

## Technical Appendix 3.2: Designated and Protected Landscape Assessment Review

### Introduction

In terms of assessing any potential change to landscape effects, the relevant design change of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is the removal of seven turbines from the 36 Turbine Scheme presented in the EIA Report (April 2020) along with short sections of track and hardstanding associated with these seven turbines.

A review of the implications arising from the removal of these seven turbines was undertaken for the following statutory designated landscapes, or landscapes otherwise protected by the planning system.

#### National Context

- Cairngorms National Park (CNP);
- Wild Land Area (WLA) 19. Braeroy – Glenshirra – Creag Meagaidh; and
- WLA 20. Monadhliath.

#### Local Context

- Ben Alder, Laggan and Glen Banchor Special Landscape Area (SLA);
- Loch Lochy and Loch Oich (SLA); and
- Loch Ness and Duntelchaig (SLA).

The above areas are illustrated in Figure 3.3: Designated and Protected Landscapes, and assessed in the following tables, in accordance with the methodology for the Landscape Assessment outlined in the EIA Report (April 2020) (Volume 2, Chapter 7, Section 7.5).

This assessment does not include cumulative landscape effects which are discussed in Technical Appendix 3.4.

## Comparison of Landscape Effects for Designated and Protected Landscapes

**Table 1: Cairngorms National Park (CNP)**

Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities					
Attribute	Sensitivity	Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Magnitude Rating
<i>General Qualities</i>					
Magnificent mountains towering over moorland, forest and strath.	High	The EIA identified that mountain areas affected include the South Monadhliath and areas on the western side of the Cairngorm plateau and to the east of Glen Truim. The effect on most of these areas would be minimal as the 36 Turbine Scheme would appear small and remote in the wider landscape to the west. A very localised significant effect to small parts of the South Monadhliath LCT has been identified but would be small in the context of the CNP as a whole and unlikely to significantly affect this Special Landscape Quality within the vast scale of the CNP as a whole. Although the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be unlikely to lead to a change to the effect on this Special Landscape Quality it would improve the composition of the turbines by reducing stacking.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Vastness of space, scale and height.	Medium	The EIA identified that large scale landscapes are theoretically able to accommodate some large scale development. There is some potential locally for the perceived scale of the landscape to be reduced slightly in the upper glen of the Spey and small parts of the Monadhliath plateau, along the western CNP boundary. However, this would be minimal and the localised nature of this effect is unlikely to significantly affect this Special Landscape Quality within the vast scale of the CNP as a whole. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be unlikely to lead to a change to the effect on this Special Landscape Quality however it would reduce the influence on the upper glen of the Spey in particular.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities					
Attribute	Sensitivity	Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Magnitude Rating
Strong juxtaposition of contrasting landscapes. (such as settled landscapes of the glens seen against the mountains and smaller scale immediate contrasts of pine trees against heather, or heather moorland adjacent to pine forest)	Medium	Within the CNP, the effect of the 36 Turbine Scheme would primarily comprise an appearance of turbines set in a low part of the skyline or in the upland western context. The association of the 36 Turbine Scheme with the upland landscape context external to the CNP where other turbines are already intermittently present is generally unlikely to alter the relationship between upland and lowland landscapes or the contrast between other neighbouring landscapes although a localised minor – moderate (not significant) effect was been identified within the Spey Headwaters: Upper Glen of the Spey LCA. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the intervisibility with the turbines within the LCA. It would also reduce the intensity of turbines in the western cluster, remove some of the turbines which appear slightly larger and closer to the LCA and improve the sense of containment of the development within the landform ‘bowl’.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
A landscape of layers, from inhabited strath to remote, uninhabited upland.	Medium	The association of the 36 Turbine Scheme with the existing ‘bowl’ of elevated plateau moorland, below the tops and above the glens, where the existing turbines of Stronelaig are already present, is unlikely to lead to a change in the perception of layering. However, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the intensity of turbines in the western cluster, remove some of the turbines which appear slightly larger and closer to the LCA and improve the sense of containment of the development within the landform ‘bowl’.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
The harmony of complicated curves. (gently curving landform in contrast to the more angular landscapes of the western Highlands)	Medium	The 36 Turbine Scheme would not alter the landform. In a few places the presence of turbines may cause interruption to undulating profiles and diminish the scale of landform changes but the consistent vertical turbines could also be seen to enhance subtle variations in some views. From areas around the western boundary of the CNP, where the 36 Turbine Scheme would have the greatest landscape effect it would be seen in the western context, where a transition to landscapes more characteristic of the western Highlands takes place. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the intensity of turbines in the western cluster, remove some of the turbines which appear slightly larger and closer to the LCA and improve the sense of containment of the development within the landform 'bowl'.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Landscapes both cultural and natural.	High	The presence of either the 36 Turbine and 29 Turbine Proposed Developments in the western upland context may lead to a perception of more developed uplands outwith the CNP. However, this would be perceived from relatively small areas of the CNP and in many instances it would be seen from areas where existing wind turbines are already present in a similar landscape setting within the same western context. The consistency of development type in the same landscape context would mean the contrast of upland and lowland would be retained although the sense of 'natural' uplands outwith the CNP may be very slightly reduced. However, the wide expanses of upland within the CNP would be unaffected.	Low	Low	No Change
<i>The Mountains and Plateaux</i>					
The unifying presence of the central mountains.	Medium	Situated at least 25 km away, neither the 36 Turbine Proposed Development or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the role of the central mountains as a backdrop or unifying presence within the core of the CNP.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
An imposing massif of strong dramatic character.	High	Situated at least 25 km away from the main Cairngorm mountain massif, neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Proposed Development would affect its imposing quality or presence. Both would appear as a distant element and, whilst it may be perceptible in good weather, it is unlikely to detract from the immediate presence of the mountains.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
The unique plateaux of vast scale, distinctive landforms and exposed, boulder-strewn high ground.	High	The 36 Turbine Scheme would feature as an element within the landscape context from small parts of the South Monadhliath plateau, predicted to lead to localised Moderate (significant) effects on landscape character around the western boundary of the CNP. This is not considered to lead to a significant effect on the South Monadhliath LCA as a whole and these localised effects would be very small and peripheral in the context of the CNP as a whole. The removal of Turbine 29, as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the prominence of turbines in the neighbouring landscape and improve the coherence with Stronelairg. Despite these improvements no noticeable effect is likely to the main Cairngorm plateau which would be relatively distant at over 25 km.	Low - Medium	Low - Medium	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
The surrounding hills.	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Developments would affect some of the surrounding hills such as the Ardverikie Hills and Southern Hills. They would form a feature in views from the summits of some hills, usually seen in combination with the existing Stronelairg, but would be relatively small within expansive vistas. The effect of both schemes on landscape character of these areas has been identified as negligible.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The drama of deep corries.	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any of the most dramatic corries. Although they may be a feature perceived within the landscape from the top of some, this is considered unlikely to affect appreciation of the drama of these features.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Exceptional glacial landforms.	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be a feature perceived in the context of some glacial landforms but they are considered unlikely to affect the appreciation and diversity of these features.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Snowscapes.	Medium	It is unlikely that either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to any effect to this Special Landscape Quality.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
<i>Moorlands</i>					

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Extensive moorland, linking the farmland, woodland and the high tops.	High	The 36 Turbine Scheme would indirectly affect some small areas of moorland, towards the west of the CNP and clothing the lower slopes of the plateaux and potentially forming a new focus within these expansive landscapes from a few locations. However, it would not significantly affect these areas or the distinctive characteristics of moorland as an element of the CNP. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the intensity of turbines, remove some of the turbines which appear slightly larger and closer to the CNP and improve the sense of containment of the development on the plateaux within the landform 'bowl'.	Low	Negligible	Reduction
A patchwork of muirburn.	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to any changes in management of moorland areas or the appreciation of muirburn patterns.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
<i>Glens and Straths</i>					
Steep glens and high passes.	High	While the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the Glen Shirra, Spey Headwaters, Pattack Glen / Strath Mashie, Glen Truim and Càthar Mòr glen areas, the assessment of these areas concluded that it would result in a reduction to Negligible-Minor effects from Minor and Minor-Moderate effects identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme to the Spey Headwaters LCAs. It also concluded that there may be Minor effects to parts of the Ardverikie: Glen Shirra LCA and Negligible effects to other areas. Despite these improvements, these effects are very localised in the context of the CNP as a whole and would not significantly affect this Special Landscape Quality.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Broad, farmed straths.	Medium	Ardverikie: Pattack Glen / Strath Mashie is the only area with some characteristics reflective of the qualities of broad, farmed straths which may be affected by either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. The landscape character assessment of both schemes concluded a negligible effect to this area.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Renowned rivers.	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine or 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any rivers. The landscape character of the Spey Headwaters would be locally affected by the 36 Turbine Scheme but this is unlikely to affect appreciation of the River Spey and would be further reduced with the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Beautiful lochs.	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine or 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any lochs within the CNP.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
<i>Trees, Woods and Forests</i>					
Dark and venerable pine forest.	Low	There would be some areas of forest within Glen Shirra and around Ardverikie theoretically indirectly affected by the both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. These are mostly plantation rather than ancient. Given the limited range of open visibility obtained from these areas, any perceptible effect on the appreciation of these forests is considered unlikely for either scheme.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Light and airy birch woods.	Medium	Areas of birch woodland would be theoretically indirectly affected within Strath Mashie and upper Glen Spey. Given the limited range of open visibility obtained from these areas, any perceptible effect on their appreciation is considered unlikely for either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Parkland and policy woodlands.	Medium	There would be no parkland or policy woodland affected by either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Long association with forestry.	Low	This Special Landscape Quality would not be affected by either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
<i>Wildlife and Nature</i>					
Dominance of natural landforms (such as burns and rivers, lochs, hills and mountains)	Medium	The appearance either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development as turbines on the western or north-western skyline may create a new focus within the landscape context from some localised areas which could distract from the scale and appearance of natural landforms such as hills and mountains, as described in the landscape character assessment. However, they would normally appear small within a broad context, seen outwith the boundary of the CNP, and would appear in views from only a small number of locations where other human modifications are usually already present. While the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would improve the relation of the scheme with Stronelaig and the bowl-shaped landform of the plateaux, it is unlikely that any areas where natural landforms predominate would be significantly affected by either scheme. From the core parts of the park both schemes would appear distant and unlikely to distract from the more immediate dramatic landforms.	Low	Negligible	Reduction
Extensive tracts of natural vegetation.	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any vegetation within the CNP and the appearance of any changes to vegetation outwith the CNP would be limited to small parts of the very western boundary.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Association with iconic animals.	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect this Special Landscape Quality.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change



Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities					
Attribute	Sensitivity	Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Magnitude Rating
Wild Land (concerning the remote qualities of the mountain core and Cairngorm mountain plateaux in particular)	High	As the Special Landscape Quality description describes the mountain core, this Special Landscape Quality is assumed to refer to this area. The 36 Turbine Scheme would have a very limited effect on the mountain core. Distant views from mountain summits would be unlikely to affect wildness, as existing, closer wind farms at similar distance are already present within the western context seen from these locations. This is demonstrated in the view from VP10: Braeriach. There may be a small effect on views within WLA 15 (Cairngorms) further to the south-east, but this would not be significant. VP19: Carn na Caim is representative of the worst case view from this area. Detailed assessment of WLA 15 has been scoped out on this basis, in agreement with SNH. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the intensity of development to the west, however given the distance it is not expected to alter the effect of the from that identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme.	Low	Low	No Change
Wildness (concerning wild characteristics in other areas beyond the mountain core)	High	Both the assessment of the WLA 20 (Monadhliath) for the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development (see Table 3 below) identified potential localised significant effects. However, the majority of areas with characteristics of wildness would not be affected by the either scheme.	Low – Medium	Low – Medium	No Change
Visual and Sensory Qualities					
Layers of receding ridge lines.	High	From some elevated locations, both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen on the western skyline and may affect the appearance of ridgelines. From closer locations and lower locations, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the prominence of turbines on the principal skyline, although there is less of the layered effect present in these areas. From more distant high level areas both schemes would appear on a lower ridge, interrupting the layered effect but small and distant, seen within a similar context of other wind farms, and often barely perceptible.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Grand panoramas and framed views.	Varying Low - High	The 36 Turbine Scheme would appear in views from some mountain summits but in few low level views. These would be further reduced with the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. The visual effects are discussed in Technical Appendix 3.3. In general, it may form a noticeable feature from some discrete areas, leading to very infrequent sequential effects if moving across high summits. It would also be potentially visible in a few closer views where other turbines already form features within the view. Localised significant effects as a result of the 36 Turbine Scheme to views from high points, in this small area, represented by VP18: Loch na Lairige were identified. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development has reduced these to not significant. From summits on the core mountain massif, it would be distant and very small, within an expansive context, where other wind turbines are usually already present.	Low	Negligible	Reduction
A landscape of many colours.	Medium	Whilst the both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be perceptible within the landscape, they would be unlikely to affect the appreciation of colours within the CNP.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Dark skies.	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would have lighting and therefore would have no effect on dark skies.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Attractive and contrasting textures.	Low	Whilst both the 36 Turbine Proposed Development and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be perceptible within the landscape, they would be unlikely to affect the appreciation of textures within the CNP.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The dominance of natural sounds.	Low	Sounds of construction works from both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be perceptible in the short term from the very edge of the park in some conditions but would be unlikely to be distracting at over 1.5 km. The sound of the operational wind turbines is unlikely to be perceptible from any part of the CNP.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
<i>Culture and History</i>					
Distinctive planned towns.	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with any towns.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Vernacular stone buildings.	Low	It is unlikely that either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the appreciation of this Special Landscape Quality.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Dramatic, historical routes.	Medium	The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove visibility of turbines from large sections of General Wade's Military Road within upper Glen Spey, part of Scottish Hill Track 237 and Heritage Path 'The Corrieyairack Pass' which extends beyond the CNP to the west that previously experienced visibility from the 36 Turbine Scheme. It would reduce visibility in the area around Garvabridge to tips of 2 turbines partially filtered by trees which would generally be barely perceptible as an element in the view from a short part of the route and would not affect the use of the route. The visual effect on this route as a whole is anticipated to be reduced from the Minor-Moderate effects identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme to Negligible for the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. This is considered to reflect the visual effect of the part within the CNP. None of the other historical routes listed would be affected (Glenshee, The Lecht, Drumochter, Larig Ghru, Glen Feshie, Glen Tilt, Glen Dee, Jock's Road and the Giack Pass).	Low	Negligible	Reduction
The wistfulness of abandoned settlements.	Low	It is unlikely that either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the appreciation of past settlement within the CNP. Cultural Heritage effects are discussed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Special Landscape Qualities</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Focal cultural landmarks of castles distilleries and bridges.	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen from any of the key locations identified by this Special Landscape Quality including Ruthven Barracks. There would be some very limited visibility of turbines from Garva Bridge in Glen Spey which may form a very slight distraction in the view but would not affect the value of the bridge as a landmark. Cultural Heritage effects are discussed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The Royal connection.	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect this Special Landscape Quality.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
<i>Recreation</i>					
A landscape of opportunities	Medium	The presence of the 36 Turbine Scheme within the wider landscape may be visually experienced by recreational users in some areas, such as a select number of high peaks and parts of the upper Glen Spey. This may distract occasionally for users closer to the Proposed Development (for example in the south Monadhliath or Glen Spey), however the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce this. The appearance of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may lead to very occasional sequential effects for those moving across high ridges and summits, however, from the core of the park it would be distant and unlikely to draw focus. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered unlikely to reduce enjoyment for recreational users and from most areas and would improve the potential experience within the upper Glen Spey compared to the 36 Turbine Scheme.	Low	Negligible - Low	Reduction
Spirituality	Medium	Whilst the wind turbines of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be evident from a small number of locations within the CNP, the lower ground human elements and movement would seldom be visible other than from a few limited places on the western boundary. As such, it is unlikely that feelings of solitude would be diminished by either scheme.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

Assessment of Landscape Effects	
<p><b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine.</b></p>	<p>Relatively small parts of the CNP would be theoretically visible with the both the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development, as shown on the ZTV (Figure 3.3 of this AI and Figure 7.2.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)), although the extent and intensity would be reduced. Change experienced as a result of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would vary from the reduced appearance of blades at relatively close proximity above the western skyline within mountain, plateau and glen areas close to the western border of the CNP, to the very limited presence of turbines set within a low point of the north-western horizon within mid-range elevated landscapes in the south-western part of the CNP, and distant appearance of turbines within an expansive landscape vista from high summits and facing slopes beyond 20 km. The magnitude of change for LCAs within the detailed study area ranges from <b>Negligible</b> to <b>Medium</b> (within The Monadhliath – South Monadhliath LCA). Beyond this distance it would be <b>Low</b> or <b>Negligible</b>.</p> <p>This is considered to lead to a magnitude of change of <b>Negligible</b> for most Special Landscape Qualities (as detailed above), but <b>Low</b> for some Special Landscape Qualities. Two Special Landscape Qualities” <i>The unique plateaux of vast scale, distinctive landforms and exposed, boulder-strewn high ground</i>”, and “<i>Wildness</i>”, are anticipated to have a <b>Low – Medium</b> magnitude of change, reflective of the changes to The Monadhliath – South Monadhliath LCA, but in a context which considers the scale and relative contribution of this area within the CNP as a whole. Those Special Landscape Qualities with higher magnitude of change largely reflect the qualities of openness, expansiveness, wildness / lack of development and relationship between lowland and upland landscapes.</p>

Assessment of Landscape Effects	
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to indirect effects experienced from relatively small parts of the CNP, mostly affecting elevated areas and summits, but also affecting a small part of the Upper Glen of the Spey and Glen Shirra. Due to the disparate nature of these small areas of intervisibility, sequential effects when moving across summits would be minimal.</p> <p>The 36 Turbine Scheme is anticipated to lead to localised significant Moderate effects within The Monadhliath – South Monadhliath LCA along a relatively short section of the western boundary of the CNP and would appear to bring turbines closer to the boundary and may affect the sense of remoteness from some limited high points. However, the removal of Turbine 29 as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the prominence of turbines in the neighbouring landscape and improve the coherence with Stronelairg. Despite this improvement, the western ridgeline would still be influenced by the blades of the eastern cluster and as such no change to the effect on landscape character is anticipated.</p> <p>Within the Spey Headwaters – Upper Glen of the Spey LCA and, to some extent, the Spey Headwaters – Spey Dam and Ardverikie - Glen Shirra LCAs the 36 Turbine Scheme would form a new focus above the skyline and could distract from the existing smaller, scale landscapes and diminish the perceived height of enclosing slopes. However, it would not be out of place within the context due to effects of existing development and tracks resulting in Minor and Minor – Moderate (not significant) effects. However, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would largely reduce visibility in these areas to a few tips of turbines partially filtered by trees which are likely to be generally barely perceptible as an element in the view.</p> <p>Although some of the effects of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be significant in the local context, they are not considered sufficient to result in any significant landscape effect within the context of the CNP as a whole. Furthermore, it would lead to a reduction in effects to the lower-level landscapes within south-western part the CNP from those identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme. The landscape effects detailed are considered unlikely to lead to significant effects on any of the Special Landscape Qualities of the CNP. In most cases, the focus of the CNP is orientated away from the 29 Turbine Proposed Development, as recognised by the Special Landscape Quality, <i>"The unifying presence of the central mountains"</i>. This reduces the potential for significant effects to the landscapes and Special Landscape Qualities of the CNP. There is potential for some of the Special Landscape Qualities to be affected on a very localised basis: for example within elevated views from some areas close to the western boundary of the National Park there would be potential effects on <i>"Vastness of space, scale and height"</i>, <i>"Dominance of natural landforms"</i>, <i>"Grand panoramas and framed views"</i>, and <i>"Wildness"</i>, and within Glen Spey near the boundary there would be potential effects on <i>"Landscapes both cultural and natural"</i> and <i>"Steep Glens and High Passes"</i>. However, given the improved design, this is not considered sufficient to lead to a significant effect on the Special Landscape Qualities themselves as effects would be very localised and these qualities would be present and intact within the vast majority of the CNP.</p> <p>An overall effect of <b>Minor</b> was identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme. Despite the improvements to the design the overall effect of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development on the CNP is also considered to be <b>Minor</b> and not significant during construction and operation and the integrity of the CNP would not be affected.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	No Change.

**Table 2: Wild Land Area 19: Braeroy – Glenshirra – Creag Meagaidh**

<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
<b>Perceived Naturalness</b>	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect land-cover in the WLA. From areas unaffected by Stronelairg, small numbers of turbines could marginally reduce a perception of naturalness outwith the WLA as it may give an impression of other infrastructure being present. However, this would usually affect a part of the context where forestry can already be perceived.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Lack of construction or other artefacts	High	The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the theoretical new areas of the WLA within which wind turbines would be perceived from those identified for 36 Turbine Scheme, with the main area improvement being pass between Braeroy and Loch Spey. Some areas of new visibility would remain on the north facing slopes. This would involve a very small number of turbines, usually affecting a part of the context where forestry, access, buildings and transmission towers around Melgarve Bothy are already present. NatureScot mapping shows this attribute to be relatively low in these locations. VP16: Footpath East of Loch Spey (see Figure 7.9.16.3) shows how the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove visibility from the lower glen floor in this area. Nevertheless, it may still slightly increase the perception of development from some discrete areas and may give an impression of wind development moving slightly closer from higher summit areas where other turbines are already present within the surrounding landscape (see VP11: Carn Liath, VP15: Beinn Teallach and VP17: Carn Dearg (Glen Roy)).	Low - Medium	Low	Reduction

<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Little evidence of contemporary land use	High	Where perceived in the surrounding landscape the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to a greater sense of contemporary land use within the wider area. Wind energy development may be seen to move slightly closer from areas where Stronelairg can already be perceived as demonstrated by VP11: Carn Liath) and VP17: Carn Dearg (Glen Roy) and there would be a new perception of this being present in some lower slopes. However, the few potentially visible features would affect a small part of the context when seen from these areas, where existing land uses such as forestry are already evident. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would also remove visibility from other areas – namely within the central pass (see VP16: Footpath East of Loch Spey).	Low - Medium	Low	Reduction
Rugged or challenging terrain	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the challenging nature of the terrain.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Remoteness and inaccessibility	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to any changes in accessibility within the WLA. From areas where turbines would form a new feature, there are usually already tracks or paths which are more evident in the landscape.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
A sense of sanctuary or solitude	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may increase a sense of others working or present within the surrounding landscape in some areas. However, both schemes would appear relatively separate from areas within the WLA and therefore unlikely to noticeably affect this perceptual response.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Risk or anxiety	Low	It is unlikely that the either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any sense of risk or anxiety.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change



<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Arresting or inspiring qualities / sense of awe	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development turbines may appear within expansive elevated views from some areas (see VPs 11: Carn Liath, VP 15: Beinn Teallach and VP 17: Carn Dearg (Glen Roy)). In this context, they would be present within views where Stronelaig is already a feature but would increase the numbers and bring them closer within the view. However the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove visibility and thus a potential new focus in views from some lower locations, such as the central Braeroy – Loch Spey pass (see VP16: Footpath East of Loch Spey). It is however unlikely that either scheme would noticeably affect the existing arresting qualities which are experienced within the interior which relate more directly to the immediate mountains.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Physically challenging	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development are likely to affect the degree of physical challenge which would be evoked by those accessing the WLA.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Rounded hills and plateaux that are awe-inspiring in their massive scale and simplicity, whilst geological features and rivers contribute strongly to the sense of naturalness.	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be present within the surrounding landscape, seen from higher areas and facing slopes. Where seen in the context of Stronelairg, they are likely appear closer which may give a perception of slightly reduced scale (as shown by VP11: Carn Liath and VP17: Carn Dearg (Glen Roy)). In other lower areas, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove potential visibility of turbines which may have formed a new focus and disrupted the simple skyline (as shown by VP16: Footpath East of Loch Spey). However, despite these improvements this is unlikely to result in a change to the overall effect to this Key Quality. Neither scheme is likely to affect awe-inspiring perceptions, as most of the WLA would be unaffected and would generally not be perceived in relation to the main mountain groups which provide the greatest sense of awe. There would be no change to geological features or rivers from either scheme which would affect their sense of naturalness.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
A strong contrast of experience between the hills and plateaux with the straths, glens and corries, varying in their accessibility, exposure and visibility of human elements.	High	Expansive views from the high tops where the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be perceived usually already feature the turbines of Stronelairg which were not present when the WLA description was written (September 2017). Both schemes may appear to bring turbines closer and increase their prominence but a strong sense of remoteness would not be experienced from these areas because of the influence of the existing turbines (see VP 11: Carn Liath, VP 15 Beinn Teallach, and VP 17 Carn Dearg (Glen Roy)). The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove visibility within the central pass between Braeroy and Loch Spey, where small numbers of the 36 Turbine Scheme turbines would have been visible potentially resulting in effects to the floors of the glens, straths and corries. Both schemes are considered unlikely to affect the sense of sanctuary within the interior.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities					
Key Quality	Sensitivity	Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Effect Rating
A hidden interior that is simple in landform and land cover, contributing to a perceived 'emptiness' and a strong sense of remoteness and sanctuary.	High	Within the interior, there would be limited intervisibility with either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. A small number of the 36 Turbine Scheme Turbines would be visible above the north-east horizon from parts of the central Braeroy – Loch Spey pass. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove this visibility from the glen floor and limit it to the lower slopes. This area is already affected to some degree by access tracks and bothies, as can be seen from SNH Wild Land Attribute Mapping: Absence of Modern Artefacts (see Figure 7.4.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)). While the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may form a small new focus it would represent a reduction to the potential influence of turbines on this Key Quality and is unlikely to affect the empty feeling and sense of remoteness as it would not be present within the immediate landscape. Other more remote corries and glens would be unaffected.	Low	Negligible - Low	Reduction
Access and recreation focused around the margins, with an interior that is visited by few and possesses a sense of solitude, physical challenge and risk.	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would form a feature of the surrounding context from some peripheral areas: for example around Luib Chonnal bothy and hills accessed from the Coireyairack pass but would not affect popular routes accessed from the south of the WLA including some routes around Creag Meagaidh and Glen Roy. The effects on the most remote parts of the interior would be limited as discussed under the previous Key Quality above. Neither scheme is likely to affect perceptions of solitude, physical challenge or risk.	Low	Low	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Long, remote glens that penetrate far into the hills and plateaux: some arresting by virtue of their narrowness and steep side-slopes, and some because of their openness against a surrounding backcloth of towering mountains.	High	While the 36 Turbine Scheme may affect the central Braeroy – Loch Spey pass, the 29 Proposed Development would not affect the glen floors of the remote glens within the WLA. However, it may still affect some of the lower slope of the glen. This area is less remote than some of the other glens as evidenced by the Map of Relative Wildness (see Figure 7.4.1 of the EIA Report (April 2020)) as it has a track through parts of it and bothies at Luib Chonnal and Melgarve are evident from some areas as are development and contemporary land uses at either end. Only a few turbines would be evident within this from the slopes of this glen and though they may slightly increase a sense of contemporary land use this would be unlikely to be significant in terms of the WLA overall as most of this glen would be unaffected and other glens, often more remote, would not be affected. The 29 Turbine would reduce the potential effects on this Key Quality.	Low	Negligible - Low	Reduction

<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine</b>	<p>The 36 Turbine Scheme would be present within the surrounding landscape, seen from some higher areas and facing slopes. The types of effect can be largely categorised into two types:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From elevated areas, it would be generally seen within the context of Stronelairg but would appear larger and slightly closer. This is demonstrated by the representative VPs 11: Carn Liath, VP 15 Beinn Teallach, and VP 17 Carn Dearg (Glen Roy); and</li> <li>• From lower areas, typically around Loch Spey and within the pass between Braeriach and Loch Spey small numbers of turbines would form a new focus on the skyline within the landscape context to the north-east. This is demonstrated by the representative VP16: Footpath East of Loch Spey (see Figure 7.9.16.1 – 7.9.16.3 of the EIA Report (April 202)).</li> </ul> <p>The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove intervisibility within the pass between Braeriach and Loch Spey and therefore the potential new focus to the north-east (see Figure 3.3). This would represent a noticeable reduction in potential influence on the WLA. From elevated areas, both schemes would be experienced in similar ways although the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove some of the nearest turbines and improve coherence with Stronelairg.</p> <p>The WLA covers the part of the LCTs Smooth Moorland Ridges, Rugged Massif – Lochaber, Isolated Mountain Plateau and Rolling Uplands – Inverness. Magnitude of landscape change for these LCTs for the 36 Turbine Scheme ranges between Low and Medium with the Higher ratings affecting the Rolling Uplands – Inverness (Medium, due largely to direct effects occurring outwith the WLA) and Rugged Massif - Lochaber (Medium to Low) where theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development would occur to areas not already affected by existing Stronelairg turbines within the Braeroy – Loch Spey pass. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the magnitude of changes experienced particularly within the Rugged Massif – Lochaber.</p> <p>Overall, considering the magnitude of landscape change to physical and perceptual attributes and Key Qualities the magnitude of change to wildness values within this WLA is considered to reduce from <b>Low – Medium</b> for the 36 Turbine Scheme to <b>Low</b> for the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.</p>

<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect some parts of this WLA although much of this theoretical intervisibility would be within elevated areas which already feature turbines of Stronelairg, Millennium and Beinneun wind farms within the visual context, which reduce the strength of the attributes 'Lack of construction or other artefacts' and 'Evidence of Contemporary Land Use'. Within these areas, the closer and larger scale of the turbines would be seen to bring wind farm development closer to the WLA which would reduce these attributes slightly and may also affect the attribute 'Arresting or inspiring qualities / sense of awe'. However, this is considered unlikely to lead to a significant effect due to the effects of the existing developments, particularly as the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove some of the closest turbines from the 36 Turbine Scheme reducing potential influence on the WLA.</p> <p>From some lower areas, most notably within the pass between Braeroy and Loch Spey, the revised design of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would remove visibility of turbines avoiding the creation of a new feature within the landscape context that would have taken place with the 36 Turbine Scheme. While there would still be some new areas of visibility on the slopes leading up from the glen, contemporary land use and features around Melgarve Bothy are evident from these areas, including forestry, buildings and the 400kV Beauly – Denny transmission towers. These elements affect the same part of this context, thereby reducing the perceived wildness in this area. This effect is upheld by review of NS's Map of Relative Wildness and Absence of Modern Artefacts maps (see Figures 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)) which show a reduced wildness in these areas. Nevertheless, the presence of the turbines as new features may have an effect on the attributes "<i>Lack of construction or other artefacts</i>" and "<i>Evidence of Contemporary Land Use</i>". The 29 Turbine Proposed Development further improves the visual separation of the turbines from the wild land area, due in part to the other development at Melgarve Bothy which interrupts the intervening view and removal of the nearest turbines. It is considered unlikely that the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would lead to a notable effect on the attributes "<i>A sense of sanctuary or solitude</i>" or "<i>Risk or anxiety</i>". Therefore, this is considered unlikely to lead to a significant effect on wild land in this area.</p> <p>The majority of the WLA would remain unaffected by either scheme, including the majority of areas identified by the Map of Relative Wildness (see Figure 7.4.1 of the EIA Report (April 2020)) as having the highest degree of perceived wildness. Where these high wildness areas are identified as being affected, this is usually due to the fact that the visual influence of Stronelairg has not been considered in the Map of Relative Wildness. If this were the case, it is considered likely that these areas would be shown to have a reduced relative wildness.</p> <p>As with the 36 Turbine Scheme, the above effects of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development are considered likely to lead to some perceptible effect on all the Key Qualities of the WLA. However, when taking into account that most of the WLA, including the most remote areas, would remain unaffected, this is not anticipated to be significant.</p> <p>Overall, the combined effect of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development on the Physical and Perceptual attributes and Key Qualities is considered to lead to a <b>Minor</b> (not significant) wild land effect on WLA 19: Braeroy – Glen Shirra – Creag Meagaidh, during construction and operation. This is a reduction from the <b>Minor-Moderate</b> (not significant) effect identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	Reduction.

**Table 3: Wild Land Area 20: Monadhliath**

<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Perceived naturalness	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect land-cover in the WLA. From some areas which are not already affected by Stronelaig, small numbers of turbines could marginally reduce a perception of naturalness within this part of the wider context. Although turbines of other developments are usually evident, the area perceived as being affected by surrounding infrastructure could be slightly increased.	Low	Low	No Change
Lack of construction or other artefacts	High	From the majority of areas within which either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be perceived, other wind turbines already feature within the context (see VP8: Carn Dearg (Monadhliath)). The exception are a few very small areas, in dips and hollows where a few tips may be newly visible and some higher summit areas in the southern tip of the WLA where eastern cluster blades would be present on the western horizon. Although no wind turbines influence these areas, there is a greater appearance of forestry, roads and properties to the south and east, due to their height and prospect. Nevertheless, turbines of both schemes would form new features and may slightly reduce the area within which this attribute is strongest as indicated by the NatureScot Wild Land Attribute Mapping: Absence of Modern Artefacts (see Figure 7.4.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)). Where existing turbines other than Stronelaig are present, both schemes would lead to an increase in turbines within the surrounding context, although this attribute is less strong in these areas and the other developments are usually closer and likely to be more prominent. Where Stronelaig is already present, there may be a perception of bringing turbines closer, but this would be a minimal change this part of the context is already similarly affected. The removal of Turbine 29 as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would help to reduce this perception. Overall, the areas affected are small within the context of the WLA as a whole.	Low - Medium	Low - Medium	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Little evidence of contemporary land use	High	The appearance of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may lead to an increase in perceptions of contemporary land use in the surrounding context where seen without existing Stronelaig turbines. However, they would result in only a minimal change when seen with Stronelaig, particularly with the removal of Turbine 29 as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. In some small areas within the southern tip of the WLA where other turbines are not evident, both schemes would introduce a perception of contemporary land use in the neighbouring area. Where seen with existing Stronelaig turbines there would be minimal effect on this attribute because the turbines would be associated with an area already utilised for this purpose.	Low	Low	No Change
Rugged or challenging terrain	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect the challenging nature of the terrain. Tracks may be perceived from the very western edge of the WLA and closer to the boundary but the inaccessible qualities of the neighbouring WLA landscapes would remain.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Remoteness and inaccessibility	Medium	Although tracks would reach closer to the western boundary of the WLA, there would be no increase in accessibility within it from either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
A sense of sanctuary or solitude	High	From most parts of the WLA, the appearance of turbine tops of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development are unlikely to affect the sense of solitude. Within the high parts of the southern tip where the tips and blades of eastern cluster turbines and occasionally western cluster turbines would be a new feature, this could reduce a sense of being far from other people, within these very localised areas.	Low	Low	No Change
Risk or anxiety	Low	It is unlikely that either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect any sense of risk or anxiety.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change



<b>Assessment of Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>					
<b>Attribute</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Physical and Perceptual Attributes</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Magnitude Rating</b>
Arresting or inspiring qualities / sense of awe	High	Proposed turbines may appear within expansive elevated views from some locations, but largely from areas where existing turbines are already a feature within the view. From some elevated summits in the southern tip of the WLA, eastern cluster blades and tips may appear over the skyline where other turbines are not evident. However, in these areas the westerly view is more limited and does not feature the more expansive mountain vista. From most areas both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen within a pattern of other existing wind development and would contribute only incrementally to the appearance of such structures within the view. Expansive easterly views to the south and east towards the Cairngorms, would remain unaffected by wind turbines.	Low	Low	No Change
Physically challenging	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development are generally likely to lead to a change in the fulfilment of physical challenge that would be evoked in those accessing this area.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
A range of massive rounded hills and plateaux that are awe-inspiring in their simplicity, openness and immense scale, and offer panoramic views to distant mountain ranges.	High	The vast majority of the hills and plateau areas would have no effect from either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. From some small parts both would be evident but in most cases, this would be in a context where other wind energy developments are already present in the surrounding landscape. In a few elevated areas in the south, new eastern cluster turbine tips would form an interruption to a smooth skyline, and very infrequently, more distant western cluster turbines would be present in westerly views. However, this would affect a small part of the surrounding skyline. From some locations, the schemes would be seen within more expansive views of far mountains. However, the most elevated locations where these types of views are obtained usually have intervisibility with Stronelairg wind farm, as shown in VP8: Carn Dearg (Monadhliath), and would therefore affect a part of the view already similarly affected. It is therefore considered that the awe-inspiring qualities of the hills would not be significantly affected by either scheme.	Low	Low	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
An extensive, simple interior with few human artefacts, contributing to a perceived 'emptiness' and a strong sense of naturalness, remoteness and sanctuary.	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with the vast majority of the WLA, and other wind turbines already feature within the context from the majority of areas potentially affected. The exception are a few very small areas, in dips and hollows where a few tips may be newly visible and some higher summit areas in the southern tip of the WLA where blades would be present on the western horizon. Therefore, the majority of the interior would not be changed and perceptions of emptiness, naturalness and remoteness would persist. The higher summits in the south usually have some influence from other exterior development and land management to the south and east due to their height and prospect, although newly appearing blades over the western horizon may lead to some reduction in perceived remoteness. Within the dips and hollows, the appearance of a few tips may slightly reduce a perceived sense of remoteness or sanctuary although a sense of being separate from these features would remain. These areas reflect extremely small parts of the WLA overall and it is considered that, whilst there would be a recognised effect on these areas, the effect on the Key Quality would not be significant as the vast majority of areas where this quality is experienced would not be affected.	Low	Low	No Change
A hill range in which many types of recreation take place, but its large, remote interior maintains a sense of sanctuary, challenge and risk.	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development are likely to lead to any change to perceptions of challenge and risk because it would not lead to any very noticeable changes in accessibility to the WLA. For recreational users, the sense of remoteness or sanctuary within the interior may be slightly affected in very small areas as described above. This would have a minimal sequential effect when moving through the WLA as these areas are so disparate. No significant effect is anticipated to the arresting qualities experienced and it is considered unlikely that either scheme would affect recreational enjoyment.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

Assessment of Effects on Key Qualities					
Key Quality	Sensitivity	Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Effect Rating
Long, narrow glens cutting into the hill and plateau edges which are remote, but facilitate access.	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would share intervisibility with any of the long glens which cut into the plateau.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Assessment of Landscape Effects					
<b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine</b>	<p>Similarly to the 36 Turbine Scheme, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be present within the landscape context of this WLA, seen mainly from higher summits and plateau areas with the vast majority of the WLA being unaffected. The types of effect would result from either increased presence of wind turbines within the surrounding context or areas of new intervisibility with the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. The majority of areas within which either scheme would be theoretically visible would be in addition to existing wind turbines, usually either Stronelairg, Corriegarth, Dunmaglass or a combination of these. From areas where Corriegarth and / or Dunmaglass are already present, both schemes would be further from, and likely to be less prominent than these developments. Where they were seen with Stronelairg, the eastern cluster turbines may appear slightly closer, but would affect a part of the context where similar development is already present. The removal of Turbine 29, as part of the 29 Turbine proposed Development would help to reduce the influence of the eastern cluster on the south-western part of the WLA. Areas of new intervisibility would include occasional dips and hollows, and some higher summits in the southern part of the WLA. Small numbers of eastern cluster tips or blades would be evident above the skyline from these areas. Western cluster turbines may be occasionally present within the further landscape context.</p> <p>Within the detailed study area this WLA is mostly within the Rolling Uplands – Inverness LCT and Monadhliath: South Monadhliath CNP LCA (small parts of the Monadhliath: North Monadhliath and Badenoch – Upper Glen Banchor CNP LCAs would be unaffected). Magnitude of landscape change is Medium for both these LCAs although for Rolling Uplands – Inverness this relates generally to direct and indirect changes outwith the WLA. A Low magnitude is considered more reflective for this LCT within the WLA.</p> <p>Overall, considering the magnitude of landscape change to physical and perceptual attributes and Key Qualities the magnitude of change to wildness values within this WLA resulting from the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered to be unchanged from that identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme, generally <b>Low</b> but occasionally <b>Medium</b> during construction and operation, within around 8 km of the eastern cluster.</p>				

<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>Similarly to the 36 Turbine Scheme, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would affect only small parts of this WLA and by and large areas where existing wind turbines of Stronelairig, Corriegarth and Dunmaglass are already present within the context, and reduce the degree of wildness and the attributes "<i>Lack of Construction or other Artefacts</i>" and "<i>Little Evidence of Contemporary Land Use</i>". Beyond around 8 km, it is likely that the turbines of other wind farms would be more prominent. However, both schemes would increase the extent of surrounding wind development. Where Stronelairig is already a feature, this effect would be reduced, as the part of surrounding context affected would already be similarly affected, particularly for the 29 Turbine Proposed Development as it would remove Turbine 29. Nevertheless, the turbines of both schemes would sometimes appear to be closer and larger, particularly within 8 km. This may appear to bring the influence of human artefacts and contemporary land use closer, thereby reducing the strength of these attributes in these small areas. A greater impression of a surrounding developed landscape could also reduce the attribute "<i>Perceived Naturalness</i>".</p> <p>From summit areas there is the potential to affect "<i>Arresting or Inspiring Qualities / Sense of Awe</i>" due to the appearance of both schemes in expansive westerly views. However, where these types of views are obtained, due to the elevation, Stronelairig is almost always an existing feature within the same part of the view. Although the turbines of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may appear larger and closer, the presence of Stronelairig and removal of Turbine 29 would reduce the degree of effect.</p> <p>From some small areas comprising a few dips and hollows to the north and north-east of the eastern cluster, and higher summits and ridges to the east, both schemes would form a new feature where no other wind turbines influence the landscape. From these areas, tips over the horizon would form a small interruption to the smooth skyline and would locally reduce the attributes "<i>Lack of Construction or Other Artefacts</i>" and "<i>Evidence of Contemporary Land Use</i>". In places this could also give a sense of reducing the scale of the landform or creating a greater perception of active land use in neighbouring areas which could reduce "<i>Perceived Naturalness</i>" and "<i>Sense of Sanctuary and Solitude</i>" slightly. However, this would be very localised.</p> <p>The above effects from both schemes are considered likely to lead to some perceptible effect on Key Qualities which relate to the broad open hills and remote interior but are considered unlikely to perceptibly affect those relating to the glens and recreational values. When taking into account that most of the WLA would remain unaffected, this is not anticipated to lead to any significant effects on Key Qualities.</p> <p>Overall, the combined effect of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development on the Physical and Perceptual attributes and Key Qualities is considered remain unchanged from that of the 36 Turbine Scheme leading to a <b>Minor</b> (not significant) wild land effect on WLA 20: Monadhliath, although small and limited areas closer to the development may receive a very localised <b>Moderate</b> (significant) effect. Effects would occur during both construction and operation. The integrity of the WLA would not be affected.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	No Change.

**Table 4: Ben Alder, Laggan and Glen Banchor SLA**

Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities					
Key Quality	Sensitivity	Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Effect Rating
Ever changing compositions, including:					
Contrasting landform, land-use and views	Medium	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would mainly appear within views from a few upland areas on the skyline of the hills to the north and some lowland areas. Although they would not affect the contrast as they may distract in some discrete views. The 36 Turbine Scheme for example may distract within areas around Glen Shirra and Glenshero Lodge and some tops of the Ardverikie Hills. However, often appearing alongside Stronelairg wind farm, it would generally not appear out of place in the upland landscape. (see VP13: Geal Charn (Ardverikie)). The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce potential influence within areas around Glen Shirra and Glenshero Lodge which could distract from the contrast in this area (see VP18: Loch na Lairige). Despite this reduction, it may still distract in some areas.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
A dynamic sense of place with changing combinations of mountain, moorland, forest, woodland strath and loch	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be likely to noticeably affect this dynamic sense of change when moving through the landscape but would become one of the features occasionally seen within the diverse backdrop.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Striking landscape features such as Coire Ardair on Creag Meagaidh, Creag Dubh near Newtonmore and Dirc Mhòr glacial meltwater channel	High	Limited visibility of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development from Creag Dubh is likely to be barely perceptible and would not affect the setting of this feature in the landscape. There would also be possible visibility of both schemes from the top of Dirc Mhòr and Coire Ardair but this would not affect the immediate experience of these features or their setting when viewed from within or below.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Long ranging panoramas and intimate vistas across Loch Laggan	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be visible in views across or around Loch Laggan though it may appear in high level views above the loch, this would be part of a wider setting and considered unlikely to be distracting.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The contrasting lonely character of Glen Banchor	High	There would be no intervisibility of the either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development with Glen Banchor.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The simple landform horizon of the Monadhliath in contrast to Ben Alder and Creag Meagaidh	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would appear over the skyline of the Monadhliath in northerly views when seen from elevated areas within the Ardverikie hills (see VP13: Geal Charm). The schemes would almost always be seen in the context of the existing Stronelairst turbines, though may appear closer from some areas. This could slightly increase the perception of turbines to the north but would not result in a very noticeable change. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the noticeability of turbines on the skyline from some areas around Strath Mashie (see VP18: Loch na Lairige) but from this area it would not be seen in combination with Ben Alder or Creag Meagaidh.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Recreational value of Creag Meagaidh	Medium	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen from parts of the summit of Creag Meagaidh but not within the remote Coire. VP11: Carn Liath gives an impression of how it would appear from summits in this area. The turbines would almost always be seen with Stronelairst but may appear closer from these areas. However, this is considered unlikely to noticeably affect recreational accessibility or enjoyment of this area.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Remote Qualities of Ben Alder	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would appear in extensive vistas from the summit of Ben Alder as a distant feature (around 28 km). They would be seen the context of existing Stronelaig turbines and may perceptibly increase the extent and scale of visible turbines but would be unlikely to affect its remote feel.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Historic landscapes including:					
Heritage features including medieval castles such as Eilean an Rìgh in Loch Laggan, depopulated medieval townships and post medieval crofting townships and farmsteads	High	No significant effects are anticipated to any of these features from either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development. Cultural heritage effects are discussed in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Picturesque contrasts between upland mountains and settled straths, enhanced by castles and lodges	High	While there may be some effects on picturesque style and views from the 36 Turbine Scheme, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce visibility within Glen Spey around Glenshero Lodge to tips of 2 turbines partially filtered by trees which are likely to be generally barely perceptible as an element in the view reducing potential effects to the picturesque contrasts.	Low	Negligible	Reduction
Cluny Castle and Glen Truim House policy landscapes	High	The policy landscapes at Glen Truim and Cluny would not be affected by either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change



Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities					
Key Quality	Sensitivity	Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality	Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)	Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development	Change to Effect Rating
Current and historic settlement patterns and more contemporary defensive structures such as Dun da Lamh Fort	High	A small number of turbines of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be visible within the setting of Dun da Lamh Fort but would not hinder ability to understand and appreciate the monument as a defensive settlement with strategic panoramic views across the landscape. No changes would occur to any current or historic settlement patterns. The cultural heritage effects are discussed in detail in Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage.	Low	Low	No Change
Assessment of Landscape Effects					
<b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine</b>	<p>The ZTVs (see Figure 3.3 of the AI and 7.2.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)) shows that there would be limited intervisibility of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development with this SLA, across higher summits and facing slopes of mountains and hills to the north and south of Loch Laggan and Strath Mashie, and small areas of lower glen within Glen Shirra, Upper Glen of the Spey and Càthar Mòr. The presence of woodland within parts of this area and removal of turbines as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would further reduce the degree to which they would be evident. From higher areas, the both schemes would usually be seen on the northern skyline of the Monadhliath in the context of the existing Stronelairg turbines. They would not add a new feature to this part of the context, but from some areas the turbines may appear larger and slightly more prominent, potentially more likely to draw focus, although the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce this somewhat. This is predicted to lead to a Low magnitude of landscape change on the Isolated Mountain Plateau, Small Craggy Knolls and Hills LCTs and Ardverikie Hills CNP LCA. From lower areas, the turbines would generally not be seen but in upper Glen Spey the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would noticeably reduce perceptibility of turbines in the north-western horizon compared to the 36 Turbine Scheme. Seen in the context of existing forestry and access tracks the remaining visible turbines of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be limited to tips likely to be screened by forestry. This is predicted to reduce the magnitude of change on the Spey Headwaters – Upper Glen of the Spey LCA, the Spey Headwaters – Spey Dam and Ardverikie – Glen Shirra LCAs.</p> <p>Taking into account that the majority of the SLA would be unaffected, and the Negligible or Low magnitude of change to Special Qualities, the overall magnitude of change for the SLA from the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered to be <b>Low</b>, unchanged from the 36 Turbine Scheme.</p>				

<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or 29 Turbine Proposed Development would directly affect the SLA and would only indirectly affect relatively small areas. From upland areas to the south and east of Loch Laggan, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would appear on the northern / north-eastern skyline of the Monadhliath, usually within a context where existing Stronelairg turbines are already visible and reduce the sensitivity of this part of the surrounding context (see VP13: Geal Charn (Ardverikie)). Whereas the 36 Turbine Scheme turbines would have occupied a low point between Creag Mhòr and Meall na h-Aisre, the removal of turbines as part of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would noticeably reduce the prominence of turbines from areas, such as around Glen Shirra and Strath Mashie (represented by VP18: Loch na Lairige), and upper Glen Spey. The 36 Turbine Scheme Turbines would have been contained by the landform and would not form the highest feature on the skyline but would be potentially prominent in an area which often forms a focus of the view. The 29 Turbine Proposed Development reduces this to a level that is generally likely to be barely perceptible. This would reduce the potential effects to the smooth, and simple skyline of the Monadhliath which is noted as a contributory factor to the Special Quality 'Ever changing compositions' and could therefore lead to an effect on this quality. Despite these improvements, when taking into account that the majority of the SLA would be unaffected and that the change on most Special Quality elements would be barely perceptible, the anticipated effect of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is anticipated remain unchanged from the 36 Turbine Scheme leading to a <b>Minor</b> (not significant) effect on the SLA during construction and operation. The integrity of the SLA would therefore not be affected.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	No Change

**Table 5: Loch Lochy and Loch Oich SLA**

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
The Great Glen, including:					
Part of a chain of lochs and imposing steep-sided V shaped glen which cleaves through the central Highlands between Inverness and Fort William	High	Intervisibility of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is limited to higher tops and slopes, mainly to the west of Loch Lochy. This would not affect the appreciation of the imposing great glen and lochs as a feature within the SLA.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Steep slopes contain and channelling views, with eye catching peaks to the west and parallel ridges to the east forming a corrugated appearance	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen within the linear glen views. To the east from elevated areas, they would appear through and around Glen Tarff to the north-east and would therefore not noticeably affect the corrugated appearance of the landform ridges to the east.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Experience of SLA obtained from the Great Glen Way	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with any part of the Great Glen Way within this SLA.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Distinctly interior Highland landscape with landmark features such as Glengarry Castle Hotel and Well of the Seven Heads	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen from any of the enclosed interior landscapes of the glen and would not be intervisible with the Glengarry Castle Hotel or Well of the Seven Heads.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Experience of SLA from the A82	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with any part of the A82 within this SLA.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Classic Highland Scenery, Distinctive Mountain Top Views, including:					
Views from low-lying areas across fields, lochs and woodland slopes to summits and linear views along lochs, varying in different weather systems	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would form a feature within views from low-lying areas within this SLA.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Outstanding views from high elevation such as Meall Dubh and Meall na Teanga	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would form a feature within the north-east of views from mountains on the west side of Loch Lochy including Meall na Teanga and Meall Dubh. However, they would be distant and relatively small within these wide and expansive views. Highest areas may be intervisible with all the proposed turbines. These would be seen in an area where Stronelaig already affects the view though may appear slightly more prominent.	Low	Low	No Change
Intimate Drama including:					
Sense of comfort and shelter gained from intimate scale features in contrast to drama and grandeur of the wider glen	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with areas on the floor of the glen and would therefore not affect the intimate scale.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Double waterfall at the mouth of Gleann Cia-aig	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be intervisible with any part of Gleann Cia-aig.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Càm Bhealach, a hanging valley on west side of Loch Lochy, seen from A82	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development may be perceptible from mountain slopes to either side of the Càrn Bhealach but would not be seen from the interior of the Bhealach itself. They would not affect appreciation of the Bhealach and hanging valley when seen from the Great Glen.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change

<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine</b>	<p>The ZTV (see Figure 3.3) indicates that indirect change to this SLA from the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be limited to high ground and mountain slopes and summits to the west of Loch Lochy and Creag nan Gobhar, a small hill summit area on the east side of Loch Oich. Similarly to the 36 Turbine Scheme, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would form a feature within the north-east of views from mountain-sides and summits but would comprise barely perceptible tips from Creag nan Gobhar. Turbines would be at least 20km from the western mountains and would therefore appear as a relatively small feature within these wide and expansive views, usually seen in an area where Stronelairst already affects the view.</p> <p>Taking into account that the majority of the SLA would be unaffected, and the Negligible magnitude of change to the majority of Special Qualities, the overall magnitude of change is for the SLA from the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered to remain unchanged from that identified for the 36 Turbine Scheme, <b>Negligible</b>.</p>
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>Similarly to the 36 Turbine Scheme, indirect effects of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development to this SLA would be limited to its appearance within elevated views from mountain summits to the west of Loch Lochy. This would theoretically affect the “<i>outstanding views from high elevation</i>” element of the “<i>Classic Highland Scenery, Distinctive Mountain Top Views</i>” Special Quality. Both schemes would affect only a small part of the expansive views obtained from these locations and, as they would be seen within a part of the view where Stronelairst is already present, would only form a small increase to the presence of wind turbines within these views. However, they may be slightly more prominent and therefore may be slightly more likely to draw focus. As there would be no intervisibility from lower lying and interior parts of the Great Glen, none of the other Special Qualities would be noticeably affected by either scheme. Taking into account the very localised nature of effects within this landscape, and the limited magnitude of change occurring to Special Qualities generally, the landscape effect on the Loch Lochy and Loch Oich SLA is considered to be <b>Negligible</b> (not significant) during construction and operation for the 29 Turbine Proposed Development, unchanged from that of the 36 Turbine Scheme.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	No Change.

**Table 6: Loch Ness and Duntelchaig SLA**

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
The Dramatic Great Glen, including:					
The striking profile of the glen, seen from either end, the water and elevated viewpoints on loch-side ridges and hill tops	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be seen as part of the surrounding landscape context to the south, usually seen from upper glen-side slopes to the west of Loch Ness as lower slopes are usually wooded. They would appear relatively distant and beyond the confines of the Great Glen, therefore unlikely to affect appreciation of the striking trench-like landform.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Steep-sided slopes, incised by water-courses with woodland and forest and an open smooth moorland skyline ridge	High	There would be theoretical visibility of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development from steep side slopes on the western side of the glen, usually higher slopes as lower slopes tend to be wooded. This may interrupt the smooth skyline from some areas but would appear relatively distant. They would usually be seen within the context of the existing Stronelaig turbines and therefore in a part of the context already affected by wind turbines. Some new areas of intervisibility may be obtained where trees allow from lower slopes. This would lead to a slightly increased effect along the skyline, but would reflect the pattern of other wind energy developments which are visible through the side valleys of the eastern hills (Corriegarth and Dunmaglass). The 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the density of the turbines in the west cluster in particular from these areas. VP2: Great Glen Way, Balbeg demonstrates the type of appearance which may occasionally be obtained from slightly lower slopes while VP3: Meall Fuar-mhonaidh demonstrates the type of view which would be obtained from highest areas and how the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the density and stacking of the western cluster.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
The contrast between northern and southern loch-side in relation to access, activity and settlement	Medium	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is likely to affect the contrast between these areas as it would not lead to any perceptible direct changes to access or development in these areas. Use of the existing Stronelairg access is unlikely to lead to a perceptible change.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Distinctive views of grand proportions and long vistas along Loch Ness	High	There would be minimal perceptibility of the either the 36 Turbine Proposed Development or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development when viewed from the shoreline of Loch Ness. In general loch side trees and forest cover over the eastern ridgeline would result in turbines being barely perceptible from these areas.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Atmospheric mists and low clouds	Low	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be likely to affect any appreciation of the landscape relating to weather conditions.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Urquhart Castle and Foyers former British Aluminium Factory, prominent focal points along the loch	High	Neither the 36 Turbine Scheme or 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered likely to be perceptible from any part of Urquhart Castle (see VP20: Urquhart Castle) or the former British Aluminium Factory and are unlikely to feature negatively within the context of any views towards these features.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Experience of the SLA from the B852, B851, and A82, Great Glen Way and Caledonian Canal	High	Although there may be glimpsed views of both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development from some of the road routes and theoretically from the canal through Loch Ness, these effects would be limited and unlikely to be significant (see Technical Appendix 3.3, Route Receptors R1 – R3). Although the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the density of the western cluster when seen from these routes, both schemes would be potentially prominent in occasional views from the Great Glen Way but these would be intermittent as the route is generally in amongst forestry. Where seen, they would reflect the pattern of existing wind development within the context, being visible through occasional side valleys of the Monadhliath (see VP2: Great Glen Way, Balbeg).	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)

<b>Assessment of Effects on Special Qualities</b>					
<b>Key Quality</b>	<b>Sensitivity</b>	<b>Potential Changes to Effects on Key Quality</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating in EIA Report (36 Turbine Scheme)</b>	<b>Magnitude Rating for 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>
Prominent landmark of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh and role as a vantage point	High	Both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would appear within the expansive easterly views from Meall Fuar-mhonaidh and would form a perceptible addition, to Stronelaig turbines and Corriegarth turbines. However the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the numbers of turbines and improved composition within the south-eastern hills (see VP 3: Meall Fuar-mhonaidh and Technical Appendix 3.3). However, both schemes would rarely affect the setting of Meall Fuar-mhonaidh when seen from other parts of the SLA.	Low	Low	No Change (with reduced influence of turbines)
Contrasting Intimate Plateau, including:					
Intimate mix of landscape elements of changing visual interest	High	There would be limited theoretical visibility of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development from the eastern plateau area, usually in the form of glimpsed views of turbines through side valleys and from higher points. While they may be perceptible, it is considered unlikely to distract from the foreground elements and changing patterns and experiences within this area.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Historic Landscape, including:					
Achulin depopulated township	High	At over 30km distant, the few tips of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development which would be theoretically visible from this area are likely to be barely perceptible.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
Intensive prehistoric activity associated with Loch Duntelchaig, Loch Ashie and Loch Ruthven	Medium	At over 20km both the 36 Turbine Proposed Development and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be distant from this area and would have very little perceptibility.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change
The Caledonian Canal and Abbey within Fort Augustus	Medium	There would be no intervisibility of either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development with Fort Augustus.	Negligible	Negligible	No Change



<b>Assessment of Landscape Effects</b>	
<b>Potential changes to Magnitude of Change between the 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine</b>	<p>There would be limited direct change within this SLA from either the 36 Turbine Scheme or the 29 Turbine Proposed Development relating to use of the existing access track to Glendoe Hydro and Stronelairg wind farm but this would be unlikely to be very perceptible due to its existing use. The ZTV (see Figure 3.3) shows that indirect change relating to intervisibility with the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would occur with steep side slopes on the western side of the glen and the higher ridgeline including Meall Fuar-Mhonaigh, similar to that of the 36 Turbine Scheme (see Figure 7.2.2 of the EIA Report (April 2020)). There would be limited intervisibility with lower slopes and loch shore areas and local woodland cover is likely to result both schemes being barely perceptible from these areas. From higher slopes, turbines would appear on the skyline usually appearing as tips. However, scattered tree and forest cover in these areas would reduce the true extent of areas affected (see VP2: Great Glen Way, Balbeg). From more elevated and open areas around and on Meall Fuar-mhonaigh (see VP3), larger numbers of turbines would be perceived, within a backdrop of layered horizons, seen within the context of the existing Stronelairg and Corriegarth turbines. From this direction the reduced density of the western cluster of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would be perceptible compared to the 36 Turbine Scheme. Along the eastern ridgeline and the Loch Duntelchaig plateau, there would be more limited intervisibility with the 29 Turbine Proposed Development, usually involving turbines seen distantly or as tips between gaps in the hills. This intervisibility would also be reduced, particularly along the eastern ridgeline, by local woodland and forest.</p> <p>Taking into account likely intervisibility with Meall Fuar-mhonaigh, but relatively limited magnitude of change to other Special Qualities, the overall magnitude of change for the SLA due to the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered to be Low, unchanged from the 36 Turbine Scheme.</p>
<b>Potential changes to Landscape Effect between 36 Turbine Scheme and 29 Turbine Proposed Development</b>	<p>The direct impact of the access from both the 36 Turbine Scheme and the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered unlikely to lead to any perceptible effect. No perceptible effects on the SLA are anticipated in relation to intervisibility with lower slopes and shoreline areas of Loch Ness, the eastern ridgeline or the eastern plateau from either scheme as the minimal glimpses available would reflect the existing pattern of wind development (Corriegarth and Dunmaglass) and would not alter any of the characteristics or Key Qualities of the SLA. However, from higher slopes around Meall Fuar-mhonaigh and the western ridge both schemes would be perceived in the south-eastern hills as part of a greater area of existing wind energy development including Corriegarth and Stronelairg (see VP3: Meall Fuar-mhonaigh). Although, the turbines of both schemes may appear slightly larger and more prominent, the 29 Turbine Proposed Development would reduce the perceived density of the western cluster. The schemes would have a small effect on <i>“the role of Meall Fuar-mhonaigh as a vantage point”</i> which is part of a Special Quality, but would not affect the appreciation of the Great Glen from this area, or the role of Meall Fuar-mhonaigh as a landmark.</p> <p>From slightly lower areas, both schemes may be seen on their own on the skyline, although trees and woodland areas would reduce the availability of this intervisibility (see VP2: Great Glen Way, Balbeg). This would lead to a slightly increased effect along the skyline, affecting the Special Quality of an <i>“open, smooth moorland skyline ridge”</i>, but would generally reflect the pattern of other wind energy developments which are visible when moving through this landscape, through the side valleys of the eastern hills (Corriegarth and Dunmaglass). While both schemes would be seen from these areas, they would not affect appreciation of the landform and landscapes of the Great Glen.</p> <p>When taking account the contribution of these effects and Special Qualities on the SLA as a whole, the landscape effect of the 29 Turbine Proposed Development is considered to be Minor (not significant) during construction and operation, unchanged from the 36 Turbine Scheme. The integrity of the SLA would not be affected.</p>
<b>Change to Effect Rating</b>	No Change

