

10 Cultural Heritage

Contents

10.1	Executive Summary	10-1
10.2	Introduction	10-2
10.3	Legislation, Policy and Guidelines	10-2
10.4	Consultation	10-4
10.5	Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria	10-7
10.6	Baseline Conditions	10-15
10.7	Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment	10-26
10.8	Standard Mitigation	10-32
10.9	Likely Effects	10-33
10.10	Additional Mitigation and Enhancement	10-40
10.11	Residual Effects	10-40
10.12	Cumulative Assessment	10-41
10.13	Summary	10-44
10.14	References	10-49

This page is intentionally blank.

10 Cultural Heritage

10.1 Executive Summary

- 10.1.1 This chapter identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage significance of the site and assesses the potential for direct and settings effects on archaeological heritage assets resulting from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This chapter also identifies measures that should be taken to mitigate predicted adverse effects.
- 10.1.2 This assessment has identified 88 non-designated heritage assets and one designated asset within the site. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid directly impacting upon the Scheduled Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1).
- 10.1.3 The Proposed Development has also been designed so as to avoid impacts upon known heritage assets where possible. Given the extent and density of recorded remains it has not been possible to avoid all impacts and there would be direct impacts on seven non-designated heritage assets. All of these assets are of post-medieval date and comprise the sites of former buildings (Sites 5 and 12) and a well (Site 109) recorded from historic mapping, areas of former rig cultivation (Sites 73 and 74) and a road (Site 114) and a slipway (Site 119) of 20th century date. Assets recorded and known only from historic mapping are judged to be of negligible importance. The remaining assets are judged to be of low importance. The Proposed Development would remove any deposits associated with the assets known from historic mapping evidence and the slipway. The Proposed Development would impact upon only part of the remaining assets leading to some loss of information content. A **minor** and not significant direct effect has been predicted in each case.
- 10.1.4 Planning policies and guidance require that account is taken of potential effects upon heritage assets by proposed developments and that where possible such effects are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible, effects on any significant remains should be minimised or offset. Given the potential for presently unknown archaeological remains, in particular of prehistoric and post-medieval date, to survive within the site, a programme of archaeological works designed to avoid inadvertent damage to known remains and to investigate and mitigate against the possibility of uncovering hitherto unknown remains will be undertaken.
- 10.1.5 The implementation of the above outlined mitigation measures will prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage assets; investigate the potential for previously unknown assets and disseminate the results of archaeological works to the public. Following the implementation of mitigation measures there may be a slight loss of overall information content and as such a marginal magnitude of residual impact is anticipated. The residual direct effect would be **negligible** and not significant.
- 10.1.6 Potential operational effects on the settings of designated heritage assets within the 5 km and 10 km study areas and selected assets within the 15 km study area have been considered in detail as part of this assessment. **Moderate** and significant effects have been predicted upon the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinqouy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape.
- 10.1.7 A programme of Historic Building Recording will be undertaken within the site as compensatory mitigation to create a baseline record of the condition of the upstanding buildings on the site and partially offset potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the setting of the post-medieval landscape of Faray.
- 10.1.8 There would be **moderate** and significant residual effects on the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinqouy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape, although the core components and integrity of the setting of these assets would not be adversely affected.
- 10.1.9 The possibility of cumulative effects has been considered and assessed. A **minor** and not significant cumulative effect has been predicted on the setting of the Burn of Musetter standing stone (Site 22) and the chambered cairns at The Manse (Site 23), Eday Church Hall (Site 24), Calf of Eday (Site 28)

Bay of London (Site 33), Vinguoy Hill (Site 40), Fitty Hill (Site 124) and Howa Tower (Site 125). No additional cumulative effects have been predicted.

10.2 Introduction

10.2.1 This chapter considers the issues associated with the potential cultural heritage effects of the Proposed Development at Faray, Orkney. The Proposed Development is for a wind farm of six turbines with a maximum tip height of up to 149.9 m and is described in detail in EIA Report Chapter 3.

10.2.2 This chapter identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage significance of the site and known heritage assets within its boundary (refer to Figures 10.1 and 10.2). The assessment also identifies all designated heritage assets up to 5 km from the site and all nationally important designated heritage assets up to 10 km from the site with the potential for significant effects on their setting (Figures 10.3 and 10.4). The assessment includes descriptions of the context of the assessment; methodology; baseline conditions; likely effects (both direct and setting) and mitigation proposals as necessary. The assessment considers the effects of the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development in detail. An assessment of potential cumulative effects is also made.

Statement of Capability

10.2.3 This chapter has been produced by Lynne Roy (BA (Hons), MSc, MCIfA, FSA Scot) of AOC Archaeology Group. AOC is a Registered Organisation of the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA). This chapter conforms to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists' Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CIfA 2017); Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment (CIfA 2014) and follows IEMA's EIA Guidelines (as updated) (IEMA, 2016).

10.3 Legislation, Policy and Guidelines

Legislation

10.3.1 Relevant legislation documents have been reviewed and taken into account as part of this cultural heritage assessment. Of particular relevance are:

- The Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended);
- The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended);
- The Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended);
- Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011;
- Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014;
- The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (as amended);and
- Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992 (as amended 2001

Planning Policy

10.3.2 Full details of the relevant planning policy are provided in Chapter 5. The most relevant planning policy relevant to this chapter are contained within:

- Scottish Planning Policy (Scottish Government, 2014a);
- The National Planning Framework for Scotland (NPF3) (Scottish Government, 2014b);
- Historic Environment Policy for Scotland 'HEPS' (HES, 2019a);

- - Our Place in Time. The Historic Environment Strategy for Scotland (Scottish Government, 2014c);
 - The adopted Orkney Local Development Plan (Orkney Islands Council (OIC), 2017a); and
 - PAN2/2011 'Planning and Archaeology' (Scottish Government, 2011).
- 10.3.3 SPP (Scottish Government, 2014), HEPS (HES, 2019a), PAN 2/2011 'Archaeology and Planning' (Scottish Government, 2011) and Policy 8 of the adopted Orkney Local Development Plan (LDP) (OIC 2017a) deal specifically with planning policy and guidance in relation to heritage which collectively expresses a general presumption in favour of preserving heritage remains in situ. Their 'preservation by record' (i.e. through excavation and recording, followed by analysis and publication, by qualified archaeologists) is a less desirable alternative.
- 10.3.4 OIC's approach to proposals which effect the historic environment is set out in Policy 8(A) of the LDP which states that:
- "Development which preserves or enhances the archaeological, architectural, artistic, commemorative or historic significance of cultural heritage assets, including their settings, will be supported. Development which would have an adverse impact on this significance will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that:*
- i. Measures will be taken to mitigate any loss of this significance; and*
 - ii. Any lost significance which cannot be mitigated is outweighed by the social economic, environmental or safety benefits of the development"* (OIC, 2017a, 31).
- 10.3.5 The setting of Scheduled Monuments is also an important consideration when determining applications. This principle is outlined in paragraph 145 of SPP and Policy 8 of the Local Development Plan for Orkney. These policies express the importance of preservation of the integrity of the setting of Scheduled Monuments and also the preservation of the special interest and character of Listed Buildings and their settings.
- 10.3.6 The Historic Environment Policy for Scotland (HES, 2019a) sets out the Scottish Government's policy for the sustainable management of the historic environment. Key principles of the policy note that *"Changes to specific assets and their context should be managed in a way that protects the historic environment...If detrimental impact on the historic environment is unavoidable, it should be minimised. Steps should be taken to demonstrate that alternatives have been explored, and mitigation measures should be put in place"* (HEP4).

Guidance

- Consideration has been taken of the following best practice guidelines/guidance in preparing this assessment:
- OIC Supplementary Guidance; Historic Environment and Cultural Heritage (OIC, 2017b) and the further information which accompanies it; OIC Planning Policy Advice: Historic Environment (Topics and Themes) (OIC, 2017c);
- OIC Supplementary Planning Guidance: The Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site (OIC, 2010);
- Orkney Islands Council Energy Supplementary Guidance (OIC, 2017);
- Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA) Standards and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk Based Assessments (CIfA, 2017) and Commissioning Work or Providing Consultancy Advice on the Historic Environment (CIfA, 2014);
- HES "Managing Change in the Historic Environment" guidance note series, particularly Historic Environment Scotland's Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting (HES, 2020);

- SNH (now NatureScot) published guidance for ‘Assessing the Cumulative Impact of Onshore Wind Energy Developments’ (SNH 2012); and
 - Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5 (SNH & HES 2018).
- 10.3.7 HES’s setting guidance defines setting as “*the way the surroundings of a historic asset or place contribute to how it is understood, appreciated, and experienced*’ (HES, 2016a). The guidance further notes that ‘*planning authorities must take into account the setting of historic assets or places when drawing up development plans and guidance, when considering various types of environmental and design assessments/statements, and in determining planning applications*” (*ibid*). It advocates a three-stage approach to assessing potential impacts upon setting:
- Stage 1: identify the historic asset.
 - Stage 2: define and analyse the setting.
 - Stage 3: evaluate the potential impact of the proposed changes.
- 10.3.8 OIC’s Planning Policy Advice on the Historic Environment (Topics and Themes) contains further guidance on setting which it notes “*usually consists mainly of [a site’s] visual relationships¹ with the surrounding landscapes and other sites, such as the views to and from the site*’, observing that ‘*a site’s setting may have changed over time, and is likely to be made up of a combination of:*
- *It’s original extent, functional relationships and design.*
 - *Associations, relationships and meanings which it has accumulated since it was created.*
 - *How the site is experienced now*” (OIC, 2017c, 10, 2.03).

10.4 Consultation

10.4.1 Table 10.1 summarises the responses from statutory and non-statutory consultation bodies in regard to cultural heritage and the Proposed Development.

Table 10.1 – Consultation

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and how addressed
Historic Environment Scotland (HES)	<p>In their response to scoping, dated the 11th of June 2019, HES stated that they considered a potential for significant adverse impacts on heritage assets within their remit including the Quoy Broch 270m NW of (Scheduled Monument, Index no.1440).</p> <p>Assessment should consider the potential for impacts on the setting of heritage assets located on nearby islands and should include the following heritage assets located on Eday and Rapness [sic]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muckle Hill of Linkataing, chambered cairn, homestead and field system (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1355) 	<p>No direct impacts on Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>Buffer applied around the Scheduled Monument and design altered to move turbines away from immediate setting of monument.</p> <p>Site visits to these monuments and others in the ZTV were undertaken and where relevant detailed</p>

¹ OIC also acknowledge the role that non-visual settings can play highlighting the relationship between the sunken HMS Hampshire and the memorial to those lost on it which overlooks it from the shore (OIC, 2017c), 10, para 2.07.

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and how addressed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carrick House, chambered cairn NW of, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1432) • Vinguoy Hill, chambered cairn, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no.1410) • Huntersquoy, chambered cairn 480m SW of Carrick Farm, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1250) • Carrick Farm, chambered cairn and cairn 500m SSW of (Scheduled Monument, Index no.1251) • Fold of Setter, enclosure, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1441) • Stone of Setter, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index No. 4299) • Mill Hill chambered cairn, Millbounds (Scheduled Monument, Index no.1321) • Sangar Crofthouse including adjoining threshing barn, windmill tower, kiln and byre, and detached house to southeast, Rapness, Westray (Category A listed Building, LB48010) <p>HES also requested sight of any ZTV (Zone of Theoretical Visibility) analysis, provisional wireframe views and photomontages prior to submission of any planning application and EIA Report for the proposals. It noted that provision of a large scale ZTV with heritage assets clearly marked on it would be particularly useful.</p> <p>HES agreed a list of proposed visualisations on 11th November 2019 and confirmed they had no further advice to add at this stage.</p> <p>HES wrote to the Applicant on 30th October 2019 to notify them of their intention to amend the existing entry in the schedule of monuments for ‘Quoy, broch 270m NW of’ to ‘Chambered cairn, 280m NW of Quoy, Faray’.</p> <p>On 22nd November the amended schedule of monuments was duly updated</p> <p>On 12th March 2020, following issue of draft wireline visualisations, and subsequent clarification by AOC that locations of draft viewpoints at Doggerboat showed views of the turbines in all directions and a query as to</p>	<p>assessment is presented in Section 10.9 or in Appendix 10.2. Note that Carrick Farm, chambered cairn and cairn 500m SSW of (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1251); Fold of Setter, enclosure, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1441); and Huntersquoy, chambered cairn 480m SW of Carrick Farm, Eday (Scheduled Monument, Index no. 1250)</p> <p>fall outwith the ZTV. Where applicable, views towards these monuments are considered as part of the settings of nearby monuments that would have visibility of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Proposed list of visualisations and a copy of provisional ZTV sent to HES on the 13th September and 22nd October 2019 respectively.</p> <p>It is agreed that the monument north-west of Quoy is a chambered cairn and not a broch and the monument is referred to as a chambered cairn throughout the assessment.</p> <p>Photomontage visualisation (Figure 10.13) accordingly situated at Doggerboat to demonstrate the worst-case scenario.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and how addressed
	<p>HES's preferred location for a visualisation which showed views towards the Quay Chambered Cairn HES advised that visualisations should be produced to demonstrate the worst-case scenario i.e. the most adverse potential impact. The locations of other visualisations were agreed</p> <p>HES also noted that they remained of the view that the Proposed Development would raise such issues of national interest that they would likely object to the proposals. Of particular concern is the potential significant adverse impact on the setting of Chambered cairn, 280m NW of Quoy, Faray (SM 1440).</p> <p>HES noted that they had considered mitigation that would lessen this impact, such as amending the turbine layout, restricting the number of turbines or restricting the height of the turbines but concluded that it was difficult to understand how such measures would be likely to reduce the impact for their interests.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has been designed to maximise space between the chambered cairn, 280m NW of Quoy, Faray and a buffer of 500 m has been applied between the cairn and the nearest proposed turbine.</p>
<p>Orkney Islands Council (OIC) Planning Manager</p>	<p>OIC note in their Scoping Opinion that the entire island is of historical importance as a landscape, bearing 6,000 years of habitation, culminating in abandonment in the mid 20th century. Due to its recent use primarily as a sheep run, the preservation of standing building, and archaeological remains in the landscape is good. The island has not been subject to any extensive archaeological survey, so few items are currently recorded. In support of the EIA, an assessment should be undertaken of the historic environment/archaeology of both Faray and the Holm of Faray up to and including the 20th century remains, including the intertidal zone. The assessment should include a walkover survey and desk-based assessment and this should inform the design layout of the proposal to avoid any direct impact on physical remains of significance. Furthermore, the EIA should include a viewshed analysis to identify historic environment assets that may be effected by the proposal and an assessment</p>	<p>A walkover and desk-based assessment of the island of Faray have been undertaken and include 20th century remains. A total of 75 previously unrecorded assets have been identified. The survey informed the design layout of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Survey of the intertidal zone focused on the south-east coast of the island where impacts on potential buried remains from construction of landing areas and associated infrastructure are possible (10.5.28).</p> <p>Survey of the Holm of Faray and intertidal zone of other areas of the island were not undertaken as they will not be impacted by the Proposed Development.</p>

Consultee	Summary of Response	Where and how addressed
	that considers impacts on the setting of the identified sites.	Impact on the setting of heritage assets has been undertaken alongside ZTV analysis (See Figures 10.3-10.5, Section 10.9 and Appendix 10.2).
Orkney County Archaeologist (OIC)	<p>AOC attended a meeting with the Orkney County Archaeologist on the 7th of October 2019.</p> <p>Faray is relatively poorly understood in terms of archaeological remains. The current layout avoids known remains but there are likely to be well preserved buried remains across island. Given the clear potential for further remains to be present the Orkney County Archaeologist stated that she would wish to see a structured programme of mitigation that would include geophysics.</p> <p>The geophysics would be followed by trial trench evaluations and if necessary, mitigation excavations and would be in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) which would contain a clear method statement for post-excavation analysis and reporting.</p> <p>AOC consulted the Orkney County Archaeologist in February 2020 with regards to proposed visualisations. Additional visualisations were requested from St Magnus Church, Egilsay and approaches from the ferry. The list of proposed visualisations was agreed.</p>	<p>Walkover survey and detailed map regression has been undertaken and 75 previously unrecorded assets identified. Layout avoids these where possible.</p> <p>The potential for previously unrecorded remains to be present on the site is also acknowledged and a detailed mitigation strategy, which would include geophysics, trial trenching and, if needs be, further investigations is included in Section 10.8 of this chapter.</p> <p>Additional wirelines showing view of the Proposed Development from these locations are included (Figures 10.24 and 10.25) and discussed in detail in Appendix 10.2</p>

10.5 Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria

Consultation

- 10.5.1 An EIA Scoping Opinion was received from OIC on the 21st of June 2019. AOC met with the Orkney County Archaeologist on the 7th of October 2019 to discuss the project. Setting assessment visits were undertaken to designated assets within 10 km of the site over the course of October 2019 and in August 2020. AOC consulted directly with Historic Environment Scotland (HES) with regard to the potential implications on nationally important heritage assets and a proposed list of visualisations was agreed with the OIC County Archaeologist in February 2020 and with HES in March 2020. Detail regarding consultation responses and how points raised by consultees are addressed is presented in Table 10.1 above.

Study Area

- 10.5.2 Four study areas were identified for this assessment:

- A core study area (the site) which includes all land within the site boundary which is subject to assessment for potential direct effects. This study area was subject to walkover survey and was used to identify cultural heritage features which may be directly affected by the Proposed Development (Figures 10.1 and 10.2).
- A 5 km study area for the assessment of potential effects on the settings of all designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments; Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes; Inventoried Battlefields and Conservation Areas within 5 km of the proposed turbines (Figure 10.3).
- A 10 km study area for the assessment of potential effects on the settings of all nationally important designated heritage assets including Scheduled Monuments; Category A Listed Buildings; Inventoried Gardens and Designed Landscapes, Inventoried Battlefields and World Heritage Sites within 10 km of the proposed turbines. This study area is covered by the ZTV (Figure 10.4).
- A 15 km study area for the assessment of selected assets identified as potentially sensitive to changes in their settings and within the ZTV (Figure 10.5)

10.5.3 Each heritage asset referred to in the text is listed in the Gazetteer in Technical Appendix 10.1. Each has been assigned a 'Site No.' unique to this assessment, and the Gazetteer includes information regarding the type, period, grid reference, NRHE number, SMR number, statutory protective designation, and other descriptive information, as derived from the consulted sources.

Desk Study

10.5.4 The following sources were consulted for the collation of data:

- The Orkney County Archaeologist;
- The National Record for the Historic Environment (NRHE) as held by HES;
- The Historic Land-use Assessment Data (HLAMap) for Scotland as hosted by HES;
- Spatial data and descriptive information for designated assets held on Historic Environment Scotland Data website;
- Ordnance Survey maps (principally First and Second Edition), and other published historic maps held in the Map Library of the National Library of Scotland;
- Online aerial satellite imagery, Google Earth, Bing, ESRI aerial mapping;
- Scottish Remote Sensing Portal for LiDAR data;
- The Scottish Palaeoecological Database (Coles et al., 1998);
- Unpublished historic maps and documents held by Orkney Library and Archive, Kirkwall;
- Vertical and oblique aerial photographs held by the National Collection of Aerial Photographs (NCAP, as held by HES); and
- Published bibliographic sources, including historical descriptions of the area (Statistical Accounts, Parish Records).

Site Visit

10.5.5 An archaeological walkover survey of the site was undertaken on 17th August 2020 with the aim of identifying any previously unknown archaeological remains. All known and accessible heritage assets were assessed in the field to establish their survival, extent, significance and relationship to other sites. Weather and any other conditions affecting the visibility during the survey were also

recorded. All heritage assets encountered were recorded and photographed. The location of features noted in the field was recorded using ArcGIS Collector and cross-referenced with hand-held GPS and mapping to record and confirm the position of each asset and to record the route of the survey. All features were marked on plans, at a relevant scale, and keyed by means of Grid References to the Ordnance Survey mapping.

Assessment of Likely Effect Significance

10.5.6 This assessment distinguishes between the term ‘impact’ and ‘effect’. An impact is defined as a physical change to a heritage asset or its setting, whereas an effect refers to the significance of this impact. The first stage of the assessment involves establishing the value and importance of the heritage asset and assessing the sensitivity of the asset to change (impact). Using the proposed design for the Proposed Development, an assessment of the impact magnitude is made and a judgement regarding the level and significance of effect is arrived at.

Criteria for Assessing Sensitivity of Heritage Assets

10.5.7 The definition of cultural significance is readily accepted by heritage professionals both in the UK and internationally and was first fully outlined in the Burra Charter, which states in article one that ‘cultural significance’ or ‘cultural heritage value’ means aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual value for past, present or future generations (ICOMOS, 2013, Article 1.2). This definition has since been adopted by heritage organisations around the world, including HES. HEPS notes that to have cultural significance an asset must have a particular “aesthetic, historic, scientific or social value for past, present and future generations” (HES, 2019a). Heritage assets also have value in the sense that they “...create a sense of place, identity and physical and social wellbeing, and benefit the economy, civic participation, tourism and lifelong learning” (Scottish Government, 2014). All heritage assets have significance; however, some heritage assets are judged to be more important than others. The level of that importance is, from a cultural resource management perspective, determined by establishing the asset’s capacity to contribute to our understanding or appreciation of the past (HES, 2019b). In the case of many heritage assets their importance has already been established through the designation (i.e. Scheduling, Listing and Inventory) processes applied by HES.

10.5.8 The rating of importance of heritage assets is first and foremost made in reference to their designation. For non-designated assets importance will be assigned based on professional judgement and guided by the criteria presented in Table 10.2; which itself relates to the criteria for designations as set out in Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019b) and Scotland’s Listed Buildings (HES, 2019c).

Table 10.2 –Criteria for Establishing Importance of Heritage Assets

Importance	Receptors
Very High	World Heritage Sites (As protected by SPP, 2014). Other designated or non-designated assets with demonstrable Outstanding Universal Value.
High	Scheduled Monuments (as protected by the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (the "1979 Act"). Category A Listed Buildings (as protected by the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997) (the "1997 Act"). Inventory Gardens and Designed Landscapes (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011).

Importance	Receptors
	Inventory Battlefields (as protected by the 1979 Act, as amended by the 2011 Act). Outstanding examples of some period, style or type. Non-Designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, 2014).
Medium	Category B and C Listed Buildings (as protected by the 1997 Act). Conservation Areas (as protected by the 1997 Act). Major or representative examples of some period, style or type. Non-designated assets considered to meet the criteria for the designations as set out above (as protected by SPP, 2014).
Low	Locally Listed assets. Examples of any period, style or type which contribute to our understanding of the historic environment at the local level.
Negligible	Relatively numerous types of features. Findspots of artefacts that have no definite archaeological remains known in their context. The above non-designated features are protected by Paragraph 137 of SPP, 2014.

10.5.9 Determination of cultural heritage significance can be made with reference to the intrinsic, contextual and associative characteristics of an asset as set out in HEPS (HES, 2019a) and its accompanying Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019b). HEPS Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019b) indicates that the relationship of an asset to its setting or the landscape makes up part of its contextual characteristics. The Xi'an Declaration (ICOMOS, 2005) set out the first internationally accepted definition of setting with regard to heritage assets, indicating that setting is important where it forms part of or contributes to the significance of a heritage asset. While SPP does not differentiate between the importance of the asset itself and the importance of the asset's setting, HES's Managing Change Guidance, in defining what factors need to be considered in assessing the impact of a change on the setting of a historic asset or place, states that the magnitude of the proposed change should be considered "*relative to the sensitivity of the setting of an asset*" (HES, 2020, 11); thereby making it clear that assets vary in their sensitivity to changes in setting and thus have a relative sensitivity. The EIA Handbook suggests that cultural significance aligns with sensitivity but also states that "*the relationship between value and sensitivity should be clearly articulated in the assessment*" (HES and SNH, 2018, 184). It is therefore recognised (ibid;) that the importance of an asset is not the same as its sensitivity to changes to its setting. Elements of setting may make a positive, neutral or negative contribution to the significance of an asset. Thus, in determining the nature and level of effects upon assets and their settings by the development, the contribution that setting makes to an asset's significance and thus its sensitivity to changes to setting need to be considered.

10.5.10 This approach recognises the importance of preserving the integrity of the setting of an asset in the context of the contribution that setting makes to the experience, understanding and appreciation of a given asset. It recognises that setting is a key characteristic in understanding and appreciating

of some, but by no means all, assets. Indeed, assets of high or very high importance do not necessarily have high sensitivity to changes to their settings (e.g. do not necessarily have a high relative sensitivity). An asset’s relative sensitivity to alterations to its setting refers to its capacity to retain its ability to contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the past in the face of changes to its setting. The ability of an asset’s setting to contribute to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it and its significance also has a bearing on the sensitivity of that asset to changes to its setting. While heritage assets of high or very high importance are likely to be sensitive to direct effects, not all will have a similar sensitivity to effects on their setting; this would be true where setting does not appreciably contribute to their significance. HES’s guidance on setting makes it clear that the level of effect may relate to *“the ability of the setting [of an asset] to absorb new development without eroding its key characteristics”* (HES, 2020, 11). Assets with very high or high relative sensitivity to settings effects may be vulnerable to any changes that affect their settings, and even slight changes may erode their key characteristics or the ability of their settings to contribute to the understanding, appreciation and experience of them. Assets whose relative sensitivity to changes to their setting is lower may be able to accommodate greater changes to their settings without having key characteristics eroded.

10.5.11 The criteria used for establishing an asset’s relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is detailed in Table 10.3. This table has been developed based on AOC’s professional judgement and experience in assessing setting effects. It has been developed with reference to the policy and guidance noted above including SPP (Scottish Government, 2014), HEPS (HES, 2019a) and its Designation Policy and Selection Guidance (HES, 2019b), the Xi’an Declaration (ICOMOS, 2005), the EIA Handbook (SNH & HES, 2018) and HES’s guidance on the setting of heritage assets (HES, 2020).

Table 10.3 - Criteria for Establishing Relative Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset to Changes to its Setting

Relative Sensitivity	Criteria
Very High	An asset, the setting of which, is critical to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having Very High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, make an essential direct contribution to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES, 2019b, Annex 1)).
High	An asset, the setting, of which, makes a major contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having High Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This is particularly relevant for assets whose settings, or elements thereof, contribute directly to their cultural significance (e.g. form part of their Contextual Characteristics (HES, 2019b, Annex 1)).
Medium	An asset, the setting of which, makes a moderate contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should be thought of as having Medium Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This could be an asset for which setting makes a contribution to significance but whereby its value is derived mainly from its other characteristics (HES, 2019b).
Low	An asset, the setting of which, makes some contribution to an understanding, appreciation and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Low Sensitivity to changes to its setting. This may be an asset whose value is predominantly derived from its other characteristics

Relative Sensitivity	Criteria
Marginal	An asset whose setting makes minimal contribution to an observer's understanding, appreciation and experience of it should generally be thought of as having Marginal Sensitivity to changes to its setting.

10.5.12 The determination of a heritage asset's relative sensitivity to changes to its setting is first and foremost reliant upon the determination of its setting and the key characteristics of setting which contribute to its cultural significance and an understanding and appreciation of that cultural significance. This aligns with Stage 2 of the HES guidance on setting (HES, 2020, 9). The criteria set out in Table 10.3 are intended as a guide. Assessment of individual heritage assets is informed by knowledge of the asset itself; of the asset type if applicable and by site visits to establish the current setting of the assets. This will allow for the use of professional judgement and each asset is assessed on an individual basis.

Criteria for Assessing Magnitude of Impact

10.5.13 Potential impacts, that is the physical change to known heritage assets, and unknown buried archaeological remains, or changes to their settings, in the case of the Proposed Development relate to the possibility of disturbing, removing or destroying in situ remains and artefacts during the construction phase or the placement of new features within their setting during the operational phase.

10.5.14 The magnitude of the impacts upon heritage assets caused by the Proposed Development is rated using the classifications and criteria outlined in Table 10.4.

Table 10.4 - Criteria for Criteria for Classifying Magnitude of Impacts

Impact Magnitude	Criteria
High	Substantial loss of information content resulting from total or large-scale removal of deposits from an asset. Major alteration of an asset's baseline setting, which materially compromises the observer's ability to understand the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset and erodes the key characteristics (HES, 2020) of the setting.
Medium	Loss of information content resulting from material alteration of the baseline conditions by removal of part of an asset. Alteration of an asset's baseline setting that effects the observer's ability to understand the contribution that setting makes to the significance of the asset to a degree but whereby the cultural significance of the monument in its current setting remains legible. The key characteristics of the setting (HES, 2020) are not eroded.
Low	Detectable impacts leading to minor loss of information content. Slight alterations to the asset's baseline setting, which do not affect the observer's ability to understand the contribution that setting makes to the asset's overall significance.

Impact Magnitude	Criteria
Negligible	Loss of a small percentage of the area of an asset's peripheral deposits. A reversible alteration to the fabric of the asset. A marginal alteration to the asset's baseline setting.
None	No effect predicted.

Criteria for Assessing Significance

- 10.5.15 The predicted level of effect on each heritage asset is then determined by considering the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity in conjunction with the predicted magnitude of the impact. The method of deriving the level of effect is provided in Table 10.5.

Table 10.5 - Level of Effect based on Inter-Relationship between the Sensitivity of a Heritage Asset and/or its setting and the Magnitude of Impact

Magnitude of Impact	Importance and/or Sensitivity				
	<i>Negligible</i>	<i>Low</i>	<i>Medium</i>	<i>High</i>	<i>Very High</i>
<i>High</i>	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major	Major
<i>Medium</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Minor	Moderate	Moderate	Major
<i>Low</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Minor	Minor	Moderate
<i>Negligible</i>	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible /Neutral	Negligible/ Neutral	Minor	Minor

- 10.5.16 The level of effect is judged to be the interaction of the asset's importance and/or relative sensitivity (Tables 10.2 and/or 10.3) and the magnitude of the impact (Table 10.4). In order to provide a level of consistency, the assessment of importance and relative sensitivity, the prediction of magnitude of impact and the assessment of level of effect is guided by pre-defined criteria. However, a qualitative descriptive narrative is also provided for each asset to summarise and explain each of the professional value judgements that have been made in establishing importance and/or sensitivity and magnitude of impact for each individual asset.
- 10.5.17 Using professional judgment and with reference to the Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment (as updated) (IEMA, 2017), and the EIA Handbook (SNH & HES, 2018) the assessment considers **moderate** and greater effects to be significant (shaded grey in Table 10.5), while **minor** and lesser effects are considered not significant.

Integrity of Setting

- 10.5.18 SPP notes that where there is potential for a proposed development to have an adverse effect on a Scheduled Monument or on the integrity of its setting, permission should only be granted where there are 'exceptional circumstances'. Adverse effects on integrity of setting are judged here to relate to whether a change would adversely affect those attributes or elements of setting which contribute to an asset's significance to the extent that the ability to understand and appreciate the asset is diminished.
- 10.5.19 In terms of effects upon the setting of heritage assets, it is considered that only those effects identified as 'significant' in the assessment will have the potential to adversely affect integrity of setting. Where no significant effect is found it is considered that the integrity of an asset's setting

will remain intact. This is because for many assets, setting may make a limited contribution to their significance and as such changes would not affect integrity of their settings. Additionally, as set out in Table 10.4, lower ratings of magnitude of change relate to changes that would not obscure or erode key characteristics of setting.

- 10.5.20 Where significant effects are found, a detailed assessment of adverse effects upon integrity of setting is made. Whilst non-significant effects are unlikely to affect integrity of setting, the reverse is not always true. That is, the assessment of an effect as being 'significant' does not necessarily mean that the adverse effect to the asset's setting will harm its integrity. The assessment of adverse effect upon the integrity of an asset's setting, where required, will be a qualitative one, and will largely depend upon whether the effect predicted would result in a major impediment to the ability to understand or appreciate the heritage asset and therefore reduce its cultural significance.

Cumulative Effect Assessment

- 10.5.21 It is necessary to consider whether the effects of other schemes in conjunction with the Proposed Development would result in an additional cumulative change upon heritage assets, beyond the levels predicted for the Proposed Development alone. However, only those assets which are judged to have the potential to be subject to significant cumulative effects will be included in the detailed cumulative assessment provided.
- 10.5.22 The cumulative assessment will have regard to the guidance on cumulative effects upon heritage assets as set out in Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook V5 (SNH & HES, 2018) and will utilise the criteria for assessing setting impacts as set out above. The assessment of cumulative effects will consider whether there would be an increased impact, either additive or synergistic, upon the setting of heritage assets as a result of adding the Proposed Development to a baseline, which may include operational, under construction, consented or proposed developments as agreed with OIC.
- 10.5.23 In determining the degree to which a cumulative effect may occur as a result of the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline a number of factors are taken into consideration including:
- the distance between wind farms;
 - the interrelationship between their Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV);
 - the overall character of the asset and its sensitivity to wind farms;
 - the siting, scale and design of the wind farms themselves;
 - the way in which the asset is experienced;
 - the placing of the cumulative wind farm(s) in relation to both the individual proposal being assessed and the heritage asset under consideration; and
 - the contribution of the cumulative baseline schemes to the significance of the effect, excluding the individual proposal being assessed, upon the setting of the heritage asset under consideration.
- 10.5.24 This assessment is based upon a list of operational or consented developments along with developments where planning permission has been applied for. Cumulative developments are listed in EIA Report Chapter 6. While all have been considered, only those which contribute to, or have the possibility to contribute to, cumulative effects on specific heritage assets are discussed in detail in the text. Additionally, given the emphasis NatureScot place on significant effects, and the requirements of the EIA Regulations, cumulative effects have only been considered in detail for those assets where the impact on setting from the Proposed Development, alone, has been judged to be of **low** magnitude or greater. The setting of assets which would have a magnitude of impact of **negligible** or less are judged to be unlikely to reach the threshold of significance as defined in Table 10.5.

Requirements for Mitigation

- 10.5.25 National and local planning policies and planning guidance outlined in Section 10.3 of this report, require a mitigation response that is designed to take cognisance of the possible impacts upon heritage assets by a proposed development and avoid, minimise or offset any such impacts as appropriate. The planning policies and guidance express a general presumption in favour of preserving heritage remains in situ [wherever possible]. Their ‘preservation by record’ (i.e. through excavation and recording, followed by analysis and publication, by qualified archaeologists) is a less desirable alternative (SPP, 2014, paras 137, 150; OIC, 2017a, Policy 8).
- 10.5.26 The Proposed Development has been designed where possible to avoid direct impacts upon known heritage assets through careful siting of infrastructure. Where possible, impacts upon the setting of heritage assets have been avoided or minimised during the iterative design process.

Assessment of Residual Effect Significance

- 10.5.27 The residual effect is what remains following the application of mitigation and management measures, and construction has been completed and is thus the final level of impact associated with the Proposed Development. The level of direct residual effect is defined using criteria outlined in Tables 10.2, 10.3 and 10.4. No direct mitigation, beyond that inherent in the Proposed Development design, is possible for setting effects of the Proposed Development and therefore residual effects on the setting of heritage assets will be the same as predicted without mitigation.

Limitations to Assessment

- 10.5.28 This assessment is based upon data obtained from publicly accessible archives as described in the Data Sources in Section 10.5.4 as well as a walkover survey. NRHE data and HES Designation data were downloaded from HES in September 2020. This assessment does not include any records added or altered after this date. The walkover survey included survey of the intertidal zone down to the Mean Low Water at the south-east coast of Faray where impacts on potential buried remains are possible. Walkover survey of the Holm of Faray and the intertidal zone of other areas of the island to Mean Low Water were not undertaken as they will not be impacted by the Proposed Development. The search of databases and historical records included the Holm of Faray and all land down to Mean Low Water.
- 10.5.29 No intrusive archaeological evaluation has been undertaken to inform this assessment, as such there is the potential for hitherto unknown archaeological remains to survive within the site and to be disturbed by the works associated with the Proposed Development. This limitation is taken account of in the Mitigation Section where measures to avoid or minimise any such effects on hitherto unknown remains are provided for.

10.6 Baseline Conditions

Designations

- 10.6.1 A Scheduled cairn known as chambered cairn, 280m NW of Quoy, Faray (Site 1) (hereafter ‘Quoy Chambered Cairn’ extends within the north western site boundary (Figure 10.1). It is visible as a low, grass-covered mound with exposed structural stone features. The mound of the cairn is around 14 m in diameter and stands to 1.3 m at its maximum height (HES, 2019d).
- 10.6.2 There are no further designated assets within the site. Within 5 km of the site, there are 16 Scheduled Monuments (Sites 17, 22-25, 27-29, 33-35, 38-41 & 45), all of which date to the prehistoric period and the majority of which are ritual or funerary monuments. The Scheduled area of The Manse (Site 23) also includes a 19th century church and its associated enclosure walls. There are two Category B Listed Buildings (Sites 46 & 50), to the east and north of the site respectively and three Category C Listed Buildings (Sites 47-49).
- 10.6.3 Between 5 km and 10 km from the site, there are a further 15 Scheduled Monuments (Sites 15, 16, 18-21, 26, 30-32, 36, 37 & 42-44); which include 11 prehistoric funerary and burial monuments (Sites 18-21, 6, 32, 36, 37 & 42-44), two ecclesiastical buildings (Sites 16 & 31), a castle (Site 30) and a

Norse settlement (Site 15). Six Scheduled Monuments (Sites 123-128) located between 10 km and 15 km from the site are judged to be particularly sensitive to changes in their settings and/or representative of views from island locations beyond the 10 km study area.

Archaeological and Historical Background

Context

- 10.6.4 Faray has a spine of high ground running roughly north-south down the length of the Island, which rises to a maximum height of 32 m AOD, with land on either side of the spine falling gradually to the coast which varies from 3 m AOD to 18 m AOD depending on the coastal edge of the island.
- 10.6.5 The island is occupied by grassland and is subdivided by rectilinear drainage ditches. The greater proportion of the land has been improved, although limited areas of unimproved grassland survive along the coastal edge. The island is uninhabited and is currently used for sheep grazing. The upstanding remains of nine farm complexes, a former school, a boathouse, and jetty are located on the island.
- 10.6.6 Comparison between modern and historical maps of Faray show subtle changes and reduction in the coastline with land evidently lost to the sea since the 19th century. This loss is also apparent in comparison between survey photographs taken by the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS) from 1981 and photographs taken to inform this assessment in 2020. Cultural heritage assets located on the coastal edge of Faray are highly vulnerable to erosion due to their proximity to coastal processes.
- 10.6.7 Descriptions of the Orkney Islands written in the 16th and 17th centuries refer to the island as "Faray" or "Fara." In the 18th century these spellings continue to be found, but also "Faira" and "Fairay" occur. "Pharay" appears in the census records from 1841. In some cases the name was preceded by the word "North." This was in an effort to distinguish the island from another Orkney island of similar name in the parish of Walls and Flotta, which was then called "South Faray" or "Fara."

Prehistoric Evidence

- 10.6.8 The NRHE² records four prehistoric sites (Sites 1, 4, 6 and 9) within the site, one of which is a Scheduled Monument (Site 1). The Scheduled Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) extends into the north-western site boundary. Dating evidence from similar chambered cairns indicates that it is likely to have been in use between 3600 BC and 2500 BC. Four horns, facing north-west, north-east, south-west and south-east were recorded when the cairn was visited in 1928, although only three were noted as being visible in 1981. The cairn was originally defined as an Orkney-Cromarty type short horned cairn, although the projections are now interpreted as later features and the cairn is now identified as a round cairn (Henshall, 1963, 198-9). Within the cairn (Site 1), which survives to c.14 m in diameter and approximately 1.3 m in height, is a stalled chambered aligned east north-east to west south-west and measuring 4.5 m long; and is characteristic of Orkney-Cromarty group round cairns (Richards, 1992). No evidence of human remains are recorded by the NRHE; however it is historically noted that a hollow in the cairn (Site 1) may be evidence of earlier investigations or interventions in the monument. Midden deposits containing burnt material, animal bones and pottery found by the presumed entrance to the cairn (Site 1) have been interpreted as evidence of secondary use of the monument. As the only known chambered cairn on Faray it may represent the single focus for burial and ritual for a prehistoric island community (HES, 2019d). The chambered cairn is indicative of an early prehistoric presence on the island.
- 10.6.9 The NRHE record a mound (Site 4) in the south-western area of the site. The mound (Site 4) is described as being shapeless, 25 m in diameter and surviving up to 1.5 m in height. The mound was first recorded in 1981 when it was noted that it may conceal earlier remains (RCAHMS, 1984). However no further work to discover the origin of the mound (Site 4) is known to have taken place.

² National Record of the Historic Environment (HES)

The mound was surveyed by AOC in August 2020 and found to be as described in 1981 and heavily overgrown with nettles and thistles. Occasional small stones are visible protruding from the mound.

- 10.6.10 Settlement remains were reportedly found at Site 6, in the western portion of the site. The settlement has been described as a “pictish house”, in association with a midden deposit composed of limpet shells, although no datable evidence was recovered. Limpets have been documented as being eaten as a famine food, although they are also eaten by island and coastal communities throughout time. No evidence of Site 6 now exists as the stone was quarried for building material and therefore without further information, Site 6 may date to any period of time from the prehistoric period onwards.
- 10.6.11 There are no further prehistoric remains recorded on Faray, although to the north, on the Holm of Faray, a potential Bronze Age site (Site 9) comprising stone covered mounds, historically recorded as “graves” are currently considered to be evidence of Bronze Age settlement.
- 10.6.12 Within 5 km of the site, prehistoric activity, largely in the form of ritual, funerary and/or burial monuments abounds on the islands Eday to the east, Westray to the north-west, Rousay to the west and Egilsay to the south-west, which indicates a high level of activity in the northern isles of Orkney during the prehistoric period.

Early Historic Evidence

- 10.6.13 No known early historic remains or artefacts are recorded on the site. However, the potential “pictish house” (Site 6) may be of Early Historic date and several nausts (Site 11), or boat moorings often ascribed to the Norse period, have been identified on the south-east coast of Faray. An area known as ‘Kirk Noust’ is marked on Ordnance Survey mapping from 1881 and may denote the location of a former naust or boat landing place adjacent to the site of the former chapel at Site 8.
- 10.6.14 Approximately 9 km to the north-west, on the southern coast of Westray, lies the remains of what has been interpreted as a high-status Viking settlement (Site 15). The settlement remains are Scheduled. Approximately 7.7 km south-east of the site, the Scheduled Stackel Brae castle (Site 30) or defensive structure is also thought to date from the Norse period. Therefore, there is evidence of Early Historic activity in the northern Orkney Islands, albeit limited.

Medieval Evidence

- 10.6.15 No medieval remains or artefacts are recorded on the site.
- 10.6.16 In the wider 10 km study area the Scheduled medieval church of Cross Kirk, c.9.4 km north-west on the southern coast of Westray, and St Magnus’ Church (Site 31), c.8.35 km to the south-west on Egilsay, are thought to date from the 12th century.
- 10.6.17 St Magnus church is dedicated to a local earl who was murdered by a rival Orkney earl (Haakon) on the island of Egilsay around AD 1116. It is one of three sites established in Orkney around 1136 to actively commemorate and promote a local saint who was the uncle of the ascending claimant to the earldom, Rognvald. The church at Egilsay is reflective of the wealth and sophistication of the Orkney Islands’ 12th-century Golden Age, and the close relationship between the earldom and the church. The church tower is a unique survival of a small group of distinctive Norse towers in Orkney and Shetland with architectural parallels in North Germany and around the North Sea. It provides evidence for the far-flung, maritime trading and political contacts of the Orkney earldom (HES, 2004).
- 10.6.18 Faray and the associated parish of Eday appear to have been conjoined at an early date with Stronsay (Cowan, 1967, 58). The parsonage revenues of Faray and Eday pertained to the mensa of the Bishop of Orkney from a similarly early date and remained so at the time of the Reformation (1534) (Cowan, 1967, 58). In 1544, the vicarage teinds were assigned to the treasurer of Orkney. Faray was part of the Bishopric lands and the feu granted to Gilbert Balfour, the first of the Orkney Balfour family, in 1560. The Statistical Account of 1795 (Anderson, 1795) notes that ‘the church on Faray, which has been in existence since the Reformation is dedicated to an unknown saint’. A mound in the south-east corner of the burial ground (Site 8), in the western area of the site, is thought to represent the remains of the chapel (RCAHMS, 1946, 72). Leslie (Leslie, 1998a) records

that Mary Groat from Lackquoy (1871-1940) remembered that part of the church was still standing in the late 19th century and that the remains of a stone fountain or urn used for baptism lay beside the ruins of a house known as ‘the Bu’ and may have come from the chapel.

- 10.6.19 An early traveller, generally given the name Jo Ben, described Faray in 1529 and noted that *“this island is very good for beasts, especially cows which crop the thickets there with great melody, and the children here sing to the brutes. The whole island is full of grain and fish”* (Ben, 1529).
- 10.6.20 It is possible that the structure at Site 6 dates from the medieval period. In addition, it is likely that at least some of the post medieval settlement remains (Sites 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 & 13) recorded across Faray have earlier antecedents.

Post-Medieval Evidence

- 10.6.21 Until 1724, Faray and the Holm of Faray remained with the Balfour family. With the marriage in 1724 of Isabel Balfour to Archibald Stewart of Brugh in Westray, it then became part of the Stewart Estate (Leslie, 1998a). The Old Statistical Account (OSA), written in 1795, notes that due to the exposure to sea spray the corn crop was regularly damaged. It is noted that Faray was well adapted to the pasture of cattle and sheep; and that tang (seaweed) was grown on some of its shores, for the manufacture of kelp (Anderson, 1795). Prior to 1852 Faray had no landing pier and no formal land divisions. Households had no official land division and the island operated a runrig system whereby each household was allocated and farmed rigs all across the island split according to relative fertility of land and between family groups creating a mosaic landscape typical of 19th century farming (Lee, 2015). The sheep were given free reign across the island in winter but in summer, when the crops started to grow, they were confined to the Holm of Faray. The sheep were prone to trying to cross from the Holm of Faray to Faray at each low tide and thus households were required to take turns at herding them back across to the Holm of Faray twice a day (Leslie, 1998a).
- 10.6.22 In 1802, the rental for ‘Pharay’ was £24 10/- Scots with additional payments of malt, butter, bere meal, geese, cabbages and hanks of spinning wool from the sheep grazing on the Holm of Faray. Cabbages were grown for the laird in quoys (enclosure for cabbage plants) and rent was paid to the factor who came twice a year. In 1810 Faray was under the ownership of James Stewart of Brugh in Westray and the rental returns of that year provide details of the tenants and the houses they occupied. The main occupations on the island were farming and fishing and a number of households were recorded at each croft. The censuses tend to indicate one man as the farmer while another would be a fisherman and others were farmer / fishermen and all the houses would have had a boat (Leslie, 1998a). Further details regarding the tenants at the farmsteads as noted in the census returns is recorded against the relevant entry in the Site Gazetteer in Appendix 10.1.
- 10.6.23 By 1845, the New Statistical Account (NSA) records Faray as *“Pharay”* and notes that there were 65 inhabitants, 40 acres of arable land and that the main produce was bere (a type of oat), oats, potatoes and cabbages. Animal husbandry on Faray consisted of sheep, pig, and oxen with horses also recorded. Only four boats are mentioned, two being described as herring boats and two as lobster boats. Kelp production is also documented (Simpson, 1845). There were also three stone quarries on the island (Leslie, 1998b).
- 10.6.24 A farmstead or house at “Bull” or “Bu”(Site 67) appears in the 1810 rental and the census for 1841. In 1810, the tenant of Bull was William Hercus who also had the tenancy of Lakequoy (Lackquoy) (Site 57). The lands of the Bu were located between Hamar (Site 55) and Lackquoy (Site 57). Bu is an old Norse word for a farmstead of high status. Leslie (Leslie, 1998a) describes the Bu as ‘the head house’ and notes that it was a two storey house in the centre of the island, close to Hamar, and enclosed by a stone dyke. It was used by the laird for his summer holiday accommodation. The Bu land became part of both Hamar and Lackquoy at the time of the “planking” and the building was demolished sometime between 1841 and 1851. The Bu is not mentioned or recorded in the OS Name Books of 1879-80. Another farmstead known as Mounthoolie is noted by a genealogy website relating to Faray which records field names associated with each farmstead and in relation to Windywall (Site 58) notes a field called Mounthoolie *‘where the old house of Mounthoolie stood’* (Genealogy Northern-skies.net, N.D) No further references to a farm at Mounthoolie are made in rent returns, census records or historic mapping.

- 10.6.25 In 1852 Faray was 'planked' and boundaries were created between each farm. The planks were larger cultivated strips and divided regularly (Lee, 2015) unlike the small irregular strips of runrig land visible on aerial photographs and satellite imagery (Sites 69-72). At the time of the planking there were seven houses on the island and from north to south these were; Quoy (Site 51), Cott (Site 52), Doggerboat (Site 53), Hamar (Site 55), Lackquoy (Site 57), Windywall (Site 58) and Holland (Site 59). There were generally two dwelling houses on each farm although three are recorded at Lackquoy. The Groat family are recorded living at 'Lakequoy' in the mid-19th century. In 1866 a Mr Groat is recorded as having built a new dwelling at Roadside to accommodate himself and his new wife (Leslie, 1998a).
- 10.6.26 The house and farm at Ness (Site 60) in the south of the island were established in 1852 at the same time as the land divisions. A large wall or sheep dyke (Site 65) across the north of the island was also constructed in 1852 in order to keep sheep from crossing over the Lavey Sound at low tide from the Holm of Faray during the summer months when they were prone to eating crops. The construction of the sheep dyke negated the need for island inhabitants to monitor the Lavey Sound and herd sheep back to the Holm of Faray at each low tide (Leslie, 1998a).
- 10.6.27 Within the site, three unroofed buildings (Sites 5, 12 and 13) and two enclosures (Sites 7 and 10) are depicted on the first edition OS map and within 1 km of the site a further unroofed structure (Site 3) is recorded on the Holm of Faray. The old schoolhouse survives as the only roofed structure on Faray (Site 54). The school master in 1879-80 was Mr Marcus (OS1/23/4/68) who was resident of Doggerboat (Site 53) (OS1/23/4/83). He worked the farm at Doggerboat as well as teaching in the school. At this time, it was recorded that the roof in the school had started to leak so badly that people refused to send their children to the school. This prompted the laird to erect a new school on the island and rent it out to the school board. The new school was a combined house and school with a door from the dwelling house into the classroom. Masons came from Smitlady in Westray to build the school (Leslie, 1998a).
- 10.6.28 The OS Name Books of 1879-80 provides a record of the eight farms on Faray at that time. The island is described as being the property of the late Mr Stewart and having been left to the Church of Scotland. A 'brough' or broch is noted at the north end of the island and refers to the site of Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) which throughout the 19th century was described as, and thought to be, a broch. All farms excepting Windywall, Holland, Ness and Doggerboat are described as encompassing single stone built dwelling houses. Holland, Windywall and Ness are described as comprising two small dwelling houses whereas Doggerboat is described as a small farm house with cottages adjoining. Each house is described as single storey, stone built with thatched roofs with the majority being noted to be in 'good' or 'fair' repair. The small farm houses at The Hill and The Cott and the farm complex at Doggerboat are all described as being in 'poor' repair. The schoolhouse is noted as being in good repair with a slate roof. Stoves were likely installed in most houses in Faray by the time of the 19th century. The peats burned in the fireplace or stove would have come from the Holm of Faray or possibly Eday. Those from the Holm of Faray were not of particularly good quality (Ordnance Survey Books of Reference 1879-1880).
- 10.6.29 Fishing was a key part of the Faray economy in the 19th century and two big herring boats are noted by Leslie (Leslie, 1998a) as fishing off the coast of Faray and being hauled up at 'the West Geo'. Leslie also notes that there was also a lot of cod fishing and that "*all the south end shore was covered with split cod drying*". The fish was purchased by an Adam Finstown who had a shop in Beuth, Eday and bought the dried cod for shipping south. There was a salt store north of the boat house which was then also in use as a kelp store (Leslie, 1998a). Fishing for sillocks was also undertaken (sillocks are small coal fish/saithes or ceuthes). The fish were dried in the chimney of the open fires with peats and when they were so far dried they were put in the roof in nets. When they were so dry that they would break over they were tied in bundles of 100 and sent to Kirkwall. The remains of six nausts are recorded in the south of the island (Site 11). A naust was shelter above high water mark where a vessel could be safeguarded from storms. They were generally unroofed boat shaped stone settings open at the seaward end to admit the craft. Equipment such as ores were kept in the boats whereas other equipment such as sails, buoys and ropes required indoor storage. A bod or boathouse was therefore common close to the landing point with the gable seaward end bearing the door (Tait, 2012).

- 10.6.30 Leslie (Leslie, 1998a) notes that the population in Faray in 1852 was 100. The population of Faray fell from 82 in 1861 to 58 in 1891 (The Orcadian, 2018). The ownership of Faray passed down through the Stewart line to the last James Stewart of Burgh, who died unmarried in 1858. By a trust disposition and settlement dated 11th June 1858, it then passed to the Stewart Endowment.
- 10.6.31 Within the 5 km study area there are five Listed Buildings all of which date from the 17th (Site 46) to the 19th centuries (Sites 47-50). Two of the Listed Buildings; the Category B Carrick House (Site 46) and Category C Listed Eday Church (Site 47) are located on Eday to the west of the site. Rusk Holm house (Site 49), a Category C Listed Building is located on Rusk Holm to the west of the site. The Category A Listed Sangar Crofthouse (Site 50) and Category C Helzie, Rapness Windmill (Site 48) are located on Westray to the north-west.

Modern Evidence

- 10.6.32 The house known as the Bu (Site 67) was demolished by the late 19th century, however, Leslie (Leslie, 1998a) recalls that as a child the field where the house had stood was known as 'Bu land' and that the plough regularly brought up stones from the Bu. A note in the Orcadian on 3rd February 1938 records a sandstone whorl (Site 68) found by the farmer at Lackquoy in a meadow near the former house site at the Bu (The Orcadian, 1938).
- 10.6.33 In December 1908, a Peterhead fishing vessel the SS Hope ran aground on the Holm of Faray during a storm. Five men from Faray braved the storm in a rowing boat to rescue the crew. They subsequently each received a medal and other gifts from Edward VII and were referred to as the 'Faray Heroes' (The Orcadian, 2018).
- 10.6.34 One of the last burials in Faray is thought to have been that of Ann Drever, wife of William Wallace at the Ness. The gravestone in the burial ground (Site 8) notes that she died on 22nd October 1907. Subsequent burials would have been in the Old Kirkyard on Eday. In 1925, mason Alex Costie from Westray came over and built a dyke around the burial ground, which had not been enclosed previously. The remains of the chapel were incorporated within the dyke.
- 10.6.35 In 1933, only one house had the fields fenced and fencing of fields in grass was primarily undertaken after this time. In 1935 the council built a large concrete jetty on the west coast of Faray. This made a great difference to boating and allowed much easier shipping of cattle (Leslie, 1999b).
- 10.6.36 In November 1942, an aeroplane caught fire and was abandoned over the sea. The pilot was rescued after being in the water for 30 minutes by Mr Leslie of Holland. The pilot was taken to Faray and then transferred to Kirkwall. In June 1944 a Spitfire developed engine problems and the pilot, Flight Sergeant Miller, had to make a forced landing in a field at Lackquoy. The plane just missed a deep ditch and hit some new fencing that had been put up before coming to a halt. Parts of it were spread over two small fields. Flight Sergeant Miller was unharmed, and the plane was later dismantled and shipped off the island to be reassembled (McNeill, 2015).
- 10.6.37 Sustaining the small population of Faray in the 20th century, where much physical labour was required to move people, animals and supplies on and off the island, transportation and communication were difficult, and services such as a shop and post office were non-existent, was becoming increasingly difficult. The land became more difficult to let and crofts were amalgamated, the land at Quoy going in with Cott around 1931. Following the Second World War, it proved difficult to get a teacher for the island and the school closed in July 1946. The two remaining pupils from Windywall and Cott were sent to school in Westray with the intention that they would get back to the island at weekends. In view of the difficulty of transportation in winter, this did not necessarily happen and parents were unhappy with the arrangement and subsequently left the island (Leslie, 1998a).
- 10.6.38 Of the eight houses on Faray, only six were occupied by the end of the Second World War. The population at this time was around 20. The last inhabitants left over a short period of time, going to different parishes both on The Mainland of Orkney and in the North Isles. The Orcadian of 11th April 1947 carried an article on the evacuation of the island noting that "*Extensive advertising of the island holdings has failed to attract new inhabitants*" and that "*the troubles arising out of bad weather*

conditions and indicates the drop in manpower has made the hauling up of boats a serious handicap” (The Orcadian, 1947).

- 10.6.39 The islands of Faray and Holm of Faray were acquired by Orkney Islands Council in 2019.

Cartographic Evidence

- 10.6.40 Blaeu’s first atlas of Scotland, published in 1654, includes a description of Faray noting that... “...in a very savage and boundingly rising sea, lies North Fara, about three miles long, but restricted with few buildings, and not unfortunate in commodities”. Blaeu’s 1654 map of Orkney and Shetland (not illustrated) is highly schematic and annotates an island as “Fara”, as the largest island between Westray and “Eda” in a shape not comparable to later records. Adairs’ map of 1682 (not illustrated) is similar to Blaeu’s although the island is annotated as “Farra”. Moll’s map of 1745 (not illustrated) documents Faray as “Faira” and records the presence of a dwelling in the southern area of the island.
- 10.6.41 Mackenzie’s charts of the Orkney Islands of 1750 (not illustrated) show a more accurate depiction of Faray in relation to surrounding islands and also shows a pictogram of a ‘farmers house’ showing that the island was occupied and used for agriculture but provides no further detail regarding land use. Sayer and Bennet’s nautical map of the Orkney Islands dated 1781 records the island of Faray although no reference is made to the landmass nor are there any depictions to suggest activity on the island. Eunson’s map of 1795 similarly shows no information about the land use on the site. Whilst Thomson’s map of 1822 was not a nautically focused undertaking, the map records no further information about the land use on Faray in the early 19th century.
- 10.6.42 Large-scale (25 inch) Ordnance Survey (OS) maps are available for the site reflecting the fact that it was considered an inhabited area and thus targeted for detailed survey in the 19th century. The Ordnance Survey (OS) 25 inch maps were published in 1881 with a less detailed six inch map published in 1882 (Figure 10.6). The 1882 map provides a useful overview of the island showing areas of enclosed improved land in irregular and regular fields associated with farmsteads or crofts which are depicted and annotated (north to south) as Quoy (Site 51); Cott (Site 52); Doggerboat (Site 53), Hamar (Site 55); The Hill (Site 56), Roadside (Site 14); Lackquoy (Site 57); Windywall (Site 58); Holland (Site 59); and Ness (Site 60). The map also shows tracks such as Site 107 providing access between the farmsteads on the island. Numerous wells (Sites 109, 112 and 116-118) are also annotated. A crane (Site 130) is marked on the six inch OS map of Faray dated 1882 but rather curiously is not shown on the earlier large-scale OS map of 1881. Conversely cranes at Torhelia Geo (Site 129) and Rammy Geo (Site 131) are shown on the 1881 map but not the OS map of 1882. The cranes are all shown to be located on the coastal/cliff edge and were likely related to the fishing industry and/or boat landings. The variation in records of these features between maps of such close publication date may indicate that they were mobile or in use for only short periods of time. To the north of the site, the Holm of Faray is depicted as being joined to Faray, although the two are recorded as being separated at high tide. To the south, of the site, several arable fields are depicted, although no further structures are recorded on the OS maps of 1881 and 1882.
- 10.6.43 Extracts from the large-scale Ordnance Survey maps of 1881 are presented in Figures 10.7-10.11. Figure 10.7 shows the detail of the north part of the island. The Scheduled cairn (Site 1) which extends into the north-western boundary of the site is annotated as “the site of Brough”. The farmsteads of Quoy (Site 51) and Cott (Site 52) are also shown. Both farmsteads are shown to comprise extensive complexes of roofed structures with Quoy comprising six buildings and Cott comprising two parallel building ranges with ancillary structures to the north. Figure 10.8 shows the farmstead complex at Doggerboat (Site 53) north of the school (Site 54) which in turn is shown north of Hamar (Site 55). The farmsteads at Hamar and Doggerboat are shown to be connected by a track. Figure 10.9 shows the farmstead of Lackquoy located east of rectilinear fields with a spring shown to the north-west and a small pond to the south-west. North-east of Lackquoy the farmsteads of Roadside and The Hill are shown. Figure 10.10 shows the farmsteads of Windywall (Site 58) and Holland (Site 59) with associated irregular plots of enclosed land and tracks linking the land and farmsteads as well as a small pond. Figure 10.11 shows the farmstead at Ness (Site 60) and the boat shed (Site 75) to the south-east. No indication of the nausts at Scammalin (Site 11) are shown indicating that they were no longer in use at this time.

- 10.6.44 A disused graveyard (Site 8) and a school (Site 54) are also annotated within the site on OS mapping from 1881 and 1882.
- 10.6.45 Only the central portion of Faray is record on the OS 25 inch edition published in 1900. This map records the expansion of arable fields in the southern portion of the island between Windywall (Site 58), Holland (Site 59) and Ness (Site 60). Between 1881 and 1900 the tracks on the island and within the site appear to have been straightened and improved, potentially to better facilitate transport on the island.
- 10.6.46 There are no maps of Faray between 1900 and 1972. The OS Plan of 1972 records reduced and unroofed settlements at Quoy (Site 51), Cott (Site 52) Doggerboat (Site 53), The Hill (Site 56) and Lackquoy (Site 57). The structures at Hamar (Site 55), Windywall (Site 58), Roadside (Site 14), Holland (Site 59) and Ness (Site 60) are depicted as partially roofed. This indicates that Hamar, Windywall, Roadside and Ness had deteriorated in condition less than the other structures on the island and may have continued in some use for storage of equipment as part of the management of the island as a sheep farm.
- 10.6.47 By 1981, only the former school (Site 54), one of the buildings at Holland (Site 59) and buildings at Windywall (Site 58) are depicted as being roofed, which suggests that the structures on the site were not intensively used and were being left to deteriorate.

Aerial Photographic Evidence

- 10.6.48 A search of aerial photographs held by HES's National Collection of Aerial Photography (NCAP) revealed nine vertical sorties dating from 1946 to 1987 that covered the site.
- 10.6.49 A list of all photographs consulted is included in Section 10.14 of this chapter. The aerial photographs revealed numerous features relating to past land management practices across the site. Features visible on historical aerial photographs include runrig cultivation, rectilinear field boundaries and ditches, enclosures, farmsteads and the routes of former trackways linking farms. Areas of runrig identified from aerial photography includes Sites 69-74 and these areas are plotted on Figure 10.1 The features largely correspond with features that can be seen on modern aerial photography and satellite imagery and the majority of features identified corresponded to assets recorded during map regression. Features recorded during aerial photographic consultation were cross-referenced to historic mapping records and checked on the ground during the walkover survey.

Walkover Survey

- 10.6.50 The walkover survey was undertaken on 17th August 2020 in variable weather. Visibility varied from poor to very good and survey transects were adapted to visibility conditions accordingly throughout the day.
- 10.6.51 The most numerous asset types recorded during the walkover survey were clearance cairns. These cairns abound throughout the island and are variable in their size, style and likely function. The most numerous clearance cairn types are those found adjacent to large drainage ditches and are representative of stones cleared out of the ditch and placed adjacent to it such as Site 79 (Appendix 10.3; Plate 1). There are also numerous cairns placed close to, or at, the coastal edge such as Site 90 (Appendix 10.3 Plate 2). It is assumed that these represent stones removed from fields onto the least productive land on the edge of the island. It is likely that some also contain stones from previous built structures such as sheep enclosures, quoys, dykes and possible earlier prehistoric structures. Quoys or plantiecrubs were used for growing kale and cabbages and were a vital resource for providing crops and animal feed over the winter in the 18th and 19th centuries but would have been less frequently used and thus probably removed in the 20th centuries. Stone structural remains vary from coherent upstanding remains with plan form still visible and likely to be the remains of sheep enclosures or quoys such as at Site 111 (Appendix 10.3; Plate 3), to subtle semi-buried piles of stones which may be prehistoric in date such as Site 61 (Appendix 10.3 Plate 4). The presence of remains of quoys and enclosures across the island may be suggestive of earlier structures and/or settlement because the structures will have been placed on small patches of good

- soil and were often sited adjacent to or on sites with availability or rubble from prehistoric ruins (Tait, 2012).
- 10.6.52 A distinct difference was observed in the style of cairns located on the east and west coast of the island. Cairns on the east coast predominantly comprise small tumbled mounds of stones arranged in relatively haphazard fashion (Sites 76 and 77) (Appendix 10.3 Plates 5-6). By contrast many (although by no means all) of the cairns on the west coast are neatly stacked in sub rectangular piles and often within a small dug out recess (Appendix 10.3 Plates 7-8). This difference in style and appearance of cairn may in part reflect differing geologies on the west and east coast of the island but may also reflect a cultural preference.
- 10.6.53 In the west of the island is a large mound (Site 4; Appendix 10.3; Plate 9) measuring 25 m across and up to 1.5 m high. It was first recorded by the RCAHMS in 1981 who noted that it may contain an ancient structure (RCAHMS, 1984). It comprises a large grass and thistle covered mound with a depression in the centre. Occasional stones are visible protruding through the mound bank.
- 10.6.54 The remains of a prehistoric chambered cairn (Site 1) are located in the north of the island. The cairn survives as a grass covered mound around 14 m in diameter 1.3 m at its maximum height (Appendix 10.3; Plate 10). The chamber is visible as a hollow in the centre of the mound in which three pairs of stalls divided by orthostats can be identified (Appendix 10.3; Plate 11). The cairn has evidently been partially excavated in the past and two linear features radiate from the north-east and south-west sides of the cairn. The remains of an extensive length of drystone walling (Site 65; Appendix 10.3 Plates 12-13) are located north of the cairn. The wall was constructed as a sheep dyke in the mid 19th century at the time of the planking and may incorporate some stones from the cairn. However, it is unlikely that the cairn was robbed extensively for building stone as its form and mound appear to survive relatively intact.
- 10.6.55 The remains of a burial ground and the site of a former chapel (Site 8) are located in the west of Faray. The burial ground is surrounded by a drystone wall with gate piers on its eastern end (Appendix 10.3 Plate 14). The burial ground enclosure was constructed in 1925 and is reported to contain stones from the remains of the former chapel. A long-term danger of erosion undermining the south-west corner of the graveyard was identified in 1981. Gabions in the south-west corner were recorded during the walkover survey and appear to be protecting the burial ground from erosion (Appendix 10.3; Plate 15). The burial ground contains c.30 upstanding or partially upstanding gravestones. Details of their inscriptions are included in the Site Gazetteer in Appendix 10.1. A small pile of indistinct rubble (Site 108; Appendix 10.3; Plate 16) partially overgrown is located south of the burial ground and may mark the location of a former structure.
- 10.6.56 The upstanding remains of nine farm complexes survive on Faray. Each farmstead survives in a state of disrepair and none could be entered or surveyed in detail due to health and safety concerns.
- 10.6.57 Quoy (Site 51; Appendix 10.3, Plate 17) is the most northerly house on Faray, lying closest to Lavey Sound, which separates Faray from the Holm. It was found to comprise a complex of five unroofed and partially ruined stone structures surrounded by dense nettle vegetation. All are of drystone flagstone rubble construction with dressed blocks for window and door lintels. All survive above wall height with most surviving to full gable height. The remains of large flagstone roof tiles survive on some structures and tumbled around the centre.
- 10.6.58 Cott (Site 52; Appendix 10.3, Plate 18) lies in the north end of Faray, between Quoy (the most northerly house) and Doggerboat. It comprises the remains of three rectangular buildings associated with a large walled sub rectangular enclosure to the north. Buildings are of drystone construction and built from flagstone rubble with dressed blocks for window and door lintels. The northernmost building is aligned east to west and is roofed with large flagstone tiles. Some gaps in tiles show wooden roof trusses beneath. The central building is aligned north-east to south-west and appears to be the remains of a dwelling house with a chimney surviving on its north-east elevation. Walls, gables and chimney are partially harled/consolidated with mortar. Remains of wooden window frames are also in place in the central building. The southern structure survives to gable height and is smaller and ancillary to the main house. Remains of partial walls hint at previous additional adjoining structures. The complex is in a partial state of collapse and surrounded by dense nettle vegetation.

- 10.6.59 Doggerboat (Site 53) is the third house from the north end of Faray, lying between Cott (Site 52) and the school (Site 54). The farmstead of Doggerboat (Appendix 10.3, Plate 19) is a late-18th or early 19th century single-storey, roughly rectangular-plan croft house built from grey flagstone rubble with lighter dressed blocks at corners and for window and door lintels. The principle range is aligned east south-east to west south-west with a large sub rectangular walled enclosure to the north. The range consists of three sub compartments, unroofed but with some partially collapsed wooden roof trusses surviving and rare flagstone roof tiles. A modern trailer is stored at the eastern end of the range. A separate structure is set off to the south-west and comprises a single room single storey sandstone unroofed structure. Both gable ends are intact.
- 10.6.60 The school (Site 54; Appendix; 10.3 Plate 20) is of drystone construction with a corrugated iron roof. It has a wooden extension, also with a corrugated iron roof, to its north elevation. The former school is used by the crofter for accommodation during lambing and for shelter during rough weather when it is not possible to leave the island. There is a fenced enclosure to north, partially constructed from large rectangular flagstone tiles and used for controlling sheep during shearing (Appendix 10.3 Plate 21).
- 10.6.61 Hamar (Site 55; Appendix 10.3; Plate 22) lies on the north end of the island with the school (Site 54) to the north and Lackquoy (Site 56) to the south. It lies on the east side of the road. It comprises the remains of a post-medieval farmstead complex with later alterations. Buildings are of drystone construction and built from red sandstone rubble with occasional darker sandstone dressed blocks. Two principal ranges of buildings are aligned roughly east to west with a large sub rectangular stone enclosure to north. The easternmost structure has a corrugated iron roof and is consolidated with mortar. All other buildings are unroofed. A slightly tapering, circular-plan kiln (Appendix 10.3; Plate 23) adjoins the south-east gable of the barn. The farmstead is located within an enclosure defined by wooden fences and is much overgrown with nettles.
- 10.6.62 Lackquoy (Site 57 Appendix 10.3; Plate 24) is situated in the middle of the island, to the south of Hamar (Site 55) and north of Windywall (Site 58). It lies on the west side of the road (Site 114) that runs from one end of the island to the other, but on the opposite side from Hamar. It is a late 18th or early 19th century single-storey east to west aligned range roughly rectangular in plan and built from grey flagstone rubble with lighter dressed blocks at corners and for window and door lintels. It is roofless but survives with gables largely intact. East of Lackquoy on the opposite side of the road are the remains of two structures which form part of the former farmstead of Roadside (Site 14 Appendix 10.3; Plate 25). The southern structure is aligned east to west and is unroofed. It is of drystone construction and built from rough red sandstone rubble with lighter dressed sandstone blocks at corners and for window and door lintels. The remains of a smaller structure are attached to the southern elevation with the south-east wall surviving to gable height. Substantial repairs are visible in the centre of the southern gable indicating perhaps a previous collapse or structural fail. The northern structure is partially roofed with large flagstone slabs. Some wooden roof trusses also remain in place as do door and window lintels. The western and northern elevations have been consolidated with mortar. Numerous building phases are visible in the western elevation as well as an infill wall linking the two structures. A small tumbled lean-to stone structure is attached to northern end of the west elevation. The farmstead is surrounded by nettles which probably mask further tumbled stone and roofing tiles. North-east of Roadside is The Hill (Site 56 Appendix 10.3; Plate 26) which survives as a single drystone sandstone structure roughly rectangular in plan. It is roofless but with gables largely intact.
- 10.6.63 Windywall (Site 58; Appendix 10.3; Plate 27) lies in the southern half of the island to the north of Holland, west of the road. It comprises the remains of two drystone rectangular structures positioned roughly at right angles to one another. One aligned roughly north to south with the other east to west in reverse L-shape. The southern and east to west aligned structure is unroofed but survives to gable height with chimneys intact on the west gable. The north (north-south aligned) building is partially roofed with large sandstone tiles. Large areas of tile are missing, showing wooden roof trusses beneath. A small lean-to structure is attached to the north elevation and is roofed with stone tiles. Both buildings have extended lengths of tumbled wall indicating the presence of previous structures.

- 10.6.64 Holland (Site 59; Appendix 10.3; Plate 28) lies towards the south end of Faray. It comprises the remains of four rectangular roofless structures with numerous areas of ancillary walling and tumbled stone piles indicating the likely presence of additional structures. All are of grey sandstone rubble drystone construction and survive above wall height but not to full gable height. The interiors of the structure are part infilled with tumbled stone and overgrown with nettles.
- 10.6.65 The Ness (Site 60; Appendix 10.3; Plate 29) is the most southerly of the houses on Faray and was constructed at sometime between 1841 and 1851. This was at the time of the planking and the end of the old runrig system of agriculture. Ness comprises the remains of five rectangular structures of dry rubble construction. Three of the buildings are arranged in a u-shape with two ancillary structures set off to south and east. The southern part of the U-shape is aligned east to west and has a corrugated iron roof and is used for storage. South of Ness are the remains of another building (Site 115 Appendix 10.3 Plate 30) surviving as tumbled stone walls and roughly rectangular in plan.
- 10.6.66 The road (Site 114) which runs north to south through the centre of the island is built of stone, wide, cambered and with banks and ditches at either side (Appendix 10.3; Plate 31). It is overgrown with grass and survives as visible grassy track (Appendix 10.3; Plate 32).
- 10.6.67 The slipway (Appendix 10.3; Plate 33) and boathouse (Appendix 10.3; Plate 34) are located in the south of the island. An alternative landing place for boats is located Djubi Geo (Appendix 10.3; Plate 35).
- 10.6.68 On the south-east coast of Faray four pointed-ended nausts set in two pairs were recorded by RCAHMS in May 1981 (RCAHMS, 1984). At this time, it was reported that all were truncated by erosion. Photographs by Lamb (Lamb, 1981) (SC 1922729; SC 1922731) show the openings of the nausts hanging 1 m above beach level. The former locations of the nausts were visited by AOC in August 2020. Two subtle depressions at the edge of the cliff possibly mark the locations of the nausts (Appendix 10.3; Plate 36) however the structural remains clearly visible on Lamb's 1981 photographs no longer survive. It is concluded that the majority of the features have likely been lost to coastal erosion in the 40 years since they were identified by RCAHMS.
- 10.6.69 The remains of walling eroding from the north-western coastal edge were recorded at Muller Geo (Site 91) and possibly represent the remains of quoys or sheep shelters (Appendix 10.3; Plate 37). Their location eroding out of the cliff prevented any detailed survey of their extent. An area of stone on the south-east facing cliff at Scammalin (Site 132) possibly represents a structure eroding out into the sea (Appendix 10.3; Plate 38). The location on the coastal edge may indicate the remains of a structure associated with coastal industry such as kelp or fish processing. There are no above ground remains of the structure and it is buried below the surface and thus of some antiquity.
- 10.6.70 The remains of a large quarry scoop (Site 106) (Appendix 10.3; Plate 39) were recorded in the centre of the island near Kirk Noust and may be related to quarrying for stone for construction of the nearby farmsteads or burial ground wall. A number of later features relating to stock management were also recorded and included a sheep dip (Site 110 Appendix 10.3; Plate 40) and water tank (Site 93 Appendix 10.3; Plate 41). The remains of a small feature (Site 94 Appendix 10.3; Plate 42) of unknown function were recorded adjacent to a drain in the south of the island.

Evolution of the baseline

- 10.6.71 Future baselines (without the Proposed Development) would largely be expected to mirror the current baseline. Any alteration to the baseline condition of the heritage assets within the site would likely relate to continued deterioration of upstanding structures as a consequence of natural weathering and, in some cases, stock grazing. Analysis of historic mapping and previous archaeological survey photographs has revealed that land on the coastal edge of Faray has been lost to coastal erosion over the last 200 years. Loss of the site of boat nausts (Site 11) on the south-east coast has been documented within the last 40 years. Heritage assets located within the intertidal zone and at the coastal edge are therefore at risk from potential disturbance and/or loss as a consequence of coastal erosion and this risk is increasing due to sea level rises associated with climate change. The current baseline is taken as the basis for the construction effects assessment presented here.

- 10.6.72 The setting of the site and assets within the wider study area will be altered in the future through the construction of consented turbines and other developments. The effects of consented and proposed turbines on the setting of heritage assets is discussed under cumulative effects.

10.7 Receptors Brought Forward for Assessment

- 10.7.1 The baseline assessment (Section 10.6) has identified one designated asset and 88 non-designated assets located within the site which could potentially be affected by the Proposed Development. There are no previous modern archaeological interventions recorded on the site although antiquarian investigations have been noted above. Overall, there is considered to be a high potential for further previously unrecorded buried remains to survive on the site.
- 10.7.2 A Scheduled cairn (Site 1) is located in the north-west of the site. No further designated assets are recorded within 1 km of the site. This assessment has identified five Listed Buildings within 5 km of the site and a further 32 Scheduled Monuments within 10 km of the site. Six Scheduled Monuments (Sites 123-128) located between 10 km and 15 km from the site are judged to be particularly sensitive to changes in their settings and/or representative of views from island locations beyond the 10 km study area.

Receptors Brought Forwards for Assessment of Direct Effects

- 10.7.3 A total of 89 cultural heritage assets have been identified within the site. Their relative importance has been classified according to the method shown in Table 10.2 and is discussed below and summarised in Table 10.6
- 10.7.4 Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) is of high importance. The cairn has the potential to contribute to our understanding and appreciation of the nature of prehistoric society in Faray. The cairn also contributes to our understanding of the design and construction of prehistoric burial monuments in the Neolithic period; it retains structural details in the form of its stalled chamber and there is potential for the survival of buried archaeological deposits. Although disturbed, the remains of the cairn have the potential to provide material for dating which when compared with similar monuments could contribute to a better understanding of the chronological development of cairn building during the Neolithic in the Orkney Islands. Additionally, there is the potential for environmental material to survive within the cairn which could provide information on demographics, land use and the Neolithic environment (HES, 2019d). The cairn is the only example of a chambered cairn on the island of Faray and as such was potentially the burial and ritual focus for the island, although the possibility that other cairns were previously located on the island cannot be ruled out.
- 10.7.5 A grassy mound which may conceal an earlier structure (Site 4) has been identified within the site. There is evidence of prehistoric activity on the site (Sites 1, 6 and 9) and therefore it is possible that the mound may conceal another prehistoric site. Equally the mound may relate to later agrarian practices. No structural remains could be identified and as such the nature and date of the mound remains unknown. It is possible given its location close to an earlier chapel site and nearby post-medieval farmsteads that this represents the remains of a farm mound of which there are also examples on the nearby islands of Papa Westray, North Ronaldsay and Sanday; some of which have been radiocarbon dated to the 7th century to 13th century AD (Davidson et al, 1986). Therefore, the mound (Site 4) is judged to be of medium importance. Similarly, the potential prehistoric settlement remains on Holm of Faray (Site 9) retain evidence for prehistoric settlement in an area in which known settlement and early activity is scarce, the remains of this asset have the potential to inform about early settlement of Faray and as such are judged to be of medium importance.
- 10.7.6 The potential "Pict's House" (Site 6) is judged to be of low importance. While the asset is described as being largely destroyed during post-medieval quarrying works it is possible that associated archaeological features may survive as buried remains in the vicinity of Site 6. The asset is likely to date prior to the late 19th century and as such if any remains do survive, they will add to the understanding of the long term settlement on the island.
- 10.7.7 The burial ground and associated site of a chapel (Site 8) within the western area of the site date to at least the 17th century and continued in use until the early 20th century. The former chapel building

is recorded as being quarried for stone to build the burial ground wall and potentially for other post-medieval structures on Faray. Therefore, there is the potential for buried remains associated with the chapel and burial ground to survive in the vicinity of Site 8. Any remains which do survive have the potential to further the understanding of the long term settlement and activity on Faray as well as the pre post-medieval ecclesiastical and burial arrangements of the smaller Orkney Islands and they are judged to be of medium importance.

- 10.7.8 Post-medieval deserted settlement remains on the Orkney Islands are not uncommon and it is widely accepted that the Orkney Islands had a relatively higher population in the post-medieval period compared to their current populations. Therefore, building remains, and historic field boundaries are relatively common features on the Orkney Islands. The remains identified and recorded across the island provide testimony to post-medieval and early 20th century land management practices.
- 10.7.9 The remains of the nine farmsteads (Sites 51-53 and 55-60), a former school building (Site 54) and a boathouse (Site 75) survive as visible remains of the 19th and 20th century settlement and eventual abandonment of Faray. The buildings comprise linear arrangements of single-storey, stone buildings with associated outbuildings including livestock sheds, barns and in the case of Hamar a kiln and are typical of traditional Orkney croft complexes which are usually single storey, low profile buildings made up of two or sometimes three rooms with an adjoining byre (Fenton, 1978). The presence of chimney stacks on the gables of the Faray houses indicates that the buildings were constructed or altered after 1830-1840, when flues in the gable end were typical (Newman, 1991) and thus the buildings within the site are likely of 19th century date although they may also incorporate earlier structural elements. The low form, thick and irregular rubble walls with gabled ends is typical of the region in protecting against Atlantic storms. The walls are largely constructed from undressed stone that is likely to have been gathered from surrounding land with dressed elements of stone incorporated for lintels, door and window surrounds and on building corners. Flagstone roofs, as a lapped and seamed underlayer for turf or thatch, is a traditional roofing method in Orkney, because of the abundance of flagstone. The weight of the flagstones were supported on timber rafters, particularly as larger quantities of timber were imported to the Orkney Islands from the Scottish Mainland during the 19th century (Fenton, 1978). Individually the non-designated post-medieval building remains (Sites 5, 7, 10, 12 & 51-60) recorded on the site are judged to be of low importance. However, together they form a corpus of evidence which documents the development of the island throughout the post-medieval and modern periods and preserve a palimpsest of evolving land management methods. The assets thus have a group historic and architectural value which is judged to be of medium importance.
- 10.7.10 Kilns were common on small crofts but surviving examples are now rare (Fenton, 1987). They were used to dry the grain for grinding and sometimes also the grain for the next years seed and were also used to dry malt as part of the process of making ale. The circular, tapering kiln at Hamar (Site 55) therefore is of medium value.
- 10.7.11 As shown on Figures 10.1 and 10.2 the site contains a dense concentration of individual assets recorded during the walkover survey. Twenty-nine (Sites 61-64, 78-81, 83-88, 90, 92, 95-100, 102-104, 113, 120, 122) of the 88 non-designated assets comprise the remains of small clearance cairns (Appendix 10.3; Plates 1-2 and 5-8). Individually they provide limited information regarding clearance of stone from the land for cultivation and associated digging of drainage ditches and are of negligible importance. However, together these assets represent the collective effort of the former residents of Faray in dividing and draining the land in the 19th century in an attempt to improve productivity and thus contribute to our understanding of local activity and are of low importance. Similarly the wells (Site 109, 112, 116-118) marked on historic OS maps are individually of negligible importance but are related to the wider management of water resources across the island and have a higher group value.
- 10.7.12 Numerous sites are known only from documentary evidence and have no above ground associated remains. These include three former cranes recorded from historic mapping (Site 129-130) and the record of the find of a sandstone whorl (Site 68) and are judged to be of negligible importance. The documentary records of the former location of the Laird's House or the Bu are associated with accounts of remains being found in the ploughsoil and are judged to be of low importance. The

remaining identified assets largely relate to historical land division and land management practices, specifically rig cultivation (Sites 69-74) and trackways (Site 105, 114) are typical of abandoned late post-medieval occupation evidence that abounds across the Orkney Islands. They are consequently judged to be of low importance.

10.7.13 It should be noted that some of the assets described above are subtle in nature and have an indistinct form and could thus potentially be of earlier date or natural origin. It is also possible that identified later assets may obscure and/or incorporate earlier features and as such the importance levels in Table 10.6 should be read as indicative.

10.7.14 **Table 10.6 - Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Importance of Features within the Site**

Site No	Name	Description	Importance	Group Value
1	Quoy Chambered Cairn	Scheduled cairn	High	N/A
2	The Castle	Non-designated asset – natural feature	None	N/A
3	Point of Dogs Bones	Non-designated asset - Structure	Low	N/A
4	Faray Mound	Non-designated asset- undated	Medium	N/A
5	Doggerboat	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval structure historic mapping	Negligible	N/A
6	Faray, Settlement (possible)	Non-designated asset- undated	Low	N/A
7	Holland	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval enclosure	Low	Medium
8	Burial Ground	Non-designated asset- Undated burial ground and chapel	Medium	Medium
9	Holm of Faray	Non-designated asset – prehistoric house	Medium	N/A
10	The Nev	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval enclosure	Low	Medium
11	Scammalin	Non-designated asset - nausts	Low	N/A
12	Holland	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval structure historic mapping	Negligible	N/A

Site No	Name	Description	Importance	Group Value
13	Quoy Noust	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval enclosure	Low	N/A
14	Roadside	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
51	Quoy	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
52	Cott	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
53	Doggerboat	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
54	School	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
55	Hamar	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Medium	Medium
56	The Hill	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
57	Lackquoy	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
58	Windywall	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
59	Holland	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
60	Ness	Non-designated asset- Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
61-64, 78-81, 83-88, 90, 92, 95-100, 102-104, 113, 120, 122	Faray, clearance	Non-designated asset – stone clearance associated with field drainage ditches	Negligible	Low
65	Lavey Sound	Non-designated asset – Sheep dyke	Low	Medium

Site No	Name	Description	Importance	Group Value
66	Lavey Sound, east	Non-designated asset – wall remnants, possibly part of sheep dyke	Low	Medium
67	Bu	Non-designated asset – documentary record Laird's House	Low	N/A
68	Lackquoy	Non-designated asset - Sandstone Whorl	Negligible	N/A
69-74,	Faray, rig cultivation	Non-designated asset – Rig cultivation	Low	Low
75	Ness	Non-designated asset – boat shed	Low	Medium
76	Ness	Non-designated asset – Post-medieval building remains	Low	Medium
77	Torhelia Geo	Non-designated asset – stone mound – possible cairn	Low	N/A
82	Hamar	Non-designated asset – Post-medieval building remains	Low	Medium
89	Point of Tobar	Non-designated asset - very small standing stone	Low	N/A
91	Muller Geo	Non-designated asset – wall remnants (eroding from cliff)	Low	N/A
93	Muller Geo	Non-designated asset – stone tank	Negligible	N/A
94	Quoy Noust	Non-designated asset - stone feature	Low	N/A
101	Roadside	Non-designated asset - Post-medieval buildings	Low	Medium
105	Holland to Ness	Non-designated asset - track	Negligible	Low
106	Kirk Noust	Non-designated asset-quarry scoop	Negligible	Low
107	Roadside to The Hill	Non-designated asset - track	Negligible	Low

Site No	Name	Description	Importance	Group Value
108	Kirk Noust	Non-designated asset – stone remains	Medium	N/A
109, 112, 116-118	Ness	Non-designated assets – well	Negligible	Low
110	Holland	Non-designated asset – trough/sheep dip	Negligible	N/A
111	Holland	Non-designated asset – Post-medieval building remains	Low	Medium
114	Faray Road	Non-designated asset - Road	Negligible	Low
115	Ness	Non-designated asset – Post-medieval building remains	Low	Medium
119	Ness	Non-designated asset - slipway	Low	N/A
121	Djubi Geo	Non-designated asset - slipway	Low	N/A
129-131	Cranes	Non-designated asset - slipway	Negligible	N/A
132	Scammalin	Non-designated asset – structural remains	Low	N/A

Receptors Brought Forwards for Assessment of Settings Effects

- 10.7.15 The Scheduled area of the only Neolithic chambered cairn (Site 1) on Faray, extends into the north-western site boundary. There are no further Scheduled Monuments recorded on Faray. There are 16 Scheduled Monuments recorded to the east and south of the site, on Eday between 1 km and 5 km from the site. ZTV analysis indicates that there will be no visibility from the five Scheduled Monuments on Eday within 5 km of the site;; Carrick House chambered cairn (Site 27); Sandhill burnt mound (Site 29); Fold of Setter, enclosure (Site 38); Huntersquoy chambered cairn (Site 41); and Carrick Farm chambered cairn (Site 45).
- 10.7.16 Within 10 km of the site there are a further 15 Scheduled Monuments. Three of which are located to the north-west on the south coast of Westray (Sites 15, 16 & 37); two are located on Egilsay to the west of the site (Sites 31 & 32); seven are located on Rousay to the south-west of the site (Sites 18-21, 36, 43 & 44); and a further three are located on the south coast of Eday (Sites 26, 30 & 42), to the south of the site. ZTV analysis indicates that there will be no visibility from the Scheduled Monuments on the southern coast of Eday (Sites 26, 30 & 42) or from the four Scheduled Monuments on Rousay (Sites 18, 19, 21 & 36) to the south-west of the site. As such, the setting of these Scheduled Monuments would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development and therefore they have not been brought forward for further assessment further within this EIA Report.
- 10.7.17 There are five Listed Buildings located between 1 km and 5 km from the site; two of which are Category B Listed, Carrick House (Site 46) c.3.62 km east of the site on Eday, and Sangar (Site 50),

c.4.2 km north-west of the site on the southern coast of Westray. The other three Listed Buildings are Category C Listed and include Rusk Holm House (Site 49), a ruinous house on Rusk Holm c.1.61 km west of the site; Rapness Windmill Stump (Site 48) c.3.3 km north-west of the site on the south coast of Westray; and Eday Church (Site 47), c.4.19 km south-east of the site. ZTV analysis indicates that there will be no intervisibility between the Proposed Development and the Category B Listed Carrick House (Site 46) and the Category C Listed Eday Church (Site 47) on Eday to the east of the site. As such, the setting of these two Listed Buildings would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development and therefore they have not been brought forward for further assessment further within this EIA Report.

10.7.18 Given the preliminary findings outlined above the following assets have been carried forward for detailed assessment:

- Seven of the 88 non-designated assets that have been identified on the site could potentially be directly impacted by the Proposed Development (Sites 5, 12, 73, 74, 109, 114 and 119) (Figures 10.1 and 10.2).
- The Scheduled Quoy Chambered cairn (Site 1) which extends into the north-western site boundary.
- Eleven Scheduled Monuments located between 1 km - 5 km from the site on Eday and the Calf of Eday (Sites 17, 22-25, 28, 33-35, 39 & 40) (Figure 10.3).
- Located between 1 km - 5 km one Category B Listed Building (Site 50) on Westray to the north of the site; and two Category C Listed Buildings, one on Rusk Holm (Site 49) to the west and one on Westray (Site 48) to the north of the site (Figure 10.3).
- Nine Scheduled Monuments (Sites 15, 16, 18, 20, 31, 32, 37, 43 & 44) located between 5 km and 10 km from the site (Figure 10.5); and
- Six Scheduled Monuments (Sites 123-128) located between 10 km and 15 km from the site judged to be particularly sensitive to changes in their settings and/or representative of views from island locations beyond the 10 km study area.

10.8 Standard Mitigation

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

10.8.2 It is acknowledged that despite the walkover survey undertaken to inform this assessment, there may be further previously unrecorded subtle archaeological features within the site or hitherto unknown buried remains. Given the presence of known assets and the potential for presently unknown archaeological remains, in particular of post-medieval date, to survive within the site, a programme of archaeological works will be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction of the Proposed Development.

Protection of Archaeological Sites

10.8.3 Heritage assets within 50 m of the proposed working areas, including all areas to be used by construction vehicles, will be fenced off where appropriate under archaeological supervision prior to construction. This fencing will be maintained throughout the construction period to ensure the preservation of these assets.

10.8.4 The Applicant is seeking in-perpetuity consent for the Proposed Development. If further groundworks are required in the event of decommissioning, or replacement of turbines then all known sites within 50 m of the proposed working areas will be fenced off where appropriate with a

visible buffer under archaeological supervision. This will be undertaken prior to decommissioning in order to avoid accidental damage by heavy plant movement.

Archaeological Evaluation

- 10.8.5 A geophysical survey of the proposed access routes, cable routes, turbine locations, crane pads and other infrastructure will be undertaken. The geophysical survey will cover a 60 m buffer on either side of the proposed centrelines for the access tracks and cable routes so as to allow for micro-siting in the event of significant remains being identified during the trial trenching. A 50 m buffer around each of the proposed turbine locations will be covered to allow for micro-siting and the future presence of the turbines, as once constructed their magnetic signatures will prevent further magnetometry geophysical surveys from being undertaken within their vicinity.
- 10.8.6 The geophysical survey will be followed by trial trenching which will be targeted on any possible anomalies that were identified and will also include a representative percentage of the total footprint of the development infrastructure. Depending on the results of these investigations further works during construction including further excavations and/or an archaeological watching brief may be required. The purpose of the geophysical survey and the archaeological trial trenching will be to identify any archaeological remains threatened by the Proposed Development, to assess their significance and to mitigate any impact upon them either through avoidance or, if preservation in situ is not warranted, through preservation by record. Depending upon the results of the geophysical survey and the trial trenching there is the potential that further works, such as excavation and post-excavation analyses, could be required. Details of mitigation will be agreed with OIC in consultation with the Orkney Country Archaeologist through a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI).
- 10.8.7 Any archaeological fieldwork commissioned in order to mitigate direct effects will result in the production and dissemination of a professional archive, which will add to our understanding of the cultural heritage of the island of Faray.

Development Design

- 10.8.8 The Proposed Development has been designed to present a clearly structured, balanced arrangement which responds positively to key landscape features and local topography. Steps have been taken to promote a simple balanced composition that minimises overlapping turbines, skyline effects and back-grounding (see Chapter 2 for further details). Consideration has also been given to other design issues, including turbine colour, size and siting; the design and form of the substation building; and the alignment of access tracks to ensure these proposed features relate to the key characteristics of the landscape. As setting effects largely result from the visual presence of the turbines within the landscape the same mitigation measures apply to setting effects on cultural heritage assets.

10.9 Likely Effects

Construction

- 10.9.1 During construction, direct physical impacts are likely to occur from site vegetation clearance, earthmoving operations, creation of the substation, road construction, and all associated infrastructure (turbine bases, compounds, drainage etc.). Setting impacts are likely to occur due to the introduction of construction machinery on site, additional construction traffic and construction of compounds. Settings impacts relating to construction are limited to those assets in close proximity to the proposed works and thus are largely limited to assets within the site.
- 10.9.2 There would be a medium magnitude of impact on the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) during construction of the Proposed Development which would necessitate heavy goods vehicles operating within 1 km of the cairn. The majority of construction activity, including that associated with the slipway, landing jetty, substation, construction compound and borrow pit search areas would be located greater than 1 km from the cairn. There would be no interruption of key views towards the cairn within Faray or of views across the coast from the cairn itself. However the

- associated noise and views of large construction vehicles to the south may temporarily interrupt and affect the ability to understand the monument in its remote coastal setting. As a ritual funerary monument the cairn is of high sensitivity to changes in its setting. The temporary level of effect on the setting of the cairn would be **moderate** and significant.
- 10.9.3 The likely effects of construction activities upon setting would be temporary, short term and reversible, however, direct physical impacts and new infrastructure are usually permanent in nature and therefore have a lasting effect.
- 10.9.4 The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid direct impacts on known heritage assets where possible. The turbines and associated infrastructure have been sited to avoid directly impacting upon the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1). A buffer of 500 m from the Scheduled Area has also been applied to ensure that there would be no damage to any buried remains associated with the monument from vibrations caused by earthworks required for construction of the Proposed Development.
- 10.9.5 Seven of the 88 non-designated assets that have been identified on the site could potentially be directly impacted by the Proposed Development (Sites 5, 12, 73, 74, 109, 114 and 119) (Figures 10.1 and 10.2).
- 10.9.6 Sites 5 and 12, were identified by the First Edition Mapping Survey Project run by RCAHMS in 2000 which recorded the location of two unroofed structures shown on the 1st edition of the OS six-inch map but not shown on later maps. Similarly, Site 109 comprises the site of a well shown on OS maps from 1881 but not shown on current mapping. In all three cases no trace of the structures is visible on the ground and they are judged to be of negligible importance (Table 10.6). The Proposed Development would likely remove any surviving deposits associated with these remains and would thus constitute a high magnitude of impact. The level of effect would therefore be **minor** and not significant in each case.
- 10.9.7 Two of the assets (Site 73 and 74) were recorded on aerial photographs and satellite imagery as part of this assessment and comprise the remains of rig agriculture. Remains of rig cultivation are commonly encountered across the Orkney Islands and indeed across Faray and these examples are considered to be of low importance (Table 10.6). As shown on Figure 10.2, the Proposed Development would impact upon only part of each recorded area of rig cultivation and thus result in an alteration in baseline conditions caused by removal of part of each asset. The magnitude of impact would therefore be medium in each case. The level of effect would be **minor** and not significant.
- 10.9.8 Site 114 comprises the remains of a road that runs north to south along the spine of the island. It was constructed by the council in the early 20th century. The road is built of stone but is overgrown with grass and survives as a grassy track with visible banks and ditches at either side. The road connects the main farm complexes along the island and roughly follows the route of an earlier north to south aligned track shown on OS mapping of 1882 (Figure 10.6). The Proposed Development would impact upon part of the road in the centre of the island where the access track would follow the alignment of the road. The construction of the access track would thus remove some deposits associated with the road but would maintain its alignment and thus it would remain legible as the principle access through the island. The road survives best to the south of the farmstead at Ness (Appendix 10.3; Plate 31) where the banks and ditches either side can be seen. This section of the road would not be impacted by the Proposed Development and thus evidence for its construction and form would be preserved. The overall magnitude of impact on the road is judged to be medium. The level of effect would be **minor** and not significant.
- 10.9.9 Site 119 comprises the remains of the concrete slipway which was constructed in 1935 to improve access to the island. Although of relatively late date and modern construction, the slipway survives as one of the last alterations to the built heritage of the island prior to its abandonment in 1947 and is of relevance in understanding how access has been gained to the island in the 20th and 21st centuries. The Proposed Development would require the removal of the slipway and replacement with a more substantial and modern structure. While the asset will be removed in its entirety it will be replaced by a structure performing a similar function and thus the ability to understand this part

of the island as the principal historical and modern access point would be retained. On balance the magnitude of impact is judged to be medium. The level of effect would be **minor** and not significant.

- 10.9.10 Aerial photographic analysis and the walkover survey have shown that the site has been subject to some previous disturbance from ground improvement drainage works in the 19th and early 20th centuries and these works may have disturbed superficial buried deposits on the site. However, study of documentary records relating to past land use in Faray has demonstrated the potential for buried remains relating to earlier land use as evidenced by records of ploughing upturning structural remains of the Bu and the finding of a spindle whorl over 0.3 m below the ground surface. Additionally, ongoing coastal erosion has exposed structural remains (Site 132) on the south-east coast of the island. There remains, therefore, a clear potential for further previously unknown buried remains being disturbed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.
- 10.9.11 Given this, a mitigation strategy will be required to safeguard and, where necessary, record any such remains. A four-stage mitigation strategy including survey, archaeological evaluation followed by excavation and/or watching brief and post-excavation analysis will be undertaken as set out in Section 10.8 above.
- 10.9.12 The level of any potential effect on previously unrecorded remains cannot be quantified at present as the significance of any further assets which may be present on the site is, by their very nature unknown. However, should any previously unrecorded important remains be identified on the site, either through geophysical survey, trial trenching or subsequent works they will be subject to an appropriate archaeological mitigation strategy, the results of which will contribute to our overall understanding of Faray's past and therefore create a beneficial legacy.

Operation

- 10.9.13 Direct effects upon any previously unknown archaeological remains which may be present on the site would cease with the completion of the groundworks stage of construction and consequently no direct effects are predicted during the operational phase of the Proposed Development. All operational phase effects would thus be limited to impacts upon the settings of assets such as Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings as well as the character and setting of the post-medieval agricultural landscape of Faray.
- 10.9.14 ZTV analysis and mapping have been used to identify those designated assets that could potentially be affected by changes to their settings during the operational phase of the Proposed Development and the assets that have been carried forward for detailed assessment have been outlined in paragraphs 10.7.15 to 10.7.18 (above). The detailed assessments have included a review of the contextual characteristics of each asset using information drawn from their designation documentation, supplemented by observations on the morphology, condition and character of each asset and the nature of their settings made during site visits undertaken in October 2019³ and August 2020.
- 10.9.15 The settings assessment found that the effect of the Proposed Development upon the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinquoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape would be **moderate** and significant. The assessment found that the effect of the Proposed Development on the setting of the remaining 27 designated assets brought forward for assessment would not be significant as the effect levels would be **neutral** to **minor**. These findings are listed in Table 1 within Technical Appendix 10.2. A summary discussion for the assets subject to detailed assessment is provided within Appendix 10.2 and has been informed by ZTV modelling, site visits, photomontages and wireframes (Figures 10.12-10.25) as appropriate.

Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1)

- 10.9.16 The Scheduled Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) comprises a low, grass-covered mound recently rescheduled as the remains of a chambered cairn dating from the Neolithic period, probably built

³ For practical reasons it was not possible to visit those designated assets that are located on islands which are not served by Orkney's scheduled public transport service.

and in use between 3600 BC and 2500 BC. The mound of the cairn is around 14 m in diameter and stands to 1.3 m at its maximum height. The chamber is visible as a hollow in the centre of the mound in which three pairs of stalls divided by orthostats can be identified. Two linear features radiate from the north-east and south-west sides of the cairn. A roughly triangular raised area measuring around 6.7 m long, 2 m wide and 0.2 m high, with one side slab and two smaller stones protruding from it, is visible to the west north-west of the cairn (HES, 2019d). The monument occupies an area of rough pasture set slightly back from the remains of a 19th century sheep dyke which in turn is located on the edge of a low sea cliff on the north-west coast of Faray. Approached from the south and east the monument is visible as a low grassy mound which is legible to an informed observer as a prehistoric monument from approximately 500 m away (it is however noted that the distance where it would become apparent to a layperson is expected to be significantly less). On approach from the north along the narrow strip of land that links Faray with the Holm of Faray, the cairn is visible as a low mound against the skyline with the ground gradually rising behind it.

- 10.9.17 The cairn has a coastal setting defined by wide open vistas across the sea to west, north and east. To the south, the setting comprises open low gradually rising semi-improved grazing land. The farmstead of Quoy is visible south south-east of the monument and is seen silhouetted against the skyline. The wider setting includes extensive views over coastal waters in a wide arc from the west over Westray Firth to the southern tip of Westray, north over Holm of Faray to Westray and east over the Sound of Faray to Eday. Land rises to the south of the chambered cairn foreshortening views across the island of Faray.
- 10.9.18 The location of the Quoy Chambered Cairn at the edges of cultivated land suggests that the relationship between the cairn and the agricultural land was actively minimised. Woodman found that the majority of Neolithic monuments in the Orkney Islands are situated on the coast overlooking large areas of seascape (Woodman, 2000) and thus the example at Faray is typical of the regional distribution of cairns and suggests that the siting of such monuments were concerned with relationships between islands and the sea routes that united them rather than the interior of the islands on which they are located. Noble (Noble, 2006, 109) argues that the individual islands of the archipelago are unlikely to have been isolated and divided and that coastal links between communities is signified by the siting of cairns overlooking wide coastal vistas.
- 10.9.19 The cairn commands wide views across the coast to Westray and Eday and has clear views of Vinguoy Hill and the Hill of Linkataing and thus may have originally been intervisible with the chambered cairns (Sites 40 and 17) located on the shoulders of these hills. HES (HES, 2019d) suggest that as the only chambered cairn on Faray, the monument may represent the single focus for burial and ritual for an island community. However, it remains possible that other prehistoric funerary monuments were once located on the island and that they have been removed by later agriculture and settlement activities. The dense cluster of prehistoric funerary monuments on Rousay and Eday are located on two of the least fertile islands in the Orkney Islands and hence in locations least susceptible to damage by ploughing and the improvement of land (Davidson and Henshall, 1989: 14). Evidence for agricultural improvements abounds around the farms on Faray and thus the possibility that other prehistoric monuments were associated with the Quoy Chambered Cairn cannot be ruled out.
- 10.9.20 The remote and open coastal setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn contributes to the understanding of the asset as a funerary monument constructed in an isolated location at the margin of fertile land with excellent surveillance opportunities across the sea and to nearby islands. The low rising hills of the site to the south form part of the wider setting of the cairn and form a contrast to the extensive coastal setting in other directions. The setting of the cairn thus contributes to an understanding of its cultural value and it is of high relative sensitivity to changes within its setting.
- 10.9.21 As shown on the appended photomontage (Figure 10.12) all of the Proposed Development turbines would be visible to below hub height in views south from the cairn. The nearest turbine would be located 550 m south of the cairn and would be seen to full height and at this distance would be a prominent feature. Aviation obstruction lighting would be fixed to each turbine providing a steady red medium intensity light. In accordance with guidance the lighting would reduce in intensity below the horizontal to minimise the downward spillage of light and thus would be of limited intensity when viewed from ground level. The turbines would be seen offset from the distinctive silhouette

of the Quoy farmstead on the ridge of the island but they would appear as substantial features against the skyline to the east of the farm. Figure 10.13 shows the predicted view of the Proposed Development in views towards Quoy Chambered Cairn from Doggerboat (Site 53) to the north. This location was selected to show a worst-case scenario at a high point of the island where both the Proposed Development and the cairn would theoretically be visible. As shown on Figure 10.13s, it is not possible to distinguish the Quoy Chambered Cairn from the surrounding grass vegetation from this location owing to its low height and the intervening landform. The photomontage shows that a single turbine (Turbine 1) would be visible in views north towards Quoy Chambered Cairn from this location and that it would be a prominent feature in these views. However, as it is not possible to distinguish the cairn at this distance, there would be limited impact on views towards the cairn from across the island. Closer views of the cairn, from where the monument is distinguishable would not be impacted by the Proposed Development.

- 10.9.22 The Proposed Development would be visible in views towards Quoy Chambered Cairn on approaches to the island by sea from the Westray ferry route to the north-west. From here it is difficult to distinguish the cairn from the surrounding grassland but the turbines would appear in the background as substantial features breaking the skyline. The cairn is not distinguishable from the North Ronaldsay ferry route to the north-east and also cannot be seen from the coast of Eday.
- 10.9.23 The Proposed Development would thus represent a notable alteration to the setting of the monument beyond those elements which directly contribute to an understanding and appreciation of its cultural value, i.e. the coastal setting, but would encroach upon the wider topographic landscape setting as shown in Figure 10.13 The magnitude of impact would be medium and the level of effect would be **moderate** and significant
- 10.9.24 The Proposed Development would not adversely affect the ability to understand the cairn's critical relationship with the coast and surrounding islands. The turbines would be located within the island interior at the core of the agricultural land and would thus be separate from the marginal rough grassland in which the cairn is set. There would be a clear separation between the cairn's coastal setting and the Proposed Development. The ability to view the cairn in isolation from the Proposed Development on approach to it from the south would be maintained and views out over the cairn to sea would be unaffected. The key relationship between the monument and the coast would remain legible and thus the overall integrity of its setting would not be adversely affected.

Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17)

- 10.9.25 Muckle Hill of Linkataing, chambered cairn, homestead and field system (Site 17) is set in sloping heather and peat moorland on a north-west facing slope on Eday at approximately 25 m above ordnance datum (AOD). The hill slopes directly down to the sea providing panoramic views over the Sound of Faray to the south-west and the small island of Red Holm and Westray to the north-west. There are no obvious visual relationships with other chambered cairns except for, theoretical intervisibility with the Quoy Chambered Cairn assuming that it was once more conspicuous.
- 10.9.26 The monument comprises three discrete archaeological entities. The principal monument consists of four stones in a regular setting which may represent the remains of the chamber of a chambered tomb, although no trace of a cairn is visible and no discoveries of human remains are recorded. The second component consists of two, possibly three, low banks with a large, earth fast saddle quern at their centre, interpreted as a dwelling. The third component is a curvilinear stone wall that has been exposed by peat cutting. Neolithic chambered cairns such as Muckle Hill of Linkataing are considered to have a high relative sensitivity to changes to their settings as they were placed purposefully within the landscape, often in relation to topographical features such as ridgelines, watercourses and coastlines or in relation to other monuments. This is particularly true of the Orkney Islands where chambered cairns often have clear visual relationships with bodies of water including the firths and channels which interweave between the islands.
- 10.9.27 As shown on Figure 10.14 all six turbines of the Proposed Development would be clearly visible from the chambered cairn. The lower portions of turbines T6, T3 and T1 would be hidden from view by the intervening landform which surrounds the turbines and also by the shoulder of the Muckle Hill of Linkataing. Visibility of the Proposed Development would be greatest in the south-west of the

monument closest to the coastal edge and would be reduced in the north of the Scheduled Area where only 1-2 turbine tips would be visible. There would be no visibility of the Proposed Development from the north-east of the Scheduled Area which includes the stone wall. The turbines would be seen at a distance of 3 km from the chambered cairn, where they would be seen to break the skyline and would appear as prominent vertical features in an otherwise open view of low-lying hills. The Proposed Development would be seen beyond the core setting of the monument which is defined by the broad shoulder of the hill upon which it stands and views over the sea to the north-west. The Proposed Development would thus alter the baseline setting of the monument and would draw the eye in the direction of views towards Faray rather than the more extensive views out to Westray. This would have some impact upon an observer's ability to understand and appreciate the monument. However, the cultural significance of the monument in its current setting would remain legible and as such the integrity of its setting would not be affected. The magnitude of impact is judged to be medium. The level of effect would be **moderate** and significant.

Vinquoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40)

- 10.9.28 Vinquoy Hill, chambered cairn (Site 40) is a Maeshowe type chambered cairn of Neolithic date. It survives as a circular heather-covered mound, measuring approximately 18 m in diameter and standing up to 3 m high. The entrance is on the south side and the 5 m long passage and chamber are partly subterranean, cut back into the hill. The monument has been restored to enable public access and is now part of the Eday Heritage Trail. It has a modern glass dome window and a ventilation pipe set in a concrete slab on its top. This suggests that it has been re-roofed to allow public access to its chamber and it is therefore unclear how much of this conspicuous mound is authentic and how much is a modern reconstruction. A large metal cylindrical modern water tank is located 10 m south-west of the monument and, along with its associated post-and-wire fence enclosure and access track, dominates the setting and views south-west from the monument. All five of the Spurness Point turbines on Sanday are visible in views east of the cairn. Vinquoy Hill chambered cairn is located in a prominent position on the south shoulder of Vinquoy Hill at 74 m AOD just below the highest point of the island, the summit of Vinquoy Hill to the north lies at 76 m AOD. This location is exactly where the cairn becomes visible from most of the northern part of Eday and from the islands of Westray and Sanday (Ritchie, 1995: 48).
- 10.9.29 The monument commands panoramic views across the landscape the most extensive of which are views over Calf Sound to the north-east and across the Sound of Faray to the west. The placing of a chambered cairn on one of the highest available points of the landform of the island is not coincidental and suggests that value was placed on these views during the Neolithic period. The alignment of chambered cairns is also considered to be a factor in understanding the cultural significance of the monuments and their settings. Vinquoy Hill is aligned with Huntersquoy chambered cairn (Site 41), Carrick Farm chambered cairn (Site 45), Fold of Setter ritual/ceremonial enclosure (Site 38) and the Stone of Setter standing stone (Site 39) all of which are located south-east of Vinquoy Hill within 1.24 km of the monument. The chambers within Neolithic cairns were typically orientated towards their entrances and views from these entrances can often be seen to be focussed on topographical features or watercourses. In some instances, the entrances appear to have been purposefully aligned towards solar events. Archaeological evidence also suggests that feasting or other activities took place in front of the entrances at many chambered cairns. Neolithic chambered cairns are therefore considered to be particularly sensitive to changes along the alignments of their internal chambers, passages and entrances. In the case of Vinquoy Hill with its south facing entrance and key visual links to monuments to the south-east, it can be judged to be of greatest sensitivity to changes in its setting to the south-east and along the north to south aligned ridge of Vinquoy Hill.
- 10.9.30 Figure 10.18 presents a wireline view of the Proposed Development from Vinquoy Hill chambered cairn. Figure 6.20 presents a photomontage from the summit of the nearby Vinquoy Hill and shows the chambered cairn as a grassy mound north-east of the water tank. Both visualisations show full visibility of the Proposed Development at a distance of 2.9 km west of the monument. The turbines are visible to their full height, backdropped against the low hills of Rousay with the tips of all six turbines breaking the skyline. Aviation obstruction lighting would be fixed to each turbine providing a steady red medium intensity light and would also be visible. At this distance, the Proposed

Development would represent a substantial change to the setting of the monument and would be a prominent feature in views west from the monument. The Proposed Development would also be visible in views towards Vinguoy Hill chambered cairn when viewed from the chambered cairn at the Calf of Eday (Site 28) from where turbine tips would be seen to backdrop the cairn. However, the Proposed Development would occupy only a proportion of the overall view from the monument. It would not interrupt key views along the north-south aligned ridge of Vinguoy Hill nor would it feature in key views south-east from the monument to other prehistoric funerary monuments on Eday. Therefore, these elements of its setting, which directly contribute to our understanding of the monument's cultural significance, would not be impacted. The magnitude of impact is judged to be medium the level of effect would be **moderate** and significant.

- 10.9.31 The monument's contextual relationship with the coast and the firths will remain clearly legible as will its visual relationship with other prehistoric monuments on Eday and as a consequence the relationship between the cairn and its setting will be preserved. For these reasons, although the Proposed Development would represent a notable alteration to the setting of Vinguoy Hill, those elements of the setting which directly contribute to our understanding of the cairn's cultural significance would remain legible and the overall integrity of the setting would not be adversely affected.

Faray Post-medieval Landscape

- 10.9.32 As demonstrated by this assessment, the island of Faray preserves evidence of human activity from the Neolithic period onwards. Due to abandonment of the island in the mid-20th century the preservation of standing buildings, and archaeological remains dating to the late 19th century and early 20th centuries is particularly good. The upstanding building remains, taken together with the rectilinear land divisions and associated clearance cairns form a corpus of evidence which documents the development of the island throughout the post-medieval and modern period and preserve a palimpsest of evolving land management methods. The remains of the principle farmsteads on Faray occupy a low ridge which runs north to south along the spine of the island and as a consequence the structures can be seen as distinctive silhouettes in views across the island itself and in views to the island on approach from the sea and also from surrounding islands.
- 10.9.33 As domestic agricultural dwellings, the setting of the post-medieval farmsteads and their associated land divisions relate primarily to the immediate adjacent associated former cultivated in-field land and the rough grazing out-field land on the coastal edge. The landscape is primarily functional and is of low relative sensitivity to changes in its setting. Figure 10.13 shows the predicted views of the Proposed Development from the farmstead of Doggerboat (Site 53). This shows turbines located within the immediate setting of the farmstead from where they would appear to dominate the remains. The turbines would be located within the core setting of the post-medieval farmsteads within areas of former cultivation and would be a substantial alteration to the historic character of the landscape which may affect the way that some observers are able to understand and appreciate these remains. This is particularly true of views towards Faray from the coast and neighbouring islands from where the turbines would be seen to dominate the farmstead buildings replacing them as the most distinctive skyline features in views towards the island. The change in the distinctive profile of the island, in combination of the placement of turbines within the core setting of the farmsteads would constitute a high magnitude of impact. The level of effect would be **moderate** and significant.
- 10.9.34 The Proposed Development has been designed with reference to the historic farmsteads, road and land divisions and as such all of the core elements of the post-medieval landscape will be retained in situ. It will consequently remain possible to understand the post-medieval abandoned landscape of Faray including relationships between the individual farmsteads, their land divisions and the relationship with the coast. As such the overall integrity of the setting of the post-medieval landscape would not be affected.

Decommissioning

- 10.9.35 The Applicant is seeking in-perpetuity consent for the Proposed Development. In the event of decommissioning, or replacement of turbines, it is anticipated that the levels of effect would be

similar but of a lesser level than those predicted during construction. Decommissioning would be undertaken in line with best practice processes and methods at that time and will be managed through an agreed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.

10.10 Additional Mitigation and Enhancement

- 10.10.1 A detailed methodology for addressing direct impacts has been described in Section 10.8 above. Depending on the results, the proposed investigations have the potential to add to our understanding of the Orkney Islands' archaeological and built heritage and could provide opportunities for further academic studies going forward. The publication of the results would therefore constitute a beneficial enhancement.
- 10.10.2 It is evident from comparison between photographs from archaeological surveys undertaken by RCAHMS in 1981 and today that land on the south-east coast has been lost and continues to be lost to coastal erosion. Loss of archaeological remains to coastal erosion is a problem throughout the Orkney Islands (see Gibson, 2008) and is expected to worsen as a result of sea level rises associated with climate change. The remains of two possible structures (Sites 91 and 132) eroding from the cliff edge were recorded during the walkover survey. Measured survey and recording of these assets as well as other features on the coastal edge will help to preserve a record of their extent and nature before they are lost. Similarly, this assessment has revealed the ongoing deterioration of upstanding building remains across the island. Historic Building Recording including plans and elevations of structures within each farmstead and detailed photographs of the current condition of the buildings would provide a permanent record of these buildings prior to any further loss from structural collapse and weathering. Publication of the records of these buildings would also make Faray's built heritage remains more accessible and engaging for local communities on surrounding islands. As the island is not readily or publicly accessible a permanent and accessible record of its upstanding remains would be a valuable resource and would create a baseline against which any further deterioration could be measured and understood. The ability to enjoy, appreciate, learn from and understand Scotland's historic environment, now and in the future, is one of the key principles outlined in HEPS (HES, 2019; HEP2).

10.11 Residual Effects

Construction

- 10.11.1 The Proposed Development has been designed, where possible, to avoid direct impacts on known heritage features. The implementation of the above outlined mitigation measures will prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage assets; and investigate the potential for previously unknown assets. Following the completion of construction, no further groundworks would be undertaken. Mitigation will allow for the detailed recording of any remains encountered during the construction phase and the results will therefore enhance our understanding of Faray's archaeological heritage. However, the predicted direct impacts of high magnitude would remain. The Proposed Development has also been designed so as to avoid impacts upon known heritage assets where possible. Given the extent and density of recorded remains it has not been possible to avoid all impacts and there would be direct impacts on seven non-designated heritage assets. All of these assets are of post-medieval date and comprise buildings (Sites 5 and 12) and a well (Site 109) recorded from historic mapping, areas of former rig cultivation (Sites 73 and 74) and a road (Site 114) and slipway (Site 119) of 20th century date. Assets recorded and known only from historic mapping are judged to be of negligible importance. The remaining assets are judged to be of low importance. The Proposed Development would remove any deposits associated with the assets known from historic mapping evidence and the slipway. The Proposed Development would impact upon only part of the remaining assets leading to some loss of information content. A **minor** and not significant direct effect has been predicted in each case.
- 10.11.2 Following the implementation of mitigation measures there may be a slight loss of overall information content and as such a marginal magnitude of residual impact is anticipated. The residual direct effect would be **negligible** and not significant. Potential effects on unknown previously

unrecorded buried remains cannot be predicted at this stage, although these will be addressed by the proposed mitigation measures.

- 10.11.3 The predicted residual impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets will be the same as assessed for the construction effects

Operation

- 10.11.4 The predicted residual impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets will be the same as assessed for the operational and cumulative effects.
- 10.11.5 No other significant residual operational effects are anticipated.

Decommissioning

- 10.11.6 In the event of decommissioning, or replacement of turbines, it is anticipated that the levels of effect would be similar but of a lesser level than those predicted during construction.

10.12 Cumulative Assessment

- 10.12.1 As set out above in paras 10.5.21 – 10.5.24, cumulative effects relating to cultural heritage are for the most part limited to effects upon the settings of heritage assets.
- 10.12.2 With regard to the likely significant cumulative effects on cultural heritage assets, the assessment considers operational, consented and within-planning wind farm developments at distances up to 40 km from the Proposed Development. The location of cumulative developments is shown on Figure 6.11. Developments at the scoping stage are not considered. A full list of the cumulative developments is included in Chapter 6. The cumulative schemes include the operational Spurness Point on Sanday, Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust on Westray and Hammars Hill Rennibister and Crowness Business Park turbines on Mainland.
- 10.12.3 Archaeological remains are by their very nature an irreplaceable resource and are subject to threats both within and outwith the planning system. The range of non-development threats is broad and includes deterioration of upstanding structural remains and damage to remains on the coastal edge through coastal erosion (see Gibson, 2008). Any archaeological remains which may be present on the site need to be understood within this context of gradual loss which occurs on an Orcadian, regional and national scale. Archaeological investigations allow any loss to be controlled through programmes of recording, sampling and analysis. The consequence of this is that where direct impacts occur through either development or academic research, then our understanding of these assets is enhanced, and the results of these investigations inform our knowledge of Orkney's past. Indeed, our understanding of Orkney's archaeological heritage is itself the cumulative product of the results of numerous investigations undertaken over many generations. Any direct impacts which may result from the Proposed Development would be addressed through the detailed programme of mitigation that has been set out in Section 10.8, which will include comprehensive investigations should this be required, the results of which will contribute to our overall understanding of Orkney's past and therefore create a beneficial cumulative legacy. The significance of the cumulative effect on archaeology during construction, combined with other developments or causes of loss will thus be **negligible** and not significant. As such this assessment will focus on the likely significant cumulative effects upon the setting of heritage assets which have the potential to occur during the operational phase.
- 10.12.4 As indicated in the methodology section paras 10.5.21 – 10.5.24 only heritage assets where effects of low magnitude or above have been predicted for the Proposed Development alone are considered in the detailed assessment. Cumulative effects on assets for which effects of negligible magnitude or less have been predicted for the Proposed Development alone are not considered to have the potential to reach the EIA threshold of significance and have therefore been excluded from the detailed assessment.
- 10.12.5 Moderate significant effects resulting from the Proposed Development alone have been predicted on the settings of three Scheduled Neolithic chambered cairns: Faray (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing (Site 17) and Viquoy Hill (Site 40) and cumulative visualisations have been prepared for

these assets (Figures 10.12 – 10.14 and 10.18) and character of their settings have been described in paragraphs 10.9.16 – 10.9.31 above.

- 10.12.6 When viewed from the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), the Proposed Development would appear as a prominent feature in views to the south which are not currently occupied by wind farm development. The proposed Quanterness wind farm would also be visible in this view from where it would appear offset to the south-east and in the far distance. Views from Quoy Chambered Cairn to the east features the tips of Spurness Point wind farm and Sanday. The extreme tips of Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust and Newark are visible in views to the north-west. All of these turbines would appear substantially smaller than the Proposed Development due to their lower blade tip height and/or the distance of separation. Overall, the developments within this part of the cumulative baseline are smaller and more limited in scale than the Proposed Development which means that the weight of the effect upon the setting of Quoy Chambered Cairn would result from the addition of the Proposed Development rather than from the underlying cumulative baseline and no additional cumulative effects are predicted.
- 10.12.7 The operational turbines at Rennibister, Kingarly, Hammers Hill and Burgar Hill are all visible in views south-west from Muckle Hill of Linkataing chambered cairn (Site 17). These would be seen in the same view as the Proposed Development. The proposed turbines at Quanterness and Hammers Hill Extension would also be visible in this view. The extreme tips of Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust and Newark are visible in views to the north-west. With the exception of Quanterness, the developments within this part of the cumulative baseline are smaller and more limited in scale than the Proposed Development which means that the weight of the effect upon the setting of Muckle Hill of Linkataing chambered cairn would result from the addition of the Proposed Development rather than from the underlying cumulative baseline and no additional cumulative effects are predicted.
- 10.12.8 The operational turbines at Rennibister, Kingarly, Hammers Hill and Burgar Hill are visible in views west from Vinguoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40). These would be seen in the same view as the Proposed Development. The proposed turbines at Quanterness and Hammers Hill Extension would also be visible in this view. The extreme tips of Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust and Newark are visible in views to the north-west. The operational turbines at Spurness Point on Sanday are visible in views to the east and appear as relatively prominent features above the low lying landform. The Proposed Development would not be seen in the same view as the Spurness Point turbines but would be visible in the wider panoramic view from the cairn. The Proposed Development would thus introduce a second relatively prominent wind farm development into a view which currently features only very distant views of wind farm development. The increase in the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development would constitute an additional synergistic effect of negligible magnitude. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and not significant.
- 10.12.9 The Burn of Musetter standing stone is set on a plateau at 45 m AOD within rough heather moorland. It commands extensive views across the landscape including views south-east towards the chambered cairn at The Manse (site 23), east towards the chambered cairn at Sandhill (Site 34) and north-east towards the chambered cairn at Eday Church Hall (Site 24). All six turbines of the Proposed Development would be visible in views north-west from the standing stone beyond Ferness Bay. Figure 6.21, which shows the view from the Sands of Musetter, demonstrates that the Proposed Development would appear as a prominent feature against the skyline in views north-west from the standing stone. The operational turbines of Westray Development Trust, Gallowhill and Newark would also be visible in this view. However, owing to the separation distance between these wind farms and the Proposed Development they would appear as very minor and distant components of the view. All five of the Spurness Point wind farm turbines are visible in views east from the standing stone at a distance of 4.95 km beyond the Sandhill chambered cairn. The Proposed Development would thus introduce a second relatively prominent wind farm development into a view which currently features only very distant views of wind farm development. The increase in the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development would constitute an additional synergistic effect of negligible magnitude. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and not significant.

- 10.12.10 The chambered cairns of the Manse (Site 23), Eday Church Hall (Site 24) and Bay of London (Site 33) are located within a wider cluster of prehistoric monuments in south and central Eday which have core visual interrelationships with one another as well as north to other funerary monuments in north Eday. All three of these monuments are positioned to command views east over Eday Sound and all have visibility of Spurness Point wind farm to the east. The Proposed Development would be located north-west of these monuments and would thus not be seen in the same view as the operational turbines. The Proposed Development turbines would be taller and located closer to each monument than those at Spurness Point and thus would appear as larger landscape features albeit beyond the core settings of each monument. The Proposed Development would increase the proportion of the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the core interrelationship between these monuments and the wider Eday landscape. The magnitude of cumulative impact would be negligible. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and not significant.
- 10.12.11 The Calf of Eday, chambered cairn (Site 28) comprises an Orkney-Cromarty type round cairn with a partly rock-cut Bookan-type chamber. The monument survives entirely below ground level and is covered by a low heather-covered mound the centre of which has been removed together with one of the lintels to give access to the chamber. Access to the Calf of Eday was not gained for the purposes of the assessment and the monument was overlooked from the adjacent east shore of Eday. From here, it was seen to be set in heather moorland overlooking Calf Sound. As a prehistoric ritual burial monument overlooking the coast and with probable key visual links along a north-west to south-east alignment from Vinguoy Hill (Site 40) to the Stone of Setter (Site 39), the monument is judged to be of high relative sensitivity to changes in its setting. All six of the Proposed Development turbines would be seen in views west from this monument at a distance of 4.9 km. The turbines would be visible as blade tips seen against the skyline and beyond the intervening ridges of Vinguoy Hill and Resting Hill. The turbines would be seen to backdrop the chambered cairn at Vinguoy Hill (Site 40) which stands close to the high point on the island of Eday. All other funerary monuments with which the Calf of Eday is intervisible are located at lower points in the landscape and thus the landform would be seen to rise behind them and the Proposed Development would be seen beyond that intervening landform. The Spurness wind farm is theoretically visible c.5.5 km south-east of the cairn from across Lashy Sound and Eday Sound. Neither the Proposed Development nor the Spurness wind farm interrupt key views across Calf Sound and towards the ritual funerary monuments on Eday. The Proposed Development would increase the overall view that would be occupied by relatively large scale wind farm development but would not affect the observer's ability to understand the contribution that the coastal setting makes to the asset's overall significance. The magnitude of cumulative impact would be negligible. The level of effect would be **minor** and not significant.
- 10.12.12 The burnt mound at Dale, Eday (Site 35) survives as a roughly crescent-shaped grass covered mound, measuring approximately 11 m in diameter and 1.4 m high. The burnt mound is bisected across its northern third by a modern drainage channel and stone dyke. The mound is situated on the west coast of Eday, 70 m from the coastal edge at around 10 m AOD and is surrounded by low-lying boggy ground. The monument commands open and wide views west across Westray Firth to Egilsay and north over rising ground at Fers Ness. The placing of burnt mounds was to a large extent determined by their function and proximity to a local water source, though an allowance has to be made for the positioning of the mounds on a west facing slope which may indicate that it was placed to be prominent within, or exact control over, the adjacent coastal area. The burnt mound is judged to be of low sensitivity to changes in its setting. All six turbine tips of the Proposed Development would be visible in views north from the burnt mound from where it would be seen beyond the intervening low rising ground at Fers Ness and its associated large modern farm complex. The wind farms at Gallowhill, Westray Development Trust and Newark would also be theoretically visible in the same views as the Proposed Development. Views of the Proposed Development turbines, alongside those at Gallowhill, Westray Development Trust and Newark, would be located beyond the prevalent coastal views out from the burnt mound and located on separate land masses beyond the watercourse and land which relates to an understanding of the cultural significance of this monument. As such no additional cumulative effects are predicted.

- 10.12.13 The chambered cairns at Fitty Hill (Site 124) and Howa Tower (Site 125) have interrelated settings which are key to their understanding and appreciation. Both cairns command wide views across the sea and their relationship with one another and the coast is considered to form the critical part of the setting of both monuments. The operational turbines at Gallowhill stand within 500 m of the Howa Tower chambered cairn and within 1.5 km of the Fitty Hill chambered cairn. The Westray Development Trust turbine is set slightly to the north-west within 700 m of Howa Tower chambered cairn. The operational turbines form prominent features when viewed from these cairns but do not distract from the key visual relationship between the cairns or their key outward seaward views. The Proposed Development would be located south of the cairns and offset from the operational turbines. Owing to the distance separation of over 11 km the Proposed Development turbines would appear as smaller distance features and would not distract from an understanding of the cairns in their landscape setting. The weight of the non-significant effects upon the setting of the cairns would largely result from the operational turbines rather than the Proposed Development although distant views of the turbines in combination with the closer views of the Westray turbines would increase the proportion of views occupied by wind farm development resulting in a negligible magnitude of impact. The level of cumulative effect would be **minor** and not significant
- 10.12.14 The Category C Listed Helzie windmill stump at Rapness (Site 48) is set in improved pasture on gentle south facing slope overlooking Rapness Sound and Rapness Ferry Terminal. The Category A Listed Building of Sangar croft house (Site 50) is situated prominently at a crossroads of unclassified roads less than 1 km from the ferry pier at Rapness. Numerous modern features are visible in the views from both assets including modern farm buildings, wind turbines and overhead electricity lines. An understanding and appreciation of the windmill tower and the croft buildings in their current setting is gained from an understanding of their relationship with the surrounding arable agricultural land which in turn can inform us about changing settlement patterns and agricultural land-use. The windmill and the croft are judged to be of low relative sensitivity to changes in their settings. Figure 10.15 shows predicted visibility from Sangar croft house and Figure 6.22 shows predicted visibility from the nearby Westray Ferry Terminal at Rapness. These visualisations show that all six of the Proposed Development turbines would be visible from both assets beyond intervening agricultural land to which the setting of the windmill and croft relates and beyond modern farm buildings. A single wind turbine is currently visible in views south from Sangar croft house. Owing to the separation distance of 4.67 km, the Proposed Development would appear similar in size and scale to the small wind turbine south of the croft house. The Proposed Development would thus be seen in a view which already features a modern wind turbine (Sangar) and ferry terminal (Helzie). Views towards the assets from across the landscape would not be affected by the increase in wind farm development and the both assets would remain fully legible in their agricultural settings. As such no additional cumulative effects have been predicted.
- 10.12.15 ZTV and visualisation evidence suggests that operational developments; Hammars Hill, Burgar Hill and Rennibister, are theoretically visible from Rusk Holm (Site 49) and Faray (Figure 10.13) although these turbines could not be visually detected during the site visit. The extreme tips of Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust and Newark are also theoretically visible in views to the north-west. Given the scale and proximity of the Proposed Development to the post-medieval landscape of Faray and the Category C Listed building at Rusk Holm, the principal effect will come from the Proposed Development rather than the cumulative schemes. For this reason, no additional cumulative effects on the setting of Rusk Holm (Site 49) or the Faray post-medieval landscape are predicted.

10.13 Summary

- 10.13.1 This chapter identifies the archaeological and cultural heritage value of the site and assesses the potential for direct and settings effects on archaeological heritage assets resulting from the construction and operation of the Proposed Development. This chapter also identifies measures that should be taken to mitigate predicted adverse effects.
- 10.13.2 This assessment has identified 88 non-designated heritage assets and one designated asset within the site. The Proposed Development has been designed to avoid directly impacting upon that designated asset; Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1).

- 10.13.3 The Proposed Development has also been designed so as to avoid impacts upon known heritage assets where possible. Given the density and extent of known remains it has not been possible to avoid all impacts and there would be direct impacts on seven non-designated heritage assets. All of these assets are post-medieval remains and comprise the sites of former buildings (Sites 5 and 12) and a well (Site 109) recorded from historic mapping, areas of former rig cultivation (Sites 73 and 74), a road (Site 114) and a slipway (Site 119) of 20th century date. Assets recorded and known only from historic mapping are judged to be of negligible importance. The remaining assets are judged to be of low importance. The Proposed Development would remove any deposits associated with the assets known from historic mapping evidence and the slipway. The Proposed Development would impact upon only part of the remaining assets leading to some loss of information content. A **minor** and not significant direct effect has been predicted in each case.
- 10.13.4 Planning policies and guidance require that account is taken of potential effects upon heritage assets by proposed developments and that where possible such effects are avoided. Where avoidance is not possible, effects on any significant remains should be minimised or offset. Given the potential for presently unknown archaeological remains, in particular of prehistoric and post-medieval date, to survive within the site, a programme of archaeological works designed to avoid inadvertent damage to known remains and to investigate and mitigate against the possibility of uncovering hitherto unknown remains will be undertaken.
- 10.13.5 The implementation of the above outlined mitigation measures will prevent inadvertent damage to known heritage features; investigate the potential for previously unknown features and disseminate the results of archaeological works to the public. Following the implementation of mitigation measures there may be a slight loss of overall information content and as such a marginal magnitude of residual impact is anticipated. The residual direct effect would be **negligible** and not significant.
- 10.13.6 There would be a **moderate** and significant temporary effect on the setting of Quoy Chambered Cairn during the construction phase. Effects associated with construction noise and traffic would cease on completion of the construction phase.
- 10.13.7 Potential operational effects on the settings of designated heritage assets within the 5 km and 10 km study areas and selected assets within the 15 km study area have been considered in detail as part of this assessment. **Moderate** and significant effects have been predicted upon the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinguoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape.
- 10.13.8 A programme of Historic Building Recording will be undertaken within the site as compensatory mitigation to create a baseline record of the condition of the upstanding buildings on the site and partially offset potential impacts of the Proposed Development on the setting of the post-medieval landscape of Faray.
- 10.13.9 There would be **moderate** and significant residual effects on the setting of the Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinguoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape, although the core components and integrity of the setting of these assets would not be adversely affected.
- 10.13.10 The possibility of cumulative effects has been considered and assessed. A **minor** and not significant cumulative effect has been predicted on the setting of the Burn of Musetter standing stone (Site 22) and the chambered cairns at The Manse (Site 23), Eday Church Hall (Site 24), Calf of Eday (Site 28), Bay of London (Site 33), Vinguoy Hill (Site 40), Fitty Hill (Site 124) and Howa Tower (Site 125). No additional cumulative effects have been predicted

Table 10.7 – Summary of Effect

Description of Effect	Significance of Likely Effect		Mitigation Measure	Significance of Residual Effect	
	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse		Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Construction					
Direct impacts on non-designated assets of negligible importance recorded from historic maps (Sites 5, 12 and 109)	Minor and not significant	Adverse	A mitigation strategy in four stages is proposed; geophysical survey and trial trenching will be undertaken in the first instance. Should the results of the trial trenching indicate that further works are required further excavation and post-excavation analysis will be undertaken.	Negligible and not significant	Adverse
Direct impacts on known non-designated remains of low importance that are present on the site (Sites 73, 74, 114 and 119).	Minor and not significant	Adverse	A mitigation strategy in four stages is proposed; geophysical survey and trial trenching will be undertaken in the first instance. Should the results of the trial trenching indicate that further works are required further excavation and post-excavation analysis will be undertaken.	Negligible and not significant	Adverse
Direct impacts on previously unrecorded non-designated archaeological remains of potential medium or high importance that could be present on the site.	Major and significant	Adverse	A four-stage mitigation strategy is proposed; survey and trial trenching will be undertaken initially and will be followed by excavation and post-excavation analysis as necessary. Any significant remains will be preserved in situ wherever possible.	Negligible and not significant	Adverse
Temporary significant effects on the setting of Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1) during construction operation	Moderate and significant	Adverse	Effects on setting from heavy traffic movement and associated noise would cease on completion of construction.	Neutral	-

Description of Effect	Significance of Likely Effect		Mitigation Measure	Significance of Residual Effect	
	Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse		Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Operation					
Moderate significant effects on the settings of Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Vinquoy Hill Chambered Cairn (Site 40) and the Faray post-medieval landscape.	Moderate and significant	Adverse	Historic Building Recording to be undertaken to ensure better understanding and appreciation of the surviving extent and condition of upstanding built heritage remains on Eday and ensure a lasting legacy of their preservation by record for future generations prior to any further deterioration. Measured survey and recording of assets eroding from the coastal edge will help to preserve a record of their extent and nature before they are lost to coastal erosion.	Moderate and significant	Adverse
Decommissioning					
The Applicant is seeking in-perpetuity consent for the Proposed Development. In the event of decommissioning, or replacement of turbines, it is anticipated that the levels of effect would be similar but of a lesser level than those during construction. Decommissioning would be undertaken in line with best practice processes and methods at that time and will be managed through an agreed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.					

Table 10.8 – Summary of Cumulative Effects

Receptor	Effect	Cumulative Developments	Significance of Cumulative Effect	
			Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Burn of Musetter standing stone (Site 22). Chambered cairns at The Manse (Site 23),	Settings Effect	Spurness Point on Sanday, Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust on Westray and Hammars Hill	Minor and not significant	Adverse

Receptor	Effect	Cumulative Developments	Significance of Cumulative Effect	
			Significance	Beneficial/ Adverse
Eday Church Hall (Site 24), Calf of Eday (Site 28) Bay of London (Site 33), Vinguoy Hill (Site 40), Fitty Hill (Site 124) and Howa Tower (Site 125)		Rennibister and Crowness Business Park turbines on Mainland		
Quoy Chambered Cairn (Site 1), Muckle Hill of Linkataing Chambered Cairn (Site 17), Dale Burnt Mound (Site 35) Helzie Windmill (Site 48) Rusk Holm (Site 49) Sangar croft house (Site 50) and the Faray post-medieval landscape.	Settings Effects	Spurness Point on Sanday, Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust on Westray and Hammars Hill Rennibister and Crowness Business Park turbines on Mainland	No additional cumulative effect	N/A
Direct impacts on known non-designated assets on Faray	Direct Effects	Spurness Point on Sanday, Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust on Westray and Hammars Hill Rennibister and Crowness Business Park turbines on Mainland	Negligible and not significant	N/A
Unknown archaeological remains	Direct Effects	Spurness Point on Sanday, Gallowhill and Westray Development Trust on Westray and Hammars Hill Rennibister and Crowness Business Park turbines on Mainland	Negligible and not significant	N/A

10.14 References

- Anderson, J. Rev. 1795. Stronsay and Eday, County of Orkney Old Statistical Accounts of Scotland Volume XV. Available at: https://stataccscot.edina.ac.uk/static/statacc/dist/viewer/osa-vol15-Parish_record_for_Stronsay_and_Eday_in_the_county_of_Orkney_in_volume_15_of_account_1/ Accessed 19/03/2020
- Ben, J., 1529. 'A Description of the Orkney Islands by Jo. Ben, living there in the year 1529'. in W., Macfarlane, 1726. Geographical Collections relating to Scotland made by Walter Macfarlane. edited from Macfarlane's transcript held in the Advocates Library by Sir Arthur Mitchell. 1906. Scottish History Society LI, Vol. III, 313-23.
- CIfA, (2014). *Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment*. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists. Published December 2014. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS&GCommissioning_1.pdf. Accessed: October 2019
- CIfA, (2017). *Standard and guidance for historic environment desk-based assessment. The Chartered Institute for Archaeologists*. Published December 2014. Updated January 2017. Available at: https://www.archaeologists.net/sites/default/files/CIfAS%26GDBA_3.pdf. Accessed: October 2019
- Cowan, I. B., 1967, *The Parishes of Medieval Scotland*, Scottish Record Society vol. 93
- Davidson, J L and Henshall, A S 1989, *The chambered cairns of Orkney: an inventory of the structures and their contents*, Edinburgh, 158-9.
- Davidson, A., Harkness, D & Simpson A 1986 *The Formation of Farm Mounds on the Island of Sanday, Orkney* *Geoarchaeology: An International Journal* 1, 45-60
- Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017 (as amended)*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2017/101/contents/made>. Accessed: October 2019
- Fenton, A. (1978) *The Northern Isles: Orkney and Shetland*. John Donald Publishers, Edinburgh.
- Fenton. A (1987) *Country Life in Scotland*. John Donald Publishers, Edinburgh.
- Gibson, J (2008) *Rising Tides. The Loss of Coastal Heritage on Orkney*. Orkney: Northings
- Henshall, A S 1963, *The chambered tombs of Scotland*, vol. 1, Edinburgh, 232-3, ORK. 47.
- Historic Environment Scotland, (2004). *Statement Of Significance St Magnus Church, Egilsay* Accessed September 2020
- Historic Environment Scotland, (2020). *Managing Change in the Historic Environment: Setting*. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549> Accessed September 2020
- Historic Environment Scotland et al. (2016). *The Heart of Neolithic Orkney World Heritage Site: Management Plan, 2014-19*. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=c96546cf-ff4d-409e-9f96-a5c900a4f5f2>. Accessed September 2020
- Historic Environment Scotland (2019a) '*Historic Environment Policy for Scotland* 'HEPS'. Available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=80b7c0a0-584b-4625-b1fd-a60b009c2549>

[research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7](https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=1bcfa7b1-28fb-4d4b-b1e6-aa2500f942e7).

Accessed September 2020

Historic Environment Scotland (2019b) *Designation Policy and Selection Guidance*. Available at:

<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=8d8bbaeb-ce5a-46c1-a558-aa2500ff7d3b>.

Accessed September 2020

Historic Environment Scotland (2019c). *Scotland's Listed Buildings*. Available at:

<https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=34c90cb9-5ff3-45c3-8bc3-a58400fcbc44>.

Accessed September 2020

Historic Environment Scotland (2019d). Quoy, broch 270m NW of Designation Report of Handling

ICOMOS (2005). *Xi'an Declaration*. Available at:

<https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/xian-declaration.pdf>. Accessed

September 2020 ICOMOS. (2013). Burra Charter. Available at: <https://australia.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Burra-Charter-2013-Adopted-31.10.2013.pdf>. Accessed September 2020

IEMA, (2016). *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment*. Available at:

<https://www.iema.net/assets/newbuild/documents/Delivering%20Quality%20Development.pdf>

Accessed September 2020

Lee, D H J 2015 Northern World Views in Post medieval Orkney: Towards a more Holistic Approach to Later Landscapes. *Historical Archaeology* 49 (3) 126-148.

Leslie, R 1998a The Island on North Faray. In Sib Folk News Orkney Family History Society Issue No 7.

Leslie, R 1998b The Faray Story Part 2. In Sib Folk News Orkney Family History Society Issue No 8.

Leslie, R 1999 Faray Part 4 In Sib Folk News Orkney Family History Society Issue No 10.

Newman, P. and Newman, A. (1991) Simmens and Strae: Thatched Roofs in Orkney in Scottish Vernacular Buildings Working Group Journal, Volume 15. p.27-40 at

https://www.svbwg.org.uk/journals/SVBWG_VB_15_1991.pdf Accessed September 2020.

McNeil, R 2015 Royal Air Force Commands <http://www.rafcommands.com/> Accessed September 2020.

Noble, G. (2006) Harnessing the waves: Monuments and ceremonial complexes in Orkney and beyond. *Journal of Maritime Archaeology*, Vol1, Issue 1, pp 100–117.

Ordnance Survey Books of Reference 1855-1882 Parish of Eday Available at

<https://digital.nls.uk/ordnance-survey-books-of-reference-1855-1882/archive/99264807#?c=0&m=0&s=0&cv=15&xywh=-4%2C-1%2C5056%2C4145> Accessed

September 2020

Orkney Island Council (2017a). *Orkney Local Development Plan*. Available at:

http://www.orkney.gov.uk/Files/Planning/Development-and-Marine-Planning/Local-Plan/OLDP_2017/Orkney_Local_Development_Plan_2017_2022.pdf. Accessed September 2020.

Orkney Islands Council (2017b). *Supplementary Guidance: Historic Environment and Cultural*

Heritage. Available at: http://www.orkney.gov.uk/Files/Planning/Development-and-Marine-Planning/Adopted_PPA_and_SG/Guidance_for_the_Plan/Historic_Environment_and_Cultural_Heritage_Supplementary_Guidance.pdf. Accessed September 2020..

Orkney Islands Council (2017c). *Planning Policy Advice: Historic Environment (Topics and Themes)*, available at: https://www.orkney.gov.uk/Files/Committees-and-Agendas/Council-Meetings/GM2017/09-03-2017/I14_App4_PPA_Historic_Env_Topics_Themes.pdf. Accessed September 2020.

Ritchie, A. 1995. *Prehistoric Orkney*. London: Historic Scotland/BT Batsford.

Scotland's Places. 2020. Ordnance Survey Name Books- Orkney Volume 4. Available at: <https://scotlandsplaces.gov.uk/search/results?st=faray>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2011), PAN 2/2011 *Archaeology and Planning*, available at: <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/355385/0120020.pdf>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2014), *Scottish Planning Policy*, available at: <http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2014/06/5823SNH>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2014b) *The National Planning Framework for Scotland (NPF3)* available at: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/national-planning-framework-3/> Accessed December 2020

Scottish Government (2014c) *Our Place in Time*, available at: <https://www.historicenvironment.scot/archives-and-research/publications/publication/?publicationId=fa088e13-8781-4fd6-9ad2-a7af00f14e30>
Accessed December 2020

Scottish Natural Heritage (2012). *Assessing the Cumulative Impact Of Onshore Wind Energy Developments* Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2017-09/Guidance%20note%20-%20Assessing%20the%20cumulative%20impact%20of%20onshore%20wind%20energy%20developments.pdf>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Natural Heritage & Historic Environment Scotland (2018). *Environmental Impact Assessment Handbook v5*. Available at: <https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2018-05/Publication%202018%20-%20Environmental%20Impact%20Assessment%20Handbook%20V5.pdf>. Accessed September 2020.

Simpson, J. Rev. 1845. Stronsay and Eday, County of Orkney New Statistical Accounts of Scotland Volume XV. Available at: https://stataccscot.edina.ac.uk/static/statacc/dist/viewer/nsa-vol15-Parish_record_for_Stronsay_and_Eday_in_the_county_of_Orkney_in_volume_15_of_account_2/. Accessed 20/03/2020

Tait, I 2012 *Shetland Vernacular Buildings* Shetland Times Limited, Lerwick.

The Orcadian. 2018. OIC set to purchase Faray, Holm of Faray and Red Faray. Available at: <https://www.orcadian.co.uk/oic-set-to-purchase-faray-holm-of-faray-and-red-holm/> Accessed 19/03/2020

UK Government (1979). *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (as amended)*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1979/46>. Accessed September 2020.

UK Government (1997) *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (as amended)*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1997/9/contents>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2006). *Planning etc. (Scotland) Act 2006*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2006/17/contents>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2011). *Historic Environment (Amendment) (Scotland) Act 2011*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2011/3/contents/enacted>. Accessed September 2020.

Scottish Government (2014). *Historic Environment (Scotland) Act 2014*. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2014/19/contents/enacted>. Accessed September 2020.

Woodman, P. E. 2000. Beyond significant patterning, towards past intentions: the location of Orcadian chambered tombs, in C. Buck, V. Cummings, C. Henley, S. Mills & S. Trick (eds) *Proceedings of the UK Chapter of Computer Applications and Quantitative Methods in Archaeology:91–105*. BAR International Series, 844: Oxford: BAR

Historic Maps

- 1654 Blaeu, *Orkney and Shetland*
- 1665 Sanson, *Les Isles Orkney*
- 1745 Moll, *Orkney Shire*
- 1750 MacKenzie, M., *Pomona or main-land*
- 1795 Eunson, G *A chart of the islands of Orkney... with the coast of Scotland*
- 1832 Thomson, J *Orkney Islands John Thomson's Atlas of Scotland, 1832*
- 1881 Ordnance Survey *Orkney LXXXVI.5 and 6 (Eday & Westray)* Survey date: 1879
Publication date: 1881
- 1881 Ordnance Survey *Orkney LXXXVI.2 (with extension LXXXVI.1) (Eday & Westray)*
Survey date: 1879 Publication date: 1881
- 1881 Ordnance Survey *Orkney LXXX.14 (Eday)* Survey date: 1879 Publication date: 1881
- 1882 Ordnance Survey *Orkney, Sheet LXXX* (includes: Eday; Westray) Survey date: 1879
Publication date: 1882
- 1902 Ordnance Survey *Orkney LXXXVI.2* Publication date: 1902 Revised: 1900
- 1903 Ordnance Survey *Orkney Sheet LXXX* (includes: Eday; Westray) Publication date:
1903 Date revised: 1900

Aerial Photographs

Library Reference	Sortie	Date	Frame Run/ Photo Number	Barcode Reference
SCOT B_0157	CPE/Scot/UK/0188	10/10/1946	4123 to 4126 and 4175 to 4178	SB_001100
SCOT B_0253	LEU/UK/0002	16/04/1948	7082 to 7086	SB_001527
SCOT B_0563	543/1663	23/02/1962	0270 to 0280	SB_002391
SCOT C_0050	CPE/Scot/UK/0188	10/10/1946	5034 to 5036,	SB_002865
SCOT C_0094	543/1663	23/02/1962	0072 to 0074	SB_002919
SCOT C_0212	ASS/60687	26/06/1987	302 to 303	SB_003079
SCOT OS_06_01	OS/64/220	25/09/1964	035 to 038	SB_003710
SCOT OS_06_02	OS/64/146	22/08/1964	034 to 035	SB_003706
SCOT OS_06_02	OS/63/045	26/04/1964	043 to 047	SB_003661
SCOT OS_06_05	OS/70/195	01/06/1970	015 to 016	SB_004537