

Balliemeanoch Pumped Storage Hydro

Volume 5: Appendices
Appendix 5.2: Landscape Assessment

ILI (Borders PSH) Ltd

July 2024

Quality information

<u>Prepared by</u>	<u>Checked by</u>	<u>Verified by</u>	<u>Approved by</u>
Charlotte Williams Senior Landscape Architect	Robert Hewitt Associate Director	Ruth Mauritzen Associate Director	David Lee Technical Director

Revision History

<u>Revision</u>	<u>Revision date</u>	<u>Details</u>	<u>Authorized</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
1	July 2024	Submission	DL	David Lee	Technical Director

Distribution List

<u># Hard Copies</u>	<u>PDF Required</u>	<u>Association / Company Name</u>

© 2024 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Landscape Assessment.....	4
1.2	Cumulative Landscape Effects.....	26

Tables

Table 1	Landscape Designations	6
Table 2	WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains Wild Land Appraisal.....	12
Table 3	LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains	14
Table 4	LCT 35 Rugged Mountains.....	16
Table 5	LCT 37 Upland Glens - Argyll	18
Table 6	LCT 39 Plateau Moor & Forest - Argyll.....	19
Table 7	LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll	20
Table 8	LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll	23
Table 9	Cumulative Landscape Effects – Landscape Designations	26
Table 10	Cumulative landscape effects on WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains.....	30
Table 11	Cumulative Landscape Effects – Landscape Character Types	31

1. Introduction

This appendix should be read in conjunction with **Volume 2, Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Assessment** and **Volume 5, Appendix 5.1 Landscape and Visual Methodology** and is supported by the following figures.

- **Volume 3, Figure 5.3 Wild Land Areas;**
- **Volume 3, Figure 5.4 Landscape Designations; and**
- **Volume 3, Figure 5.5 Landscape Character Types.**

All landscape and visual mitigation measures are embedded and described in **Volume 2, Chapter 3: Evolution of Design and Alternatives**, **Volume 5, Appendix 5.4 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan** and **Figures 5.4.1, to 5.4.4.**

1.1 Landscape Assessment

This appendix provides a detailed assessment of the significance of effects on landscape receptors at each of the assessment phases: Construction, Operation (year 1) and Operation (year 15). The assessment is set out in the following tables:

- **Table 1 Landscape Designations**
- **Table 2 WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains Wild Land Appraisal**
- **Table 3 LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains**
- **Table 4 LCT 35 Rugged Mountains**
- **Table 5 LCT 37 Upland Glens - Argyll**
- **Table 6 LCT 39 Plateau Moor & Forest - Argyll**
- **Table 7 LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll**
- **Table 8 LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll**

Approximate distances are given below from each of the landscape receptors to relevant parts of the Development. This includes the permanent elements of the Tailpond, including the inlet/outlet structure, the two tunnel portals, the permanent infrastructure surrounding the Headpond and the temporary infrastructure surrounding the Marine Facility. The approximate distances are given as the closest part of the receptor to the closest section of the specific part of the Development stated.

It is acknowledged that part of the landscape within the Study Area is plantation forestry at different felling stages. The landscape assessment assumes that this would remain to some degree.

It should be noted that the southern access track leading to the Headpond would be constructed as part of the Blarghour Wind Farm development and only utilised for the Development, without any further amendments, if the wind farm is built and if the necessary land rights can be secured. Therefore, the only effects associated with this track would be limited to construction vehicle movement and occasional maintenance vehicle movement at operation along this route. If the wind farm is not built, there would be no activity along this route associated with the Development, and the magnitude of effect would remain the same.

1.1.1 Construction timescale assumptions

The construction programme for the Development including timescales is set out within **Volume 2, Chapter 2: Project and Site Description**. The duration of construction in relation to the landscape and visual impact assessment methodology is set out within **Volume 5, Appendix 5.1 Landscape and Visual Methodology**. The overall construction period is expected to span up to seven years, however the more intensive periods are as follows:

- Headpond construction: short-term (four years);

- Northern access track to the Headpond construction and movement of material along: short-term (four years);
- Southern access track to the Headpond movement of material along: short-term (four years) (noting that this would include only movement of material as the track would already be constructed if being used);
- Access track construction and movement along between the Tailpond and the Headpond: short-term (four years);
- Tailpond construction: short-term (four years);
- Marine Facility construction and, operation and demobilising: medium-term (the Marine Facility would be demobilised at the end of the seven-year construction period however the most intensive period of use would be over the first four years);
- Inland Access Tracks near to Marine Facility construction and movement of material along: short-term (four years as the most intensive period of use for the Marine Facility would be within the first four years); and
- Above ground tunnel portals construction – short-term (three years).

Table 1 Landscape Designations

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
Inveraray Castle GDL		
<p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: Within GDL</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The presence of existing forestry tracks and minor routes through the GDL increase the capacity of the landscape to accommodate track upgrades as part of the Development. The nature of the planned town of Inveraray, mature vegetation network within the GDL and important elevated views across the GDL increase the susceptibility to the scale and massing associated with the Development. There is context for energy infrastructure in the GDL, including the Inveraray substation to the north of Dubh Loch, however this is separated from the historic town of Inveraray.</p> <p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Construction activity would result in direct but slight change to the landscape components, setting and perceptual associations of this GDL. Construction activity would consist of the construction, operation and demobilisation of the Marine Facility, limited vegetation clearance, widening of two existing forestry tracks to enable the movement of plant and materials from the Marine Facility to the Headpond site, use of temporary Construction Compounds and a section of new track to connect to the existing tracks. Most of the track upgrade and usage would be enclosed by existing forestry at the edge of the parklands and pasture. The two access tracks within this GDL follow local Walking Routes and would bisect two core paths. This would result in signage across C200 and a temporary displacement for C201 but activity would be similar to existing forestry operations.</p> <p>Intervisibility of most construction operations would be limited to the immediate context of the Marine Facility and elevated parts of the landscape at Dun Na Cuaiche where the scenic quality and views are closely associated with the landscape setting of the parklands and woodlands of the GDL. The Marine Facility would occupy a small part of the GDL and within the loch. The intensity and nature of construction and operation of the jetty including the movement of plant and watercraft on Loch Fyne would be in contrast to the adjacent parkland setting, scenic quality and parkland pattern of this GDL. Associated lighting would extend the influence of light spill and impression of character within the context of Inveraray.</p> <p>Overall, there would be a partial alteration to the landscape receptor however there would be limited change to the most valued aspects of the landscape components, scenic quality and artistic interest of Inveraray Castle GDL. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Medium</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Marine Facility would be demobilised and temporary Construction Compounds restored. Access Tracks would return to current forestry management and recreational use of core paths and local trails. Any vegetation removal at the loch shore would be re-planted. Taking this into account there would be a very slight alteration landscape components, scenic quality, and artistic interest of Inveraray Castle GDL. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, perceptual effects would be similar to year 1. Any new loch shore vegetation would have established, and the duration of change would be long-term. However, the magnitude of effect would remain very low.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Landscape Sensitivity

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Ardkinglas and Strone GDL

Distance to the Development:
Marine facility: 7.04 km

Construction

At construction, the existing landscape components within this GDL would be unaffected. The intervening landform at the headland of Loch Fyne combined with existing woodland within the GDL would limit intervisibility or impression of construction activity associated with the Marine Facility. Lighting associated with the jetty has the potential to temporarily affect the dawn and dusk setting and extend the influence of lighting concentrated within Inveraray. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period).

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Value: **Very High**

Susceptibility: High

The attributes that make up the distinctive character of the GDL, including woodland garden collections, are susceptible to the Development proposed. The views to the south across Loch Fyne are also susceptible.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Operation (Year 1)

At operation year 1, the Marine Facility would be demobilised and there would be no change to the perceptual associations and setting of this GDL. The duration of change would be long-term.

Neutral (not significant)

Landscape Sensitivity: Very High

Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.

Magnitude of effect: **None**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, perceptual effects would be similar to year 1. There would be no change to the perceptual associations and setting of this GDL.

Neutral (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **None**

Ardanaiseig House GDL

Distance to the Development:
Headpond: 7.41 km

Construction

At construction, the existing landscape components within the GDL would not be affected. Existing woodland within and at the boundaries of this GDL would restrict intervisibility with construction activity. There would be no perceptible change to the perceptual associations and setting. Framed views of Loch Awe would not be affected by works at the Tailpond. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).

Neutral (not significant)

Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The attributes that make up the distinctive character of the GDL, including woodlands and walled gardens, are susceptible to the Development. The views outwards across Loch Awe and to the rising uplands are also susceptible.</p>	<p>Magnitude of effect: None</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the landscape components and setting of this GDL would not be affected by the Development. Framed views of Loch Awe would remain unchanged and there would be no change to the perceptual associations. The duration of change would be long-term.</p>	<p>Neutral (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.</p>	<p>Magnitude of effect: None</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, there would remain to be no changes to key characteristics of the landscape that are integral to its distinctive character.</p>	<p>Neutral (not significant)</p>
North Argyll LLA		
<p>Distance to the Development: x: 658 m Marine facility: 3.14 km</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The wildness and dramatic views across the landscape and the lochs are perceptual and setting attributes of this LLA. Factors that decrease susceptibility include widespread intervisibility with wind farms and the presence of overhead lines.</p> <p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Very High</u></p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Construction would result in direct effects to the landscape fabric in a very small part of the LLA comprising the northern access track to the Headpond and the junction of the A83 to the inland track north-east of the Marine Facility. Construction would result in signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access and intensification of use along an existing track through plantation forestry near to the Allt na Cuile Riabhaiche glen and leading to the B819.</p> <p>The movement of plant and materials would increase the sense of activity but this would not be dissimilar to existing forestry management in the local landscape and in small parts of the LLA.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Headpond and within Loch Awe would result in a noticeable and incongruent change to the western setting, scenic quality, sense of remoteness and isolation within northern and upland parts of the LLA where there is intervisibility. The impression of change would be limited to upland summits such as Ben Cruachan where the construction footprint occupies a small part of the wider landscape setting or dramatic, panoramic views associated with this LLA. Overall, the scale, location and intensity of construction activity would be a marked contrast with the existing setting. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Medium</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Landscape Sensitivity

Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.

Magnitude of Effect

Operation (Year 1)

At operation year 1, direct impacts are limited to occasional maintenance activity and scarring associated with access track upgrades within the LLA although this would not be dissimilar to existing forestry management. Such changes would be isolated to very small parts of the LLA and partially enclosed by plantation.

Indirect change to the setting and perceptual associations would result from the introduction of the Headpond. The Headpond and associated tracks that connect permanent Compounds would result in a very limited change to the sense of isolation and the impression of the natural landscape within the context of operational windfarms and OHLs. Overall, the special qualities associated with the LLA, in particular the quality of the dramatic and panoramic views from the rugged mountains, would remain mostly intact. Embedded mitigation measures including native woodland planting and bog rehabilitation would not have established at operation year 1. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, effects would be similar to those experienced at year 1 of operation. There would be no discernible change to the landscape elements and activities of this LLA. Effects are limited to a small part the setting. Embedded mitigation measures including native woodland planting and bog rehabilitation would have established but would not reduce the magnitude of effect further. Changes to the impression of character on the setting is limited to isolated and elevated parts of the LLA to the north however, the dramatic and panoramic views from the rugged mountains would remain intact. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

West Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA

Distance to the Development:
Marine facility: Within LLA.

Value: High

Susceptibility: High

The small-scale landscape pattern, linear bands of broadleaf woodland and scenic views towards adjacent loch shores and towards the rugged mountains are attributes of this LLA which offer limited opportunities to accommodate

Construction

Construction within this LLA is limited to construction, operation, and demobilisation of the Marine Facility west of Inveraray and nearby Access Tracks. Direct change to the landscape fabric of this LLA would include the construction of a pier, associated lighting, an increase in personnel, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, movement of watercraft on Loch Fyne, signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access, earthworks and the upgrade of the forestry tracks that border the pastoral field north of the A83.

The operation of the Marine Facility throughout most of the construction phase would introduce new and uncharacteristic activity and plant into a localised part of the landscape with increased movement of watercraft on the Loch and cranes and lighting on the jetty. Effects to the scenic quality in particular the effect of lighting associated with the jetty would be pronounced along the loch shore and in contrast to the dawn and dusk setting. The widening and operation of existing tracks to transport plant and materials and the construction of small section of new track across part of the pastoral field would increase intensity of activity but not dissimilar to other transport

Moderate adverse (significant)

Landscape Sensitivity

the Development. Despite the influence from transport routes and overhead lines the susceptibility to change is high.

Landscape Sensitivity: High

Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.

Magnitude of Effect

and forestry operations within the LLA and within the context of the A83 and A819. Overall, the construction would affect a very small geographic area but important to the special qualities and setting of this LLA. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period).

Magnitude of effect: **Medium**

Significance of Effect

Operation (Year 1)

At operation year 1, the Marine Facility would no longer be operational, but the associated temporary Construction Compounds and Access Tracks would be reprofiled and seeded. Where any trees or vegetation were removed during construction these would be replanted on a like for like basis. There would be no perceptible change to the impression of the special qualities and setting of this LLA. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, effects would be similar to year 1. There would be no perceptible change to the impression of the special qualities and setting of this LLA. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Negligible adverse (not significant)

East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA

Distance to the Development:
Marine facility: 1.89 km

Value: High

Susceptibility: High

The small-scale landscape, woodland and scenic views towards adjacent loch shores and towards the rugged mountains are attributes of this LLA which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. Detracting features, including the influence from transport routes and views to wind farms reduce the susceptibility.

Construction

Changes at construction would be limited to the perceptual associations and northwestern setting of this LLA associated with the Marine Facility located on the northern shore of Loch Fyne. The construction, operation, and demobilisation of the Jetty and the upgrade of existing tracks leading inland to the A819 would result in slight change to the setting and scenic quality of the southern shore of Loch Fyne. The geographical extent of change is limited to very small part of this LLA. The intensity of operations on the loch, including the moment of watercraft, plant including cranes and lighting would contrast with the existing setting. The introduction of lighting associated with the Jetty, would extend the influence of light spill at dawn and dusk further southwest of Inveraray but within the same context of transport corridors of the A83 and A819.

Overall, the scale, location and intensity of construction activity would be in contrast with the existing setting albeit across a localised extent. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period). The localised nature of change would not substantially affect the overall impression and scenic quality of this LLA.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Minor adverse (not significant)

Landscape Sensitivity

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Landscape Sensitivity: High

Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.

Operation (Year 1)

At operation year 1, the Marine Facility would no longer be operational. The Development would result in no discernible change to the special qualities of this LCA. Any vegetation removed at construction would have been replanted and the dramatic views of the loch edge rising to the upland landscapes would return to the existing condition. The duration of change would be long-term.

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, perceptual effects would be similar to year 1. The Development would result in no discernible change to the special qualities of this LCA. The duration of change would be long-term.

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Table 2 WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains Wild Land Appraisal

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Value: **Very High**

Susceptibility: **High**

The inaccessibility and strong wildness qualities are attributes of this WLA which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. The steep sided mountain ranges and dramatic mountain scenery from the backdrop to more settled landscapes. The extensive forestry plantation and operations lower susceptibility as they are very typical of the surrounding landscape and commonly have management and felling activity associated with them.

Landscape Sensitivity: **Very High**

Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.

Key Attributes and Qualities

"Arresting, steep, high mountains with precipitous rocky tops and ridges that offer panoramic views of elevated tops continuing far into the distance"

Description of Potential Changes

Construction

At construction, activity would not directly affect the landscape elements of the WLA, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of the WLA. Based on ZTV coverage, the intervisibility and impression of construction activity associated with the Headpond and associated Construction Compounds and Access Tracks would be concentrated in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA. Construction of the Tailpond and Marine Facility would not affect the WLA.

The panoramic views from the WLA would be affected by the intensity of the construction activity however such activity would not block long distance views.

The Development is likely to result in a slight alteration to the key attribute and quality of the WLA in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA.

The magnitude of effect is considered to be **low**. Taking into consideration the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be **moderate adverse (significant)**.

Operational Year 1

The Development would not directly affect the landscape elements of the WLA, so any effects would be perceptual changes to this key attribute and quality. In terms of views outwards from the mountains in the WLA, ZTV coverage illustrates intervisibility of the Headpond and permanent Construction Compounds including the Switching Station, ventilation shaft compounds and tunnel portal compounds and occasional maintenance traffic concentrated in an upland and steeply rising landscape north of the A85. Such intervisibility would be limited to elevated areas and summits at the southern edge of the WLA and appear in combination with other existing waterbodies including Loch Awe, Loch Nant and associated lochans (as shown by Viewpoint 8 within *Volume 4: Visualisations*). The Headpond would also appear distant with existing wind turbines and plantation forestry within the landscape and would not block any panoramic views of elevated summits into the distance. Other parts of the Development would not be visible.

In terms of views towards the WLA where it is possible to experience some of the wild land qualities of the area, including naturalness and ruggedness, where the Headpond Embankment is visible on the horizon, it is typically set against the rising landform of the craggy upland and partially screened by forestry plantation. Due to distance, intervening landform and detracting features such as forestry plantations between the Development and the WLA, the WLA is not the focus of the view where this occurs.

The Development is likely to result in a very slight alteration to the key attribute and quality of the WLA in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA.

The magnitude of effect is considered to be **very low**. Taking into consideration the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be **minor adverse (not significant)**.

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Key Attributes and Qualities	Description of Potential Changes
	<p><i>“A series of deep glens carved through the mountains, with arresting side slopes and spectacular geological features that contribute to a strong sense of naturalness”</i></p>	<p><u>Construction and Operational Year 1</u> The Development would not directly affect the WLA, so any effects would be perceptual changes to this key attribute and quality. There are not expected to be any perceptual changes to the key attribute and quality of the WLA. The magnitude of effect is considered to be none. Taking into consideration the very high sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be neutral (not significant).</p>
	<p><i>“A high number of visitors that seek different wild land qualities and are able to experience a wide range of remoteness, risk and physical challenge”</i></p>	<p><u>Construction</u> The intensity of construction would contrast with strong sense of wildness and tranquillity experienced within elevated areas at the periphery of this WLA. The activity has the potential to partially alter the high levels of tranquillity and wildness within the WLA. However, construction would occur within the context of forestry operations including felling and wind farms and this would only affect a small area of the southern part of the WLA. The magnitude of effect is considered to be low. Taking into consideration the very high sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be moderate adverse (significant).</p> <p><u>Operational Year 1</u> The introduction of the Development in particular the associated scarring from the introduction of the Headpond Embankment and maximum drawdown would read as an increase in large manmade features the affect the southern setting and strong wildness qualities associations. However, the Development would be located within the context of a much a broader landscape setting of natural lochs of a similar scale and appearance, operational wind farms, and forestry operations. The Development is likely to result in a very slight alteration to the key attribute and quality of the WLA in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA. The magnitude of effect is considered to be very low. Taking into consideration the very high sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>

Overall, considering the key attributes and qualities of the WLA, the magnitude of effect at construction is considered to be **low**. Taking into consideration the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be **moderate adverse (significant)**.

Overall, considering the key attributes and qualities of the WLA, the magnitude of effect at year 1 of operation is considered to be **very low**. Taking into consideration the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be **minor adverse** (not significant). By year 15 of operation, this is considered to be reduce to **negligible adverse** (not significant) once deciduous tree planting would have established associated new tracks would be better assimilated within the landscape and the tone and colour would be in less contrast compared with year 1 of opening.

Table 3 LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 1.96 km Headpond: 8.03 km</p> <p>Value: High</p> <p>Susceptibility: Medium</p> <p>The steep slopes, recreational opportunities and sense of seclusion are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. The context of detracting features, including wind farms and power stations, and large-scale field pattern lessen the susceptibility of the LCT.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction activity associated with Marine Facility would be in neighbouring LCTs on the northern side of Loch Fyne, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. There is the potential for some intervisibility with the Headpond infrastructure construction activity within a very small area of the north-eastern part of the LCT at Beinn na Sroine, however at this distance there would be no perceptible change to the impression of character. It is unlikely that the remainder of the LCT would be affected.</p> <p>Changes to the perceptual associations and setting as a result of the construction, operation and demobilisation of the Marine Facility would be concentrated within the area that occupies the south bank of Loch Fyne and A819. The movement of watercraft on the loch, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, limited removal of loch side vegetation would reduce the sense of seclusion and in slight contrast with the Lochside setting within the context of Inveraray and the A83. The introduction of lighting associated with the jetty, would extend the influence of light spill at dawn and dusk south-west of Inveraray.</p> <p>Overall, most of the key characteristics of the LCT remain intact and changes to the perceptual qualities localised to small areas which exhibit less of a sense of seclusion relative to the upland and remote aspects of this LCT. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
<p>Landscape Sensitivity: High</p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Development would be located in neighbouring LCTs on the northern side of Loch Fyne, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. The Marine Facility would be demobilised, replanting of lochside vegetation and temporary Construction Compounds restored. There would be no perceptible change to the setting along the shoreline of Loch Fyne.</p> <p>ZTV coverage of the Headpond is limited to a very small area in the northern most part of this LCT within the Study Area. Existing plantation would further limit intervisibility of the Headpond from less secluded parts of this LCT, where forestry management operations are commonplace. Taking this into account there would be limited perceptible change to the sense of seclusion and setting. Overall, the key characteristics and impression of character would remain intact. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, effects would be similar to those at year 1. Mitigation measures associated with landscape planting and habitat restoration would not reduce the magnitude of effects further. There would be limited perceptible change to the impression of character and setting. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Table 4 LCT 35 Rugged Mountains

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 10.05 km Headpond: 9.90 km</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The inaccessibility and strong wildness qualities are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. The steep sided mountain ranges and dramatic mountain scenery form the backdrop to more settled landscapes. The extensive forestry plantation and operations lower susceptibility as they are very typical of the surrounding landscape and commonly have management and felling activity associated with them.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity would be located in other LCTs in the Study Area, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. Based on ZTV coverage, the intervisibility and impression of construction activity associated with the Headpond and associated Construction Compounds and Access Tracks would be concentrated in an upland and steeply rising landscape north of the A85, from the summit of Ben Cruachan. Construction of the Tailpond and Marine Facility would not affect this LCT.</p> <p>The scale, geographical extent of construction activity including excavation of a borrow pit, large-scale earthworks, transport of material, an increase in personnel, new Access Tracks across upland moor to traffic along the Access Tracks, temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting would result in a partial deterioration of the landscape resource during peak periods of construction. The intensity of construction would contrast with the strong sense of wildness and tranquility experienced within elevated areas at the periphery of this LCT, the activity has the potential to partially alter the high levels of tranquillity and wildness within the LCT. However, construction would occur within the context of forestry operations including felling and wind farms.</p> <p>Most of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain intact, but the impression of construction activity on the southern setting within a relatively inaccessible part of the landscape would be in marked contrast to the scenic qualities and more distant landscape setting to the south. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Medium</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>
<p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Development would be located within LCT 40 - Craggy Upland – Argyll and LCT 53 - Rocky Coastland as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. ZTV coverage illustrates intervisibility of the Headpond and permanent Compounds (including the Switching Station, ventilation shaft compounds and tunnel portal compounds and occasional maintenance traffic) concentrated in an upland and steeply rising landscape north of the A85, from the summit of Ben Cruachan.</p> <p>The introduction of the Development in particular the associated scarring from the introduction of the Headpond Embankment and maximum drawdown would read as an increase in large manmade features which would affect the southern setting and strong wildness qualities associated with this part of the LCT. However, the Development would be located within the context of a much a broader landscape setting of natural lochs of a similar scale and appearance, operational wind farms, and forestry operations.</p> <p>Taking this into account the contrast with the scenic quality would be limited. Most of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain intact, with the impression of the Development limited to the southern setting within a relatively inaccessible part of the landscape. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u> At operation year 15, effects would be similar to those at year 1 of opening. Deciduous tree planting would have established associated new tracks would be better assimilated within the landscape and the tone and colour would be in less contrast compared with year 1 of opening. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 5 LCT 37 Upland Glens - Argyll

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 3.58 km Headpond: 7.22 km</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Medium</u></p> <p>The uneven landform and small-scale landscape pattern of glens and meandering rivers are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. The context of linear settlements somewhat reduces the susceptibility, however the scale of which would be likely to emphasise the scale of the Development. Detracting features such as quarries, nearby roads and overhead wires lessen the susceptibility.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity would be located in neighbouring LCTs, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. Construction activity associated with the Marine Facility access track upgrades further inland leading to the A819 and the southern access track leading to the Headpond would result in very slight alterations to a small part of the LCT associated with Glen Shiba.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the construction, operation and demobilisation of the Marine Facility would be limited by intervening broadleaf woodland and plantation forests along the edges of the LCT. Any impression of change would be isolated to a very small area between the A83 and the loch shore and result from the movement of watercraft and tall plant on Loch Fyne and associated lighting at the Marine Facility.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Headpond, associated Construction Compounds and Access Tracks would be barely perceptible from a small part of the LCT associated with Glen Strae and Glen Orchy. Overall, most key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected and the geographic area of the LCT within the Study Area that would be indirectly affected by the Development at construction is limited. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond and Marine Facility over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Medium</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be medium.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Development would be located in neighbouring LCTs in the Study Area, as such effects would be limited to the setting and perceptual qualities of this LCT. The low lying and linear nature of this LCT would reduce the impression of change at operation. ZTV coverage within the northern compartment of this LCT in the Study Area relates to the smaller of the two embankments and is unlikely to affect the setting or perceptual associations.</p> <p>The Marine facility would have been demobilised and there would be no change to the setting experience within the southern compartment of this LCT. Most of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected and the duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, effects would be similar to those at year 1 of opening. mitigation measures are unlikely to affect the magnitude of effects within this LCT, the duration of change would be long-term and the magnitude of effect would remain very low.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 6 LCT 39 Plateau Moor & Forest - Argyll

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Marine Facility: 270 m Headpond: 1.03 km</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Low</u></p> <p>The lack of built form and parts with a small-scale pattern on the edge of the LCT are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. The predominantly large-scale pattern, plantation forestry, forestry management operations, wind farms and an overhead power line combined with the plateau landform are attributes which are more tolerant of the Development. On balance susceptibility within the Study Area is low.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, there would be direct changes to a small part of the LCT where existing forestry tracks access from the A819 would be upgraded and mobilised for construction traffic moving along the southern access track leading to the Headpond. The movement of plant and materials along tracks used for recreation, limited vegetation clearance would be isolated to an area where existing forestry operations are commonplace, and some areas have been recently felled. However, the landform within which activities are contained, would limit any impression to the immediate setting.</p> <p>Despite intervisibility in eastern parts of this LCT towards Inveraray, a combination of existing forestry and landform would limit any change to the setting, as a result of construction activities at the Marine Facility, to a small uninhabited area of moor and plantation forestry where forestry management is experienced.</p> <p>Direct changes to the landscape fabric are not dissimilar to the existing context albeit the intensity of movement is greater. There would be limited perceptible change to the setting, within the context of other detracting features. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity along the Access Tracks over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Medium</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be medium.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, direct changes to the LCT would include some scarring associated with track upgrades and the occasional movement of vehicles. Taking into account planned felling schedules potential effects would be contained by a combination by existing plantation forestry and forestry operations. The frequency and accessibility of recreational access and use would return to existing levels. The Marine Facility would be demobilised and there would be no change to the south-eastern setting near Inveraray. Existing landform would limit any intervisibility of the Headpond to a very small knoll of plateau moor as such changes to the perceptual quality and setting would be barely discernible.</p> <p>Most of the key characteristics of the LCT would be unaffected. The geographic area of the LCT that would be directly or indirectly affected would be very limited. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, effects would be similar to those at year 1 of opening. Proposed mitigation measures including landscape restoration would not reduce the impression of change, and the duration of change would be long-term. The magnitude of effect would remain very low.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 7 LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: Within LCT</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Medium</u></p> <p>The sparsely settled landscape, naturalistic character and intricate landscape pattern associated with the glens are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. Committed felling plans within the LCT which would result in the plantation clearance in different stages in the felling cycle inform the susceptibility of the LCT. The scale and amorphous landform within which the Development is proposed and plantation forests and presence of several wind farms lower the landscape susceptibility.</p> <p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: Medium</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be Medium.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, the Headpond site construction would be located within this LCT and result in direct effects to the landscape fabric of the upland moor. The Headpond construction would include the construction of a borrow pit, large-scale earthworks, transport of material, an increase in personnel, new Access Tracks across open moorland to connect into the southern and northern Access Tracks to the Headpond and access track between the Tailpond and Headpond, small-scale structures, construction traffic along the Access Tracks, temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting. Despite only directly affecting a small geographic area of the overall LCT, which occupies most of the Study Area, it would become a dominant feature.</p> <p>Upland moorland, Lochan Airigh and peat bog would be replaced by Headpond infrastructure as part of the construction of the Headpond, which are characteristic, yet common, features of the LCT. The irregular landform of the upland moorland would be affected due to large-scale earthworks, construction of large-scale embankments, cutting and benching of earthworks to create compounds which would be at odds with the natural form of the landscape. The landform and plantation associated with Plateau Moor and Forest Argyll LCT to the south-east of the Headpond, would assist in restricting and softening of intervisibility with the construction activity from the remaining LCT area within the Study Area and limit the extent of change to the setting and perceptual qualities.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the northern access track to the Headpond would include signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access including the upgrade of an existing track through forestry plantation near to the Allt na Cuile Riabhaiche glen and leading to the B819 that would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported and construction traffic along the access track. This would result in the loss of moorland and peat bog and plantation. However, the majority of construction activity associated with other Access Tracks within this LCT would be contained within existing forestry tracks and plantation. Construction activity associated with the access track between the Headpond and Tailpond would include the upgrade of an existing track north of the Allt Beochlich glen. This track would be widened to enable construction plant and materials to be transported. Construction activity would also include the temporary displacement of a local path, construction of a new access track further east to the east of Lochan Romach, construction traffic along the Access Tracks and temporary Construction Compounds, construction of the two tunnel portals and laydown areas alongside the Access Tracks. This would result in signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access. Operations at the Tailpond would also affect the setting in the west of this LCT.</p> <p>The overall scale of construction operations would substantially affect the tranquillity of the more wild and natural aspects of the upland moorland. However, there would be no direct change to the highest quality landscape elements including the oak-birch woodland on lower slopes, stone walls, isolated farmsteads and small villages and the intricate landscape pattern of the glens. Due to the openness of the moorland, despite only directly affecting a small geographic area of the overall LCT, there would be a wider influence, however noting some restriction of this due to surrounding plantation forests. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p>Magnitude of effect: High</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

At operation year 1, the Headpond infrastructure would include Upper Gate House, Switching Station, tracks, Headpond Embankments and Headpond reservoir with regular drawdown cycle (twice per day) and associated scarring apparent in the inside of the Headpond, two embankments, new Access Tracks around the Headpond with occasional maintenance traffic. The open moorland, peat bog and Lochan Airigh would be replaced with the Headpond infrastructure. These landscape elements are characteristic of the LCT but are common features. The new additions to the landscape would be located within a small part of the LCT but due to the open moorland, would have perceptual affects in a wider area, however this is limited in places due to pockets of forestry plantation in the LCT. The permanent Compounds including Switching Station and tunnel portals (PC05, PC06, PC14 and PC15) associated with the operational maintenance of the Headpond would be small-scale and detracting from the open and naturalistic nature of the upland moor in this part of the LCT.

The Headpond reservoir would appear similar and within context of larger waterbodies in the local landscape such as Loch Nant. The new Headpond infrastructure, including the presence of the Embankments, would highly contrast with the landscape perception of wildness of the LCT and would be incongruent in the landscape. Maintenance associated with the Headpond would include occasional vehicle movement, which in a landscape with some local farm traffic and access to nearby wind farms, are considered to be a very slight alteration to the landscape receptor.

At operation, the northern access track to the Headpond and permanent Compounds would introduce new infrastructure within open moorland. Operational tracks within plantation would be similar to existing forestry activity within the local landscape. The widened and new tracks between the Tailpond and the Headpond would appear scarring, with occasional maintenance traffic to tunnel portals and small-scale permanent structures along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen. This would be partially contained by existing vegetation along glens rising on the craggy upland and would introduce some uncharacteristic features in an otherwise natural landscape. The Tailpond would be located in the neighbouring LCT to the west on the loch shore and has some localised influence on the setting.

Embedded mitigation measures would include belts and clusters of broadleaf woodlands that extend from lower slopes of glens, peat bog / upland rehabilitation, and heathland restoration between the Headpond and Tailpond would assist in landscape assimilation and reduce the impression of manmade features including the Embankments, buildings and structures. Opportunities for advanced planting would reduce the duration of adverse effects relating to the scarring of tracks and prominence of the southern Embankment of the Headpond. The Access Tracks would also be accessible to recreational users and improved the local path network throughout this LCT.

The addition of new infrastructure associated with the Headpond would be uncharacteristic in the open moorland landscape. On balance the scale and extent of change to the impression of character within a small part of this large-scale LCT at year 1 of operation would have a partial alteration to the landscape receptor and the duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Medium**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, effects would noticeably reduce to those experienced at year 1 of operation. The new infrastructure associated with the Headpond, and Access Tracks would remain as permanent, unnatural features in the landscape, but mitigation planting and habitat restoration would help to assimilate the Development into the local landscape setting. Over time the colour of scour lines, the Embankments, and the Access Tracks would be less contrasting due to natural regeneration and dry heathland sowing on the Headpond Embankments.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

The establishment and scale of native woodland planting would increase the scale of oak-birch woodland on lower slopes and reduce the impression of scale resulting from the Embankments and enclose the network of tracks between the Tailpond and Headpond.

From upland areas the Headpond would appear not dissimilar to other lochs within this LCT. Large-scale waterbodies at this elevation would be typically unnatural, however it should be noted that in close proximity to this LCT (in neighbouring LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains) Loch Shira is at a lower elevation but remains to be in an upland location which provides some context.

The establishment of the embedded mitigation would reduce the impact on the wild and natural character of the LCT. This characteristic would be partially lost in localised parts of the LCT, which is typical of the LCT and it is considered that the geographic scale of the LCT is able to accommodate this change.

The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Table 8 LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: Within LCT Marine facility: Within LCT</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Medium</u></p> <p>The managed woodland, complex topography, small-scale landscape and highly scenic views across the lochs are attributes of this LCT which offer limited opportunities to accommodate the Development. However, the presence of development, including the town of Inveraray, road infrastructure often adjacent to the LCTs lessen the susceptibility.</p> <p><u>Landscape Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account value judgements and susceptibility to change, overall sensitivity of the landscape character is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, there would be direct effects on the LCT localised to the Tailpond site and the Marine Facility.</p> <p>Construction activity at the Tailpond would include large-scale excavation works and a cofferdam to enable the construction of the inlet/outlet structure in the loch, construction of a temporary access track off the B840 through pastoral land and the removal of mature and distinctive loch side vegetation including a small area of ancient semi-natural woodland. Construction activity would also include the upgrade of an existing track, signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access, local paths widened for construction plant and materials to be transported along with diversion of the B840, an increase in personnel, construction traffic along the Access Tracks, small-scale structures, earthworks and temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting. This would also include watercraft on Loch Awe. Such changes associated with the Tailpond would be located within the small-scale landscape at the loch edge and would involve the removal of mature loch side vegetation which is a contributing feature to the character of the landscape in the LCT. Despite there being other breaks in the mature loch side vegetation further along the loch edge, these are typically not located where a vegetated glen extends down the craggy upland towards the loch edge, which is evident where the Tailpond is proposed, therefore this break would be uncharacteristic. The upgrade of the Access Tracks between the Tailpond and Headpond would also be partially located within this LCT.</p> <p>Changes to the setting and perceptual associations would affect the same part of the LCT and the opposite bank of Loch Awe by construction activity leading from the Tailpond towards the Headpond on rising landform. Construction activity associated with the underground elements of the Development and the activity around the Headpond borrow pit would affect the impression tranquility and natural aspects of the LCT for a short duration within the construction programme.</p> <p>There would also be direct effects within another compartment of this LCT associated with the Marine Facility. This would include the construction of the jetty, an increase in personnel, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, watercraft on Loch Fyne, signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access, earthworks and the construction of a new access track off Upper Avenue through forestry plantation and pastoral land to the A83 to the west of Inveraray and associated lighting. Construction activity associated with a temporary construction access track through agricultural land to the west of the Jetty to connect into the Upper Avenue existing track would result in the removal of a small part of forestry plantation, which is typical in the surrounding area. Construction plant and activity would displace pastoral fields, which are characteristic of the farmed shores of the loch.</p> <p>The activity and plant would also affect the aesthetic aspect of the LCT as the construction activity would affect the highly scenic views across Loch Awe and Loch Fyne, including construction material transported along the loch. This would avoid construction traffic travelling through minor settlements and the local road network near to the Tailpond. During construction, there will likely be localised disruption to public access along the B840 as a result of the increased vehicle movements. A diversion of the B840 will be necessary during construction works. The combination of temporary buildings, laydown areas and the intensity of activity would be highly contrasting with the existing landscape features.</p> <p>Overall, the changes at construction are likely to affect some of the key characteristics of the LCT which are integral to the distinctive character of the LCT, including woodland on the loch shore, scenic views across the loch, the small-scale landscape and displacement of the pastoral landscape and uneven landform. However, direct and indirect changes would be localised and limited to two parts local landscape. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Magnitude of effect: **High**

Operation (Year 1)

At operation year 1, direct effects on the landscape fabric of this LCT would result from the operational Tailpond infrastructure including the inlet/outlet structure and lower gate house (PC03) and the occasional movement of vehicles on the Access Tracks between the Tailpond and Headpond. The Marine Facility would be demobilised and temporary Construction Compounds restored to their existing condition and associated tracks enclosed by woodland. There would be very limited intervisibility with the Headpond within this LCT on a small area approximately 7 km south of the Headpond and effects on the setting would be barely perceptible.

At the Tailpond, the inlet/outlet structure would occupy a small area on the loch shore and into the loch between pockets of mature woodland. Upgraded tracks would appear as scarring elements on the landscape and contrast with the existing tone and connect the two tunnel portals (PC05 and PC06) along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen. Together with occasional maintenance traffic would increase the presence of uncharacteristic manmade features within the landscape. The network of operational tracks that extend beyond this LCT to the east would affect the perceptual associations and setting of both compartments of this LCT that line Loch Awe.

Embedded mitigation measures would include large-scale native woodland planting within the LCT which would provide some landscape integration of the Development. The measures would include native woodland planting including woodland to east of Tailpond to create a vegetated backdrop to the new infrastructure, contribute to the loss of ancient woodland in this location, and strengthen the pattern of loch side vegetation rising up through the glens. Measures would also include translocation of ground flora to mitigate partially against the loss of ancient woodland. Advanced planting early in the construction phase would reduce the duration of effects resulting from the loss of the loch side vegetation.

Measures include mimicking smaller-scale buildings on the loch shore and siting of infrastructure associated with the Tailpond to minimise landscape and visual change to ensure new components would be more similar in scale to the character of those within the receiving landscape.

Although the geographical extent of direct and indirect change within this LCT is limited relative to its scale, the contrast in land use with the natural character and breaks in the woodland vegetation to accommodate the new infrastructure would be pronounced and uncharacteristic in the rocky coastland landscape. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Medium**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, effects would notably reduce to those experienced at year 1. The new infrastructure associated with the Tailpond and Access Tracks would remain and would be more assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting due to the establishment of native woodland, heathland and grassland restoration. The native woodland in particular would notably strengthen the integrity of the wooded glens which is one of the higher valued aspects of this LCT. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

**Moderate adverse
(significant)**

**Minor adverse (not
significant)**

Sensitivity of Landscape Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

1.2 Cumulative Landscape Effects

The following tables provide an assessment of the potential cumulative effects on landscape receptors at year 15 of operation of the Development based on the scenarios set out in **Volume 2, Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Assessment and Volume 3, Figures 5.8 and 5.9.**

Once the Development is in operation, the principal parts of the Development that influence the landscape are limited to the Headpond and Tailpond, therefore this assessment of cumulative landscape effects focuses on these parts of the Development. For the purposes of this assessment the following assumptions have been made:

- Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm: Scenario 1 is comprised of 14 existing turbines up to 54.1m tip height. In Scenario 2, 18 new turbines at 180m tip height would entirely replace the existing turbines and is referred to as Beinn Ghlas Wind farm Repowering.
- Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented: Scenario 1 is comprised of 17 turbines at 136.5 m tip height. In Scenario 2, 17 new turbines at 180m tip height would entirely replace the existing turbines and is referred to as Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation.
- Balliemanoch PSH Grid connection has been included in Scenario 2 as the Development will require connection to the electricity grid, although the Applicant expects this to be an underground connection. However, the worst-case scenario of an OHL has been assumed from the Development to the Creag Dhubh substation (consented scheme) solely for the purposes of this assessment. Any overhead line would be subject to its own separate consenting process under the Electricity Act and this does not form part of the current proposals.

Table 9 Cumulative Landscape Effects – Landscape Designations

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
Inveraray Castle GDL	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this GDL</u>: Inveraray to Crossaig OHL</p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development</u>: N/A</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this GDL</u>: N/A</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The principal parts of the Development are located entirely outside of this GDL therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the GDL. There would be no theoretical visibility between the principal parts of the Development and this GDL. The Marine Facility and inland Access Tracks near to Marine Facility are located in this GDL but would result in no cumulative change. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. Taking this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A</u></p>		
<p>Ardkinglas and Strone GDL</p>	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this GDL: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A</u></p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this GDL: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A</u></p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Development is located entirely outside of this GDL therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the GDL. There would be no theoretical visibility between the principal parts of the Development and this GDL. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. Taking this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>
<p>Ardanaiseig House GDL</p>	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this GDL: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Cruachan Hydro Scheme, Cruachan Expansion and Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL</u></p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Development is entirely located outside of this GDL therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the GDL. The likely intervisibility between the proposed Headpond and the cumulative schemes would be theoretically visible from parts of the southern area of the GDL. Visibility is strongly limited further by woodland cover both within the GDL and in the immediate landscape. Overall, the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. Taking this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this GDL:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this GDL with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> N/A</p>	<p>There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	
<p>North Argyll LLA</p>	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this LLA:</u> Cruachan Hydro Scheme, Creag to Dalmally OHL, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL and the Inveraray to Crossaig OHL</p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> Nant Hydro Scheme, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented and the Beochlich Hydro Scheme</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this LLA:</u> Cruachan Expansion, Barachander Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection and the Balliemeanoch PSH Grid connection</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The principal parts of the Development are entirely located outside of this LLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LLA. The permanent site access via the northern track is located within this LLA but would result in no cumulative change. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including smaller scale substations, OHLs and the Cruachan Hydro scheme within this LLA, whilst several wind farms are interspersed across the southern setting. The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be concentrated around the head of Loch Awe and as the land rises towards Ben Cruachan and further to the northeast. Intervisibility is limited further by expansive blocks of plantation forestry to the south of the LLA. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would affect the perceptual associations across the southern setting of this LLA. The concentration of energy infrastructure within the large-scale landscape to the south would slightly reduce the scenic quality experienced from the more elevated parts of this landscape. Overall, the addition of the Development, would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the southern setting of the LLA, but isolated to the most upland areas of the landscape and most key characteristics remain unchanged. 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 minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) This cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including additional wind farms partially within and closer to the boundary of the LAA. The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be similar to Scenario 1, with the addition of landform also limiting intervisibility with cumulative schemes in Scenario 2. Overall, the addition of the Development would be similar to Scenario 1. 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 minor adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm Repowering, Ladyfield Wind Farm and the Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation</u></p>		
<p>West Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA</p>	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this LLA: Inveraray to Crossaig OHL</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A</u></p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this LLA: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A</u></p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Development is located entirely outside of this LLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LLA. There would be no theoretical visibility between the principal parts of the Development and this LLA. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. Taking this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>
<p>East Loch Fyne (Coast) LLA</p>	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this LLA: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for</u></p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Development is located entirely outside of this LLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LLA. There would be no theoretical visibility between the principal parts of the Development and this LLA. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. Taking this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> N/A</p> <p>Scenario 2</p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes within this LLA:</u> N/A</p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this LLA with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> N/A</p>	<p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p> <p>There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain none and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be neutral (not significant).</p>	

The following table provides an appraisal of the potential cumulative landscape effects on WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains based on the worst-case Scenario 2, as set out in **Volume 2, Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual Assessment**. The cumulative appraisal is undertaken for when the Development is at operation at year 15.

Table 10 Cumulative landscape effects on WLA 09 Loch Etive Mountains

Key Attributes and Qualities	Description of Potential Cumulative Changes
<p><i>“Arresting, steep, high mountains with precipitous rocky tops and ridges that offer panoramic views of elevated tops continuing far into the distance”</i></p>	<p>The Development is entirely located outside of this WLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the WLA. The addition of the Development into the cumulative baseline would affect the perceptual associations across the southern setting of the WLA. The concentration of energy infrastructure within a large-scale landscape to the south would slightly reduce the scenic quality of the panoramic views experienced from a small, elevated part of the southern area of the WLA.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into the cumulative baseline is likely to result in a very slight alteration to the key attribute and quality of the WLA in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA.</p> <p>The magnitude of effect is considered to be very low. Taking into consideration the very high sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>
<p><i>“A series of deep glens carved through the mountains, with arresting side slopes and spectacular geological features that contribute to a strong sense of naturalness”</i></p>	<p>The Development is entirely located outside of this WLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the WLA.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into the cumulative baseline would not affect the key attribute and quality of the WLA.</p> <p>The magnitude of effect is considered to be none. Taking into consideration the very high sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be neutral (not significant).</p>

Key Attributes and Qualities

Description of Potential Cumulative Changes

“A high number of visitors that seek different wild land qualities and are able to experience a wide range of remoteness, risk and physical challenge”

The Development is entirely located outside of this WLA therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the WLA. The addition of the Development into the cumulative baseline would affect the perceptual associations across the southern setting of the WLA. The concentration of energy infrastructure within a large-scale landscape to the south would slightly reduce the sense of remoteness experienced from a small, elevated part of the southern area of the WLA.

The addition of the Development into the cumulative baseline is likely to result in a very slight alteration to the key attribute and quality of the WLA in a limited area in the southern part of the WLA.

The magnitude of effect is considered to be **very low**. Taking into consideration the **very high** sensitivity, the significance of effect is considered to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Table 11 Cumulative Landscape Effects – Landscape Character Types

Landscape Receptor	Relevant Cumulative Schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes within this LCT: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, An Suidhe Wind Farm, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm and Carraig Gheal Wind Farm</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Beinn Ghlas</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Development is entirely located outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including OHLs in the western setting. The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to a very small geographic area of the LCT from a localised high point at Beinn na Sroine. The concentration of energy infrastructure within a large-scale landscape to the west would slightly reduce the scenic quality experienced from a very small, elevated part of this LCT. However, most of the key characteristics would remain unchanged. 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 minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain very low and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Windfarm Repowering,
Barachander Wind Farm,
Ladyfield Wind Farm, Eredine
Wind Farm, An Carr Dubh Wind
Farm and Balliemanoeh PSH
Grid connection

LCT 35 Rugged
Mountains

Scenario 1

Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Cruachan Hydro Scheme and Cruachan Expansion

Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:

Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, An Suidhe Wind Farm, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm and Carraig Gheal Wind Farm

Scenario 2

Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: N/A

Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development:

Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Beinn Ghlas Windfarm Repowering, Barachander Wind Farm, Ladyfield Wind Farm, Eredine Wind Farm, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm and Balliemanoeh PSH Grid connection

Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)

The Development is entirely located outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including Cruachan Hydro Scheme and Cruachan expansion on the edge of the LCT and wind farms and OHLs in the southern setting.

The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to a small geographic area within the southern part of the LCT associated with high landform and expansive, panoramic views southwards. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would affect the perceptual associations and scenic quality experienced from a small, elevated part of the southern area of the LCT. Most of the key characteristics of the LCT would remain unchanged.

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 **minor adverse** (not significant).

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

There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain **very low** and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 1
Minor adverse
(not significant)

Scenario 2
Minor adverse
(not significant)

LCT 37 Upland
Glens - Argyll

Scenario 1

Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)

Scenario 1

Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Inveraray to Crossaig OHL

The Development is entirely located outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including OHLs and wind farms in the southern setting. The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to a very small geographic area of the LCT from near to Kilchurn Castle. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would affect the perceptual associations across the southern setting the LCT and slightly reduce the scenic quality experienced. Most of the characteristics of the LCT would remain unchanged.

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL and Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented

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

Scenario 2
Negligible adverse (not significant)

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

There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain **very low** and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 2
Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: N/A

Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and Ladyfield Wind Farm

LCT 39 Plateau Moor & Forest - Argyll

Scenario 1
Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suidhe Substation OHL Connection and An Suidhe Substation

Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)

The principal parts of the Development are located entirely outside of this LCT therefore cumulative effects would be indirect and limited to the setting and perceptual aspects of the LCT. The southern access track to the Headpond and inland Access Tracks near to Marine Facility are located in this LCT but would result in no cumulative change. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including OHLs and a substation as well as a wind farm in the western setting. The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be limited to a very small geographic area of the LCT associated with a localised high point at Cruach Mhor. The concentration of energy infrastructure within the forested landscape to the west would slightly reduce the scenic quality experienced from a very small part of the northern area of the LCT.

Scenario 1
Negligible adverse (not significant)

Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented

Overall, the addition of the Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure on the western setting of the LCT but limited to a very small geographic area in part of the northern area of the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **very low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 2
Negligible adverse (not significant)

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

There would be little difference between Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 relating to the nature and scale of cumulative change resulting from the addition of the Development. The magnitude of cumulative change would remain **very low** and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be **negligible adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 2

Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm

Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Ladyfield Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid connection

LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll

Scenario 1

Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Nant Hydro Scheme, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm, Creag Dhubb to Dalmally OHL, Creag Dhubb Substation OHL Connection, Creag Dhubb Substation, Dalmally OHL, Beochlich Hydro Scheme, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented and An Suidhe Wind Farm

Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, Cruachan Hydro Scheme and Cruachan Expansion

Scenario 2

Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm Repowering, Barachander Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL

Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)

The Headpond is located within this LCT which has the potential for direct cumulative change. The northern access track to the Headpond, part of the southern access track to the Headpond and part of the track between the Tailpond and the Headpond are also located in this LCT but would result in no cumulative change.

This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including wind farms, OHLs and hydro schemes across the LCT. Such cumulative schemes are typically organised in concentrated pockets across the LCT. The setting of the LCT is also influenced by an OHL and a hydro scheme.

The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be located on either side of Loch Awe, including upland moorland and lower land adjacent to Loch Awe, including around Dalavich. Intervisibility is limited within the LCT due to expansive blocks of plantation forestry across the LCT which restricts views in places, as well as irregular landform.

The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would locally increase the prominence of energy infrastructure into a small geographic area of the LCT. The Headpond would be in close proximity to other cumulative schemes, such that the Development would be consistent with the existing pattern of energy infrastructure in a concentrated part of this LCT. This would reduce cumulative effects on the wildness of the LCT. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would affect the perceptual associations and setting of the LCT.

Overall, the addition of the Development would increase the influence of energy generation infrastructure within a small geographic area of the LCT consistent with the existing pattern of energy infrastructure. The perceptual effects from the addition of the Development would be experienced over a larger area of the LCT, however the scenic quality of the LCT is not considered to be an integral characteristic of the LCT. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **medium** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).

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

The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including additional wind farms and OHLs within the LCT. Alike Scenario 1, such schemes would continue to be predominantly organised in concentrated pockets across the LCT.

The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be slightly increase the impression of energy infrastructure compared to Scenario 1 as there would be a greater number of energy infrastructure schemes within the LCT due to

Scenario 1
Minor adverse
(not significant)

Scenario 2
Minor adverse
(not significant)

Connection, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Eredine Wind Farm, Ladyfield Wind Farm and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid connection

additional wind farms. The addition of the Development would increase the area of the pocket, but it would retain separation from other concentrated pockets of energy infrastructure in this LCT due to intervening forestry plantation and landform.

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

Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: N/A

LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll

Scenario 1

Cumulative schemes within this LCT: Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Inveraray to Crossaig OHL and Dalmally OHL

Cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the Development: Cruachan Hydro Scheme, Cruachan Expansion, Nant Hydro Scheme, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm, Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Beochlich Hydro Scheme, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented and An Suidhe Wind Farm

Scenario 2

Additional cumulative schemes within this LCT: Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection

Additional cumulative schemes outside this LCT with the potential for intervisibility with the principal parts of the

Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)

The Tailpond is located within this LCT which has the potential for direct cumulative change. Part of the track between the Tailpond and the Headpond, the Marine Facility and part of inland Access Tracks near to Marine Facility are also located in this LCT but would result in no cumulative change. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including small sections of OHLs within the small-scale landscape within this LCT and hydro schemes, OHLs and wind farms in neighbouring LCT which would influence the perceptual associations.

Intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be concentrated around the head of Loch Awe, as well as pockets of intervisibility along the coastline near to the Tailpond and at the other end of Loch Awe near to Ederdine.

The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce additional energy infrastructure into the LCT, locally increasing energy infrastructure into a small geographic area of the LCT. The proposed Tailpond would be located in part of the LCT with existing influence from a small section of OHL and the B840. The proximity of the Tailpond to existing energy infrastructure would be consistent with the existing pattern of energy infrastructure in the wider setting of the LCT concentrated in pockets. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would affect the perceptual associations across the LCT and the setting of the LCT, including the addition of both the Headpond and Tailpond. This would affect scenic quality focused along the loch and its background.

The cumulative increase and influence of energy generation infrastructure within a small geographic area of the LCT would be consistent with the existing pattern of energy infrastructure. Cumulative effects on the perceptual and scenic quality would be very limited. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).

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

The cumulative baseline scenario would be further influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including a small section of OHL within the LCT and several wind farms in the setting. As set out within Scenario 1, such schemes would continue to be predominantly organised in concentrated pockets across the LCT and within the setting of the LCT.

The likely intervisibility between the Development and cumulative schemes would be slightly increased compared to Scenario 1 but not sufficient to increase the magnitude of cumulative effect which remains **low**. Taking account of the **high** sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be **minor adverse** (not significant).

Scenario 1
Minor adverse
(not significant)

Scenario 2
Minor adverse
(not significant)

Development: Beinn Ghlas
Wind Farm Repowering,
Barachander Wind Farm,
Blarghour Wind Farm –
Variation, An Carr Dubh Wind
Farm, Eredine Wind Farm,
Ladyfield Wind Farm and
Balliemeanoch PSH Grid
connection

