassessment of the effects on specific assets, including Mauldslie Farm. 	<p>General Comments:</p> <p>Clarity on the comments provided by ELCAS were requested on 09/06/2025.</p> <p>Note the comments were provided in an email chain between the recipients.</p> <p>Baseline:</p> <p>Concerns regarding the collation of data and figure formats were addressed in Section 3 of this report.</p> <p>Archaeological Potential:</p> <p>Archaeological potential has been updated in Section 3 of this report.</p> <p>Proposed Mitigation:</p> <p>Examples of projects of a similar scale and nature where the mitigation suggestions were successfully applied were requested.</p> <p>Operational Impacts:</p> <p>Addressing the concerns for noise assessment on heritage asset</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
			settings is beyond the remit of the cultural heritage assessment. Further noise assessments within Chapter 12 of the EIA ascertained the development is within a suitable vicinity to the assets mentioned by ELCAS.
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	16 th May 2025	<p>HES provide formal response to the FEI submitted in March 2025.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HES outline the reasons for objecting to the proposed development based on significant impacts on the setting of Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston Inventory Garden & Designed Landscape (GDL00029). The reason given for these significant impacts is the visibility of T1, T2, and T3 along the south-facing axial view within 'The Wilderness'. Concerns regarding the commercial forestry which partially screens parts of some turbines. With underassessment of the views from the principal rooms. HES disagree with the reports concluding proposal that the overall effect would not result in a significant impact upon the setting of Arniston House. Instead, they conclude that the introduction of visible turbines in the axial view from principal rooms and garden ground outside the house would cause adverse impacts on the setting of the house. HES disagree with the anticipated effects to be low adverse on the GDL's setting significance. HES advise that in order for the proposed development to not be objected, the following Turbines 1 	<p>SLR respond on May 30th to the comments provided by HES (Appendix B).</p> <p>Providing additional information for Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston House Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029).</p> <p>Addressing the key setting and viewshed concerns outlined by HES, SLR proposes suggestions for where the assets settings and approach would not be significantly impacted.</p> <p>Further comments are provided for the different viewsheds to and from the House and Gardens, suggesting that the overall ability to understand appreciate and experience the assets would not be significantly</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
		<p>and 3 should be removed or relocated so that they do not appear in the views along the axis from the south-facing principal rooms and from outside the house in the garden ground.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mitigation proposed the removal of T1, T2, and T3. 	<p>impacted and ask for the reconsideration of the objection.</p>
East Lothian Council Archaeology Service (ELCAS) on Behalf of Midlothian Council	25 th June 2025	<p>ELCAS responded to the FEI comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Figures should where appropriate include the full extent of an asset as mitigation measures are implemented. Supporting documentation for assets recorded during the field survey – historic mapping or LiDAR. Details the unsubstantiated land-use section, including the sources used for analysis and the lack of detail for peat mitigation. Mitigation concerns cover the specific assets to be impacted by the proposed development. Proposing further mitigation methods (trial trenching, geophysical survey) but mostly looking for a Programme of Archaeological Works or Monitored Soil Strip. <p>Operational:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELCAS requests that additional visualisations are produced to support the assessment of setting impacts to Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area, Hirendean Castle and Moorfoot Chapel, and Gladhouse Reservoir and villa. Further assessment of Arniston GDL should also be carried out. Noise impact should consider how those visiting the asset would be affected in their ability to understand, experience, and appreciate the asset. 	<p>General Comments:</p> <p>Updated figures (see Figure 7.1) where polygons are provided for assets which are to be mitigated in the proposed development.</p> <p>Supporting documentation, including historic mapping, Trove descriptions, and LiDAR have been added to the gazetteer (Appendix A).</p> <p>Additional information has been added to the historic land use section and site discussion addressing peat concerns in Section 3.</p> <p>Updated figures (see Figure 7.1) where polygons are provided for assets which are too close or to be mitigated in the proposed development.</p> <p>Additional information has been added to the historic land use</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
			<p>section and site discussion addressing peat concern in Section 3.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been amended in Section 4.1.</p> <p>Operational:</p> <p>Wirelines have been provided for Arniston House (LB808), Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029), Gladhouse Villa (LB14633), Gladhouse Reservoir (LB45811), Crichton and Borthwick Conservation Area (CA343), and Borthwick Castle (LB805) in order to help inform assessments. These wirelines use the Alternative Layout (removal of T1, T2, and T3).</p> <p>Additional wirelines for Hirendean Castle (SM5608) and Moorfoot Chapel (SM5976) will not substantiate our understanding of the anticipated impact the Proposed Development will have on the asset's settings.</p> <p>The removal of T1-3 lessens any</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
			<p>peripheral distraction to the assets when viewing them from the north along the River South Esk. Given that the Moorfoot Chapel's setting is conducive with its immediate landscape and the River South Esk would suggest that any imposing views behind the asset upon its southwestern approach, would not be significantly impacted.</p> <p>Given Hirendean Castle is elevated in the landscape provides more of a long-distance setting, with a remaining preference for visibility down the valley towards the Chapel. Additionally, removing T1-3 would lessen any distracting views from the southwestern approach.</p>
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	7 th July 2025	<p>Following HES' continued objection to T1 and T3, with the advised removal of T1, T2, and T3.</p> <p>An optioned mitigation strategy is proposed with the removal of Turbines, 1, 2, and 3.</p> <p>As such, they request additional wirelines with the alternative turbine layout.</p>	<p>The mitigation section has been updated, outlining the potential impacts on assets following the alternative turbine layout in accordance with HES's objection.</p> <p>Wirelines are provided with the removal of the</p>



Consultee	Date	Summary of Key Points	Response
			turbines for Arniston House (LB808) and Designed Landscape (GDL00029).



3.0 Updated Baseline and Archaeological Potential

The Updated Baseline presented in this section takes into account the comments made by ELCAS in their response dated 14th March 2024 and up to their latest response dated 25th June 2025. As well as the results of an additional blanket walkover carried out on 2nd September 2025. All heritage assets within the site and 1km of this area are shown on **Figure 7.1**. All recorded non-designated heritage assets within the site and 1km of the site are listed in the gazetteer that is contained within **Appendix A** of this FEI Report.

To substantiate the previous 2023 targeted site walkover, a blanket walkover of the site was carried out on September 2nd, 2025. The intention of the additional site visit was to ensure a fully comprehensive archaeological and heritage potential assessment was undertaken. Covering the entirety of the site allowed an in-depth understanding of the site and expand on existing features previously recorded. Further exploration outlined a series of unrecorded clearance cairns and agricultural features, expanding on existing assets previously surveyed. The aforementioned areas of interest that were inaccessible, have been visited and no further potential archaeological assets were recorded within those areas.

3.1 Current Baseline

3.1.1 Nationally Important Designated Heritage Assets

There are no designated heritage assets within the site.

There are 92 heritage assets of national importance within 10 km of the proposed turbine locations, consisting of 53 Scheduled Monuments, 32 Category A Listed Buildings, six Inventoried GDLs, and one Inventoried Battlefield. There are 54 assets of Regional Importance within 5 km of the proposed turbine locations, 51 Category B Listed Buildings and three Conservation Areas.

3.1.2 Known Heritage Assets

3.1.2.1 Prehistoric and Roman Context

There is a single prehistoric heritage asset recorded within the site, a potential burnt mound (SLR2) noted on the northern slope of Torfichen Hill, c.0.12 km southeast of proposed Turbine 6. Whilst the walkover survey undertaken in May 2023 did not identify the presence of SLR2, likely due to the height of vegetation, a previous walkover survey on the same site by Rathmell Archaeology (2021) noted it as present, as did the most recent survey in September 2025. The most recent survey supported previous assumptions of the asset being a burnt mound.

A single prehistoric findspot was noted within 1km of the site. The findspot comprised a cremation urn (SLR1) and is recorded north of the site, c.1.1 km north of Turbine 9. The urn is noted as being Bronze Age in date and was found within a small, paved pit, containing the remains of an adult, a burnt flint flake and a bone artefact. The find demonstrates a degree of prehistoric activity within the area surrounding site, although there is no clear relationship established between the findspot and the burnt mound making it difficult to determine whether the isolated assets were part of a larger settlement concentrated within the site, further north or south in the upland areas, or towards the River South Esk in the west.

Additionally, a cairnfield (SLR43/SLR45), potentially prehistoric in date, is located towards the northern site boundary, to the northwest of the Moorfoot Hills in an area of unimproved peat moorland. The area has recorded approximately 50 cairns covered in peat, spanning 160m north to south by 70m east to west, and the cairns average between 2m and 4m in diameter and are generally less than 0.5m high (WOSAS, 2025). The cairnfield supports an



agricultural presence within the site which may have extended beyond to the northern periphery of the site where peat coverage is visible to the northwest and is indicative of poor survival of archaeological remains (refer to Figure 10.1.6 of the EIA report).

There are no recorded Roman assets within the Site, nor within the 1km study area. The closest evidence of Roman activity is a portion of Dere Street (SM2962), a Roman road from the 1st Century AD. This portion of Dere Street is located c.10km east of the site.

3.1.3 Medieval Context

There are no recorded medieval heritage assets within the site or 1km of the site boundary. However, there is known medieval activity within the wider landscape, with the Moorfoot Chapel and monastic grange (SM5976) located c.2.5km southwest of Turbine 1. Given the later agricultural use of the land within the Site, it is likely that the site was already in use for agricultural purposes at this point in time. However, continued agricultural use in later periods may have removed any earlier remains.

3.1.4 Post-Medieval

There are 12 recorded post-medieval heritage assets within the site boundary.

The majority of the post-medieval assets within the Site are agricultural in nature, seemingly split between the two farmsteads located roughly at the east and west of the site.

SLR21 is the location of a house and enclosure, named as Sowburnrig on the 1853 Ordnance Survey historic mapping¹. It is located c.0.12km north of Turbine 16. A sheephouse (SLR7), likely associated with Sowburnrig due to its proximity, is located c.0.16km south of Turbine 16 and c.0.28km south of SLR21.

A farmstead with a series of enclosures is noted on the 1853 Ordnance Survey historic mapping². This farmstead is named Pigsknowes (SLR33) and is located c.0.42km northeast of Turbine 2. A sheepfold (SLR32) is located c.45m northeast of SLR33 and is likely associated. A wall (SLR63) is located within the Pigsknowes farmstead and is still extant today.

A further six post-medieval sheepfolds or enclosures are recorded within the site boundary. SLR8 is located c.0.38km southwest of Turbine 3, SLR34 and SLR35 are located c.0.3km north and northwest of Turbine 1, SLR42 is 0.26km northeast from T17, SLR28 is located c.0.28km west of Turbine 10 and SLR29 is located c.0.3km south of Turbine 13.

All of the above assets demonstrate the agricultural nature of the land within the site during the post-medieval period, with two unnamed farmsteads. The presence of sheepfolds throughout the site demonstrates that the land was primarily used for grazing.

Broadlaw Quarry and associated trackway (SLR31) are located in the south and southwest of the site. The asset was a granite quarry, which was first used in the late 19th century for a short period before quarrying was restarted in the 1950s. The quarry is now disused. A series of quarry workers' cottages (SLR30) are located 0.3 km to the east of the quarry, now comprising an unroofed and ruinous structure.

¹ Edinburghshire, Sheet 19

² Edinburghshire, Sheet 19



In addition to the post-medieval assets within the site boundary, there are seven recorded post-medieval heritage assets within 1km of the site. These assets are mainly agricultural in nature, with the majority of the assets comprising farmsteads or other agriculture-related buildings.

There are three estate cottages (SLR5, SLR6, SLR18), constructed as part of the Arniston Estate, located 1.1 km southwest of Turbine 2. Mauldslee Farmhouse (LB45814) is located c.1.4 km southwest of Turbine 2. A sheep house (SLR20) is located c.1.2 km northeast of Turbine 17.

Furthermore, two limeworks (SLR36, SLR37) are located to the north of the site, indicating some industrial exploitation of the surrounding landscape.

3.1.5 Undated Features or Structures

The 2023 survey found 10 undated heritage assets on the Historic Environment Record (HER) noted within the site, with the majority of these sites being agricultural in nature.

There are seven undated enclosures/sheepfolds throughout the site³, two structures that are likely agricultural in nature (SLR53, SLR54), and an area of ridge and furrow along the southeastern site boundary (SLR60).

Prior to the undertaking of the walkover survey, a search of available historic mapping, aerial photography and LiDAR data was undertaken, and areas of interest were highlighted. These assets were identified during the survey and are discussed below.

2023 Site Walkover:

Three undated heritage assets were identified during the walkover survey in May 2023.

SLR101 is a series of enclosures that were visible on both LiDAR data and in person, as a series of small turf-covered walls, located c.0.2 km southwest of Turbine 12. They cover a visible area of approximately 100m by 75m. A distinctive cross-shaped set of walls was identified both on the LiDAR and during the walkover.

SLR102 is a circular turf covered feature, with a hollowed out interior area, located c.0.13 km north of proposed Turbine 12. Whilst a singular feature was identified during the walkover, further analysis of LiDAR shows a potential three more circular features within the vicinity of SLR102.

SLR103 is a circular turf-covered feature, approximately 80m in diameter, appearing to be a mound with a distinctive ditch encircling it. There are no obvious entrances to the feature. This feature was identified on LiDAR prior to the walkover; it is not present on historic mapping. LiDAR analysis shows a smaller enclosure, c.22m in diameter, directly to the east of SLR103. This was not visible during the site visit. SLR103 is located c.0.17 km northeast of proposed Turbine 2.

Photographs of SLR101, SLR102 and SLR103 can be found in the accompanying Appendix A of the March 2025 Further Information report.

2025 Site Walkover:

An additional survey carried out in 2025 has identified a further nine undated heritage assets within the study area. A turf and stone structure (SLR104) is located in the northeastern portion of the site. The asset is recorded as a sheep shelter on the OS 25 inch (1892-1914)⁴ which suggests a post-medieval date or earlier. The structure demonstrates the extent of occupation and farming activity in the area, although how long the asset was in use is

³ SLR44, SLR49, SLR50, SLR51, SLR52, SLR62, SLR65

⁴ Sheet 24 – Peebles



unclear as later modern mapping does not label the feature (OS 1:25,000, 1945-65). An additional undated perpendicular feature has been identified (SLR105) during the most recent field survey. SLR105 is located 0.2km northwest of Turbine 14, also labelled as a sheep shelter and is visible on the 1st edition OS map. Given that there are two sheep shelters reinforces an earlier agricultural presence in the area and potential land management.

The 2025 site walkover also identified a further six areas of clearance cairns, adding to the existing cairnfields (SLR43/SLR45) outlined in the 2023 survey⁵. The cairns are distributed throughout the northeastern portion of the site and provide a strong indication for earlier and ongoing agricultural land-use in the surrounding area. The clearance cairns may date as early as the prehistoric period; however, it is difficult to accurately date the assets without further investigation. Historic mapping shows that this portion of the site had been drained when the first edition OS map was published⁶. This indicates that the land was being drained to come under use, most likely during the post-medieval period. Ongoing land management may have also included land clearance, suggesting that the clearance cairns may also be post-medieval in date.

SLR112 is a series of stones from a dug-out drainage system located in the eastern portion of the site, north of the B7007. Situated 0.1km south of Turbine 18, historic mapping from the first edition OS map, suggests post-medieval to modern draining within the site, in accordance with the topography of the land. The continued draining of the land would have altered its farming capabilities, but not to the extent to which anything other than pastoral grazing is suitable for.

Historic Mapping within the study area:

Within 1km of the study area, a further six undated heritage assets have been recorded. These comprise two enclosures (SLR55, SLR61), three areas of quarrying (SLR56, SLR57, SLR58) and a clearance cairn (SLR59). In addition to further desk-based assessments carried out in the most recent survey, an additional seven unrecorded assets have been identified within the vicinity of the site, consisting of two sheepfolds (SLR113, SLR114) and five old quarries⁷.

The cluster of smaller areas of quarrying (SLR56, SLR57, SLR58) and the sheepfold (SLR113), located to the northwest of the site, c.0.9km north of Turbine 7 are mostly likely associated agricultural assets during post-medieval agricultural developments, although the lack of mapping reference makes it difficult to establish. The quarries appear to be infilled and are no longer in-use. The sheepfold, first recorded on the OS 25-inch map of 1893⁸, is no longer in use and lies within an area of forestry.

SLR114 is an old sheepfold, which has been incorporated into the current animal pen walling system. Recorded on the OS 25-inch⁹, the sheepfold is most likely post-medieval in date. The numerous sheepfolds within the site and the vicinity of the site show a strong pastoral farming presence.

Additionally, the five old quarries identified on historic mapping and LiDAR are situated around the northeastern periphery of the site. This would support the aforementioned land management taking place within the northeastern portion of the site, suggesting the activities

⁵ SLR106, SLR107, SLR108, SLR109, SLR110, SLR111

⁶ Edinburghshire, sheet 19, 1854

⁷ SLR115, SLR116, SLR117, SLR118, SLR119

⁸ Edinburghshire XX.6, 1893

⁹ Edinburghshire XX.6, 1893



spanned beyond the site boundary into the surrounding landscape, The old quarries are listed on the 1st edition OS map of 1853. Overall, the presence of post-medieval agricultural activity within the study area is prevalent with no clear indication of earlier settlement, informing the site was primarily used for farming practices.

3.1.6 Site Walkover

As agreed upon at scoping, a targeted site walkover was undertaken for the EIA chapter on the 2nd of May 2023. The site visit aimed to visit all known heritage assets within the site, the proposed turbine locations and any potential assets highlighted through assessment of historic mapping, LiDAR data and aerial photography prior to the visit.

Access to Turbines 16, 18 and 19 and the associated fields in the freeze layout was prohibited due to lambing season. The presence of the majority of previously recorded assets were confirmed as present within the Site. However, SLR2, SLR44, and SLR51 could not be located. This does not mean that these assets were not present within the study area and likely means that vegetation height was not conducive to identifying the assets. Furthermore, at the time of the survey, SLR7, SLR21, SLR42, and SLR43 were not accessible due to livestock restrictions.

As previously stated, a further three assets were identified during the walkover (SLR101, SLR102, SLR103). Photographs of these assets are available in Appendix A of the March 2025 Further Information report. Two areas of further interest were identified on LiDAR prior to the survey. An area c.80m north of Turbine 13 can be seen on LiDAR, showing what appears to be some intersecting walls, likely enclosures of some sort. These were not able to be found during the walkover, likely due to the overgrowth of vegetation.

A further area of interest, c.0.37km north of Turbine 15 was identified on LiDAR. The asset was inaccessible due to the livestock restrictions, however, from a distance it appeared to be a series of walls forming an enclosure with a modern static caravan in the centre.

The requested survey walkover carried out in September 2025 visited all areas which were previously unattainable. No further archaeological assets were recorded within the areas attended during the May 2023 walkover and the additional nine features identified within the site, have no known historical record.

3.1.7 Historic Mapping and Historic Land Use Assessment

Assessment of the Historic Land Use Assessment (HLA) map indicates that the land within the site boundary was primarily used as an area of rough grazing and unimproved rough pasture. The entry for the rough grazing category of land use notes that areas of rough grazing were associated with pre-19th century agriculture and settlement and may contain remains dating back to the prehistoric period. The description states that '*Archaeological landscapes are most likely to survive in this type of modern land use. Nevertheless, there will be extensive areas with little sign of historic use*'.

Following feedback provided by ELCAS in June 2025, we also provide the detailed definition of rough grazing¹⁰:

Most of Scotland's hills, mountains and moorlands are used as areas of rough grazing and, in some instances, are managed for sporting activities such as stalking and grouse shooting. They may be heather moorlands or rough grasslands, and they may have been drained in

¹⁰ HLAmap, n.d. HLA Type – Rough Grazing. Available at: <https://hlapmap.org.uk/types/7/moorland-and-rough-grazing/rough-grazing>



the past. However, this land use type excludes those areas of hill ground that have recently been improved by fertilising, ploughing or direct drilling with clover or grass seed.

Rough grazing lands have evolved to their present extent as a result of woodland clearance, grazing and episodes of farming over some 6,000 years. These marginal areas bear witness to pre-19th century agriculture and settlement and contain other remains that can date back to the prehistoric period.

The land cover and activity of the site would suggest that there is an elevated potential for any archaeological features within the site to remain undisturbed. There are smaller parcels of the site which are in use as forestry plantations and the presence of a quarry to the southern part of the site. Therefore, whilst some areas of the Site are disturbed by the forestry and quarrying, the agricultural nature of the majority of the site suggests a higher level of preservation.

A review of the online historic mapping available from the National Library of Scotland was undertaken. The site is first seen in detail on the Roy Military Survey of Scotland Map from 1747-1755. There is a settlement noted within the site boundary named Recthouse. This appears to be small and agricultural in nature (e.g., a farmstead). Whilst all settlements do not directly map to any known heritage assets, due to the scale of the map, there is potential that 'Recthouse' is the farmstead of Pigsknowes (SLR33), first labelled on the 1st edition Ordnance Survey Map of 1853.

Ordnance Survey Mapping from 1853 shows the site as unenclosed rough grazing land. As previously stated, the farmsteads of Pigsknowes and Sowburnrig are shown, along with their respective enclosures.

The Ordnance Survey mapping dated 1892¹¹ shows the land as unenclosed rough grazing, with the continued presence of Pigsknowes and Sowburnrig farmsteads. The quarry in the south of the site (SLR31) is noted, and observed as disused, with the quarry workers' cottages (SLR30) already described as ruins. A set of ruins is located within the quarry itself, appearing to be a set of two conjoined roofless rectangular structures, however, their function is not detailed on the map. Additionally, the OS survey records numerous old quarries within the vicinity of the site showing the extensive quarrying taking place.

By 1905¹² Pigsknowes farmstead is no longer named however the structures are still present. Compared to the structures depicted on the 1853 mapping, Pigsknowes appears to be in some state of disrepair, with the surrounding enclosed land parcels no longer having full borders. The landscape of the site appears to still be unenclosed rough grazing.

In consideration of ELCAS' concerns for the presence of peat within the site being an indication of archaeological preservation, should there be any, historic mapping has been compared to the survey conducted for the Geology, Hydrology and Hydrogeology Input (Chapter 10 of the EIA).

3.1.8 Previous surveys

Two previous surveys were undertaken within the Study area, both in 2021.

In March and April 2021, GUARD Archaeology undertook a desk-based assessment and walkover survey along the access track and the site of Broadlaw Quarry (SLR31), which lies along the southern edge of the site boundary. The HER entry states that three heritage assets were identified within their proposal area, which was the quarry, the access track and

¹¹ Edinburghshire, Sheets XX.NE and XX.NW

¹² Ordnance Survey Edinburghshire Sheets XX.NE and XX.NW



a small structure within the quarry. They further identified a sheepfold to the north of the access track (SLR29) and an area of quarry workers housing (SLR30).

A second survey was undertaken in 2021, by Rathmell Archaeology. This was to inform a planting scheme within their study area. They identified 16 heritage assets within their study area, mostly agricultural in nature, with the presence of SLR2 being confirmed. During their walkover survey, they were unable to ascertain the presence of SLR44, and SLR51.

3.1.9 Aerial Photography and LiDAR

LiDAR data for the site was reviewed and used to inform the site walkover, as described in **Section 3.1.6**.

The online aerial imagery of NCAP and publicly available satellite photography were examined for evidence of archaeological sites. No further archaeological sites were identified.

3.1.10 Discussion of Site

There is limited evidence of prehistoric activity within the site, with a potential prehistoric (Bronze Age) burnt mound (SLR2) identified in the south of the site, a cairnfield located 0.3km northeast from T14. A Bronze Age cremation urn (SLR1) was discovered within 1 km of the site. The remains provide evidence of some level of prehistoric occupation within the vicinity of the site, albeit focussed on the Bronze Age with remains from other periods currently identified. Burnt mounds are often found separated from settlements, close to watercourses, and often, but not always, in an upland environment¹³. There is a potential for further burnt mounds to be identified in the vicinity of SLR2, on the northern slope of Torfichen Hill, however there is no recorded watercourse within the vicinity of the asset which may indicate no further assets. There is unlikely to be any evidence of settlement within the vicinity of SLR2, however, that does not completely rule out settlement activity within the Site in general.

The prevalence of the cairnfield suggests that earlier agricultural practices were taking place in the study area. Although, the overall limited evidence for further prehistoric features within the site and the surrounds may be due to a genuine lack of intensive occupation and activity throughout the majority of the site. However, it may also be the result of the loss of once extant sites due to agricultural activity throughout the site which has been documented within the historic record.

As such, there is a low potential for further unrecorded prehistoric heritage assets within the majority of the site. However, the potential for prehistoric activity may be higher around the known location of SLR2 and SLR43/SLR45.

There is no evidence of Roman activity within the site nor the 1km study area. As such, there is a very low potential for unknown Roman heritage assets within the site.

There is no evidence of medieval heritage assets within the site, nor within the 1km study area. However, there is known medieval activity within the wider landscape, including undated assets which may also date to the medieval period. Any medieval activity within the site is likely to have been agricultural in nature, due to the lack of settlement activity within the site and the evidence for ongoing draining, may be indicative of earlier pastoral farming. However, any agricultural activity after the medieval period may have removed any earlier

¹³ Biggar Archaeology Group (2013) *Burnt Mounds, Unenclosed Platform Settlements and information on burnt stone activity in the River Clyde and Tweed valleys of South Lanarkshire and Peeblesshire*. Available at: https://biggararchaeology.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Burnt-Mounds_Platform-Settlements_Lo.pdf



medieval remains. Therefore, the likelihood of further unknown medieval assets within the site is considered to be very low.

Additionally, the extensive remains of post-medieval activity within the site and 1km of the site, mainly consisting of agricultural activity supports ongoing agricultural practices in the area. This activity was likely split between the two named farmsteads that are visible on historic mapping within the site, Pigsknowes and Sowburnrig. However, there is the potential for earlier post-medieval activity within the site that is unrecorded within the historic mapping, due to the continuous agricultural nature of the area from an early time. Furthermore, even though extensive draining of the Site has been undertaken, most likely from the medieval or post-medieval period, the drainage ditches have ensured that the land is grazeable for livestock. The conditions of the site suggest that areas to the southwest may have better preservation and have been less altered by modern farming techniques or activity. This would suggest that archaeological features may be present in areas of disturbed land. While these assets would most likely be associated with medieval or post-medieval farming practices, it would expand the extent to which settlers occupied the surrounding land to other key assets within the landscape, including Chaple Moor to the southwest. It is also noted from Figure 10.1.6 of the EIA the lack of peat in the surrounding site. Deep peat, classified as peat over 2m is limited to the northwest of the site, as such is it is unlikely to preserve any unknown heritage.

Whilst the assets from the post-medieval period are relatively well recorded, due to the prevalence of historic mapping and their presence on available LiDAR, the identification of unrecorded heritage assets, likely of post-medieval date during the 2021 Rathmell Archaeology Walkover and both the 2023 and 2025 walkover, provide a moderate potential for unrecorded post-medieval assets within the site boundary. Any unrecorded or unknown post-medieval heritage assets within the site are likely to be agricultural in nature, potential field boundaries, enclosures, cairns, or other associated features.

3.1.10.1 Baseline Conclusions

The amendments to the baseline are in relation to the comments provided by ELCAS on 25/06/25. Key concerns expressed by ELCAS related to the baseline which they felt had been underassessed, specifically in relation to the prehistoric and medieval periods. To expand on the potential for archaeological remains dating to these periods, the following reassessment of the assets within and surrounding the site has been considered. As well as the historic land use assessment which explores the importance of peat prevalence within the site, and how this may broaden our understanding for the sites historic land use, and historic preservation.

In addition to the desk-based assessments carried out, this baseline is supported by the data collected during two walkover surveys, ensuring that the site has been thoroughly surveyed. An updated gazetteer (**Appendix A**) and Figure (**Figure 7.1**) has been appended to this report to support the conclusions.



4.0 Assessment of Potential Impacts and Proposed Mitigation

The assessment of impacts below has been considered for two circumstances, the original layout submitted with the EIA and an alternative layout, comprising the removal of T1, T2, and T3 as well as related infrastructure, as suggested by HES.

4.1 Construction Effects

4.1.1 Construction Impacts

Original Layout

The following potential construction impacts have been based on the reassessed archaeological baseline and the maximum likely impact that would be caused by the proposed development.

Direct impacts would derive from any groundworks or other ground disturbance undertaken as part of the construction phase of the Proposed Development. Specific activities which have the potential to cause impacts in this way include:

- excavation of turbine bases, substation foundations, crane hard standings, borrow pits and cable trenches; and
- construction and upgrading of access tracks, working compounds and laydown areas.

Where significant ground disturbance takes place, these activities would remove or change any heritage assets located within the area of ground disturbance. This damage would be irreversible and permanent.

With reference to Figure 7.1a, appended to this report, the Proposed Development has the potential for a direct impact on the following known assets recorded within the site:

- SLR2 – Burnt Mound, located 20m southeast of T6;
- SLR35 – Sheepfold, located adjacent to track leading to proposed T1;
- SLR42 – Enclosure, located within potential borrow pit location at the east end of the site;
- SLR104 – Turf and stone bank, located to the south of the borrow pit location at the east end of the site;
- SLR110 – Clearance cairn, located within the proposed temporary construction compound; and
- SLR112 – Drainage channel, located south of T18.

With regards to SLR2 and SLR110, their potential dating to the prehistoric period identifies them as being of medium cultural significance (with reference to Table 7.2 of the EIA Report). The removal of SLR110, as part of the construction of the temporary construction compound, would result in a **high adverse** magnitude of impact and a **moderate** significance of effect. However, due to the undetermined date of the asset, professional judgement has been applied and this would be considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

As SLR2 is not within any areas of infrastructure, the only potential impact results from accidental damage. This would be considered to have a **low adverse** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **very minor** significance of effect. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.



SLR35, SLR42, SLR104, and SLR112 are considered to be of low cultural significance (with reference to Table 7.2 of the EIA report).

The removal of SLR42 and SLR104 during the construction process would have a high adverse magnitude of impact on these assets, and as such, the significance of effect would be **minor**. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.

As SLR35 and SLR112 are not within any areas of infrastructure, the only potential impact results from accidental damage. This would be considered to have a **low adverse** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **very minor** significance of effect. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Furthermore, there is the potential for direct impacts on unrecorded heritage assets, particularly assets of a prehistoric date in the area surrounding SLR2 and SLR43/SLR45. The potential cultural heritage significance of unrecorded assets would be medium, due to their potential prehistoric date. As such, their removal would indicate a **high adverse** magnitude of impact, which would result in a **moderate** significance of effect. Due to the unknown nature or number of the unrecorded remains and based on the above assessment, professional judgement has been applied and this would be considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Alternative Layout – Removal of T1, T2, and T3

With reference to **Figure 7.1b**, the construction impacts resulting from the alternative layout would remain largely the same as the original layout.

The potential for impact to SLR35 would be removed, as there would no longer be an adjacent track.

4.1.2 Proposed Mitigation

With reference to the comments provided by ELCAS on 25th June 2025, an updated scope of mitigation has been prepared. Mitigation has been considered with reference to both the original layout and the alternative layout.

Adverse direct impacts on archaeological remains would be offset to some degree by the positive effect that archaeological recording would have in respect to our understanding of the archaeological record, which will be of wider benefit to the archaeological and local community. Whilst the proposed mitigation would be a benefit of the Proposed Development, it would not offset the impact caused by the removal of assets due to proposed construction works. As such, after the implementation of the proposed mitigation, the residual effect upon the impacted assets would remain the same (outlined in **Table 2** and **Table 3** of this report).

The works outlined below will ensure that the any impacts are mitigated in line with guidance from ClfA, ALGAO and HES under the Historic Environment Policy for Scotland.

Original Layout

With respect to the Original Layout, the following mitigation is proposed:

- SLR2 – Fencing off and avoidance to prevent accidental damage;
- SLR35 – Fencing off and avoidance to prevent accidental damage;
- SLR42 – Archaeological Watching Brief;
- SLR104 – Archaeological Watching Brief on extent of asset within the borrow pit and fencing off of any part of the asset outside of the borrow pit in order to prevent accidental damage;
- SLR110 – Watching brief on Temporary Construction Compound;
- SLR112 – Fencing off and avoidance to prevent accidental damage; and



- Turbine 6 – Watching Brief due to proximity to SLR2.

Furthermore, a working protocol will be implemented with the construction team to facilitate the reporting of unrecorded archaeological features and their subsequent recording.

The precise scope of the programme of mitigation should be agreed with the East Lothian Council Archaeology Officer (on behalf of Midlothian Council), in the form of a planning condition. The agreed mitigation programme would be documented in an agreed Written Scheme of Investigation.

Alternative Layout – Removal of T1, T2, and T3

With reference to **Figure 7.1b**, the proposed mitigation resulting from the alternative layout would remain largely the same as the original layout. There would no longer be the need for the mitigation proposed for SLR35, as the asset would no longer be located adjacent to any infrastructure.

4.2 Operational Effects

4.2.1 Original Layout

The operational impacts associated with the original submitted layout are considered to be the same as those outlined within the EIA report and the Further Information report submitted in March 2025.

4.2.2 Alternative Layout – Removal of T1, T2, and T3

Development Effects have been reassessed to establish the level of impact the removal of T1, T2, and T3 would have on the assets assessed within the EIA report. To ensure consistency, the methodology used is the methodology outlined within Chapter 7 of the EIA report.

Moorfoot Chapel, monastic grange and chapel (SM5976)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report assessed the potential impacts upon the Moorfoot Chapel had a magnitude of impact resulting in very minor significance of effect upon the asset.

This was due to the Proposed Development being located to the east of the grange, presenting a minor distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset's localised agricultural setting, and its connection to the river. Given the River South Esk would have been used as a key approach for the Chapel, the peripheral distraction would affect our ability to understand and experience the asset upon this approach also.

As such, the alternative layout, removing T1, T2 and T3, which were previously prominent turbines in the proposals, would improve aspects of this peripheral distraction. It is not considered that the reduction of this impact upon the assets setting are such that the magnitude of impact would fall below very low adverse still. The resulting significance of effect would therefore be **very minor**, which will remain the same as the submitted 2023 Application Layout. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Loquhariot, fort 500m SW of (SM6260)

An assessment presented in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report determined that the potential impacts on Loquhariot Fort would result in a very minor significance of effect on the asset. The fort's primary contributors to its significance includes being its proximity and prominence overlooking Gore Water and Tyne Water, as well as its proximity to several other forts in the surrounding landscape. In this regard, the proposed turbine development was anticipated to be visible in views from the asset to the southeast across Gore Water. However, further assessment of the forts setting (within the March 2025 Further Information) assessed that



the slopes on the southern side of the Gore Water valley acts as a visual barrier in views south from the asset, therefore the long-distance views in this direction do not form part of the fort's setting. Moreover, no intervisibility has been established with the several forts and defensive settlements to the south of the asset.

Regarding the wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (**EIA Figure 7.11a-c**), the optional changes to the turbine layout will cause no change to the potential effects concluded in Chapter 7.6 of the Submitted EIA Report. This is due to the proposed changes not being discernible within these views to the southwest of the asset, as T1, T2, and T3 are the furthest turbines from the asset.

Therefore, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to remain as **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect is **very minor**. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Jeffries Corse Cairn (SM3527)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report assessed the potential impacts upon the Jeffries Corse Cairn, resulting in a moderate significance of effect, primarily due to the impacts on the asset's relationship with Dundreich Cairn (SM2777) and views across the valley containing the River South Esk. Whilst considered significant in EIA terms, these effects were considered compliant with NPF4 Policy 7h, as the impacts were not considered to adversely affect the integrity of the asset's setting.

The cairn's elevated position in the landscape provides clear views towards the northwest, where multiple prehistoric burial cairns are located on the Pentland Hills. Jeffries Corse Cairn is also located at the head of the valley with the River South Esk Flood Plain and Valley visible to the north and northeast. The proposed turbine development was anticipated to be visible in views to and from the asset, with the reciprocal views from the River South Esk flood plain and Dundreich Cairn (SM2777), and most significantly, in the central view across the mouth of the valley.

The alternative layout would remove the closest distracting turbine row, T1, T2, and T3. T3 is also offset to the north of the front row, demonstrating that its removal will offer a clearer visual channel through the valley to the northeast of the Cairn.

These changes would improve some peripheral and imposing views outlined in the submitted 2023 EIA report, primarily in views towards the River North Esk flood plain and the entrance to the valley that contains the source of the River North Esk. However, the proposed development would still draw the eye away from the flood plain and the mouth of the valley, creating a distraction from the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the asset's connection to this aspect of its setting.

Furthermore, the views from Dundreich Cairn towards Jeffries Corse Cairn would remain impacted to the same degree, as the turbines positioned behind the crest of the hill would draw the eye away from cairn and erode our ability to understand, appreciate and experience the connection between the two assets.

As such, the magnitude of impact would remain **medium adverse**, with the significance of effect remaining **moderate**. This would be considered **significant** in EIA terms, however, these impacts would be considered compliant with NPF4 Policy 7h as they would not adversely impact the integrity of the asset's setting due to all other aspects of the asset's setting remaining intact.

Dundreich Cairn (SM2777)

The potential impacts for Dundreich Cairn assessed in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA, identified a **moderate** significance of effect upon the asset. This was primarily due to the impacts on the asset's relationship with Jeffries Corse Cairn (SM3527). Whilst considered significant in EIA



terms, these effects were considered compliant with NPF4 Policy 7h, as the impacts were not considered to adversely affect the integrity of the asset's setting.

In relation to the wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.5a-c), the removal of T1, T2, and T3 would not change the level of impact of the proposed development on the key views between the asset and Jeffries Coarse Cairn. The proposed development would still feature heavily in views to the northeast, drawing the eye away from SM3527 and still erode the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the relationship between the two assets.

As such, **a medium adverse** magnitude of impact would remain, resulting in an overall **Moderate** significance of effect. As outlined within the EIA Chapter, this would be considered **significant** in EIA terms. However, as the other aspects of the asset's setting would be retained, this would not adversely impact the integrity of the asset's setting. As such, the impacts would be compliant with NPF4 Policy 7h.

Falla Luggie Tower (SM5653)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA reports assessed the potential impacts upon the Falla Luggie Tower had a magnitude of impact resulting in a negligible significance of effect upon the asset's setting. The changes to the turbine layout are not discernible within these views, and the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter remain the same in the alternative layout. As such the magnitude of impact is anticipated to remain **neutral** and the significance effect is **negligible**. This is **not significant** in EIA terms.

Hirendean Castle (SM5608)

The assessed potential impacts for Hirendean Castle in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA discerns an impact resulting in minor significance of effect upon the asset. This was due to the proposed development being located northeast of the castle, with the potential to cause peripheral distractions in views towards Moorfoot Chapel (SM5976) and the River South Esk. Currently, such peripheral views are screened by the commercial forestry to the east of the Castle, however, due to the life cycle of commercial forestry this has the potential to be removed.

Should the commercial forestry be removed, the alternative turbine layout would reduce these distractions in views to the northeast, as well as when approaching the asset along the valley from the north; removing T1, the closest turbine, T2, the most central and visually intrusive turbine, and T3, which is offset to the north, would improve imposing peripheral views should the commercial forestry screening the development be removed. Therefore, the alternative layout would improve the impacts outlined in the submitted 2023 Chapter.

However, given that the remainder of the development would be present, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to remain low and adverse, and as such, the significance of the effect is **minor**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Corsehope Rings (SM1166)

The very minor significance of effect attributed to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of Corsehope Rings were afforded based on the potential impact assessments outlined in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA.

This was in relation to the anticipation that the proposed turbine development will be visible in views to the north and northwest. Concerns regarding long-distance views to the south of the asset are highlighted by Midlothian Council. However, the southern views do not appear to be significant in terms of their contribution to the asset's setting. Instead, the Heriot Watercourse running from the northwest to the northeast and the Corsehope Burn flowing in



the valley to the east of the asset appear to be key visual points of control. These key views are more localised, rather than outwith the valley to the northwest where the proposed development is located. Additionally, the view from the asset towards Halltree Rings (SM1170), also a hill fort, to the east are a key long-distance view. The introduction of 11 turbine tips into the approach and view from Halltree towards Corsehope will only cause a minor distraction to the ability to understand, appreciate and experience their relationship.

Regarding the wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.13a-e), the changes to the turbine layout, excluding T1, T2, and T3, will remove the tips of the turbines from the northeastern viewshed. The change would be minimal, taking away T1 will reduce peripheral distraction but not completely address the potential effects concluded in Chapter 7.6 of the Submitted EIA Report. Overall, the changes to the turbine layout would minorly reduce distraction in views to the north of the asset, although not significantly enough to change the degree of impact outlined in the submitted 2023 EIA report. As such, following the proposed development changes, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect is **very minor**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Halltree Rings (SM1170)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA reports assessed the potential impacts upon the Halltree Rings had the potential impact resulting in minor significance of effect upon the asset. This was due to the proposed turbine development disrupting peripheral views to the northwest of the asset, particularly in reciprocal views between the asset and Corsehope Rings (SM1166).

In relation to the wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.12a-b). The changes to the turbine layout are not discernible within these views, and the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter remain the same with the 2025 SEI layout. As such, the magnitude of impact is anticipated be **very low adverse** and consequently, the significance of effect is **very minor**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Soutra Aisle (SM3067, SM7573)

The assessed potential impacts for Soutra Aisle in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA discerns an impact resulting in very low adverse significance of effect upon the asset. In response to the proposed turbine layout which discerns no impact on the crucial approach leading to the medieval asset is from the south. While views of the turbines are visible to the southwest from Soutra Aisle, the turbines are not placed within views that contribute to the significance of the asset. Given the closest turbine is T18, and that the Proposed Development is to the southwest, suggests that the removal of T1, T2, and T3 would be of negligible effect on mitigating any adverse impacts. Therefore, the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter remain the same with the alternative layout, with the magnitude of impact anticipated to be **very low adverse** and as such, the significance of effect is **very minor**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Gladhouse Villa (LB14633) and Gladhouse Reservoir Including Dam, Weirs, Revetments, Gangway, Measuring House, Tweedaleburn Aqueduct and Bridges over Tributaries (LB45811)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report concluded that the proposed development would cause negligible significance of effect upon Gladhouse Villa and Gladhouse Reservoir. A visualisation from the northern end of the reservoir (Figure 6.45) was produced for Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the EIA report,



The magnitude of impact was identified due to potential distractions in peripheral views when looking from villa towards the reservoir to its east.

Modifications to the turbine layout would not significantly reduce the potential for distraction nor would it improve the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the assets and their significance. Removing the closest turbine (T3) and additionally imposing Turbines 1 and Turbine 2 would lessen the encroachment of the development from these peripheral views, however, the rest of the development would still be present. Whilst the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter would be improved, the overall significance of effect would remain the same in the alternative layout. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect is **negligible**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Mauldslie Farmhouse and Steading (LB45814)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report and Section 6.2 of the March 2025 Further Information report assessed the potential impacts upon the Mauldslie Farmhouse and Steading. The report determined that the proposed development would have a negligible significance of effect upon the asset. This is because the entirety of the proposed turbine development would be visible to the northeast from the farmhouse and steading. The visualisations produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.7a-c) demonstrate that the removal of T1, T2, and T3 will reduce the distance between the farmhouse and the proposed development. Given that the views are not integral to the significance of the asset, as outlined in Section 1.6.121 of March 2025 Further Information report, would indicate no discernible difference to the conclusions made in the submitted 2023 Chapter. Therefore, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to remain as **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect being **negligible**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Middleton Hall, including gatepiers, gates, Ha-ha and boundary walls (LB806)

The potential impacts assessed in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA for Middleton Hall, found that the proposed development would have a very minor impact upon the asset. This was due to the proposed layout of the turbines appearing within views when approaching the asset from the western driveway, views across the formal garden to the east, and peripheral views to the southwest. The alternative layout changes proposed will be of little improvement to the impacts, given that this row of turbines are the most offset from the asset. As such, the impacts outlined in the submitted 2023 Chapter will remain the same; the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **very low adverse**, and as such, the significance of effect as **very minor**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area (CA343)

The EIA assessment of Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area in Chapter 7.6, and the updated assessment in Section 3.2 of the March 2025 Further Information report, concludes the proposed development will be of negligible impact upon the assets. This is in response to the Proposed Development being located c.2km southwest of the Conservation Area, with the closest proposed turbines being Turbine 16 and Turbine 17 both located c.3km southwest turbine layout where three tips visible from Borthwick Castle. In relation the wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.8a-c). and the 2025 Alternative Layout (**Figure 3 and Figure 4**), the changes to the turbine layout will be minimal, where the tips of T3 are slightly offset from the turbine cluster in the northeastern viewshed. Removal of T1 and T2 would reduce the visible tips, alleviating some of the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter. Although these alterations are not



sufficient to reduce the overall significance of impact for the asset and some negligible impacts may still be prevalent. The effect is negligible given that the anticipated effect is not to impact upon any major views within the Conservation Area and the ability to appreciate its architectural, medieval and rural character as well as retaining the setting of key buildings.

As such, the magnitude of impact is anticipated to remain **very low adverse**, and consequently, the significance of effect is **negligible**.

Crichton Castle (SM13585)

The March 2025 Further Information report assessed the potential significance of effect upon Crichton Castle (SM13585) to be **minor**. The proposed development is anticipated to have minor significance of effect upon the assets setting. This is due to the entirety of the proposed turbine tips being visible to the south and southwest of the asset. Analysis of the castle's placement identified a strategic use of the landscape, with its position on the western ridge offering protection from eastern approaches. The structure was also oriented to oversee the valley from north to south, suggesting a deliberate effort to monitor and control movement through the area.

In regard to wirelines produced for the 2023 Application Layout (EIA Figure 7.8a-c), the visuals to the south and southwest will remain impacted to the same degree with the removal of T1, T2, and T3. This is due to the closest turbine being Turbine 16, and with T1-T3 being placed in the very distance of the viewshed. As such, the impacts outlined in the March 2025 Further Information report, stating the magnitude of impact is anticipated to be **low adverse** and as such the significance of effect is **Minor**, will remain the same in the alternative turbine layout. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Temple and Arniston Conservation Area (CA342) (Figure 7.2)

Chapter 7.6 of the EIA reports assessed the potential impacts upon the Temple and Arniston Conservation Area had a neutral magnitude of impact resulting in nil significance of effect. The proposed turbine development was anticipated to be present in peripheral views to the southeast of the asset; although long distance views, which would include the proposed development, do not contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area. Therefore, the impacts outlined within the submitted 2023 Chapter remain the same with the 2025 alternative layout, with the magnitude of impact anticipated to be **neutral** and as such, the significance of effect as **nil**. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designated Landscape (GDL00029)

As outlined in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report and the March 2025 Further Information report, the Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designated Landscape was assessed to have a minor significance of effect resulting from the impact of the 2023 Application Layout, considering the impact on key approaches and views from both the house and its surrounding designed landscape.

Following HES' response to the submitted EIA 2023 Chapter, and subsequent consultation outlined in Table 1 of this report, their recommendation was to remove Turbines 1 and 3 so as to reduce impact on the setting of the Category A-Listed Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston Inventory Garden and Designated Landscape (GDL00029). The removal of T1, T2, and T3 was proposed to prevent distraction from the views along the axis from the south-facing principal rooms and from outside the house in the garden grounds. This would ensure that the proposed development would not encroach on the sense of enclosure or privacy afforded by the rural farmland and would not introduce any modern elements into this otherwise unmodernised view.



As such, removing the three turbines (T1, T2, and T3) will remove the impact of the proposed development of the views along the important visual axis. In relation to the visualisations produced for the March 2025 Further Information report (Figures 1-3) and the updated wirelines for 2025 Alternative Layout (**Figure 1** of this report), the deletion of these turbines would remove the impacts outlined in the submitted 2023 Chapter and in response to HES' concerns. As such the magnitude of impact would be mitigated, as the turbines would no longer be present within this key axial view.

Whilst for the majority of the year, there would be no anticipated visibility of the remaining turbines, at instances where there is less foliage there is the potential for the turbines to be present in very minor peripheral views to the east of the axial view. These turbines have the potential to cause a very slight distraction to the ability to appreciate the axial view; however, the ability to understand and experience the axial view will remain unimpacted.

As such, the revised assessment for the impact on Arniston Inventoried Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029) concludes a **very low adverse** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **very minor** significant of effect. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

Arniston House (LB808)

As outlined in Chapter 7.6 of the EIA report and the March 2025 Further Information report, the Arniston House Listed Building was assessed to have a minor significance of effect resulting from the impact of the 2023 Application Layout, due to impacts to the south facing axial view.

Following HES' response to the submitted EIA 2023 Chapter, and subsequent consultation outlined in Table 1 of this report, their recommendation was to remove Turbines 1 and 3 so as to reduce impact on the setting of the Category A Listed Arniston House (LB808). The removal of T1, T2, and T3 was proposed to prevent distraction from the views along the axis from the south-facing principal rooms and from outside the house in the garden grounds. This would ensure that the proposed development would not encroach on the sense of enclosure or privacy afforded by the rural farmland and would not introduce any modern elements into this otherwise unmodernised view.

As such, removing the three turbines (T1, T2, and T3) will reduce the impact of the proposed development on the views along the important visual axis. In relation to the visualisations produced for the March 2025 Further Information report (Figures 1-3) and the updated wirelines for 2025 Alternative Layout (**Figure 1** of this report), the deletion of these turbines would remove the impacts outlined in the submitted 2023 Chapter and in response to HES' concerns. As such the magnitude of impact would be mitigated, as the turbines would no longer be present within this key axial view.

Whilst for the majority of the year, there would be no anticipated visibility of the remaining turbines, at instances where there is less foliage there is the potential for very minor peripheral views of the remaining turbines to the east of the axial view. These turbines have the potential to cause a very slight distraction to the ability to appreciate the axial view, however the ability to understand and experience the axial view will remain unimpacted.

As such, the revised assessment for the impact on Arniston House (LB808) concludes a **very low adverse** magnitude of impact, resulting in a **very minor** significant of effect. This is considered **not significant** in EIA terms.

4.2.3 Cumulative Impacts

The EIA report outlined the potential for cumulative impacts on Jeffries Corse Cairn (SM3527) and Dundreich Cairn (SM2777) (Section 7.9).



The removal of T1, T2, and T3 would not change the cumulative effect predicted upon the assets and as such the impacts outlined within the EIA report are unchanged.



5.0 Residual Effects

Table 2 and Table 3 present the residual effects for each identified impacts outlined within this report, after mitigation has been carried out. Table 2 outlines the residual effects if the layout of the proposed development remains that proposed in the 2023 EIA. Table 3 outlines the residual impacts if the proposed alternative layout is used as mitigation.

Table 2: Residual Effects based on the Original 2023 EIA Layout

Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (18 turbine layout)
Burnt Mound (SLR2)	Construction	Very Minor	Fenced Off	Planning Condition	Very Minor
Sheep Fold (SLR35)	Construction	Very Minor	Fenced off	Planning Condition	Very Minor
Enclosure (SLR42)	Construction	Minor	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Minor
Turf and Stone Boundary (SLR104)	Construction	Minor	Watching Brief and partial fencing off	Planning Condition	Minor
Clearance Cairn (SLR110)	Construction	Moderate	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Moderate
Stones in a Drainage Channel (SLR112)	Construction	Very Minor	Fenced Off	Planning Condition	Very Minor
Potential unrecorded remains in the vicinity of T6	Construction	Moderate	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Moderate
Moorfoot Chapel, Monastic Grange And Chapel (SM5976)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Loquhariot, Fort 500m SW of (SM6260)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Jeffries Corse, Cairn SM3527	Setting	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Moderate
Dundreich, cairn (SM2777)	Setting	Moderate	N/A	N/A	Moderate



Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (18 turbine layout)
Falla Luggie Tower, towerhouse (SM5653)	Setting	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Hirendean Castle (SM5608)	Setting	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
Corsehope Rings, fort (SM1166)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Halltree Rings, settlement, Chapel Hill (SM1170)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Soutra Aisle, burial aisle and part of site of medieval hospital (SM3067, SM7573)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Gladhouse Villa (LB14633) And Gladhouse Reservoir Including Dam, Weirs, Revetments, Gangway, Measuring House, Tweeddaleburn Aqueduct And Bridges Over Tributaries (LB45811)	Setting	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Mauldslie Farmhouse And Steading (LB45814)	Setting	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible
Middleton Hall, Including Gatepiers, Gates, Ha-Ha And Boundary Walls (Lb806)	Setting	Very Minor	N/A	N/A	Very Minor
Borthwick and Crichton	Setting	Negligible	N/A	N/A	Negligible



Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (18 turbine layout)
Conservation Area (CA343)					
Crichton Castle (SM13585)	Setting	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
Temple and Arniston Conservation Area (CA342)	Setting	Nil	N/A	N/A	Nil
Arniston Inventoried Garden And Designated Landscape (GDL00029)	Setting	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor
Arniston House (LB808)	Setting	Minor	N/A	N/A	Minor

Table 3: Residual Effects based on the Alternative Layout (Removal of T1, T2, and T3)

Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (15 turbine layout)
Burnt Mound (SLR2)	Construction	Very Minor	Fenced Off	Planning Condition	Very Minor
Sheep Fold (SLR35)	Construction	Very Minor	Removal of Infrastructure related to T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Nil
Enclosure (SLR42)	Construction	Minor	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Minor
Turf and Stone Boundary (SLR104)	Construction	Minor	Watching Brief and partial fencing off	Planning Condition	Minor
Clearance Cairn (SLR110)	Construction	Moderate	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Moderate
Stones in a Drainage Channel (SLR112)	Construction	Very Minor	Fenced Off	Planning Condition	Very Minor



Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (15 turbine layout)
Potential unrecorded remains in the vicinity of T6	Construction	Moderate	Watching Brief	Planning Condition	Moderate
Moorfoot Chapel, Monastic Grange And Chapel (SM5976)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Loquhariot, Fort 500m SW of (SM6260)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Jeffries Corse, Cairn SM3527	Setting	Moderate	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Moderate
Dundreich, cairn (SM2777)	Setting	Moderate	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Moderate
Falla Luggie Tower, towerhouse (SM5653)	Setting	Negligible	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Negligible
Hirendean Castle (SM5608)	Setting	Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Minor
Corsehope Rings, fort (SM1166)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Halltree Rings, settlement, Chapel Hill (SM1170)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Soutra Aisle, burial aisle and part of site of medieval hospital (SM3067, SM7573)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Gladhouse Villa (LB14633) And Gladhouse Reservoir Including Dam, Weirs, Revetments, Gangway,	Setting	Negligible	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Negligible



Asset	Type of Impact	Significance of Effect (18 turbine layout)	Mitigation	Means of Implementation	Residual Effect (15 turbine layout)
Measuring House, Tweeddaleburn Aqueduct And Bridges Over Tributaries (LB45811)					
Mauldslie Farmhouse And Steading (LB45814)	Setting	Negligible	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Negligible
Middleton Hall, Including Gatepiers, Gates, Ha-Ha And Boundary Walls (Lb806)	Setting	Very Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Borthwick and Crichton Conservation Area (CA343)	Setting	Negligible	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Negligible
Crichton Castle (SM13585)	Setting	Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Minor
Temple and Arniston Conservation Area (CA342)	Setting	Nil	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Nil
Arniston Inventoried Garden And Designated Landscape (GDL00029)	Setting	Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor
Arniston House (LB808)	Setting	Minor	Removal of T1, T2, and T3	Design Change	Very Minor



6.0 Conclusion

This Further Environmental Information report supplements the information provided in Chapter 7 of the 2023 EIA report and the March 2025 Further Information report. It has been produced to set out clarifications and updates in response to comments by Historic Environment Scotland and East Lothian Council Archaeology Service (ELCAS) on behalf of Midlothian Council.

The report has provided an updated baseline assessment, with the results of a blanket walkover survey undertaken in August 2025, in order to aid in a more accurate appraisal of the archaeological potential of the site and update the potential for direct impacts on heritage assets. An updated site gazetteer is appended to this report (**Appendix A**). In relation to Policy ENV24 and Policy ENV25, of Midlothian Council's Local Development Plan (2017), the mitigation measures proposed within this report ensure that the proposal has been sited and designed to minimise damage to known heritage assets. The updated FEI has also readdressed concerns in relation to where potential archaeological remains exist and have ensured their preservation in situ and avoidance as much as possible. Where assets may be adversely affected, suitable mitigation measures are in place to ensure their appropriate recording.

Additionally, the report has considered the change in potential impacts on assets resulting from the suggested removal of T1, T2 and T3. It concludes that the impact on the setting of the majority of assets would remain the same, whilst the reduction of impacts on Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029) would result in a very minor significance of effect upon the asset's setting. These impacts would be considered **not significant** in EIA Terms.





Appendix A Updated Gazetteer

Torfichen Wind Farm

Further Environmental Information 2

Renewable Energy Systems Ltd

SLR Project No.: 405.P64791.00001

29 October 2025

SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR1	Canmore ID 53284 MEL8256	333340	655749	Findspot; Cremation	Non-designated	Outerston Hill	This asset consists of a Bronze Age Collard Urn, discovered in 1938. The eroded face of an old gravel put on the crest of a ridge 200m northwest of the Shepherd's house on Outerston Hill. Urban placed upright on the paced floor of a small pit. The urn contained the cremated remains of an adult alongside a burnt flint flake and bone artefact (EQ 499-50). The pit the urn was in was filled with burnt material, including bone fragments, and sherds of a bipartite vessel c.178mm high which is cordoned and bears horizontal zones of decoration.	Prehistoric
SLR2	Canmore ID 53321 MEL8262	333469	653519	Mound; Burnt Mound?	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	This circular and turf-covered mound is comprised between two small drainage ditches at the foot of the northwest-facing slopes of Torfichen Hill. Composed of small stones set on a matrix of black earth, measuring 8.5m by 7.8m and 0.7m maximum in height.	Prehistoric



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							Potential burnt mound but not visible on modern or historic mapping.	
SLR43	Canmore ID 53272 MEL8245	334700	655699	Clearance Cairn; Cairnfield	Non-designated	Sowburn Rig	This asset is situated near the headwaters of Middleton South Burn 370m SW of Sowburnrig (centre of Cairnfield), 285m OD, on level ground to the NW of the Moorfoot Hills. The area comprises of unimproved peat, with an average depth of 2m, covers a cairnfield consisting of 50 cairns about 160m NS by 70m EW. The cairns average between 2m and 4m in diameter and generally less than 0.5m high.	Prehistoric
SLR45	MEL8245	334700	655699	Clearance Cairn; Cairnfield	Non-designated	Sowburn Rig	This asset is part of the above cairnfield (SLR43).	Prehistoric
SLR5	Canmore ID 234634 MEL6263	331017	653080	Estate Cottage	Non-designated	Temple, Mauldslie Hill Cottages	These 19th century assets comprise two pairs of single storeys, six bay, rectangular plan cottages with later modifications.	Post-medieval
SLR6	Canmore ID 234634 MEL6264	331003	653066	Estate Cottage	Non-designated	Mauldslie West Cottages	This asset forms part of the previously described labourer's cottage (SLR5).	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR7	MEL12333	334978	655847	Sheep House	Non-designated	Sowburnrig	This asset comprises the remains of a sheep house, dating to the early 19th century/ possible earlier. The square sheep house is shown of the 1st edition OS map.	Post-medieval
SLR8	MEL12439	331747	653522	Sheep House	Non-designated	Blackburn	This asset comprises the remains of a sheep house, dating to the early 19th century/ possible earlier. The square sheep house is shown of the 1st edition OS map.	Post-medieval
SLR14	LB45814 Canmore ID MEL6245	330823	653016	Farmhouse; Farmstead	Category B Listed Building	Mauldslie Farmhouse And Steading	<p>This asset comprises the remains of farmhouse dating to 1836, 2 story, 3 bay, rectangular plan with additions and modifications. Coursed, tooled sandstone to the south elevation, tooled rubble to the remainder with broached dressings, projecting cills; long and short quoins.</p> <p>Predominantly 12 pane timber lying pane sash and case windows to ground floor and 10 pane lying pane sash and case window to 1st floor. Grey</p>	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							<p>slate roof with lead ridge; stone skews. Tooled, coped gablehead stacks with circular cans. Cast iron rainwater goods.</p> <p>The steading to the north of the farmhouse dates to early 19th century; U plan; random rubble with droved dressings. Consist of a single storey and attic, 2 bay bothy to the southeast of the steading and a grey slate roof with lead ridges.</p>	
SLR18	Canmore ID 234634 MEL6264	331003	653066	Estate Cottage	Non-designated	Mauldslie West Cottages	This asset forms part of the previously described labourer's cottage (SLR5) and is located at the same grid reference as SLR6.	Post-medieval
SLR20	MEL12329	336382	656457	Sheep House	Non-designated	Middleton Hill	This asset comprises the remains of a sheep house, dating to the early 19th century/ possible earlier. The square sheep house is shown of the 1st edition OS map.	Post-medieval
SLR21	MEL12332	334871	656105	House; Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Sowburnrig	This asset comprises the remains of a sheep house, dating to the early 19th century/ possible earlier. The square sheep house is	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							shown of the 1st edition OS map.	
SLR28	Canmore ID 53323 MEL8264	333683	653848	Sheep Fold; Circular Enclosure	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	<p>This asset consists of a series of small ring enclosures, possibly sheepfolds.</p> <p>One enclosure measures at 14m by 15m within an earthen bank which is approximately 3.5m broad and 0.3m high. No entrance was discernible.</p> <p>Another enclosure also 14m by 15m within and earthen back of 3.5m broad and 0.4m high, this enclosure does have a potential in WNW.</p> <p>A possible enclosure c.7m diameter in centre is barely visible.</p> <p>The final visible enclosure is oval in shape, measuring at c.11m by 10m within an earthen bank c.3m broad and 0.3m high. There is a possible entrance in the NW.</p>	Post-medieval
SLR29	Canmore ID 53324	334750	654506	Sheep Fold; Enclosure	Non-designated	Broad Law	This asset consists of cropmarks for an oval enclosure, measuring at 14m by 15.5m within a bank	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
	MEL8265						of earth and some stone which is 3.5m broad and 0.6m high. The entrance is possibly to the south of the potential sheepfold.	
SLR30	Canmore ID 73339 MEL8657	334813	654277	Workers Cottage; Quarry	Non-designated	Broad Law	These assets consist of quarry worker cottages from the 19th century. The terraced cottages are situated on the NW-facing slope of Broad Law, 400, NE of the disused quarry. The cottages are in a ruinous state, comprising of four compartments with doorway entrances from the north./ Evidence of fireplaces remain and both the quarry and the cottages post-date the 1st edition of the OS 6-inch map (Edinburghshire Sheet 19, surveyed 1853, published 1854), but pre-date the 2nd edition (Edinburghshire Sheet XX.NE, published 1895, revised 1892), by which time both quarry and cottages had already been abandoned.	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR31	MEL12461	334644	654179	Quarry; Trackway	Non-designated	Broadlaw Quarry, Temple	<p>The asset consists of a 19th century to modern quarry and associated features including a trackway. The quarry is not shown on the Ordnance Survey 1st Edition map of 1864 but is depicted and marked as 'disused' on the 2nd Edition map of 1895.</p> <p>Additionally, a small double-compartment building is recorded with the quarry in 1895, associated with the quarry's operations.</p> <p>An access track to the quarry is also depicted, running from the public road to the west and a second trackway is shown leading to a linear roofed structure, (likely associated workers cottages). The access trackway is shown on later Editions and is visible on aerial photographs from 1946 and 1988. The second trackway is not currently mapped but is visible on aerial photographs.</p>	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR31	MEL12461	334644	654179	Quarry; Trackway	Non-designated	Broadlaw Quarry, Temple	This asset comprises of additional extensions to the track previously mentioned.	Post-medieval
SLR31	MEL12461	334644	654179	Quarry; Trackway	Non-designated	Broadlaw Quarry, Temple	This asset comprises of additional extensions to the track previously mentioned.	Post-medieval
SLR32	MEL12440	332550	653928	Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Yorkston Moss	The asset is described as a circular stone enclosure, most likely a sheepfold, shown on 1st edition OS map. The surviving southern portion of the enclosure survives at a height of 1.2m by 0.6m wide, the northern portion reaches 0.55m in height. Modern wooden posts remain in situ at the entrance.	Post-medieval
SLR33	MEL12441	332450	653868	Building; Enclosure; Farmstead	Non-designated	Pigsknowes	The asset comprises of a small; building and enclosures which are labelled as Pigsknowes on the 1st edition OS map. Identified on mapping as a small structure with four associated enclosures, the farmstead is not shown on modern mapping. Remains of the enclosure were identified as banks measuring at 1-01.3m wide	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							and 0.4-0.6m high. The only evidence for a standing structure was a wall measuring at 0.8m high by 0.8m in extent and was constructed of mortared rubble, 0.3m by 0.15m.	
SLR34	MEL13140	332109	653088	Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Wesley Cleugh Burn	The circular sheepfold is visible as an earthwork on aerial photography and LiDAR. No further record of the asset.	Post-medieval
SLR35	MEL13141	332207	653072	Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Wesley Cleugh Burn	The circular sheepfold is visible as an earthwork on aerial photography and LiDAR. No further record of the asset.	Post-medieval
SLR36	Canmore ID 302545 MEL10148	334112	656257	Limestone Quarry	Non-designated	Esperton Lime Works, Limestone Quarry	The asset comprises of a disused limestone quarry, now infilled. Part of the Esperton Limeworks and quarries and is linked to the lower levels by a tramway.	Post-medieval
SLR37	Canmore ID 302543 MEL5101	335517	657859	Lime Works; Lime Kiln	Non-designated	Middleton Lime Works	This asset comprises the Middleton Lineworks which are situated along the south bank of the Middleton North Burn and extend to the west side of Hurcheon Hill. Older workings are depicted on	Post-medieval



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							the 1st edition OS 6-inch map (Edinburghshire 1854, sheet 19), and the 2nd edition OS 6-inch map shows an internal rail system linking the quarries to the limeworks.	
SLR41	MEL13053	333633	653263	Triangulation Pillar	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	This asset comprises a visible trig point not shown on modern or historical mapping, the rectangular trig has a height of 1m and a base width of 0.6m, tapering at the top to 0.37m.	Modern
SLR42	MEL8224	335499	655999	Enclosure; Farmstead?	Non-designated	Sowburnrig	The asset has been recorded as an enclosure or possible farmstead.	Undated
SLR44	Canmore ID 53326 MEL8266	333199	653069	Enclosure; Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	The asset comprises an oval enclosure, 150m east of Torfichen Hill, 11m by 13m within an earthen bank which is 2.5m broad and 0.2-0.4m high. No entrance is discernible.	Undated
SLR49	Canmore ID 53319 MEL8261	333019	653138	Circular Enclosure; Sheep Fold?	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	This asset consists of a circular earthwork, a possible sheepfold. The enclosure is 15m in diameter with an earthen bank 3m broad and 0.3m high with no entrance.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							Surrounding the asset are field banks and evidence of rig-and-furrow, with the assets visible on LiDAR and aerial photography but nothing is shown on historical or modern mapping.	
SLR50	Canmore ID 53322 MEL8263	333833	654494	Enclosure	Non-designated	Broad Law	The asset is comprised of a rectilinear enclosure, open to the west. The east bank is 38m long, at right angles from its north end an arm 52m long and from the south end an arm 19m long, the banks are of earth and are 3.5m broad and 0.5m high – except for the southeast corner which is partially visible and the end and north bank constructed of stone.	Undated
SLR51	MEL13044	333431	653701	Pen	Non-designated	Yorkston Moss	This asset, recorded during a field survey, is a rectangular enclosure, shown on modern OS and marked as a livestock pe. No historical mapping labels the pen and it is not visible on aerial photography.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR52	MEL13045	332472	653772	Sheep Fold	Non-designated	Yorkston Moss	Identified during a field survey in 2021, the asset, identified as a sheepfold, is visible on LiDAR and aerial imagery is not recorded on modern or historical mapping. The sheepfold is circular, with an entrance measuring at 1.3m wide to the southeast. The banks measure at 0.65m wide and had a maximum height of 0.6m.	Undated
SLR53	MEL13048	332079	653922	Structure?	Non-designated	Black Burn	This asset comprises of a small sub-circular/ sub-rectangular feature not shown on historical or modern mapping but is visible on LiDAR. The hollow measured a maximum depth of 0.8m within a turf-covered upcast bank measuring 5.3m by 1.9m and a possible entrance on the northwestern side.	Undated
SLR54	MEL13049	332097	653890	Structure?	Non-designated	Blackburn	This asset comprises of a small sub-circular feature with an entrance 0.45m wide at the north side, with the internal dimensions 1.7m by 2.3m in extent and	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							a maximum internal height of 0.5m. The asset is visible on LiDAR but no records on historical or modern mapping.	
SLR55	MEL13050	331925	654688	Sheep Fold; Enclosure	Non-designated	Yorkston Moss	This asset comprises a circular livestock enclosure shown modern OS, aerial imagery and LiDAR, not on historical mapping. Circular enclosure with a possible entrance 1.5m wide on the southeast side and defined by an earthen bank measuring 2.57m wide and a maximum height of 0.9m.	Undated
SLR56	MEL13054	332137	655014	Quarry	Non-designated	Cocksmoor Wood	This asset consists of a subcircular depression with turf and exposed rock cut into a western facing hillside, with a 12m diameter and maximum height of 2.5m, not shown on modern or historical mapping.	Undated
SLR57	MEL13055	332069	655069	Quarry	Non-designated	Cocksmoor Wood	This asset is described as a quarry pit, recorded and identified during a field survey in 2021.	Undated
SLR58	MEL13056	332179	655208	Quarry	Non-designated	Cocksmoor Wood	The asset was identified as a semi-circular feature with	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							a southwest side entrance and undulating base of turf and rock, With a maximum depth of 2m. The quarry pit is visible on imagery and LiDAR, but no records are shown on historical or modern mapping.	
SLR59	MEL13057	332140	655307	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated	Cocksmoor Wood	These assets consist of a cluster of clearance cairns of angular blocks and locally sourced stone. The longest cairn was 1.75m in lengths and 1.93m wide, with a height range of 0.08-0.38m. The smallest cairn was 6m long, 2.3m wide and a height of 0.2-0.6m. No record of the clearance cairns was shown on mapping.	Undated
SLR60	MEL13058	333241	652669	Ridge And Furrow	Non-designated	Torfichen Hill	The asset consists of an oval enclosure, 11m by 13m, within an earthen bank, 2.5m broad and 0.2-0.4m high with no evidence of an entrance. The sub-rectangular block of rig marked as oriented northeast-southwest, visible on aerial imagery but no visible boundaries.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR61	Canmore ID 73338 MEL8656	331782	651705	Enclosure?	Non-designated	Mauldslie Hill	This oblong enclosure, measuring at 100m by 20m is visible as earthworks and on aerial imagery.	Undated
SLR62	Canmore ID 53308 MEL8260	332169	653028	Enclosure; Field Boundary	Non-designated	Wesley Cleugh Burn	This asset comprises field banks, visible as rectilinear cropmarks, forming a cross centred on top of the hillock. A small enclosure 60m to the northwest is also visible as a small ring cropmark.	Undated
SLR101		333796	654617	Enclosures, Possible Farmstead	Non-designated		This asset was identified during a field survey in 2023 and comprised a series of enclosures that were visible on both LiDAR data and in person. The series of small turf-covered walls and covers a visible area of approximately 100m by 75m. A distinctive cross-shaped set of walls was identified both on the LiDAR and during the walkover.	Undated
SLR102		333950	654876	Enclosure	Non-designated		The circular turf-covered feature consisted of a hollowed out interior area. Whilst a singular feature was identified during the walkover, further analysis of LiDAR shows a potential	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							three more circular features within the vicinity of SLR102.	
SLR103		332378	653591	Circular earthwork, possible enclosure	Non-designated		This asset is another circular turf-covered feature, approximately 80m in diameter, appearing to be a mound with a distinctive ditch encircling it. There are no obvious entrances to the feature. This feature is visible on LiDAR but is not present on historic mapping. LiDAR analysis shows a smaller enclosure, c.22m in diameter, directly to the east of SLR103.	Undated
SLR104		335476	655864	Turf and stone boundary/ sheep shelter	Non-designated		The asset consists of a stone turf bank, measuring at 100m long and 1-1.5m wide. The bank is visible from aerial imagery and LiDAR and is visible on early and modern mapping.	Undated
SLR105		334628	654918	Ridge with perpendicular banks/ sheep shelter	Non-designated		This asset comprises of a 295m long ridge, approximately 2-5m wide. The bank is visible on aerial imagery, LiDAR, and OS six-inch mapping which lists part of the perpendicular features as a sheep shelter.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR106		335494	656533	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		This asset comprises a clearance cairn, 1m height, 10m by 7m located at the end of a field and east to west oriented. Visible on aerial and LiDAR. Not labelled on historic or modern mapping.	Undated
SLR107		335317	656222	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		The asset comprises a clearance cairn measuring at 17m by 3m, 0.75m in height. The low spread cairn is oriented northeast to southwest and is visible on aerial photography and LiDAR, the cairn is not visible on historic or modern mapping.	Undated
SLR108		335578	656281	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		The asset is a 5m by 1.5m low spread clearance cairn, oriented east to west. The cairn is partially visible on aerial and LiDAR, although there is no record on modern or historic mapping.	Undated
SLR109		335315	655469	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		The asset comprises of a 20m by 5m clearance cairn with the lower stones turfed over. The cairn is orientated northwest to southeast. Visible on aerial and LiDAR,	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
							the cairn is not recorded on historic or modern mapping.	
SLR110		335046	655654	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		This asset comprises a clearance cairn, located to the edge of the field, measuring 8.5m by 2m and is oriented northwest to southeast. Visible on aerial photography and LiDAR but is not visible on historic or modern mapping.	Undated
SLR111		335582	655691	Clearance Cairn	Non-designated		This asset comprises of a series of stones with no orientation, measuring at 5m by 2m. The cairn is not very visible on aerial, LiDAR, and there is not mapping records.	Undated
SLR112		335803	655415	Stones in Drainage Channel	Non-designated		The asset comprises a series of stone in a drainage channel. The channel is visible on aerial, LiDAR, and historic mapping, as early as OS six-inch 1830-1880.	Undated
SLR113		332168	655360	Sheepfold	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The asset is no longer visible on aerial photography due to forestry.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR114		331735	654704	Sheepfold	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The asset appears to have become incorporated into a larger animal pen which is still in use.	Undated
SLR115		334724	656625	Old Quarry	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The old quarry appears to be out of use, but disturbance is visible from aerial imagery.	Undated
SLR116		337019	656095	Old Quarry	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The old quarry appears to be out of use, but disturbance is visible from aerial imagery.	Undated
SLR117		336722	655659	Old Quarry	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The old quarry appears to be out of use, but disturbance is visible from aerial imagery.	Undated
SLR118		336540	655390	Old Quarry	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The old quarry appears to be out of use, but disturbance is visible from aerial imagery.	Undated



SLR Number	Reference Number	Coordinates		Site Type	Designation	Site Name	Description	Period
		Easting	Northing					
SLR119		334641	653104	Old Quarry	Non-designated		This asset has been identified via historic mapping and LiDAR. The old quarry appears to be out of use, but disturbance is visible from aerial imagery.	Undated





Appendix B Letter to Historic Environment Scotland (May 2025)

Torfichen Wind Farm

Further Environmental Information 2

Renewable Energy Systems Ltd

SLR Project No.: 405.P64791.00001

29 October 2025

30 May 2025

Attention: Sam Fox
Historic Environment Scotland
Longmore House
Salisbury Place
Edinburgh
EH9 1SH

SLR Project No.: 405.064791.00001

ECU Reference No.: ECU00004661

RE: THE ELECTRICITY WORKS (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT)
(SCOTLAND) REGULATIONS 2017

TORFICHEN WIND FARM, MIDLOTHIAN - ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Dear Mr Fox,

Thank you for your response to the Additional Information provided for Torfichen Wind Farm, dated 16th May 2025. Within the response, HES outline the consultation and responses to date for the proposed development. In addition, HES outline the reasons for objecting to the proposed development based on significant impacts on the setting of Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston Inventory Garden & Designed Landscape (GDL00029). The reason given for these significant impacts is the visibility of T1, T2, and T3 along the south-facing axial view within 'The Wilderness'.

Arniston House (LB808)

Within the response to the Additional Information, HES notes that the "*mansion was sited and designed to take account of views, both of, and from, the house*". In HES's response to the original EIA Chapter (29th February 2024), views to and from the house are noted as:

- Views of the house at the end of the east tree-lined drive;
- Views along the winding north drive which result in the slow reveal of the house;
- Views within the last 500m of the north drive which provide a reveal of the entire house;
- Views southwards from the house through 'The Wilderness', along the designed visual axis; and
- Views toward the house, northwards, through the designed visual axis of 'The Wilderness'.

In their response to the Additional Information, HES notes "*There are views to the north of the house, where the proposed development would not be visible from within the house*". It is believed that HES is referring to the northwards views from the principal north-facing rooms, which overlook the open parkland of the Arniston Estate, the Firth of Forth and the Lomond Hills¹⁴.

SLR agrees that the aforementioned views to and from the house are all aspects of the asset's setting which contribute to its significance, allowing both views outwards to the surrounding landscape and points of appreciation for the house and its architecture.

SLR also agrees that views from the principal, south-facing, rooms in the house which overlook 'The Wilderness' and along the axis are of importance to the setting of the Listed Building, as they provide a designed view towards the location of the prior garden

¹⁴ Haynes, N. (2020) *William Adam and Antiquity: an Arcadian Retreat at Arniston* in Humm, L., Lowrey, J., and Mackechnie, A. (eds) *The Architecture of Scotland, 1660-1750*. Edinburgh University Press, pp.379-404.



installations, towards the ornamental pillar (LB810), to the farmland and to the Moorfoot Hills beyond.

However, SLR disagrees that the views southwards are the only views that “*contribute most to an understanding, appreciation and experience of the listed building’s cultural significance*”. This approach disregards and downplays the other aspects of the asset’s setting which form the asset’s cultural significance and contribute to the character of the Listed Building’s setting. This appears to contradict a later statement within your response, “*the axis is therefore part of few deliberately designed views from the house which contribute to the house’s setting*”.

For example, the screened approach towards the house from both the east and north drive provides a sense of seclusion and isolation from the surrounding working agricultural land, before the reveal of the property. This allows for enclosure and privacy, as well as a point of appreciation for the architecture of the building itself. Views to the north from the inside of the house are deliberately sited to overlook the distant landscape, highlighting the estate’s separation from the surrounding towns and cities, with views from ground level to the north being more restricted and continuing the sense of privacy and isolation.

In addition, this response appears to disregard the importance of reciprocal views towards the house from along the axial view within ‘The Wilderness’, which is a key point of appreciation for the rear of the listed building, showcasing its architectural value within the setting of the wider Arniston Estate and GDL (GDL00029).

The only effects on the setting and character of the house would be in outward views from the south-facing principal rooms, with the rest of the approaches and key views outlined above being retained without any impact from the Proposed Development.

Furthermore, whilst SLR agrees that the presence of proposed T1, T2, and T3 would draw the eye from the south-facing axial view and as such disrupt our ability to appreciate and experience this singular part of the “*design and aesthetic qualities of the setting of the house*”, we disagree that the presence of the turbines within this view would disrupt our ability to understand these design and aesthetic qualities. Whilst present in more distant views, the turbines do not interrupt views towards closer features, including the sunken garden, the former water feature, the ornamental pillar, and the farmland. Furthermore, whilst they are present in front of views of the Moorfoot Hills, they do not completely disrupt or screen them. The reasoning for the siting of the house along this south-facing axis, and the reasoning for the deliberate gap in plantation to allow for these views is still able to be understood.

As such, we do not consider the impact to be contrary to NPF4 Policy 7 (c) and as such request that the objection on Arniston House (LB808) be lifted.

In addition, SLR wishes to highlight inconsistencies in the conclusions drawn for similar setting impacts across comparable projects. For instance, a potential objection was lifted for the Aultmore Wind Farm Extension (ECU Ref: ECU00003365), despite a similar concern having previously been raised in relation to Letterfourie House and Fountains (LB15541). The decision regarding Letterfourie House was articulated as follows: “*We note the design changes to the layout and location of the proposed turbines that have moved the proposed southwest cluster further to the west. This cluster would be visible in important axial views from Letterfourie House, rising above the hills to the southwest of the house.*

The turbines would introduce a distraction into these views, particularly turbine 3 (Figure 7.3, possibly turbine 15 on Figure 3.2). The motion of the turbine blade close to the horizon would add to this distraction. In our view, this would have an adverse impact on an appreciation and experience of this Category A listed building. Although we consider that this would result in a significant impact on the setting of the house, we do not consider that this impact would raise issues of national interest that would warrant an objection.”

The rationale provided by HES regarding the impact on axial views appears consistent between Letterfourie House and Arniston House—specifically, the presence and movement



of turbine blades being considered a distraction. However, in the case of Letterfourie House, this impact was ultimately not deemed sufficient to warrant an objection.

We therefore seek clarification on the apparent disparity in these judgments. However, as SLR finds similar contributing factors to the understanding, appreciation and experience of both assets, we ask that the objection on Arniston House (LB808) be reconsidered and removed.

Arniston House Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029)

With regards to the Arniston House GDL, HES' original response to the planning application noted that there would be limited visibility of the proposed development from several key locations within the GDL. These key locations with limited visibility are listed as follows:

- The approach to the house along the east drive, with views of the Moorfoot Hills screened by trees;
- The approach to the house along the north drive, with views of the Moorfoot Hills screened by historic designed woodland;
- The Beech Avenue to the east of the house, with views of the Moorfoot Hills screened by historic designed woodland at its end; and
- Views from the north of the house towards the Moorfoot Hills, which are visible on either side of the house from parkland directly to the house's north, with the horizon screened by the roof of the house.

Additionally, the GDL's setting is also composed of its direct historical and visual relationship with Arniston House (LB808). Whilst the impact on the Listed Building has been assessed separately, its contribution to the GDL and the significance of the GDL is integral.

The original response notes "*The only part of the GDL which may be impacted by the Proposed Development is the axial view from the house through 'The Wilderness'.*"

SLR agrees with HES' statement that "*the view is a significant part of the designed landscape*" and that this axial view is sensitive to change. However, we disagree with the statement that the proposed development would disrupt "*our ability to understand, appreciate and experience the design and aesthetic qualities of the Inventory Garden and Designed Landscape*".

Whilst the proposed turbines would impact the ability to appreciate and experience the southwards axial view and its inclusion within the design of the gardens, the ability to understand its placement, with regards to design and aesthetic qualities would remain. Whilst the turbines would be present in front of views of the Moorfoot Hills, they do not completely disrupt or screen them. The reasoning for the design of this axis extending from the house and the reasoning for the deliberate gap in plantation to allow for these views is still able to be understood.

Furthermore, all other aspects of the GDL, including the ability to understand, appreciate and experience the design and aesthetic qualities of the GDL would remain unimpacted by the proposed development. These include the views from key locations within the GDL, including those from the east and north drives, Beech Avenue, and northern parkland, and the other aspects of the GDL as noted in our Additional Information report. As such, the broader experiential and aesthetic qualities of the GDL would be preserved.

Whilst the axial view is acknowledged as a sensitive part of the GDL, the ability to understand its placement and role within the GDL would remain. Furthermore, the majority of key views and design elements, which are all integral to the GDL's character and setting, would be unimpacted.



We consider that no single view within, to, or from a GDL holds the entirety of its character and setting, and GDLs are complex designations which incorporate multiple important elements and views from which they can be experienced, appreciated, and understood. The views along the eastern and northern drives, views from the parkland to the north of the house, and views along the axial view towards the house would remain unimpacted.

As such, we suggest that the proposed development is compliant with relevant legislation (NPF4 Policy 7 (i)) in regard to Arniston House (GDL00029).

Closure

With regards to the justification provided for both Arniston House (LB808) and Arniston House Garden and Designed Landscape (GDL00029), we request that HES remove their objection to the proposed development.

Regards,

SLR Consulting Limited

Erin Ashby, MSc ACIfA

Senior Archaeology and Heritage Consultant





Making Sustainability Happen