

Balliemeanoch Pumped Storage Hydro

Environmental Impact Assessment
Report

Volume 5: Appendices
Appendix 5.3: Visual Assessment

ILI (Borders PSH) Ltd

July 2024

Quality information

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

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	July 2024	Submission	DL	David Lee	Technical Director

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	4
1.1.	Visual Assessment.....	4
1.1.1	Construction timescale assumptions.....	5
1.2	Cumulative Visual Effects.....	38

Tables

Table 1	Viewpoint 1: Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray.....	6
Table 2	Viewpoint 2: Minor road near A815.....	8
Table 3	Viewpoint 3: Kilmaha.....	10
Table 4	Viewpoint 4: Dalavich Jetty.....	12
Table 5	Viewpoint 5: Loch shore off coastal road between Inverinan and Dalavich.....	14
Table 6	Viewpoint 6: Inverinan.....	16
Table 7	Viewpoint 7: Eilean na Maodail peninsula.....	18
Table 8	Viewpoint 8: Ben Cruachan.....	20
Table 9	Viewpoint 9: Dorlin Point.....	22
Table 10	Viewpoint 10: Ardanaiseig GDL.....	23
Table 11	Viewpoint 11: A85.....	24
Table 12	Viewpoint 12: Stob Garbh.....	25
Table 13	Viewpoint 13: Ben Eunaich.....	27
Table 14	Viewpoint 14: Beinn a' Chleibh.....	29
Table 15	Viewpoint 15: Ben Lui.....	30
Table 16	Viewpoint 16: Duncan Ban Macintyre Monument.....	31
Table 17	Viewpoint 17: Loch Awe watercraft.....	32
Table 18	Viewpoint 18: A815 – St Catherines.....	34
Table 19	Viewpoint 19: A83 lay-by.....	36
Table 20	Cumulative Visual Effects.....	38

© 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.

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 5.2A Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Headpond and Embankments;*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.2B Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Permanent Compounds and Inlet Outlet;*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.2C Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Permanent Tracks;*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.2D Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Operational Elements Combined; and*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.2E Zone of Theoretical Visibility – Operational Elements Combined and Permanent Tracks*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.6 Recreational Routes and Core Paths*
- *Volume 3, Figure 5.7 Representative Viewpoints and Operational ZTV*

The visual assessment is also supported by a package of visualisations from each of the 19 viewpoints at Operation (year 1) and Operation (year 15), which are presented in **Volume 4, Visualisations**.

All landscape and visual mitigation is 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. Visual Assessment

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

- Table 1 Viewpoint 1: Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray
- Table 2 Viewpoint 2: Minor road near A815
- Table 3 Viewpoint 3: Kilmaha
- Table 4 Viewpoint 4: Dalavich Jetty
- Table 5 Viewpoint 5: Loch shore
- Table 6 Viewpoint 6: Inverinan
- Table 7 Viewpoint 7: Eilean na Maodail peninsula
- Table 8 Viewpoint 8: Ben Cruachan
- Table 9 Viewpoint 9: Dorlin Point
- Table 10 Viewpoint 10: Ardanaiseig GDL
- Table 11 Viewpoint 11: A85
- Table 12 Viewpoint 12: Stob Garbh
- Table 13 Viewpoint 13: Ben Eunaich
- Table 14 Viewpoint 14: Beinn a' Chleibh
- Table 15 Viewpoint 15: Ben Lui
- Table 16 Viewpoint 16: Duncan Ban Macintyre Monument
- Table 17 Viewpoint 17: Loch Awe watercraft
- Table 18 Viewpoint 18: A815 – St Catherines
- Table 19 Viewpoint 19: A83 lay-by

- Table 20 Cumulative Visual Effects

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, and 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 visual assessment assumes that this would be 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. 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 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 Viewpoint 1: Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 3.52 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll, North Argyll LLA, Inveraray Castle GDL</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u></p> <p>The recreational receptors experiencing this view have climbed Dun Na Cuaiche, Inveraray specifically for the elevated view focused across Loch Fyne. The watchtower and benches at the summit are orientated towards the channelled views down the loch.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>During the construction phase of the Development, the construction, operation and demobilisation of the Marine Facility would be an apparent addition within the focus of views along Loch Fyne. The Marine Facility would be located within the bay to the south of the southernmost headland associated within the low-lying town of Inveraray. Visible activities include the construction of the jetty, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, operating watercraft on the loch, earthworks, the removal of small pockets of loch side vegetation and the construction of a new access track off Upper Avenue and associated lighting at the loch shore and along the jetty.</p> <p>The operational jetty would be a small but noticeable addition in views and protrude into Loch Fyne. The movement of plant and materials is likely to be partially set against the loch water, which would be highly noticeable. Whilst the jetty is operational, the scale of watercraft and plant operating on the loch shore would appear in high contrast to the scale of existing small fishing vessels within Loch Fyne and the built form within Inveraray. Activities during demobilisation would be like those at construction and the jetty piles would be left in situ just above the high tide water level. Whilst there will be the localised removal of some vegetation, there would be no obvious break in the overall integrity of loch shore vegetation and the parkland landscape within Inveraray Castle GDL would not be directly affected by construction activity.</p> <p>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 be visible. Existing vegetation would filter views of access track upgrades further inland leading to the A819 would be visible in the middle distance. This would include the upgrade of an existing track between the A83 and A819 to the north of Inveraray and the upgrade of an existing track along Upper Avenue to the north of Inveraray which would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported and would result in signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access. However, the movement of construction plant which would be partially screened and similar to existing forestry operations visible, albeit at a more intense frequency during the construction phase. Where views of the Access Tracks can be obtained, the widening of existing tracks would appear in contrast with the existing colours in the surrounding vegetation. Such activity would distract from the focus of views along Loch Fyne. Panoramic views panning west and further inland would be within the context of prominent clear felling operations, an overhead line and associated tracks.</p> <p>Overall, the location of construction activity and plant associated with the Marine Facility would occupy a small but key part of the view focused along Loch Fyne and the contrast in scale and appearance would be highly incongruent. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Marine Facility over a short-term period). Taking all of this into account and the magnitude of effect is considered to be medium.</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p>Magnitude of effect: Medium</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Marine Facility would no longer be operational. Effects would be limited to views of some scarring of the landscape in localised places within the bay south of the southernmost headland associated within the low-lying town of Inveraray. There would be no change to the parklands within the Inveraray Castle GDL.</p> <p>Where visible between existing vegetation, the scarring associated with the track upgrades would remain and would initially be in contrast with the colour tone of the surrounding vegetation. Temporary Construction Compounds would be</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

restored. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at the high tide water level but the impact of this would not be obtrusive.

Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform at Cruach Mhor. Any appearance of scarring associated with Access Tracks would be limited, partially screened with limited change to the composition and focus of views along Loch Fyne. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the tracks would have assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting. Overall, the changes would be barely perceptible in the middle distance. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at the high tide water level but the impact of this would be unobtrusive. The iconic nature of the existing view would return to baseline levels. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Table 2 Viewpoint 2: Minor road near A815

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Residential (road users are not considered in the assessment due to a lower sensitivity)</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 2.02 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains, East Argyll LLA</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u> Views contribute to the landscape setting of residential receptors.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>During the construction phase of the Development, the construction, operation, and demobilisation of the Marine Facility would be apparent across a small part of the background on the opposite loch shore. Construction activities including the construction of the jetty, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, operating watercraft on the loch, earthworks, the removal of small pockets of loch side vegetation would be in marked contrast with the loch shore setting and visual composition south of Inveraray.</p> <p>Once in operation, the jetty would facilitate the delivery of construction plant and watercraft on the loch would appear against the wooded backdrop of plateau moor and forest. However, the scale and movement of watercraft and associated lighting along the jetty would become an additional focus of views. Activities during demobilisation would be like those at construction and the jetty piles would be left in situ just above the high tide water level.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with temporary Construction Compound and access track through agricultural land to the west of the jetty would be visible. However, access track upgrades further inland would be predominantly screened by existing vegetation and unlikely to result in noticeable visual change due to the rising landform and more wooded backdrop. Construction activity associated with the Headpond and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform at Cruach Mhor.</p> <p>Overall, construction activity associated with the Marine Facility would result in a noticeable and incongruent change to the composition of the view and 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 have been demobilised. Temporary Construction Compounds would be restored. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at high tide water level but the impact of this is barely perceptible. The perpendicular angle of views towards the former Marine Facility is such that visual scarring associated with Access Tracks would be visible but set against the backdrop of mature woodland and rising landform and therefore limit the contrast in visual change. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform at Cruach Mhor. The overall visual change would be unobtrusive in the composition of the view. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u> At operation year 15, the appearance of Access Tracks and former compound sites would have assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting than at year 1 of operation. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at high tidewater level. However, the degree of change would be barely perceptible and the duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, views towards Headpond Embankment 1 would appear as an unnatural straight line on part of the skyline. However, moorland and grassland vegetation would have re-established and help to integrate the colour and tone into the wider craggy upland context and less contrasting. Most of the Development would be screened by existing vegetation. Glimpsed and sequential views experienced along the road network, where forestry has been cleared. Such views of any operational infrastructure would remain a small part of the overall panorama, would be oblique to users of the local road and cycle network and would be in the context of distant wind turbines and plantation forestry. The duration of change would be long-term. The magnitude of effect would reduce as the result of the establishment of Embankment vegetation.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Table 4 Viewpoint 4: Dalavich Jetty

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and residential</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tunnel portals: 5.15 km Headpond: 7.63 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with Headpond Embankment 1 and access track upgrades would be apparent across a small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view in the long distance and set against the rising craggy upland. Construction of the Embankment including large-scale earthworks, transport of material, an increase in personnel, temporary compounds, Access Tracks and associated construction traffic across open moorland, tunnel portals, temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting, would become the focus of the long-distance views.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Access Tracks between the Headpond and Tailpond would be visible and extend the influence of activity in a small part of the horizontal extent of the view. Construction activity in views would include removal of moorland vegetation, upgrade of an existing track north of the Allt Beochlich glen, transportation of materials to and from the Headpond and tunnel portals. The loss of vegetation within open craggy moorland would be particularly obtrusive.</p> <p>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity would be noticeable and in contrast within the existing composition across a small but important and high-quality part of a wide-angle view. The duration of change would be medium-term (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>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The recreational receptors experiencing this view on Loch Awe and in tourist accommodation have an interest in their surroundings. The residential receptors on the edge of Dalavich have open, expansive upper storey views where the landscape setting is enjoyed.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of Headpond Embankment 1 across a small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view in the distant background. This would be partially set against the rising craggy upland, but part of the Embankment edge would appear as a straight line across an undulating skyline, which would be a small but unnatural addition. The exposed rock surface associated with the Headpond Embankment would also be apparent in the view. The other permanent infrastructure in view would comprised of the upper gate house, power cavern shafts, surge shafts, ventilation shafts and the tunnel portals set against the landscape backcloth and the appearance of upgraded and new Access Tracks leading to the Headpond with occasional maintenance traffic. These additions would be less perceptible in the long distance and screened in places from receptors by intervening landform.</p> <p>The scarring associated with the ground plane of the upgraded track between the Tailpond and Headpond and tunnel portals alongside would be a contrasting colour to surrounding vegetation within the open moor and would result in a noticeable change and distract from the focus of views along the loch shore.</p> <p>New planting and habitat restoration would be discernible on the rising hillside leading to the Headpond.</p> <p>The scale and nature of the Headpond Embankment 1 and the upgraded track would appear incongruous within a high-quality part of a wider angled view. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Medium</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, views of Headpond Embankment 1 and part of the waterbody infrastructure and surrounding permanent infrastructure would remain. Over time the material appearance of the Embankment would recede and appear less contrasting than at year 1. The occasional movement of maintenance vehicles would appear like that of other farming and forestry operations.

Embedded mitigation measures, including the establishment of native woodland on rising slopes and glens and bog restoration would help to assimilate the appearance of tracks and slightly reduce the scale of the contrast of the Headpond into the view. However, the appearance of the Headpond would remain noticeable and in contrast to the composition and balance of features in views. The duration of change would be long-term.

**Moderate adverse
(significant)**

Magnitude of effect: **Medium**

Table 5 Viewpoint 5: Loch shore off coastal road between Inverinan and Dalavich

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 1.38 km Headpond: 4.17 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 40 Craggy Upland - Argyll</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u> The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view, including those walking and cycling.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Tailpond would be apparent in views experienced by recreational receptors. Construction of the Headpond would not be visible. The removal of lochside vegetation, large-scale excavation and earthworks to enable the construction of the inlet/outlet structure would be highly incongruent and dominate the focus of views. The cofferdam would require the movement of watercraft and the introduction of plant into Loch Awe. 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, therefore this break would be incongruent and apparent.</p> <p>Other visible construction activity would include the creation of the cofferdam to construct the inlet/outlet structure on the loch shore, construction of a new access track off the B840 through pastoral land, the substantial removal of mature loch side vegetation, upgrade of an existing track, movement of plant, personnel and materials, diversion of the B840, and temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting. The scale and concentration of activity and plant would be set against the rising moorland and partly against deciduous vegetation alongside the glen and the scale would be emphasised by the contrasting scale created by the presence of existing farmsteads and residential property at Balliemanoch Farm.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Access Tracks between the Tailpond and Headpond would be visible across part of the horizontal extent of the view. This would include the upgrade of an existing track north of the Allt Beochlich glen that would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported and would result in signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access. Construction activity would also include 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.</p> <p>The overall, scale and intensity of construction activity associated with the Tailpond and tracks would occupy a considerable part of the horizontal extent and substantial change to the visual composition. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: High</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of new infrastructure associated with the tailpond at the loch shore in the middle distance. This would include the inlet/outlet structure in the loch, tunnel portals, scarring through pastoral land from the reinstated access track off the B840, t, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks and on Loch Awe around the inlet/outlet structure and lower gate houses and tunnel portals. There would be residual scarring associated with earthworks and the resulting break in the mature loch side vegetation. The infrastructure would extend into Loch Awe, which there is no context for in the vicinity. The Tailpond infrastructure would be a noticeable addition to the composition of the view. Temporary compounds would be reprofiled and restored.</p> <p>Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would include the upgrade of an existing track to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen with scarring, a new access track to the east of Lochan Romach with scarring, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks comprising the tunnel portals and lower gate houses and tunnel portals alongside the Access Tracks along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen.</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Embedded mitigation measures in particular native woodland would appear newly planted surrounded by deer fencing within the context of the Tailpond on the rising hillside. There are opportunities for advanced planting to allow for the early establishment to increase visual screening and landscape integration benefits of the inlet/outlet structure and the Access Tracks alongside glens. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.

Overall, the new infrastructure and scarring of tracks would be a pronounced change to the composition of the view in the middle distance. The operational effects would be located across the focus of the view as the craggy upland rises from the loch edge. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **High**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Tailpond infrastructure would remain visible but native woodland within and adjacent to the inlet/outlet structure and associated permanent compounds would have established. This would reduce the scale and contrast of visual change and help to integrate the Tailpond infrastructure into the view. The tunnel portals would remain visible albeit as the lower gatehouses and tunnel portals would be integrated into the hillside. The scale of woodland proposed along the glens and slopes to the loch edge would also be re-established and would assimilate the appearance of Access Tracks similar to the tracks in the existing view. Overall, the Development would result in a small but noticeable change to the overall composition of middle-distance views. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Table 6 Viewpoint 6: Inverinan

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups:</p> <p>Residential and recreational (road users are not considered in the assessment due to a lower sensitivity)</p> <p>Distance to the Development:</p> <p>Tailpond and tunnel portals: 1.71 km</p> <p>Headpond: 3.93 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u></p> <p>Views contribute to the landscape setting enjoyed by residents orientated directly towards the site and highly susceptible to change. The views and experience of the landscape important to people using the Caledonia Way cycle route.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Tailpond would be apparent across the view in the middle distance from upper storeys. The removal of loch side vegetation, large-scale excavation and earthworks to enable the construction of the inlet/outlet structure would be highly incongruent and dominate the focus of views. The cofferdam would require the movement of watercraft and the introduction of plant into Loch Awe. The scale of vegetation removal on the loch shore would be apparent, although, foreground vegetation would screen views from lower levels.</p> <p>Other construction activities visible would include the construction of a new access track off the B840 through pastoral land, the upgrade of an existing track and signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access that would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported. Construction activity would also include an increase in personnel, construction traffic along the Access Tracks, small-scale structures, temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting. Construction activity associated with the track upgrades and the movement of materials and plant between the Tailpond and Headpond would be visible across a small part of the horizontal extent of the view.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Headpond Embankments, waterbody or Marine Facility would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, the scale and intensity of construction activity and plant associated with the Tailpond and tracks would result in a pronounced change and become the main focus of views from upper stories but largely screened from recreational receptors. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: High</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
<p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be filtered views from lower levels of new infrastructure associated with the Tailpond at the loch shore in the middle distance. Views from upper stories would be uninterrupted and the inlet/outlet structure would be a noticeable addition in middle distance views. This would include the inlet/outlet structure in the loch, scarring through pastoral land from the reinstated access track off the B840, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks, occasional maintenance on Loch Awe, lower gate house buildings. Lower-level views would remain largely screened by mature loch side vegetation in the foreground of the view and would not be in the focus of the view comprising the rising craggy upland.</p> <p>Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would contrast in colour to the surrounding moorland and loch side vegetation. This would include the upgrade of an existing track to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen, a new access track to the east of Lochan Romach, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks, the tunnel portals and small-scale permanent structures alongside the Access Tracks along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen. There would be no view of the Headpond Embankments due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Embedded mitigation measures in particular native woodland planting would appear newly planted surrounded by deer fencing in views. Over time this would provide a vegetated backdrop to the new infrastructure, in views. There are opportunities for advanced planting to allow for the early establishment to increase visual screening and landscape integration benefits of the inlet/outlet structure and the Access Tracks alongside glens.</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Overall, the new infrastructure and visual scarring would result in a noticeable and incongruent change to the composition and balance of features in direct and middle-distance views from upper stories of residential receptors. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Medium**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Tailpond infrastructure including the inlet/outlet structure and associated permanent compounds would remain. However, embedded mitigation measures in particular loch shore native woodland would have established. This would aid visual integration of the Tailpond infrastructure such that it would be less of a contrast to the existing view of the built form on the loch side which would appear enclosed by mature vegetation. The characteristic glen side vegetation extending down to the loch edge would also be re-established. The tracks would have assimilated into the local landscape and visual context, appearing similar in appearance to existing tracks.

Overall, the Tailpond infrastructure would result in an unobtrusive change to a small part of the view but in direct and middle-distance views from upper stories of residential receptors. The duration of change would be long-term. Changes from recreational receptors would be barely perceptible.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Minor adverse (not significant)

Table 7 Viewpoint 7: Eilean na Maodail peninsula

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 632 m Headpond: 2.87 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u> The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view, including those walking.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Tailpond would become apparent. The removal of loch side vegetation, large-scale excavation and earthworks to enable the construction of the inlet/outlet structure would be highly incongruent and dominate the focus of views. The construction of the cofferdam and movement of watercraft would be noticeable on the loch. 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, therefore the removal of loch shore vegetation would be pronounced.</p> <p>Other visible construction activities would include a new access track off the B840 through pastoral land, the removal of mature loch side vegetation, the upgrade of an existing track and signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access that would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported, an increase in personnel, construction traffic along the Access Tracks, small-scale structures, earthworks and temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas and associated lighting. The activity and plant would be set against the rising moorland and partly against deciduous vegetation alongside the glen. The large-scale agricultural buildings along the loch shore, closer to the visual receptor, would give some context to larger scale buildings, however these are set back from the loch shore and views are partly screened and softened by mature loch side vegetation.</p> <p>The scale of construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen existing tracks and the creation of new tracks would be in contrast with the existing forestry and farming activity along tracks in the local landscape. The scarring associated with the ground plane of the tracks would appear a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. These additions would be noticeable in the open, expansive view. Some construction activity rising up from the Tailpond would be screened by intervening landform. Construction activity associated with the Headpond or Marine Facility would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Tailpond and Access Tracks would dominate the central part of the view and in marked contrast with the composition and balance of features in the view. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: High</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of new infrastructure associated with the Tailpond at the loch shore in the middle distance. This would include the inlet/outlet structure in the loch, scarring through pastoral land from the reinstated access track off the B840, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks, occasional maintenance on Loch Awe and small-scale permanent structures. The horizontal scale of the inlet/outlet structure would be emphasised by the new break in the mature loch side vegetation, including where the caravans would have been removed. The infrastructure would extend into Loch Awe, which there is no context for in the vicinity. The Tailpond infrastructure would be a pronounced change to a small but central part of the view. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would include the upgrade of an existing track to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen, a new access track to the east of Lochan Romach, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks and small-scale permanent structures alongside the Access Tracks comprising the tunnel portals along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen. This would be noticeable at this distance.</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Embedded mitigation measures in particular native woodland planting would appear newly planted surrounded by deer fencing against the rising landform. There are opportunities for advanced planting to allow for the early establishment to increase visual screening and landscape integration benefits of the inlet/outlet structure and the Access Tracks alongside glens. However, this is unlikely to reduce the magnitude at year 1 of operation.

Overall, the scale and appearance of the inlet/outlet structure and the loss of vegetation would result in a pronounced change across the central part of the view in the middle distance. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **High**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the inlet/outlet structure would be visible across a small but central part of the views on the loch shore, the remainder of the open view along the loch would remain unaffected. Embedded mitigation measures, in particular the native woodland at the loch shore and rising along the glens and hillside would help to integrate the Development into the view and screen the Access Tracks and most other permanent compounds and structures. One of the gatehouse buildings would remain visible within the context of established woodland and at a scale similar to other existing buildings. The scale of native woodland would enhance the visual integrity of wooded glens compared with the existing view. Overall, the operational infrastructure would be limited to loch side views of the inlet/outlet structure in the middle distance. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Table 8 Viewpoint 8: Ben Cruachan

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 12.71 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 35 Rugged Mountains, North Argyll LLA and Loch Etive Mountains Wild Land Area (WLA)</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u> The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view at the summit of Ben Cruachan.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Headpond would be visible in the long distance. This would include the construction of a borrow pits, 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. This would be enclosed between two blocks of forestry plantation and then over open moorland within the craggy upland moor. The activity and plant would introduce new and manmade features into an otherwise naturalistic and highly scenic view and would be incongruous within the existing composition.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be visible through the existing block of plantation. This would include the temporary displacement of local paths for 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. The would be screened somewhat by existing plantation vegetation until the route continues across open moor. Construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen the existing track. This would include movement of construction plant be at a greater intensity to existing farming and forestry operations visible in distant views. The scarring associated with the ground plane of the tracks would appear a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. These additions would be noticeable in the open, expansive view. Construction activity associated with the Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Headpond, and tracks would occupy a small part of the horizontal extent of the otherwise panoramic view. The introduction of activity and plant into a highly scenic view with very minimal detracting features would be incongruous and a noticeable change to the composition of the view. 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>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Headpond would appear in the long-distance views within in a very small part of the craggy upland moor and within an overall panoramic context. Visible Development components of the Headpond would include both Embankments, the reservoir waterbody and smaller scale structures within permanent compounds including the Switching Station (PC15). Periodic maximum drawdown level of the Headpond reservoir would reveal the exposed rock face and the contrast in colour would appear scarring in distant views. However, at top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to other upland lochs within the view.</p> <p>Occasional maintenance traffic operation along new and upgrade Access Tracks to and around the Headpond would appear between two blocks of mature plantation vegetation and within moorland but unlikely to affect the overall composition of views. Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would be an unobtrusive change to the overall composition of the view at this distance. The Tailpond infrastructure would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Overall, the introduction of the Headpond and the associated scarring as a result of exposed rock within the Headpond, Embankments and tracks would result in a small but noticeable change in a small part of the composition of panoramic view in the long distance. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Headpond infrastructure would occupy the small scale and extent of the views as assessed at year 1 of operation. Over time the weathering of the inner side off the Headpond reservoir would reduce the scale of contrast during periodic periods of drawdown. The establishment of grassland and weathering of the outer Embankment face would also reduce the contrast in visual appearance. The appearance of Access Tracks would appear like other established tracks within the landscape. Native woodland and habitat restoration proposals would not affect the visual composition from this viewpoint. At top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to and within the context of other upland lochs within the view.

Overall, the operational infrastructure would be less perceptible change in the existing view. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Table 9 Viewpoint 9: Dorlin Point

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 9.23 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 40 Craggy Upland – Argyll</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, there would be potentially barely perceptible views to construction activity and plant associated with Headpond Embankment 2 in the long distance. This would be heavily screened by intervening forestry plantation and set against rising craggy upland. Construction activity associated with the Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform and vegetation.</p> <p>Overall, any potential views of construction activity and plant would be within a very small of the horizontal extent of the view and not dissimilar to existing activity associated with existing maintenance activity in existing plantation landscapes. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view, including walkers and those using the picnic area.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there may be heavily screened views to a small part of Headpond Embankment 2 and part of the waterbody. This would be heavily screened by intervening forestry plantation and set against rising craggy upland. The appearance of the Embankment albeit manmade is at such distance and the horizontal field of view affects so small that there would be not perceptible change to the overall composition of the view. 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, views towards the very small part of Headpond Embankment 2 would be similar to that assessed at year 1 of operation. The weathering of the Embankment and establishment of heathland would result in no perceptible change to the visual composition and the duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 10 Viewpoint 10: Ardanaiseig GDL

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 8.18 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 40 Rocky Coastland – Argyll, North Argyll LLA, Ardanaiseig House GDL</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, there would be views of construction activity and plant associated with Headpond Embankment 2 would appear across a very small part of the background of long-distance views and heavily screened by intervening forestry. Construction activity associated with the track upgrade, extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be partially visible through the existing block of plantation in the long distance. Construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen the existing track. The frequency of construction traffic would be greater than existing forestry operations visible. The scarring associated with the ground plane of the tracks would appear a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. These additions would result in an unobtrusive change in the composition of the view. Other construction activity associated with the Headpond, Marine Facility or Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform and vegetation.</p> <p>The overall change in composition of the view would be limited and the within the context and backdrop of the rising hillside. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view, including walkers and those visiting Ardanaiseig House GDL.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, views of the Development would be limited to distant views of Headpond Embankment 2 and the appearance of operational maintenance traffic on Access Tracks. The appearance of the Embankment would result in a barely perceptible change to a small part of the background on the undulating skyline.</p> <p>The northern access track to the Headpond would include the upgrade of an existing track forestry plantation near to the Allt na Cuile Riabhaiche glen and leading to the B819 with scarring and occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks. Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. Embedded mitigation measures and the Tailpond infrastructure would not be visible from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Overall, any potential views of operational infrastructure associated with Headpond Embankment 2 and track upgrades would be within a small of the horizontal extent of the view and would be barely perceptible. The duration of change would be long-term.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, the very small part of Headpond Embankment 2 would potentially remain in views but would continue to be heavily screened by intervening forestry plantation. Overall, the operational infrastructure would be a barely perceptible change. The duration of change would be long-term.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 11 Viewpoint 11: A85

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Road users and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 9.66 km Tailpond and tunnel portals: 9.43 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 53 Rocky Coastland – Argyll and North Argyll LLA</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, construction activity and plant associated with Headpond Embankment 2 would occupy a very small part of the horizontal field of view on the distant skyline. Activities would be screened by intervening plantation forestry. Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be perceptible through the existing block of plantation in the long distance. Construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen the existing track and the movement of plant and material along the track. The frequency of movement would be greater than existing forestry operations but mostly enclosed by plantation forest. These additions would be an unobtrusive change in the composition of the view. Construction activity associated with the rest of the Headpond, Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform and vegetation.</p> <p>Overall, any potential views of construction activity and plant would be within a small of the horizontal extent of the view within the context of a large block of plantation forest and there be limited change to the overall visual composition. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The landscape setting is important to recreational receptors experiencing this view from the scenic rest stops. Those travelling along the A285 scenic route also experience transient views of the surroundings across Loch Awe.</p>	<p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Development would be barely discernible. Headpond Embankment 2 would occupy a very small part on the distant skyline within the context of plantation forestry and craggy upland moor. The northern access track to the Headpond would be mostly contained within existing plantation forest and any associated effects a result of widening during construction would be barely perceptible in the long distance. There would be limited perceptible change to the overall visual composition. The duration of change would be long-term.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p> <hr/> <p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, the very small part of Headpond Embankment 2 and part of the waterbody would potentially remain in views but would continue to be heavily screened by intervening forestry plantation. Overall, the operational infrastructure would be a barely perceptible change. The duration of change would be long-term.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 12 Viewpoint 12: Stob Garbh

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 12.92 km Headpond: 13.22 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 35 Rugged Mountains, North Argyll LLA and Loch Etive Mountains WLA</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u> The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view at the summit of Stob Garbh.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the headpond would be visible in the long distance. This would include the construction of a borrow pits, 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. This would be enclosed between two blocks of forestry plantation and then over open moorland within the craggy upland moor. The activity and plant would introduce new and manmade features into an otherwise naturalistic and highly scenic view and would be incongruous within the existing composition.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be visible through the existing block of plantation. This would include signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access and for 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 be screened somewhat by existing plantation vegetation until the route continues across open moor. Construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen the existing track. This would include movement of construction plant be at a greater intensity to existing farming and forestry operations visible in distant views. The scarring associated with the ground plane of the tracks would appear a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. These additions would be noticeable in the open, expansive view.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Headpond, and tracks would occupy a small part of the horizontal extent of the otherwise panoramic view. The introduction of activity and plant into a highly scenic view with very minimal detracting features would be incongruous and a pronounced change to the composition of the view. 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>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Headpond would appear in the long-distance views within in a very small part of the craggy upland moor and within an overall panoramic context. Visible Development components of the Headpond would include both Embankments, the reservoir waterbody and smaller scale structures within permanent compounds including the Switching Station (PC15). Periodic maximum drawdown level of the Headpond reservoir would reveal the exposed rock face and the contrast in colour would appear scarring in distant views. However, at top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to other upland lochs within the view.</p> <p>Occasional maintenance traffic operation along new and upgrade Access Tracks to and around the Headpond would appear between two blocks of mature plantation vegetation and within moorland but unlikely to affect the overall composition of views. Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would be an unobtrusive change to the overall composition of the view at this distance. The Tailpond infrastructure would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p>	<p>Moderate adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Overall, the introduction of the Headpond and the associated scarring as a result of exposed rock within the Headpond, Embankments and tracks would result in a small but noticeable change in a small part of the composition of panoramic view in the long distance. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Headpond infrastructure would occupy the small scale and extent of the views as assessed at year 1 of operation. Over time the weathering of the inner side off the Headpond reservoir would reduce the scale of contrast during periodic periods of drawdown. The establishment of grassland and weathering of the outer Embankment face would also reduce the contrast in visual appearance. The appearance of Access Tracks would appear like other established tracks within the landscape. Native woodland and habitat restoration proposals would not affect the visual composition from this viewpoint. At top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to and within the context of other upland lochs within the view.

Overall, the operational infrastructure would be less perceptible change in the existing view. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Table 13 Viewpoint 13: Ben Eunaich

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 17.17 km Headpond: 17.41 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 35 Rugged Mountains, North Argyll LLA and Loch Etive Mountains WLA</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u> The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view at the summit of Ben Eunaich.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Headpond would be visible in the long distance. This would include the construction of a borrow pits, 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. This would be enclosed between two blocks of forestry plantation and then over open moorland within the craggy upland moor. The activity and plant would introduce new and manmade features into an otherwise naturalistic and highly scenic view however the views would be within a very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and the views of activity and plant would also be in broadly the same direction as An Suidhe Wind Farm in the long distance, therefore some movement is already present in this direction.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be visible through the existing block of plantation. This would include signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access for 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. The would be screened somewhat by existing plantation vegetation until the route continues across open moor. Construction activity would include the removal of existing vegetation in places to widen the existing track. This would include movement of construction plant be at a greater intensity to existing farming and forestry operations visible in distant views. The scarring associated with the ground plane of the tracks would appear a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. These additions would be noticeable in the open, expansive view.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Headpond, and tracks would occupy a very small part of the horizontal extent of the otherwise panoramic view. The change would be unobtrusive and the duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, the Headpond would appear in the long-distance views within in a very small part of the craggy upland moor and within an overall panoramic context. Visible Development components of the Headpond would include both Embankments, the reservoir waterbody and smaller scale structures within permanent compounds including the Switching Sstation (PC15). Periodic maximum drawdown level of the Headpond reservoir would reveal the exposed rock face and the contrast in colour would appear scarring in distant views. However, at top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to other upland lochs within the view.</p> <p>Occasional maintenance traffic operation along new and upgrade Access Tracks to and around the Headpond would appear between two blocks of mature plantation vegetation and within moorland but unlikely to affect the overall composition of views. Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would be an unobtrusive change to the overall composition of the view at this distance. The Tailpond infrastructure would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Overall, the introduction of the Headpond and the associated scarring as a result of exposed rock within the Headpond Embankments and tracks would result in a very small change in a very small part of the composition of panoramic view in the long distance. The change would be barely perceptible in the composition of the view. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Headpond infrastructure would occupy the very small scale and extent of the views as assessed at year 1 of operation. Over time the weathering of the inner side off the Headpond reservoir would reduce the scale of contrast during periodic periods of drawdown. The establishment of grassland and weathering of the outer Embankment face would also reduce the contrast in visual appearance. The appearance of Access Tracks would appear like other established tracks within the landscape. Native woodland and habitat restoration proposals would not affect the visual composition from this viewpoint. At top water level, the Headpond would appear similar to and within the context of other upland lochs within the view.

Overall, the operational infrastructure would be less perceptible change in the existing view. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **Very Low**

Negligible adverse (not significant)

Table 14 Viewpoint 14: Beinn a' Chleibh

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 21.45 km Tailpond and tunnel portals: 21.55 km</p> <p>Located on the boundary of LCT 35 Rugged Mountains and LCT 251 Highland Summits, North Argyll LLA, Ben Lui WLA</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view at the summit of Beinn a' Chleibh.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Headpond Embankment 2 would be visible but barely perceptible in the long distance. This would be located within a very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and would not alter the existing composition of the view.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be theoretically visible through an existing block of plantation but unlikely to result in perceptible change at this the long distance.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Headpond waterbody and infrastructure to the west of the Headpond, Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Headpond, and access track would occupy a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view. The introduction of activity and plant in an otherwise highly scenic view with very minimal detracting features would be incongruous but barely perceptible at this distance. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of new infrastructure and scarring following construction associated with the Headpond Embankment 2 but barely perceptible in the long distance. This would be located within a very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and would not alter the existing composition of the view.</p> <p>Occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks would be a barely perceptible change to the overall composition of the view at this distance. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond waterbody and infrastructure to the west of the Headpond and the Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, Headpond Embankment 2 would result in a barely perceptible change in a very small part of the composition of the view in the long distance. 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, the Headpond infrastructure would remain, and over time the outer face of Headpond Embankment 2 and Access Tracks would weather and further integrate into the view. There would be no discernible change in views. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 15 Viewpoint 15: Ben Lui

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 23.10 km Tailpond and tunnel portals: 23.20 km</p> <p>Located on the boundary of LCT 35 Rugged Mountains and LCT 251 Highland Summits, Ben Lui WLA and Loch Lomond and The Trossachs National Park</p> <p><u>Value: Very High</u></p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with Headpond Embankment 2 would be visible but barely perceptible in the long distance. This would be located within a very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and would not alter the existing composition of the view.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the track upgrade extending to the north-east of the Headpond would be theoretically visible through an existing block of plantation but unlikely to result in perceptible change at this the long distance.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with Headpond waterbody and infrastructure to the west of the Headpond, Marine Facility and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, the construction activity and plant associated with the Headpond, and access track would occupy a very small part of the horizontal extent of the view. The introduction of activity and plant in an otherwise highly scenic view with very minimal detracting features would be incongruous but barely perceptible at this distance. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Susceptibility: Very High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view at the summit of Ben Lui.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: Very High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be very high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of new infrastructure and scarring following construction associated with Headpond Embankment 2 but barely perceptible in the long distance. This would be located within a very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and would not alter the existing composition of the view.</p> <p>Occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks would be a barely perceptible change to the overall composition of the view at this distance. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond waterbody and infrastructure to the west of the Headpond and the Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.</p> <p>Overall, Headpond Embankment 2 would result in a barely perceptible change in a very small part of the composition of the view in the long distance. 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, the Headpond infrastructure would remain, and over time the outer face of Headpond Embankment 2 and Access Tracks would weather and further integrate into the view. There would be no discernible change in views. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 16 Viewpoint 16: Duncan Ban Macintyre Monument

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational and visitors to places of interest</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Headpond: 12.1 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 40 Craggy Upland – Argyll and North Argyll LLA</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>Most construction activity would be screened by intervening landform and blocks of plantation forests. Activities associated with Headpond Embankment 2 would be barely perceptible across very small part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view and oblique to the main focus of views north towards the surrounding Wild Land Areas. The construction and operation of new and upgraded access tracks would be barely perceptible within a large swathe of plantation, and the movement of plant would appear similar but at a slightly greater scale than existing forestry operations. Overall, the introduction of activity and plant would be barely perceptible and not dissimilar to existing movement in the landscape. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Headpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
<p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, views of the Development would be limited to Headpond Embankment 2 and the northern access track but both would be barely perceptible due to intervening forestry plantation in the long distance. Headpond Embankment 2 would be a barely discernible part of the horizontal and vertical extent of the view, would not alter the existing composition of the view and would not be located within the focus of the views north towards the surrounding Wild Land Areas. The northern access track to the Headpond would be set within the context of plantation forest near to the Allt na Cuile Riabhaiche glen and leading to the B819 with scarring and occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks. Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain but at this distance, similar to other tracks within the landscape.</p> <p>Overall, the presence of new infrastructure would result in a barely perceptible change across very small part of the composition of the view in the long distance. 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, the impression of visual change would reduce from year 1 of operation. Headpond Embankment 2 would be barely discernible and plantation forest. The tracks would have assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting. The deciduous planting associated with the tracks would also have established, to further integrate the tracks into the view and appear similar to existing tracks. Overall, the operational infrastructure would be a barely perceptible change in the existing view and would not be located within the focus of the view north towards the surrounding Wild Land Areas. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Table 17 Viewpoint 17: Loch Awe watercraft

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Recreational</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Tailpond and tunnel portals: 989 m Headpond: 3.8 km</p> <p>Located between LCT 40 Craggy Upland – Argyll and LCT 53 Rocky Coastland - Argyll</p> <p><u>Value: High</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u></p> <p>The views of the surroundings are an important contributor to the experience of recreational receptors experiencing this view.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u></p> <p>Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>At construction, activity and plant introduced into the view associated with the Tailpond would be apparent from recreational receptors. Construction of the Headpond would not be visible. The removal of lochside vegetation, large-scale excavation and earthworks to enable the construction of the inlet/outlet structure would be highly incongruent and dominate the focus of views. The cofferdam would require the movement of watercraft and the introduction of plant into Loch Awe. 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, therefore this break would incongruent and apparent.</p> <p>Other visible construction activity creation of the cofferdam to construct the inlet/outlet structure on the loch shore, construction of a new access track off the B840 through pastoral land, the substantial removal of mature loch side vegetation, upgrade of an existing track, movement of plant, personnel and materials diversion of the B840, and temporary Construction Compounds and laydown areas, associated lighting. The scale and mass of activity and plant would be set against the rising moorland and partly against deciduous vegetation alongside the glen and the scale would be emphasised by existing caravans on the loch shore.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Access Tracks between the Tailpond and Headpond would be visible across part of the horizontal extent of the view. This would include the upgrade of an existing track north of the Allt Beochlich glen that would be widened for construction plant and materials to be transported, signage erected on the local paths affected by construction access, 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.</p> <p>The overall, scale and intensity of construction activity associated with the Tailpond and tracks would occupy a considerable part of the horizontal extent and substantial change to the visual composition. The duration of change would be medium-term (with peak activity at the Tailpond over a short-term period).</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: High</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>
	<p><u>Operation (Year 1)</u></p> <p>At operation year 1, there would be views of new infrastructure associated with the Tailpond at the loch shore in the middle distance. This would include the inlet/outlet structure in the loch, tunnel portals, scarring through pastoral land from the reinstated access track off the B840the removal of caravans creating gaps in the loch side vegetation, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks, occasional maintenance on Loch Awe and small-scale permanent structures. There would be residual scarring associated with earthworks and the resulting break in the mature loch side vegetation. The infrastructure would extend into Loch Awe, which there is no context for in the vicinity. The Tailpond infrastructure would be a noticeable addition to the composition of the view. Temporary compounds would be reprofiled and restored.</p> <p>Where visible, the scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would remain and would be a contrasting colour to the surrounding vegetation. This would include the upgrade of an existing track to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen with scarring, a new access track to the east of Lochan Romach with scarring, occasional maintenance traffic along the Access Tracks comprising the tunnel portals and small-scale permanent structures alongside the Access Tracks along the part to the north of the Allt Beochlich glen.</p>	<p>Major adverse (significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor

Magnitude of Effect

Significance of Effect

Embedded mitigation measures in particular native woodland would introduce new features including whip tubes and associated fencing would also be visible within the context of the Tailpond on the rising hillside. There are opportunities for advanced planting to allow for the early establishment to increase visual screening and landscape integration benefits of the inlet/outlet structure and the Access Tracks alongside glens. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond would not be visible due to intervening landform.

Overall, the new infrastructure and scarring of tracks would be a pronounced change to the composition of the view in the middle distance. The operational effects would be located across the focus of the view as the craggy upland rises from the loch edge. The duration of change would be long-term.

Magnitude of effect: **High**

Operation (Year 15)

At operation year 15, the Tailpond infrastructure would remain visible but native woodland within and adjacent to the inlet/outlet structure and associated permanent compounds would have established. This would reduce the scale and contrast of visual change and help to integrate the Tailpond infrastructure into the view. The tunnel portals would remain visible albeit as small-scale structures integrated into the hillside. The scale of woodland proposed along the glens and slopes to the loch edge would also be re-established would assimilate the appearance of Access Tracks similar to the tracks in the existing view. Overall, the Development would result in a small and unobtrusive change to the overall composition of middle-distance views. The duration of change would be long-term.

Minor adverse (not significant)

Magnitude of effect: **Low**

Table 18 Viewpoint 18: A815 – St Catherines

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
<p>Receptor Groups: Residential (road users are not considered in the assessment due to a lower sensitivity)</p> <p>Distance to the Development: Marine facility: 3.14 km</p> <p>Located within LCT 34 Steep Ridges and Mountains and East Argyll LLA</p> <p><u>Value: Medium</u></p> <p><u>Susceptibility: High</u> Views contribute to the landscape setting of residential receptors. Users of the local road network do not have their focus on the surroundings and views would be oblique.</p> <p><u>Visual Sensitivity: High</u> Taking into account the value judgements and the susceptibility to change, overall visual sensitivity is considered to be high.</p>	<p><u>Construction</u></p> <p>During the construction phase of the Development, the construction, operation, and demobilisation of the Marine Facility would be apparent across a small part of the background on the opposite loch shore. Construction activities including the construction of the jetty, temporary Construction Compounds, construction traffic, operating watercraft on the loch, earthworks, the removal of small pockets of loch side vegetation would be in marked contrast with the loch shore setting and visual composition south of Inveraray.</p> <p>Once in operation, the jetty would facilitate the movement of vehicles and watercraft on the loch would appear against the wooded backdrop of plateau moor and forest. However, the scale and movement of watercraft and associated lighting along the jetty would become an additional focus of views. Activities during demobilisation would be like those at construction and the jetty piles would be left in situ just above the high tide water level.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with a temporary Construction Compounds and access track through agricultural land to the west of the jetty would be visible. However, access track upgrades further inland would be predominantly screened by existing vegetation and unlikely to result in noticeable visual change due to the rising landform and more wooded backdrop.</p> <p>Construction activity associated with the Headpond and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform at Cruach Mhor.</p> <p>Overall, construction activity associated with the Marine Facility would result in a noticeable and incongruent change to the composition of the view and 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 have been demobilised. Temporary Construction Compounds would be restored. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at high tide water level but the impact of this is barely perceptible. The angle of views towards the former Marine Facility is such that visual scarring associated with Access Tracks would be visible but set against the backdrop of mature woodland and rising landform and therefore limit the contrast in visual change. Operational infrastructure associated with the Headpond and Tailpond would not be visible due to intervening landform at Cruach Mhor. The overall visual change would be unobtrusive in the composition of the view. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Low</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, the appearance of the Access Tracks and former Construction Compound sites would have assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting than at year 1 of operation. The jetty piles left in situ would be visible at lower water level. However, the degree of change would be barely perceptible and the duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Sensitivity of Visual Receptor	Magnitude of Effect	Significance of Effect
	<p><u>Operation (Year 15)</u></p> <p>At operation year 15, the appearance Access Tracks and former compound sites would have assimilated into the local landscape and their colour would be less contrasting than at year 1 of operation. The jetty piles would remain in situ and would continue to be visible at high tide water level.</p> <p>Overall, the changes from the construction activity would be barely perceptible. The duration of change would be long-term.</p> <p>Magnitude of effect: Very Low</p>	<p>Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

1.2 Cumulative Visual Effects

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

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 54.1 m 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.
- Balliemanoach PSH Grid connection has been included in Scenario 2 as the Development will require connection to the 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 Dhuhb 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 20 Cumulative Visual Effects

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
Viewpoint 1	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suidhe Substation and An Suidhe Substation OHL Connection</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> N/A</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The principal parts of the Development would not be visible from Viewpoint 1. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of energy infrastructure is a very small part of the horizontal extent of view and would not be in the focus of the view across Loch Fyne. This part of the view has existing influence from detracting forestry plantation. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would not increase the influence of energy infrastructure in the view. The elements of the Development visible would be limited to scarring of the landscape and breaks in plantation vegetation, which are typical features in the view associated with forestry plantation in different felling stages. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) Scenario 2 would not introduce any further cumulative schemes; therefore, the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low and the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 2	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Inveraray to</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The principal parts of the Development would not be visible from Viewpoint 2. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would not increase the influence of energy infrastructure in the view. The magnitude</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p>Crossaig OHL, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, An Suidhe Wind Farm, An Suidhe Substation OHL Connection and An Suidhe Substation</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, Eredine Wind Farm and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm</p>	<p>of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the High sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) Similar to Scenario 1, the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would not increase the influence of energy infrastructure in the view and the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low and the significance of effect is negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 3	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Dalmally OHL, Beochlich Hydro Scheme and An Suidhe Wind Farm</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) Headpond Embankment 1 would be visible in the background in a small part of the horizontal extent of the view. Other parts of the Development, including permanent small-scale structures in the landscape surrounding the Headpond and scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would result in no cumulative change. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including two wind farms which would be separated. There would also be a short section of OHL that is likely to be screened by vegetation in the foreground and a Hydro Scheme which is unlikely to be perceptible at this distance. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into part of the view that would include the Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme as well as the OHL and Hydro Scheme if visible. The Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme would be located in front of the Development which would further screen and reduce the impression of change of Headpond Embankment 1. The rest of the panorama to be unaffected. 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).</p> <p>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 an additional OHL and wind farm which would result in energy infrastructure being visible across a large part of the horizontal extent of view. Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm would further screen Headpond Embankment 1. The two wind farms that would occupy the majority of the view, would be in closer proximity to the receptor and would be separated from the Development and nearby cumulative schemes in the distance. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the medium sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 4	Scenario 1	Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)	Scenario 1

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility</u>: Dalmally OHL and Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility</u>: Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm</p>	<p>The Headpond Embankment would be visible in the background view. Other parts of the Development, including permanent small-scale structures in the landscape surrounding the Headpond and scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would result in no cumulative change as they would be less perceptible in the long distance.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario includes a short section of OHL that may be partially screened by landform Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme which would predominantly be located beyond and partially screened by the plantation vegetation in the distance.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would introduce the influence of energy infrastructure into part of the view that would include the Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme. The Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme would be located within plantation and immediately south of the Development and would filter views of the Headpond.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p> <p>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including an additional wind farm which would result in energy infrastructure being visible across a larger part of the horizontal extent of view. The additional wind farm would be in closer proximity to the receptor and would be separated from the Development and nearby cumulative schemes in the distance. The addition of the Development would add to the presence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Minor adverse, (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 5	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility</u>: Dalmally OHL and Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility</u>: Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)</p> <p>The inlet/outlet structure would be visible at the loch shore in the middle distance within a small part of the horizontal extent of the view.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented a short section of OHL rising up the rocky coastland and craggy upland and a wind farm primarily beyond and partially screened by plantation vegetation in the background.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would extend the influence of energy infrastructure across the horizontal extent of the view. However, the appearance inlet/outlet structure is unlikely to be associated with scale and mass of the cumulative schemes. 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).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p> <p>The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low and the significance of cumulative effect would be minor adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
Viewpoint 6	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Dalmally OHL and An Suidhe Wind Farm</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm and Eredine Wind Farm</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The inlet/outlet structure would be visible at the loch shore in the middle distance within a small part of the view.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of a short section of OHL rising up the rocky coastland and craggy upland and two wind farms in the background primarily within the craggy upland. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would concentrate energy infrastructure across the central part of the view between the two wind farms. The addition of the Development would intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view in a panorama that has some screening from existing foreground vegetation.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>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 two additional wind farms in the background within the craggy upland. This would increase energy infrastructure being visible across a large part of the horizontal extent of the view.</p> <p>Overall, the addition of the Development would intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view in a panorama that has some screening from existing foreground vegetation. The other cumulative schemes in the view would be separated from the Development as they would generally be located in the distance within the craggy upland.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Sequential views along the Core Path network to the west of Loch Awe near to Viewpoint 6 This viewpoint represents a ‘worst case’ view from a static point from the core path network to the west of Loch Awe. Due to the screened nature of views along the core path network in the vicinity, predominantly due to forestry plantation, it is not considered that there would be significant sequential visibility effects arising from the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario. The Development would be located in an area where existing cumulative schemes would be located and would not be located in a ‘gap’ between energy related developments for users of the core path network.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 7	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Dalmally OHL and Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, An Carr</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The inlet/outlet structure would be visible at the loch shore in the middle distance within part of the horizontal extent of the view. Other parts of the Development, including permanent small-scale structures in the landscape surrounding the Headpond and scarring associated with the ground plane of new tracks and track upgrades would result in no cumulative change.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including a short section of OHL rising up the rocky coastland and craggy upland and a wind farm in the background primarily within the craggy upland.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would slightly extend the influence of energy infrastructure in the horizontal extent of view. The Development would be in a small part of the view, where visible</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	Dubh Wind Farm and Eredine Wind Farm	<p>through foreground vegetation which would create separation from the other cumulative schemes. The remainder of the rising rocky coastland and craggy upland in the view would remain unaffected.</p> <p>Overall, the addition of the Development would intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view, allowing the remainder of the rest of the panorama to be unaffected.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p> <p>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes, including three additional wind farms in the background within the craggy upland. This would increase energy infrastructure being visible across a large part of the horizontal extent of the view.</p> <p>Overall, the addition of the Development would intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view in a panorama. This would be within the horizontal extent of view already influenced by wind farms, albeit separated somewhat as these would be located in the craggy upland.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Sequential views along the B840 near to Viewpoint 7</p> <p>This viewpoint represents a 'worst case' view from a static point near to the B840. For those moving along the B840, the addition of the Development would be visible and would appear separate to other cumulative schemes on higher land. As indicated on Figure 5.2E, visibility of the Development would be limited to pockets to the south and largely not visible from further along the B840 to the north. As the B840 continues to be a low level, for pockets of visibility to the south, separation of the principal parts of the Development would remain to be separated from other cumulative schemes. It is not considered that there would be significant sequential visibility effects arising from the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario.</p>	
Viewpoint 8	<p>Scenario 1</p> <p><u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, Creag Dhubh Substation, Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suidhe Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Dalmally OHL, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm and Nant Hydro Scheme</p> <p>Scenario 2</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)</p> <p>The Headpond Embankments and part of the waterbody would be visible in the long distance in a small part of the horizontal extent of the view and similar to other upland lochs.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario features several OHLs, wind farms and a hydro scheme in the distance. Some of the schemes would be located within or set against areas of plantation and would be partially screened from this distance. The nature of cumulative schemes, other than OHLs which are typical in the existing view, appear visually separate in the landscape due to distance between and intervening forestry plantation.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would slightly the influence of energy infrastructure into part of the horizontal extent of the view that would include the Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme in the craggy upland and an OHL. However, the Development would be concentrated within part of the view affected by energy infrastructure and is less likely to be associated with the scale and mass of windfarms.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p>	<p>Scenario 1</p> <p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2</p> <p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Ladyfield Wind Farm, Eredine Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, Barachander Wind Farm and Balliemanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>The cumulative baseline scenario would continue to be influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes. There would be additional wind farms and OHLs in the view, however the development other than OHLs would remain to be concentrated in pockets from the elevated view. The addition of the Development is unlikely to alter the overall balance of features in this part of the views.</p> <p>Taking all of this into account, the magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 2 is judged to be minor adverse (not significant).</p>	
Viewpoint 9	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm - Variation</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would barely be perceptible due to the screening of the Development resulting in only a small part being potentially visible and distance. Overall, the addition of the Development would result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. and the significance of cumulative effect is negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 10	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Creag Dhubh Substation and Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Ladyfield Wind Farm and Balliemanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would barely be perceptible due to the screening of the Development resulting in only a small part being potentially visible and distance. Overall, the addition of the Development would result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. and the significance of cumulative effect is negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 11	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Creag</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond Embankment would be barely perceptible. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including two OHLs and a substation which would be screened somewhat by intervening forestry vegetation, The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would barely be perceptible due to the screening of the Development resulting in only a small part being potentially</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p>Dhubh Substation and Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Ladyfield Wind Farm and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>visible and distance. Overall, the addition of the Development would result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for 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 2 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 12	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suidhe Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Dalmally OHL, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm and Nant Hydro Scheme</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Ladyfield Wind Farm, Eredine Wind Farm, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, Barachander Wind Farm and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond would be visible in the background in a small part of the horizontal extent of the view and would appear like other upland lochs.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario features several OHLs, wind farms and a hydro scheme in the distance. Some of the schemes would be located within or set against areas of plantation and would be partially screened from this distance. The nature of cumulative schemes, other than OHLs which are typical in the existing view, appear visually separate in the landscape due to distance between and intervening forestry plantation.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would slightly the influence of energy infrastructure into part of the horizontal extent of the view that would include the Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented scheme in the craggy upland and an OHL. However, the Development would be concentrated within part of the view affected by energy infrastructure and is less likely to be associated with the scale and mass of windfarms.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>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 OHLs and wind farms. Overall, the addition of the Development would continue to intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view. The cumulative schemes and the Development would continue to be in clusters in the distance.</p> <p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 13	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Dalmally OHL, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, An Suidhe Wind Farm, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Creag Dhubh to</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond Embankment is barely perceptible in this view. Taking this into account, the addition of the Development would result in a barely perceptible deterioration in the existing view. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes)</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p>Dalmally OHL and Inveraray to Crossaig OHL.</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Ladyfield Wind Farm, Eredine Wind Farm, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p>	
Viewpoint 14	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suidhe Substation, An Suidhe Wind Farm, An Suidhe Substation OHL Connection, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm and Nant Hydro Scheme</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, Eredine Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Ladyfield Wind Farm, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm Repowering, Barachander Wind Farm and Balliemeanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond Embankment would be barely discernible. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) Due to the cumulative schemes being barely perceptible due to distance, it is considered that the cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 15	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Inveraray to</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond Embankment would be barely discernible. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would result in no change.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p>Crossaig OHL, Creag Dhubh to Inveraray OHL, An Suidhe Substation, An Suidhe Wind Farm, An Suidhe Substation OHL Connection, Blarghour Wind Farm – Consented, Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, Carraig Gheal Wind Farm, Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm and Nant Hydro Scheme</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Eredine Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation, Blarghour Wind Farm OHL Connection, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm, Ladyfield Wind Farm, Beinn Ghlas Wind Farm Repowering, Barachander Wind Farm and Balliemanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be none. Taking account of the very high sensitivity, 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) Due to the Development being barely perceptible due to distance, it is considered that the cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1.</p>	<p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 16	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Creag Dhubh Substation, Creag Dhubh Substation OHL Connection, Creag Dhubh to Dalmally OHL and Carraig Gheal Wind Farm</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Eredine Wind Farm, Ladyfield Wind Farm, An Carr Dubh Wind Farm and Balliemanoch PSH Grid Connection</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Headpond would be barely discernible. This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including two OHLs, a substation and a wind farm. Overall, the addition of the Development would be barely perceptible. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) Due to the Development being barely perceptible due to distance, it is considered that the cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 17	<p>Scenario 1</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes)</p>	<p>Scenario 1</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<p><u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Dalmally OHL and Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Blarghour Wind Farm - Variation</p>	<p>The inlet/outlet structure would be visible at the loch shore in the middle distance within a small part of the horizontal extent of the view.</p> <p>This cumulative baseline scenario is influenced by the presence of various energy infrastructure schemes including a short section of OHL rising up the rocky coastland and craggy upland and a wind farm primarily beyond and partially screened by plantation vegetation in the background.</p> <p>The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would extend the influence of energy infrastructure across the horizontal extent of the view. The Development would be in a small part of the view and would be located at the loch shore, which would create separation from the other cumulative schemes. Overall, the addition of the Development would intensify the influence of energy infrastructure in a small part of the horizontal field of view and the remainder of the rising rocky coastland and craggy upland in the view would remain unaffected.</p> <p>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).</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) The cumulative baseline scenario for Scenario 2 would be very similar to Scenario 1, such that the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1.</p>	<p>Minor adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Minor adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 18	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Inveraray to Crossaig OHL, An Suide Wind Farm, An Suide Substation OHL Connection, An Suide Substation and Blarghour Wind Farm - Consented</p> <p>Scenario 2 <u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> Eredine Wind Farm, Blarghour Wind Farm – Variation and An Carr Dubh Wind Farm</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) The Marine Facility would be demobilised and the residual jetty piles would remain. The addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would not increase the influence of energy infrastructure in the view. The magnitude of cumulative change resulting would be very low. Taking account of the high sensitivity, the significance of cumulative effect in Scenario 1 is judged to be negligible adverse (not significant).</p> <p>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 across the majority of the horizontal extent of the view. This would include three additional wind farms. Alike Scenario 1, the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario would not increase the influence of energy infrastructure in the view and the conclusions are considered to be the same as for Scenario 1.</p> <p>Sequential views along the A815 near to Viewpoint 18 This viewpoint represents a ‘worst case’ view from a static point from the A815. As the principal parts of the Development would not be visible from the A815 there is not considered to be significant sequential visibility effects arising from the addition of the Development into this cumulative scenario.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Negligible adverse (not significant)</p>
Viewpoint 19	<p>Scenario 1 <u>Cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility:</u> N/A</p> <p>Scenario 2</p>	<p>Scenario 1 (existing, consented and under construction schemes) There would be no cumulative effect as no other cumulative schemes would be visible from this viewpoint.</p> <p>Scenario 2 (existing, consented, under construction and application stage schemes) There would be no cumulative effect as no other cumulative schemes would be visible from this viewpoint.</p>	<p>Scenario 1 Neutral (not significant)</p> <p>Scenario 2 Neutral (not significant)</p>

Visual Receptor	Relevant cumulative schemes	Cumulative Magnitude of Effect	Cumulative Effect
	<u>Additional cumulative schemes with theoretical intervisibility: N/A</u>		

