March 2025

Glen Earrach Pumped Storage Hydro

Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Volume 5: Appendices
Appendix 6.2: Landscape Assessment

Glen Earrach Energy Ltd

Glen Earrach AECOM

Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Alex Crossley Landscape Architect Charlotte Williams Principal Landscape Architect	Charlotte Williams Principal Landscape Architect	Ruth Mauritzen Associate Director	David Lee Technical Director – Renewable Energy

Issue History

Issue	Issue date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	March 2025	Submission	DL	David Lee	Technical Director – Renewable Energy

Table of Contents

Tables

1. Introduction

1.1.1 This appendix should be read in conjunction with **Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual Assessment (Volume 2: Main Report) and Appendix 6.1 Landscape and Visual Methodology (Volume 5: Appendices)** and is supported by the following figures.

- **Figure 6.4 Landscape Designations and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3: Figures);** and
- **Figure 6.5 Landscape Character Types and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3: Figures).**

1.1.2 All landscape and visual mitigation measures are embedded and described in **Chapter 3: Evolution of Design and Alternatives (Volume 2: Main Report), Appendix 6.4 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Volume 5: Appendices) and Figures 6.4.1 to 6.4.3 (Volume 3: Figures).**

2. Landscape Assessment

2.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed assessment of the significance of effects on landscape receptors at each of the assessment phases: Pre-Construction and Enabling, Construction, Operation (year 1) and Operation (year 15). It also provides details of likely cumulative effects on landscape receptors. The assessment is set out in the following tables:

- **Table 2-1 Landscape Designations**
- **Table 2-2 LCT 222 - Rocky Moorland Plateau - Inverness**
- **Table 2-3 LCT 225 - Broad Steep-Sided Glen**
- **Table 2-4 LCT 220 - Rugged Massif - Inverness**
- **Table 2-5 LCT 221 - Rolling Uplands**
- **Table 2-6 LCT 224 - Farmed and Wooded Foothills**
- **Table 2-7 LCT 226 - Wooded Glen**
- **Table 2-8 LCT 227 - Farmed Strath**
- **Table 3-1 Cumulative Landscape Effects - Landscape Designations**
- **Table 3-2 Cumulative Landscape Effects - Landscape Character** Types

2.1.2 Approximate distances are given below from each of the landscape receptors to relevant parts of the Proposed Development. This includes the permanent elements of the Lower Control Works (LCW) and the Embankments and the top water level of the Headpond. The approximate distances are given as the closest part of the receptor, to the closest section of the specific part of the Proposed Development stated.

2.1.3 It is acknowledged that part of the landscape within the Study Area comprises plantation forestry at different stages of felling. The landscape assessment assumes that there would be no change to this management practice.

2.2 Construction timescale assumptions

2.2.1 The Construction programme for the Proposed Development including timescales is set out within **Chapter 2: Project and Site Description (Volume 2: Main Report)**. The overall Pre-Construction and Enabling and Construction periods are expected to span up to eight years, however the more intensive periods are as follows:

- Headpond Construction: three years (short-term);
- LCW Construction: three years (short-term); and

- Tunnel Portal Construction: less than one year (short-term) at different points in the programme.

Table 2-1 Landscape Designations

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA		
Distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: Within SLA LCW: Within SLA Value: **High** Susceptibility: **High** The steep-sided landform trench of the SLA with a simple and distinctive linear profile, long vistas across the loch and the tranquillity of the SLA offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the context of the pylons, telecommunications mast and distant views of turbines and scale of the SLA does lessen the susceptibility somewhat. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the SLA. There would be perceptual effects on the setting of the SLA associated with the plant and activity including site clearance, Temporary Access Tracks, material storage and tunnel portal construction in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. This would be perceived in small parts of the SLA, predominantly within the northern part. The works would interrupt the sequential experience travelling along the glen and would introduce human scale activity in part of the surrounding landscape, albeit within the context of existing forestry plantation activity. The construction noise would also affect the tranquillity of the SLA in a localised area, albeit in the context of the A82 and existing forestry plantation activity which lessens the scale of impact somewhat. The remainder of the key characteristics of the SLA would largely remain unchanged. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	Minor adverse (not significant)
	Construction During Construction, plant and activity associated with the LCW, Headpond, Secondary Bund and part of the Temporary Access Tracks would be directly present within the SLA. This would include both the works to construct the LCW, including an access off the A82 and localised earthworks, as well as the movement of construction material across the waterbody of Loch Ness, also directly within the SLA. The construction activity associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund and part of the Temporary Access Tracks would be in close proximity to the prominent summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh which would diminish the unique openness and wildness aspects of the moorland. The construction of the Headpond and associated infrastructure would result in the modification to the existing Loch nam Breac Dearga on open moorland and would result in the loss of dwarf birch and montane scrub, albeit in a localised area. The construction activity would have an adverse, direct alteration to the moorland plateau due to the scale and contrast of the activity. The scale of the Great Glen Fault with the backcloth of the massif and mountains would not be affected as the Proposed Development would not encroach upon this landscape. The construction activity and plant at the LCW would interrupt the sequential experience travelling along the glen and would introduce human scale activity and vegetation removal in an otherwise natural view. The construction noise would also affect the tranquillity of the SLA in a localised area, albeit in the context of the A82 which lessens the scale of impact somewhat. The construction works are not considered to detract from the prominence of Urquhart Castle along the loch due to the separation in distance and by forestry plantation between the LCW and Urquhart Castle. The simple and distinctive profile of the loch and typically horizontal skyline would be altered by the introduction of construction activity at the loch shore and extending into the water as well as on the moorland plateau which would be perceived across a considerable extent of the SLA due to the openness and long vistas available. However, the Headpond and LCW would rarely be perceived in combination and the views of grand proportions from the SLA diminishes the detail of foreground features, which lessens the scale of change. Due to the scale of Loch Ness which dwarfs boats on its waters, this would also lessen the scale of change.	Moderate adverse (significant)

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	The LCW is unlikely to affect the perception of scale due to views of movement of vehicles along the A82 in close proximity and the localised landform alteration is in keeping with the sections of exposed rock stabilisation in close proximity. All changes would be within the context of some detracting features, including forestry plantation, pylons, telecommunications mast, views of distant wind farms and the presence of the A82 and Foyers Power Station at the loch shore, which lessens the alteration to the wildness aspects of the SLA. Any indirect changes on the setting of the SLA, associated with the Temporary Construction Compounds and remainder of the Temporary Access Tracks, largely located in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie and more elevated positions on the moorland plateau, would be perceived in small parts of the SLA, predominantly within the northern part. The works would interrupt the sequential experience travelling along the glen and would introduce human scale activity in part of the surrounding landscape, albeit within the context of existing forestry plantation activity. The construction noise would also affect the tranquillity of the SLA in a localised area, albeit in the context of the A82 and existing forestry plantation activity which lessens the scale of impact somewhat. Lighting requirements would include lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond, navigational buoys at the LCW, the tower crane lit at the LCW in low light levels and lighting from occasional construction barge movement across Loch Ness. This would affect the perceptual qualities of the SLA, however the majority of the key characteristics of the SLA, including the landform pattern and long vistas, would not be perceptible during darkness so would not be affected. The lighting would also be in the context of existing lighting on the loch shore in close proximity, including watercraft and the settlement of Foyers. A number of the key characteristics would remain unchanged, including the striking profile of the glen and the distinctive landform trench of the SLA, the long vista available down the loch and varying land uses across the SLA. Overall, there would be a localised direct effect on the SLA associated with the LCW, Headpond, Secondary Bund and part of the Temporary Access Tracks. However, due to the long vistas available, there would be a wider influence across the SLA associated with the incongruent introduction of construction plant and activity and effects on the simple, horizontal character of the SLA on both the loch side and moorland plateau. The change would be less pronounced due to the context of nearby loch side physical interventions and several key characteristics of the SLA would remain intact. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and LCW would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Medium**	
	<u>Operation (Year 1)</u> At Operation year 1, the permanent infrastructure of the LCW, Headpond and associated embankments and Spillway, Secondary Bund and Permanent Access Tracks would be directly located in a small part of the SLA. The permanent Headpond infrastructure would introduce unnatural straight edges within the moorland plateau and would affect the typically horizontal nature of the skyline in close proximity to the prominent Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit, however this would be barely perceptible from the majority of the SLA due to the containment by landform and forestry plantation in the wider landscape. As demonstrated from viewpoints 7 and 10, the proximity of the Headpond infrastructure to Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would not compromise the distinctive shape of this hill peak, maintaining its visibility as a landmark feature in views from both ends of the loch. The scale of the Great Glen Fault with the backcloth of the massif and mountains would also not be affected as the Proposed Development would not encroach upon this landscape. The permanent infrastructure of the Headpond would be	Minor adverse (not significant)

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect

located in a small part of the large-scale landscape in close proximity to the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh which lessens the perceived scale of change.

The permanent LCW would interrupt the sequential experience travelling along the glen and would introduce human scale activity and vegetation removal in an otherwise natural view. This would be perceived across a considerable extent of the SLA due to the openness and long vistas available, however would be in keeping with the horizontal nature of the SLA. The views of grand proportions from the SLA diminishes the detail of foreground features and the encroachment into the loch would only be barely perceptible from either end of the loch where the angle of view and distance would substantially lessen the scale of change. The operational infrastructure at the LCW is not considered to detract from the prominence of Urquhart Castle along the loch due to the separation in distance and by forestry plantation between the LCW and Urquhart Castle.

The LCW is unlikely to affect the perception of scale due to views of movement of vehicles along the A82 in close proximity and the localised landform alteration. The retaining wall would be a noticeable feature until the native planting fully establishes although would not be too dissimilar to the sections of exposed rock stabilisation in close proximity. All changes would be within the context of some detracting features, including forestry plantation, pylons, telecommunications mast, views of distant wind farms and the presence of the A82 and Foyers Power Station at the loch shore, which lessens the alteration to the wildness aspects of the SLA.

Any indirect changes on the setting of the SLA, associated with Permanent Compounds and Permanent Access Tracks, largely located in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie, would be perceived in small parts of the SLA, predominantly within the northern part. The perception of the permanent infrastructure would interrupt the sequential experience travelling along the glen and would introduce human scale activity in part of the surrounding landscape, albeit within the context of existing forestry plantation activity.

At Operation, the water level changes within Loch Ness would occur more frequently than the existing fluctuating levels although this is not considered to result in any material alteration to the appearance of the loch shore which along with the horizontal nature of the loch surface, would remain unaffected. Further details relating to potential effects on cultural heritage assets within the SLA, such as Cherry Island crannog, are contained in **Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage (Volume 2: Main Report)**.

Operational lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond and LCW. This has the potential to affect the tranquillity of the SLA, however the majority of the key characteristics of the SLA, including the landform pattern and long vistas, would not be perceptible during darkness so would only be partially affected when experienced at dusk and dawn in very localised parts of the SLA. The lighting would also be in the context of existing lighting on the loch shore associated with watercraft and the settlement of Foyers.

A number of the key characteristics would remain unchanged, including the striking profile of the glen, the distinctive landform trench of the SLA, the prominence and setting of Urquhart Castle, the long vista available down the loch and varying land uses across the SLA.

Proposed landscape and ecological mitigation, including native planting at the LCW and peatland restoration, native (including riparian) woodland planting, montane willow scrub regeneration and planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	regeneration and planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. Deer fencing would be erected around the planting areas; however, this would not be dissimilar to fencing within the existing landscape and is not considered to have an adverse effect on the landscape character. Overall, there would be a localised direct effect on the SLA associated with the LCW, Headpond, Secondary Bund and part of the Permanent Access Tracks. Due to the long vistas available, there would be a wider influence across the SLA associated with the permanent LCW, however this would be less pronounced due the scale of the landscape and nearby loch side context of Foyers and the A82. The majority of the key characteristics of the SLA would remain intact. The duration of change would be long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	
	<u>Operation (Year 15)</u> At Operation year 15, there would remain to be a localised direct effect on the SLA associated with the LCW, Headpond, Secondary Bund and Permanent Access Tracks. The new planting associated with the LCW would assist in partial containment and integration of the LCW within the loch shore, which would lessen the perception of new infrastructure in a relatively undisturbed section of the western side of the loch and would contribute to reinstating the loch side native vegetation. The new planting associated with the wider landscape around the Headpond would also assist in partial screening and integration of the Permanent Access Tracks but would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting within the SLA, which is noted as an opportunity for landscape enhancement in published guidance. Overall, despite the remaining localised direct effect on the SLA associated with the LCW, Headpond, Secondary Bund and Permanent Access Tracks the integrity of the SLA and its component key characteristics and special qualities would remain largely unaffected by the Proposed Development and the scale of the SLA assists in lessening the perceived scale of change. The duration of change would be long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	Minor adverse (not significant)

Table 2-2 LCT 222 - Rocky Moorland Plateau - Inverness

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: Within LCT LCW: 1.47 km Value: **High** Susceptibility: **Medium** The openness of the landscape with expansive views, lack of human intervention and remoteness are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the context of the extensive forestry plantation, presence of windfarms and large-scale pattern of the landscape lessens the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **Medium** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be medium.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be direct works in a small part of the LCT near to the River Coiltie. This would include construction plant and activity including site clearance, new Temporary Access Tracks, material storage and tunnel portal construction. The Temporary Access Tracks would be partly along existing forestry tracks, which would limit any change to the LCT, and would include localised widening. The remaining works would temporarily affect the remoteness and tranquillity on the open plateau, however the geographical area over which the change would be experienced would be a localised part of the LCT due to containment from surrounding landform and would be within the context of nearby forestry Operations. Lighting requirements would comprise floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions in a small part of the LCT. This would affect the perception of remoteness on the plateau and absence of human artefacts however the geographical area over which the change would be experienced would also be limited. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: Low	Minor adverse (not significant)
	Construction During construction, plant and activity associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds, including Tunnel Portals, would be directly present within the LCT. The works at the Headpond, including associated embankment construction, and Temporary Construction Compounds on the rising moorland plateau would displace localised areas of moorland plateau. The construction of the Headpond and associated infrastructure would result in the modification to the existing Loch nam Breac Dearga on open moorland and would result in the loss of dwarf birch and montane scrub, albeit in a localised area. The displacement of the small areas of moorland vegetation, which is a key characteristic of the LCT, is in the context of rocky outcrops which break up the vegetated areas, therefore reducing perception of the scale of change that this landscape element would be lost in. The construction works, including cutting and benching of earthworks, would be at odds with the natural form of the landscape and would temporarily disrupt the existing simple moorland backdrop to the adjacent lower straths and glens. Remoteness on the open plateau and existing buffer that the LCT provides between areas of greater land use intensity due to the introduction of incongruous plant and movement. However, noting that the perception of such changes would be limited to pockets of the LCT due to the context of the undulating landform and presence of native and coniferous vegetation in the wider landscape. Sound of the construction works would affect the tranquillity in a localised part of the LCT on the open plateau. The Temporary Access Tracks used for Construction would partly follow existing forestry tracks, which would limit the change to the LCT. However, construction of new tracks through the rising plateau moorland, from the River Coiltie extending towards the proposed Headpond would create additional tracks and movement of construction plant within the landscape. The Temporary Construction Compounds would also result in additional activity and built form in this localised part of the LCT. The new Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds would affect the remoteness and lack of human intervention of the open plateau with the introduction of movement and plant, particularly at the Workers Accommodation. However, the geographic area over which the change would be experienced would be limited due to siting within the valley associated with the River Coiltie and between Glas-bheinn Bheag and Glas-bheinn Mhor, and existing native and coniferous vegetation cover. The changes near to the River Coiltie would also be within the context of large areas of forestry rather than open moorland, a small-scale hydroelectric scheme on the River Coiltie and an existing borrow pit. This concentrated area of Temporary Construction	Moderate adverse (significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	Compounds on the more contained, lower ground lessens the impact on the remoteness and lack of human intervention characteristics in this part of the LCT. Temporary lighting would be required during the construction period and would include floodlights at the compounds and lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond, which would be used in low light conditions. This would be in a series of small pockets within the LCT extending from the Workers Accommodation (TC05) to the Headpond. This would affect the perception of remoteness on the plateau and absence of human artefacts however the geographical area over which the change would be experienced would also be limited. It should be noted that part of the core path network and the Glen Coiltie walking loop would be rerouted during the Construction phase. These routes would be temporarily diverted in close proximity to the existing route and would be similar in nature thereby not affecting the recreational resource of the LCT. Overall, the scale of the construction operations would substantially alter the more wild and natural aspects of the upland moorland in a small part of the LCT, which is fundamental to many of the key characteristics of the LCT. However, the geographical extent of the change experienced would be limited due to the containment of construction activity by the landform of the LCT and native and coniferous vegetation cover in the surrounding landscape. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and Tunnel Portals would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **High**	
	<u>Operation (Year 1)</u> At Operation year 1, the permanent infrastructure of the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds would be directly present across a small part of the LCT and would displace open moorland. The Headpond and associated embankments would permanently displace a very small area of open moorland and would result in the expansion of Loch nam Breac Dearga. The Secondary Bund would also introduce an additional small body of water in the landscape but is only expected to be full every six months. The new waterbodies would not be uncharacteristic in the context of numerous lochs and lochans within the wider LCT although would be larger in scale and a more regular form. The straight edges of the Headpond waterbody associated with the three embankments and the Spillway would contrast from natural lochs and rugged character on the open plateau, however this would only be perceptible from a very small part of the LCT. The introduction of the large, embankments and their linear form would contrast with the lack of landscape pattern in the LCT. However, the perception of scale would be reduced due to the surrounding large-scale landscape and the change would only be perceived from pockets of the LCT due to the context of the undulating landform and presence of native and coniferous vegetation in the wider landscape. The Permanent Access Tracks would include sections of new track across the moorland plateau. Such tracks would result in localised scarring on the landscape and would be located in a part of the LCT with existing influence from forestry tracks. However, the new tracks would be on a higher elevation than existing which would encroach on the perception of remoteness on the open plateau. The Permanent Compounds, including four Tunnel Portals and switching station, would be largely concentrated in a small part of the LCT on lower ground and within the context of forestry plantation, a borrow pit and a small hydroelectric scheme near to the River Coiltie. A ventilation shaft with fencing and one Tunnel Portal would be located in the upland landscape, however the geographical area over which such infrastructure would be perceptible from would be limited due to the containment of landform, which would limit impact on the remote qualities of the plateau landscape.	Moderate adverse (significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	The Temporary Construction Compound areas would be reinstated after Construction although these would appear as disturbed moorland for the short term until they re-establish. Proposed landscape and ecological mitigation, including peatland restoration, native (including riparian) woodland planting, montane willow scrub, dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting as well as ancient woodland enhancement in the wider landscape, around the Headpond and near to the River Coiltie would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. Deer fencing would be erected however this would not be dissimilar to similar fencing present in the existing landscape and is not considered to have an adverse effect on the landscape character. Operational lighting comprising motion-sensor lighting would be required at the Permanent Compounds and Substation (PC04) introducing occasional light sources within localised parts of the LCT. This would affect the perception of remoteness on the plateau, however the geographical area over which the change would be experienced would also be limited. Overall, there would be a localised direct effect on the LCT associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds. There would be changes to some of the key characteristics of the LCT, including the remoteness and limited human intervention, however the changes would be experienced across a limited proportion of the LCT. The permanent infrastructure would be concentrated largely within two areas of the LCT which also lessens the degree of influence. The duration of change would be long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Medium**	
	<u>Operation (Year 15)</u> At Operation year 15, there would remain a localised direct effect on the LCT associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds. The land upon which the Temporary Construction Compounds were located during the construction period would be considered to be fully reinstated by year 15. The new planting near to the River Coiltie and the landscape around the Headpond would have established and would assist in the integration of the new infrastructure, predominantly the Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds, into the local landscape. The new planting would contribute to swathes of native planting and regeneration of vegetation across the LCT, which is a key characteristic of the LCT and would contribute to reinstating historic native planting across this landscape. Overall, whilst there would remain a direct effect on the LCT associated with the Headpond and the concentration of Permanent Compounds concentrated in a localised part of the LCT around the River Coiltie, it is not considered that these would become a dominating feature in the wider landscape. Effects on the key characteristics of the LCT would therefore be limited and perceived across small parts of the LCT. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	Minor adverse (not significant)

Table 2-3 LCT 225 - Broad Steep-Sided Glen

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 0.86 km LCW: Within LCT Value: **High** Susceptibility: **High** The clearly defined landform of the glen and deep loch, long views across the water, vegetation cover and simple visual composition of land, water and sky are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the context of the busy trunk road, power lines, forested slopes, presence of similar development including Foyers Power Station and settlements does lessen the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the LCT. There would be perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT associated with the plant and activity including site clearance, new Temporary Access Tracks, material storage and tunnel portal construction in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. This would be perceived in small parts of the LCT, predominantly within the northern part. The works would affect views across the loch to the surrounding moorland, albeit within the context of existing forestry plantation activity. The construction noise would also affect the tranquillity of the LCT in a localised area, albeit in the context of the A82 and existing forestry Operations which has the potential to lessen the scale of impact somewhat. The remainder of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain largely unchanged. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	Minor adverse (not significant)
	Construction During Construction, plant and activity associated with the LCW and associated Temporary Construction Compound would be directly present within the LCT. This would include both the works to construct the LCW, including an access off the A82, jack up barges, moored barges, concrete batching plant, tall construction plant and localised earthworks, as well as the movement of construction material across the waterbody of Loch Ness. The construction activity would displace part of a pocket of mature loch side broad leaved vegetation, part of which is designated as ancient woodland, which is a key characteristic feature of the loch shore and would alter the contrast between the broadleaf woodland and forestry in a small part of the LCT. However, the extent of influence of the construction activity would be evident across a large proportion of the LCT which increases the magnitude of change. The construction works would introduce tall plant and activity, along with material storage in one of the long stretches of relatively uninhabited land between settlements in the western side of the glen. However, it would appear less contrasting in this part of the LCT due to the influence of the existing Foyers Power Station on the opposite side of the loch, wood pole lines and the busy A82 corridor, which all provide physical interventions near to or at the loch edge. The extent of influence of the construction of the LCW would comprise a considerable proportion of the LCT, predominantly within the waterbody of Loch Ness and the edge of parts of the loch shore largely on the eastern side of Loch Ness. The affected area of the LCT would experience change to the perceptual aspects of the landscape, including alteration to the simple linear visual composition of bands of land, water and sky and the visual focus directed along the glen or across the water being altered due to the addition of the construction activity at the loch shore and extending into the waterbody of Loch Ness. The construction works at the Headpond would be perceptible from pockets of the LCT within the waterbody towards the northern and southern head of the loch and on the loch shore on both the eastern and western side of the loch. There are minimal areas where both the LCW and the Headpond would both be perceptible, which lessens the perceived change. The movement of construction vehicles along a section of existing forestry track off the A831 would be in close proximity to the LCT, however is unlikely to be perceptible due to the containment by forestry plantation. Any indirect changes on the setting of the LCT, associated with the Temporary Construction Compounds, including Tunnel Portals, and Temporary Access Tracks, largely located in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie, would be	Moderate adverse (significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	perceived in small parts of the LCT, predominantly within the northern part. The works would be at a distance affecting views across the loch to the surrounding moorland, albeit within the context of existing forestry plantation activity. The construction noise would also affect the tranquillity of the LCT in a localised area, albeit in the context of the A82. A number of the key characteristics would remain unchanged, including the contrast between the busier western side of the loch and quieter eastern side of the loch, the landform of the glen and deep loch, albeit with a localised alteration at the loch side, the presence of large-scale conifer forests and agricultural land. Construction lighting requirements would include navigational buoys at the LCW, the tower crane lit at the LCW in low light levels and lighting from occasional movement of construction craft across Loch Ness. There would be wide geographical extent of influence across the LCT due to the openness across the water body of Loch Ness which would have a localised effect on areas of uninhabited land between settlements. This would be in the context of existing lighting on the loch shore in close proximity, including watercraft and the settlement of Foyers. Overall, there would be a localised direct effect on the LCT associated with the LCW. However, due to the openness across the water body of Loch Ness, there would be a wider influence across the LCT associated with the scale of construction plant and activity which would appear uncharacteristic within an otherwise stretch of undeveloped shoreline. This would be in combination with movement across the loch associated with the transportation of construction material. The change would be less pronounced due to the context of similar development and cranes present at the loch shore at Foyers and the large scale of the landscape. The remainder of key characteristics of the LCT would remain intact. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond, Tunnel Portals and LCW would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Medium**	
	<u>Operation (Year 1)</u> At Operation year 1, the permanent infrastructure of the LCW would be directly located in a small part of the LCT. This would be a physical intervention in an otherwise relatively undeveloped shoreline in the LCT, however this would be within the context of the adjacent A82 road corridor and Foyers Power Station on the opposite side of the loch. The LCW would share a similar horizontal extent of the loch shore as Foyers Power Station but much reduced vertical scale and mass with no buildings present. The permanent loss of a section of mature loch side broad leaved vegetation, part of which is designated as ancient woodland, which is a key characteristic feature of the loch shore would alter the contrast between the broadleaf woodland and forestry in a small part of the LCT. The localised alteration to the landform to facilitate the LCW with a retaining structure would not be dissimilar to the rock stabilisation techniques adopted along sections of the A82 corridor. Whilst this would be experienced across a large geographical extent of the LCT, the large-scale nature of the landscape due to the vast expanse of Loch Ness would also lessen the perception of the scale of the works. Whilst the elevated bridge structure would appear relatively apparent against the backcloth of newly planted, but yet established, slope and shoreline, the treatment of the abutments and bridge deck using a system of timber panels would screen the concrete deck and create a more natural treatment and visually recessive structure and bridge profile. The timber structure would continue around the edge of the smolt screen and the diffusers which would add accents of natural materials across the new structure. The LCW platform would be broken up using a variety of muted surface treatments reflecting the colours in the landscape and natural rock tones. Areas of raised planting beds with native understorey and tree planting would begin to break up and soften the retaining wall and the newly created rocky shoreline in between the diffusers would further integrate the LCW into the loch shore landscape. Motion-sensor lighting would be required at the LCW along with navigational lighting around part of the smolt	Minor adverse (not significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	screen. Whilst this would be perceptible across a relatively wide geographical influence across the LCT due to the openness across the water body of Loch Ness, this would be in the context of existing lighting on the loch shore at Foyers and vehicle headlights on the A82. At Operation, the water level changes within Loch Ness would occur more frequently than the existing fluctuating levels because of the Proposed Development, although this is not considered to result in any material alteration to the appearance of the loch shore which along with the horizontal nature of the loch surface, would remain unaffected. Further details relating to potential effects on cultural heritage assets within the LCT, such as Cherry Island crannog, are contained in **Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage (Volume 2: Main Report)**. The operational infrastructure at the Headpond would be perceptible from pockets of the LCT, experienced from the loch towards the northern and southern head of the loch and on the loch shore on both the eastern and western side of the loch. There are few areas where both the LCW and the Headpond would both be perceptible, which lessens the perceived change. The movement of maintenance vehicles along a section of existing forestry track off the A831 would be in close proximity to the LCT, however this is unlikely to be perceptible due to the containment by forestry plantation. The Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds would also be perceptible from parts of the LCT. This would generally be from small parts in the northern section however there would be a considerable area with influence from occasional maintenance activity on the existing Alltsigh access track. Due to this being an existing track and the context of forestry Operations in the wider landscape, this is not considered to have an adverse effect on the LCT. A number of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain unchanged, including the contrast between the busier western side of the loch and quieter eastern side of the loch, the landform of the glen and deep loch, albeit with a localised alteration at the loch side, the presence of large-scale conifer forests and agricultural land. The simple linear and enclosed visual composition of bands of land, water and sky would remain as would the long skylines of even height with the glen and loch as unifying features. Whilst the LCW would create a new visual focus along the western shoreline, the careful use of natural materials to break up the access road and platform, lack of buildings and limited vertical structures would ensure that the visual focus directed along the linear route of the glen and up to the skyline would remain uninterrupted. Overall, there would be a localised direct effect on the LCT associated with the LCW. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	
	<u>Operation (Year 15)</u> At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the LCW would have established, reinstating a wooded shoreline around the infrastructure and integrating the bridge piers into the landscape. Whilst there would remain a localised direct effect on the LCT the vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain unaffected by the Proposed Development. Magnitude of effect: **Low**	Minor adverse (not significant)

Table 2-4 LCT 220 - Rugged Massif - Inverness

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 6.36 km LCW: 8.44 km Value: **High** Susceptibility: **High** The openness of the landscape with expansive views from hill tops, vegetation cover and sense of remoteness and wildness are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the large-scale landscape does lessen the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the LCT. There would be very limited perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT due to a lack of intervisibility and distance from the works in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
	Construction During Construction, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT. Based on ZTV coverage, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would cover small pockets of elevated land where the perceptual influence of the construction works associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Temporary Construction Compounds and Temporary Access Tracks may be experienced. The geographical area experiencing the change would be limited to areas of higher land, including Burach and Carn Dubh. Such pockets lie adjacent to large-scale forestry plantation with existing tracks, lie at a similar topography to the works to the Headpond and near to the settlements of Invermoriston and Fort Augustus so have existing influence from human activity and are considered to be less wild and remote than other parts of the LCT. The scale and movement introduced by the construction activity would diminish the scenic quality of the expansive views of adjacent straths and landscape character types from the LCT, however noting the existing influence of coniferous plantation and settlement in close proximity which lessens the degree of influence. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets of elevated land within the LCT, and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
	Operation (Year 1) At Operation year 1, there would be no direct influences of the Proposed Development on the LCT. As during Construction, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small areas of perceptual influence of the permanent infrastructure associated with the Headpond, Secondary Bund, Permanent Access Tracks, Permanent Compounds on elevated land. The scale of the permanent infrastructure would slightly diminish the scenic quality of the expansive views experienced, however noting the existing influence of coniferous plantation and settlement in close proximity which lessens the degree of influence. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets on elevated land and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	Operation (Year 15) At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the Headpond would assist in partial containment of the permanent infrastructure and would reduce perceptual effects on the LCT. The changes would be similar to that of year 1 Operation due to the limited effects arising from the Proposed Development on the key characteristics of the LCT. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Table 2-5 LCT 221 - Rolling Uplands - Inverness

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 8.16 km LCW: 6.14 km Value: **Medium**	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the LCT. There would be very limited perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT due to a lack of intervisibility and distance from the works in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. Any perception of works to the upgrade of the existing forestry track would be in the context of existing forestry activity, which would reduce any changes to key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
Susceptibility: **Medium** The strong sense of remoteness of the uninhabited interior, expansive views across the LCT and the uniformity of the coverage of heather moorland dominating provides limited opportunity to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the presence of large-scale wind farms and the large-scale, simple landform lessens the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **Medium** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be medium.	Construction During Construction, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT. Based on ZTV coverage, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets of perceptual influence of the construction works associated with the Headpond, a very small pocket of perceptual influence of the construction works at both the Headpond and LCW and a very small pocket of influence from Temporary Construction Compounds. The geographical area experiencing the change would be largely limited to areas of higher land near to Carn Easgann Bana in the southern part of the LCT, where there is existing influence from large-scale wind farm development on a similar elevation to the south east, and a small pocket on the periphery of the northern edge of the LCT near to the B851. There would also be indirect influence from Temporary Access Tracks, however the majority of influence across the LCT would be from construction traffic using existing tracks only. This lessens the influence of change due to existing activity on such routes and in the context of forestry Operations. The scale and movement introduced by the construction activity would slightly diminish the strong sense of remoteness evident from the interior although this would be limited to small pockets of the LCT where the presence of large-scale wind farms and the distance from the construction activity would substantially limit the impression of change. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets, largely on the edge of the LCT, and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and LCW would be short-term.	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	
	Operation (Year 1) At Operation year 1, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT. The indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets of perceptual influence from the Headpond, LCW and small pockets of influence from the Permanent Compounds on elevated land. There would also be indirect influence from the Permanent Access Tracks, however the majority of influence across the LCT would be from existing tracks only. This lessens the influence of change due to existing activity on such routes and in the context of forestry Operations. The presence of the permanent infrastructure on the moorland plateau and the steep-sided glen would slightly diminish the strong sense of remoteness evident from nearer to the interior although this would be limited to small, occasional pockets of the LCT where the presence of large-scale wind farms and the distance from the operational infrastructure would substantially limit the impression of change. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. New planting within the landscape around the Headpond and at the LCW would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets, largely on the edge of the LCT, and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
	Operation (Year 15) At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the LCW and near to the Headpond would assist in partial containment of the permanent infrastructure and would reduce perceptual effects on the LCT. The changes would be similar to that of year 1 Operation due to the distance between the pockets of the LCT affected and the Proposed Development. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Table 2-6 LCT 224 - Farmed and Wooded Foothills

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 4.40 km LCW: 2.24 km Value: **High** Susceptibility**: Medium** The upper slopes of the LCT provide extensive and panoramic views which contrast with the extensive coverage of forestry and woodland, the complexity of the geology and the enclosed lower slopes of the LCT which collectively offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Proposed Development. The diverse land uses across the LCT and contrast in landscape pattern between parts of the LCT reduce the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the LCT. There would be very limited perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT due to a lack of intervisibility and distance from the works in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. Any perception of works to the upgrade of the existing forestry track would be in the context of existing forestry plantation activity, which would reduce any changes to key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
	Construction During Construction, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT as construction activities would be located within an adjacent LCT. As such, effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of the LCT. Based on ZTV coverage, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to pockets of perceptual influence of the construction works associated with the Headpond, LCW, Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds. The majority of these pockets are located within areas of large-scale forestry plantation, as such in reality there would be a very limited impression of any change concerning outward views, and several high points on the moor open slopes and summits including Creag na h-lolaire and Tom Bailgeann. Panoramic views from the open, upper slopes would be affected by the nature, scale and movement introduced by the construction activity. The openness of the views would be unaffected but the scenic qualities relating to the panoramic views would be partially affected, however noting the existing influence of large-scale forestry plantation and felling patterns which are typically of high influence within the LCT itself. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. Overall, many of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected and the geographic area of the LCT within the Study Area that would be indirectly affected by the Proposed Development during Construction would be very limited resulting in a very slight alteration to the landscape receptor. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and LCW would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)
	Operation (Year 1) At Operation year 1, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT. The indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to pockets of perceptual influence of the Headpond, LCW, Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds from several high points on the moor open slopes and summits. Limited sections of these open, upper slopes where panoramic views are a characteristic of the LCT would be partially influenced at a distance by the presence of the permanent infrastructure. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development.	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	New planting within the landscape around the Headpond and at the LCW would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. Overall, most key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected and the geographic area of the LCT within the Study Area that would be indirectly affected by the Proposed Development at Operation would be very limited. The duration of change would be long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	
	Operation (Year 15) At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the LCW and landscape surrounding the Headpond would assist in partial integration of the permanent infrastructure into the landscape and would reduce perceptual effects on the LCT. The changes would be similar to that of year 1 Operation due to the limited effects arising from the Proposed Development on the key characteristics of the LCT. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse (not significant)

Table 2-7 LCT 226 - Wooded Glen - Inverness

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 5.16 km LCW: 6.47 km Value: Medium	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be direct works in a small part of the LCT associated with the localised widening of the existing forestry track and its use to convey the Pre-Construction and Enabling works traffic. The works would have a very slight alteration to the key characteristics of the LCT due to the existing forestry Operations in this locality. There would be very limited perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT relating to works near to the River Coiltie due to a lack of intervisibility and presence of extensive swathes of intervening forestry plantation. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**
Susceptibility: **High** The intimate landscape pattern, sense of naturalness and remoteness traversing the upper glens, generally small-scale landscape and extensive vegetation cover across much of the LCT provides limited opportunity to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the context of the extensive conifer forests with existing access tracks and the	Construction During Construction, the direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT would be limited to construction plant movement along existing forestry tracks in the upper glens along a Temporary Access Track. The geographic area over which the change would be experienced would be highly limited due to the containment from the existing forestry vegetation and the activity would not be dissimilar to some of the movement associated with the existing forestry Operations within the LCT which reduces the sense of naturalness and remoteness in this part of the LCT. There would be highly localised indirect influence on the LCT from other aspects of the Proposed Development, including the Headpond and Temporary Construction Compounds including Tunnel Portals, which intervisibility would be limited by containment from existing vegetation cover in the LCT and wider landscape. The remaining key characteristics, linking to the intimate, semi-enclosed landscape, land use across the LCT and vegetation pattern, would remain intact.	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
major through road through the lower glens slightly lessens the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	It should be noted that part of the core path network, Glen Coiltie walking loop and the Affric Kintail Way recreational route would be rerouted during the Construction phase. These routes would be in close proximity to and similar in nature to the existing route and would not affect the recreational resource of the LCT. Overall, the construction operations within the LCT would be highly limited and would have a very slight alteration to the landscape receptor in a localised part of the LCT. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and Tunnel Portals would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	
	Operation (Year 1) At Operation year, there would be occasional maintenance traffic movement along the Permanent Access Track directly within the LCT. This would not be dissimilar to existing forestry Operations within the LCT. The geographic area over which the change would be experienced would be highly limited due to the containment from the existing forestry vegetation. There would be highly localised indirect influence on the LCT from other aspects of the Proposed Development, which would be limited by containment from existing vegetation cover in the LCT and wider landscape. The remaining key characteristics, linking to the intimate, semi-enclosed landscape, land use across the LCT and vegetation pattern, would remain intact. Overall, the operational maintenance traffic within the LCT would be highly limited and would have a very slight alteration to the landscape receptor in a localised part of the LCT. The duration of change would long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**
	Operation (Year 15) At Operation year 15, the changes would be similar to that of year 1 Operation. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**

Table 2-8 LCT 227 - Farmed Strath - Inverness

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Approximate distance to the Proposed Development: Headpond: 5.24 km LCW: 3.13 km Value: **Medium** Susceptibility: **High** The complex landscape pattern of the straths, the intricate vegetation patterns of the riparian trees and woodlands which create contrast to the setting of the adjacent uplands and enclosure within the LCT provides limited opportunity to accommodate the Proposed Development. However, the presence of the local road network and influence of human activity and built form slightly lessens the susceptibility. Landscape Sensitivity: **High** Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.	Pre-Construction and Enabling At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be no direct works within the LCT. There would be very limited perceptual effects on the setting of the LCT due to a lack of intervisibility and distance from the works in a small part of the landscape near to the River Coiltie. Any perception of works to the upgrade of the existing forestry track would be in the context of existing forestry activity, which would limit any changes to key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	**Negligible adverse** (not significant)
	Construction During Construction, there would be no direct influence of the Proposed Development on the LCT. Based on ZTV coverage, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets of perceptual influence of the construction works associated with the Headpond and Temporary Construction Compounds. The geographical area experiencing the change would largely be limited to small pockets within the northern part of the LCT near the B851 and B862 which is partly in an area of coniferous vegetation. There would also be indirect influence from Temporary Access Tracks, however any influence of new tracks would be limited to small parts of the LCT and the remaining area of influence from construction traffic using existing forest tracks would be equally limited by the context of forestry Operations, such that the change would be imperceptible. The scale and movement introduced by the construction activity would have an influence on the outward views from the LCT, but it should be noted that views are generally directed along the strath, which would be unaffected. The scale of change would be reduced partly due to the distance which reduces the impression of change and the existing influence within the LCT from the road network and coniferous vegetation cover which detracts from scenic quality but also provides containment to the LCT. The vast majority of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected by the Proposed Development. Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond would be short-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**
	Operation (Year 1) At Operation year 1, there would be no direct influences of the Proposed Development on the LCT. As during Construction, the indirect influence on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets of perceptual influence of the Operational Headpond and Permanent Compounds. There would also be indirect influence from Permanent Access Tracks, however any influence of new tracks would be limited to small parts of the LCT and the remaining area influence from occasional maintenance traffic on existing tracks which lessens the influence of change due to the existing activity and context of forestry Operations. The scale of the permanent infrastructure on the moorland plateau would have an influence on the outward views from the LCT but it should be noted that views are generally directed along the strath, which would be unaffected. New planting within the landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation.	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	Overall, the indirect effects on the setting of the LCT would be limited to small pockets and there would be a very limited alteration to any of the key characteristics of the LCT. The duration of change would long-term. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	
	Operation (Year 15) At Operation year 15, the new planting near to the Headpond would have established and would further reduce perceptual effects on the LCT. The changes would be similar to that of year 1 Operation due to the distance between the pockets of the LCT affected and Proposed Development. Magnitude of effect: **Very low**	Negligible adverse **(not significant)**

3. Cumulative Landscape Effects

3.1.1 The following tables provide an assessment of the potential cumulative effects on landscape receptors at year 15 of Operation of the Proposed Development based on the scenarios set out in **Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual (Volume 2: Main Report), Figure 6.8 Cumulative Schemes (Scenario 1) and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3: Figures)** and **Figure 6.9 Cumulative Schemes (Scenario 2) and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3 Figures)**.

3.1.2 Once the Proposed Development is in Operation, the principal parts of the Proposed Development that influence landscape character are limited to the Headpond, LCW and GIS Switchyard, therefore this assessment of cumulative landscape effects focuses on these parts of the Proposed Development. For the purposes of this assessment the following assumptions have been made:

- The Proposed Development would have a grid connection to Bingally substation. Although overhead lines are not part of these proposals a worst-case straight-line connection has been assumed at this stage and is included as Glen Earrach PSH grid connection; and
- The cumulative assessment is based on the information about the cumulative schemes that is available at the time of writing.

Table 3-1 Cumulative Landscape Effects - Landscape Designations

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this SLA: Foyers PSH, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Loch Na Cathrach PSH and Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this SLA: Foyers PSH, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Loch Na Cathrach PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station Loch Kemp PSH, Foyers Power Station extension and Dell 2 Wind Farm	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located within the SLA which have the potential for direct cumulative change. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including hydro schemes and a short section of OHL across the SLA which are apparent in the long vistas and contribute to offering a human scale against the vast open water of Loch Ness. Such cumulative schemes are generally located near to the loch shore of Loch Ness and are dispersed throughout the SLA with no clusters or patterns. The setting of the SLA is also influenced by various wind farms within the landscape to the east and west as well as hydro schemes interspersed in the wider landscape. The presence of wind farms, pylons and masts are noted in the published SLA citation. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be located across the majority of the waterbody of Loch Ness, the majority of the eastern loch shore	**Scenario 1** Minor adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Minor adverse (not significant)

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
		of Loch Ness with areas further inland typically on higher ground on the foothills and pockets on the western loch shore and higher plateau and massif landscape. The intervisibility would be perceptible within the long vistas available within the SLA. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would locally increase the presence of energy infrastructure into a small geographic area of the SLA however this would be apparent across a wider area of the SLA due to the long vistas available. The majority of this influence would be from the LCW due to its locality on the loch shore and this location would be consistent with the existing sporadic nature of existing interventions of energy development at the loch shore. The influence of the Headpond would result in new energy development within a more elevated part of the SLA which differs from the existing locations at the loch shore, however the influence of this part of the Proposed Development would be less pronounced due to the surrounding landform offering containment. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would not affect many of the key characteristics and special qualities of the SLA, including the landform trench and the less built-up southern slopes of Loch Ness. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy infrastructure, largely limited to the LCW, across the SLA but would be consistent with the existing pattern and scale of energy infrastructure. The addition of the Proposed Development, due to the scale of the SLA and key characteristics including the landform trench and long vistas unaffected, is considered to have a limited effect on the scenic quality of the SLA. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**	

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
		The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure. There would be another PSH at the loch shore and a power station extension, which would locally increase the presence of energy infrastructure at the central part of the loch shore on the eastern side of Loch Ness. There would also be further wind farms outside of the SLA with perceptual influence. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the SLA. The addition of the Proposed Development would increase the presence of energy infrastructure at the central part of the loch shore however would retain separation as it would be on the opposite side of the loch. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would remain **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).	

Table 3-2 Cumulative Landscape Effects - Landscape Character Types

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
LCT 222 - Rocky Moorland Plateau - Inverness	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Coiltie Hydro, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension and Corrimony Wind Farm **Scenario 2**	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The Headpond and GIS Switchyard would be located within the LCT which has the potential for direct cumulative change. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including a hydro scheme, mast and wind farms which influence the openness, little active land use, remoteness and lack of pattern within the moorland plateau and also the perception of scale as the infrastructure adds elements of known size. Such cumulative schemes consist of a cluster of wind farms, a small hydro scheme within forestry and a mast within the open moorland. The setting of the LCT is also influenced by further wind farms to the east of Loch Ness and various other energy infrastructure including hydro and a short section of OHL. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be located across pockets of the LCT due to landform changes across the LCT offering some containment. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would locally increase the presence of energy infrastructure in a small geographic area of the LCT within the open moorland. The Proposed Development would introduce energy infrastructure in a gap between the wind farm cluster and mast, and	**Scenario 1** Minor adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Minor adverse (not significant)

	Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Coiltie Hydro, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Corrimony Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Extension Wind Farm Grid Connection Works, Loch Liath Wind farm, Glen Earrach PSH grid connection, Bingally 400 kV Substation, Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Chrathaich Wind Farm and Fiodhag Wind Farm	the hydro scheme, however due to the containment of the hydro scheme from forestry, the containment of the Proposed Development due to the landform and the Proposed Development being a different type of development to the vertical features of the wind farms and mast, the addition is not considered to alter the pattern across the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development would locally lessen the remoteness quality of the LCT, however its relative proximity in relation to the wider LCT to the cumulative baseline schemes would reduce this impact. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy infrastructure within a small part of the large-scale LCT and would be apparent within a limited geographic area due to the landform pattern. The addition of the Proposed Development is considered to have a limited additional effect on the perceptual elements of the landscape, including remoteness and sense of scale. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)** The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure. This would include further wind farms, OHLs and a substation. This would considerably increase the size of the cluster of wind farms and add further influence of energy infrastructure across a larger extent of the LCT. There would also be further wind farms outside of the LCT with perceptual influence. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as it would retain separation due to intervening landform and a different type of development to the wind farm cluster and mast, however, would be close enough to lessen influence on the remoteness quality of the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would remain **low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).	
LCT 225 - Broad Steep-Sided Glen	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Foyers PSH, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Loch Na Cathrach PSH and Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Foyers PSH, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Loch	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The LCW would be located within the LCT which has the potential for direct cumulative change and the Headpond would be perceptible therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including hydro schemes and a short section of OHL across the LCT which influence the simple linear composition of bands of land, water and sky and typically pockets of uninhabited land at the loch shore. Such cumulative schemes are generally located near to the loch shore of Loch Ness and are dispersed throughout the LCT with no clusters or patterns. The setting of the LCT is also influenced by various wind farms within the landscape to the east and west as well as hydro schemes interspersed in the wider landscape. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be located across the majority of the waterbody of Loch Ness, the majority of the eastern loch shore of Loch Ness and pockets on the western loch shore. The intervisibility would be perceptible within the long vistas available within the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would locally increase the presence of energy infrastructure into a small geographic area of the LCT at the loch shore however this would be apparent across a wider area of the LCT due to the long vistas available. The location would be consistent with the existing sporadic nature of existing interventions of energy development at the loch shore. The influence of the Headpond would result in new energy development within the setting of the LCT and would have a slight alteration on the visual focus to the skyline. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would not affect many of the key characteristics of the LCT, including the landform of the glen and loch and the quieter eastern side of Loch Ness. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy infrastructure across the LCT but would be consistent with the existing pattern and scale of energy infrastructure. The addition of the Proposed Development, due to the scale of	**Scenario 1** Minor adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Minor adverse (not significant)

	Na Cathrach PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station Loch Kemp PSH and Foyers Power Station extension	the LCT and key characteristics including the landform unaffected, is considered to have a limited effect on the scenic quality of the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)** The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure. There would be another PSH at the loch shore and a power station extension, which would locally increase the presence of energy infrastructure at the central part of the loch shore on the eastern side of Loch Ness. There would also be further wind farms outside of the LCT with perceptual influence. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development would increase the presence of energy infrastructure at the central part of the loch shore however would retain separation as it would be on the opposite side of the loch. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would remain **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).	
LCT 220 - Rugged Massif - Inverness	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: None **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Millennium East Wind Farm and Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The cumulative baseline scenario does not include any energy infrastructure directly within the LCT but the setting of the LCT is influenced by various energy infrastructure schemes in the wider landscape, including wind farms and a power station, which are located in the expansive views from elevated parts of the LCT. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development, limited to the Headpond, and cumulative schemes would be limited to small pockets on higher points within the LCT. The presence of the A887 and surrounding forestry plantation would reduce the scenic quality and sense of remoteness and wildness experienced from the small pockets within the LCT. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the northern setting of the LCT but limited to small geographic areas. This would have a limited effect on the sense of remoteness and wildness due to existing detracting features and would have a limited influence on the expansive views due to the scale of the surrounding landscape and landform providing containment to parts of the Proposed Development. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)** The cumulative baseline scenario would include energy infrastructure schemes directly located within the LCT at Scenario 2, including a wind farm and OHL. There would also be additional influence of energy infrastructure on the setting of the LCT, including further wind farms to the north. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as it would remain to have a limited influence on the remoteness and wildness qualities of the LCT and expansive views from the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).	**Scenario 1** Negligible adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Negligible adverse (not significant)

LCT 221 - Rolling Uplands - Inverness	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection and Cloiche Wind Farm **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Cloiche Wind Farm and Dell 2 Wind Farm	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The cumulative baseline scenario would include two wind farms and a short section of OHL in one part of the LCT and access tracks to another wind farm in a very small part of the LCT. The setting of the LCT would also be influenced by further energy infrastructure schemes in the wider landscape, including wind farms and hydro schemes which are visible from the expansive views from more elevated parts of the LCT. The remoteness of the LCT has existing influence from the number of large wind farm developments, as noted in the published description of key characteristics. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to very small pockets on higher points within the LCT. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the western setting of the LCT but limited to very small geographic areas. This would have a limited effect the sense of remoteness and expansive views from the LCT due to the existing presence of energy development both directly within and within the setting of the LCT, the distance between the LCT and the Proposed Development, the highly limited intervisibility with the Proposed Development and the proximity of the Proposed Development to the more inhabited western side of Loch Ness. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)** The cumulative baseline scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 but would include another wind farm. There would be additional influence of energy infrastructure on the setting of the LCT, including further wind farms to the west, a power station extension at the loch shore and a hydro scheme. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as it would remain to have a limited influence on the remoteness quality of the LCT and expansive views from the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).	**Scenario 1** Negligible adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Negligible adverse (not significant)
LCT 224 - Farmed and Wooded Foothills	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: None **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Loch Kemp PSH	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The cumulative baseline scenario would not include any energy infrastructure schemes directly within the LCT but the setting of the LCT would be influenced by wind farms, hydro schemes and OHL where visible as there is extensive mature vegetation and forestry plantation within the LCT which provides containment and restricts outward views in parts. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to small pockets on higher points within the LCT where there is no mature woodland and plantation forestry cover to screen views. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the setting of the LCT but limited to small geographic areas. This would have a limited effect on the panoramic views from such points within the LCT due to small parts of these that the Proposed Development would influence and existing energy infrastructure in similar parts from the panoramic views. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**	**Scenario 1** Negligible adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Negligible adverse (not significant)

		The cumulative baseline scenario would include a hydro scheme and there would be additional influence of energy infrastructure on the setting of the LCT, including further wind farms, OHL and a power station extension where visible. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as it would remain to have a limited influence on the panoramic views from the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).	
LCT 226 - Wooded Glen - Inverness	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Shenval Hydro, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Gartally Micro-hydro and Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Shenval Hydro, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Gartally Micro-hydro, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Millennium East Wind Farm, Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in and Cnoc Farasd Wind Farm	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. As there would be highly limited intervisibility with the principal parts of the Proposed Development, it is not considered that the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would affect the key characteristics of the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **none**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **no change** (not significant). **Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)** The effects at Scenario 2 would be the same as Scenario 1 due to the lack of intervisibility between the LCT and the principal parts of the Proposed Development. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **none**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **no change** (not significant).	**Scenario 1** No change (not significant) **Scenario 2** No change (not significant)
LCT 227 - Farmed Strath - Inverness	**Scenario 1** Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Corriegarth Wind Farm **Scenario 2** Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Corriegarth Wind Farm and Dell 2 Wind Farm .	**Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)** The principal parts of the Proposed Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The cumulative baseline scenario would include the access tracks of a wind farm and the setting of the LCT would be influenced by wind farms, hydro schemes and OHL where visible as there are pockets of mature vegetation and forestry plantation within the LCT. The influence of existing energy infrastructure on the setting of the LCT would affect the perception of the setting of adjacent rugged, remote uplands. Views within the LCT are generally directed along the strath which would have limited influence from energy infrastructure. The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to a small area in the Strathnairn/Stratherrick strath of the LCT. This part of the LCT has existing influence from mature woodland and forestry plantation which restricts outward views and the B851 and B862 which reduces the scenic quality. Overall, the addition of the Proposed Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the setting of the LCT but limited to a small geographic area. This would have a limited effect on the perception of the remote, rugged uplands in	**Scenario 1** Negligible adverse (not significant) **Scenario 2** Negligible adverse (not significant)

the surrounding landscape as there would be the perception of existing energy infrastructure in similar parts from the views. The Proposed Development would also not affect the views directed along the strath.

The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)

The cumulative baseline scenario would include another access track to a wind farm and there would be additional influence of energy infrastructure on the setting of the LCT, including further wind farms and OHL where visible.

The likely intervisibility between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes would slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within and within the setting of the LCT. This would continue to be limited in the views directed along the strath. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as it would remain to have a limited effect on the perception of the remote, rugged uplands in the surrounding landscape and views along the strath.

The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Glen Earrach AECOM