

Denny to Wishaw Network Upgrade

Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Volume 3 Appendices

May 2026



Prepared for:

SP Energy Networks
320 St Vincent St
Glasgow, G2 5AD

Prepared by:

AECOM Limited
1 Tanfield
Edinburgh EH3 5DA
United Kingdom

Introduction

The following document represents a review of the Project where physical impacts are likely. This includes works relating to new pylons, as well as compounds and access tracks.

The main areas examined form elements of the following components:

- WB Route and Bonnybridge Substation
- CB Route
- XX Route
- XR Route
- ZG Route

The document was designed to identify areas suitable for archaeological evaluation based on their archaeological potential (i.e. highlighting areas of previous disturbance that were considered to have no/limited archaeological potential), as well as constraints such as ecology and utilities.

The document has been supplied to the Stirling Council Archaeological Officer, who is acting on behalf of Falkirk Council and North Lanarkshire Council, and has agreed that evaluation trenching (required to inform mitigation) can be undertaken in a phased approach. It has been used to produced provisional trenching plans for the areas that will form the Phase 1 trenching, and this has been supplied to the Applicant.

Evaluation Areas

To SPEN	Project name DWNO	Client SPEN	Subject Evaluation Areas - Suitable Areas
Date 17 December 2025			

The current document details the results of a desk-based review to examine areas where archaeological evaluation might be required, or represent a suitable method of evaluating the archaeological potential of the DWNO project (the ‘Proposed Development’).

Sources that have been used include historic mapping, LiDAR data, aerial and satellite imagery, mining records, and previously recorded heritage assets, as well as information such as ecological constraints. This data has been used to identify areas that are assumed to be unsuitable for evaluation trenching due to previous disturbance (i.e. former mining and industrial areas), and areas where evaluation pre-consent may be problematic due to aspects such as ecological constraints and ground conditions (i.e. peat/bog).

The data is presented by scheme component in the tables below, as well as in the associated figures. These are as follows:

- Red – Areas marked in red are areas where trenching is not required/not suitable due to previous disturbance.
- Amber – Areas where trenching might be possible, but are heavily constrained by aspects such as ecology (including, but not limited to, SSSIs, conservation areas, badger sets, Great Crested Newts, woodland, peat), and as such trenching would be undertaken once the scheme has been consented and appropriate licences have been agreed.
- Green – Areas considered most suitable for trenching. Largely areas where there is no evidence of previous largescale disturbance.

It should be noted that some ‘Green’ and ‘Amber’ may not be suitable as a result of constraints such as utilities and services, as well as ecological and landowner constraints. Furthermore, it should be noted that most works which result in the potential for physical impacts on the reconducting works (i.e. the XX, XR, and ZG lines) will be limited to stripping adjacent to existing towers. It is possible that these areas have been previously disturbed during the original construction. Additionally, evaluation trenching near the existing towers may also be challenging due to constraints associated of works near a live/operational OHL.

This document is an update of the technical note originally issued to Falkirk Council and North Lanarkshire Council on the 15th October 2025. The update consists of the adding identification numbers (prefixed AEA) to all areas, as well as minor updates to the text where updated has revised the R/A/G rating.

WB Line

The WB line represents the 'new build' line, and will involve the greatest level of disturbance. As such, this will include construction of new towers as well as stripping for compounds and access tracks.

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
WB001-003	Possibly previously disturbed through mining activities, with later evidence of commercial woodland operations. Disturbance visible on historic aerial images (i.e. Google Earth).	No	AEA39
WB004	Appears to be in area of pasture. Adjacent fields subject to commercial forestry, but field containing WB004 may have been left undeveloped.	Yes – Tower and access track	AEA38
WB005-006	In an area of plantation so assumed to have been extensively disturbed.	No	AEA37
WB007	Possible option. No previously recorded archaeology, and looks to have been agricultural land since the early OS mapping.	Yes – Tower and access track	AEA36
WB008-011	In an area of plantation so assumed to have been extensively disturbed.	No	AEA35
WB012-015	Possible option, however, historic mapping suggest upland agricultural land and of limited archaeological potential.	Yes – Towers and access track.	AEA30-33
WB016	Within woodland area with limited access/possibly disturbed.	No	AEA29
WB017-018	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs.	Yes – Towers and access track.	AEA27-28

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
	Appears to be agricultural fields.		
WB019-020	Within woodland area with limited access/possibly disturbed.	No	AEA26
Trackway between WB019/020	Section of trackway linking Towers WB019 and WB020 in more open area and possibly suitable for evaluation trenching. However, there looks to be at least three former extraction pits/quarries/small ponds in the field, and it may have been subject to mining/be disturbed.	Yes – Access track.	AEA25
Trackway north of WB020	Section of trackway north of WB020, but south of ecological constraints.	Yes – Access track.	AEA23
WB021-028	Rough upland ground adjacent to existing OHL. Parts appear to be disturbed either by plantation or bogs. On edge of East Fannyside Muir/Slamannan Plateau SSSI as well as within a large number of other ecological constraints. so best avoided. Also assumed to be of low archaeological potential due to wetland nature and later disturbance.	Possible after consented due to ecology	AEA20-21
WB029-035	Historic mapping suggest upland agricultural land (mix of improved/semi-improved) and of limited archaeological potential. Also close to existing OHL which has resulted in some disturbance, while the	Possible after consented due to ecology	AEA19

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
	LiDAR data suggests some evidence of extraction and possible peat cutting.		
WB036	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural fields. Possibly also some options for trenching of access tracks to WB037 and the main road to the north.	Yes – Towers and access track.	AEA18
WB037	Largely in woodland.	Partially in field so possible in area not in woodland.	AEA18
WB038	Former brickworks, with tower in area of former ponds rather than structures. Assume land to be disturbed. While there may be the potential for industrial remains, this area Check for industrial remains. Also ecological constraints – Great Crested Newts and others	No	AEA17
WB039-042	Area appears to have been previously disturbed. OS mapping suggests rough grazing, however evidence of extractions pits (possibly linked to nearby brickworks) and drainage and tree cover suggests there may also have been a plantation/areas of plantation. Also, ecological constraints – Great Crested Newts and others	No	AEA17

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
WB043-045	Area south of the WHS. Low land area with potential for archaeological remains, with areas for access tracks and tower noted.	Yes	AEA15-16
Block of land between WB045-046		No	AEA14
WB046-047	Area straddles south of the WHS. Low land area with potential for archaeological remains, with areas for access tracks and tower noted.	Yes	AEA13
WB047-051	Area within woodland so difficult to access. Also large areas disturbed by mining and quarrying.	No	AEA12
WB51	Area subject to 20 th century mining/quarrying.	No	AEA11
WB051 to land along canal south of WB053	Area within woodland so difficult to access. In WHS buffer and WHS – work in Scheduled area to be covered separately as part of SMC.	No	AEA10
WB053-WB059	Area north of the WHS. Low land area with potential for archaeological remains, with areas for access tracks and tower noted.	Yes	AEA08-09

XX OHL

The XX OHL represents reconductoring works so trenching only required where ground disturbance is expected. Currently this is assumed to be a compound that will be stripped around each existing tower, although it should be noted that these areas may have been previously disturbed as a result of the original tower construction. Trenching in these areas may also be difficult due to health and safety restrictions associated with works near an operations OHL.

Access tracks will not be stripped and will instead use trackway/track matting.

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
Compound north of XX001	Agricultural field northwest of Woodend Farm. While LiDAR data does not suggest any features, land suitable for evaluation.	Yes	AEA46
XX001	Agricultural field southwest of Woodend Farm. Previous disturbance in field resulting from compound in southeast corner, with LiDAR data also showing possible disturbance/quarrying.	No	AEA47
XX002	Corner of field north of Woodend Farm. LiDAR would suggest some disturbance as possible ridge and furrow visible elsewhere in field not visible in corner. Also a large number of OHLs in the area, and as a result trenching difficult due to OHLs/utilities.	No	AEA47
XX003	Area of former Gartsherrie Colliery site. Previously disturbed.	Yes – if keen to look at possible industrial activity. Otherwise can be left out.	AEA45
XX004-007	Previous disturbance due to previous industrial activities. Some quarry pits now lakes.	No	AEA44
XX008	Land south of former Gartliston Fire Clay Clay works. LiDAR suggests	Yes.	AEA42

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
	some previous disturbance in field.		
XX009	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA42
XX010	In area of ridge and furrow (visible on LiDAR) south of Gartliston Farm.	Yes	AEA42
XX011-013	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA42
XX014	In arable field, but possible linear feature near tower on LiDAR. May be a large buried utility so possibly one to avoid – undertaken service check. If feature not a buried utility, it could be archaeology and evaluation would be needed.	Yes	AEA42
XX015-016	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA42
XX017	In large area of disturbance resulting from quarrying to south.	No	AEA41
XX018-019	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA40
XX019a-025	Large area of previous disturbance from quarrying as well as the general development of New Monkland, Dalnacoulter, and Holehills.	No	AEA39; AEA43
XX026-XX027	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA48

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
XX028	LiDAR suggests extensive disturbance. Possible flatten spoil tip or similar from former colliery to east depicted on First Edition OS mapping.	No	AEA49
XX029-030	Large area of previous disturbance from quarrying (Burnhead Quarry).	No	AEA50
XX031	Large area of previous disturbance from quarrying (Craighead Quarry).	No	AEA50
XX032-036	In industrial estates/areas of hard standing and therefore ground very disturbed.	No	AEA50
XX037-042	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be arable fields.	Yes	AEA51
XX043-049	Landscape previously disturbed by the general development of the Chapenhall area.	No	AEA52

XR OHL

The XR OHL represents reconductoring works so trenching only required where ground disturbance is expected. Currently this is assumed to be a compound that will be stripped around each existing tower, although it should be noted that these areas may have been previously disturbed as a result of the original tower construction. Trenching in these areas may also be difficult due to health and safety restrictions associated with works near an operations OHL.

Access tracks will not be stripped and will instead use trackway/track matting.

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
XR001-003	Golf course that also appears to have been disturbed by episodes of mining etc.	No	AEA54
XR004 and compound	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land that has not been subject to disturbance/extraction.	Yes	AEA55
XR005-007	Large area of previous disturbance from quarrying.	No	AEA56
XR008-009	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA57
XR010	Large area of previous disturbance from quarrying.	No	AEA58
XR011-015	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA59
XR016	In plantation/woodland.	No	AEA60
XR017	In area on edge of quarry, but clear evidence of R&F on LiDAR in surrounding fields.	Yes	AEA61
XR018-019	In area of R&F on LiDAR. Part of larger field system with lots of R&F surviving on LiDAR.	Yes	AEA61
XR020	Large area of previous disturbance associated with a modern farm.	No	AEA62
XR021	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs.	Yes	AEA63

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
	Appears to be agricultural land.		
XR022	Area appears to have been disturbed through drainage (based on LiDAR review), with areas of shallow ponds or similar on aerial photos.	No	AEA64
XR023-025	In area of parkland associated with Allanton House (now assumed to have been demolished).	Yes – if trees can be avoided	AEA65-66
XR026-030	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be heathland (XR026-027) and agricultural land (XR028-XR030).	Yes	AEA67
XR031	In/very near to woodland and road.	No	AEA68
XR032-035	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA69-70
XR036-037	In area of former Chapel Colliery.	No	AEA71
XR038	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA73
XR039	In area of woodland/scrub.	No	AEA72
Access track to XX039	More open agricultural land. Possibly worth trenching if trackway cannot be used.	Yes	AEA74
XR040	In area of farmyard.	No	AEA75
XR041-XR050	On footprint of former railway and therefore assumed to be disturbed.	No	AEA76

ZG OHL

The ZG OHL represents reconductoring works so trenching only required where ground disturbance is expected. Currently this is assumed to be a compound that will be stripped around each existing tower, although it should be noted that these areas may have been previously disturbed as a result of the original tower construction. Trenching in these areas may also be difficult due to health and safety restrictions associated with works near an operations OHL.

Access tracks will not be stripped and will instead use trackway/track matting.

Towers	Landscape Overview	Suitable for trenching?	AEA area on Figures
ZG001-003	Plantation/commercial woodland so no access and assumed to be disturbed by forestry operations.	No	AEA01
ZG004-ZG007	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA02
ZG008	Adjacent to highway and in area that appears to have been disturbed.	No	AEA03
Access track to ZG008	Land suitable for trenching, however, this is an area of trackway so no stripping required. As such, evaluation unlikely to be needed.	Yes	AEA04
ZG009	Near watercourse in an area that appears to be a former river channel or land that has been scoured by the river.	No	AEA05
ZG010-012	No features on historic mapping of LiDAR/APs. Appears to be agricultural land.	Yes	AEA06
ZG013	Adjacent to existing substation and in area that appears to have been disturbed.	No	AEA07

