

## **Scottish Water**

Eorpie, Waste Water Treatment Works,  
Outfall, Access road and Replacement  
Sewer.

Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment  
and walk over survey

**October 2007**

## Document Control Sheet

Client: Scottish Water Solutions  
 Project: Eoropie, Waste Water Treatment works, Outfall, Access road and Replacement Sewer.  
 Title: Archaeological desk-based assessment and walk over survey

Job No: B0570000  
 Report No:

### Prepared by

### Reviewed by

### Approved by

<b>ORIGINAL</b>	NAME <b>Claire Shaw &amp; Alastair Rees</b>	NAME <b>Alastair Rees</b>	NAME
DATE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE

<b>REVISION</b>	NAME	NAME	NAME
DATE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE

<b>REVISION</b>	NAME	NAME	NAME
DATE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE

<b>REVISION</b>	NAME	NAME	NAME
DATE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE	SIGNATURE

This report, and information or advice which it contains, is provided by Jacobs UK Limited solely for internal use and reliance by its Client in performance of Jacobs UK Limited's duties and liabilities under its contract with the Client. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this report should be read and relied upon only in the context of the report as a whole. The advice and opinions in this report are based upon the information made available to Jacobs UK Limited at the date of this report and on current UK standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this report. Following final delivery of this report to the Client, Jacobs UK Limited will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this report. This report has been prepared by Jacobs UK Limited in their professional capacity as Consulting Engineers. The contents of the report do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion. This report is prepared in accordance with the terms and conditions of Jacobs UK Limited's contract with the Client. Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this report. Should the Client wish to release this report to a Third Party for that party's reliance, Jacobs UK Limited may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that:

- Jacobs UK Limited's written agreement is obtained prior to such release, and
- By release of the report to the Third Party, that Third Party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against Jacobs UK Limited, and Jacobs UK Limited accordingly assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that Third Party, and
- Jacobs UK Limited accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of Jacobs UK Limited's interests arising out of the Client's release of this report to the Third Party.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1	General	1-1
<b>2</b>	<b>Planning and Legislative Background</b>	<b>1-2</b>
2.1	General	1-2
2.2	Scheduled Ancient Monuments	1-2
2.3	Listed Buildings	1-3
2.4	Other Archaeological Sites and Monuments	1-4
2.5	Planning Consent	1-4
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	<b>1-4</b>
3.1	Report Structure	1-4
3.2	Aims and Object	1-4
3.3	Desk based Study	1-5
3.4	Walk Over Survey	1-5
3.5	Assessment of Cultural Heritage Importance	1-5
3.6	Assessment of Potential Impacts	1-6
3.7	Predicted Impacts (direct)	1-7
<b>4</b>	<b>Archaeological and Historical Background</b>	<b>1-9</b>
4.1	General	1-9
4.2	Cultural Heritage Background	1-9
4.3	Cartographic Evidence	1-12
<b>5</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>1- 12</b>
5.1	Sites within the Study Area	1-12
<b>6</b>	<b>Assessment of Importance and Sensitivity</b>	<b>1-13</b>
6.1	General	1-13
6.2	Sites within the Proposed Development Area	1-14

6.3	Mitigation and Enhancement	1-16
6.4	Unknown or Buried Archaeology	1-16
<b>7</b>	<b>Summary and Conclusion</b>	<b>1-16</b>
7.1	General	1-16
7.2	Discussion	1-16
7.3	Acknowledgments	1-17
<b>Appendix A - Cartographic References</b>		<b>1-18</b>
<b>Appendix B - Vertical Aerial Photographs</b>		<b>1-18</b>
<b>Appendix C - Bibliographic References</b>		<b>1-18</b>
<b>Appendix D - Site Gazetteer</b>		<b>1-19</b>
<b>Appendix E - Photographic Plates</b>		<b>1-26</b>
<b>Figure 1</b>		<b>1-28</b>



## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 General

- 1.1.1 Jacobs has been commissioned by Scottish Water Solutions to carry out a desk-based assessment and Walk Over survey of the Cultural Heritage resource that may potentially be affected by the construction of an access road, waste water treatment works, outfall pipe and replacement sewer on the Eorpie headland. The main route of the pipeline runs from NGR: NB 51776 64796 to NB 51216 64863 with the access track extending from NB 513 652 to NB 51216 64863. The outfall is proposed to run from NB 5121 6486 to NB 5105 6492. During the walkover no upstanding archaeological features were recognised.
- 1.1.2 The assessment found eighteen known sites of archaeological and historical interest close to the route of the proposed sewer replacement some of Prehistoric date. Archaeological remains of National and Local importance were noted within the wider landscape as well as close to the proposed sewer replacement.
- 1.1.3 The risk to the archaeological heritage posed by the proposed construction of the water mains replacement includes the destruction of unknown archaeological remains which may survive below ground. These are undetectable until they are unearthed in the process of excavating any foundations.
- 1.1.4 The desk based assessment and walkover survey revealed that the route of the water mains is in an open coastal location on a machair ground surface comprising windblown sand.
- 1.1.5 To mitigate against the risk posed to any surviving archaeological remains surviving along the route of the pipeline, access road and associated works, a programme of archaeological monitoring was recommended by Mary Macleod of Comhairle nan Eilean Siar and was carried out by Rathmell Archaeology during the summer of 2007. No archaeological remains were located during this fieldwork.
- 1.1.6 Jacobs conforms to the standards of professional conduct outlined in the Institute of Field Archaeologists Code of conduct, and relevant Standards and Guidance documents. Jacobs is a Registered Archaeological Organisation (RAO) with the Institute of Field Archaeologists (IFA). This status ensures that there is regular monitoring and approval by external peers of our internal systems, standards and skills development.

### 1.2 Terms of reference

- 1.2.1 This Desk Based Assessment considers the affects of the proposed development on the entire historic environment including archaeological sites and monuments, historic buildings and their environs, historic gardens and landscapes.

1.2.2 For the purposes of this study, all readily available sources of information held by the relevant heritage bodies, were consulted, as well as secondary documentary sources, some manuscript sources, historic maps and aerial photographs. Data on the historic environment was acquired from the following sources:

- *Comhairle nan Eilean Siar Archaeology Unit for archaeological sites and monuments and early maps;*
- *Historic Scotland for Ancient Monuments, Listed Buildings, Designed Landscapes, Parks and Gardens and Historic Battlefields;*
- *Sites and Monument Record (SMR)*
- *National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS)*
- *Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS);*
- *Vertical and Oblique Aerial Photographs held by the RCHAMS*
- *Early Maps held in the National Map Library of Scotland*

1.2.3 The historic environment is protected by a number of statutory and non-statutory designations which include the following:

- *Scheduled Ancient Monuments;*
- *Identified archaeological sites;*
- *Conservation Areas;*
- *Listed historic buildings and structures;*
- *Locally listed historic buildings and structures;*
- *Historic Gardens*
- *Designed Landscapes.*

## 2

## Planning and Legislative Background

### 2.1 Main General

This Desk Based Assessment has been carried out within the framework of the following legislation and planning policy:

- *Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 (hereafter 1979 act);*
- *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997 (1997 Act);*
- *National Planning Policy Guideline 5, Archaeology and Planning (NPPG 5);*
- *National Planning Policy Guideline 18, Planning and the Historic Environment (NPPG 18); and*
- *Planning Advice Note 42, Archaeology (PAN 42).*
- *Western Isles Local Plan*
- *Western Isles Structure Plan, 2003*

## 2.2 Scheduled Ancient Monuments

- 2.2.1 Although no scheduled monuments are known close to or near any of the proposed water mains replacement, the following information is still of relevance to the developer. A new development must not impact upon the area of a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) without the prior formal consent of Historic Scotland. This principle is described in National Planning Policy Guidelines:
- 2.2.2 *“Scheduled ancient monuments are of national importance and it is particularly important that they are preserved in situ and within an appropriate setting. Developments, which would have an adverse effect on scheduled monuments or the integrity of their settings, should not be permitted unless there are exceptional circumstances. Scheduled monument consent is required from the Scottish Ministers through Historic Scotland for any development affecting a scheduled ancient monument, and notification to Historic Scotland of any planning application affecting the site of such a monument is required under article 15 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) (Scotland) Order 1992”.*  
(NPPG5 April 1999, Section 17)
- 2.2.3 Under the 1979 Act the Scottish Ministers are required to compile and maintain a Schedule of monuments considered to be of national importance. The statutory consent of the Scottish Ministers is required before any works are carried out which would have the effect of demolishing, destroying, damaging, removing, repairing, altering, adding to, flooding or covering up a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM).
- 2.2.4 A formal process of application to conduct such works known as Scheduled Monument Consent (SMC) is administered on behalf of the Scottish Ministers by Historic Scotland. Effects of proposed development works upon the setting of a SAM, form an important consideration in the granting or refusal of consent to conduct development works. Further information on development control procedures relating to SAMS is provided in NPPG 5 and PAN 42.
- 2.2.5 There are currently approximately 7500 Scheduled Monuments in Scotland. Approximately 200 of these are located in the Western Isles. In addition, it is estimated that there may be more than twice this number which meet the necessary requirements for designation.

## 2.3 Listed Buildings

- 2.3.1 Under the 1997 Act, the Scottish Ministers are required to compile a list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest. These buildings are classified into Categories A, B and C (S), in decreasing order of importance. This statutory protection covers not only the building itself, but also other features within its curtilage (e.g. stables and garden walls).
- 2.3.2 There is a presumption against development that will adversely affect the character of a listed building or its setting, and planning authorities are required to have a special regard for the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. Further policy information on listed buildings is published in NPPG 18. Additional guidance is published in the

Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas 1998 (hereafter 'memorandum'; Historic Scotland 1998).

## **2.4 Other archaeological sites and monuments**

- 2.4.1 Archaeological sites and monuments without statutory protection are curated by the local planning authority. NPPG 5 and PAN 42 provide national planning policy guidance and advice on the treatment of this resource. PAN 42 indicates that the principle that should underlie all planning decision-making is preservation of cultural resources, in situ where possible, and by record if destruction cannot be avoided. It is recognized in that document that preservation may not always be possible, and where damage is unavoidable various mitigation measures may be proposed.

## **2.5 Planning Considerations**

- 2.5.1 Mary Macleod of Comhairle nan Eilean Siar is the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority and has been consulted by Jacobs on archaeological matters pertaining to the proposed development proposals and the development of the mitigation strategy.

# **3 Methodology**

## **3.1 General**

- 3.1.1 This desk-based assessment has been designed to identify and assess the archaeological sites and monuments present on, or close to, the development area in order to assess the likely impact of the proposed development and to propose mitigation measures.
- 3.1.2 In undertaking this desk-based assessment, data was sought for all sites monuments and buildings of potential Cultural Heritage interest of statutory designation within a 500m corridor from the proposed pipe line route. Data was also obtained for all sites, monuments and buildings of non-statutory designation for sites within 1km corridor from the proposed pipeline route. Each archaeological or historical site, monument or building referred to in the text is listed in the gazetteer in Appendix 1. Site numbers allocated to sites and monuments and mentioned within the text will be in bold and parentheses.
- 3.1.3 Each archaeological or historical site, monument or building referred to in the text is plotted on the location maps (Figures 1) at the end of this report, using the assigned site numbers. In addition, a number of photographic plates have been included to aid site identification.

## **3.2 Aims and Objectives**

- 3.2.1 The main objective of this study is to identify the archaeological resource of the study corridor. The evidence presented, and the conclusions reached, aim to offer a comprehensive basis for further decisions regarding the direction of the outfall pipe, access road and associated works the formulation of a mitigation strategy, should this be required.

- 3.2.2 The scope of this desk-based assessment meets the requirements of current planning regulations set out in NPPG 5 and PAN 42 and also the Institute of Field Archaeologist's (1994, revised 1999) "Standard and Guidance for Archaeological Desk Based Assessments".

### 3.3 Desk Based Study

- 3.3.1 Data gathering and assessment was undertaken in accordance with the Institute of Field Archaeologists Standard and Guidance on Archaeological Desk-Based Assessments (1999). Other policy documents taken into account included the Scottish Office documents NPPG 5, NPPG 18 and PAN 42.

- 3.3.2 Information on sites both with and without statutory designation that lie within 1km of the Proposed Development Area was sought from the following sources:

- *Historic Scotland;*
- *National Monuments Record of Scotland;*
- *National Library of Scotland (including map library);*
- *Published archaeological and historic literature.*

### 3.4 Walk over Survey

- 3.4.1 A site visit was made to the Proposed Development Area on the 8<sup>th</sup> May 2007 in order to assess the presence; absence and condition of any archaeological sites identified during the desk-based study and to locate and record any previously unrecorded sites.

- 3.4.2 All sites of statutory designation within 500m of the Proposed Development Area identified during the desk-based survey were visited. This was carried out to assess any potential impacts on their setting caused by the development construction.

### 3.5 Assessment of Cultural Heritage Importance

- 3.5.1 Sites were assigned a level of importance on a scale of 'Less than Local' to 'International', as shown in Table 1. This was established on the basis of statutory designation and/or assessed cultural heritage importance.

**Table 1: Cultural Heritage Importance**

Importance	Site Type
<b>International</b>	World Heritage Site
<b>National</b>	Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) Category A Listed Buildings Designed Landscapes Some undesignated sites assessed as being of National importance using the methodology given in paragraph 3
<b>Regional</b>	Category B Listed Buildings Conservation Areas Some undesignated sites assessed as being of Regional importance using the methodology given in paragraph 3

<b>Local</b>	Category C(s) Listed Buildings Some undesignated sites assessed as being of Local importance using the methodology given in paragraph 3
<b>Less than Local</b>	Sites either already badly destroyed or whose historic value is too slight for inclusion in a higher class.

3.5.2 World Heritage Sites are afforded international protection under the UNESCO World Heritage Convention, with Scheduled Ancient Monuments (SAMs) nationally protected under the 'Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979'. The 'Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act 1997' provides for the designation of Category A, B and C(s) Listed Buildings which are considered to be of national, regional and local importance respectively.

3.5.3 Conservation Areas are assessed as being of regional importance and following discussion with Historic Scotland on previous projects; Designated Landscapes area assessed as being of national importance.

3.5.4 Many sites of cultural heritage importance are not currently afforded any statutory protection through designation. For the purposes of assessment, these undesignated sites were assigned a level of importance using professional judgement supported by review of the following guidance:

- *Criteria used in Scottish Historic Environment Policy 2 for the designation of SAMs; and*
- *Non-statutory criteria used in their designation of Listed Building categories (Memorandum of Guidance on Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas, Historic Scotland 1998).*

### 3.6 Assessment of potential impacts

3.6.1 Direct impacts from the proposed development include potential damage to any unknown archaeological features that may be present along the mains pipeline corridor. The main possible impacts from construction works are considered to be as follows:

- *direct loss of site, or damage to part of the site;*
- *indirect damage through burial, compression, alteration of drainage, vibration or subsidence;*
- *severance of linked features.*

3.6.2 Normally, for each site, structure or area, the potential negative impact would be determined as follows:

- **Slight:** *sites affected by proposed development, but where the impact on the site or setting is minimal;*
- **Moderate:** *sites which would be affected by the proposed scheme but where loss or impact on the setting would be partial (including severance);*
- **Severe:** *sites where the majority of the site will be affected, but not completely lost, or where the setting is considerably altered; or*
- **Very Severe:** *sites where the proposed scheme would result in total loss of a site.*



- 3.6.3 Where sites or monuments identified are directly or indirectly affected by the proposed development, a suitable mitigation has been proposed.

### 3.7 Predicted Impacts (direct)

- 3.7.1 The significance of predicted direct impacts (i.e. physical disturbance) was determined taking into account the importance of the archaeological resource affected (Table 1), and the magnitude of the impact.

#### 3.7.2 Magnitude

The criteria used to outline the magnitude of impact are outlined in Table 2 below:

**Table 2: Magnitude of Direct Impacts on Cultural Heritage**

Magnitude	Criteria
<b>Very Severe</b>	Disturbance to over 75% of the known or estimated area of the site
<b>Severe</b>	Disturbance to between 50% and 75% of the known or estimated area of the site
<b>Medium</b>	Disturbance to between 25% and 50% of the known or estimated area of the site
<b>Negligible</b>	Disturbance of up to 25% of the known or estimated area of the site

#### 3.7.3 Significance

The significance of direct impacts was then determined in accordance with matrix of importance and magnitude, as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3: Significance of Direct Impacts on Cultural Heritage**

Magnitude of Impact Importance	Very Severe	Severe	Medium	Negligible
<b>National</b>	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate	Slight
<b>Regional</b>	Substantial	Moderate	Slight	Negligible
<b>Local</b>	Moderate	Slight	Slight	Negligible

- 3.7.4 Assessment of impact significance of the potential impact was then adjusted as appropriate to take into account the relative importance of the specific parts of the site that would be affected. For instance, an impact which is of 'very severe' magnitude in terms of the area of the site affected may nevertheless only affect peripheral features, while a 'medium' magnitude impact may affect the core of a site. Other qualitative factors taken into account include potential severance of linked features, nature of the severed linkage, the amount of stratigraphy which would be disrupted and the overall effect on the historic integrity of the site.

#### 3.7.5 Sensitivity of Setting

As with direct impacts, the significance of impacts on setting was determined taking into account the sensitivity of the archaeological resource affected, and the magnitude of impact.

- 3.7.6 Many archaeological sites are not visible, or barely visible, from ground level. Such sites will usually not be vulnerable to visual impacts. However, some

invisible or partially invisible sites may be located in an area where the immediate topography and landscape is important to our understanding of the site, and consequently the setting and location might be more significant. A process of selection was therefore undertaken prior to selecting sites for visual impact assessment, using the following criteria:

- *the sites are visible above ground level; and*
- *the sites are either directly accessible to the public, or are visually prominent from a publicly accessible point at distance; and*
- *the nature of the sites is such that the aesthetic quality of their setting may be considered a contributory factor in assessing the overall site importance; and*
- *if invisible, the topographical context, location and landscape interrelationship of the site is important to our appreciation and understanding;*
- *the site is a SAM, or a Listed Building.*

### 3.7.7 Sensitivity

The sensitivity of cultural heritage sites to visual impacts on their setting was separately assessed according to a methodology, Table 4 below. A preliminary selection process was undertaken to identify sites that may be vulnerable to visual impacts. The sensitivity of these sites was then assessed as 'High', 'Medium', 'Low' or 'Not Sensitive'.

**Table 4: Sensitivity of Cultural Heritage Sites to Impact on Setting**

Sensitivity	Description
<b>High</b>	Sites of National importance that are visually prominent and whose visual setting contributes significantly to their importance;  Invisible or partially visible sites of National importance whose location and topographical context aid our understanding of their form and function.
<b>Medium</b>	Sites of Regional importance that are visually prominent and whose visual setting contributes significantly to their importance;  Invisible or partially visible sites of Regional importance whose location and topographical context aid our understanding of their form and function.
<b>Low</b>	Sites of Local importance whose landscape setting contributes significantly to their importance
<b>Not Sensitive</b>	Any site of national, regional, local or lesser importance whose landscape setting does not contribute to their importance.

### 3.7.8 Magnitude

The magnitude of visual impacts on the setting of cultural heritage sites was assessed according to established principles and criteria set out in published guidance (Memorandum of Guidance, Historic Scotland 1998) and Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LI/IEMA, 2002). The application of the criteria leads to a definition of the magnitude of impact for each viewpoint on a four-point scale of 'dominant', 'prominent', 'present' or 'negligible'.



### 3.7.9 Significance

The overall significance of visual impacts was then assessed by taking into account the sensitivity of the receptor and the magnitude of the impact, as shown in Table 5. For each site, the viewpoint taken into consideration was the one with the greatest magnitude of impact.

**Table 5: Determination of Significance of Impacts on Setting**

Sensitivity Magnitude	High	Medium	Low
<b>Dominant</b>	Substantial	Substantial	Moderate
<b>Prominent</b>	Substantial	Moderate	Slight
<b>Present</b>	Moderate	Slight	Slight
<b>Negligible</b>	Slight	Negligible	Negligible

## 4 Archaeological and Historical Background

### 4.1 General

4.1.1 The earliest Monuments in Scotland comprise very slight traces of temporary settlements left behind by hunters and gatherers, while some of the most recent comprise the remains of recently deserted farmhouses or WWII defensive structures.

4.1.2 The four main categories of archaeological remains that may be encountered are:

- **upstanding remains:** built structures such as buildings, field boundaries, and features such as standing stones and stone circles;
- **earthworks:** soil-covered remains that can be seen as surface undulations at ground level. These can include ruined buildings or their foundations, banks, mounds, ramparts, ditches, gullies and hollows;
- **buried features:** soil-covered remains which have no visible trace at ground level (possibly revealed by aerial photography); and
- **artefact scatters:** scatters of potsherds, flint, tools, metal objects, animal bones, worked stone, mortar or human remains.

4.1.3 Palaeoenvironmental evidence may also be found in association with archaeological remains. Specialised analysis of palaeoenvironmental data can provide useful dating evidence and an indication of past land-use.

### 4.2 Cultural Heritage Background

#### The prehistoric periods

4.2.1 Human occupation of Scotland began with the arrival of Mesolithic hunter-gatherer groups around 7,000 BC. Mesolithic occupation of the Western Isles is indicated by the presence of shell middens and flint scatters along

coastlines and rivers. Although no direct evidence for Mesolithic activity has been discovered on Benbecula or the Western Isles generally, its probable presence has been suggested by palaeoenvironmental evidence found in peat deposits at Callanish on Lewis.

- 4.2.2 With the introduction of agriculture in the Neolithic period, around 3500 BC, communities became more settled and land was cleared for farming, such as the evidence indicated at site **5** with the possible remains of an ard. Stone axes which may have been used for woodland clearance have been discovered at Newmarket and other sites near Stornoway. Other such axes attest links with the north of Ireland and mainland Scotland. Peat accumulation on the Western Isles has obscured most Neolithic settlement sites, so the majority of evidence for the Neolithic occupation of the island comes from ritual monuments and communal burial mounds such as the large chambered cairn of Cnoc na Croich, in the grounds of Lews Castle, Stornoway. Stone circles and standing stones began to be erected by about 2500 BC, towards the end of the Neolithic period, possibly for ritual activities associated with the lunar, stellar and solar cycles.
- 4.2.3 The archaeological landscape of the subsequent Bronze Age (c. 2,000 BC to 700 BC) continues to be dominated by ritual and burial monuments. The period is characterised by a change from communal to individual burial, often with grave goods, including new styles of pottery and bronze artefacts. Although a number of Bronze Age settlements have been discovered on Lewis, the general picture is somewhat limited. There is clear indication of Bronze Age activity with the discovery of the Early Bronze Age farm at Callanish, (near to the stone circle). This site revealed the remains of a preserved field systems in the form of distinctive rig and furrow and the remains of stone field walls. From this discovery it became evident that the peat blanket within the interior of the island has potentially buried a wide range of prehistoric sites and structures.
- 4.2.4 In contrast to earlier periods, the archaeological record of the Iron Age is dominated by settlement evidence such as that found at site **3** and **6**. In Atlantic Scotland the early Iron Age is characterised by Atlantic roundhouses (brochs, duns etc). These structures vary considerably in architectural complexity; while this may be partly a chronological development, it could also derive from variations in the wealth or status of the occupants. While they may appear initially to be defensive structures, they were all probably primarily farmhouses. By around the start of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium AD, a new type of house appears. These 'wheelhouses' are characterised by semi-subterranean construction with a circular outer wall and radial internal divisions. These were themselves superseded by cellular buildings (10 and 11). There was considerable overlap in the occupation of these types, and they often occupied the same sites, with no apparent break in occupation. Other Iron Age structural types found on Lewis include crannogs, for example Dun Bharabhat at Loch Baravat.

### **The Early Historic period**

- 4.2.5 Occupation of many monument types continues into the Early Historic period, especially of sites in machair areas. Pictish occupation of monuments such as the broch at Loch na Berie is characterised by construction of cellular structures within the broch itself, often associated with

metalworking activities. Other sites on the west coast of Lewis such as Cnip and Bostadh show similar continuity of use.

- 4.2.6 Lewis, like many of the isles of Scotland was subject to extensive settlement by Norse invaders/settlers from the late 8<sup>th</sup> century onwards, with site **12** believed to date to this period. The occupation by the Norse is primarily evident through toponymy (place-name evidence) which maintain a distinct combination of Scandinavian and Celtic origin, as well as historical and archaeological evidence. By the end of the 11<sup>th</sup> century the Western Isles formed part of the Norse Kingdom of Man and the Isles. Norse rule continued until 1266, when the kingdom was ceded to Alexander III of Scotland after King Haakon was defeated at the Battle of Largs in 1263. Norse settlements such as Bostadh demonstrate a radical change in building style, with rectangular longhouses replacing the earlier circular or cellular building traditions. This building influence continued in practice until the 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> century in the form of traditional Black houses, which have comparisons with the Viking Longhouse. Burial sites are also known, for instance at Valtos, while the hoard of chess pieces (Lewis Chess Men) found at Uig represent one of the most impressive artefactual finds of recent years.

### The Medieval and Post-Medieval periods

- 4.2.7 The 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries marked a period of conflict over land throughout the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. The large landowners found the traditional crofting economy to be unprofitable, and there was a growing tendency towards 'improvement' of agriculture. This took various forms, including the establishment of larger farms and the spread of sheep farming, but one of the main effects was to push the bulk of the rural population onto a smaller proportion of the land, often through evictions or even forced emigration (the 'Highland clearances'). Eorpie and to a greater extent Port of Ness are products of such policies.
- 4.2.7 In a similar manner, the township of Goathill (just outside Stornoway), with 92 houses in 1785, disappeared altogether before 1821, while smaller settlements at Widows Row and Nether Holm were abandoned between 1851 and 1899, at about the same time as the foundation of a new settlement the same size as Nether Holm on much less favoured land at Holm. As is the case throughout the Western Isles, cultivation earthworks ('rig') are visible in many areas not considered suitable for arable farming today; such cultivation of poor land is a feature of subsistence farming and overpopulation.
- 4.2.8 This transformation can primarily be seen between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> editions of the Ordnance Survey map (1851 and 1899). At the time of the compiling of the 1<sup>st</sup> edition OS map, Sir James Matheson took possession of the Lewis and commissioned a detailed survey in order to assist his plans for the re-organisation of crofts on the island. Therefore, between 1848 and 1852, the island was surveyed and the results published in 1853 (Oliver 1993). This project was subsequently expanded for the whole of Scotland with the borders and Wigtownshire being next for survey. Matheson's plan for the crofts superseded an earlier scheme begun in 1811, following a survey of the pre-crofting landscape, which was incorporated into Gibbs plan of 1817. Despite this earlier improvement, the OS map depicts not only the new houses, laid out in rows according to Matheson's 1849-51 re-allotment, but

also many of the features of the old allotments, as well as some of the pre-crofting settlement remains, where these were still visible, e.g the palimpsest at Eoropie. A very good example of the island in a period of great change is similarly demonstrated at Port of Ness. At the time of survey, prior to 1849, there were very few buildings in the Butt of Lewis area and similarly enclosure (head-dykes) of any kind were notable by their absence. By the time of the second edition OS map in 1899, however, the crofts had been laid out in a linear re-allocation and there were numerous roofed buildings. At Eoropie, this overlying of two systems of field system can be seen clearly on maps and in the upstanding remains that remain a feature of the landscape today.

### 4.3 Cartographic Evidence

- 4.3.1 The main source of sound cartographic evidence that illustrates the village of Eoropie in detail is the sequence of Ordnance Survey maps, beginning in 1853 with the first edition. These maps reveal that the village of Eoropie has changed very little in the last 100 years, conforming to the established linear arrangement. It can not be determined when this layout to the village was established; however a comparison could be made with the village of Bragar to the south which is centralised along a linear pattern. It has been concluded that Bragar North and South was re-organised around 1840-50 into a 'modern' crofting settlement, the basis of which can still be seen today. Perhaps a similar approach was used around Eoropie, organising the scattered clachans into a crofting settlement.
- 4.3.2 The 1<sup>st</sup> edition map (Isle of Lewis, 1856) notes the small patchwork of lazy beds (1) located to the north west of the village, at the coast. St. Moluag's Church (4) is recorded as being in a ruinous condition.
- 4.3.3 By the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition OS (Isle of Lewis, 1898) it can be seen that the village has expanded mainly to the southeast, conforming to the established central line, merging with the village of Five Penny Ness. It can also be seen that improvements have been made with the infrastructure of the area with a network of track ways interlinking the villages and the lighthouse at the Butt of Lewis. Site 4, St. Moluag's church is still recorded as being in ruins.
- 4.3.4 By the 1965 OS it can be seen that the village has changed very little with the exception of a few new houses and the restoration of St. Moluag's church (4).

## 5

## Results

### 5.1 Sites within the study area

- 5.1.1 A total of eighteen sites were identified within the vicinity of the proposed development area by the desk-based assessment. Information on this is presented in Appendix A and illustrated in Figure 1.
- 5.1.2 An assessment of importance following the methodology described in Section 3, above was assigned to each site in order to assess the archaeological significance of the known sites, that may be affected by the

proposed development and all sites are shown on Figure 1. Detailed site descriptions are provided in Appendix A.

- 5.1.3 One A Listed building (4) lies within 500m for the proposed replacement waste water treatment works.
- 5.1.6 The remaining seventeen sites found within the study area are all non-designated sites.
- 5.1.7 Aerial photographs studied for the Western Isles show that cropmarks are present within 500m of the development area. These cropmarks include trackways, rig and furrow cultivation, rectilinear features and enclosures.
- 5.1.8 A walkover survey of the proposed development did not uncover any new sites.

## 6 Assessment of Importance and Sensitivity

### 6.1 General

- 6.1.1 An assessment of the potential impact upon each site has been undertaken using the assessment matrix outlined in Chapter 3.

**Table 6: Summary of Identified sites of Cultural Heritage Interest**

Site No	Name/Short Description	Statutory Designation	Importance
Site 1	Lewis, Eorpie, Field-System; Lazy Beds	None	Local
Site 2	Cnoc Beag Gormal; Cairn	None	Local
Site 3	Lewis, 22 Eorpie, Lewis; Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Worked Quartz; Flint; Stones	None	Local
Site 4	Teampull Mholuaidh, St Moluag's Church; Religion/ Chapel; Church	A (s) listed	National
Site 5	Croft 10, Eorpie, Lewis; Stone Setting; Worked Wood	None	Less than local
Site 6	Croft 17, Eorpie, Lewis; Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Stones	None	Local
Site 7	Eorrapidh; Crofting Township; Head-Dyke	None	Local
Site 8	Eoropaidh; Residential	None	Local
Site 9	Lewis, Eorpie; Settlement (Possible); Pottery	None	Local
Site 10	Eorpie; Promontory, enclosure with cellular structures	None	Local
Site 11	Eorpie; Cellular complex	None	Local
Site 12	Traigh Sanda; Enclosure, rectilinear, turf and stone	None	Less than Local
Site 13	Traigh Sanda; Cairn	None	Local
Site 14	Lewis, 12 Eorpie; Trial Excavation	None	Less than local
Site 15	Eorrapidh; Crofting Township; Head-Dyke	None	Local
Site 16	Eorpie; Cemetery	None	Local
Site 17	St. Ronan's Well; Holy Well	None	Local

Site 18	Cultivation cropmarks	None	Less than local
---------	-----------------------	------	-----------------

## 6.2 Sites within the Proposed Development Area

- 6.2.1 No Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Listed Buildings are directly affected by the development.
- 6.2.2 Seventeen non-designated sites lie within 500m of the development area. Due to the proximity of these sites to the development area, information from aerial photography, it is highly likely that undiscovered buried archaeological remains may be present within the footprint of the proposed development area. These remains have the potential to be of National, Regional and Local importance and so therefore development without mitigation has at worst the potential to cause a very severe impact of substantial significance.
- 6.2.3 All sites were assessed for adverse indirect impacts on their setting caused by the proposed development. A summary of this is shown in Table 7 and a detailed description of the impact on the sites is set out below.

**Table 7: Assessment of Impact on identified sites of Cultural Heritage interest**

Site No	Name/Short Description	Sensitivity	Impact on Setting
Site 1	Lewis, Eorpie, Field-System; Lazy Beds	Low	Negligible
Site 2	Cnoc Beag Gormal; Cairn	Low	Negligible
Site 3	Lewis, 22 Eorpie, Lewis; Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Worked Quartz; Flint; Stones	Low	Negligible
Site 4	Teampull Mholuaidh, St Moluag's Church; Religion/ Chapel; Church	High	Slight
Site 5	Croft 10, Eorpie, Lewis; Stone Setting; Worked Wood	Low	Negligible
Site 6	Croft 17, Eorpie, Lewis; Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Stones	Low	Negligible
Site 7	Eorrapidh; Crofting Township; Head-Dyke	Low	Negligible
Site 8	Eorpaidh; Residential	Low	Negligible
Site 9	Lewis, Eorpie; Settlement (Possible); Pottery	Low	Negligible
Site 10	Eorpie; Promontory, enclosure with cellular structures	Low	Negligible
Site 11	Eorpie; Cellular complex	Low	Negligible
Site 12	Traigh Sanda; Enclosure, rectilinear, turf and stone	Low	Very Severe
Site 13	Traigh Sanda; Cairn	Low	Medium
Site 14	Lewis, 12 Eorpie; Trial Excavation	Not Sensitive	Negligible
Site 15	Eorrapidh; Crofting Township; Head-Dyke	Low	Negligible
Site 16	Eorpie; Cemetery	Low	Negligible
Site 17	St. Ronan's Well; Holy Well	Low	Negligible
Site 18	Cultivation cropmarks	Low	Medium

### 6.2.4 Sensitivity

Of the sites within the 500m corridor one (4) has High sensitivity to the proposed development route due to its National importance.



Site (14) is Not Sensitive as the partial remains of a 19<sup>th</sup> century dwelling were excavated and its full extent was not revealed.

The remaining sixteen sites within the study area have Low sensitivity to the proposed development route.

#### **6.2.5 Significance of Impacts**

One site within the study corridor (4) will have Slight impact on its setting from the replacement sewage pipeline and access road.

Site 18 will be subject to Medium impacted by the proposed development as it occurs within the centre of the development area. Portions of the rig and furrow which were identified on the aerial photographs will be severely truncated by the insertion of the pipeline.

Site 12 has Very Severe sensitivity as it occurs on the location of the treatment works. However this area has been subject to previous intrusive measures when the initial sewage tank was inserted and has therefore been previously truncated (Plate 1).

Site 13 has Medium Sensitivity as it occurs close to the pipeline and evasive measures can be taken to avoid this site by slight alteration to the path of the pipeline.

The remaining fourteen sites within the study corridor have Negligible impact on their settings from the replacement water mains pipeline.

#### **6.2.5 Potential unknown remains**

No specific or definite archaeological sites of Medieval or earlier date are known in the study area or its immediate surroundings. Some areas are covered by peat and therefore as outlined previously, this could potentially conceal remains of a prehistoric or later date.

#### **6.2.6 Discussion**

There are no Conservation areas within the study corridor or wider study area.

There are no Designed Landscapes within the study corridor or wider study area.

There is one A-listed building within the study area, St Moluag's Church (4). This building is deemed to be of National importance and under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) (Scotland) Act, 1997 appropriate steps must be taken to ensure maintenance of the character and appearance of the buildings and their immediate surroundings.

All of the remaining sites within the wider context of the area are considered to be of local importance or less. Within the study area and beyond, the landscape consists mainly of agricultural buildings and associated workings, including enclosures; field boundaries reflecting the agricultural practices carried out from the Post Medieval period and continued as late as the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The potential for unrecorded sites can not be dismissed and caution must be applied along the length of the proposed route of the water mains.

### **6.3 Mitigation and Enhancement**

- 6.3.1 The preferred mitigation strategy is to preserve *in situ* and in an appropriate setting all cultural heritage resources. Site-specific mitigation measures are proposed below to avoid, reduce and offset some of the potential impacts detailed above.
- 6.3.2 A range of construction activities could have direct, adverse, permanent and irreversible impacts upon archaeological features or deposits. The pipeline construction and associated access/working wayleave will create a corridor approximately 5-10m wide within which known or unknown archaeological features will be damaged or lost. In addition, the excavation of deep sand deposits to site the treatment works has the potential to impact upon deeply obscured settlement remains. The erection of earthfast fencing may also damage features and deposits. Other above ground activities that could have an adverse impact upon the cultural heritage resource include vehicular movements, laying and removing of geotextile membranes, creation of temporary buildings, car parking areas and storage areas for materials.

### **6.4 Unknown or buried archaeology**

- 6.4.1 There is always the potential for buried and unknown archaeology to be present.

## **7 Summary and Conclusion**

### **7.1 General**

- 7.1.1 The assessment has to date identified a total of eighteen sites close to and within the route of the access road, treatment works and new sewer. However, the impact upon unknown and buried sites and deposits is the over-riding threat to the archaeological resource. To mitigate against any potential damage to these unknown sites, it is suggested that careful routing and a programme of rigorous watching briefs provide suitable mitigation. However, the final decision on the type and scale of mitigation works lies with Mary Macleod the Western Isles archaeologist.

### **7.2 Discussions and Recommendations**

#### **7.2.1 Archaeological potential of the study area.**

Agricultural land-use is the principal factor shaping the landscape of the study area and influencing the potential for the survival of other archaeological remains not detected by this study. There is a possibility that archaeological remains could survive in fields that have been extensively ploughed.

The assessment has to date identified a total of one designated and seventeen non-designated sites with 500m of the proposed development area.



The presence of numerous archaeological sites close to the study areas underlines the potential for archaeological remains to occur ranging from the prehistoric period to the post medieval period. The archaeological potential of the study area is therefore high.

### **7.2.2 Archaeological Proposals**

The proposed route of the sewer, access road, and site of treatment works all lie within an area with high archaeological potential. There is potential for the presence of deeply stratified settlement remains from the Early Neolithic Period to the Late Iron Age. In addition, there is very high potential for the presence of human burials dating from the Earlier Prehistoric period to the early Christian Period. For this reason, it is proposed that a rigorous programme of mitigation in the form of close monitoring of all excavation in the Eorpie headland is appropriate. A rigorous Watching brief methodology should be formulated as early as possible to prevent delays that may be incurred due to the discovery of deeply stratified archaeological remains or human burials.

### **7.2.3 Unknown or buried archaeology**

The main impact of the proposed works will be upon unknown and buried archaeology, however, if, the existing route of the sewer is followed closely, then there is the potential for less damage than may normally be expected. However, the final decision on any mitigation will be made by Mary Macleod the Western Isles Archaeologist.

### **7.2.4 Other Sites of Archaeological Importance**

The majority of the sites within the study area are considered to be of Local or Less than local importance, comprising of townships (site **15**), enclosures and field systems (**1**), which are indicative of a Post Medieval settlement. The landmark St. Moluag's Church (**4**) is A listed and of National importance. The potential for unrecorded sites can not be dismissed and caution must be applied along the length of the proposed route of the pipeline and access road.

The known sites within the development area indicate that there has been utilisation of this location from early Prehistory to the present day. The place name evidence also points to the presence of an as yet unidentified chapel and possible associated cemetery.

Areas such as this with deep deposits of wind blown sand obscuring deeply stratified settlements have always comprised favoured locations for human settlement and burial as the sand is easily excavated and the headland is a prominent location.

## **7.3 Acknowledgements**

The author wishes to thank, Douglas Laird and Mary Macleod for advice and assistance during the preparation of this report.

## Appendix A – Cartographic References.

1853	1 <sup>st</sup> Edition Ordnance Survey	Island of Lewis (Ross-shire), sheet 1, 1:10560
1898	2 <sup>nd</sup> Edition Ordnance Survey	Island of Lewis (Ross-shire), sheet 1, 1:10560
1965	Ordnance Survey	Island of Lewis (Ross-shire), sheet 1, 1:10,560

## Appendix B – Vertical Aerial Photographs

Sortie	Frames	Date	Scale	Lib
106G/Scot/UK104	6130-6129	19/05/46	1:25700	C14
106G/Scot/UK104	4343-4340 3345-3343	19/05/1946	1:10000	B53
CPE/UK/186	2248-2250	9/10/1946	1:9800	B103
OS 67/94	39-47	14/05/1967	1:10000	B103
OS 84/134	21-29	28/05/84	1:13000	B103
ASS 60687	62-60	26/6/87	1:24000	C212

## Appendix C – Bibliographic References.

Armit, I	1996	<i>The Archaeology of Skye and the Western Isles</i> , Edinburgh University Press.
Armit, I	1998	Dun Charlabhaigh and the Hebridean Iron Age, Highland News Group.
Dodgshon, RA	1996	'Hebridean farming townships prior to crofting and the clearances: a documentary perspective', in Gilbertson D, M Kent and J Grattan (eds), <i>The Outer Hebrides: the Last 14,000 Years</i> (Sheffield Environmental and Archaeological Research Campaign in the Hebrides, Vol 2), Sheffield Academic Press, 185-193.
Hedges, Ponting & Ponting,	1978	'Eorpie, structural remains', <i>Discovery Excav Scot</i> , 1978, 34.
MacDonald, D. Rev.	1791-99	Old Statistical Account of Scotland, Vol. 19: Barvas, County of Ross and Cromarty, 263-273.

MacRae, W. Rev.	1834-45	New Statistical Account of Scotland, Vol. 14: Barvas, County of Ross and Cromarty, 141-150.
Ponting & Ponting, M. & G.	1977 c	'Eoropie, Ness, rescue excavation, stone walls, paved floor', <i>Discovery Excav Scot</i> , 1977, 32,
Pringle, D (ed)	1994	The Ancient Monuments of the Western Isles, Historic Scotland.

## Appendix D – Gazetteer

<b>Site No.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Name</b>	Lewis, Eoropie
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Field-System; Lazy Beds
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 5120 6530
<b>NMRS No</b>	NB 56NW 19
<b>Local SMR No</b>	3039 – MWE129505
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/NMRS/SMR/cartographic/AP's
<b>Description:</b>	A field-system which may belong to the crofting township of Eoropie (NB56NW 9) is depicted on the 1st edition of the OS 6-inch map (Island of Lewis, Ross-shire 1853, sheet 1), but it is not shown on the current edition of the OS 1:10000 map (1992). Information from RCAHMS (AKK) 13 March 1997
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Name</b>	Cnoc Beag Gormal
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Cairn
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 5179 6529
<b>NMRS No</b>	NB 56NW 21
<b>Local SMR No</b>	N/A
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/NMRS
<b>Description:</b>	There is a grass-covered mound about 13.5 x 12m across the slightly convex top and about 19 x 21m wide at the base, and 1m high. A few stones show on the surface. It is estimated that, if circular, the cairn would have been about 14m diameter at the top and about 20m diameter at the base. It is located on the E side of the road to the Butt of Lewis Lighthouse, about 260m from the crossroads (B8013, B8014) in Eoropie, and lies on Croft 22. The cairn stands on the low W shoulder of land overlooking a broad shallow agricultural valley in which stands St Moluag's Church (200m to the SE). The cairn is known locally as Cnoc Beag Gormal (Gormal is a woman's name), and was drawn to our attention by Miss D Milne and Dr Ian Orkney. M R Curtis and G R Curtis 1998.
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Name</b>	Croft 22
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Worked Quartz; Flint; Stones
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 5176 6522

**NMRS No** NB 56NW 22  
**Local SMR No** 13172 – MWE146606  
**Status/Source:** Local: Field survey/SMR/NMRS

**Description:** The presence of an occupation site or sites on Croft 22 on the E side of the road to the Butt of Lewis Lighthouse, is suggested by the undernoted finds. They were found by fieldwalking the area of land (c 100 x 20m), which has been ploughed within the past year, in the S part of the croft. Finds include two fine Beaker sherds; pottery; struck quartz; pot boilers and modern finds. M R Curtis and G R Curtis 1998

**Site No.** 4  
**Name** Teampull Mholuaidh, St Moluag's Church  
**Type of remains:** Religion/ Chapel; Church - A listed  
**NGR:** NB 5192 6515  
**NMRS No** NB 56NW 3  
**Local SMR No** 456 – MWE4419  
**Status/Source:** National: Field survey/cartographic/NMRS/SMR

**Description:** Teampull Mholuidh (OE) (In Ruins) OS 6-inch map, (1898). The 'Church of St Mulvay' was associated with shallow-tide sacrifices to the sea-god Shony, which ceased only 32 years before Martin's visit (M Martin 1716). Depicted as unroofed and annotated as Teampull Fo Luith (in ruins) on the 1st Edition of the Ordnance Survey 6-inch map (Island of Lewis, Rosshire, 1853, sheet 1). The Object Name Book (OS) describes the site as 'The ruins of a Church, the walls of which are still standing and apparently not much decayed. It had four windows; two in the sides and two in the ends. It is one of the largest ruins of Churches in the Lewis island. There is very little known regarding it, but it appears to be of considerable antiquity' (Name Book 1852).

Standing in a field about 250 yds to the N of Eorpie village is Teampull Mholuidh, which has been roofed and restored in recent times and is in good condition. Measuring internally 44ft by 17ft 8ins it is oblong on plan, with a projecting sacristy 10ft 1in by 5ft 2ins internally on the NE, and a projecting chapel 9ft by 5ft 3ins internally on the SE, and lies almost due E and W. The main walls are 15ft 10ins high and 2ft 9ins in thickness, while the projecting walls are slightly thinner and are covered with lean-to roofs. The door, 2 ft 5 in wide, is near the W end of the S wall, and is arched semi circularly and splayed internally, the rybats and front arch of sandstone having been inserted, a repair which has also been made in the N, S and E windows. The single main window in the N wall is at a higher level than the corresponding one in the S, both being splayed internally. Two small openings close together and 1ft wide are placed near the wall head in the E end of each of the N and S walls. In the centre of each gable is a long narrow window, the western, 1 ft 3ins wide with rybats much decayed, being arched semi circularly and splayed internally, while the eastern, 1 ft 1in wide with new rybats, also splayed internally, has a pointed arch with moulded arras. Three putlog holes are seen about the centre of the N wall and two opposite on the S. South of the E window is a recess 10 ins wide and 11ins deep. A door 2 ft 2ins wide, with 1ft 2in jambs, checks and square scansions, leads to the sacristy, which has a slit window 6 ins wide, splayed inwardly in the E wall, a small lamp recess 11 ins wide by 1ft 4 1/2 ins deep in the S wall and another 1ft 1 in wide by 1ft 2ins deep in the W wall. The chapel is entered from outside the

church by a door in the W wall, the present scansions of which have been inserted. In the centre of the S and E walls is a slit window, 5 ins wide and splayed internally, while a similar window 9 ins wide looks into the E end of the church. A splayed plinth (modern), projecting 1 ft 6 ins, runs along the W wall and turns the SW corner and is also seen on the middle of the E wall. The original building may date from the 14th century. (See Fig. 15 in RCAHMS 1928) BELL.-A good bell in the church measures 1 ft 3 in in diameter at mouth, 8 ins at crown, and is 10 1/2 ins high. The canons are rounded and two rings circle the crown, which meets the shoulder in a third ring. The waist is rather straight and the widening sound bow comparatively small. There are two bands at the bottom near the lip, the upper being inscribed all round with the words TE DEUM LAVDAMVS 1631, L.W. in roman letters 5/8th in high, and the lower with a very small pattern, now indistinct. The bell is said to have come from the old church of St Lennan, Stornoway. Martin associates this "Church of St Malvay" with "an ancient custom to sacrifice to a seagod called Shony, at Hallow-tide," which he describes. RCAHMS 1928

'Teampull Moluach' is briefly described, with plan before restoration. D MacGibbon and Ross 1896

The 'Teampull Mor at Eorpie', variously called St Molua's, St Malvay's, St Olaf's and St Mallonvy's, had various pagan rites associated with it. The original building, which may date from the 14th century (RCAHMS 1928), was completely restored about 1902 and religious services have been held there from time to time, the last in 1955 (Information from OS (WS) 8 September 1956). W C MacKenzie 1919

Teampull Mholuidh, at NB 5192 6515, is as described and planned by the Commission. Visited by OS (RL) 16 June 1969

**Site No.** 5  
**Name** Croft 10  
**Type of remains:** Stone Setting; Worked Wood  
**NGR:** NB 5194 6510  
**NMRS No** NB 56NW 24  
**Local SMR No** 13174 – MWE146608  
**Status/Source:** Less than local: NMRS/SMR

**Description:** A watching brief was undertaken during erection of electricity poles. In the 1.6m deep trench for the pole on Croft 10, a setting of 25 stones was found about 15cm below the turf. Along with the first stones lifted by the mechanical excavator were two pieces of worked wood: one, 24.5cm long, is notched (possibly a peg); the other, 32.6cm long, is slightly curved. A third piece, 11.6cm long, may be an ard. A fuller report has been lodged with the NMRS. Sponsor: Scottish Hydro-Electric plc. M R Curtis and G R Curtis 1998.

**Site No.** 6  
**Name** Croft 17  
**Type of remains:** Settlement (Possible); Pottery; Stones  
**NGR:** NB 5180 6510  
**NMRS No** NB 56NW 23  
**Local SMR No** 13173 – MWE146607

<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/NMRS/SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Finds include two fine Beaker sherds; pottery; struck quartz; pot boilers and modern finds. Croft 17: a few surface finds from a ploughed area, about 75 x 15m, suggest an occupation site, including pot sherds and pot boilers (see also Hedges, Ponting and Ponting 1978). M R Curtis and G R Curtis 1998
<b>Site No.</b>	7
<b>Name</b>	Eoropaidh
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Residential
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 5154 6510
<b>NMRS No</b>	NB 56NW 31
<b>Local SMR No</b>	N/A
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/NMRS/cartographic
<b>Description:</b>	<p>Two groups of dry stone buildings of 'blackhouse' type are situated about 116m NW of the crossroads of the B8014 and the minor road to Butt of Lewis lighthouse within the modern Eoropie township. The double building at NB 51549 65102 is roofless, but retains most of the walls and gable ends. It would appear to have been enclosed within circular 'S' bend 'curtain' wall at the NW end. Internally there are at least two main rooms with other extensions from the outer walls.</p> <p>The other roofless building about 26m to the SE at NB 51564 65082, is more heavily eroded than that above and in parts has been reduced to a jumble of stones. The building would appear to have been L-shaped, the main rectangular section is of two compartments. Both buildings are not depicted on the 1st edition of the OS 6-inch map (Island of Lewis, Ross-shire 1853, sheet 1), the houses shown on the main street are shown in a different configuration to the later maps. The building appears on the 1st edition of the OS 25-inch map (Island of Lewis, Ross-shire 1853, sheet 1.1), which also shows that there was an additional structure stood on the NW side. No evidence for this was seen on the date of visit in an area which has been cleared to provide a turning point for vehicles. At the dates of the 2nd and subsequent editions, only the building to the NW is shown, the second house only appearing on the OS 6-inch Revision map c.1930-40. No explanation for this can be provided as the L-shaped structure would appear to be of the same date as the larger building to the NW. Visited by RCAHMS (DE,CS,SW), 3 August 2005</p>
<b>Site No.</b>	8
<b>Name</b>	Eoropie
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Settlement (Possible); Pottery
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 5152 6507
<b>NMRS No</b>	NB 56NW 5
<b>Local SMR No</b>	458 – MWE4421
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: NMRS/SMR
<b>Description:</b>	OS 6"record sheet held in the Royal Museum of Scotland (RMS).
<b>Site No.</b>	9
<b>Name</b>	Eoropie

<b>Type of remains:</b>	Enclosure, rectilinear, turf and stone
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 51171 65139
<b>NMRS No</b>	N/A
<b>Local SMR No</b>	6630- MWE142117
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Surrounding land status code – A Recommended action – monitor
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Name</b>	Eoropie
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Promontory, enclosure with cellular structures.
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 51077 65176
<b>NMRS No</b>	N/A
<b>Local SMR No</b>	6631 – MWE142118
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Surrounding land status code – A Recommended action – monitor
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Name</b>	Eoropie
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Cellular complex
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 51058 65217
<b>NMRS No</b>	N/A
<b>Local SMR No</b>	6632 – MWE142119
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Surrounding land status code – A Recommended action – monitor
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Name</b>	Traigh Sanda
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Enclosure, rectilinear, turf and stone
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 51211 64844
<b>NMRS No</b>	N/A
<b>Local SMR No</b>	6629 – MWE142116
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Less than local: Field survey/SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Surrounding land status code – A Recommended action – monitor
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Name</b>	Traigh Sanda
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Cairn
<b>NGR:</b>	NB 51328 64791
<b>NMRS No</b>	N/A
<b>Local SMR No</b>	6627 – MWE142114
<b>Status/Source:</b>	Local: Field survey/SMR
<b>Description:</b>	Surrounding land status code – C Recommended action – monitor
<b>Site No.</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Name</b>	Eoropie
<b>Type of remains:</b>	Trial Excavation



**NGR:** NB 517 649  
**NMRS No** NB 56SW 67  
**Local SMR No** N/A  
**Status/Source:** Local: NMRS

**Description:** The proposed site of a house development was evaluated as human remains had previously been found in the immediate vicinity. The foundation trenches of the proposed house were mechanically excavated under archaeological supervision to a depth of 1.2m. No human remains were present within the foundation trenches. Evaluation did identify, however, the presence of several features including a wall base, an area of cobbling, and deposits containing hand-made pottery, fish and animal bones. The features were characterised, through partial excavation, and probably represent the remains of a 19th-century domestic dwelling. (GUARD 914).

**Site No.** 15  
**Name** Eorrapidh  
**Type of remains:** Crofting Township; Head-Dyke  
**NGR:** NB 5175 6500  
**NMRS No** NB 56NW 9  
**Local SMR No** N/A  
**Status/Source:** Local/Field survey/NMRS

**Description:** The Object Name Book (OS) describes the township as 'A village of huts built of stone and clay, and thatched with straw. It is the most northerly village in the Lewis, situated on a patch of good arable land, which is very much impoverished by the sand being blown over it from the shore in stormy weather. These huts are apparently the most wretched in the Lewis, they are like the others, filled with dung for nine months of the year; and during the other three, they are often filled with sand. Name Book 1852

A linear crofting township, comprising twenty-five roofed, five unroofed buildings of which three are annotated as 'Ruin', and nine enclosures is depicted on the 1st edition of the OS 6-inch map (Island of Lewis, Ross-shire 1853, sheet 1). A head-dyke runs to the NE of this crofting township, the township of Cuig Peghinnean (NB56SW 19) and the crofting township of Cnoc Ard (NB56SW 20). The complete head-dyke runs from NB 512 656 to NB 533 641. The present crofting township with its field-system to the N is shown on the current edition of the OS 1:10000 map (1992). Information from RCAHMS (AKK) 13 March 1997

**Site No.** 16  
**Name** Eorpie  
**Type of remains:** Human remains  
**NGR:** NB 51790 64925  
**NMRS No** N/A  
**Local SMR No** 6827 – MWE140697  
**Status/Source:** Local: SMRS

**Description:** Report of shallow, skeletalised inhumations consistently found in this area. The cemetery does not extend into adjacent croft to the south east. MacGregor 2000.

**Site No.** 17



**Name** St Ronan's Well  
**Type of remains:** Well: Holy  
**NGR:** NB 52000 65000  
**NMRS No** NB56NW 7  
**Local SMR No** 460 – MWE4423  
**Status/Source:** Local/Field survey/NMRS/SMR/cartographic

**Description:** Holy well (undated)

**Site No.** 18

**Name**  
**Type of remains:** Circular depressions, enclosures with rig and furrow  
**NGR:** NB 513 649  
**NMRS No** N/A  
**Local SMR No** N/A  
**Status/Source:** Local/ AP's

**Description:** The 1946 AP's show three circular depressions equal distance apart forming a triangle within this unoccupied area of ground, purpose unknown. This area also has traces of sub-rectangular enclosures with traces of rig and furrow.

## Appendix E – Photographic Plates



**Plate 1:** View towards existing septic tank from West with proposed E-W track.



**Plate 2:** View towards septic tank from East showing route of existing sewer.





**Plate 3:** View north along route of proposed N-S oriented track.



**Plate 4:** View from West along proposed E-W track and route of existing sewer.