March 2025

# Glen Earrach Pumped Storage Hydro

## Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Volume 5: Appendices
Appendix 6.3: Visual Assessment

Glen Earrach Energy Ltd

Glen Earrach AECOM

## Quality information

| Prepared by | Checked by | Verified by | Approved by |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alex Crossley<br>Landscape Architect<br>Charlotte Williams<br>Principal Landscape Architect | Charlotte Williams<br>Principal Landscape Architect | Ruth Mauritzen<br>Associate Director | David Lee<br>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.

- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2A Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Headpond and Embankments;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2B Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Lower Control Works;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2C Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Secondary Bund;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2D Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Temporary Construction and Permanent Compounds;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2E Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Construction Tracks;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2F Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Permanent Tracks;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.2G Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Operational Elements Combined and Permanent Tracks;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.6 Local Walking Routes, Recreational Routes, Core Paths and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility; and**
- **Volume 3, Figure 6.7 Viewpoints and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility.**

1.1.2 The visual assessment is also supported by a package of visualisations from each of the 13 viewpoints at Operation (year 1) and Operation (year 15), which are presented in **Volume 4: Visualisations**.

1.1.3 All landscape and visual mitigation is 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** associated **Figures 6.4.1 to 6.4.3.**

# 2. Visual Assessment

2.1.1 This appendix provides a detailed assessment of the significance of effects on visual 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 visual receptors. The assessment is set out in the following tables:

- Table 2-1 Viewpoint 1: Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit
- Table 2-2 Viewpoint 2: Settlement of Foyers
- Table 2-3 Viewpoint 3: Foyers Campsite
- Table 2-4 Viewpoint 4: Great Glen Way and Bunloit Road near Bunloit
- Table 2-5 Viewpoint 5: Beach near to Loch Ness View off the B852
- Table 2-6 Viewpoint 6: Great Glen Way near Urquhart Castle
- Table 2-7 Viewpoint 7: Dores Beach
- Table 2-8 Viewpoint 8: Suidhe Viewpoint off the B862
- Table 2-9 Viewpoint 9: Loch Ness, canoeists and pleasure craft
- Table 2-10 Viewpoint 10: B862 and Loch Ness 360 Trail near to Fort Augustus
- Table 2-11 Viewpoint 11: Core Path to the north west of Fort Augustus
- Table 2-12 Viewpoint 12: Local walking users off the Core Path network and Glen Coiltie Walking Loop
- Table 2-13 Viewpoint 13: A82 layby
- Table 4-1 Cumulative Visual Effects

2.1.2 Approximate distances are given below from each of the visual receptors to relevant parts of the Proposed Development. This includes the permanent elements of the Lower Control Works and the embankments ((Main Dam and Saddle Dams 1 and 2) and 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 visual 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 duration of Construction in relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment methodology is set out within **Appendix 6.1 Landscape and Visual Methodology (Volume 5: Appendices)**. 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);
- Lower Control Works Construction: three years (short-term); and
- Tunnel Portal Construction: less than one year (short-term) at different points in the programme.

### Table 2-1 Viewpoint 1: Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 0.27 km<br>Lower Control Works: 2.33 km<br><br>Located within LCT 222: Rocky Moorland Plateau - Inverness (near to the boundary of LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen)<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of those recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform, including Glas-bheinn Bheag.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Headpond including the Main Dam, Saddle Dam 1 and Saddle Dam 2, as well as Temporary Construction Compounds including tunnel portal 4, the Secondary Bund and Temporary Access Tracks would be visible directly in the foreground and middle ground of the view. This would include extensive earthworks and movement into an otherwise tranquil and wild landscape. The Construction activity associated with the Headpond would be set against the rising landform however would dominate the view, due to the scale of change in the view, the degree of contrast to the existing rocky moorland plateau and proximity to the receptor.<br><br>The changes to the view would not affect or screen the landform of Glas-bheinn Mhòr in the middle ground or the distant views of mountains on the skyline due to the elevated positioning of the receptor. Nor would it affect the part of the view with panoramic views of Loch Ness, extending from the north east to the south west. The construction activity would be set within the context of an existing wind farm in the background of the view (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm), however, would be much closer to the viewpoint receptor. The background of the view, including the large-scale plateau with the backcloth of the massif and mountains, which forms an important part of the view and which the eye is drawn to, would not be affected.<br><br>The activity associated with the Temporary Access Tracks and construction of the Temporary Construction Compounds and Secondary Bund on elevated ground near to the Headpond would extend from the foreground of the view into the middle ground. This would introduce further movement into an otherwise relatively still view and would extend the influence of construction activity across the horizontal extent of the view.<br><br>It should be noted that for users of the walk to the Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit, the majority of the walk would not be affected by the construction activity of the Headpond due to intervening landform. There would be views associated with construction vehicles moving along the Temporary Access Tracks across the rocky moorland plateau in the middle ground and background of the views which would contrast from the existing limited movement across the landscape. Further to the north west of the viewpoint location, the construction activity would extend over a larger part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view as less would be screened by intervening landform. | Major adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions and lighting rigs in remote locations, including the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources visible across parts of the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness although could experience it during periods of low light levels (dawn and dusk) when the lighting would be apparent.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be a substantial change to the composition of the foreground view. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and tunnel portals would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very high** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 1)</u><br>At Operation year 1, there would be direct views of the Headpond waterbody, Main Dam, Saddle Dam 1, Saddle Dam 2, Secondary Bund, Permanent Compounds, including tunnel portal 4, and Permanent Access Tracks in the foreground and middle ground of the view. This would introduce large-scale infrastructure into an otherwise uninterrupted view which contains limited human influence apart from the presence of the more distant wind farm (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm). The changes would occupy a large proportion of the horizontal extent of the view. The rock treatment of the Main Dam, Saddle Dam 1 and Saddle Dam 2 would be noticeable in the view and would contrast with the existing landscape. The Proposed Development would be set within a large-scale landscape, which lessens the scale of change, however due to the proximity to the receptor, the changes would remain noticeable. The views towards Loch Ness would remain unaffected by the Proposed Development.<br><br>Periodic maximum drawdown of water within the Headpond reservoir would reveal the exposed rock face which along with the engineered cut slopes of the Borrow Pit and Upper Control Works would contrast in colour and profile with the adjacent landscape, appearing prominent within the view. However, at top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to other upland lochs within the view. This would be set within the context of a landscape with the presence of lochs and lochans which reduces the degree of contrast; however, it would be seen in combination with the infrastructure of the Proposed Development with some straight edges, which reduces the naturalness of the waterbody in comparison with other natural waterbodies in the landscape. The changes to the view would continue to not affect or screen the landform of Glas-bheinn Mhòr in the middle ground or the distant views of mountains which define the skyline.<br><br>The Permanent Access Tracks, the Permanent Compounds and Secondary Bund on elevated land would extend from the foreground of the view into the middle ground. This would introduce further movement into an otherwise relatively still view and would extend the influence of activity and human influence across the horizontal extent of the view. The Permanent Compounds and Secondary Bund would be visible in very small parts of the horizontal extent of the view but would be noticeable due to the human intervention contrasting with the open moorland plateau. | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | It should be noted that for users of the walk to the Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit, the majority of the walk would not be affected by Operational views of the Headpond due to intervening landform. There would be views associated with maintenance vehicles moving along the Permanent Access Tracks across the rocky moorland plateau in the middle ground and background of the views which would contrast from the existing limited movement across the landscape. Further to the northwest of the viewpoint location, the Headpond waterbody would extend over a larger part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view as less would be screened by intervening landform, however this would be less of a contrast as it would replace and extend the existing Loch nam Breac Dearga.<br><br>Operational lighting requirements would be limited to motion-sensor lighting at the Permanent Compound (tunnel portal 4). This would only be used occasionally and if required but has the potential to introduce new lighting sources into a very small part of the view which would only likely be experienced during dusk or dawn given that people are unlikely to be at the summit in darkness.<br><br>Proposed landscape and ecological mitigation in the wider landscape and around the Headpond, including montane willow scrub regeneration and planting, native woodland (including riparian) planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting would barely be 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 visual amenity.<br><br>Overall, whilst the scale and nature of the Headpond and associated dams would be a noticeable change in the foreground view, the remaining components of the view would be largely unchanged including the large-scale plateau with the backcloth of the massif and mountains. The iconic views of Loch Ness would also remain unaffected thereby limiting the overall extent of change from this summit viewpoint. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation, however any views of scarring from the Permanent Access Tracks would be less pronounced. The new planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond, including montane willow scrub regeneration and planting, native woodland (including riparian) planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting would be perceptible within the view. This would be on a lower elevation to the receptor so would not screen views towards the permanent infrastructure but would soften views towards the Permanent Access Tracks and Compounds. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape and reinforce the scenic qualities in the view.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

### Table 2-2 Viewpoint 2: Settlement of Foyers

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Residential, recreational and road users<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 4.72 km<br>Lower Control Works: 2.29 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen (near to the boundary of LCT 224: Farmed and Wooded Foothills)<br><br>Value: **Medium**<br><br>Susceptibility: **High**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of those recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint and views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **High**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None**<br><br>Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound would be visible in the background of the view. The concentration of the construction activity would be in the focal part of the view across the loch but would be heavily filtered by intervening vegetation for the majority of receptors. There would likely be more direct views experienced from upper stories for the residential receptors, which represents the worst-case scenario and upon which this assessment is based.<br><br>The construction activity would affect part of the steep-sided glen and western loch shore, introducing incongruous plant and activity into this part of the view. This would include access off the A82, jack up barges, moored barges, concrete batching plant, tall construction plant and localised earthworks. The activity would also result in the removal of mature native loch side vegetation, which, whilst seen within the context of existing gaps in the vegetation network along the loch shore would, together with the scale of construction plant be an apparent and pronounced change in the composition of the view.<br><br>The construction activity would be within the context of existing detracting forestry plantation including areas of felling and movement along the A82, however would remain to be an incongruous addition in the middle ground of the view. The remainder of the horizontal extent of the view would be largely unaffected, apart from the movement of construction barges on the loch, with the vertical extent of change also limited, especially due to the elevated position of the receptor relative to the Proposed Development, which lessens the effect on the composition of the view.<br><br>It should be noted that views from elsewhere along the B852 and Loch Ness 360 trail through the settlement of Foyers and on the core path network associated with the Falls of Foyers, intervening mature vegetation in the foreground and middle ground heavily screens views towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Lighting requirements during Construction at the Lower Control Works would include lighting of navigational buoys, the tower crane and construction barges which would be lit during periods of low light levels. This would introduce new light sources across part of the horizontal extent of the view, although it would largely be located in part of the view within which existing light sources in the settlement of Foyers are visible, including street lighting.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would result in a noticeable change to the view, directly visible across the loch from upper stories of residential properties on elevated land. Lower-level views from the road and | No change (**not significant**)<br><br>Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | footpath would be largely screened by intervening roadside planting. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Lower Control Works would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be views of the Lower Control Works in the background of the view along with occasional movement of monitoring vehicles along the existing Alltsigh Access Track. The permanent infrastructure of the Lower Control Works would be located in the focal part of the view across the loch but would be heavily filtered by intervening vegetation for the majority of receptors.<br><br>The Lower Control Works would appear in a small part of the overall horizontal and vertical extent of the view. The removal of shoreside vegetation would open up views of vehicle movement along the A82 which is currently largely screened. Whilst the elevated bridge structure would appear as a relatively noticeable element against the backcloth of newly planted, but not 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 Lower Control Works 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 help integrate the Lower Control Works into the loch shore landscape. Motion-sensor lighting would be required at the Lower Control Works along with navigational lighting around part of the smolt screen which would be seen in the context of existing light sources in Foyers including street lighting.<br><br>The occasional movement of monitoring vehicles along the existing Alltsigh Access Track is not considered to be dissimilar to existing vehicle movement on the track. It should be noted that views from elsewhere along the B852 and Loch Ness 360 trail through the settlement of Foyers and on the core path network associated with the Falls of Foyers, intervening mature vegetation in the foreground and middle ground heavily screens views towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of the Lower Control Works within a section of currently undisturbed shoreline would be a noticeable change in the composition in the background of the view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the Lower Control Works would have established, reinstating a wooded shoreline around the infrastructure and integrating the bridge piers into the landscape. The trees and understorey planting within the raised beds would break up and screen large parts of the retaining wall, lessening the scale and degree of change and assimilating the infrastructure into the loch shore. The Lower Control Works would be seen set against the rising steep-sided glen which combined with the planting and material treatment of the infrastructure would result in a largely unobtrusive change in the composition of the view.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-3 Viewpoint 3: Foyers Campsite

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Visitors and recreational users<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 3.78 km<br>Lower Control Works: 1.29 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Medium**<br><br>Susceptibility: **High**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of those recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint and views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by visitors.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **High**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None**<br><br>Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound would be directly visible in the middle ground of the view. The concentration of the construction activity would occupy the focal part of the view across the loch.<br><br>The construction activity would affect part of the steep-sided glen and western loch shore, introducing incongruous plant and activity into this part of the view. This would include access off the A82, jack up barges, moored barges, concrete batching plant, tall construction plant and localised earthworks. The activity would also result in the removal of mature native loch side vegetation, which, whilst seen within the context of existing gaps in the vegetation network along the loch shore would, together with the scale of construction plant be an apparent and pronounced change in the composition of the view.<br><br>The construction activity would be within the context of existing detracting forestry plantation including areas of felling and movement along the A82, however would remain to be an incongruous addition to the view in the middle ground of the view. The remainder of the horizontal extent of the view would be largely unaffected, apart from the movement of construction barges on the loch, with the vertical extent of change also limited due to the overall scale of the landscape in the view, which slightly lessens the effect on the composition of the view.<br><br>It should be noted that further along the beach on the core path, views are similar to that of the viewpoint location towards the Proposed Development. Elsewhere within the camping site, views are typically more screened towards the Proposed Development due to intervening mature loch side vegetation.<br><br>Lighting requirements during Construction at the Lower Control Works would include lighting of navigational buoys, the tower crane and construction barges which would be lit during periods of low light levels. This would introduce new light sources across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic, however this would largely be located in part of the view and the receptors would experience some existing light sources in the settlement of Foyers. | No change (**not significant**)<br><br>Major adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be substantial as the construction activity would be directly visible across the loch, in the middle ground and as a focus to the view. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Lower Control Works would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very high** | |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be direct views of the Lower Control Works in the middle ground of the view. The permanent infrastructure would be located in the focal part of the view across the loch and would extend into the loch, which would be less discernible from this angle as it would appear foreshortened but would nonetheless remain perceptible from this distance and within the undeveloped context of the loch shore.<br><br>The Lower Control Works would occupy a central part of the overall horizontal extent of the view. The removal of shoreside vegetation would open up views of vehicle movement along the A82 which is currently largely screened. Whilst the elevated bridge structure would appear as a relatively noticeable element against the backcloth of newly planted, but not 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 Lower Control Works 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 help integrate the Lower Control Works into the loch shore landscape. Motion-sensor lighting would be required at the Lower Control Works along with navigational lighting around part of the smolt screen which would be seen in the context of existing light sources in Foyers.<br><br>It should be noted that views from elsewhere along the B852 and Loch Ness 360 trail through the settlement of Foyers and on the core path network associated with the Falls of Foyers, intervening mature vegetation in the foreground and middle ground heavily screens views towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>It should be noted that further along the beach on the core path, views are similar to that of the viewpoint location towards the Proposed Development. Elsewhere within the camping site, views are typically more screened towards the Proposed Development due to intervening mature loch side vegetation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of the Lower Control Works within a section of currently undisturbed shoreline would be a pronounced change in the composition of the middle ground view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **High** | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the new planting associated with the Lower Control Works would have established, reinstating a wooded shoreline around the infrastructure and integrating the bridge piers into the landscape. The trees and understorey planting within the raised beds would break up and screen large parts of the retaining wall, lessening the scale and degree of change and assimilating the infrastructure into the loch shore. The Lower Control Works would be seen set against the rising steep-sided glen which combined with the planting and material treatment of the infrastructure would result in a largely unobtrusive change in the composition of the view.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-4 Viewpoint 4: Great Glen Way and Bunloit Road near Bunloit

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Residential, recreational and road users<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 4.53 km<br>Lower Control Works: 3.74 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen (near to the boundary of LCT 222: Rocky Moorland Plateau – Inverness)<br><br>Value: **Medium**<br><br>Susceptibility: **High**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of those recreational receptors on this long-distance trail and views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **High**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform. Any potential views would be likely limited to taller plant and would be in the context of forestry plantation Operations, in a very small part of the view in the distance and there would be a multitude of elements in the foreground and middle ground which would reduce the prominence, degree of contrast and scale of change in the view. The duration of change would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude: **Very low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Saddle Dam 1, Spillway, Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds would be apparent in the distant part of the view. The construction activity would be visible in one very small part of the horizontal extent of the view, associated with the Spillway, and another small part of the horizontal extent of the view associated with the Saddle Dam 1. There would be largely screened views towards the Temporary Access Tracks by intervening mature vegetation. The views to the Temporary Construction Compounds would largely be screened due to intervening landform and vegetation such that they would be barely discernible in the view.<br><br>The works associated with the Saddle Dam 1 and Spillway would be visible against the skyline and largely against the rising landform. The works associated with the Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds would be located in the view near to the distinctive outline of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh, however due to the multitude of elements in the foreground and middle ground, this distracts and screens in part from the distant skyline, which reduces the perception of the scale of change. The silhouette of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would be unaffected. There is also some existing movement in the foreground of the view associated with vehicles along Bunloit Road, which reduces the degree of contrast.<br><br>It should be noted that for users of the Great Glen Way and the local road network further along Bunloit Road to the north and south of the viewpoint location and other residential receptors off Bunloit Road, there would be some instances where views would not be available to construction activity associated with the Proposed Development due to intervening mature vegetation, however there would be pockets where parts of the construction activity would be visible which would be similar in nature to those from the viewpoint location. Receptors nearby may have more open views towards the Temporary Access Tracks which would slightly extend the horizontal extent of the view altered, albeit would remain to be small, and there would likely be views of construction traffic along, which would barely be perceptible at this distance.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions and lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources largely in one part of the view from the | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | receptor in the background which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors would include pockets of lighting associated with residential properties and farmsteads in the surrounding landscape.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be unobtrusive largely due to the intervening nature of the view between the receptor and the higher landform on the skyline in the background of the view, where the changes would be located. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 1)</u><br>At Operation year 1, there would be views of the Saddle Dam 1, the Spillway, Permanent Compound and heavily screened views of the Permanent Access Tracks by intervening mature vegetation. This would be located within two small sections of the horizontal extent of the view in the background, however the majority of permanent infrastructure would be barely perceptible so the change would largely be associated with the Saddle Dam 1 in one small part of the horizontal extent of the view.<br><br>The Saddle Dam 1 would introduce a straight section of embankment in an otherwise gently undulating skyline, however this would be relatively small in comparison to the wider section of landform visible in the background and would not be wholly dissimilar to the existing profile of where the change is occurring and other sections along the horizon. The change would be located near to the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh however the silhouette of the summit would be unaffected and the scale of the summit would lessen the perception of the scale of the Saddle Dam 1. The rock treatment of the Saddle Dam 2 would also be perceptible in the view. Due to the multitude of elements in the foreground and middle ground, this distracts and screens in part from the distant skyline, which reduces the perception of the scale of change.<br><br>It should be noted that for users of the Great Glen Way and the local road network further along Bunloit Road to the north and south of the viewpoint location and other residential receptors off Bunloit Road, there would be some instances where views would not be available to Operational infrastructure associated with the Proposed Development due to intervening mature vegetation, however there would be pockets where Operational infrastructure would be visible which would be similar in nature to those from the viewpoint location. Receptors nearby may have more open views towards the Permanent Access Tracks, which would slightly extend the horizontal extent of the view altered, albeit would remain to be small, and there would likely be views of scarring and occasional maintenance traffic, which would barely be perceptible at this distance.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond and selected Permanent Compounds. This would introduce new lighting sources largely in one part of the view from the receptor in the background which would be | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors would include pockets of lighting associated with residential properties and farmsteads in the surrounding landscape.<br><br>Proposed landscape and ecological mitigation and compensation, including native (including riparian) woodland planting, montane willow scrub regeneration and planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of Saddle Dam 1 would be an unobtrusive change in the background of the view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation, however any views of scarring from the Permanent Access Tracks would be less pronounced. The new planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond, including montane willow scrub regeneration and planting, native woodland (including riparian) planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting would be perceptible in the background of the view on the rising land where views are available through intervening vegetation in the foreground and middle ground. The planting would soften any views towards the Headpond, Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape.<br><br>Overall, the changes would remain similar to that at year 1 of Operation. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-5 Viewpoint 5: Beach near to Loch Ness View off the B852

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 10.78 km<br>Lower Control Works: 9.59 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>The recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint on the edge of Loch Ness have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, the works would be barely perceptible due to intervening landform and forestry plantation. Any potential views would be likely be limited to taller plant and would be in the context of forestry plantation Operations and in a very small part of the panorama in the distance which would reduce the degree of contrast and scale of change. The duration of change would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude: **Very low**<br><br>Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Spillway, Temporary Construction Compounds on elevated ground and Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound at the loch shore are likely to be perceptible in the background of the view. The construction activity associated with the Spillway and Temporary Construction Compounds would be located on the skyline near to the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh. Whilst the eye is drawn to this landform, the intervening landform with forestry plantation would largely screen the activity and would reduce the perception of change at this distance set within the large-scale landscape.<br><br>The construction activity associated with the Lower Control Works would be located adjacent to the loch shore in the distance and against the steep-sided glen. The removal of mature loch side vegetation would be perceptible at this distance due to the scarring and difference in colour to other breaks in the loch side vegetation. There would be views during Construction of movement across the loch in the middle ground and background associated with the movement of construction activity. This would be in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch but would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast. The movement would be within the context of existing movement in this part of the view associated with the A82, which reduces the degree of contrast.<br><br>It should be noted that views from across the length of the small beach from which the viewpoint is taken would have similar views towards the Proposed Development, from varying angles. From the Loch Ness View scenic viewing point itself, there are direct views towards the Proposed Development, however, are less expansive than on the beach due to intervening vegetation in the foreground.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions, lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond, navigational buoys at the Lower Control Works, the tower crane lit at the Lower Control Works in low light levels and lighting from occasional movement across Loch Ness. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic across a typically unlit part of the view. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness. | Negligible adverse (**not significant**)<br><br>Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be noticeable as the construction activity would largely be apparent within two small but separate parts of the horizontal and vertical extent of the wide panorama which would introduce movement, plant and activity into two separate parts of the view with limited built form and movement at present and to which the eye is drawn to within the panorama. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond, Lower Control Works and tunnel portals would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would likely be views of the Spillway, Lower Control Works, Permanent Compounds and Permanent Access Tracks across two small parts of the horizontal and vertical extent of the wide panoramic view in the background of the view. The Spillway would largely, if not entirely, be screened by intervening landform with forestry plantation and would therefore be barely perceptible at Operation. The Permanent Compounds and Permanent Access Tracks are also likely to be largely screened by the intervening forestry plantation and would be barely perceptible at this distance.<br><br>Whilst within a focal part of the panorama down the loch, views of the Lower Control Works from this angle of view would not protrude into loch and it would be set against the rising steep-sided glen which reduces the scale of change. At Operation year 1, there would remain to be scarring from loch side vegetation removal which would be perceptible from this distance but would be a very small part of the overall panorama set within the large-scale landscape which reduces the scale of change. The landform which forms an important part of the scenic quality and composition of the view either side of the loch would be unaffected.<br><br>It should be noted that views from across the length of the small beach from which the viewpoint is taken would have similar views towards the Proposed Development, from varying angles. From the Loch Ness View scenic viewing point itself, there are direct views towards the Proposed Development, however, are less expansive than on the beach due to intervening vegetation in the foreground.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond, Lower Control Works and selected Permanent Compounds. This would introduce a new lighting sources predominantly in one part of the view due to screening which would be uncharacteristic across a typically unlit part of the view. However, it would only be occasionally lit and it should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>New planting associated with the Lower Control Works and the wider landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the scale and nature of the Lower Control Works would be an unobtrusive change in the composition of the view in the background of the panoramic view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation, however the scarring from the loch side vegetation removal to facilitate the Lower Control Works would be less pronounced. The proposed native planting associated with the Lower Control Works would have established which would lessen the scale and degree of change. Views of the proposed planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond would soften any views towards the Spillway, Permanent Compounds and Permanent Access Tracks. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape.<br><br>Overall, the changes would reduce in magnitude to that at year 1 of Operation as the Lower Control Works infrastructure would remain to be set against the rising steep-sided glen and would not protrude into the loch and the most perceptible aspect of such works would be less obvious due to new planting and recovery from the Construction period over time. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-6 Viewpoint 6: Great Glen Way near Urquhart Castle

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 10.75 km<br>Lower Control Works: 10.08 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br><u>Value: Very **High**</u><br><br><u>Susceptibility: **High**</u><br>The recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint on the edge of Loch Ness have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br><u>Visual Sensitivity: **High**</u><br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high. | <u>Pre-Construction and Enabling</u><br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform and forestry plantation. Any potential views would be likely be limited to taller plant and would be in the context of forestry plantation Operations, in a very small part of the panorama in the distance and would not be within the focus of the view, which is largely on Loch Ness and Urquhart Castle in a different part of the view, which would reduce the prominence in the view, degree of contrast and scale of change. The duration of change would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |
| | <u>Construction</u><br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Spillway and Temporary Construction Compounds would be located in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view in the background of the view. The Temporary Access Tracks may also be visible in the same part of the view and at a lower elevation but is likely to be heavily screened by intervening vegetation in the foreground. The activity would be set against the skyline and would introduce movement in a part of the view within limited movement, however activity would largely, if not entirely, be screened by intervening forestry plantation in the middle ground and would not be within the focus of the view, which is largely on Loch Ness and Urquhart Castle in a different part of the view. The construction activity would therefore be a barely perceptible change from this receptor.<br><br>There may be views during Construction of movement across the loch in the middle ground and background associated with the movement of construction activity. This would be in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch but would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast however this would be less perceptible at this distance. The movement would be within the context of Urquhart Castle, which is a focal part of the view, however, would have a degree of separation and in the context of existing movement in this part of the view associated with the A82.<br><br>It should be noted that further along the Great Glen Way recreational route to the east and west of the receptor views are largely screened as the route enters areas of woodland.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions and lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness. | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be barely perceptible in the composition of the view in the background. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and tunnel portals would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 1)</u><br>At Operation year 1, any views of the Spillway, Permanent Compounds or Permanent Access Tracks would be located in the background of the view on the skyline. The Permanent Access Tracks on a lower elevation are likely to be screened by intervening foreground vegetation. Due to the distance and scale of change, permanent infrastructure would barely be perceptible and would be largely, if not entirely, be screened by intervening forestry plantation in the middle ground. The Spillway, which would be unlikely to be perceptible due to intervening forestry plantation, would not be within the focus of the view, which is largely on Loch Ness and Urquhart Castle in a different part of the view. The Operational infrastructure would therefore be a barely perceptible change from this receptor.<br><br>It should be noted that further along the Great Glen Way recreational route to the east and west of the receptor views are largely screened as the route enters areas of woodland.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond and at selected Permanent Compounds, which would be uncharacteristic in the view however would be likely to be screened by intervening landform and vegetation. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>New planting associated with the wider landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of the Spillway would be barely perceptible in the composition of the view in the background. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation. The proposed native planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond would soften any views towards the Spillway, Permanent Compounds or Permanent Access Tracks. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape. The duration of change would be long-term. | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | |

## Table 2-7 Viewpoint 7: Dores Beach

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 18.40 km<br>Lower Control Works: 17.44 km | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, any views of the works would be in the distance in a very small part of the panorama and would barely be perceptible from this distance due to being set against the rising landform, the scale of works and intervening landform and forestry vegetation. The duration of change would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude: **Very low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |
| Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>The recreational receptors experiencing this iconic viewpoint on the edge of Loch Ness have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Saddle Dam 2, the Spillway, Temporary Access Tracks and the Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound would be apparent in the distant part of the view. Whilst the construction activity would be visible in two small parts of the overall horizontal extent of the wide panoramic view, this would be predominantly located in the focus of the view down the loch and associated with the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh. The works would also be visible at the loch shore and against the skyline, which would increase the perception of the scale of change. The construction works would introduce movement and development in an otherwise still part and largely undeveloped part of the panorama which would be a noticeable change in the composition of the view.<br><br>The construction activity associated with the Headpond and Temporary Access Tracks would slightly alter the iconic skyline, albeit at a distance. Contrastingly, the Lower Control Works would be set against the rising steep-sided glen but the associated vegetation removal would be noticeable, albeit in the contrast of existing gaps in the loch side vegetation in the view. There would also be movement across the loch in the foreground extending to the background associated with the movement of construction material which would introduce new movement closer to the receptor. This would be in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch but would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast.<br><br>It should be noted that views from across the length of Dores Beach would have a similar view towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions, lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond, navigational buoys at the Lower Control Works, the tower crane lit at the Lower Control Works in low light levels and lighting from occasional movement across Loch Ness. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be in new locations but not dissimilar from existing settlements on the loch shore and at a distance. | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be noticeable and in contrast within the existing composition across a small but important and high-quality part of a wide-angle view. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and Lower Control Works would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be views of the Saddle Dam 2, the Permanent Access Tracks and the Lower Control Works across two small parts of the horizontal extent of the wide panoramic view in the distant background. The Spillway would be barely perceptible at this distance. The Operational infrastructure would continue to be located in an important part of the view and the vertical extent of the view would be affected at both the loch shore and the skyline, which increase the scale of change. The Saddle Dam 2 would alter the gently rolling nature of the skyline in a very small part of the view to a straighter edge, which is unnatural in the view but would be at a distance. The rock treatment of the Saddle Dam 2 would also be perceptible in the view. The scale of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would lessen the perception of the scale of the Saddle Dam 2.<br><br>There is also likely to be scarring associated with the Permanent Access Tracks, however this and occasional maintenance traffic along which would be barely perceptible at this distance.<br><br>As the Lower Control Works would be set against the rising steep-sided glen, this would also be barely perceptible at this distance, however the removal of vegetation from the loch shore is likely to be perceptible in the context of other gaps along the loch shore. The landform which forms an important part of the scenic quality and composition of the view either side of the loch would be largely unaffected.<br><br>It should be noted that views from across the length of Dores Beach would have a similar view towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Lower Control Works and Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be in new locations but not dissimilar from existing settlements on the loch shore and at a distance. The lighting would also only be occasionally lit.<br><br>New planting associated with the Lower Control Works and wider landscape around the Headpond would not be perceptible at year 1.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of Saddle Dam 2 would be perceptible within a high-quality part of a wider angled view however would be within the background and in a very small part of the view. The duration of change would be long-term. | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation, however the scarring from the Permanent Access Tracks would be less pronounced. The proposed native planting associated with the Lower Control Works and in the wider landscape around the Headpond, including parts near to the Permanent Access Tracks would have established which would slightly lessen the scale and degree of change, however this would be less perceptible at this distance. The native woodland planting on the moorland landscape would soften views towards the Saddle Dam 2.<br><br>Overall, the changes would the native woodland planting on the moorland landscape would soften views towards the Saddle Dam 2. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-8 Viewpoint 8: Suidhe Viewpoint off the B862

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational and road users<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 11.09 km<br>Lower Control Works: 11.51 km<br><br>Located within: LCT 224 Farmed and Wooded Foothills<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>The recreational receptors experiencing this iconic viewpoint on the edge of Loch Ness have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Main Dam and Temporary Access Tracks would be located in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view in the background of the view. This would be located in a similar part of the horizontal extent of the view that the eye is drawn to due to the presence of Loch Knockie in the middle ground and the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh in the background. The construction activity would be partly set against the skyline and therefore noticeable in the view, despite the distance.<br><br>The part of the view where the construction activity is located would have little reference to human activity and built form, however, would be in the context of a wind farm (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm), also in the background of the view, which lessens the degree of contrast. The views of construction activity would partly diminish the scenic qualities of this part of the view; however, this would be less apparent due to the layered landscape of variable topography and features in the foreground and middle ground, the context of extensive coniferous plantation land use in the middle ground and movement along the B862 road corridor in the foreground.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions and lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor, however, would remain to be uncharacteristic.<br><br>The scale and intensity of construction activity would be a noticeable feature in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view in the background. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be views of the Main Dam across a very small part of the horizontal extent of the wide panoramic view and views of Permanent Access Tracks across a wider part of the view in the background. Views of the Main Dam would be set against the rising landform beyond, which would lessen the scale of change in the view and would not alter the pattern of the gently undulating skyline. The distance from the receptor to the permanent infrastructure would diminish the perceptibility. The scale of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would lessen the perception of the scale of the Main Dam. The views would be within the context of a wind farm (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm) at | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | a similar distance and multitude of features in the foreground and middle ground of the view would diminish the impression of the scale of change. The Main Dam would not be in the focus of the view, which is largely the panoramic extent the mountain range and Loch Knockie in the middle ground.<br><br>Views of the Permanent Access Tracks would include a small section of new track and a wider section visible of the existing Alltsigh track. Views of occasional monitoring movement would not be dissimilar across the majority of the horizontal extent of the view to existing movement along the Alltsigh track. There would be a small new section of occasional movement, which would be within the context of forestry Operations and barely noticeable at this distance.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic but would be occasionally lit.<br><br>The new planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond, including montane willow scrub regeneration and planting, native woodland (including riparian) planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting would not be perceptible at year 1.<br><br>The scale and nature of Main Dam would appear as an unobtrusive change in the background of the view and the extended distance of the view would diminish the perceptibility for such receptors. The duration of change would be long term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the views would be similar to that of year 1 of Operation. The duration of change would be long-term. The new planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond, including montane willow scrub regeneration and planting, native woodland (including riparian) planting and dwarf birch, juniper and Scots pine regeneration and planting would be perceptible within the background of the view. This would soften views towards the Main Dam and Permanent Access Tracks. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-9 Viewpoint 9: Loch Ness, canoeists and pleasure craft

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 10.39 km<br>Lower Control Works: 11.95 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225 Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>The recreational receptors experiencing these dynamic panoramic views from the centre of Loch Ness, including from along the Great Glen Canoe Trail, have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Main Dam and Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound are likely to be visible in two small parts of the overall horizontal extent of the panoramic view. The construction activity associated with the Main Dam would not be in the focus of the view down the loch but would be within the context of the prominent summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh and the white rendered property on the loch shore, which draws the eye. The works would also be set against the skyline which would increase the scale of change as it would contrast the existing undulating skyline. The construction works would introduce movement and development into an otherwise still and largely undeveloped part of the panorama, resulting in a noticeable change in the composition of the view. However, the works would also partly be screened by and is set back from intervening forestry plantation on landform in the middle ground, which lessens the scale of change.<br><br>The construction works associated with the Lower Control Works would be set against the rising steep-sided glen which would reduce the perceptibility at this distance and would reduce the prominence of the intervention into the waterbody of Loch Ness from this angle. The associated loch side vegetation removal would be barely perceptible in a small, distant part of the view. While construction activities will be barely noticeable within a small horizontal extent of the wide-angled panoramic view, they are situated within the focal point of the view down the loch, which is otherwise largely undeveloped.<br><br>The construction works would add additional movement to the waterbody of Loch Ness in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch. However, this would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions, lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond, navigational buoys at the Lower Control Works, the tower crane lit at the Lower Control Works in low light levels and lighting from occasional movement across Loch Ness. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness. | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Overall, the combination of construction activity at the Headpond and Lower Control Works would result in a noticeable change in the composition of the view, albeit in a small part of the overall panoramic view and at a distance. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond and Lower Control Works would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 1)</u><br>At Operation year 1, the Main Dam and Lower Control Works would be visible with two small parts of the horizontal extent of the view. The Permanent Access Track would also be visible in the background of the view. The Main Dam would be situated in the background of the view and despite the man-made linear edge, would largely follow the existing undulating skyline which would reduce the scale of change. The Main Dam would remain to be partially screened by and is set back from intervening forestry plantation on landform in the middle ground, which lessens the scale of change. The scale of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would lessen the perception of the scale of the Main Dam. The Permanent Access Track intervisibility would be limited to occasional views of maintenance vehicles along the existing Alltsigh access track, which reduces the degree of contrast to existing activity.<br><br>The Lower Control Works would be barely perceptible in a small, distant part of the view at the loch shore. The Lower Control Works would be set against the rising steep-sided glen which would reduce the perceptibility at this distance and would reduce the prominence of the intervention into the waterbody of Loch Ness from this angle. While barely noticeable within a small horizontal extent of the wide-angled panoramic view, it is situated within the focal point of the view down the loch, which is otherwise largely undeveloped. The slight alteration to the landform, which is an important part of the scenic quality and composition of the view on either side of the loch, would be barely perceptible at this distance.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond and Lower Control Works. This would introduce new lighting sources in pockets across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>The new planting at the Lower Control Works and in the wider landscape around the Headpond would not be perceptible at year 1.<br><br>Overall, the combination of permanent infrastructure at the Headpond and the Lower Control Works would reduce to an unobtrusive change to the composition of the view at Operation. The composition of the view comprising clear views down the loch framed by the steep-sided rising glen would largely be unaffected. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, views towards the Main Dam and Permanent Access Track would remain however the native planting associated with the wider landscape around the Headpond would soften views towards the Main Dam, although only a small part of the native planting would be visible. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape. Native planting associated with the Lower Control Works would heavily filter any long-distance views of the Proposed Development, resulting in a barely perceptible change to the background of the view.<br><br>Overall, an unobtrusive change in the composition of the view would remain, albeit softened within the view. The duration of change would be long-term<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-10 Viewpoint 10: B862 and Loch Ness 360 Trail near to Fort Augustus

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational and road users<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 14.59 km<br>Lower Control Works: 16.21 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Very high**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Very high**<br>The recreational receptors experiencing this iconic viewpoint on the edge of Loch Ness have an interest focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Very high**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, the activity and plant associated with the Lower Control Works and associated Temporary Construction Compound would be located in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view in the distant background at the loch shore. This would include the removal of loch side vegetation, activity and plant however would be barely perceptible in a small, distant part of the view at the loch shore. The visibility of the Lower Control Works would be greatly reduced as it would be set against a distant slope of the steep-sided glen. Whilst construction activity would be barely perceptible in a small horizontal extent of the wide angled panoramic view, it is located within the focus of the view down the loch to an otherwise mainly undeveloped part of the panorama.<br><br>The construction works would add additional movement to waterbody in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch however it would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast. However, due to distance this would also be barely perceptible.<br><br>It should be noted that views from the section of the Loch Ness 360 which runs parallel to the B862 to the south of Loch Ness would have a similar view towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include navigational buoys at the Lower Control Works, the tower crane lit at the Lower Control Works in low light levels and lighting from occasional movement across Loch Ness. This would introduce new lighting sources across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic, however this would be located in one part of the view and the receptors would experience existing light sources in the settlement of Fort Augustus.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be a barely perceptible change in the composition of the view across a very small but important part of a wide-angle view. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Lower Control Works would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse **(not significant)** |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, the Lower Control Works would be barely perceptible in a small, distant part of the view at the loch shore. The visibility of the Lower Control Works would be greatly reduced as it would be set against a distant slope of the steep-sided glen. Whilst barely perceptible in a small horizontal extent of the wide angled panoramic view, it is located within the focus of the view down the loch to an otherwise mainly undeveloped part of the panorama. The landform which forms an important part of the scenic quality and composition of the view either side of the loch would be unaffected.<br><br>There would also be occasional visibility of maintenance along the Permanent Access Tracks however this would be limited to the existing Alltsigh access track, which reduces the degree of contrast to existing activity.<br><br>It should be noted that views from the section of the Loch Ness 360 which runs parallel to the B862 to the south of Loch Ness would have a similar view towards the Proposed Development.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Lower Control Works. This would introduce new lighting sources across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic, however this would be located in one part of the view and the receptors would experience existing light sources in the settlement of Fort Augustus.<br><br>New planting associated with the Lower Control Works and wider landscape around the Headpond would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity at Operation would be a barely perceptible change in the composition of the view across a small part of a wide-angle view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse **(not significant)** |
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the native planting associated with the Lower Control Works and in the wider landscape around the Headpond would further soften any long-distance views of the Proposed Development. However, alike the permanent infrastructure, this would be barely perceptible at this distance.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity at Operation would be a barely perceptible change in the composition of the view across a small part of a wide-angle view. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very low** | Negligible adverse **(not significant)** |

### Table 2-11 Viewpoint 11: Core Path to the north west of Fort Augustus

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 18.40 km<br>Lower Control Works: 21.13 km<br><br>Located within LCT 226 Wooded Glen - Inverness<br><br>Value: **Low**<br><br>Susceptibility: **High**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to experience of the recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Medium**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be medium. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant associated with the Main Dam would be visible in a very small part of the overall panoramic view in the distance. The works would be set against the skyline which would increase the scale of change as it would contrast the existing undulating skyline. Within the plateau, the large-scale landscape reduces the perceived impact of the Proposed Development due to the scale being less pronounced. The views of construction activity would also be within the context of extensive forestry plantation as well as wind farm and overhead line development, which lessens the degree of contrast.<br><br>The Temporary Access Tracks are potentially visible in a small part of the horizontal panorama in the distance, however, would largely be screened by any construction activity visible associated with the Main Dam.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds in low light conditions and lighting rigs in remote locations including the Headpond. This would introduce new lighting sources in a very small part of the view across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be viewed in the distance within a small extent of the view and within the context of other detracting features. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the Headpond would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be barely perceptible views of the Permanent Access Tracks and Main Dam in the background of the view. The Main Dam provides an unobtrusive change to the outline of the rolling moorland plateau and rocky outcrops against the skyline. The scale of the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh would lessen the perception of the scale of the Main Dam.<br><br>The permanent infrastructure would result in the addition of man-made structures and faint linear scars in the landscape in the form of access tracks in a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view. The presence of other man-made | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | elements in the view, including distant wind farms (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm), forestry plantation with tracks, and isolated farmsteads lessens the degree of contrast in the view.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at the Headpond.<br><br>The new planting in the wider landscape around the Headpond would not be perceptible due to intervening landform.<br><br>Overall, permanent infrastructure would be viewed in the distance within a small extent of the view and within the context of other detracting features. The duration of change would be long-term. This would introduce new lighting sources in a very small part of the view across the horizontal extent of the view from the receptor which would be uncharacteristic. It should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: Very **Low** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the Main Dam and the Permanent Access Tracks would remain visible in a small part of the background of the view against the rising landform.<br><br>Overall, permanent infrastructure would be viewed in the distance within a small extent of the view and within the context of other detracting features. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: Very **Low** | Negligible adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-12 Viewpoint 12: Local walking users off the Core Path network and Glen Coiltie Walking Loop

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Recreational<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 4.03 km<br>Lower Control Works: 5.32 km<br><br>Located within LCT 222: Rocky Moorland Plateau – Inverness<br><br>Value: **Medium**<br><br>Susceptibility: **High**<br>Views of the surroundings are an important contributor to experience of the recreational receptors experiencing this viewpoint.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **High**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, there would be direct views of works mainly in the foreground and middle ground, including 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 comprise the majority of the horizontal extent of the view and would be predominantly located on the lower ground of the valley landscape. The construction activity and plant would dominate the enclosed and intimate scale of the landscape. Despite being within the context of forestry tracks, the construction works would introduce incongruous activity in an otherwise relatively wild and still view due to the scale and degree of contrast due to the displacement of the rocky moorland plateau across a large proportion of the view. The duration of change would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude: **High** | Major adverse (**significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with Temporary Access Tracks and Temporary Construction Compounds would be apparent in the foreground, middle ground and background of the view. This would comprise the majority of the horizontal and vertical extent of the views across the valley landscape as the activity would be located on both the lower elevations near to the course of the River Coiltie and the Temporary Access Tracks would extend onto the higher landform in the background of the view rising towards Glas-bheinn Bheag.<br><br>The construction activity and plant would dominate the enclosed and intimate scale of the landscape, particularly with respect to the Temporary Workers Accommodation due to the scale and contrast to the existing moorland landscape. Despite being within the context of forestry tracks, the construction works would introduce incongruous activity in an otherwise relatively wild and still view due to the scale and degree of contrast due to the displacement of the rocky moorland plateau across a large proportion of the view. The Temporary Access Tracks on the landscape rising up towards Glas-bheinn Bheag would be a noticeable addition in the view however would be less contrasting due to the existing incisions by watercourses in the landscape creating linear lines on this landform.<br><br>The rocky outcrops are typically on the steeper land either side of the course of the River Coiltie, which the construction works would largely avoid. The presence of the rocky outcrops would also reduce the contrast of change resulting from the loss of moorland vegetation. The construction works, whilst comprising localised earthworks to facilitate the Temporary Construction Compounds, the landform forming the composition of the view either side of the course of the River Coiltie would be unaffected. As the Temporary Access Track crosses over the ridgeline in the background of the view, this would be barely perceptible as it would be set against higher landform in the background of the view rather than against the skyline. | Major adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | It should be noted that on the core path network and the Glen Coiltie Walking Loop to the east of the viewpoint location, potential views towards the construction activity are less perceptible due to intervening landform, upon which the viewpoint location is located on, and intervening forestry vegetation. The views towards the Proposed Development would also be typically within the context of less wild features in the view, including distant wind farms, forestry plantation with tracks, maintenance vehicles on tracks and a small-scale quarry, which lessens the degree of contrast in the view.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include floodlights for the compounds. This would introduce new lighting sources that would be apparent to the receptor however it should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be pronounced due to the scale of the works across the majority of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view. The duration of change would be medium-term, however peak activity at the tunnel portals would be short-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Very High** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 1)</u><br>At Operation year 1, there would be views of the Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds in the foreground, middle ground and background of the view. This would comprise the majority of the horizontal and vertical extent of the views across the valley landscape as the Proposed Development would be located on both the lower elevations near to the course of the River Coiltie and the Permanent Access Tracks would extend onto the higher landform in the background of the view rising towards Glas-bheinn Bheag.<br><br>The permanent infrastructure would result in the addition of man-made structures and access tracks in parts of the otherwise relatively wild and still view. The Permanent Compounds, including the Tunnel Portals and GIS Switchyard would be directly visible in the open moorland in the middle ground of the view which would contrast the existing view and appear incongruous. The Permanent Access Tracks would be noticeable due to the scarring however would be less contrasting due to the existing incisions by watercourses in the landscape creating linear lines on this landform.<br><br>The rocky outcrops are typically on the steeper land either side of the course of the River Coiltie, which the Operational infrastructure would largely avoid. The landform forming the composition of the view either side of the course of the River Coiltie would remain to be largely unaffected. As the Permanent Access Track crosses over the ridgeline in the background of the view, this would be barely perceptible as it would be set against higher landform in the background of the view rather than against the skyline.<br><br>The Temporary Construction Compounds would be reinstated although they would appear as localised sections of open ground until the vegetation establishes . As at the Construction phase, this would be within the context of rocky outcrops which break up the vegetated areas, therefore reducing the degree of contrast of this change. | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | It should be noted that on the core path network and the Glen Coiltie Walking Loop to the east of the viewpoint location, potential views towards the permanent infrastructure are less perceptible due to intervening landform, upon which the viewpoint location is located on, and intervening forestry vegetation. The views towards the Proposed Development would also be typically within the context of less wild features in the view, including distant wind farms, forestry plantation with tracks, maintenance vehicles on tracks and a small-scale quarry, which lessens the degree of contrast in the view.<br><br>Lighting requirements would include motion-sensor lighting at selected Permanent Compounds. This would introduce new lighting sources that would be apparent to the receptor however this would only be occasionally lit and it should be noted that receptors are unlikely to visit the viewpoint location in darkness.<br><br>New planting associated either side of the River Coiltie and on rising land would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation. There would be views of deer fencing on the lower slopes opposite the viewpoint location which would be a man-made addition to the wild landscape but would not be uncharacteristic in this landscape.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds would appear as a noticeable change to the view, predominantly in the middle ground and background. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | |
| | <u>Operation (Year 15)</u><br>At Operation year 15, the proposed native woodland planting either side of the River Coiltie and additional planting on rising land would have established and would largely screen views towards the Permanent Access Tracks and Permanent Compounds in the foreground and middle ground which would lessen the scale and degree of change. The Temporary Construction Compound areas are considered to be fully reinstated by year 15. The Permanent Access Tracks would remain to be visible in the background of the view against the rising landform towards Glas-bheinn Bheag but due to the intervening vegetation and the scarring less pronounced, these would be less noticeable in the view. The planting would also contribute to reinstating historic native planting in this part of the landscape.<br><br>Overall, the changes would reduce to an unobtrusive change in the view by year 15 of Operation. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Low** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

### Table 2-13 Viewpoint 13: A82 layby

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| Receptor Groups:<br>Road users. It should be noted that the layby is likely to be closed during Construction and the layby eventually incorporated into the new junction, removing the layby facility altogether, therefore receptors are limited to road users.<br><br>Approximate distance to the Proposed Development:<br>Headpond: 2.52 km<br>Lower Control Works: 0.21 km<br><br>Located within LCT 225: Broad Steep-Sided Glen<br><br>Value: **Medium**<br><br>Susceptibility: **Low**<br>The road users experiencing this viewpoint would not have views focused on their surroundings.<br><br>Visual Sensitivity: **Medium**<br>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be medium. | Pre-Construction and Enabling<br>At Pre-Construction and Enabling, intervisibility with the works would be unlikely due to intervening landform.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **None** | No change (**not significant**) |
| | Construction<br>During Construction, there would be vegetation clearance of the mature loch side vegetation in the foreground and middle ground of the view, which would open up views towards the works associated with the Lower Control Works and Temporary Construction Compound. This would include access off the A82, jack up barges, moored barges, concrete batching plant, tall construction plant and localised earthworks. The construction activity and plant would be visible along the edge of the loch due to the construction of an access off the A82 and also extending into the waterbody of Loch Ness, which would be directly visible. The incongruous activity would result in the addition of plant and material protruding into the loch, which there is nothing comparable to in the existing view, therefore resulting in a pronounced change in the foreground and middle ground.<br><br>The activity would be in the context of the existing detracting features of the view on the opposite side of the loch, including extensive forestry plantation and Foyers Power Station, as well as the movement and signage along the A82, including forestry vehicles, which reduces the degree of contrast. The construction works would occupy a considerable proportion of the horizontal extent of the view but would not be in the important part of the view which is across the loch due to the mature loch side vegetation which limits views down the loch.<br><br>There would be views during Construction of movement across the loch in the foreground, middle ground and background associated with the movement of construction activity. This would be in the context of existing pleasure craft on the loch but would appear contrasting to other recreational vessels which would increase the degree of contrast. The movement would be within the context of existing movement associated with the A82, which reduces the degree of contrast.<br><br>It should be noted that from further along the A82 views are similar to that at the viewpoint location where there are some gaps towards Loch Ness, whereas large parts are fully enclosed by intervening mature loch side vegetation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be pronounced due to the proximity of the viewpoint receptor, however reduced in part due to the context of the A82 corridor. The duration of change would be medium-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **High** | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |

| Sensitivity of Visual Receptor | Magnitude of Effect | Significance of Effect |
|---|---|---|
| | Operation (Year 1)<br>At Operation year 1, there would be direct views of the Lower Control Works, including the access road off the A82, in the foreground and middle ground. This would displace views of mature loch side vegetation in the foreground which restricted long distance views down Loch Ness however these would now be opened up somewhat. The Lower Control Works would comprise a relatively small part of the overall horizontal extent of the view and would not be in the focus of the view across the loch to the eastern side of Loch Ness. The permanent infrastructure would result in the addition of man-made structures into the view which extends into the loch, however this would be within the context of the existing A82 corridor which would lessen the degree of contrast.<br><br>New planting associated with the Lower Control Works would be barely perceptible at year 1 of Operation.<br><br>It should be noted that from further along the A82 views are similar to that at the viewpoint location where there are some gaps towards Loch Ness, whereas large parts are fully enclosed by intervening mature loch side vegetation.<br><br>Overall, the scale and nature of the Lower Control Works would remain to be a pronounced addition in the view in the foreground and middle ground however the effect reduced in part due to the context of the A82 corridor. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **High** | Moderate adverse (**significant**) |
| | Operation (Year 15)<br>At Operation year 15, the proposed native planting associated with the Lower Control Works would assist in softening views of the permanent infrastructure. The Lower Control Works would remain to be located out of the focus of the view and would be in the context of the A82 and views of the Foyers Power Station and forestry plantation on the opposite side of the loch, which reduces the degree of contrast and the scale of change.<br><br>Overall, the changes would reduce to a noticeable change in the view by year 15 of Operation. The duration of change would be long-term.<br><br>Magnitude of effect: **Medium** | Minor adverse (**not significant**) |

# 3. Sequential Visual Effects

3.1.1 Whilst the viewpoint assessment above is representative of visual receptor groups within the Study Area, it is also important to consider the experience of visual receptors sequentially moving through the landscape along key recreational routes and transport corridors (refer to **Figure 6.6 Local Walking Routes, Recreational Routes, Core Paths and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3: Figures)**). The following section provides commentary on the likely effects arising from the Operational infrastructure of the Proposed Development for visual receptors along key routes.

## 3.2 Loch nam Breac Dearga Trail

3.2.1 There is theoretical visibility of Operational infrastructure for approximately half of the route once it reaches the open plateau. This is considered the most scenic part of the route as the other half is largely through forestry plantation. The views of the Operational infrastructure would be largely associated with the Main Dam and increased size of the waterbody of Loch nam Breac Dearga. This would contrast the wildness and lack of human influence of existing views along the trail. The Operational infrastructure is likely to have a significant residual impact on users of the trail due to the scale in close proximity to the receptors, as it would affect the majority of the most scenic part of the trail and it would fundamentally alter Loch nam Breac Dearga which the receptors are focused on in the views.

3.2.2 The majority of the existing Alltsigh access track that would be used at Operation for occasional monitoring purposes is on the Loch nam Breac Dearga Trail. The effect on visual amenity for users of the Loch nam Breac Dearga Trail would not be adversely affected due to existing forestry vehicle movements that would be considered to be similar.

## 3.3 Loch Ness 360 Trail

3.3.1 There is theoretical visibility of Operational infrastructure for an almost continuous section of the Loch Ness 360 trail approximately from where the routes passes through the settlement of Foyers to Dores. However, due to intervening mature loch side vegetation it is considered that the actual visibility of Operational infrastructure would generally be heavily filtered and only with intermittent views.

3.3.2 Further south along the eastern side of Loch Ness, there would likely only be pockets of intervisibility with the Operational infrastructure. This would likely be limited to distant views of the infrastructure associated with the Headpond and from higher points on the route. There would be intervisibility for a short section of the route near to Fort Augustus with distant views to the Lower Control Works.

3.3.3 On the western side of Loch Ness, there would be small pockets of the route with likely intervisibility with various aspects of the Operational infrastructure. This would be reduced in part where the route travels through and near to mature woodland and forestry plantation, including near to the Lower Control Works.

3.3.4 **Viewpoints 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10** are located along the Loch Ness 360 trail within the Study Area. Three of the viewpoints (**Viewpoints 2, 4 and 7**) are likely to be significantly affected at year 1 of Operation and only one viewpoint (**Viewpoint 4**) is likely to be significantly affected at year 15 of Operation. Overall, it is considered that there would only be very short sections of the Loch Ness 360 trail with views of the Operational infrastructure and only likely to be significant residual effects from very short parts of the route near to Bunloit. Therefore, the route as a whole would not be significantly affected.

## 3.4 Great Glen Way

3.4.1 On the western side of Loch Ness, there would be small pockets of the route with likely intervisibility with various aspects of the Operational infrastructure. This would be reduced in part where the route travels through and near to mature woodland and forestry plantation, including near to the Lower Control Works.

3.4.2 **Viewpoints 4 and 6** are located along the Great Glen Way within the Study Area. One of the viewpoints (**Viewpoint 4**) is likely to be significantly affected at years 1 and 15 of Operation. Overall, it is considered that there would only be very shorts sections of the Great Glen Way with views of the Operational infrastructure and

only likely to be significant residual effects from very short parts of the route near to Bunloit. Therefore, the route as a whole would not be significantly affected.

## 3.5 Affric Kintail Way

3.5.1 There is no theoretical visibility with Operational infrastructure from the Affric Kintail Way within the Study Area. Part of the existing access track off the A831 that will be used at Operation for occasional monitoring purposes is on a section of the Affric Kintail Way. The effect on visual amenity for users of this part of the Affric Kintail Way and a short section further to the west would not be adversely affected due to existing forestry vehicle movements that would be considered to be similar.

## 3.6 A82

3.6.1 There would be a very small part of the route with likely intervisibility with the Lower Control Works part of the Proposed Development in very close proximity. This would be lessened in part by existing mature loch side vegetation resulting in the views only likely to be from immediately adjacent to the Lower Control Works and associated infrastructure due to the removal of part of the loch side vegetation. The remainder of the route is unlikely to be affected by Operational infrastructure of the Proposed Development.

3.6.2 **Viewpoint 13** is located along the A82 within the Study Area which is likely to be significantly affected at year 1 of Operation. Overall, it is considered that there would only be one very short section of the A82 with views of the Operational infrastructure and not likely to be significant residual effects on the route.

## 3.7 B852

3.7.1 There is theoretical visibility of Operational infrastructure for an almost continuous section of the B852 approximately from where the routes passes through the settlement of Foyers to Dores. However, due to intervening mature loch side vegetation it is considered that the actual visibility of Operational infrastructure would generally be heavily filtered and only with intermittent views.

3.7.2 **Viewpoints 2 and 5** are located along the B852 within the Study Area. One of the viewpoints (**Viewpoint 2**) is likely to be significantly affected at year 1 of Operation. Overall, it is considered that there would only be very short sections of the B852 with views of the Operational infrastructure and there are unlikely to be any residual significant effects on the route.

# 4. Cumulative Visual Effects

4.1.1 The following tables provide an assessment of the potential cumulative effects on visual 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)**.

4.1.2 Once the Proposed Development is in Operation, the principal parts of the Proposed Development that influence visual amenity are limited to the Headpond, LCW and GIS Switchyard. Therefore, this assessment of cumulative visual 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 4-1 Cumulative Visual Effects**

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| Viewpoint 1: Meall Fuar-mhonaidh summit | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Foyers PSH, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station, Shenval Hydro, Coiltie Hydro, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Gartally Micro-hydro, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 1. There would be direct views of the Headpond infrastructure, including the waterbody, Main Dam, Saddle Dam 1, Saddle Dam 2 and Secondary Bund in the foreground and middle ground of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of numerous energy infrastructure schemes which are visible from this elevated position in the landscape. This includes wind farms on the plateau and upland landscape to the east and west of Loch Ness and short sections of new OHL typically in the background of views and a mast on the plateau landscape in the middle ground. There are also hydro schemes on the loch shore of Loch Ness and in the landscape with no pattern, however due to the size of such schemes and forestry cover in the surrounding landscape, they are often not perceptible within the large-scale landscape. The energy schemes would be visible within pockets across the majority of the wide panoramic view but would typically be separated. There would be a concentration of energy infrastructure associated with the cluster of wind farms (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm and extension) in the middle ground and background of the view on the plateau landscape partially set against the skyline and partially against landform beyond.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into a new part of the view in the foreground. The Proposed Development would appear separate to other cumulative schemes due to distance and difference in terms of the type of development as it would not be vertical energy infrastructure which is typical of cumulative schemes within the view. However, due to the proximity of receptors, it would be apparent that the Proposed Development comprises energy infrastructure rather than more distant views where it is less noticeable as part of the large-scale landscape. The view would have existing influence of energy infrastructure in the direction of the Proposed Development, including the Bhlaraidh Wind Farm and Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension in the background of the view. The Proposed Development would fit into the views of existing hydro schemes interspersed in the wider landscape with no pattern. The views towards Loch Ness would be unaffected. | **Scenario 1**<br>Minor adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Moderate adverse (significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Chrathaich Wind Farm, Cnoc Farasd Wind Farm, Dell 2 Wind Farm, Loch Kemp PSH, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Millennium East Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Foyers PSH, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station, Shenval Hydro, Coiltie Hydro, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Gartally Micro-hydro, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Fiodhag Wind Farm, Bingally 400 kV Substation, Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Foyers Power Station extension and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of numerous energy infrastructure schemes, including further wind farms on the plateau landscape on the western side of Loch Ness and the uplands on the eastern side, as well as new OHL in the background of the view, where visible due to intervening landform, and another hydro scheme and power station extension at the loch shore. This would result in energy infrastructure being more apparent across the panoramic views from the elevated viewpoint location and would result in a cluster of energy infrastructure in the middle ground and background of the view to the west of the receptor which draws the eye of the receptor.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 however would add another energy development into the cluster of energy infrastructure in views to the west. There would remain to be separation between the Proposed Development and cumulative schemes due to distance and the type of development, however the addition would contribute to filling the view with energy infrastructure in this direction which draws the eye away from the views towards Loch Ness further. The views towards Loch Ness would remain to be unaffected.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **medium**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **moderate adverse** (significant). | |
| Viewpoint 2: Settlement of Foyers | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Foyers PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 2. There would be views of the Lower Control Works in the background of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is theoretically influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes in the wider landscape including a hydro scheme in the middle ground at the loch shore and wind farms and a grid connection on the upland landscape in the background of the view, however this is unlikely to be visible due to intervening built form and vegetation within the settlement of Foyers. Therefore, it is unlikely that any cumulative energy schemes would be visible with the addition of the Proposed Development so there is not considered to be any potential for significant cumulative effects. | **Scenario 1**<br>No change (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>No change (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Loch Kemp PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Foyers PSH and Foyers Power Station Extension and Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection | 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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>As at Scenario 1, it is unlikely that any cumulative energy schemes would be visible with the addition of the Proposed Development so there is not considered to be any potential for significant cumulative effects.<br>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). | |
| Viewpoint 3: Foyers Campsite | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Foyers PSH and New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Foyers PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Foyers Power Station Extension | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 3. There would be direct views of the Lower Control Works in the middle ground of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is theoretically influenced by a hydro scheme along the loch shore in the middle ground and a short section of OHL at Bunloit, however this is unlikely to be visible due to intervening mature loch side vegetation. Therefore, it is unlikely that any cumulative energy schemes would be visible with the addition of the Proposed Development so there is not considered to be any potential for significant cumulative effects.<br>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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>As at Scenario 1, it is unlikely that any cumulative energy schemes would be visible with the addition of the Proposed Development so there is not considered to be any potential for significant cumulative effects.<br>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**<br>No change (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>No change (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| Viewpoint 4: Great Glen Way and Bunloit Road near Bunloit | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Coiltie Hydro, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Dell 2 Wind Farm and Loch Kemp PSH, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Coiltie Hydro, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 4. There would be views of the Headpond, limited largely to Saddle Dam 1, in a small part of the horizontal extent of the view in the background. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including views of distant wind farms on the upland landscape in pockets of the panoramic view. There would also be views of a new mast, small sections of OHL and a hydro scheme theoretically visible in pockets of the view. The views of such schemes are likely to be limited due to intervening vegetation in the surrounding landscape and in the context of local vertical infrastructure including a wood pole line which further increases separation of the cumulative energy infrastructure in the view.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into a small part of the view in the background. This would appear separate and different in type to the majority of any other visible cumulative schemes so any intensification of existing effects would be limited. The scale of the surrounding landscape, the intervening vegetation and existing wood pole line in the foreground and middle ground of the view would increase the separation of the Proposed Development with other cumulative energy schemes.<br>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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including a further wind farm and OHL on the upland and plateau landscape and hydro scheme closer to the loch shore. Such schemes would be in a different part of the view to the Proposed Development and would differ in the type of development, therefore would appear separate. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would therefore be similar to that at Scenario 1.<br>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**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |
| Viewpoint 5: Beach near to Loch Ness View off the B852 | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Loch Na Cathrach PSH, Coiltie Hydro, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Foyers PSH and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 5. There would be views of the Lower Control Works in a small part of the wide panoramic view in the background. There would theoretically also be views of the Spillway but due to intervening landform with forestry plantation it would barely be perceptible at this distance. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including views of hydro schemes at the loch shore, a short section of OHL and a mast. However, the hydro scheme in the background of the view in the focal part of the view down the loch would barely be perceptible at this distance and due to intervening loch side vegetation. Intervening forestry plantation would partially screen views to any schemes on the steep-sided glen or plateau landscape.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure in the distant part of the view at the loch shore. The Proposed Development would appear separate from any other cumulative scheme due to distance. The Proposed Development would also be in keeping with the occasional intervention of energy development on the loch | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | **Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Loch Na Cathrach PSH, Cnoc Farasd Wind Farm, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Coiltie Hydro, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Foyers PSH, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Foyers Power Station Extension and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | shore, however noting the distance and backdrop of the steep sided glen for both the Proposed Development and cumulative scheme, which reduces the perception of change.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including wind farms on the plateau landscape and power station extension as another intervention on the loch shore in the distance. The wind farms would be in a different part of the view to the Proposed Development and would differ in the type of development, therefore would appear separate. The wind farms would also likely be largely screened due to intervening landform and at a distance, so are considered to have a limited influence of energy infrastructure in the view. The additional intervention on the loch shore would likely remain to be barely perceptible at this distance and due to intervening loch side vegetation, therefore the additional of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline would be similar to that at Scenario 1.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). | |
| Viewpoint 6: Great Glen Way near Urquhart Castle | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Loch Na Cathrach PSH, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Corrie Garth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Loch Na Cathrach PSH, Chrathaich Wind Farm, Cnoc Farasd Wind Farm, Dell 2 Wind | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be barely visible from Viewpoint 6 due to intervening forestry plantation. It is therefore unlikely that the addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario has the potential for significant cumulative effects.<br>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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>As at Scenario 1, the principal parts of the Proposed Development would not be seen as an additional to the cumulative baseline scenario so the potential for significant cumulative effects is unlikely.<br>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**<br>No change (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>No change (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Farm, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | | |
| Viewpoint 7: Dores Beach | **Scenario 1**<br><u>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility</u>: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Loch Na Cathrach PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Foyers PSH, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br><u>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility</u>: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Loch Na Cathrach PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Foyers PSH, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast and Foyers Power Station Extension | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 7. There would be views of the Headpond, specifically the Saddle Dam 2, and the Lower Control Works across two small parts of the horizontal extent of the wide panoramic view in the distant background. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes which are visible including a hydro scheme near to the viewpoint location. There are also wind farms, short sections of OHL, a hydro scheme and mast in the background of the view both at the loch shore and the plateau landscape. Such schemes in the distance of the view, including on the loch shore which is the focus of the view down the loch, and the plateau landscape are barely visible due to distance and the backdrop of the steep sided glen.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into both the loch side and plateau landscape, where there is existing influence of cumulative energy schemes. The Proposed Development at the loch shore would be barely perceptible from this distance alike cumulative schemes also in the background of the view and would appear separate from the hydro scheme near to the viewpoint location. The addition of the Proposed Development on the plateau landscape would appear different to other energy development in this part of the view as it would not be vertical infrastructure and would be a very small addition in the view.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including another intervention on the loch shore in the distance, which would be barely perceptible. This would result in a similar cumulative baseline scenario to Scenario 1 and therefore the addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| Viewpoint 8: Suidhe Viewpoint off the B862 | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Corrimony Wind Farm and Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Chrathaich Wind Farm, Loch Kemp PSH, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Millennium East Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Corrimony Wind Farm, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station, Fiodhag Wind Farm, Bingally 400 kV Substation, Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 8. There would be views of the Main Dam across a very small part of the horizontal extent of the wide panoramic view. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of numerous energy infrastructure schemes which are visible from this elevated position in the landscape. This includes wind farms on both the plateau landscape on the western side of Loch Ness and the uplands to the east in two groupings, hydro and power station schemes with no pattern but interspersed in the landscape and a mast in the background. The surrounding landscape has extensive forestry and mature vegetation; therefore, visibility of the hydro and power station cumulative schemes is likely to be more sparsely located in the wider landscape.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into a small part of the view in the background. The Proposed Development would extend the influence of energy infrastructure into a new part of the view, however, would be in keeping with the sporadic nature of energy development in the background of the view. The Proposed Development would also differ in the type of development to the other vertical energy developments on the horizon so would have a limited contribution to intensifying the influence of energy infrastructure across the wide panoramic views of the large-scale landscape.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of numerous energy infrastructure schemes, including further wind farms, a substation and longer sections of OHL across the plateau landscape. There would also be another wind farm on the rugged massif and another hydro scheme on the eastern side of Loch Ness. This would add further energy influence in the existing pocket of wind development to the north of the view and would extend further energy influence across more of the horizontal extent of the view.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would extend the influence of the cluster of energy development to the north of the viewpoint receptor into a larger part of the horizontal extent of the view. However, the part of the Proposed Development that would be visible would be in a very small part of the view and would appear different to the predominantly vertical energy development in this cluster, therefore reducing the extension of influence of energy development.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Minor adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| Viewpoint 9: Loch Ness, canoeists and pleasure craft | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Foyers PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station and New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Loch Kemp PSH, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Foyers PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit and Foyers Power Station Extension | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 9. The Main Dam and Lower Control Works would be visible with two small parts of the horizontal extent of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including three hydro schemes at the loch shore and a short section of OHL on the steep-sided glen which are separated in views due to distance between the schemes.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into another loch side location, which would be in keeping with the occasional interventions of energy development at the loch shore and would be separated from the other cumulative schemes. The Lower Control Works would also be in a small part of the view and less perceptible at this distance so the influence of increased energy development in the view would be limited. The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would extend the influence of energy infrastructure into a new part of the vertical extent of the view associated with the Main Dam. As this would appear differently to the other hydro schemes at the loch shore and vertical mast, it is not considered that this would contribute to filling of the view with energy infrastructure due to the differences in appearance and separation between the cumulative schemes and the Proposed Development.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including another hydro scheme at the loch shore and a power station extension near to an existing intervention at the loch shore. The addition of the Proposed Development at the loch shore would remain to be in keeping with the occasional interventions and would remain to be barely perceptible at the distance. The addition of the Proposed Development associated with the Main Dam is considered to be similar to Scenario 1.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). | **Scenario 1**<br>Minor adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Minor adverse (not significant) |
| Viewpoint 10: B862 and Loch Ness 360 Trail near to Fort Augustus | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Foyers PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station and New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Loch Kemp PSH, Millennium East Wind Farm, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme, Foyers | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 10. The Lower Control Works would be barely perceptible in a small, distant part of the view at the loch shore. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including three hydro schemes at the loch shore and a short section of OHL on the steep-sided glen which are separated in views due to distance between the schemes.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into another loch side location, which would be in keeping with the occasional interventions of energy development at the loch shore and would be separated from the other cumulative schemes. The Lower Control Works would also be in a small part of the view and less perceptible at this distance so the influence of increased energy development in the view would be limited.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including another hydro scheme at the loch shore, a power station extension near to an existing intervention at the loch shore and a wind farm in the opposite direction to the focal part of the view down the loch. The addition of the Proposed Development at the loch shore would remain to be in keeping with the occasional interventions and would remain to be barely perceptible at the distance. | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | PSH, Glendoe Hydroelectric Power Station and New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit | The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant). | |
| Viewpoint 11: Core Path to the northwest of Fort Augustus | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Chrathaich Wind Farm, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Millennium East Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Corrimony Wind Farm, Glenmoriston Hydroelectric power station, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast, Bingally 400 kV Substation, Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Fiodhag Wind Farm and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 11. There would be barely perceptible views of the Main Dam in the background of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes which are visible, including a cluster of wind farms and a mast on the plateau landscape in one part of the panoramic view to the north east of the viewpoint location. There is also theoretical visibility of a power station, however due to the surrounding extensive forestry plantation, the intervisibility is expected to be limited.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into a small part of the view in the background. The Proposed Development would result a very minor extension of the influence of energy infrastructure across the horizontal extent of the view with existing influence of the cluster of wind farms and mast on the plateau landscape. The Proposed Development would appear different and less noticeable than the vertical cumulative energy schemes, which would lessen the cumulative effects. The remainder of the panoramic view of the large-scale landscape would remain to be largely unaffected by energy development.<br>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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including further wind farms and new OHL in the existing cluster of energy development within the plateau landscape to the north east of the receptor. There would also be a new wind farm in close proximity to the receptor but in the opposite direction. This would extend further energy influence across more of the horizontal extent of the view.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1. Although there would be a greater part of the horizontal extent of the view with influence from energy development, the Proposed Development would continue to result in a minor extension and would appear different than the vertical cumulative energy schemes.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |
| Viewpoint 12: Local walking users off the Core Path network and Glen Coiltie Walking Loop | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Bhlaraidh Wind | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The GIS Switchyard would be directly visible from Viewpoint 12 in the middle ground of the view. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes which are visible, including a wind farm and mast in the background of the view on the plateau landscape, which are concentrated in one part of the view. | **Scenario 1**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Farm and Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension, Chrathaich Wind Farm, Loch Liath Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection | The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of further energy development in the same part of the view as the cumulative energy schemes. The Proposed Development would appear separate from such schemes due to intervening landform, differences to the vertical infrastructure and distance from any of the other schemes.<br>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).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including further wind farms in the background of the view on the plateau landscape and an OHL extending from the middle ground of the view into the background. The additional wind farm developments would be located in a similar part of the view but at a greater distance.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development in the middle ground would remain separate from the other cumulative energy schemes in the background of the view. The new OHL would extend from the same location in the view as the GIS Switchyard which would increase the influence of energy development in this part of the view although would relate to it and therefore appear as a single development. The proposed landscape planting would reduce such cumulative effects due to screening by year 15 of Operation.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant). | **Scenario 2**<br>Minor adverse (not significant) |
| Viewpoint 13: A82 layby | **Scenario 1**<br>Cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm, Foyers PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection and Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Additional cumulative schemes with likely theoretical intervisibility: Cloiche Wind Farm, Corriegarth Wind Farm, Corriegarth 2 Wind Farm and Loch Kemp PSH, Foyers PSH, New 33kV Overhead Line Spur for connection to New Communications Mast at | **Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)**<br>The principal parts of the Proposed Development would be visible from Viewpoint 13. There would be direct views of the Lower Control Works in the foreground and middle ground. The cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes which are visible, including two hydro schemes at the loch shore, a short section of OHL on the steep-sided glen and wind farms on the upland landscape in the background, which are separated in views due to distance.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into another loch side location, which would be in keeping with the occasional interventions of energy development at the loch shore and would be separated from the other cumulative schemes. The addition of the Lower Control Works would considerably increase the influence of energy development in the view however this would have a minimal influence on the existing cumulative energy schemes in the view due to differences to the vertical infrastructure and distance from any of the other schemes.<br>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 **negligible adverse** (not significant).<br><br>**Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)**<br>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including another hydro scheme at the loch shore and a power station extension near to an existing intervention at the loch shore.<br>The addition of the Proposed Development at the loch shore would remain to be in keeping with the occasional interventions and would remain to appear separated from other cumulative schemes in the view.<br>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **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**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant)<br><br>**Scenario 2**<br>Negligible adverse (not significant) |

| Visual Receptor | Relevant Cumulative Schemes | Cumulative Magnitude of Effect | Cumulative Effect |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Bunloit, Drumnadrochit, Corriegarth 2 Windfarm Grid Connection, Alt Luaidhe Hydro-scheme and Foyers Power Station extension | | |

# 5. Cumulative Sequential Visual Effects

5.1.1 Whilst the cumulative viewpoint assessment above is representative of visual receptor groups within the Study Area, it is also important to consider the experience of visual receptors sequentially moving through the landscape along key recreational routes and transport corridors (refer to **Figure 6.6 Local Walking Routes, Recreational Routes, Core Paths and Operational Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Volume 3: Figures)**). The following section provides commentary on the likely cumulative effects arising from the additional Operational infrastructure of the Proposed Development for visual receptors along key routes for both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2.

## 5.2 Loch nam Breac Dearga Trail

5.2.1 For Scenario 1, from the Loch nam Breac Dearga Trail, cumulative schemes likely to be visible would be minimal for the first part as it passes through forestry plantation. Views of a mast (Erection of a 70m High Meteorological mast) and wind farms (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension and Corrimony Wind Farm) are likely to be visible across the plateau landscape in the middle ground and background of views for the majority of the second part of the route. There would be other energy developments further from the receptors along the second part of the route which would be visible in pockets as part of a wide panorama. This would include wind farms, hydro schemes and sections of OHL. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would be apparent for the majority of the second half of the route once it reaches the open plateau and would be visible in combination with the other cumulative energy developments in the view. The addition of the Proposed Development would extend the influence of energy development across the horizontal extent of views and would be apparent for the most scenic part of the route. Due to the proximity of receptors, it would be apparent in views that the Proposed Development comprises energy infrastructure rather than more distant views where it is less noticeable as part of the large-scale landscape and contrasting to other cumulative energy schemes with vertical structures.

5.2.2 For Scenario 2, the cumulative scenario would include greater influence from energy development across the panoramic views from receptors travelling along the route on the open plateau landscape. This would include further wind farms (Loch Liath Wind farm, Fiodhag Wind Farm and Chrathaich Wind Farm) and also OHL (Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Bhlaraidh Extension Wind Farm Grid Connection Works and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection). The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would no longer extend the influence of energy infrastructure across the horizontal extent of the view as there would already be the influence of cumulative energy schemes. Due to the containment of the Proposed Development around the summit of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh, there is separation from the cluster of cumulative schemes across the wider plateau landscape.

5.2.3 There is likely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail predominantly due to the extension of influence across the panoramic views for Scenario 1. There is unlikely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail for Scenario 2.

## 5.3 Loch Ness 360 Trail

5.3.1 For Scenario 1, from the Loch Ness 360 Trail, there are likely to be intermittent views of various cumulative energy schemes. Views would be screened for users along part of the trail due to mature loch side vegetation and forestry plantation in close proximity to the receptors reducing outward views. There would likely be intermittent views of loch side energy intervention, including hydro schemes with separation along Loch Ness, as well as more distant wind farms and other vertical infrastructure on the plateau and upland landscape. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would only be apparent for sections of the route, including from where the routes passes through the settlement of Foyers to Dores on the western side of Loch Ness and pockets of visibility on the east. Receptors would likely experience existing intermittent views of distant wind farms in a similar part of the view (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension and Corrimony Wind Farm) to the Headpond part of the Proposed Development, however due to the distance the Proposed Development would appear separate and different as it would not have vertical features alike the cumulative energy schemes. The Lower Control Works would appear as a loch side energy intervention and would also be separated from other cumulative schemes which is in keeping with the cumulative baseline.

5.3.2 For Scenario 2, the cumulative scenario would include greater influence from energy development as there would be an increased number of schemes with intermittent visibility in the wider landscape. This would include additional schemes on the plateau landscape, including wind farms (Loch Liath Wind farm, Fiodhag Wind Farm and Chrathaich Wind Farm) and also OHL (Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Bhlaraidh Extension Wind Farm Grid Connection Works and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection). The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1. Despite the greater influence from energy development, the Proposed Development would remain to appear separate and different and therefore not intensifying the original effects or filling the area with energy development further.

5.3.3 **Viewpoints 2, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10** are located along the Loch Ness 360 trail within the Study Area. None of the viewpoints are anticipated to experience significantly adverse cumulative effects. There is unlikely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail for Scenario 1 and 2.

## 5.4 Great Glen Way

5.4.1 For Scenario 1, from the Great Glen Way, there are likely to be intermittent views of various cumulative energy schemes. Views would be screened for users along part of the trail due to mature loch side vegetation and forestry plantation in close proximity to the receptors reducing outward views. There would likely be intermittent views of loch side energy intervention, including hydro schemes with separation along Loch Ness, as well as more distant wind farms and other vertical infrastructure on the plateau and upland landscape. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would only be apparent for sections of the route. Receptors would likely experience existing intermittent views of distant wind farms in a similar part of the view (Bhlaraidh Wind Farm, Bhlaraidh Wind Farm Extension and Corrimony Wind Farm) to the Headpond part of the Proposed Development, however due to the distance the Proposed Development would appear separate and different as it would not have vertical features alike the cumulative energy schemes. The Lower Control Works would appear as a loch side energy intervention and would also be separated from other cumulative schemes which is in keeping with the cumulative baseline.

5.4.2 For Scenario 2, the cumulative scenario would include greater influence from energy development as there would be an increased number of schemes with intermittent visibility in the wider landscape. This would include additional schemes on the plateau landscape, including wind farms (Loch Liath Wind farm, Fiodhag Wind Farm and Chrathaich Wind Farm) and also OHL (Bingally 400 kV Substation OHL tie-in, Bhlaraidh Extension Wind Farm Grid Connection Works and Glen Earrach PSH grid connection). The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1. Despite the greater influence from energy development, the Proposed Development would remain to appear separate and different and therefore not intensifying the original effects or contributing to filling of the views with energy development further.

5.4.3 **Viewpoints 4 and 6** are located along the Great Glen Way within the Study Area. None of the viewpoints are anticipated to experience significantly adverse cumulative effects. There is unlikely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail for Scenario 1 and 2.

## 5.5 Affric Kintail Way

5.5.1 There is no theoretical visibility with Operational infrastructure from the Affric Kintail Way within the Study Area therefore no potential for significant sequential cumulative effects.

## 5.6 A82

5.6.1 For Scenario 1, from the A82, there are likely to be intermittent views of cumulative energy schemes typically associated with loch shore hydro schemes and distant views of wind farms on the upland landscape. Views would be screened for users along part of the road due to mature loch side vegetation and forestry plantation in close proximity to the receptors reducing outward views. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would only be apparent for a very short part of the route associated with the Lower Control Works in close proximity. This would be in keeping with intermittent views of other hydro schemes which are separated due to distance along the shoreline of Loch Ness.

5.6.2 For Scenario 2, the cumulative scenario would include greater influence from energy development as there would be an increased number of interventions at the loch shore. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline would be similar to that at Scenario 1 as the Lower Control Works would continue to be in

keeping with the pattern of other hydro schemes in the view and would only be apparent for a very short section of the route.

5.6.3 **Viewpoint 13** is located along the A82 within the Study Area and there it is not anticipated that the viewpoint would experience significantly adverse cumulative effects. There is unlikely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail for Scenario 1 and 2.

## 5.7 B852

5.7.1 For Scenario 1, from the B852, there are likely to be intermittent views of cumulative energy schemes typically associated with loch shore hydro schemes and distant views of wind farms on the upland landscape to the east of Loch Ness. Views would be screened for users along part of the road due to mature loch side vegetation and forestry plantation in close proximity to the receptors reducing outward views. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would only be apparent for shorts parts of the route associated with both the Lower Control Works and Headpond. The addition of the Lower Controls Works would be in keeping with intermittent views of other hydro schemes which are separated due to distance along the shoreline of Loch Ness. The addition of the Headpond would extend the influence of energy development in the vertical extent of views however would typically largely be screened by intervening forestry vegetation and would appear differently to other energy development at a similar elevation as it would not have vertical features alike the cumulative energy schemes.

**5.7.2** For Scenario 2, the cumulative scenario would include greater influence from energy development as there would be an increased number of interventions at the loch shore and also distant views of wind farms and OHL on the upland landscape to the east of Loch Ness and plateau landscape to the west. The addition of the Proposed Development into the cumulative baseline scenario would be similar to that at Scenario 1 for the Lower Control Works as it would continue to be in keeping with the cumulative baseline. The addition of the Headpond, where visible due to intervening vegetation at both the loch shore and forestry on the steep-sided glen and plateau landscape, would typically be in a similar part of the view to existing wind farms on the plateau landscape. However, due to the distance the Proposed Development would appear separate and different as it would not have vertical features alike the cumulative energy schemes.

5.7.3 **Viewpoints 2 and 5** are located along the B852 within the Study Area. None of the viewpoints are anticipated to experience significantly adverse cumulative effects. There is unlikely to be a significant cumulative residual impact on users of the trail for Scenario 1 and 2.

Glen Earrach AECOM