

# DESK-BASED ASSESSMENT AND WALKOVER SURVEY INNERHADDEN HYDRO SCHEME PERTH AND KINROSS

1	<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>1</i>
2	<i>Methodology and Approach.....</i>	<i>1</i>
3	<i>Results of the Assessment.....</i>	<i>3</i>
4	<i>Assessment of Significance .....</i>	<i>7</i>
5	<i>Analysis .....</i>	<i>13</i>
6	<i>Mitigation and Recommendations .....</i>	<i>14</i>
7	<i>General Conclusions.....</i>	<i>18</i>
8	<i>References .....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Appendix 1</i>	<i>Sites List.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Appendix 2</i>	<i>Sites outwith Study Area Potentially Affected by Proposed Development ....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Appendix 3</i>	<i>Further Sites Discovered in Walkover Survey.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Appendix 4</i>	<i>Pipeline Waymarks .....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Appendix 5</i>	<i>Photographic Register .....</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Appendix 6</i>	<i>Criteria for Assessment of Significance.....</i>	<i>33</i>

**Illustration 1** Location Plan

**Illustration 2** Archaeological Sites

<b>Author</b>	David Perry MA (Hons), FSA Scot and David Bowler BA, MPhil, FSA Scot, MIFA
<b>Illustrator</b>	Dave Munro
<b>Editor</b>	Damian Hind

## **ABSTRACT**

*Richard Barclay of Innerhadden Hydro Ltd commissioned SUAT Ltd to undertake an archaeological desk-based assessment and walkover survey of the route of the pipeline for a hydro-electric scheme in Glen Sassunn, near Kinloch Rannoch, Perth and Kinross.*

*Most of the route is only sparsely occupied by archaeological features, which can be protected by restricting ancillary activities such as access routes and materials dumps, by careful siting of the pipeline, and by targeted archaeological supervision of the digging of the pipe trench.*

*However, there are two important clusters of sites. One of these is a complex of tracks, platforms and mill lades, lying in the woodland close to the present farmhouse and steading, and probably part of the former village of Innerhadden. The other is a complex of well-preserved shielings and related features on the moorland around Coire a' Chapuill.*

*The two clusters offer an important opportunity to see a pre-clearance village and its dependent shielings together. For these we recommend a combination of avoidance, survey, excavation under supervision, and perhaps the re-use of existing channels to reduce impact.*

*A third smaller cluster of shielings in the upper part of the glen appears to be clear of the pipeline.*

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Introduction

Richard Barclay of Innerhadden Hydro Ltd commissioned SUAT Ltd to undertake an archaeological desk-based assessment and walkover survey of the route of the pipeline for a hydro-electric scheme in Glen Sassunn, near Kinloch Rannoch, Perth and Kinross. This was given the SUAT site code KX03. The route of the proposed pipeline extends along the W side of the glen, from the head of the Glen Sassunn Burn at NN 650 540, NE to a proposed powerhouse at Innerhadden House at NN 670 570. A second inflow pipe from the east side of the glen at NN 670 540 will extend westward across the head of the glen to join the main pipe near the latter's source.

This programme of archaeological works has been undertaken as part of the background scoping exercise for a planned hydro-electric scheme. Planning permission has not yet been sought.

## 1.2 Scope of the Assessment

The study area covers the west and south sides of Glen Sassunn, to S of Kinloch Rannoch, Perthshire.

## 1.3 Objectives

The main aim of this desk-based assessment and walkover survey is to establish the presence/absence, date, character and quality of any archaeological remains surviving within the development area. The results of this assessment will be used to inform future mitigation strategies for this area of the proposed development.

# 2 Methodology and Approach

## 2.1

SUAT Ltd abides by the Codes of Conduct and Approved Practice and Standards of the Institute of Field Archaeologists.

## 2.1 Sources Consulted

A desk-based study of the proposed development area was undertaken, involving the examination of all available information sources relevant to the area. The following sources of information were searched:

- *Historic Scotland*: the Schedule was checked for any Scheduled Ancient Monuments or listed buildings within or close to the proposed development area.
- *The Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historical Monuments of Scotland (RCAHMS)*: sites recorded in the National Monuments Record of Scotland (NMRS) and vertical aerial photographs held in the Air Photographs Collection were examined.
- *Perth and Kinross Heritage Environment Record (PKHER)*: sites not recorded in the NMRS were examined.

- *The Map Library of the National Library of Scotland*: all Ordnance Survey and pre-Ordnance Survey maps of the area were examined.
- *The National Archives of Scotland*: plans relevant to the proposed development area were examined.

## 2.2 Previous Research

A walkover survey was undertaken by GUARD in the environs around Bunrannoch in 1999. A farmstead, several shieling groups, peat tracks and cairns were identified in the uplands to the W of Innerhadden Burn (MacGregor 1999). In 2001 excavation by GUARD was undertaken of a sub-rectangular 'shieling' structure, c 4.8 x 3.4m in size, with an open gable end, at Coire a' Chapuill, Glen Sassunn. The trench measured c 4.8 x 4.7m maximum, and covered the interior and area in front of the entrance. The results of excavation suggest it was not used as a dwelling but may have served as a milking shed or store (Atkinson et al 2001).

## 2.3 Field Survey

The walkover was conducted by Damian Hind and David Bowler of SUAT Ltd on 24th and 26th May 2005. The entire length of the proposed pipeline was walked from end to end, starting at the top of the glen. All visible evidence of human activity was noted, particularly ditches, banks and platforms suggestive of settlement. Where possible, approximate dimensions were estimated, but measured survey was not attempted at this stage.

All archaeological features encountered were described and photographed, and their grid co-ordinates ascertained using a hand-held GPS system. Approximate positions were also estimated by eye and recorded on a base plan of the glen and the proposed pipeline supplied by the client, so as to provide a sketch plan as an alternative to the GPS data, in case of problems or errors.

The position of the proposed pipeline had previously been marked on the ground by the client, using white posts and canes driven into the ground, some numbered, in a mixture of arabic and roman numerals. These were also recorded on the base plan and located by GPS, as a way of calibrating the GPS record against the previously surveyed pipeline, and correcting any errors or problems. The marker posts are listed in Appendix 4 and shown on Illustration 2.

When all the grid points recorded by GPS were plotted onto the base plan, the fit with the plan of the pipeline supplied by the client was remarkably good, only two points (28, 36) requiring correction by means of the sketch plan. With these exceptions, all points recorded in the walkover survey are shown on Illustration 2 using raw GPS data, without any further attempt at adjustment or refinement.

A further site visit was made on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2005, during which the line of the proposed route and the affected and archaeological features were discussed. This visit clarified the requirements of the pipeline, and what conservation was practicable within the parameters of the construction. A further walkover was carried out on the amended line of the scheme from the Glen Sassun intake to the convergence of the two pipes. This new line follows the NW edge of the burn, but on the level, boggy ground between the burn and the access road. No new features were recorded.

### 3 Results of the Assessment

A complete gazetteer of sites identified in the baseline survey is given in Appendices 1 and 2 and summarised below. Site locations are given in Illustration 2. All features discovered in the walkover survey are listed in Appendix 3 and shown on Illustration 2. The photographic record is listed in Appendix 5.

#### 3.1 Baseline Conditions

Glen Sassunn descends steeply from S to N. The Innerhadden Burn originates in the SE, and the Glen Sassunn Burn originates in the SW. These two burns converge high up in the glen and then descend N in a steep-sided ravine as the Innerhadden Burn, about 3km to the River Tummel, just E of its emergence from Loch Rannoch.

The proposed pipeline begins near the source of the Innerhadden Burn, makes a long arc W to the Glen Sassunn Burn, and then descends parallel to the Innerhadden Burn, which it rejoins near the mouth of the glen, just S of the farmhouse and steading of Innerhadden. A very rough, steep and stony farm track begins at the steading, and ascends the W flank of the glen, gradually converging to the W bank of the Glen Sassunn Burn, which it follows out of the study area to the SW. The proposed pipeline in places follows and in places crosses this track, and has a total length of about 6km.

Almost all of the glen consists of high moorland, thickly covered in heather, grazed by sheep and populated by grouse. The ground is very uneven, with numerous glacial features, dissected by small burns, and occasional morasses. The two major burns flow over clean boulder beds in steep-sided ravines between glacial banks and terraces.

The final kilometre of the pipeline at the mouth of the glen passes through or on the edge of woodland, with grassy verges beside the farm track, before terminating in a steep bank overlooking the burn and the farmhouse, partly occupied by a mound of clearance boulders, and partly by other farm debris.

#### 3.2 Sites of Cultural Heritage Interest within Study Area

##### 3.2.1 Medieval/Post-Medieval

<i>No</i>	<i>NMRS No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type</i>
1	NN65NE 13	Inverhadden	Sculptured Cross-Slab
2	NN65NE 14	Inverhadden, Dalchosnie	Battle Site
3	NN65NE 29	Innerhadden Burn	Shieling-Hut (Possible)
4	NN65SE 3	Glen Sassunn Burn	Shieling-Huts (Possible)
5	NN65NE 5, 7	Coire a' Chapuill	Shielings
6	n/a	Innerhadden	Settlement

7	n/a	Innerhadden	Sluice
8	n/a	Innerhadden	Sheepfold
9	n/a	Glen Sassunn	Foot Bridge

### 3.2.2 Further Sites discovered during Walkover

<i>No</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Description</i>
21	Platforms	Pre-clearance?	Level platform over confluence of burns. Series of natural knolls suggest possible/potential occupation sites.
22	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular shape, c 10 m dia, on bluff overlooking burn. Potential shieling site.
23	Weirs	Pre-clearance?	Sequence of 5-7 rock-built weirs in bed of burn, each c 0.5 m high.
24	Weirs	Pre-clearance?	Artificial steps in burn
25	Platform?	Pre-clearance?	Overlooking burn. 3m wide x 8 m long
26	Bridge?	Modern?	Plank on far side of burn. Remains of footbridge? 20 m N of 25.
27	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 5 m dia.
28	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 3 m dia. Lower level ground, sheltered between two bluffs, preferable for sheltered encampment. GPS grid ref in error. Position re-plotted from site sketch plan.
29	Shieling	Pre-clearance?	Shieling huts (associated with sites 30 & 31), 5 m diameter, 0.3-0.5 m high.
30	Shieling	Pre-clearance	Platform 8 m dia.
31	Shieling	Pre-clearance	Platform 5 m dia.
32	Shieling	Pre-clearance	4 m dia.
33	Shieling	Pre-clearance	4 m dia.
34	Mound	Glacial?	10 m dia.
35	Platform?	Unknown	Possible flat platform

36	Mound	Glacial?	1.8 m high. Overlooking river
37	Mound	Glacial?	Large mound, 15-20 m dia. Probably glacial, although possible lookout point, with very commanding views across glen.
38	Peat Cutting	Pre-clearance?	Possible peat cutting, with rectangular area roughly 30m N – S
39	Bank	Pre-clearance?	Boulders roughly lain and partially covered in peat, 15 m long by 3 m wide.
40	Platform	Unknown	Grassy, stony platform at road side
41	Mound	Natural?	Oval mound 5 x 10 m, aligned N - S, with highest, rise at S end.
42	Shielings	Pre-clearance	7 mounds, 3-8 m dia, 0.5-1.0 m high, with linear features. Boundary runs downslope, across contours. Quite large group, spread over 50 m to S of pipeline route, x 20 - 40 m.
43	Sheepfank? Shieling?	Early Modern?	Hollow, 5 m dia., at edge of slope. Walls c 0.8-1m high, built into slope. Marks edge of complex 42.
44	Shieling track?	Pre-clearance?	Cutting 5 m wide, in between two natural mounds.
45	Track	Pre-clearance?	Grassy track, turning away SW into woods
46	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Artificial drainage gully alongside present roadside drainage trench, 1.5-2 m deep. Curves away to W.
47	Track	Pre-clearance?	N - S track, 5 m wide, 40 m long.
48	Track	Pre-clearance?	Track crossing Lade 46. Traces of possible drystone footbridge abutment on one side.
49	Mound and platform	Pre-clearance?	Small stone mound, overgrown with moss. 2 m square platform adjacent, possible settlement site.
50	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Improved or artificial water course alongside track. 3 m deep, very straight. Note, could be reused with surface pipe for current hydro scheme.
51	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Watercourse. Joins 50 at 6718 5752, associated with 52.
52	Boundary Wall	Pre-clearance?	Collapsed wall, runs NW - SE, along edge of lade, crossing track at 6718 5752
53	Platform?	Pre-clearance?	Flat area, 50 m dia.

54	Track or Gully	Pre-clearance?	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track. Continues to site 8 (Sheepfold 6724 5759)
55	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Dump for house. Slope too steep for natural angle of repose.
56	Grouse Butt	Modern?	Horseshoe-shaped drystone rubble and turf construction. 1m x 2 m internally. Walls 4 m dia overall. Entrance on downslope side.
57	Peat Cutting	Pre-clearance?	50 m x 30 m peat cutting, rectangular.
58	Mound	Pre-clearance?	10 m x 4 m. Oval mound, perhaps hut base associated with peat cutting.
59	Dyke and mounds	Pre-clearance?	Dyke, very tumbled, with flat area to W, and 4 possible sheiling mounds. Dyke is immediately to E of narrow burn, possibly a head dyke, although following burn to S rather than contour. Potential for earlier occupation, since it occupies a sheltered position with good views of glen.
60	Burn	Pre-clearance?	Improved burn. V-profile. 5 m wide, 1.2 m overall depth, including 0.6 m high banks on either side.
61	Sheilings	Pre-clearance	Sheiling complex. 7 possible houses, c 3 m dia. 10m E of pipe route.
62	Sheilings	Pre-clearance	3 mounds. Complex forms part of 61. Appears to extend down towards burn, and uphill about 150 m.

### 3.3 Summary of Known Sites of Cultural Heritage Interest outwith Study Area

#### 3.3.1 Prehistoric

<i>No</i>	<i>NMRS No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type</i>
10	NN65NE 1	Clach na Boile	Standing Stone
11	NN65NE 21	Bunrannoch	Bronze Age hoard
12	NN65NE 6	Innerhadden Farm	Stone Circles
13	NN65NE 11	Bunrannoch	Bronze armlets

#### 3.3.2 Medieval/Post-Medieval

<i>No</i>	<i>NMRS No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type</i>
-----------	----------------	-------------	-------------

14	NN65NE 2	Cill Mo Sheonaid	Cemetery
15	NN65NE 27	Innerhadden Burn	Building; Sheepfold
16	NN65NE 36	Dalchosnie Farm	Farmsteading
17	NN65SE 3	Ruidhe an Fhraoich	Shieling-Huts (Possible)
18	n/a	Glen Sassunn	Buildings/Enclosures

### 3.3.3 Modern

<i>No</i>	<i>NMRS No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type</i>
19	n/a	Glen Sassunn	Building
20	n/a	Glen Sassunn	Building

## 4 Assessment of Significance

### 4.1 Sites of Exceptional Significance

There are no Scheduled Ancient Monuments or Listed Buildings within the study area, nor are there any sites considered to be of exceptional importance. However, there is one Scheduled Ancient Monument nearby (10) and one very significant findspot - the site of an Early Bronze Age hoard of axes at Bunrannoch (11).

While great care should be exercised in protecting the remains and setting of these sites, and Scheduled Monuments activate statutory controls on nearby development, it is considered unlikely that the proposed development will have any significant impact on the Scheduled Monument. Likewise, the site of the Early Bronze Age hoard of axes is beyond the route of the pipeline. Both sites give evidence of prehistoric settlement in the Kinloch Rannoch area, in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age periods. The following sites are considered to be of particular note within the study area:

<i>No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Statutory Designation</i>
10	Clach na Boile	SAM 1516
11	Bunrannoch, Bronze axes	n/a

### 4.2 Sites of Considerable Significance

<i>No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Statutory Designation</i>
1	Innerhadden, Sculptured Cross-Slab	None
5	Coire a' Chapuill, Shielings	None

6	Innerhadden, Mansion, Mill and Village	None
7	Innerhadden, Sluice	None
12	Innerhadden Farm, Stone Circles	None
13	Bunrannoch, Bronze armlets	None
14	Cill Mo Sheonaid, Cemetery	None

The Cross Slab (1) is now lost and its exact findspot is not recorded but its presence at Innerhadden indicates the presence of an Early Christian site, possibly at the private cemetery of Cill Mo Sheonaid (14). There may have been an early chapel there, whose former presence is remembered in the place-name to the south-west of the cemetery - Coire a' Chapuill (NN 65 56).

The group of shielings in Coire a' Chapuill (5) have recently been the subject of survey and trial excavation by GUARD (Atkinson et al 2001a), which has shown that they form a well-preserved complex, hence their inclusion here as being of considerable significance. They also appear to be associated with sites 59–62, discussed below.

Shielings are characteristic of the pastoral economy in the Highlands before the clearances, and were the normal way of utilising the upland grazing. Livestock, mainly cattle, was removed from the villages and farms on lower ground, and taken to upland pastures during the summer. Here they were looked after by the villagers who lived in temporary accommodation, and who collected the byproducts of the livestock - milk, wool or butter.

Two mid 18th-century maps (Roy's Military Survey and RHP 3846) show a village of nine or ten houses at Innerhadden (6), which was presumably abandoned during the late 18th or early 19th century. The exact location of the village is not clear, but it may have been near the present Innerhadden house or farm. Stobie's map of 1783 shows some buildings south of the mansion house and burial ground (14), near the bend in the Innerhadden Burn, possibly part of the village. The village is particularly interesting as a former fermtoun or farming township, the type of settlement typical of the Scottish countryside before the agricultural improvements of the 18th and 19th centuries.

The Sluice (7) is related to the former mill at Innerhadden. The mill appears on a plan in 1783, but had gone by the OS First Edition, when only the sluice is shown. The sluice would have controlled the water flow to the mill along a mill lead. The sluice gains in significance from its association with the surviving Mill Lade and other structures (44 – 54) found in the walkover survey, discussed below.

The three stone circles (12) and Bronze armlets (13) are further evidence of prehistoric settlement in the area of Innerhadden. The latter were presumably a hoard, similar to the axes (11).

#### 4.2.1 *Additional Sites of Considerable Significance discovered during the Walkover Survey*

<i>No</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Description</i>
42	Shielings	Pre-clearance	7 mounds, 3-8 m dia, 0.5-1.0 m high, with linear features. Boundary runs downslope, across contours. Quite large group, spread over 50 m to S of pipeline route.
43	Sheepfank? Shieling?	Early Modern?	Hollow, 5 m dia., at edge of slope. Walls c 0.8-1m high, built into slope. Marks edge of complex 42.
44	Shieling track?	Pre-clearance?	Cutting 5 m wide, in between two natural mounds.
45	Track	Pre-clearance?	Grassy track, turning away SW into woods
46	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Artificial drainage gully alongside present roadside drainage trench, 1.5 - 2 m deep. Curves away to W.
47	Track	Pre-clearance?	N-S track, 5 m wide, 40 m long.
48	Track	Pre-clearance?	Track crossing Lade 46. Traces of possible drystone footbridge abutment on one side.
49	Mound and platform	Pre-clearance?	Small stone mound, overgrown with moss. 2 m square platform adjacent, possible settlement site.
50	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Improved or artificial water course alongside track. 3 m deep, very straight. Note, could be reused with surface pipe for current hydro scheme.
51	Mill Lade?	Pre-clearance?	Watercourse. Joins 50 at 6718 5752, associated with 52.
52	Boundary Wall	Pre-clearance?	Collapsed wall, runs NW - SE, along edge of lade, crossing track at 6718 5752
53	Platform?	Pre-clearance?	Flat area, 50 m dia.
54	Track or Gully	Pre-clearance?	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track. Continues to site 8 (Sheepfold 6724 5759)
59	Dyke	Pre-clearance?	Dyke, very tumbled, with flat area to W, and 4 possible sheiling mounds. Dyke is immediately to E of narrow burn, possibly a head dyke, although following burn to S rather than contour. Potential for earlier occupation, since it occupies a sheltered position with good views of glen.
60	Burn	Pre-clearance?	Improved burn. V-profile. 5 m wide, 1.2 m overall depth, including 0.6 m high banks on either side.
61	Sheilings	Pre-clearance	Sheiling complex. 7 possible houses, c 3 m dia. 10m E of pipe route.

62	Sheilings	Pre-clearance	3 mounds. Complex forms part of 61. Appears to extend down towards burn, and uphill about 150 m.
----	-----------	---------------	--

The 17 monuments listed above resolve into two clusters, sites (44–54), in or near the woodland at the bottom of the glen, and sites (42, 43, 59–62) up on the open moorland.

The woodland cluster (44–54) is an exceptionally clear and well-preserved complex of tracks, platforms and artificial channels, obviously mill lades. These no doubt link up with the previously known sluice (7), but perhaps also supplied other mills along the way.

The upland cluster (42, 43, 59–62) is an extensive complex of well-preserved shielings and related features, and seems to be a continuation of the Coire a' Chapuill group (5) previously surveyed by GUARD. This cluster gains importance from its good state of preservation, and from the association of a large group of features together.

It may well be significant that what seems to be the largest shieling complex in the glen is so near to the bottom of the glen, not far from the permanent village (6), and its mill complex (44–54). The fact that the two clusters almost link up offers the possibility of studying the whole complex of village and shieling together as a single economic unit.

### 4.3 Sites of Some Significance

<i>No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Statutory Designation</i>
2	Innerhadden, Dalchosnie, Site of Battle	None
3	Innerhadden Burn, Shieling Hut (possible)	None
4	Glen Sassunn Burn, Shieling Huts (possible)	None
8	Innerhadden, Sheepfold	None
9	Glen Sassunn Burn, Foot Bridge	None
15	Innerhadden Burn, Building, Sheepfold	None
16	Dalchosnie Farm	None
17	Ruidh na Fhraoich, Shieling Huts (possible)	None
18	Glen Sassunn, Buildings/Enclosures	None
19	Glen Sassunn, Building	None
20	Glen Sassunn, Building	None

Four of the sites classed as of some significance (3, 4, 17) are related to the former pastoral practice of shieling. The two sheepfolds (8, 15) represent the more recent introduction of sheep farming in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The farm of Dalchosnie (16) succeeded a village which appears on Roy's Military Survey.

At two sites (4, 17) various circular features are shown on the current OS map. It is not clear what they represent, but they may be clearance cairns, ie piles of stones that were removed during cultivation of the land as arable fields. If so, then they could date to the Early Bronze Age (about 4,000 years ago), when uplands were settled and cultivated during a period of improved climate.

The supposed battle between Robert the Bruce and the English (2) is not certain and may have been an invention to explain the place-name of Glen Sassunn (the glen of the Englishman).

The footbridge (9) could no longer be found when the walkover survey took place.

#### *4.3.1 Additional Sites of Some Significance discovered during the Walkover Survey*

<i>No</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Description</i>
21	Platforms	Pre-clearance?	Level platform over confluence of burns. Series of natural knolls suggest possible/potential occupation sites.
22	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular shape, c 10 m dia, on bluff overlooking burn. Potential shieling site.
23	Weirs	Pre-clearance?	Sequence of 5-7 rock-built weirs in bed of burn, each c 0.5 m high.
24	Weirs	Pre-clearance?	Artificial steps in burn
25	Platform?	Pre-clearance?	Overlooking burn. 3m wide x 8 m long
26	Bridge?	Modern?	Plank on far side of burn. Remains of footbridge? 20 m N of 25.
27	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 5 m dia.
28	Platform	Pre-clearance?	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 3 m dia. Lower level ground, sheltered between two bluffs, preferable for sheltered encampment. GPS grid ref in error. Position re-plotted from site sketch plan.
29	Shieling	Pre-clearance?	Shieling huts (associated with sites 30 & 31), 5 m diameter, 0.3 - 0.5 m high.
30	Shieling	Pre-clearance	Platform 8 m dia.
31	Shieling	Pre-clearance	Platform 5 m dia.
32	Shieling	Pre-clearance	4 m dia.

33	Shieling	Pre-clearance	4 m dia.
34	Mound	Glacial?	10 m dia.
35	Platform?	Unknown	Possible flat platform
36	Mound	Glacial?	1.8 m high. Overlooking river
37	Mound	Glacial?	Large mound, 15-20 m dia. Probably glacial, although possible lookout point, with very commanding views across glen.
38	Peat Cutting	Pre-clearance?	Possible peat cutting, with rectangular area roughly 30m N - S
39	Bank	Pre-clearance?	Boulders roughly lain and partially covered in peat, 15 m long by 3 m wide.
41	Mound	Natural?	Oval mound 5 x 10 m, aligned N-S, with highest rise at S end.
55	Platform	Modern?	Household dump. Slope too steep for natural angle of repose.
56	Grouse Butt	Modern?	Horseshoe-shaped drystone rubble and turf construction. 1m x 2 m internally. Walls 4 m dia overall. Entrance on downslope side.
57	Peat Cutting	Pre-clearance?	50 m x 30 m peat cutting, rectangular.
58	Mound	Pre-clearance?	10 m x 4 m. Oval mound, perhaps hut base associated with peat cutting.

It will be seen that all the sites in the list above are likely to be traces of pre-clearance settlement or later, except when they may be natural glacial features. There is a distinct cluster of five shielings (29–33) in the upper part of the glen, though less well-defined than the Coire a' Chapuill cluster mentioned above. The clear separation from the Coire a' Chapuill cluster suggests a convenient division of grazing in the glen.

Certain prominent natural features were recorded as they might have been attractive to early settlers. It should be remembered that pre-clearance sites may also have attracted earlier settlement, for example medieval or prehistoric, but there was no evidence of this. The sparseness of sites in the SE corner of the study area, except for the natural mound (36) is not surprising, as this part of the glen is exceptionally high, inhospitable and difficult of access.

#### *Site of little significance*

40	Platform	Unknown	Grassy, stony platform at road side
----	----------	---------	-------------------------------------

This feature was very poorly defined and of uncertain date. It may be of natural origin.

## 5 Analysis

### 5.1 Analysis of the Threat to the Cultural Heritage Resource

At worst, development may destroy archaeological sites completely, or, at best, avoid them completely. It is the aim of this assessment to define the significance and condition of the archaeological sites and determine the likely threats affecting them, so that appropriate mitigation measures can be taken.

Archaeological features can be impacted directly by development, or indirectly by affecting issues such as setting.

#### 5.1.1 *Nature of the Likely Threats*

Any activities involving ground disturbance have the potential to cause damage to underlying archaeological remains but, if carefully sited, significant damage to known remains can be avoided. The following activities have the potential to cause damage to archaeological remains. They will need to be carefully controlled in order to avoid any damage to known archaeological remains nearby, and could result in damage to any unknown archaeological remains that may be present.

- The proposed development will require the excavation to a depth of up to about 0.9m of a route for the pipeline from its sources to the powerhouse, the construction of the powerhouse, and the construction of access tracks and site accommodation.

#### 5.1.2 *Sensitivity of the Cultural Heritage Resource*

Sensitivity varies with each archaeological site, however, in general, any ground disturbance greatly affects buried remains: hence current legislation and guidance tends towards preservation in situ. However, of particular note for this study are the following monument types:

- The majority of the sites noted in this study are compact and isolated. In many cases they are slightly off the pipeline already, and the pipeline may not touch them at all. In other cases the pipeline could easily avoid them by very slight deflections.
- The exceptions to this are the extensive complexes of features (44–54) and (42, 43, 59–62), and the peat cuttings (57). These are too large to avoid, and will require some form of mitigation.
- The third cluster in the upper part of Glen Sassun (29–32) appears to have been avoided already. The existence of two instances of marker post 05 suggest that the pipeline has already been adjusted northwards in this area.
- So long as they are not directly in the path of the pipeline, the sites noted in this study are unlikely to have their settings adversely affected. It is presumed that the pipe trench will be backfilled and the heather allowed to regenerate.

### 5.1.3 *Magnitude of the Impact*

In general, the impact to the archaeological sites can be minimised through considered planning of routes and sympathetic design. However, in general, the following points should be borne in mind for this study area:

- The sites at Innerhadden (55) may be destroyed by the siting of the powerhouse.
- Most of the sites noted survive as visible earthworks, and will probably contain archaeological layers below ground. Both will be disrupted and partly destroyed by the insertion of the pipe trench if they lie in its path.

## 5.2 **Potential for Undiscovered Sites**

Although there is a possibility that hitherto undiscovered sites may be disturbed by the development, the potential for such sites to be present is considered low. However, sites identified in the present survey as of pre-clearance, modern or uncertain date could prove to have earlier origins

## 5.3 **Sites Outwith the Study Boundaries**

A list of sites outwith but near the study area is contained in Appendix 2. The list is not exhaustive, and only applies to sites with statutory designations: Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments, and hence sites of considerable to exceptional significance.

Impact on the setting of adjacent sites is in principle significant, but in the present case will be minimal in practice, because the proposed development lies entirely within a secluded glen, and consists almost entirely of a buried pipeline, with a few low structures at the intakes and outfall, largely concealed by terrain and tree cover.

# 6 **Mitigation and Recommendations**

## 6.1 **Mitigation Strategy**

In line with current legislation, there should be a general predisposition for preservation in situ. The pipeline locations and tracks have been located to minimise contact with archaeological sites, thereby minimising potential damage.

## 6.2 **Recommendations**

### 6.2.1 *Settlement in lower glen*

Where the pipeline passes through extensive complexes of sites, some impact on the archaeology will be unavoidable. The impact on sensitive but unavoidable sites should be minimised by restricting activities such as vehicle and machine movement and spoil dumping in these areas.

The line of the scheme only directly affects the deep gully/ lade (46), so while the work will pass through a concentration, adherence to the line currently laid out will assist the continued survival of all features in this area.

### *Recommendation*

When the pipe trench passes through these areas it should be dug under archaeological supervision, with provision for downtime so that sections and plans can be recorded. It may prove cost effective to dig sensitive areas slightly in advance of general pipe trench work, with a dedicated machine, to minimise disruption to the work programme.

#### *6.2.2 Shieling complexes: sites 59-62 & 42*

The pipeline passes through these two complexes of pre-clearance features. Since they are of relatively high significance, and relatively fragile, close attention should be paid to the siting of the pipe at these points of the scheme. It will be possible to run the pipe to E of the majority of the features 59-62, with the exception of 61, where the pipe will cut “inside” – to W – of the feature by a slight change in the position of line marker 25.

Group 42 apparently lies on the line of the pipe trench, however, it would be possible to curve the line of the pipe slightly without introducing complications which would allow the complex to be left undisturbed.

### *Recommendation*

Monitor the setting out and line of the pipe trench through features 59-62, and monitor all excavation works in close proximity to the features. Amend the line of the pipe (if necessary) in order to avoid group 42 completely.

#### *6.2.3 Infrastructure*

Impacts not foreseen here may arise from the location of temporary works such as access tracks, spoil heaps, materials dumps, and site accommodation (cabins, toilets, vehicle parking, etc). The turbine house is to be an underground structure, situated within platform 55. Conversations with the client have revealed that this has been the midden/ dump for Innerhadden House: as such it comprises relatively modern material with little contextual relationship.

### *Recommendation*

Care should be taken to minimise impact on the landscape, and to avoid the sites identified in this study wherever possible. No action is recommended for the turbine house.

#### *6.2.4 Summary Table of Recommendations*

The table below lists the sites on or near the pipeline in numerical order, and offers a recommendation for each. Avoidance is the preferred recommendation, but in the case of large complexes of sites may not be possible. Within large complexes, some sites are farther from the pipeline than others, and this is reflected by offering avoidance as an option where it may be feasible. Sites well clear of the pipeline are not mentioned, but should be protected from secondary threats such as access tracks, materials dumps and vehicle parking areas.

<i>No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Recommendation</i>
-----------	-------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

6	Innerhadden	Settlement	Partly under existing house and steading, and not at risk. But also relates to various features seen in walkover survey, noted below with particular recommendations for each.
7	Innerhadden	Sluice	Relates to various mill lade features seen in walkover survey and noted below. Not threatened by scheme: no action required.
8	Innerhadden	Sheepfold	Protect if possible. Any excavation under archaeological supervision.
9	Glen Sassunn Burn	Foot Bridge	No longer extant. No action required
17	Ruidh na Fhraoich	Shielings	Not on pipeline, but near top of access track. Protect from vehicles, pipe dumps, etc.
21		Platforms	Avoid, or survey and dig under supervision. Minimise impact.
22		Platform	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
25		Platform?	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
26		Bridge?	Not directly under threat. Avoid disturbance when crossing burn.
27		Platform	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
28		Platform	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
29		Shieling	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
30		Shieling	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
31		Shieling	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
32		Shieling	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
33		Shieling	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
34		Mound	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
35		Platform?	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
36		Mound	Avoid, or dig under supervision
37		Mound	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
38		Peat Cutting	Minimise impact.
39		Bank	Minimise impact.
40		Platform	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
41		Mound	Easily avoided. Note and protect.
42		Shielings	Avoid by rerouting pipeline slightly if necessary.

43		Sheepfank ? Shieling?	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
44		Shieling track?	Minimise impact, and dig under supervision.
45		Track	Not on pipeline. Avoid.
46		Mill Lade?	Avoid, or dig under supervision.
47		Track	Avoid, or survey, and dig under supervision.
48		Track	Avoid, or survey, and dig under supervision.
49		Mound and platform	Avoid, or survey, and dig under supervision.
50		Mill Lade?	Avoid, or survey, and dig under supervision.
51		Mill Lade?	Avoid, or survey, and dig under supervision.
52		Boundary Wall	Minimise impact, and dig under supervision.
53		Platform?	Minimise impact, and dig under supervision.
54		Track or Gully	Minimise impact, and dig under supervision.
55		Platform	Since platform is made up from modern midden material, no work is recommended. Turbine house to be concealed within the material.
56		Grouse Butt	Avoid and protect
57		Peat Cutting	Avoid, or dig under supervision. Minimise impact.
58		Mound	Avoid, or survey and dig under supervision
59		Dyke	Survey and dig under supervision. Minimise impact.
60		Burn	Minimise impact.
61		Sheilings	Minimise impact by routing pipeline to one side and dig under supervision
62		Sheilings	Minimise impact by routing pipeline to one side and dig under supervision.

## **7 General Conclusions**

The proposed route of the pipeline passes mainly through open heather moorland only sparsely occupied by archaeological features. Most of these can be protected by carefully controlling ancillary activities such as access routes and materials dumps, by careful siting of the pipeline, and by targeted archaeological supervision of the digging of the pipe trench.

However, there are two important clusters of sites which require particular care. One of these is the complex of tracks, platforms and mill lades (44–54), lying in the woodland close to the present farmhouse and steading, and probably part of the former village of Innerhadden (6).

The other cluster is the complex of well-preserved shielings and related features (42, 43, 59–62), apparently a continuation of the Coire a' Chapuill group (5) previously surveyed by GUARD.

The two clusters appear to be linked, and offer an important opportunity to see a pre-clearance village and its dependent shielings together. For these two clusters we recommend a combination of avoidance wherever possible, or monitoring and recording where the excavations come close to, or cross, known features. These recommendations are made subject to the views of Perth and Kinross Heritage Trust, who advise Perth and Kinross Council on archaeological matters.

## 8 References

### *Bibliographic*

Atkinson, J, Duffy, P and MacGregor, G 2001 'Bunrannoch', *Discovery Excav Scot* 2001, 76.

Atkinson, J, Duffy, P and MacGregor, G 2001a *Rannoch Archaeological Project, 2001 Pilot Season*, unpublished report, GUARD, Glasgow.

MacGregor, G 1999 'Bunrannoch', *Discovery Excav Scot* 1999, 71.

### *Cartographic*

Blaeu, J 1654 'Scotiae provinciae mediterraneae inter Taum flumen et Vararis aestuarium...Description of the inland provinces of Scotland lying between Tay river and Murra fyrth...'.  
Gordon, R or J c1636-52 'Athol ... and Renna...Atholl Rennach wt. all the bordering waists' (Gordon 40).

Lesslie, J 1757 'A Plan of Kinloch Rannoch' (National Archives of Scotland, Register House Plans, RHP 3486).

Moll, H 1745 'The North P. of Perth Shire containing Athol and Broadalbin'.

OS 1867 Ordnance Survey [First Edition], Perthshire Sheet XXXVII. Scale 1:10560.

OS 1900 Ordnance Survey, Second Edition, Perthshire Sheet XXXVII. Scale 1:10560.

OS 1976 Ordnance Survey, Sheet NN65SE 1:10000

OS 1977 Ordnance Survey, Sheet NN65NE 1:10000

OS 1998 Ordnance Survey, Sheet NN65SE 1:10000 (digital)

OS 2002 Ordnance Survey, Sheet NN65SE 1:10000 (digital)

Pont, T c1583-96 [Garry, Tummel, and Upper Tay; Dunkeld to Blairgowrie ] (Pont 23).

Roy, W 1747-55 Military Survey, Sheets 16/4, 16/5.

Stobie, J 1783 'The counties of Perth and Clackmannan'.

Stobie, J [1805] 'The counties of Perth and Clackmannan'.

Thomson, W 1827 'North West Part of Perthshire', in Thomson, J 1832 *Atlas of Scotland*.

Willdey, T 1746 'A map of the King's Roads, Made by his Excellency General Wade in the Highlands of Scotland'.

*Photographic*

106G/Scot/UK60: 3263-3265, 4261-4265, 3418-3422; 8/5/1946

50488: 198-201; 14/5/1988

## Appendix 1 Sites List

<i>No</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>NMRS No</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Condition/ stability</i>	<i>Approximate diameter of site</i>	<i>Statutory Designation</i>
1	Inverhadden	Sculptured Cross-Slab	Considerable	Medieval	NN65NE 13	67	57	Site	n/a	None
2	Inverhadden, Dalchosnie	Battle Site	Other	Medieval	NN65NE 14	67	57	Site	n/a	None
3	Innerhadden Burn	Shieling-Hut (Possible)	Local	Medieval/ Post-medieval	NN65NE 29	6733	5570		n/a	None
4	Glen Sassunn Burn	Shieling-Huts (Possible)	Local	Medieval/ Post-medieval	NN65SE 11	651	540		n/a	None
5	Coire a' Chapuill	Shielings	Local	Medieval/ Post-medieval	NN65NE 5, 7	2662	7565		n/a	None
6	Innerhadden	Settlement	Local	Medieval/ Post-medieval	n/a	67	57	Site	n/a	None
7	Innerhadden	Sluice	Other	Post-medieval	n/a	672	575		n/a	None
8	Innerhadden	Sheepfold	Other	Modern	n/a	672	575		n/a	None
9	Glen Sassunn Burn	Foot Bridge	None	Modern	n/a	654	540		n/a	None

## Appendix 2 Sites outwith Study Area Potentially Affected by Proposed Development

No	Name	Type of Monument	Period	Easting	Northing	NMRS No	Statutory Designation	Distance from Study Area
10	Clach na Boile	Standing Stone	Prehistoric	6699	5798	NN65NE 1	SAM 1516	
11	Bunrannoch	Bronze Age hoard	Prehistoric	6668	5805	NN65NE 21	n/a	
12	Innerhadden Farm	Stone Circles	Prehistoric	673	578	NN65NE 6	n/a	
13	Bunrannoch	Bronze armlets	Prehistoric	66	57	NN65NE 11	n/a	
14	Cill Mo Sheonaid	Cemetery	Medieval/Post-medieval	6705	5775.	NN65NE 2	n/a	
15	Innerhadden Burn	Building; Sheepfold	Post-medieval	6739	5664	NN65NE 27	n/a	
16	Dalchosnie Farm	Farmsteading	Post-medieval	6793	5763	NN65NE 36	n/a	
17	Ruidh na Fhraoich	Shieling-Huts (Possible)	Medieval/Post medieval	651	540	NN65SE 3	n/a	
18	Glen Sassunn	Buildings/ Enclosures	Post-medieval	665	551	n/a	n/a	
19	Glen Sassunn	Building	Modern	672	554	n/a	n/a	
20	Glen Sassunn	Building	Modern	669	546	n/a	n/a	

### Appendix 3 Further Sites Discovered in Walkover Survey

<i>No</i>	<i>Type of Monument</i>	<i>Significance</i>	<i>Period</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>	<i>Description</i>
21	Platforms	Some	Pre-clearance?	6541	5405	Level platform over confluence of burns. Series of natural knolls suggest possible/potential occupation sites.
22	Platform	Some	Pre-clearance?	6563	5427	Irregular shape, c 10 m dia, on bluff overlooking burn. Potential shieling site.
23	Weirs	Some	Pre-clearance?	near	near	Sequence of 5-7 rock-built weirs in bed of burn, each c 0.5 m high.
24	Weirs	Some	Pre-clearance?	6578	5435	Artificial steps in burn
25	Platform?	Some	Pre-clearance?	6585	5442	Overlooking burn. 3m wide x 8 m long
26	Bridge?	Some	Modern?	near 25	near 25	Plank on far side of burn. Remains of footbridge? 20 m N of 25.
27	Platform	Some	Pre-clearance?	6598	5448	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 5 m dia.
28	Platform	Some	Pre-clearance?	[6604] error	[5452] error	Irregular, overlooking burn, c 3 m dia. Lower level ground, sheltered between two bluffs, preferable for sheltered encampment. GPS grid ref in error. Position re-plotted from site sketch plan.
29	Shieling	Some	Pre-clearance?	6599	5437	Shieling huts (associated with sites 30 & 31), 5 m diameter, 0.3-0.5 m high.
30	Shieling	Some	Pre-clearance	6605	5435	Platform 8 m dia.
31	Shieling	Some	Pre-clearance	6605	5437	Platform 5 m dia.
32	Shieling	Some	Pre-clearance	6612	5436	4 m dia.

33	Shieling	Some	Pre-clearance	6610	5436	4 m dia.
34	Mound	Some	Glacial?	6620	5428	10 m dia.
35	Platform?	Some	Unknown	6635	5429	Possible flat platform
36	Mound	Some	Glacial?	near post I	near post I	1.8 m high. Overlooking river
37	Mound	Some	Glacial?	6601	5456	Large mound, 15-20 m dia. Probably glacial, although possible lookout point, with very commanding views across glen.
38	Peat Cutting	Some	Pre-clearance?	6613	5534	Possible peat cutting, with rectangular area roughly 30m N-S
39	Bank	Some	Pre-clearance?	6612	5537	Boulders roughly lain and partially covered in peat, 15 m long by 3 m wide.
40	Platform	Little	Unknown	6615	5544	Grassy, stony platform at road side
41	Mound	Some	Natural?	6652	5697	Oval mound 5 x 10 m, aligned N-S, with highest, rise at S end.
42	Shielings	Considerable	Pre-clearance	6672	5697	7 mounds, 3-8 m dia, 0.5-1.0 m high, with linear features. Boundary runs downslope, across contours. Quite large group, spread over 50 m to S of pipeline route, x 20-40 m.
43	Sheepfank? Shieling?	Considerable	Early Modern?	6676	5697	Hollow, 5 m dia., at edge of slope. Walls c 0.8-1m high, built into slope. Marks edge of complex 42.
44	Shieling track?	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6687	5700	Cutting 5 m wide, in between two natural mounds.
45	Track	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6700	5712	Grassy track, turning away SW into woods

47	Track	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6715	5738	N - S track, 5 m wide, 40 m long.
48	Track	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6716	5741	Track crossing Lade 46. Traces of possible drystone footbridge abutment on one side.
49	Mound and platform	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6713	5741	Small stone mound, overgrown with moss. 2 m square platform adjacent, possible settlement site.
50	Mill Lade?	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6718	5739	Improved or artificial water course alongside track. 3 m deep, very straight. Note, could be reused with surface pipe for current hydro scheme.
51	Mill Lade?	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6718	5752	Watercourse. Joins 50 at 6718 5752, associated with 52.
52	Boundary Wall	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6718	5752	Collapsed wall, runs NW - SE, along edge of lade, crossing track at 6718 5752
53	Platform?	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6721	5754	Flat area, 50 m dia.
54	Track or Gully	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6722	5759	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track. Continues to site 8 (Sheepfold 6724 5759)
55	Platform	Some	Modern?	6733	5755	Dump for house. Slope too steep for natural angle of repose.
56	Grouse Butt	Some	Modern?	6642	5599	Horseshoe-shaped drystone rubble and turf construction. 1m x 2 m internally. Walls 4 m dia overall. Entrance on downslope side.
57	Peat Cutting	Some	Pre-clearance?	6642	5604	50 m x 30 m peat cutting, rectangular.
58	Mound	Some	Pre-clearance?	6641	5605	10 m x 4 m. Oval mound, perhaps hut base associated with peat cutting.

59	Dyke	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6631	5656	Dyke, very tumbled, with flat area to W, and 4 possible sheiling mounds. Dyke is immediately to E of narrow burn, possibly a head dyke, although following burn to S rather than contour. Potential for earlier occupation, since it occupies a sheltered position with good views of glen.
60	Burn	Considerable	Pre-clearance?	6644	5673	Improved burn. V-profile. 5 m wide, 1.2 m overall depth, including 0.6 m high banks on either side.
61	Sheilings	Considerable	Pre-clearance	6644	5683	Sheiling complex. 7 possible houses, c 3 m dia. 10m E of pipe route.
62	Sheilings	Considerable	Pre-clearance	6647	5688	3 mounds. Complex forms part of 61. Appears to extend down towards burn, and uphill about 150 m.

## Appendix 4 Pipeline Waymarks

(Recorded to calibrate GPS and link survey to pipeline plan)

<i>No</i>	<i>Easting</i>	<i>Northing</i>
01	not found	not found
02	not found	not found
03	6579	5436
04	6598	5451

05	6599	5444
V	6621	5429
IV	6636	5430
IVb or IIIb	6674	5436
III	6690	5433
II	6707	5425
I	6719	5413
0	6734	5385
05	6599	5453
06	6599	5456
07	6603	5473
08	not found	not found
09	not found	not found
10	6615	5503
11	6617	5523
12	not found	not found
13 ex 40	6610	5541
14 ex 42	6628	5562

15? Ex 43	6634	5571
fallen ex 44	6641	5593
17	6642	5599
18	6641	5609
19	6636	5620
20	not found	not found
21	not found	not found
22	6638	5655
23	6642	5669
24?	6644	5673
25	6645	5683
26?	6649	5694
27	6661	5698
28?	6708	5724
29?	6718	5747
30?	6721	5756
31?	6725	5760

## Appendix 5 Photographic Register

<i>Digital</i>	<i>View</i>	<i>Site</i>	<i>Description</i>
			<b>24.5.05</b>
185	N	21	Platform
186	S	21	Glen Sassun Burn from 21.
187	SE	23	Rubble stone weirs in bed of Glen Sassunn Burn.
188	NE	22	Platform in foreground. Looking down Glen Sassunn Burn. Marker Post 03 in distance.
189	NE	22	Platform in foreground. Looking down Glen Sassunn Burn. Marker Post 03 in distance. Post 04 faint, in far distance.
190	SW	24	Rubble stone weirs in bed of Glen Sassunn Burn.
191	NE	25	Marker post 03, looking down Glen Sassunn Burn. Platform 25 beyond. Post 04 in far distance, halfway up bank.
192	S	25	Platform overlooking Glen Sassunn Burn.
193	E	26	Plank on E bank of Glen Sassunn Burn. Fragment of footbridge?
194	SE	27	Platform. Post 05 over burn.
195	NE	28	Platform on terrace overlooking burn.
196	E?	29	Shieling
197	E?	30	Shieling
198	W?	31	Shieling Post 05 in background?

199	E?	32	Shieling
200	E	33	Shieling
201	E	34	Mound, glacial? occupied by sheep. Post V to left.
202	E	35	Platform?
203		36	Mound overlooking Innerhadden Burn
204	S	38	Peat cutting
205	S	39	Bank
206		-	Bridge with mink(?) trap
			<b>26.5.05</b>
210	E	41	Oval mound. Schiehallion behind.
211	E	42	Seven mounds. Shielings? Schiehallion behind.
212	NE	43	Sheepfank or shieling
213	SE	44	Possible shieling track between natural mounds. Marker post in foreground. Post 27? in background.
214	SW	45	Grassy track, turning away SW into woods
215	N	47	Track
216	N	46-48 52	From L to R, Track 47, Track and Bridge Abutment 48, Lade 46, Wall 52 alongside Lade.
217	N	50 53	Lade 50?. Platform 53 and marker post 30 in distance.

218	E	48 52	Track crossing Lade 46. Traces of possible drystone footbridge abutment on one side. Wall 52 running along E bank of lade.
219	NE	49	Mound and platform. Marker posts in foreground?
220	S	50	Mill Lade?
221	NE	51	Mill Lade? Marker post 30 and existing track beyond.
222	S	53	Platform. Marker post 30 to right, and existing track beyond.
223	W	54	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track. Crosses existing track.
224	NE	54	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track.
225	SW	54	Possible track or drainage feature in line of track.
226	N	8	Sheepfold
227	E	55	Platform. Overgrown. Overlooks burn and proposed outfall of pipeline.
228	S	56	Grouse Butt. Marker post 17 adjacent.
229	S	57	Peat cutting. Marker post 17 in right background.
230	SW	58	Oval mound, perhaps hut base associated with peat cutting 57.
231	S	59	Dyke, very tumbled, adjacent to seated figure, with flat area to W, and 4 possible sheiling mounds.
232	NE	60	Improved burn with V profile.
233	NE	61	Shieling complex. 7 possible houses. Marker post 25 in right background. River Tummel in left background. Note, apparent reversal of P25 and 61 on plan may be due to imprecision of GPS, and large extent of 61

234	E	62	Three shieling mounds. Complex forms part of 61. Schiehallion in background.
-----	---	----	--

## Appendix 6 Criteria for Assessment of Significance

### 6.1 Levels of significance

Four levels of significance have been used, derived from previous work carried out, notably by national and international conservation bodies. They deal with how worthy the particular asset is in terms of its importance, or alternatively, how dispensable it is. The terminology largely follows that outlined in the *Burra Charter*, and is as follows:

- *Exceptional* Widely regarded as an indispensable archaeological asset.
- *Considerable* A key feature, worth preserving if at all possible.
- *Some* Of interest – should normally be protected.
- *Little* Features which, at present, are thought to have relatively low archaeological value. Features of little significance are generally not dealt with here.

There is often no clear division between the above definitions; assessment of significance largely depends on underlying knowledge and understanding of the various attributes of the resource. Value judgements are an inevitable part of the process, and the evaluation may change as values develop.

### 6.2 Scales of Significance

To enhance understanding of the level of significance attributed to each feature noted in the Table of Archaeological Significance, there is a statement of the *scale of significance* of that particular feature. Normally it follows that the higher the level of significance of a feature, the more its scale increases, however, the two are not necessarily mutually dependent. For example, a feature may have exceptional archaeological significance, but on a local level. This is of most importance when there are conflicts of interest over a feature, as a separate understanding of the scale allows further refinement of the decision-making process.

- *National:* a site or feature widely recognised as being nationally important, due to its rarity, preservation, group value or some other reason.
- *Regional:* a site or feature widely recognised as being less than nationally important, but which may be, or possess elements, that make it a good example of a particular regional style. It may also be important because of being a regionally rare or significant example of its type.
- *Local:* likewise this is a site or feature which is recognised as having elements which are, or is in itself, a good example of a local style. It may also be important because it contributes to local distinctiveness or makes a contribution to the local heritage. It is assumed that all sites characterised as having local significance are also intrinsically significant on a property level as well.

### 6.3 Assessment Criteria

Criteria used by English Heritage and Historic Scotland to determine the significance of archaeological sites for scheduling purposes have been used by SUAT to define the grounds on which the assessment of significance is made. These are not exhaustive, and other criteria may be applicable.

- *Survival:* the quality of the survival of a site can be of importance, and the survival potential of below- and above-ground remains is crucial to the importance of the site.
- *Period:* whether the site is a good example of its period, or whether it shows evidence of long-term or multi-period use. Contemporary sites of different types also complement each other in terms of the information and evidence they show.
- *Group Value:* the value of a single site is enhanced greatly by being part of an associated group of related sites. In such cases preservation of not just the group, but also the context of the group should be seriously considered.
- *Rarity:* some sites, due to the overall rarity of the type, merit raised importance despite not appearing to be particularly good examples.

- *Situation*: some sites are more abundant in different geographical areas than others, and accordingly may have higher potential value if geographically more rare.
- *Diversity of Form*: whether the style is different from others of its type in terms of style or function perhaps, or according to regional variations.
- *Multiperiod/ single period*: sites showing evidence of successive reuse can have special value because they may contain particularly fine evidence of phasing and stratigraphy. Likewise, a single period site will generally have more evidence of the different functions carried out within it through having well-preserved archaeological relationships. Good examples of both site types are important in terms of their overall informational value.
- *Documentation*: a site may have particularly extensive supplementary information, such as charters or estate maps, which informs and enhances our overall understanding of it, yet cannot be seen through archaeological research. This information can serve to flesh out the evidence gathered by other means.
- *Potential*: the site may be viewed as having significant potential for providing further information on the past, or predictions may suggest that undiscovered deposits may have high informational value.
- *Amenity value*: the site may easily accessible by the general public, and its preservation may therefore be of benefit as an amenity.