



**JACOBS®**

## **Kyleakin Fish Farm**

Marine Harvest

### **Environmental Impact Assessment – Volume 2 of 4: Main Report**

Chapter 14: Landscape and Visual

Final

May 2017





## Contents

<b>14.</b>	<b>Landscape and Visual</b> .....	<b>14-1</b>
14.1	Introduction.....	14-1
14.2	The Proposed Development.....	14-1
14.3	Scope of the Assessment.....	14-2
14.4	Landscape Assessment Methodology.....	14-6
14.5	Landscape Assessment .....	14-10
14.6	Visual Assessment Methodology .....	14-16
14.7	Visual Assessment .....	14-18
14.8	Summary and Conclusions .....	14-27
14.9	References .....	14-28

## 14. Landscape and Visual

### 14.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) for the proposed Fish Feed Plant at Kyleakin on the Isle of Skye. The study has been carried out by ASH design+assessment Ltd (ASH), Chartered Landscape Architects, on behalf of Marine Harvest (MH), the Applicant.

Landscape character and visual impact assessment, although closely related to one another, have been considered separately for reasons of clarity and robustness. Consideration here of other related subjects, such as ecology and cultural heritage, are limited to the extent to which they influence the landscape character and visual amenity of the Proposed Development site and the wider area. The effects specific to these topics as assessed separately.

This chapter has been prepared using current information on the Proposed Development made available to ASH. In addition, a site visit has been made and desk studies undertaken.

#### 14.1.1 Chapter Format

This chapter is set out as follows:

- Section 14.2 describes the Proposed Development, the site and surroundings.
- Section 14.3 describes the scope of assessment.
- Section 14.4 described the method of assessment for the Landscape Assessment.
- Section 14.5 describes the **Landscape Assessment**, including a summary of baseline landscape character, designations and constraints and the identification and assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Development on landscape character.
- Section 14.6 describes the method of assessment for the Visual Assessment.
- Section 14.7 describes the **Visual Assessment**, including a summary of baseline visual amenity and the identification and assessment of potential effects of the Proposed Development on views from viewpoints, buildings, outdoor spaces and routes.
- Section 14.8 summarises the assessment findings.

### 14.2 The Proposed Development

#### 14.2.1 Description of the Proposed Development

The Proposed Development is a Fish Feed Plant comprising buildings and structures that would be located in a coastal position near to the town of Kyleakin on the Isle of Skye. As shown on Grintec's Site Layout drawing (Figure 2.1, **Ref. 14-1**), the key components of the Proposed Development are:

- Fish Feed Plant, including notable buildings and structures such as:
  - Air Stack Tower (Height 60m above ground level) coloured battleship grey;
  - collection of buildings / warehouses (Heights of tallest buildings are 30 - 40.5m above ground level), of R108, G105, B124 colour);
  - Raw Material Silos (Height 38m above ground level);
  - Oil Storage Tanks;
  - LNG Storage Tank;
- strengthened and extended intake pier and quay, and installation of slipway and additional pier structures (Height 21m above ground level);

- rock armoured slopes on coast to north of the LNG tank and north-east of the Slipway;
- re-routed permanent access track to Keltic Seafayre area;
- re-routed watercourse and associated earthworks cutting to north-west of Fish Feed Plant buildings;
- temporary site office and construction laydown areas located adjacent to the existing access off the A87 road; and
- construction access via the existing access off the A87 road.

Features designed to mitigate potential effects on the landscape are also proposed. These are detailed in **Sections 14.5.2 and 14.7.2.**

### 14.2.2 The Site and Context

The proposed Fish Feed Plant site is located on the eastern coast of the Isle of Skye in the Inner Hebrides, near the settlements of Kyleakin and Kyle of Lochalsh, see **Figure 14.1**. The site is situated within an existing quarry site, located off the A87 road, adjacent to the Skye Bridge and town of Kyleakin. The proposed site is enclosed to the east, south and west by sloped quarried sides and opens onto the coastline, beach and an existing pier on its north side. The immediate surrounding area is scrub vegetation and mixed broadleaf and conifer trees and a working quarry to the south-west.

Settlement within the 5km study area includes properties of Kyleakin, Kyle of Lochalsh and Badicual and a few dispersed properties along the A87 road and public road to Plockton. Outside the study area, Plockton is located approximately 9.3km to the north-east, Broadford approximately 9.8km to the south-west; and Portree approximately 30km to the north-west.

## 14.3 Scope of the Assessment

### 14.3.1 Study Area

Following an initial site appraisal and review of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), it was considered that any potentially significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity would be likely to occur within 5km of the Proposed Development. As such, a 5km radius study area from the centre-point of the Proposed Development has been adopted for both the landscape assessment and visual amenity assessment.

Landscape designations within a 15km radius of the Proposed Development were identified as part of this process (illustrated on **Figure 14.2a**) and are further discussed in **Section 14.5.1.2.**

### 14.3.2 Consultation, Screening and Scoping

**Table 14.1** below summarises consultation responses received, of relevance to landscape and visual issues, in date order.

**Table 14.1 : Summary of Consultation Responses of relevance to LVIA**

Consultee	Summary Response	Comment / Action Taken
The Highland Council (Pre-Application Advice Pack, 13/04/16, Ref. 14-5)	2: Summary of Issues (p1)  <i>'The scale and location of the proposal suggests that it could have a negative overall visual impact. Mitigation could include reducing the height, scale and massing of the proposed buildings and augmentation to the existing landscaping of the site. Careful siting is strongly recommended to utilise the landform to help screen and provide a backdrop of the proposal.'</i>	(1) LVIA has been undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects to assess potential effects on landscape resource and visual amenity within the surrounding area, in accordance with GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3).  (2) Discussions of siting and layout of Proposed Development undertaken between landscape

Consultee	Summary Response	Comment / Action Taken
	<p><i>Visualisations will be required to help assess the extent of visual impact and success of possible mitigation measures'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p1)</p> <p><i>'The existing woodland should be protected and further planting may assist in visual mitigation of the proposed buildings.'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p1)</p>	<p>architects and client, and consideration of colour and mass to mitigate potential visual effects and integrate Proposed Development within surrounding, see <b>Sections 14.5.2 and 14.7.2.</b></p> <p>(3) Visualisations have been prepared (see Volume 4) to illustrate extent of visual impact and proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>(4) Landscape Mitigation Plan has been prepared (see <b>Figure 14.8</b>), including proposed planting and retention of existing woodland, also see <b>Sections 14.5.2 and 14.7.2.</b></p> <p>As (4).</p>
		7: Development Plan Designation and Planning policy Appraisal (p4-7)
	<p><i>'Policy 29 Design Quality and Placemaking requires developments to improve the architectural and visual quality of a site/area. The initial drawings suggest that the development will create adverse visual amenity impacts from the A87 tourist route, from the Kyle railway line, and from the Plock of Kyle footpath network. Further assessment (perhaps in terms of visualisations) and mitigation will be required to offset these impacts.'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p4)</p> <p><i>'Policy 61 Landscape requires that new development should be designed to reflect landscape characteristics and special qualities identified in the Landscape and Character Assessment. A comprehensive Landscape and Visual Assessment will be required to determine specific impacts and mitigation is likely to be required.'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p6)</p>	<p>As (1), (2), and (4).</p> <p>As (1) and (4).</p>
		9: Natural Heritage, Impact on Trees (p7-8)
	<p><i>'Key Points: Protect and enhance existing woodland &amp; identify opportunities for additional tree planting'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p8)</p>	As (4).
		9: Natural Heritage, Impact on Landscape (p10-11)
	<p><i>'... the ES should include an initial assessment of the range and character of Visual Receptors ... [and] the developer should make some study or assessment of the movements of receptors'</i> (Ref. 14-5: p11)</p> <p><i>'Key Points: Agreed visualisations will be a</i></p>	<p>As (1).</p> <p>As (1), (3) and (4).</p>

Consultee	Summary Response	Comment / Action Taken
	<i>critical element of the required Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; The ES should address any mitigation to this impact including design and siting options for the building' (Ref. 14-5: p11)</i>	
Scottish Natural Heritage (Scoping Advice, 15/05/16, Ref. 14-6)	Annex A: 5. Landscape and visual impacts (p5-6)  Full LVIA should be carried out by a chartered landscape architect, following GLVIA 3, including assessment of effects on the Kyle-Plockton Special Landscape Area.  Recommendation of Viewpoints from Skye Bridge; Eilean Ban; Plock of Kyle; Railway/road at Badicaul; Kyle harbour/waterfront; from the water on the route taken by boats accessing Kyle harbour or traveling under the bridge.	As (1), and (5) Kyle-Plockton Special Landscape Area is assessed within the Landscape Character Assessment, details included in <b>Appendix 14.1: Landscape Assessment Tables</b> .  (6) All suggested viewpoints have been used, except from Eilean Ban (since the Vp3, Skye Bridge shows a similar view) and the boat route (since the Vp2, Train Station shows a similar view).
The Highland Council (Scoping Opinion, 02/07/16, Ref. 14-7)	3.7 Landscape and Visual Impact  <i>'the Council will expect this chapter of the ES, as with other chapters, to detail how any negative impacts of the proposal have been addressed and mitigated...'</i> (Ref. 14-7: p6)  <i>'visual mitigation ideas should be discussed within this chapter of the ES and should inform the final design proposed in the application...'</i> (Ref. 14-7: p6)  <i>'Viewpoints (VP) for the assessment of the visual impact of the proposed development must be agreed in advance of preparation of any visuals with The Highland Council in consultation with Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH). The purpose of the selected and agreed viewpoints shall be clearly identified and stated in the supporting information'</i> (Ref. 14-7: p6)  <i>'particular consideration should be given to the following locations: Skye Bridge; Eilean Ban; Plock of Kyle; Railway/road at Badicaul; Kyle harbour/waterfront; from the water on the route taken by boats accessing Kyle harbour or traveling under the bridge'</i> (Ref. 14-7: p6)  The Highland Council Visualisations Standards for Wind Farms must be adopted.	As (1) and (4).  As (2) and (4). See <b>Sections 14.5.2 and 14.7.2</b> .  As (6).  (7) Viewpoints were agreed with THC. Justification of viewpoints are included in <b>Section 14.7.1.2.1</b> .  (8) Visualisations follow this procedure.
Anne Cowling, Landscape Officer (Scoping Advice, Ref. 14-8)	Comments on landscape and visual context and outline of potential landscape and visual impacts.  Comments on visual assessment, and request	(9) These have been taken into consideration in the LVIA  (10) Relevant information on visual receptors provided

Consultee	Summary Response	Comment / Action Taken
	<p>for inclusion of detailed information on receptors; focus on categories of receptors (tourists, residents); receptor-led assessment rather than viewpoint-led assessment.</p> <p>Additional viewpoints suggested from sequence of views from laybys east on the A87.</p> <p>Comments on massing, form and layout of Proposed Development.</p>	<p>in <b>Appendix 14.2: Visual Assessment Tables</b>, and taken into consideration in assessment; categories of receptors discussed in <b>Section 14.7.3.1</b></p> <p>(11) Two viewpoints on the A87 are included: Vp9 and 10.</p> <p>As (2) and</p> <p>(12) Discussions have been had with MH and Anne Cowling on massing, form and colour, including consideration of different colour options.</p>

### 14.3.3 Principles of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment

The following is a summary of the guiding principles used for carrying out the landscape and visual assessment (LVIA). For a full description of the process and methodologies used, refer to **Section 14.4** and **Section 14.6**. Each Methodology Section is followed by a Section reporting the findings of their assessment. **Appendix 14.1** and **14.2** present the corresponding assessment tables.

#### 14.3.3.1 Assessment Guidance

This LVIA has been prepared with reference to the ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’ (GLVIA3) (**Ref. 14-3**). Reference has also been made to relevant guidelines and reports issued by national and local bodies. These include assessment methodology guidance, and local and regional planning documents. A full list is contained in the References at the end of this assessment.

#### 14.3.3.2 Professional Judgement

GLVIA3 (**Ref. 14-3**) places a strong emphasis on the importance of professional judgement in identifying and defining the significance of landscape and visual effects. As part of the assessments, professional judgement has been used in combination with structured methods and criteria to evaluate landscape value, sensitivity, and magnitude and significance of effect. The assessments have been undertaken and verified by two Chartered Landscape Architects to provide a robust and consistent approach.

#### 14.3.3.3 Key Stages of Assessment

Methods promoted by GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3) require an appreciation of the existing environment and the ability of its key components to accept the change proposed; an understanding of the potential effects which could occur and how these could affect the key components; and the potential to mitigate adverse effects. There are five key stages to the assessment:

- establishment of the baseline;
- appreciation of the Proposed Development;
- identification of key landscape and visual receptors;
- identification of potential effects; and
- assessment of effect significance.

Although separated out above for the purpose of explanation, this is rarely a step-by-step process and so stages will often overlap, restart and recur as the design develops, consultation proceeds and the assessment progresses.

While the process for understanding the development is similar for both the landscape and visual assessments, the methodologies for each are distinct and are therefore described separately in **Sections 14.4** and **14.6** respectively.

#### 14.3.4 Limitations of the Assessment

A Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been prepared and is shown on **Figures 14.4** and **14.7**. The ZTV indicates those parts of the 5km study area from where there may be views of the Proposed Development. The ZTV is a valuable tool in assisting both landscape character and visual impact assessment.

The ZTV diagram has been prepared using Ordnance Survey (OS) Terrain 5 digital terrain model (DTM) and ArcGIS software to illustrate the potential visibility of the proposed Fish Feed Plant. Terrain 5 is a grid of heightened points with regular 5 metre post spacing. The software uses this information to create a virtual, 3 dimensional, bare ground model which is representative of the earth / sea surface.

However, it should be noted that the ZTV is based on bare ground analysis (i.e. the digital terrain model) and therefore does not take into account local variations in topography, hedgerows, individual trees and woodland, walls or similar features that can alter the potential visibility locally, particularly when close to the receptor. Therefore, while the ZTV indicates areas of potential theoretical visibility of the Proposed Development, in reality not all locations within the ZTV would necessarily afford a view of the Proposed Development.

The ZTV shows areas from where parts of the Fish Feed Plant may potentially be visible for a person with a viewing height of 1.5m (i.e. an average height person standing on ground level). Therefore, while the ZTV shows theoretical visibility from ground level, it does not show visibility from other heights (e.g. 2<sup>nd</sup> storey, 3<sup>rd</sup> storey levels) and so site appraisal is critical in assessing and evaluating onsite visibility.

The ZTV has been run based on the three highest points of the Proposed Development: the uppermost point on the Production Building at 40.5m from ground level; the centre of the Air Stack Tower at 60m from ground level; and the highest point of the Pier Crane at 21m from ground level. By running the ZTV from the highest points of the Proposed Development, the ZTV shows a 'worst-case' scenario.

The assessment of visual effects has been undertaken from the nearest public road, footpath or open space to each property and assumptions have been made about the types of rooms, and about the types and importance of views obtained from these rooms. For there to be a visual effect there is the need for a viewer, and therefore only buildings that are in use have been assessed. Derelict buildings or those considered to be unoccupied at the time of the survey were not assessed.

## 14.4 Landscape Assessment Methodology

The key stages of the Landscape Assessment, as noted in **Section 14.3.3.3**, are detailed in the following paragraphs. The assessment has been prepared with reference to GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3). Those guidelines rely on an appreciation of the existing landscape, a thorough understanding of the Proposed Development, evaluation of the magnitude of change predicted to result from the Proposed Development, the sensitivity of the existing landscape to change and the potential to mitigate impacts.

### 14.4.1 Establishment of the Baseline

Landscape character is a composite of physical, biological and cultural elements. Landform, hydrology, vegetation, land use pattern, cultural and historic features and associations combine to create a common 'sense of place' and identity which can be used to categorise the landscape into definable units (character areas). The level of detail and size of unit can be varied to reflect the scale of definition required. It can be applied at national, regional and local levels.

Establishment of the baseline conditions has been undertaken through a combination of desk study and site appraisal. The following specific tasks have been undertaken:

- a review of the relevant development plans and supplementary planning guidance;



- a review of the SNH Landscape Assessment of Skye and Lochalsh Landscape Assessment (Ref. 14-4);
- generation and review of Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) diagram;
- site appraisal and identification of landscape receptors;
- identification of landscape value and sensitivity to change.

### Relative Landscape Value

The relative value of the landscape is an important consideration in informing later judgement of the significance of effects. Value concerns the perceived importance of the landscape, when considered as a whole and within the context of the study corridor. Landscape value is established through consideration of the following factors:

- presence of landscape designations, other inventory or registered landscapes / landscape features or identified planning constraints;
- the scenic quality of the landscape;
- perceptual aspects, such as wildness or tranquility;
- conservation interests such as cultural heritage features or associations, or if the landscape supports notable habitats or species;
- recreational value; and
- rarity either in the national or local context or if it is considered to be a particularly important example of a specific landscape type.

It should be noted that absence of a designation does not necessarily mean that a landscape or component is not highly valued as factors such as accessibility and local scarcity can render areas of nationally unremarkable quality, highly valuable as a local resource. Criteria for the allocation of perceived landscape value are outlined in **Table 14.2** below:

**Table 14.2 : Relative Landscape Value Criteria**

Relative Landscape Value	Criteria
High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the landscape is closely associated with features of international or national importance which are rare within the wider context;</li> <li>• the landscape is of high scenic quality and forms a key part of an important designated landscape or planning constraint; and / or</li> <li>• the landscape is an example of a scarce resource within the local context and is of considerable local importance for its, scenic quality, recreational opportunities or cultural heritage associations.</li> </ul>
Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the landscape is associated with features of national or regional importance which are relatively common within the wider context;</li> <li>• the landscape forms part of a designated landscape or is associated with other features of importance but is not rare or distinctive within the local context; and/or</li> <li>• the landscape is one of a number within the local context appreciated for its scenic quality, recreational opportunities or cultural heritage associations.</li> </ul>
Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the landscape characteristics are common within the local and regional context and the landscape is not associated with any particular features or attributes considered to be important; and / or</li> <li>• The landscape is of poor scenic quality and is not appreciated for any recreational or cultural associations.</li> </ul>

#### 14.4.2 Appreciation of the Proposed Development

Appreciation of the Proposed Development involves the accumulation of an appropriate knowledge of the Proposed Development, its nature, scale and location within the baseline landscape, and any peripheral or ancillary features proposed. Analysis of the proposed activities and changes which would take place leads to an understanding of the potential effects that may occur on the landscape resource. As part of this process, the ZTV diagram produced to aid the assessment has been consulted to inform the potential range of effects.

#### 14.4.3 Identification of Key Landscape Receptors

The identification of landscape receptors is the first step in the analysis of the potential for significant landscape effects to take place. Landscape receptors comprise key characteristics or individual features which contribute to the value of the landscape and have the potential to be affected by the Proposed Development. Landscape receptors are identified through analysis of baseline characteristics when considered in relation to the effects which might result from a development of the type proposed.

#### Landscape Sensitivity

Landscape sensitivity considers the nature of the landscape and its ability to accommodate development of the type proposed without compromising its key characteristics and components. There are two aspects which are considered when establishing the landscape sensitivity:

- Value: The baseline value of the landscape and the contributory value of individual landscape receptors to the landscape as a whole; and
- Susceptibility to change: The ability of landscape receptors to accommodate development of the type proposed without changing the intrinsic qualities of the landscape as a whole.

Landscape sensitivity has been evaluated with reference to the subject areas above and using a three-point scale as outlined in **Table 14.3** below:

**Table 14.3 : Landscape Sensitivity Criteria**

Landscape Sensitivity	Criteria
High	A highly valued landscape of particularly distinctive character susceptible to relatively small changes of the type proposed.
Medium	A reasonably valued landscape with a composition and characteristics tolerant of some degree of change of the type proposed.
Low	A relatively unimportant landscape which is potentially tolerant of a large degree of change of the type proposed.

#### 14.4.4 Identification of Potential Effects

The second step in the assessment process involves the identification of potential effects which may occur as a result of the interaction of the effects of the Proposed Development with the identified landscape receptors. The assessment takes into account direct effects upon existing landscape elements, features and key characteristics and also indirect effects which may occur secondarily to changes affecting another landscape component. The ZTV is used as a tool to gauge the extent of potential indirect change, supported by targeted field surveys. For more information on the use and limitations of ZTV diagrams refer to **Section 14.3.4**.

#### Magnitude of Change

Magnitude of change concerns the degree to which the Proposed Development would alter the existing characteristics of the landscape. The appraisal of magnitude involves consideration of the nature and scale of the change which would occur in relation to each identified potential effect and also the duration and potential

reversibility of the effect. These changes are then combined to evaluate a magnitude rating for the Landscape Character Type (LCT) as a whole.

Magnitude is categorised on a four point scale as outlined in **Table 14.4** below:

**Table 14.4 : Magnitude of Landscape Change Criteria**

Magnitude of Landscape Change	Criteria
High	Notable change in landscape characteristics over an extensive area ranging to a very intensive change over a more limited area.
Medium	Perceptible change in landscape characteristics over an extensive area ranging to notable change in a localised area.
Low	Virtually imperceptible change in landscape characteristics over an extensive area or perceptible change in a localised area.
Negligible	No discernible change in any landscape characteristics or components.

Consideration is given to the potential for effects to vary over time, particularly as any planting develops, through the inclusion of effects during both the construction and operational phases.

#### 14.4.5 Assessment of Effect Significance

Evaluation of the predicted significance of effect has been carried out through analysis of the anticipated magnitude of change in relation to the identified landscape sensitivity and using a degree of professional judgement. The assessment takes into account identified effects upon existing landscape receptors and assesses the extent to which these would be lost or modified, in the context of their importance in determining the existing baseline character.

The prominence of the scheme components in the landscape will vary according to the prevailing weather conditions. The assessment has been carried out, as is best practice, by assuming the 'worst case' scenario i.e. on a clear, bright day in winter, when neither foreground deciduous foliage nor haze can interfere with the clarity of the view obtained.

Effect significance has been evaluated using a four point scale and using the criteria outlined in **Table 14.5** below to describe either positive or negative effects:

**Table 14.5 : Landscape Effect Criteria**

Landscape Effect	Criteria
Major	The Proposed Development would be at considerable variance with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape and may become an influential feature, resulting in considerable alteration to scenic quality and large scale change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.
Moderate	The Proposed Development would be inconsistent with the landform, scale and pattern of the landscape and may become locally influential and / or result in a noticeable alteration to scenic quality and a degree of change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.
Minor	The Proposed Development would not quite fit with the scale, landform or local pattern of the landscape and may become locally influential but would result in an inappreciable alteration to scenic quality or change to the intrinsic landscape character of the area.
Negligible	The Proposed Development would result in a virtually imperceptible change in the existing landscape character of the area.

The above criteria and levels of effect represent points on a continuum. Where required, interim ratings, such as Minor-Moderate, have been used to indicate the anticipated level of effect.

For the purposes of the assessment, effects with a rating of Moderate or above are considered to be significant.

## 14.5 Landscape Assessment

The following section provides an assessment of the effects that the Proposed Development would have on landscape character within the 5km study area. The assessment evaluates the likely effects during construction and also in the longer term during the operational phase.

### 14.5.1 Basis of the Assessment

The key elements and characteristics of the Proposed Development, which may give rise to landscape effects, are as follows:

- Fish Feed Plant buildings and structures;
- strengthened and extended intake pier and quay, and installation of slipway and additional pier structures;
- rock armoured slopes on coast to north of the Liquid Natural Gas (LNG) tank and north-east of the Slipway;
- re-routed permanent access track to Keltic Seafayre area;
- re-routed watercourse and associated earthworks cutting to north-west of Fish Feed Plant buildings;
- temporary site office and construction laydown areas located adjacent to the existing access track off the A87 road; and
- construction access via the existing access track off the A87 road.

All disturbed areas would be restricted as far as practicable to the specified areas and the laydown areas, excavations for building foundations, road construction and underground utilities would also be reinstated once construction is complete.

#### 14.5.1.1 Context

The 5km study area is shown on **Figures 14.1 to 14.7** and the site and context are described in **Section 14.2.2**.

The proposed Fish Feed Plant would be located within a quarried area adjacent to the Skye Bridge and settlement of Kyleakin on the Isle of Skye. Surrounding land uses comprise forestry, recreation, marine, transport / infrastructure; and mature and semi-mature woodland.

#### 14.5.1.2 Landscape Designations and Constraints

Landscapes can be ascribed an international, national, regional or local designation that recognises the importance of the landscape for its outstanding scenic interest or attractiveness. These designations include National Scenic Areas (NSAs), Special Landscape Areas (SLAs) and Gardens and Designed Landscapes (GDLs).

The site is not located within a designated area and so there would be no direct effects as a result of the Proposed Development.

Landscape designations within a 15km radius of the Proposed Development are shown on **Figure 2a**, and consist of:

- National Scenic Areas (Wester Ross NSA; Kintail NSA; Knoydart NSA; The Cuillin Hills NSA);
- Special Landscape Areas (South West Applecross and the Crowlin Islands SLA; Kyle-Plockton SLA); and
- Gardens and Designed Landscapes (Balmacara Estate-Lochalsh Woodland GDL; Kyle House GDL)

An initial review of these areas and consideration of their distance from the Proposed Development suggested that likely significant effects would be more likely to occur within a 5km radius from the Proposed Development. Landscape designations within this 5km study area (and therefore with potential to receive potentially significant indirect effects) are shown on **Figure 14.2b** and **14.5** and listed in **Table 14.5** below.

**Table 14.5 : Landscape Designations within the Study Area**

Landscape Designation / Constraint	Action
Kyle House GDL	Included
Kyle-Plockton SLA	Included

### 14.5.1.3 Landscape Character Types

SNH, in conjunction with partner councils, undertook a detailed review and classification of the various regional landscape areas and types in Scotland and produced a series of reports known as Landscape Character Assessments. The Proposed Development and study area is covered by document No.71 Skye and Lochalsh Landscape Assessment (**Ref. 14-4**).

Following site visits in March and June 2016, and review of the Skye of Lochalsh Landscape Assessment (Stanton, 1996), seven Landscape Character Types (LCTs) have been identified within the 5km study area, as illustrated in **Figures 14.3** and **14.6**, and listed in **Table 14.6** below.

**Table 14.6: : Landscape Character Types within the Study Area**

Landscape Character Type	Action
Coniferous Woodland Plantation LCT	Included
Harbour Settlement LCT	Included
Linear Crofting LCT	Scoped Out
Offshore Islands LCT	Included
Rocky Moorland LCT	Included
Rocky Undulating Plateau LCT	Included
Rugged Massif LCT	Included
Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT	Included

As noted in **Table 14.6** above, one LCT has been scoped out of the assessment. Reference to **Figures 14.3** and **14.6** shows that a very small area of the Linear Crofting LCT is included in the 5km study area and given its distance from the Proposed Development it is not considered that there are likely to be significant effects from this LCT. As such, it has been scoped out of the landscape assessment.

### 14.5.2 Proposed Mitigation

Following a review of the Proposed Development and the site, and an initial visual assessment of receptors, a number of proposed mitigation measures were identified with the potential to reduce adverse landscape effects and to aid the integration of the Proposed Development within the landscape. These measures are shown on **Figure 14.8** and illustrated in the Photomontages in Volume 4 and would comprise:

- mitigation by design; the layout has been designed to ensure that the Proposed Development sits back into the quarry as much as possible; that the silos (which cannot be painted ) are screened in views from the

north and east; and the colour scheme of the buildings is designed to blend in as closely as possible with the colours of the adjacent landscape;

- earthworks and screen planting to north of Proposed Development, between LNG tank and rock armour;
- earthworks and screen planting to north-east of Proposed Development, adjacent to Slipway and Keltic Seafayre area;
- screen planting to north of Proposed Development, between Liquid Storage Silos and LNG tank;
- slope stabilisation and planting to north-west of Proposed Development, on newly created slopes, either side of re-routed watercourse;
- slope stabilisation and planting to north, south and west of Proposed Development, on quarried slopes; and
- earthworks and screen planting to south-west of Proposed Development, adjacent to A87 road.

The successful reinstatement of areas disturbed during construction would also be necessary to ensure that the scheme is successfully absorbed into the existing landscape. Such measures would be incorporated into the site specific Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan (CEMP).

### 14.5.3 Assessment of Effects on Landscape Character

The following section provides a summary of the landscape assessment and highlights the effects that the Proposed Development would have on landscape character within the study area during construction and also in the longer term during the operational phase, in accordance with the effect criteria outlined in **Section 14.4**. The assessment assumes that the proposed mitigation measures noted in **Section 14.5.2** would be completed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

Tables containing details of the landscape baseline and assessment the relevant LCTs and designated landscapes are contained in **Appendix 14.1** and should be referred to in order to establish a full understanding of the landscape assessment. **Table 14.7** below provides a summary of the landscape assessment findings.

**Table 14.7 : Summary of Landscape Assessment**

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Value	Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change		Landscape Effects	
			Construction	Operation	Construction	Operation
<b>Landscape Designations</b>						
Kyle House GDL	Medium-High	Medium-High	Low	Low	Minor	Minor
Kyle-Plockton SLA	Medium-High	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Moderate
<b>Landscape Character Types</b>						
Coniferous Woodland Plantation LCT	Low-Medium	Low-Medium	Low	Low	Negligible-Minor	Negligible-Minor
Harbour Settlement LCT	Medium	Medium	Low-Medium	Low-Medium	Minor-Moderate	Minor-Moderate
Offshore Islands LCT	Medium	Medium-High	Medium	Medium	Moderate	Moderate
Rocky Moorland LCT	Low-Medium	Low-Medium	Low	Low	Minor	Minor
Rocky Undulating Plateau LCT	Low	Low-Medium	Low	Low	Minor	Minor
Rugged Massif LCT	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Minor	Minor

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Value	Landscape Sensitivity	Magnitude of Change		Landscape Effects	
			Construction	Operation	Construction	Operation
Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Minor (Locally Moderate)	Minor (Locally Moderate)

Significant landscape effects have been identified in the Kyle-Plockton SLA, Offshore Islands LCT and Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT, and are discussed further in this section.

#### 14.5.3.1 Kyle-Plockton SLA

This SLA extends from the Skye Bridge at Kyle of Lochalsh north to Plockton and includes islands and small skerries along this stretch of coastline. There is a tranquil and intimate, settled sense of place, with attractive and varied views in different directions including long range views of the distant mountain ranges and closer range views of small islands, intricate coastline and the Skye Bridge. Further variations are experienced due to changing weather, visibility, and tidal fluctuations which are influential upon the landscape character. This is landscape visited and occupied by people, with Kyle of Lochalsh noted as a popular visitor destination and ‘focus of activity and vibrancy’ (Ref. 14-2) and other small settlements and dwellings, such as Badicaul, distributed along the coastline. The area is well-connected with a railway line, public road, and Skye Bridge linking the surrounding areas. Landform is intricate and small-scale and landscape character is highly influenced by the distant large-scale surrounding landscape and pronounced topographical features of the Cuillins and Torridon mountains.

**Assessment has found that the effects for the Kyle-Plockton SLA would be indirect and Moderate during construction and operation of the Proposed Development and therefore would be significant. This effect would affect only the southern third of the SLA. As detailed in Appendix 14.1, the landscape effects which may result to the Kyle-Plockton SLA comprise the following:**

- The buildings and structures of the Proposed Development, outwith this SLA, may be perceived as more industrial in nature than surrounding landscape features, which could diminish the sense of tranquil and intimate sense of place here. This potential effect would, however, be mitigated by the presence of other existing man-made structures (Skye Bridge, quarry, pier, other settlement features) which reduce sensitivity to this change; and limited due to screening effects from local landform and trees, particularly on roadsides.
- Increased activity (traffic, footfall, business) associated with the Proposed Development may increase perceptions of Kyle of Lochalsh as a focus of activity and vibrancy. This potential effect could have negative and positive implications for the area.
- The large-scale features of the Proposed Development outwith this SLA may alter the experience of this intricate and small-scale landscape. This potential effect would, however, be mitigated by the presence of other small-scale landscape features in the foreground.
- The large-scale features of the Proposed Development outwith this SLA may alter the influence of distant large-scale surrounding landscape features (such as the Cuillin mountains) on this area’s landscape character. This potential effect would, however, be mitigated by the presence of other larger-scale features (Skye Bridge, large buildings in Kyle of Lochalsh) which reduce sensitivity to this change; and limited due to screening effects from local landform and trees, particularly on roadsides.

#### 14.5.3.2 Offshore Islands LCT

This LCT comprises of a range of small, irregular and low lying islands. The majority are inaccessible to people due to dangerous rocky and shallow sea beds. They are relatively close to the mainland, appearing in views from surroundings, creating disperse and graded edges between land and sea environment. The islands in this LCT can act as a visual focus in views from surrounding areas, particularly when clustered together, as these islands are. The sense of place is strongly influenced by the island’s relationship and distance from



neighbouring land mass, whereby more isolated islands are wilder in character. Eilean Ban differs from other islands in this LCT and its character is influenced by its relationship to the Skye Bridge, which crosses this island. The perception of 'insularity' is weakened as a result but the shape of the bridge highlights the dividing and isolating stretch of water between. In contrast to the other islands, human presence is also noted on Eilean Ban where there is a managed walking trail, lighthouse, property and A-road. This LCT is included within the Plockton-Kyle SLA.

**Assessment has found that the effects for the Offshore Islands LCT would be indirect and Moderate during construction and operation of the Proposed Development and therefore would be significant. As detailed in Appendix 14.1, the landscape effects which may result to the Offshore Islands LCT comprise the following:**

- The man-made structures and forms of the Proposed Development outwith this LCT and associated human activity may diminish the sense of wildness experienced on majority of islands within this LCT; and increase the perception of human presence on Eilean Ban. This potential effect would, however, be mitigated by the wide vistas of the surrounding landscape that emphasises the dominance of natural features over the man-made landscape;
- The large-scale features of the Proposed Development outwith this LCT may 'compete' with the islands as a visual focus in vistas from surrounding areas. This potential effect would, however, be mitigated by the wide and attractive vistas of the surrounding landscape that would capture attention in a variety of directions; and limited by low scrub vegetation on the islands and local landform.
- The Proposed Development's extended pier structure outwith this LCT may obscure the perception of island edges, in views from Badicaul for example, and decrease the islands' sense of isolation and distinct character. This potential effect would, however, be partially limited by low scrub vegetation on the islands and local landform.

#### 14.5.3.3 Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT

This LCT comprises a range of smooth repetitive stepped landforms, that alternate between large open moorland and ridges. These steps create a distinctive flow to the landscape which continues until it reaches the sea. The landform is blanketed with a uniform cover of low lying vegetation such as grasses and heather. Patches of scrub woodland are found creating a buffer between roads and surrounding landscape areas. The stepped nature creates enclosed areas that are not visible from main access points or along the coast. To the east, a quarry creates a distinctive change to the rhythm of the landscape. Lines are created through the landscape through human activity such as roads, plantations, small settlements and an airstrip.

**Assessment has found that the effects for the Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT, within which the Proposed Development is situated, would be Locally Moderate and direct in the Quarry area but generally Low elsewhere during construction and operation of the Proposed Development and therefore would be locally significant. As detailed in Appendix 14.1, the landscape effects which may result to the Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT comprise the following:**

- The large-scale features of the Proposed Development may be experienced in expansive vistas. This potential effect would, however, be limited from most areas by the screening effects of tree cover.
- The man-made structures may further the perception of human influence within the LCT. This potential effect would, however, be limited from most areas by the screening effects of tree cover; and mitigated by the presence of other man-made features.

#### 14.5.4 Summary of Effects on Landscape Character

**Table 14.8** provides a summary of the order of landscape effects during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.



**Table 14.8 : Summary of Effects on Landscape Character (L=Local Effect)**

Landscape Receptor	Landscape Effect During Construction							Landscape Effect During Operation								
	No Effect	Negligible	Negligible - Minor	Minor	Minor - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Major	Major	No Effect	Negligible	Negligible - Minor	Minor	Minor - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Major	Major
<b>Landscape Designations</b>																
Kyle House GDL				•								•				
Kyle-Plockton SLA						•								•		
<b>Landscape Character Types</b>																
Coniferous Woodland Plantation LCT			•								•					
Harbour Settlement LCT					•								•			
Offshore Islands LCT						•								•		
Rocky Moorland LCT				•								•				
Rocky Undulating Plateau LCT				•								•				
Rugged Massif LCT				•								•				
Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT				•		L						•		L		

An assessment of landscape character within the 5km study area has revealed that there would be significant albeit indirect effects upon the landscape resource of the southern end of the Kyle-Plockton SLA and the Offshore Islands LCT; and locally significant direct effects on the Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT, in the quarry and its immediate environs, during construction and operation of the Proposed Development. The assessment does however take into account the fact the site is a disused quarry, which reduces the local sensitivity to, and

magnitude of, the changes which would occur as a result of the Development. It should also be noted that the Kyle-Plockton SLA and Offshore Islands LCT overlap the same area of coast to the north-east of the Proposed Development and so there is an element of “double counting” of effects in this area as a result.

All other landscape designations / character types within the study area would not receive significant effects upon their landscape character.

## 14.6 Visual Assessment Methodology

As with the landscape character, the assessment of visual impact has been made in accordance with GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3). The guidelines suggest that visual effects are assessed from a clear understanding of the development proposed and any mitigation measures which are being adopted. Familiarity with the site and the extent, nature and expectation of existing views is also a key factor in establishing the visual sensitivity in terms of the development proposed. The guidelines require evaluation of magnitude of change to views experienced by sensitive receptors, comprising individuals living, working, travelling and carrying out other activities within the landscape, and subsequent evaluation of effect significance.

Appreciation of the baseline conditions, evaluation of the predicted impacts and assessment of effects related to predicted impacts have been undertaken in accordance with guidelines in GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3).

The key stages of the Visual Assessment, as noted in Paragraph 14.3.3.3, are detailed in the following paragraphs.

### 14.6.1 Establishment of the Baseline

Establishment of the baseline conditions has been undertaken through combination of desk study and site appraisal. The following specific tasks have been undertaken:

- a review of the relevant development plans and supplementary planning guidance;
- generation and review of ZTV diagram;
- site appraisal and identification of sensitive visual receptors; and
- field survey to establish the nature and context of individual visual receptors and the key elements and qualities of the existing view.

### 14.6.2 Appreciation of the Development Proposed

Appreciation of the Proposed Development involves the accumulation of a thorough knowledge of the Proposed Development, its nature, scale and location within the baseline landscape, and any peripheral or ancillary features proposed. The consideration of any mitigation or other planting in the vicinity is also important in the understanding of potential longer term effects.

### 14.6.3 Identification of Visual Receptors

For there to be a visual effect there is the need for a viewer. Those experiencing views are referred to as visual receptors. Locations where such receptors may experience potentially significant effects such as residential and other buildings; vehicular and railway routes; pedestrian routeways; and popular vantage points have been included in the assessment. Those experiencing views are referred to as visual receptors. Such receptors have been identified through analysis of the ZTV in combination with targeted field survey.

Locations of potential visual receptors within the study area were visited and key information on the nature, composition and characteristics of the existing view experienced recorded. Consideration is given to the likely perceived value of a particular view to the viewer, taking into account the nature of the receptor and the potential activity they may be involved in, and factors such as elevation, extent and key features or attractions which may feature in the view.

## Visual Receptor Sensitivity

The evaluation of visual sensitivity considers both the perceived *value* of the existing view to the receptor, and the *susceptibility* of the visual receptor to change. Consideration is therefore given to the following;

- the susceptibility of the receptor to change, which is a combination of the nature of the receptor and the potential activity they may be involved in;
- the perceived value of a particular view to the viewer, which takes into account visual context, including key features and attractors / detractors which may feature in the existing view and affect the value of that view to the receptor; and
- the aspect and direction of change in respect of the most valued views from the receptor location including the relative elevation compared to the changed element of the view.

In this assessment, visual sensitivity is ranked as outlined in the **Table 14.9** below, (adapted from GLVIA3 methodology, **Ref. 14-3**):

**Table 14.9 : Visual Sensitivity Criteria**

Visual Sensitivity	Criteria
High	receptors in Dwellings where the changes form part of a valued view and; receptors on Footpaths, tracks and vantage points where the changes form part of a valued view.
Medium	receptors in Dwellings where the changes form a part of a less valued view; receptors on Footpaths, tracks and vantage points where the changes form a part of a less valued view; receptors on Roads where the changes form part of a valued view; and receptors in Farm buildings not used as dwellings and Industrial buildings where the changes form part of a valued view.
Low	receptors in Dwellings where the changes form a part of a unvalued view; receptors on Footpaths, tracks and vantage points where the changes form a part of a unvalued view; and receptors on Roads where the changed landscape is a less valued element in the view.

### 14.6.4 Identification of Potential Effects

The next stage in the assessment process, having identified potential receptors and their sensitivity to the Proposed Development, is to ascertain the magnitude of change which would result from the Proposed Development. This is assessed both during construction and operation of the development.

### Magnitude of Visual Change

Magnitude of change is measured on the scale outline in **Table 14.10**, (adapted from GLVIA3 methodology, **Ref. 14-3**):

**Table 14.10 : Magnitude of Visual Change**

Magnitude of Visual Change	Criteria
High	Where the development causes a significant change in the existing view.
Medium	Where the development will cause a noticeable change in the existing view.
Low	Where the development will cause a perceptible change in the existing view.
Negligible	Where the development will cause no discernible change in the existing view.

GLVIA3 (Ref. 14-3) recommends that the criteria used to assess the magnitude of change are set out as reference points along a continuum. It is important to remember that references to high, medium and low magnitude are only reference points along this continuum. In the assessment of visual effect the magnitude of change is considered in terms of the type of change taking place in a view from a receptor and the degree of change which will take place in that view.

#### 14.6.5 Assessment of Visual Effect Significance

The level of effect identified concerns the importance of changes resulting from the Proposed Development. Evaluation of the visual effect is based on consideration of the magnitude of change in relation to visual sensitivity, taking into account proposed mitigation measures, and is established using professional judgement. The assessment takes into account likely changes to the visual composition, including the extent to which new features would distract or screen existing elements in the view or disrupt the scale, structure or focus of the existing view.

The prominence of the scheme components in the view will vary according to the prevailing weather conditions. The assessment has been carried out, as is good practice, by assuming the 'worst case' scenario i.e. on a clear, bright day in winter, when neither foreground deciduous foliage nor haze can interfere with the clarity of the view obtained.

#### 14.6.6 Visual Effect Significance

Effect significance has been evaluated using a four point scale and using the criteria outlined in **Table 14.11** below:

**Table 14.11 : Visual Effect Criteria**

Visual Effect	Criteria
Major	The Proposed Development would become a prominent and very detracting feature and would result in a very noticeable deterioration to an existing highly valued and well composed view.
Moderate	The Proposed Development would introduce some detracting features to an existing highly valued and well composed view, or would be prominent within a pleasing or less well composed view, resulting in a noticeable deterioration of the view.
Minor	The Proposed Development would form a perceptible but not detracting feature within a pleasing or valued view or would be a more prominent feature within a poorly composed view of limited value, resulting in a small deterioration to the existing view.
Negligible	The Proposed Development would form a barely perceptible feature within the existing view and would not result in any discernible deterioration to the view.

The above criteria and levels of effect represent points on a continuum. Where required, interim ratings, such as Minor-Moderate, have been used to indicate the anticipated level of effect.

For the purposes of this assessment, effects of Moderate, Moderate-Major or Major are considered to be significant.

### 14.7 Visual Assessment

The following section provides an assessment of the effects that the Proposed Development would have on visual amenity within the 5km study area. The assessment evaluates the likely effects during construction and also in the longer term during the operational phase.

### 14.7.1 Basis of the Assessment

The key elements and characteristics of the Proposed Development, which may give rise to visual effects, are as follows:

- Fish Feed Plant buildings and structures;
- strengthened and extended intake pier and quay, and installation of slipway and additional pier structures;
- rock armoured slopes on coast to north of the LNG tank and north-east of the Slipway;
- re-routed permanent access track to Keltic Seafayre area;
- re-routed watercourse and associated earthworks cutting to north-west of Fish Feed Plant buildings;
- temporary site office and construction laydown areas located adjacent to the existing access off the A87 road;
- construction access via the existing access track off the A87 road.

All disturbed areas would be restricted as far as practicable to the specified areas and the laydown areas, excavations for building foundations, road construction and underground utilities would also be reinstated once construction is complete.

#### 14.7.1.1 Context

The 5km study area is shown on **Figures 14.1 to 14.7** and the site and context are described in **Section 14.2.2**.

The proposed Fish Feed Plant would be located within a quarried area adjacent to the Skye Bridge and settlement of Kyleakin on the Isle of Skye. Surrounding land uses comprise forestry, recreation, marine, and transport / infrastructure; and mature and semi-mature woodland.

#### 14.7.1.2 Visual Receptors

##### 14.7.1.2.1 Receptors in Viewpoints

Ten receptors at viewpoints (Vps) were identified within the 5 km study area, as shown on **Figures 14.7a, 14.7b** and **14.9**, and detailed in **Appendix 14.2**. These viewpoints were chosen by the landscape architect, based on the principles of the GLVIA3 guidance (**Ref. 14-3**), in conjunction with Marine Harvest and feedback from THC, SNH and community consultation. Viewpoints are noted to be either illustrative; representative; or specific. Photomontages have been produced from nine of these viewpoints and are included in Volume 4. **Table 14.12** below lists the viewpoints and their reason for inclusion in the LVIA.

**Table 14.12 : List of Viewpoints**

Viewpoint	Location	Grid Reference	Approx. distance from Proposed Development	Reason for Viewpoint Choice
1	Badicaul	175606, 828887	3km	Illustrative of worst-case views from Badicaul, a nearby settlement.
2	Train Station, Kyle of Lochalsh	176248, 827114	2.5km	Representative of views from waterfront of nearby settlement and train station arrival point. Also representative of views from boats in this direction.
3	Skye Bridge	174435, 826738	0.6km	Illustrative of worst-case views from high-point of bridge, an important landmark point between the mainland and Isle of Skye.

Viewpoint	Location	Grid Reference	Approx. distance from Proposed Development	Reason for Viewpoint Choice
4	Kyleakin Car Park	175277, 826376	1.5km	Representative of views from Kyleakin village centre, a nearby settlement.
5	A87, near Proposed Development	173251, 825818	0.8km	Illustrative of worst-case views from A87 road on main route past Proposed Development.
6	Plock of Kyle Viewpoint	175605, 827393	2km	Specific viewpoint from high point within nearby settlement, potentially visited by tourists and local residents.
7	Kyleakin War Memorial	175389, 826441	1.5km	Specific viewpoint of cultural significance within nearby settlement, potentially visited by tourists and local residents, demonstrating views from east of Proposed Development, including views from nearby Castle ruins.
8	Airstrip and A87 Junction	169637, 824324	4.6km	Illustrative of views from south-west of Proposed Development on A87 road, as experienced by potential visitors arriving / leaving by plane to Skye.
9	Donald Murchison's Memorial Viewpoint	178703, 827081	4.6km	Specific viewpoint of cultural significance on A-road, potentially visited by tourists.
10	Loch Alsh Viewpoint, A87	177218, 827204	3km	Specific viewpoint on A-road, potentially visited by tourists, representative of views from A87 to north-east of Proposed Development.

#### 14.7.1.2.2 Receptors in Buildings

Twenty seven receptor locations in buildings / groups of receptor locations in buildings were identified within the 5km study area, as shown on **Figures 14.7a** and **14.7b** and detailed in **Appendix 14.2**. These locations include residential, industrial, commercial buildings from which people may obtain views of the Proposed Development within the settlements of Badicaul, Kyle of Lochalsh, and Kyleakin; buildings on the island of Eilean Ban; and a single property near Broadford Airstrip.

#### 14.7.1.2.3 Receptors in Outdoor Spaces

Four receptor locations in outdoor spaces were identified within the 5km study area, as shown on **Figures 14.7a** and **14.7b** and detailed in **Appendix 14.2**. These are located in the Golf Course, car park and picnic area near the Plock of Kyle Viewpoint, Caisteal Maol and the Broadford Airstrip.

#### 14.7.1.2.4 Receptors on Routes

Thirteen locations for receptors on routes were identified within the 5km study area, as shown on **Figure 14.7c** and detailed in **Appendix 14.2**. These include locations where people are travelling along the railway line that terminates at Kyle of Lochalsh train station; the public road between Erbusaig and Kyle of Lochalsh; the A87 road between Donald Murchison's Monument via the Skye Bridge to Ashaig; the Caol Acaín and Kyleside roads in Kyleakin; and several core paths.

### 14.7.2 Proposed Mitigation

Following a review of the Proposed Development and the site, and an initial visual assessment of receptors, a number of proposed mitigation measures were identified with the potential to reduce adverse visual effects and

to aid the integration of the Proposed Development within the landscape. These measures are shown on **Figure 14.8** and illustrated in the Photomontages in Volume 4 and would comprise:

- mitigation by design; the layout has been designed to ensure that the Proposed Development sits back into the quarry as much as possible; that the silos (which cannot be painted) are screened in views from the north and east; and the colour scheme of the buildings is designed to blend in as closely as possible with the colours of the adjacent landscape;
- earthworks and screen planting to north of Proposed Development, between LNG tank and rock armour;
- earthworks and screen planting to north-east of Proposed Development, adjacent to Slipway and Keltic Seafayre area;
- screen planting to north of Proposed Development, between Liquid Storage Silos and LNG tank;
- slope stabilisation and planting to north-west of Proposed Development, on newly created slopes, either side of re-routed watercourse;
- slope stabilisation and planting to north, south and west of Proposed Development, on quarried slopes; and
- earthworks and screen planting to south-west of Proposed Development, adjacent to A87 road.

The successful reinstatement of areas disturbed during construction would also be necessary to ensure that the scheme is successfully absorbed into the existing landscape. Such measures would be incorporated into the site specific Construction Environmental Mitigation Plan (CEMP).

### 14.7.3 Assessment of Effects on Visual Amenity

The following section provides a summary of the visual assessment and highlights the effects that the Proposed Development would have on the views during construction and also in the longer term during the operational phase, in accordance with the effect criteria outlined in **Section 14.6**. The assessment assumes that the proposed mitigation measures noted in **Section 14.7.2** would be completed during the construction phase of the Proposed Development.

Tables containing details of the visual assessment are contained in **Appendix 14.2**, with results illustrated in **Figure 14.7a**, **14.7b**, and **14.7c**. Proposed mitigation measures are noted in **red text** within the tables in **Appendix 14.2** so as to highlight its potential role in limiting visual effects.

#### 14.7.3.1 Visual Receptor Experiences

In conducting the visual assessment, it has been recognised that a variety of people visit, live and work in the study area and there would be a range of visual experiences for different groups of people. Whilst visual perceptions are highly subjective and vary from person to person, it is nevertheless important to consider how different groups may perceive the Proposed Development in the context of the wider area. Certain assumptions and generalisations are made in doing so, about behaviour, visual perception and interactions with the environment, but this is inherent to the process and aims to give the reader a broad overview of potential visual effects upon different receptor categories.

Within the study area, visitors and residents are likely to experience views of the area in different ways. For example, people travelling through the area would likely have different experiences of the area to those living and / or working in the area. Varying visual perceptions may relate to the length and frequency of time spent in the area; the degree of familiarity with the surroundings; and the relative attention given to their surroundings. As such, two broad categories of people (or receptors) are discussed in this section:

- local residents (i.e. people working and/or living in the area on a permanent or long-term basis); and
- visitors (i.e. those travelling through the area, or staying in the area for limited period of time, on a temporary or short-term basis).

These categories are not intended to be exclusive, exhaustive or all encompassing, as it is noted that there will be people who fit neither or both descriptions. Rather, they are employed to illustrate and summarise the main



types of receptor experiences. References to different receptor categories have been made in the visual assessment tables in **Appendix 14.2**.

#### 14.7.3.1.1 The Local Resident's Experience

The visual experiences of local residents are characterised by permanent or long-term, frequently occurring experiences within a familiar visual context. A local resident's visual attention to their surroundings will vary depending on the activity they are engaged in and type of views experienced. Views from a local resident can be considered in four sub-groups (which can overlap), further detailed in **Table 14.13** below:

- views from places of permanent or long-term residence;
- views from places of permanent or long-term work or study;
- views from places of leisure, recreation and commerce, and / or places providing facilities and services; and
- views from routes when travelling through the area.

**Table 14.13 : Summary of Local Resident's Experience**

<p><b>1. Local residents' views from places of permanent or long-term residence</b> (e.g. properties in Kyleakin, Kyle of Lochalsh and Badicaul)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These views would be experienced by local residents on a frequent occurrence, in a familiar visual context, when attention to views may be heightened.</li> <li>• In Kyleakin, local residents' views from places of residence (B21, B23-26) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would largely be screened by trees, landform and the Skye Bridge in primarily side or oblique views, although the top of the air stack tower may be visible above / through trees, and the end of the extended pier may be visible under the Skye Bridge.</li> <li>• In Kyle of Lochalsh, a majority of views from places of residence would not experience significant visual effects due to screening from trees near the Proposed Development, other buildings and vegetation in Kyle, or local landform; and orientation of properties. However for a small number of local residents, (B17 on Heathmount Place) would be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would be present in elevated main views.</li> <li>• In Badicaul views from places of residence at the north end of the settlement (B1, B3) would not experience significant visual effects due to screening from nearby buildings and trees, orientation of properties. However at the south end, some local residents' views from places of residence (B2) would be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in main and oblique views, behind Eilean a Mhal island.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2. Local residents' views from places of permanent or long-term <u>work or study</u></b> (e.g. school, community centre, office buildings, harbour, shops, hotels, restaurants, garage, airstrip primarily within, but not limited to, Kyle of Lochalsh and Kyleakin)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These views would be experienced by local residents on a frequent occurrence, in a familiar visual context, but when attention to views may be reduced (since attention would likely be engaged in work /study activities).</li> <li>• In Kyleakin, local residents' views from places of work or study (B23-B25) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would largely be screened by trees, landform and the Skye Bridge in primarily side or oblique views, although the top of the air stack tower may be visible above / through trees, and the end of the extended pier may be visible under the Skye Bridge.</li> <li>• In Kyle of Lochalsh a majority of views from places of work or study in Kyle of Lochalsh would not experience significant visual effects due to the nature of their work reducing sensitivity to change, combined with screening from nearby buildings and trees, and orientation of views. However, some local residents' views from places of work or study (B14 &amp; VP2, buildings on the waterfront) would be <b>significantly affected</b> by the Proposed Development. Here, it would be visible in a mixture of views, but partially screened by trees and the Skye Bridge, with the air stack tower visible above the tree tops and extended pier visible between the bridge legs.</li> <li>• In Badicaul, local residents' views from a place of work (Tigh a Cladach B&amp;B in B2) would be <b>significantly affected</b> by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in oblique views behind Eilean a Mhal island, with the base partially screened by roadside shrubs.</li> <li>• On Eilean Ban, local residents' views from a place of work (B20, lighthouse) would be <b>significantly affected</b> by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in close proximity.</li> <li>• At Broadford Airstrip, local resident's views from a place of work (04) would not be significantly affected due to screening from trees.</li> </ul>



**3. Local residents' views from places of leisure, recreation and commerce, and / or places providing facilities and services (e.g. walking routes, the golf course, shops, restaurants and other places spent in local resident's free time)**

- These views would be experienced by local residents on a frequent occurrence, in a familiar visual context, when attention to views would vary by activity.
- In Kyleakin, local residents' views from places such as Caisteal Maol, shops restaurants and walking routes would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would largely be screened by trees, landform and the Skye Bridge, although the top of the air stack tower may be visible above / through trees, and the end of the extended pier may be visible under the Skye Bridge.
- In Kyle of Lochalsh, views from other places such as the golf course, and cafes and shops away from the waterfront would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development due to screening from nearby buildings and trees, and orientation of views. However some local resident's views from places such as Plock of Kyle (VP6), nearby car park and picnic spot (O2) and shops and cafes by the waterfront (B14) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in a mixture of views, but partially screened by trees and the Skye Bridge, with the air stack tower visible above the tree tops and extended pier visible between the bridge legs.
- On recreational walking routes in the study area (R9-13), local resident's views would not be significantly affected due to screening, orientation of views and consideration of the overall visual context.

**4. Local resident's views from routes when travelling through the area (e.g. A87 road, Skye Bridge, public road via Badical, railway line, other roads within settlements)**

- These views would be experienced by local residents on a frequent occurrence, in a familiar visual context, when attention to views would vary by mode of transport, and role of traveller (ie. driver or passenger).
- Local residents' views from the Skye Bridge (R5), railway line (R1) and public road via Badical (R2) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in main or oblique views when travelling southbound, partially screened by trees and foreground structures or islands.
- Other views from parts of the A87 (R3-4, R7-8) and road in Kyleakin (R6) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development. It would nevertheless be perceptible in repeated views along the A87, screened for the most part by trees and the Skye Bridge, and seen within a context of other built development, although of a different nature and scale.

In summary, local residents would be most likely to experience significant visual effects on a frequent basis, within a familiar visual context, from:

- places of residence on Heathmount Place in Kyle of Lochalsh (B17) and in Badical (B2);
- some places of work or study in Kyle of Lochalsh (B14 & VP2), Badical (B2) and Eilean Ban lighthouse (B20);
- places of leisure / recreation interest including Plock of Kyle Viewpoint (VP6), nearby car park and picnic spot (O2); shops and cafes by the Kyle of Lochalsh waterfront (B14); and
- and some transport corridors and routes; namely the Skye Bridge (R5), public road via Badical (R2), and coastal train route (R1).

**14.7.3.1.2 The Visitor's Experience**

The visual experiences of visitors are characterised by temporary or short-term, occasional or infrequently occurring experiences with a potentially unfamiliar visual context. A visitors' visual attention to their surroundings will vary depending on the context and activity they are engaged in. In comparison to a local resident, a visitor's attention may be focussed on their surroundings for a short but intense period. Views from a visitor can be considered in three sub-groups (which can overlap), further detailed in **Table 14.14** below:

- views from places of temporary or short-term accommodation;
- views from places of leisure, recreation and commerce, and / or places providing facilities and services that are of value / interest to tourists and visitors; and
- views from routes when travelling through the area.

**Table 14.14 : Summary of the Visitor's Experience**

**1. Visitors' views from places of temporary or short-term accommodation**

(e.g. accommodation in Kyleakin, Kyle of Lochalsh, Badical, Eilean Ban)

- These views would be experienced by visitors for a short time period, infrequently, in a potentially unfamiliar visual context, when attention to views may be heightened.
- It is difficult to identify locations of temporary or short-term accommodation, as they can be informal as well as formal. Therefore, here, accommodation is taken to refer to places where a formal advertisement of accommodation is visible from the public road (signposted hotels, B&Bs, guest houses) as opposed to properties informally hosting guests or non-advertised self-catering properties.
- In Kyleakin, visitors' views from places of accommodation would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would largely be screened by trees, landform and the Skye Bridge in primarily side or oblique views, although the top of the air stack tower may be visible above / through trees, and the end of the extended pier may be visible under the Skye Bridge.
- In Kyle of Lochalsh, visitors' views from one place of accommodation by the waterfront (Lochalsh Hotel in B14) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be present in side / oblique views, partially screened by the Skye Bridge and trees. Other views from places of accommodation in Kyle of Lochalsh would not experience significant visual effects due to screening from trees near the Proposed Development, other buildings and vegetation in Kyle, or local landform; and orientation of accommodation.
- In Badical, visitors' views from one place of accommodation (Tigh a Cladach B&B in B2) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in oblique views, behind Eilean a Mhal island, with the base partially screened by roadside shrubs.
- On Eilean Ban, visitors' views from one place of accommodation (Gavin Maxwell Cottage, B19) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, due to the lack of side windows in the Proposed Development's direction. There may be views of the Proposed Development from access to the building however.

**2. Visitors' views from places of leisure, recreation and commerce, and / or places providing facilities and services that are of value / interest to tourists and visitors**

(e.g. viewpoints, memorials, museums, walking routes, shops, restaurants, cafes)

- These views would be experienced by visitors for a short time period, infrequently, in a potentially unfamiliar visual context, when attention to views may be heightened.
- In Kyleakin, visitors' views from places such as Caisteal Maol (O3), Kyleakin War Memorial (Vp7), shops restaurants and walking routes would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would largely be screened by trees, landform and the Skye Bridge, although the top of the air stack tower may be visible above / through trees, and the end of the extended pier may be visible under the Skye Bridge.
- In Kyle of Lochalsh, visitors' views from a few places such as Plock of Kyle Viewpoint (Vp6), the nearby car park and picnic area (O2) and museum, shops and cafes by the waterfront (B14) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in a mixture of views, but partially screened by trees and the Skye Bridge, with the air stack tower visible above the tree tops and extended pier visible between the bridge legs. Views from other places such as cafes and shops away from the waterfront would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development due to screening from nearby buildings and trees, and orientation of views.
- On Eilean Ban, visitors' views from the lighthouse (B20) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in close proximity. Views from the Gavin Maxwell museum (B19) would not be significantly affected due the orientation of the buildings and lack of side windows in the direction of the Proposed Development.
- On recreational walking routes in the study area (R9-13), visitors' views would not be significantly affected due to screening, orientation of views and consideration of the overall visual context.
- On the A87, visitor's views from the Donald Murchison Memorial Viewpoint (Vp9) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development, which would be partially screened by trees and topography beside the Skye Bridge. The top of the air stack tower may be visible through / above trees, though not sky-lined, and the extended pier visible beyond the existing pier.

**3. Visitors' views from routes when travelling through the area**

(e.g. A87 road, Skye Bridge, public road via Badical, railway line)

- These views would be experienced by visitors for a short time period, infrequently, in a potentially unfamiliar visual context, when attention to views would vary by mode of transport, and role of traveller (ie. driver or passenger). Attention to the surrounding views would likely be higher than that of local residents.

- Visitors' views from the Skye Bridge (R5), railway line (R1, Vp2) and public road via Badical (R2) would be **significantly affected** by the Proposed Development, which would be visible in main or oblique views when travelling southward, partially screened by trees and foreground structures or islands. Skye Bridge is notable as a gateway landmark, marking the transition between mainland and the Isle of Skye. The visual effect on the Skye Bridge would therefore be of particular importance to visitors, but would be short-term.
- Other views from parts of the A87 (R3-4, R7-8) and road in Kyleakin (R6) would not be significantly affected by the Proposed Development. It would nevertheless be perceptible in repeated views along the A87, screened for the most part by trees and the Skye Bridge, and seen within a context of other built development, though of a different nature and scale.

In summary, visitors would be most likely to experience significant visual effects on an infrequent basis, for a short time period, in a potentially unfamiliar visual context, from:

- accommodation on Kyle of Lochalsh waterfront (in B14) and a B&B in Badical (B2);
- some points of tourist interest, namely Plock of Kyle Viewpoint (Vp6), nearby car park and picnic area (O2), museum, shops, cafes and train stations by the Kyle of Lochalsh waterfront (B14, Vp2); and Eilean Ban lighthouse (B20); and
- some important transport corridors and routes, namely the Skye Bridge (R5), public road via Badical (R2), and coastal train route (R1).

Local residents' and visitors would experience some similar views of the Proposed Development, from similar locations, but they would be experienced in different ways: local residents seeing the Proposed Development on a frequent basis from more angles and locations, within a familiar visual context; compared to visitors seeing the Proposed Development on an infrequent basis for a short-time period, from fewer locations, within a potentially unfamiliar visual context when however their visual attention to surroundings and expectations are likely to be higher.

#### 14.7.4 Summary of Effects on Visual Amenity

**Table 14.15** below provides a summary of the order of visual effects during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

**Table 14.15 : Summary of Effects on Visual Receptors**

Visual Receptor	Visual Effect During Construction								Visual Effect During Operation							
	No Effect	Negligible	Negligible - Minor	Minor	Minor - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Major	Major	No Effect	Negligible	Negligible - Minor	Minor	Minor - Moderate	Moderate	Moderate - Major	Major
Receptors at Viewpoints (Total 10)		1	1	3	2		1	2		2	1	2	2		3	
Receptors in Buildings (Total 27)		8	4	6	5	1	2	1		9	3	7	4	1	2	1
Receptors in Outdoor Spaces (Total 4)		1		1	1			1		1		1	1		1	
Receptors on Routes (Total 13)		3	2	3	2	2	1			4	2	2	2	3		
<b>TOTAL (54)</b>	43					11			43					11		

An assessment of visual receptors within the 5km study area indicates that there would be significant visual effects during construction and operation at eleven receptor locations or location groups\_ out of the total fifty-four receptor locations or location groups included in the assessment:

- Three receptor locations at viewpoints:
  - Vp1 – Badical; and
  - Vp3 – Skye Bridge; and
  - Vp6 – Plock of Kyle Viewpoint.
- Four receptor locations in buildings:
  - B2 – Group of single and 1.5 storey properties by roadside, including Tigh a Cladach B&B (Badical);
  - B14 – Buildings adjacent to waterfront, including train station, Waterside Restaurant, Railway Museum, Scottish Crofting Foundation, Kyle of Lochalsh Lifeboat Station, Lochalsh Hotel (Kyle of Lochalsh);
  - B17 – Properties on Heathmount Place in elevated position (Kyle of Lochalsh); and
  - B20 – Kyleakin Lighthouse (Eilean Ban).
- One receptor location in an outdoor space:
  - O2 – Car Park and picnic area around Plock of Kyle Viewpoint.

- Three receptor locations on sections of routes:
  - R1 – Railway Line between Portnacloich and Kyle of Lochalsh Train Station (at the railway station and at Badicaul);
  - R2 – Public road between Erbusaig and Kyle of Lochalsh, via Badicaul (at Badicaul); and
  - R5 – A87 road between Kyle of Lochalsh and Kyleakin, (along a section of the Skye Bridge).

These eleven receptor locations are primarily situated to the north-east of the Proposed Development in Badicaul (Vp1, B2, R1, R2), Kyle of Lochalsh (B14, B17), Plock of Kyle (Vp6, O2), and Skye Bridge / Eilean Ban (Vp3, B20, R5).

Receptors at four locations (Vp3, Vp6, O2, R5) would experience a relatively lower visual effect during operation than during construction.

All other receptors within the study area (at forty-three locations) would not experience significant effects during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.

## **14.8 Summary and Conclusions**

### **14.8.1 Landscape Assessment**

This assessment has included a consideration of landscape designations and LCTs within the study area.

An assessment of landscape character within the 5km study area has revealed that during construction and operation, there would be indirect significant effects on the landscape character of two areas: The Kyle-Plockton SLA and Offshore Islands LCT, which cover the same area of coast, to the north-east of the Proposed Development, and have been assessed to receive Moderate landscape effects.

From these areas, the Proposed Development would be experienced in a range of vistas of the surrounding landscape, which are relatively open and screening is limited to low scrub roadside planting. Potential effects relate to the introduction of large-scale man-made features that may decrease the tranquil, intimate sense of place; potentially pull visual attention away from the small-scale features of the landscape and influence the perception of the surrounding large-scale landscape features such as the Cuillin mountains. The Proposed Development would, however, be experienced as part of a wider landscape in which there are a variety of natural and man-made features that combine to create the landscape character.

The assessment also found that during construction and operation, there would be a direct locally significant effect on the landscape character of the Smooth Stepped Moorland LCT. That the local effect is not greater is due to the fact that the Proposed Development is located within an existing derelict quarry with an existing pier which reduces both the sensitivity to, and magnitude of, the change.

All other landscape designations and landscape character types would receive non-significant landscape effects due to a combination of the screening effect of local topography and trees, as the quarry enclosure and treed backcloth screen all but the highest built features from areas to the south west and east of the site thereby reducing potential indirect landscape effects in these directions.

### **14.8.2 Visual Assessment**

This assessment has considered receptors at viewpoints, receptors in buildings, receptors in outdoor spaces and receptors on routes within the study area.

An assessment of visual receptors within the 5km study area has revealed that during construction and operation, there would be significant visual effects for receptors relatively close to the development at 11 locations. Significant visual effects are likely for receptors within the areas of Badicaul, southern Kyle of Lochalsh, Plock of Kyle and the Skye Bridge / Eilean Ban.

The Proposed Development is more screened in views from the east, south and west and hence significant visual effects upon receptors are concentrated to locations within approximately 3km of the Proposed Development, to its north-east where there are more open views along the coast and across Loch Alsh and the Inner Sound in the direction of the site.

Where visible, the Proposed Development would be seen adjacent to the Skye Bridge, in the location of an existing quarry site and existing pier, with an operational commercial forest landscape to the rear, thus reducing sensitivity to change of the type proposed. The scale, style and nature of Proposed Development would nevertheless be very noticeable to a number of receptors, mainly located to its north and north-east.

It is recognised that a variety of people visit, live and work in the area contained within the study area and that there would be a variety of visual experiences for different groups of people. Local residents of Badicaul, Kyle of Lochalsh and Kyleakin would experience more frequent views of the Proposed Development from different angles than visitors who may experience occasional / short-term views of the Proposed Development albeit with higher expectations from locations such as the Train Station in Kyle of Lochalsh, specific viewpoints such as the Plock of Kyle Viewpoint, and transport corridors and routes, such as the A87 and Skye Bridge and public road through Badicaul. Considerations such as these have been taken into account in the visual assessment, particularly in the degree of visual sensitivity to change of the type proposed.

All other receptors would receive non-significant visual effects due to the mitigating screening effects of woodland close to the Proposed Development, landform, buildings and structures and proposed landscape mitigation which serve to contain visual effects upon the majority of receptors within the study area. Receptors in Kyleakin and the northern part of Kyle of Lochalsh would not be significantly affected for example. The carefully selected colours and materials, combined with landscape planting and mounding, have also been chosen for the Proposed Development with the intention of integrating the buildings and structures within the landscape and reducing the potential effects it may have on visual amenity.

### 14.8.3 Conclusions

This LVIA finds that the Proposed Development, a Fish Feed Plant at Kyleakin, would result in some localised significant effects to its north-east, in the coastal areas around Badicaul, Kyle of Lochalsh, the Skye Bridge and Eilean Ban. From these areas, the Proposed Development would be experienced as a large-scale man-made feature within a valued coastal landscape. It would, however, also be viewed as part of a wider landscape in which there are a variety of natural and man-made features: notably in the context of an existing quarry within which the development would be situated and the existing adjacent pier. It would also be seen adjacent to the distinctive form of the Skye Bridge and buildings of Kyleakin and lies in front of a commercial forest. Landscape and visual effects for receptors to the east, south and west of the Proposed Development would not be significant due to the screening effects of existing and proposed trees and landform, including enclosure of the site provided by the existing quarry. The Proposed Development would successfully utilise existing landscape features and proposed building colour scheme and landscape mitigation would aid integration of the Proposed Development within the immediate and wider landscape.

## 14.9 References

Ref. 14-1: Grintec (2016) *Site Plan*. Design of Greenfield Salmon Feed Fact., Kyleakin. Drawing No. 3493403110. Revision J. Job No. 81-34934.

Ref. 14-2: Horner and MacLennan (2010) *Assessment of Highland Special Landscape Areas*. Report to The Highland Council in partnership with Scottish Natural Heritage. March 2010.

Ref. 14-3: Landscape Institute and IEMA. (2013) *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment*. Third Edition. Routledge.

Ref. 14-4: Stanton, C. (1996) *Skye and Lochalsh Landscape Assessment*, No. 71. Scottish Natural Heritage Review.

Ref. 14-5: The Highland Council (2016) *Pre-Application Advice Pack*. 16/00734/PREAPP. Issued 13/04/16.

Ref. 14-6: Scottish Natural Heritage (2016) *EIA Scoping for proposed fish feed plant at Allt Anavaig quarry, Kyleakin, Isle of Skye. Town & Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011*. Letter from Alex Turner (SNH) to Mark Harvey (THC) on 12/05/16. Ref. 16/01492/SCOP

Ref. 14-7: The Highland Council (2016) *Scoping Opinion. The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Scotland) Regulations 2011 Request for Scoping Opinion*. Letter from Mark Harvey (THC) to David Biggin (Marine Harvest) on 02/07/16. Ref. 16/01492/SCOP

Ref. 14-8: Cowling, A. (2016) *Marine Harvest - Kyle Feed Mill Proposal*. Scoping Advice from Landscape Officer. 03/06/16