

**Harmony HM Ltd.**

# **High Mathernock BESS**

## **Additional Information (AI) - Landscape and Visual Amenity**

**Draft report**  
Prepared by LUC  
December 2025





# Harmony HM Ltd.

## High Mathernock BESS Additional Information (AI) - Landscape and Visual Amenity

**Project Number**  
16346

Version	Status	Prepared	Checked	Approved	Date
1.	Draft report	N. Elliot	N. Elliot D. Walker	D. Walker	16.12.2025
2.	Final report	N. Elliot	N. Elliot D. Walker	D. Walker	07.01.2026

Bristol  
Cardiff  
Edinburgh  
Glasgow  
London  
Manchester  
Sheffield  
  
landuse.co.uk

Land Use Consultants Ltd  
Registered in England  
Registered number 2549296  
Registered office:  
250 Waterloo Road  
London SE1 8RD  
  
100% recycled paper

Landscape Design  
Strategic Planning & Assessment  
Development Planning  
Urban Design & Masterplanning  
Environmental Impact Assessment  
Landscape Planning & Assessment  
Landscape Management  
Ecology  
Historic Environment  
GIS & Visualisation  
Transport & Movement Planning  
Arboriculture



OHS627041



# Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>		<b>Appendix A</b>	
<b>Background</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Figures and Visualisations</b>	<b>A-1</b>
Introduction	1	Figures	A-1
Structure of the Additional Information	2	Visualisations	A-1
<b>Chapter 2</b>			
<b>Summary of Planning Officers Recommendation</b>	<b>3</b>		
Overview	3		
Response to the Council's Concerns	4		
<b>Chapter 3</b>			
<b>Summary of Original LVA</b>	<b>5</b>		
Review of Original LVA	5		
Original Landscape Appraisal	6		
Original Visual Appraisal	6		
Original Cumulative Appraisal	6		
<b>Chapter 4</b>			
<b>Summary of Design Changes and New Information Provided</b>	<b>8</b>		
Scheme Design Changes	8		
Additional Accompanying Information	9		
<b>Chapter 5</b>			
<b>Updated LVA (including Cumulative Appraisal)</b>	<b>10</b>		
Baseline Landscape	10		
Analysis of ZTVs	11		
Updated Landscape Appraisal	12		
Updated Visual Appraisal	12		
Updated Cumulative Appraisal	14		
Updated Landscape Strategy Plan	15		
<b>Chapter 6</b>			
<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>16</b>		
Summary	17		

# Chapter 1

## Background

### Introduction

**1.1** In December 2024, Harmony HM Ltd. (the 'Applicant') submitted an application for Section 36 consent and deemed planning permission to the Scottish Ministers for a proposed 334MW High Mathernock Battery Energy Storage (BESS) development on land at Loganwood House, High Mathernock Farm, near Kilmacolm in Inverclyde (the 'Proposed Development') (ECU Ref: [ECU00005083](#) / 25/0001/EAA). A battery storage facility is considered to be a generating station.

**1.2** The Scottish Ministers are required to consult the Planning Authority where the development is located, and therefore in response to the application, Inverclyde Council considered the application. The Planning Officers provided the Draft Committee Report to the Applicant in advance of the August 2025 Planning Board meeting.

**1.3** In the draft recommendation to The Planning Board (Draft Committee Report dated 6 August 2025) Planning Officers '*recommended that the response to the Scottish Ministers is that Inverclyde Council object to the proposed development for the following reasons:*

- 1) *The proposed battery energy storage system (BESS) fails to accord with Policy 11 (e) (ii) of NPF4 as the cumulative landscape impact is incompatible with the established landscape character. The proposal also fails to comply with Policy 14 of NPF4 as the development undermines the interpretation of local landscape due to negative cumulative landscape impact.*
- 2) *The proposed battery energy storage system (BESS) fails to accord with Policies 1 and 4 of both the adopted and proposed Local Development Plan due to adverse impacts on local landscape character and setting, and the green network. The proposal also fails to comply with Policy 34 of the proposed Local Development Plan as the proposal fails to conserve, enhance or restore landscape character and distinctiveness.'*

**1.4** Impacts on the host Rugged Upland Farmland Landscape Character Type (LCT 202)<sup>1</sup> will be contained within approximately 1 km of the Proposed Development. The extent

---

<sup>1</sup> [LCT 202 - Rugged Upland Farmland](#)

of these impacts are understood to be agreed by the Council, however, it is the localised nature of these impacts in the context of NPF4 Policy 11 (e) (ii)<sup>2</sup> which is disputed.

**1.5** The concerns related to cumulative landscape impacts are understood to principally relate to the relationship between the Proposed Development and the adjacent, and now consented<sup>3</sup>, Auchentiber BESS development (ECU Ref: [ECU00004979](#)). The presence of other electricity transmission infrastructure and wind farm development within the wider landscape surrounding the Site also has a notable influence on the local landscape character.

**1.6** The application included a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVA)<sup>4</sup>, prepared by David Wilson Associates (DWA). Where relevant the preparation of this Additional Information (AI) has considered the original application material.

**1.7** LUC was appointed by the Applicant in August 2025 to provide initial landscape advice in relation to the Proposed Development, including undertaking a review of the Planning Officer's recommendation in respect to landscape and visual matters, and identify potential improvements to the scheme to address concerns raised.

**1.8** LUC has extensive experience of providing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) services and advice on behalf of developers, local planning authorities and statutory agencies, particularly in relation to large scale energy infrastructure development. We have experience and knowledge of the Inverclyde local authority area and the surrounding landscape, and between c.2009-2021 LUC was an appointed consultant to the Inverclyde Council Landscape and Planning Consultancy Frameworks.

**1.9** LUC has good knowledge of the local landscape of Inverclyde and that surrounding the Site of the Proposed Development. The team was involved in the routeing, design and assessment of the replacement 132kV overhead line between Devol Moor Substation and Erskine, on behalf of ScottishPower Energy Networks. We also have experience of BESS proposals within the Inverclyde Council Area, including the consented Dougliehill BESS ([25/0033/IC](#)), and other large scale BESS proposals across Scotland.

**1.10** LUC undertook field visits to the Site and surrounding area to complete surveys and capture updated baseline viewpoint photography, during August and September 2025.

## Structure of the Additional Information

**1.11** In response to the Inverclyde Council reasons for the refusal, the applicant has re-visited the design of the Proposed Development, which is explained further through the Additional Information provided in this report.

**1.12** This AI Report is structured as follows:

- **Chapter 2** – provides a summary of the Inverclyde Planning Officers recommendations;
- **Chapter 3** – provides a summary of the original LVA findings;
- **Chapter 4** – provides an overview of design changes and new or additional information provided within this report;
- **Chapter 5** – provides a summary of the resulting differences/ changes to the landscape and visual resource (including cumulative effects); and
- **Chapter 6** – provides conclusions on the predicted landscape and visual effects (including cumulative effects).

<sup>2</sup> [National Planning Framework 4](#)

<sup>3</sup> Consent granted by Scottish Ministers on 11 September 2024

<sup>4</sup> It is noted that whilst the original appraisal is referred to as a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), no judgements are

made in respect to the significance of effects that are identified, as this was not deemed necessary in the issued screening opinion dated 25 October 2024.

## Chapter 2

# Summary of Planning Officers Recommendation

### Overview

**2.1** The following chapter focuses on the key landscape and visual (including cumulative) issues raised in the Inverclyde Council draft Report to Committee (dated 6 August 2025).

**2.2** The draft Report to Committee refers to the potential fragmentation of the landscape, through the siting of multiple developments within the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT (LCT 202)<sup>5</sup>: *'However, the key test of whether the impacts are generally localised and acceptable relates to whether the cumulative impacts from two developments (consented Auchentiber and the proposed High Mathernock BESS) result in this type of industrial development being a recognised and consistent feature of the landscape, or that such developments result in a fragmentation of the landscape.'* [emphasis added]. This statement appears to be at odds with the position adopted by the Council in respect to the adjacent Auchentiber BESS proposal where the *'clustering'* of similar forms of development was considered to be preferable in minimising *'fragmentation of the landscape'* and more widespread cumulative landscape and visual impacts.

**2.3** The Council's response (page 28) also states that *'Screening for the proposed site relies partially on landscaping mitigation under the control of the Auchentiber consented development. The Auchentiber consent specifies a full growth maturity of 15 years.'* [emphasis added]. This is not strictly true, but because the existing application visualisations illustrate only the future cumulative situation with both schemes present, the mitigation proposals to screen and filter views of the Proposed Development in isolation are not able to be fully appreciated within the original submitted visualisations.

**2.4** The Planning Officer states that *'Many of the effects of the proposed development are localised, and the more prominent views are generally near the site'* [emphasis added] (page 28).

**2.5** In respect to the combined cumulative footprint of the Proposed Development and the adjacent Auchentiber scheme, the Council states *'The cumulative landscape effect of two BESS developments with a combined development area of 24.87Ha exceeds what would be considered a definition of generally acceptable.'* [emphasis added]. Whilst this

---

<sup>5</sup> [LCT 202 - Rugged Upland Farmland](#)

quantifiable area may be of relevance in respect to some planning policies, it is not necessarily of relevance to the landscape impacts that will arise, and particularly because the areas quoted are understood to constitute the full extents of the respective developments of the relevant planning applications, rather than the built development components (defined by the red line boundary for each site). As such, they do not reflect the extents of landscape mitigation proposals which would deliver biodiversity benefits and potential; beneficial change in terms of reinstatement and enhancement of landscape character and features— noting that *'Frequent tree cover often emphasising landform, for example concentrated on bluffs and outcrops'* represents a key characteristic of the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT.

**2.6** The area of the host LCT which the Council believes will be significantly affected is defined as *'The immediate area (approximately contained by the B788 to the south and west, the southern periphery of Port Glasgow at Devol Road to the north and Blacksholm Road to the east) is significantly adversely impacted as the local landscape would be characterised by industrial development that is a consistent and recognised feature.'* [emphasis added]. *'The cumulative landscape impact extends beyond a local impact to an impact on intermediate landscape. The operational wind farm, single 67m turbines and transmission lines are present in a number of combined views with the consented and proposed BESS developments. It is considered that the cumulative developments are a visual distraction from the landscape itself, and that there is a notable change to the visual character of the landscape as perceived from a distance. The extent of the combined developments is considered to have an impact over a larger geographical area than would normally be considered entirely local.'* [emphasis added].

**2.7** Whilst the Council draws reference to cumulative landscape impacts in this statement, multiple references are made to views and visual amenity, which are at odds with statements made earlier in the response (page 28) in respect to visual impact, such as: *'The visual impact of the proposed development is acceptable. Some longer distance views of the development are possible, however the development would appear as a minor-moderate component of the wider landscape. At distance, the horizontal and vertical scale of the development would not appear visually overbearing. Although visible, the development would not be a primary, isolated focus for the viewer, and would reside within a landscape with different and varying focal points.'* [emphasis added].

**2.8** The Planning Officer concludes that: *'The combined effect of the BESS, electricity infrastructure and other renewable developments fragments the rural nature of the landscape, and the local and intermediate landscape is*

*altered to a degree considered to constitute a negative change to the landscape character.'* [emphasis added].

## Response to the Council's Concerns

**2.9** The following chapters of this report seek to demonstrate the localised nature of the landscape effects which are predicted to arise from the introduction of the Proposed Development on both a solus (i.e. in isolation alongside existing/operational developments which form part of the existing landscape), and a cumulative basis alongside other consented and proposed developments.

## Chapter 3

# Summary of Original LVA

### Review of Original LVA

**3.1** A screening opinion for the Proposed Development was issued by the Scottish Ministers dated 25 October 2024 which determined that the Proposed Development would not constitute Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Development, and no EIA Report was required to accompany the Section 36 application.

**3.2** Nevertheless, a Landscape and Visual Appraisal (LVA) was undertaken to identify the potential landscape and visual effects arising from the introduction of the Proposed Development, on both a solus and cumulative basis.

**3.3** LVA is distinct from LVIA in that it is not a requirement of the EIA Regulations<sup>6</sup> and, although it describes effects, it is not required to determine 'significance', which is a term with specific meanings related to formal EIA processes.

**3.4** Landscape and visual appraisals are separate, although linked, processes considering landscape and visual effects separately. The application LVA therefore considered the effects of the Proposed Development on:

- Landscape as a resource in its own right (caused by changes to the constituent elements of the landscape, its specific aesthetic or perceptual qualities, and the character of the landscape); and
- Views and visual amenity as experienced by visual receptors (people) (caused by changes in the appearance of the landscape).

**3.5** The LVA which accompanies the application, prepared by David Wilson Associates (DWA). LUC has reviewed the methodology and findings of the original LVA.

**3.6** In general terms, the LVA is considered to be robust and consistent with the principles of the good practice Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (Version 3, 2013) (GLVIA3) published by the Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment (2013). The LVA is judged to have had consideration for the appropriate range of landscape and visual receptors which are likely to experience impacts from the introduction of the Proposed Development. The extent of impacts and range of receptors affected is considered to be

---

<sup>6</sup> Electricity Works (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2017

adequately captured by the appraisal, including cumulative landscape and visual impacts.

### Original Landscape Appraisal

3.7 Impacts on the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT 202 are considered on Page 8 of the appraisal with conclusions presented on Page 11 (para. 11.3).

### Original Visual Appraisal

3.8 Whilst it is understood that the Council's concerns and reasons for objection principally relate to landscape impacts, in LUC's professional opinion, both the LVA and the Council's draft committee report often conflate the two issues. It is understood from the LVA that the representative viewpoints used for the appraisal were not agreed with Council but were *'based on similar locations to those requested by Inverclyde Council for the adjacent proposed BESS site, with some additional ones which have been determined to best illustrate potential visual impacts.'* (paragraph 9.1). Whilst it is advised that viewpoints are always agreed with key consultees in advance, LUC consider that the appraisal viewpoints represent a fair and reasonable range of visual receptors (people) who will experience views of the Proposed Development.

3.9 The original accompanying visualisations include existing baseline photography along with wireline and photomontage views of the Proposed Development. The visualisations illustrate the combined views with the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS proposal, and the photomontage visualisations show the proposals with and without the accompanying mitigation proposals present. Whilst these are helpful to illustrate the potential future cumulative situation, they are based on the assumption that the planning consent scheme is implemented. It is more typical for the Proposed Development to be illustrated in visualisations on a solus basis, and then a cumulative basis where key interactions/relationships may need to be considered (as is considered to be the case in this instance).

3.10 The original visualisations also present a relatively narrow horizontal field of view (30 degrees) which prevents an appreciation of the wider landscape context within which the Proposed Development, and the adjacent Auchentiber BESS scheme will be situated.

3.11 Relevant guidance recommends that visualisations are presented at a wider horizontal field of view (e.g. 53.5 degrees, with cumulative visualisations often presented at 90 degrees) to provide a wider landscape context. As such, the selected updated photomontage visualisations which accompany this AI report illustrate the Proposed Development on both solus and cumulative basis (as detailed in Chapter 4).

### Original Cumulative Appraisal

3.12 The original LVA focuses on the future cumulative baseline scenario where the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS scheme is theoretically constructed and present in the landscape and views. Whilst the granting of consent for this scheme may bring a greater degree of certainty that this future scenario may arise, it is more typical for the Proposed Development to be considered on a solus basis (alongside other existing/operational electricity transmission, distribution and generation infrastructure already present in the landscape) and then a cumulative basis (where key interactions/relationships with consented and proposed schemes are considered, as is the case here).

3.13 It is important to understand the impacts arising from the introduction of the Proposed Development in isolation, and the approach taken within the original LVA makes it more difficult to disaggregate these impacts within the appraisal. As such, the combined or 'total' cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development and the adjacent Auchentiber BESS proposal seem to have become the focus of the appraisal.

3.14 The conclusion of the cumulative appraisal (paragraph 11.9) states *'There are some similar development types proposed within the wider landscape, but these are small and reasonably well spaced. The only potential for cumulative impact at this time is therefore with the adjacent proposed site at Auchentiber Road. This potential is closely related to the potential for visual impact due to their close proximity and is why they have often been considered together through the visual impacts assessment and in the photo montages. Considered together the area of development would be larger than if either were individually constructed. This would lead to a localised increase in cumulative and visual impacts but as visibility is very limited to the area of the Gryfe Valley described in the visual impact assessment, cumulative impacts would likewise be limited.'* [emphasis added].

3.15 The overall conclusion goes on to state (paragraph 11.10) *'The proposed development would represent a change in landscape character to the current agricultural land use at the moment but in a landscape which has much in the way of power infrastructure already. Visual impacts from this proposal would be limited by the topography of the valley and therefore contained within a small area. This would be further mitigated through screening structural boundary planting. This would also bring potential benefits for biodiversity from the currently ecologically limited agricultural usage. Cumulative impacts would arise from association with the adjacent proposed BESS development but the close proximity and limited visibility in the wider landscape would ensure that this cumulative effect would not affect the wider area.'* [emphasis added]

**3.16** Whilst these conclusions are reasonable, the emphasis is on the combined cumulative impacts of the Proposed Development and the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS scheme in the landscape together, and little to no consideration is given to the solus impacts of the Proposed Development. When considering the combined impacts, the conclusion alludes to the potential benefits that the siting of the two BESS developments in close proximity deliver, however greater emphasis could be placed on this '*clustering*' of development in one location.

**3.17** This principle is identified in the Council's consultation response to the Auchentiber proposal (page 32), which states in relation to the proposed BESS, the existing Devol Moor substation and the Inverclyde Wind Farm: '*It should be noted the site is not in a remote rural location and there are other forms of energy development in the surrounding landscape. The wind farm at Corlic Hill and the electricity pylons are the visually dominant structures in the surrounding landscape. The proposed site is 1.1km from the Devol Moor sub-station and 1.7km from the wind farm and within reasonable distance of Port Glasgow therefore the requirement for the site to be accessible would be met. **There would also be landscape benefits of clustering the three energy developments in relatively close proximity rather than spreading them out, creating a negative impact at multiple locations.***' [emphasis added].

**3.18** This principle of clustering is also reflected in the determination by Scottish Ministers (paragraph 33, letter dated 11 September 2025).

# Chapter 4

## Summary of Design Changes and New Information Provided

### Scheme Design Changes

**4.1** Since submission of the application for the Proposed Development in December 2024, the Applicant has implemented a number of changes to the scheme. These changes have principally been instigated by technical factors, including changes to how the scheme will be connected to the electricity transmission network by ScottishPower Transmission, and subsequent changes to other componentry within the Site layout. The key changes to the scheme are summarised below and shown on the updated **High**

#### **Mathernock BESS Version 2 - Proposed Site Layout:**

- Total Site area reduced from 3.1ha to 2.7ha;
- Number of battery units reduced from 87 to 60;
- Total surface area for energy storage compounds reduced from 1.95ha to 1.13ha;
- Electricity transmission connection voltage changed from 132kV to 400kV;
- Substation area within the Site increased from 0.18ha to 0.52ha to facilitate a voltage change, which negates the need for ScottishPower Transmission to introduce an additional and separate off-site 400/132kV substation (as required for the original Proposed Development - Version 1);
- Access roads widened from 4m to 6m;
- Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) attenuation pond size increased from 0.18ha to 0.24ha;
- Changes to the cut and fill profile of main development platform, including reprofiling of embankments to better integrate landform into existing topography;
- Retaining wall length reduced from 275m to 255m;
- Woodland planting extended across shallowed embankments within the Site to more effectively screen and reduce visual impact of Proposed Development;
- Woodland planting area increased from 2.27ha to 2.92ha;
- Position of species rich hedgerow altered to avoid interference with access visibility splays;

- Reinstatement/enhancement of existing hedgerows along southern boundary of Site, and stone dyke along Auchentiber Road.

## Additional Accompanying Information

**4.2** To help aid understanding around how the above design changes will potentially alter the assessed landscape and visual (including cumulative) effects, the following additional materials accompany this report:

- **Figure 1** – Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of High Mathernock BESS;
- **Figure 2** – Cumulative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (CZTV) of High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- **Figure 3** – Subtended<sup>7</sup> Zone of Theoretical Visibility of High Mathernock BESS;
- **Figure 4** – Revised Landscape Strategy Plan.

**4.3** In addition, revised photomontage visualisations have been prepared for a select number of the original LVIA representative appraisal viewpoints (as shown on **Figure 1** to **Figure 3**), to reflect the proposed changes to the scheme and illustrate the Proposed Development on both a solus and cumulative basis.

**4.4** Updated baseline photography was captured in September 2025 and visualisations have been prepared in accordance with the latest relevant guidance from the Landscape Institute<sup>8</sup> and NatureScot<sup>9</sup>.

**4.5** Each viewpoint includes the following visualisation images:

- Baseline photography (90 degree included horizontal angle of view);
- Photomontages of the Proposed Development and Mitigation Planting at Year 1 and Year 15 (53.5 degree included horizontal angle of view); and
- Cumulative Photomontages of the Proposed Development and adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS development and Mitigation Planting at Year 1 and Year 15 (90 degree included horizontal angle of view).

**4.6** The visualisation images presented for each viewpoint are detailed below:

### ■ Viewpoint 2 – Devol Road

- Image 2a: Baseline photograph;
- Image 2b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 2c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 2d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- Image 2e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.

### ■ Viewpoint 3 – High Mathernock

- Image 3a: Baseline photograph;
- Image 3b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 3c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 3d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- Image 3e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.

### ■ Viewpoint 4 – Mathernock Battery (SM)

- Image 4a: Baseline photograph;
- Image 4b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 4c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 4d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- Image 4e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.

<sup>7</sup>

<sup>8</sup> [https://landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/LI\\_TGN-06-19\\_Visual\\_Representation-1.pdf](https://landscapeinstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/LI_TGN-06-19_Visual_Representation-1.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.nature.scot/sites/default/files/2019-09/Guidance%20-%20Visual%20representation%20of%20wind%20farms%20-%20Feb%202017.pdf>

# Chapter 5

## Updated LVA (including Cumulative Appraisal)

### Baseline Landscape

**5.1** The Site and Proposed Development is located in the Gryfe Water Valley, and wholly within the Rugged Upland Farmland LCT 202 (the host LCT), the key characteristics<sup>10</sup> of which are defined as:

- *'Rugged landform comprising rocky bluffs and shallow troughs.*
- *Reservoirs in flooded troughs.*
- *Dominance of pastoral farming.*
- *Frequent tree cover often emphasising landform, for example concentrated on bluffs and outcrops.*
- *Settlement limited to farms and villages.'*

**5.2** The LCT description states that *'Woodland cover is relatively extensive, providing an important structural element, with many of the rugged hillocks covered in stands of beech or pine. The more hospitable areas are mostly improved pasture (mainly given over to sheep farming). Beech hedgerow trees are a distinctive feature in many parts of this landscape, often associated with past estates.'*

**5.3** The LCT also includes *'...influences include electricity infrastructure and masts, particularly around Gleniffer Braes, some forestry, isolated suburban development, settlement expansion and the aural impact of aircraft approaching or leaving Glasgow Airport.'*

**5.4** Outwards views from the LCT within the vicinity of Kilmacolm are *'Views are relatively contained within the western areas of this landscape, which are fringed by higher ground. The valley of Strathgryffe channels views locally.'*

**5.5** In some areas the host LCT closely relates to the adjacent Rugged Moorland Hills LCT (LCT 216)<sup>11</sup> *'the smooth plateau farmlands and higher plateau moorlands give way to a more rugged farmland landscape, forming a transition to the rugged moorland area further north west.'* Some of the key characteristics of this LCT set out below may be expressed across this transition, including where the Site is located.

---

<sup>10</sup> [LCT 202 - Rugged Upland Farmland](#)

<sup>11</sup> [LCT 216 - Rugged Moorland Hills](#)

**5.6** The key characteristics of the Rugged Moorland Hills LCT are as follows:

- *‘Large-scale simple landscape.*
- *Distinctive upland character created by the combination of elevation, exposure, rugged landform, including a fault line and cliffs, moorland vegetation and the predominant lack of modern development, emphasised by the proximity to low-lying valleys and coastal areas.*
- *Undeveloped skylines and striking views to the Glasgow conurbation.*
- *Extensive man-made reservoirs and smaller natural lochs.*
- *Important backdrop to neighbouring settled landscapes, creating a unique sense of place.*
- *Sparse settlement and predominant lack of modern development.*
- *Presence of archaeological sites on hilltops and sides, and on lower ground.*
- *Sense of apparent naturalness, wild character and remoteness which contrasts strongly with the farmed and developed lowland areas.*
- *Diversity of landscape experience.*

**5.7** Whilst many of the above characteristics remain evident within the LCT, the recent introduction of wind turbines and presence of existing electricity transmission infrastructure does affect the *‘Undeveloped skylines’* and *‘Important backdrop to neighbouring settled landscapes, creating a unique sense of place’* of the Rugged Moorland Hills LCT and as evident from the host LCT. The Proposed Development (and associated landscape effects) will be experienced in this altered context.

The Site and immediate surrounding area is not the subject of any national or local level landscape designation, however the Clyde Muirshiel Regional Park<sup>12</sup> is located appropriately 2km to the west at its closest point, and the suite is wholly located within the Green Belt, as defined within the Inverclyde Council Local Development Plan<sup>13</sup>.

## Analysis of ZTVs

**5.8** The extent of theoretical visibility indicated by the updated and additional ZTV's, outlined in **Chapter 4** and contained in **Appendix A**, is described below.

### Figure 1: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of High Mathernock BESS

**5.9** The Proposed Development is located in the upper extents of the Gryfe Water Valley and the ZTV highlights the valley form of the landscape, with high ground to the north and south and the valley climbing in elevation from east to west. There is widespread visibility within a c.500m radius of the Site, which then becomes more focused and contained to the southern valley side of the Gryfe Water Valley within 1km. Within 1km to 2km distance of the Site, theoretical visibility is focused to the higher valley sides to the west of the Site, and the southern facing higher ground to the south-east, above Cauldside. At 2km to 3km distance visibility is focused to higher slopes facing the Site to the west and south-west, with a small area of visibility on the higher ground to the south-east, near Netherwood. There are areas of woodland and forestry in the Gryfe Water Valley with some larger areas of forestry on the higher ground to the south of the Gryfe Reservoir, to the south-west. These areas of woodland and forestry will somewhat limit actual visibility from that illustrated by the ZTV, as indicated by the original LVA visualisations for viewpoints 7 and 8. Otherwise the valley is quite open in nature, with a pattern of low density rural settlement from where actual visibility will more closely reflect the theoretical visibility indicated by the ZTV.

### Figure 2: Cumulative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (CZTV) of High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS

**5.10** This combined cumulative ZTV highlights the very similar nature and extents of theoretical visibility for the Proposed Development and the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS scheme (illustrated in blue on the ZTV). The pattern and similarity of theoretical visibility is not surprising, given their siting in close proximity in the Gryfe Water Valley, on lower ground to the east of the Gryfe Reservoir. As described above, theoretical visibility is informed by the valley landscape of the Gryfe Water Valley, with visibility focused and contained to the valley floor around the Site and areas of higher ground to the north, south and west. There are some very small areas of theoretical visibility, where the Proposed Development would be seen in isolation (illustrated in yellow on the ZTV). These areas are generally focused to areas of higher ground, beyond a 1km radius from the Site. In broad terms though, ZTV overlap between the two schemes is very similar.

### Figure 3: Horizontal Subtended Zone of Theoretical Visibility of High Mathernock BESS

**5.11** The subtended horizontal ZTV illustrated on **Figure 3** highlights the maximum theoretical horizontal visibility of the proposed Development. Where this is a darker red, the

<sup>12</sup> <https://clydemuirshiel.co.uk/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.inverclyde.gov.uk/assets/attach/10164/ldp-proposed-plan-proposals-map.pdf>

Proposed Development will occupy a wider horizontal field of view, and effectively represent a larger feature in these views. Where the horizontal field of view is smaller, typically in views experienced at a greater distance from the Site, the Proposed Development will occupy a small feature in views. As indicated by the ZTV, from beyond c.1km of the Site, the Proposed Development will occupy a horizontal field of view of typically less than 10 degrees (which is shown in a pale peach colour) representing a small to barely perceptible feature in these wider views.

**5.12** The ZTV also highlights the relatively limited geographical area from which the full horizontal scale of the Proposed Development can be appreciated (occupying a horizontal field of view of up to approximately 65 degrees). This concentrated area (which is shown in dark red) is focused to the more immediate context around the Site, within a radius of approximately 200m. The ZTV does not take account of vegetation and built form which would limit the actual extents of visibility indicated, and potentially screening a proportion of the Proposed Development from many locations. Forestry and woodland, to the immediate south-west of the Proposed Development, would limit maximum theoretical visibility in this direction. In distances beyond approximately 1km from the Site, the landform generally limits the horizontal visibility of the Proposed Development quite notably.

## Updated Landscape Appraisal

**5.13** The ZTV (refer to **Figure 1**) and horizontal subtended ZTV (**Figure 3**) highlight the relatively contained nature of visibility. Theoretical visibility is available from a localised area to the west of the upper extents of the Gryfe Water Valley, between Kilmacolm and Gryfe Reservoir. Whilst some slightly longer distance visibility may arise from the higher ground to the south, experienced by a small number of receptors and at distances of greater than 2km, where visible the Proposed Development would form a very small feature in the overall views from the wider extents of the LCT. The Proposed Development would be seen alongside other existing features such as woodland/forestry (including forestry to the immediate south of the Site, whilst this remains in place), which would somewhat further limit actual visibility, and help the Proposed Development to assimilate into the landscape. As such, adverse landscape effects will very much be contained to a small area within the valley to the western upper extents of the Gryfe Water.

**5.14** The ZTVs (**Figure 1** to **Figure 3**) also highlight that visibility extends into the adjacent LCT (Rugged Moorland Hills) across the valley side to the south, and below, Devol Moor. This LCT is located across higher ground to the north of the host LCT, the southern boundary of which is just north of the minor road to the north of the Site. The revised proposed landscape mitigation proposals are illustrated on **Figure 4**. This indicates

that there will be landscape mitigation planting to all sides of the Proposed Development. As this native planting reaches maturity, it will assist in screening and softening views of the Proposed Development, helping to further assimilate the altered landform and built feature into the landscape. The proposed mitigation planting, comprising native woodland and hedgerow vegetation, will also respond to the existing characteristics of the host LCT, noting the '*frequent tree cover*' and '*Dominance of pastoral farming*' which is recognised in the key characteristics of the host LCT.

**5.15** Indirect landscape impacts on the Rugged Moorland Hills LCT 216 are predicted to arise, however, given the proximity of the Site to the transition between the host LCT and this LCT which lies north of the Site, landscape impacts will be contained within a relatively small area of this LCT to the north of Auchentiber Road and in the vicinity of Viewpoint 2: Devol Road, in an area of the LCT where existing energy generation and transmission infrastructure (e.g. Devol Moor substation, Erskine to Devol Moor 132kV OHL and Inverclyde Wind Farm) forms a feature of the landscape.

**5.16** The changes to the on-site substation infrastructure of the Proposed Development negate the need for an additional ScottishPower Transmission collector substation located off-Site, which will reduce further opportunity for wider spread cumulative landscape impacts on the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT or the adjacent Rugged Moorland Hills LCT, within which this additional infrastructure would likely have been situated.

**5.17** In summary, Moderate and above effects on landscape character are predicted from the upper extents of the Gryfe Water Valley, within a distance no greater than 1km. This includes parts of the host LCT (Rugged Upland Farmland) and the adjacent LCT (Rugged Moorland Hills). As the proposed landscape mitigation planting around the Site matures, these landscape effects will reduce. Even as a worst case scenario, before the proposed landscape mitigation planting matures, these effects are considered to be localised, being contained to the western upper extents of the Gryfe Water Valley.

## Updated Visual Appraisal

**5.18** The Proposed Development will be evident in relatively close proximity views, and as demonstrated by the subtended ZTV shown on Figure 3, will occupy a relatively large field of view. In more distant views, the Proposed Development will occupy a small horizontal field of view representing a small scale feature and change in the landscape when observed from the host LCT and the neighbouring Rugged Moorland Hills LCT. Three of the original LVA viewpoints have been selected to illustrate the views of the Proposed Development that will be experienced from the host LCT (Viewpoint 3, **Image 3a-3e**, and

Viewpoint 4, **Image 4a-4e**) and the adjacent LCT (Viewpoint 2, **Image 2a-2e**).

**5.19** Views of the revised Proposed Development are considered below from each of these viewpoints, with reference to the updated visualisations contained in **Appendix A**.

#### Viewpoint 2 – Devol Road

**5.20** The viewpoint is located within the adjacent Rugged Moorland Hills LCT on the mid slopes of the Gryfe Water Valley. Many of the key characteristics of this LCT and the adjacent Rugged Upland Farmland LCT (the host LCT) can be appreciated in the view. Existing electricity transmission infrastructure can be seen in views across the Gryfe Water Valley, crossing west to east on the south side of the valley below the skyline and passing between large blocks of coniferous forestry.

**5.21** This viewpoint is representative of recreational receptors travelling south on the Devol Road, promoted footpath/Core Path and bridleway. The year 1 photomontage (**Image 2b**) highlights that the Proposed Development sits low in the landscape, from this location. The intervening terrain, including the large cut slope to the north of the Site, will provide some partial screening of the ground and lower level componentry. The visible elements of the Proposed Development sit well below the distant horizon to the south. The Proposed Development will represent a relatively small feature in the view from this location. It will also be seen in the context of a working agricultural landscape, along with areas of nearby coniferous forestry and other electricity infrastructure, including a steel tower electricity transmission overhead line which crosses the view, to the south of the Site.

**5.22** By year 15 (**Image 2c**) the associated landscape mitigation planting will be well established. From this location the planting will not provide a notable screening role. However, as this planting matures it will help to further bed the Proposed Development into the view. Landscape enhancements in the surrounding context, including gap planting in existing hedgerows along the eastern boundary of the Site, will also be apparent with associated beneficial effects.

**5.23** A small to medium scale of change is predicted from here, with effects judged to be Minor (for both year 1 and year 15).

#### Viewpoint 3 – High Mathernock

**5.24** The viewpoint is located within the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT on the lower northern slopes of the Gryfe Water Valley. Many of the key characteristics of the LCT can be appreciated in the view, and similar views, with the dominance of pastoral farming and areas of woodland (both coniferous and deciduous broadleaves) evident in the view, whilst the influence of the operational Inverclyde Wind Farm and electricity

transmission infrastructure is evident on the enclosing skylines of the valley.

**5.25** The year 1 photomontage (**Image 3b**) highlights the proximity and open nature of views towards the Proposed Development from this location, which is representative of recreational receptors using the minor road network and for the nearest (and involved) residents.

**5.26** By year 15 (**Image 3c**) planting to the east and south of the proposed infrastructure will help to provide a level of screening. Some of the larger components in the Site will be visible above this. However, and as for the year 1 view, these features will be well contained below the horizon and seen in the context of views which have been altered by wind farms and overhead lines, both of which are evident on the horizon beyond.

**5.27** A large scale of change and Major effects are predicted from this location at year 1. The scale of change is likely to reduce to Moderate by year 15, given the screening influence of the proposed and now well established mature woodland planting. Landscape enhancements in the surrounding context, including gap planting in existing hedgerows, will also be apparent along the eastern boundary of the Site with associated beneficial effects.

#### Viewpoint 4 – Mathernock Battery (SM)

**5.28** Viewpoint is located within the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT in the lower reaches of the of the Gryfe Water Valley. Many of the key characteristics of the LCT can be appreciated in the view, with the dominance of pastoral farming and areas of woodland (both coniferous and deciduous broadleaves) evident in the view, whilst the influence of the operational wind turbines and electricity transmission infrastructure is evident on the enclosing northern skyline of the valley.

**5.29** This view is representative of recreational receptors visiting the Scheduled Monument (SM). The Year 1 photomontage (**Image 4b**) highlights the proximity and relatively open nature of views towards the Proposed Development from this location. Mature intervening trees will provide a level of screening, but this will change as receptors approach and move around the vicinity of the SM.

**5.30** By year 15 (**Image 4c**) planting to the south of the Proposed Development will help to provide a level of screening. Some of the larger components in the Site will be visible above this. However, and as for the year 1 view, these features will be well contained below the horizon and seen in the context of views which have been altered by infrastructure, including a single turbine seen on the horizon above the Site.

**5.31** A large scale of change and Major effects are predicted from this location at year 1. The scale of change is likely to

reduce to Moderate by year 15, given the screening influence of the proposed and now well established mature woodland planting. Landscape enhancements in the surrounding context, including gap planting in existing hedgerows, will also be apparent resulting in associated beneficial effects.

**5.32** In summary, when considering the solus visual effects of the Proposed Development, Moderate and above landscape and visual effects are predicted to arise. Visual effects of this nature are considered to be localised, experienced from a small area in the upper western extents of the Gryfe Water Valley. The scale and geographical extent of these visual effects are likely to be similar (probably slightly reduced given the smaller overall size) as solus visual effects associated with the consented Auchentiber BESS. It is important to consider and fully understand these solus visual effects, as although the Auchentiber BESS has been granted consent, there is no certainty that this scheme will subsequently be constructed and become a feature of the landscape in a future baseline situation.

### Updated Cumulative Appraisal

**5.33** The following appraisal focuses on cumulative interactions between the Proposed Development, and the adjacent (and consented) Auchentiber BESS. As noted previously, there are other consented and proposed developments, of a similar nature, in the wider surrounding landscape. However, these are of a distance that cumulative interactions are unlikely to be a key consenting issue.

**5.34** The original cumulative appraisal also identifies one other additional BESS scheme for consideration (paragraph 10.2), the consented Flatterton Farm proposal (23/0205/IC) located some 10km from the Site. Whilst this development constitutes the same form of development, it is located a substantial distance from the Proposed Development, in a different LCT and with no shared visual influence. It is not considered to be of relevance to cumulative landscape and visual impacts of the Proposed Development at this distance.

**5.35** A more proportionate cumulative study area is considered to be c.3-5km radius from the Proposed Development Site. Other consented and proposed developments within this approximate radius have been identified and considered, where they are considered to have potential to give rise to cumulative landscape and visual impacts on similar receptors to those which would be affected by the Proposed Development. The application for the Knocknair Renewable Energy Park (25/0125/IC) was submitted in July 2025, and is located approximately 1.5km north, north-west of the Site and comprises both BESS and solar photovoltaic arrays. This scheme is located in the adjacent LCT (Rugged Moorland Hills). Fieldwork confirmed the very limited nature of common visual influence with the Proposed Development. As such, this

scheme has been scoped out of the updated cumulative appraisal provided below.

### Updated Cumulative Landscape Appraisal

**5.36** In terms of cumulative landscape effects, the cumulative ZTV (refer to **Figure 2**) illustrates the relatively limited nature of additional visibility the Proposed Development will introduce (which is represented as areas of yellow), when compared with theoretical visibility associated with the consented Auchentiber BESS in isolation (which is represented as areas of green) or the two schemes in combination (which is represented as areas of blue). Assuming the consented (and notably larger) Auchentiber BESS is constructed, and forms part of the future cumulative baseline, then effects associated with the Proposed Development are considered to only slightly intensify effects associated with BESS infrastructure, across a localised area of the host LCT and a small area of the adjacent Rugged Moorland LCT to the north of Auchentiber Road. The geographical extent of these combined cumulative effects will be broadly similar to the geographical extent of effects associated with the Auchentiber BESS. As such, the cumulative landscape effects arising from both schemes in combination will only slightly intensify the effects of BESS infrastructure on the local landscape.

### Updated Cumulative Visual Appraisal

**5.37** The updated cumulative visualisations (**Image 2d, Image 2e, Image 3d, Image 3e, Image 4d and Image 4e**) also highlight that by clustering the Proposed Development and the consented Auchentiber BESS scheme together, the additional visual effects associated with a BESS infrastructure in views will be concentrated in parts of the existing views which affected by views of the consented Auchentiber BESS, rather than affecting alternative views. In an alternative theoretical future baseline, in which Auchentiber BESS is part of many of the existing baseline views, the scale of change associated with the Proposed Development is not judged to be considerably greater than the scale of change associated with the Proposed Development, considered in isolation. Indeed, by clustering these developments together they may even read as one slightly larger BESS scheme in the view, given the similarity in the type and scale of infrastructure proposed, and the compatible and complementary nature of the mitigation measures proposed (e.g. colour palette for key componentry and the integration of extensive mitigation planting around each scheme). These visual effects will also be more contained than visual effects associated with two more geographically distinct BESS schemes.

**5.38** In summary, both BESS schemes would typically be seen in the context of a landscape which has been influenced and to some extent altered by the presence of electricity infrastructure (which would also be the case if only one of the BESS schemes

were to be implemented post consent). The combined effects of both BESS schemes, often seen together in close proximity views, only marginally increases landscape and visual effects associated with BESS infrastructure in relation to the consented Auchentiber BESS (and noting that these effects have been deemed to be acceptable for this larger scheme via the granting of Section 36 consent and deemed planning permission).

**5.39** Furthermore, the geographical extent of combined effects associated with the Proposed Development and the consented Auchentiber BESS, are not judged to be notably larger than the geographical extent of effects associated with the consented Auchentiber BESS. The scale and geographical extent of these cumulative effects will also reduce, as the landscape mitigation around both schemes matures. To suggest that the additional cumulative effects associated with the Proposed Development, in a theoretical future baseline which includes the consented Auchentiber BESS, would fragment the landscape and result in effects which are wider than 'localised' seems unrealistic. The visualisations highlight that effects associated with the Proposed Development would only marginally increase effects associated with BESS infrastructure, in this alternative context.

## Updated Landscape Strategy Plan

**5.40** **Figure 5** details the updated Landscape Strategy Plan for the Site, including proposed mitigation and enhancement measures. The Applicant anticipates that the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures would be agreed by way of planning conditions, with further detail to be developed and agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

### Mitigation Measures

**5.41** The updated Landscape Strategy Plan is shown on **Figure 4**. The mitigation measures have been developed to screen and integrate the Proposed Development whether introduced on a solus basis or seen cumulatively alongside the adjacent Auchentiber BESS Scheme.

**5.42** This includes extended woodland planting, species rich hedgerow planting and wildflower planting (with appropriate species proposed in hedgerow and wet mix areas). The mitigation planting species have all been selected to be native and complementary to those which can be found in the vicinity of the Site and local area, so as to be in keeping with the local landscape character. More extensive woodland planting is incorporated around the slopes of the main development platform, following reprofiling of the embankment slopes to better integrate the proposed landform changes into the existing slopes. As the woodland planting matures, it will help to soften and screen views of the Proposed Development, better integrating it into the landscape and views as illustrated in the updated year 15 photomontages presented in **Appendix A** (see **Image 2c, Image 2e, Image 3c, Image 3e, Image 4c,**

and **Image 4e**). The colours of the componentry (e.g. the battery units and PCS skid units, water storage tank) and security and acoustic fencing have also been carefully considered, to help these features recede into views (when visible).

**5.43** The planting and colour palette have also been considered in light of the planting and colour palette of the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS scheme, with the adoption of muted green colours for the main componentry of the Proposed Development. By designing a scheme (and mitigation strategy) which reflects the adjacent consented scheme, should both of these schemes be consented and implemented they will better integrate into views together, possibly even helping the two schemes to be read as one single BESS development.

### Enhancement Measures

**5.44** In addition to the landscape mitigation measures described above, landscape enhancement measures are also proposed by the Applicant. These include reinstatement and enhancement of existing hedgerows and stone dykes around the boundary of Site, specifically the stone dyke along Auchentiber Road, and the existing intermittent remnant hedgerow along the eastern. South-eastern boundary of the Site between Auchentiber Road and the Gryfe Water river. Whilst these measures are unlikely to play a notable role in screening the Proposed Development, they will help to restore and enhance some of the key features which contribute positively to the rural agricultural landscape character and pattern of enclosure found within the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT.

**5.45** Where these enhancement measures are visible, they have been modelled into the updated year 15 photomontages presented in **Appendix A** (see **Image 2c, Image 2e, Image 3c, Image 3e, Image 4c,** and **Image 4e**).

## Chapter 6

### Conclusions

**6.1** It is understood that Inverclyde Council's concerns wholly relate to cumulative landscape effects, arising from the introduction of the Proposed Development alongside the adjacent consented Auchentiber BESS development (ECU Ref: [ECU00004979](#)), and in combination with other electricity transmission infrastructure and wind farm development within the wider landscape surrounding the Site.

**6.2** Impacts on the host LCT will be contained within approximately 1 km of the Proposed Development. The extent of these impacts are understood to be agreed by the Council, however, it is the localised nature of these impacts in the context of NPF4 Policy 11 (e) (ii) which is disputed.

**6.3** In response to the Inverclyde Council reasons for objection, the Applicant has re-visited the design of the Proposed Development and made a number of substantial changes to the scheme, as detailed in **Chapter 4**. The revised design has sought to reduce the built footprint of the development, minimised the cut and fill earthworks to construct the development platform, accommodate greater extents of woodland mitigation planting around the main development platform and the implementation of additional mitigation measures to better integrate the componentry of the Proposed Development (e.g. specification of appropriate colours to componentry and security/acoustic fencing).

**6.4** Whilst the substation area within the Site has increased and the tallest componentry of the has increased in height to facilitate a change in voltage, this change negates the need for ScottishPower Transmission to introduce an additional collector substation located off-Site, which will reduce further opportunity for wider spread cumulative landscape impacts on the host Rugged Upland Farmland LCT or the adjacent Rugged Moorland Hills LCT, within which this additional infrastructure would likely have been situated.

**6.5** The revised layout of the Proposed Development, along with the revised landscape mitigation strategy, is shown on **Figure 5**.

**6.6** The updated and additional ZTV mapping and photomontage visualisations which accompany this report (contained in **Appendix A**), have been prepared to illustrate the potential changes to the landscape and visual (including cumulative) effects associated with the Proposed Development. The appraisal and accompanying materials presented within this report, highlight the localised nature the solus effects associated with the Proposed Development. The landscape

and visual effects will reduce as landscape mitigation and enhancement planting associated with the Proposed Development matures.

**6.7** With regard to cumulative landscape and visual effects, these are also considered to be localised. Through clustering the Proposed Development immediately adjacent to the consented Auchentiber BESS scheme, effects associated with the Proposed Development will be only slightly intensified with BESS infrastructure becoming a defining feature within a relatively small proportion of the landscape of the host LCT, and where seen in wider views from the surrounding landscape. These effects will however be more contained than effects associated with two more distinct BESS schemes located independently of one another within the wider landscape. The scale and geographical extent of these cumulative effects will also reduce, as the compatible and complementary landscape mitigation and enhancement measures proposed around each scheme mature.

**6.8** To suggest that the additional cumulative effects associated with the Proposed Development, in a theoretical future baseline which includes the consented Auchentiber BESS scheme, would fragment the landscape and result in effects which are wider than localised is considered to be an overestimation of the predicted landscape change that will arise from the presence of the two developments in combination, given the limited geographical extent over which landscape effects will arise. The updated visualisations highlight that effects associated with the Proposed Development would only marginally increase effects associated with the consented Auchentiber BESS scheme in even the closest views of the Site which may be available, in this alternative future baseline context.

## Summary

**6.9** LUC considers that the extent of the predicted landscape impacts, including those arising cumulatively alongside the consented Auchentiber BESS scheme, can be reasonably described as localised for development of the type and scale proposed. This conclusion is drawn on the basis that impacts are contained within a small proportion of the host LCT in terms of their geographical extent, and the degree to which they impacts will affect a limited number of the key characteristics of the LCT, and in the context that effects on adjacent LCTs, namely the Rugged Moorland Hills LCT, will be extremely limited. Impacts are minimised through the proposed mitigation and enhancement measures to reduce impacts of the Proposed Development when seen from across the host LCT and the wider surrounding landscape.

**6.10** Taking account of the mitigation measures and enhancement measures proposed within the revised design to minimise landscape and visual impacts and integrate the

Proposed Development into the existing landscape, and strengthen the existing landscape framework of hedgerows, stone dykes and woodland found within the host LCT, overall the landscape and visual impacts arising from the Proposed Development on both a solus and cumulative basis are considered to be localised in the context of NPF4 Policy 11 (e) (ii) and appropriate design mitigation has been applied.

# Appendix A

## Figures and Visualisations

### Figures

- **Figure 1** – Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) of High Mathernock BESS;
- **Figure 2** – Cumulative Zone of Theoretical Visibility (CZTV) of High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- **Figure 3** – Subtended Zone of Theoretical Visibility of High Mathernock BESS; and
- **Figure 4** – Revised Landscape Strategy Plan.

### Visualisations

- **Viewpoint 2 – Devol Road**
  - Image 2a: Baseline photograph;
  - Image 2b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
  - Image 2c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
  - Image 2d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
  - Image 2e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.
- **Viewpoint 3 – High Mathernock**
  - Image 3a: Baseline photograph;
  - Image 3b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
  - Image 3c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
  - Image 3d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
  - Image 3e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.

■ **Viewpoint 4 – Mathernock Battery (SM)**

- Image 4a: Baseline photograph;
- Image 4b: Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 4c: Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS only (solus);
- Image 4d: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 1) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS;
- Image 4e: Cumulative Photomontage (Year 15) – High Mathernock BESS and Auchentiber BESS.