

**PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PHOTOVOLTAIC ENERGY FACILITY,
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Produced for:

San Solar Energy Facility (Pty) Ltd

On behalf of:



Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd
1st Floor, Block 2, 5 Woodlands Drive Office Park,
Cnr Woodlands Drive & Western Service Road
Woodmead, 2191

Produced by:



Lourens du Plessis (GPr GISc) t/a LOGIS
PO Box 384, La Montagne, 0184
M: 082 922 9019 E: lourens@logis.co.za
W: logis.co.za

- May 2022 -

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. **STUDY APPROACH**
 - 1.1. **Qualification and experience of the practitioner**
 - 1.2. **Assumptions and limitations**
 - 1.3. **Level of confidence**
 - 1.4. **Methodology**
2. **BACKGROUND**
3. **SCOPE OF WORK**
4. **RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GUIDELINES**
5. **THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**
6. **RESULTS**
 - 6.1. **Potential visual exposure**
 - 6.2. **Potential cumulative visual exposure**
 - 6.3. **Visual distance / observer proximity to the PV facility**
 - 6.4. **Viewer incidence / viewer perception**
 - 6.5. **Visual absorption capacity**
 - 6.6. **Visual impact index**
 - 6.7. **Visual impact assessment: impact rating methodology**
 - 6.8. **Visual impact assessment**
 - 6.8.1. **Construction impacts**
 - 6.8.1.1. **Potential visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility and ancillary infrastructure.**
 - 6.8.2. **Operational impacts**
 - 6.8.2.1. **Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors located within a 1km radius of the PV facility**
 - 6.8.2.2. **Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within a 1 – 3km radius**
 - 6.8.2.3. **Lighting impacts**
 - 6.8.2.4. **Solar glint and glare impacts**
 - 6.8.2.5. **Ancillary infrastructure**
 - 6.8.2.6. **Secondary impacts**
 - 6.9. **The potential to mitigate visual impacts**
7. **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**
8. **IMPACT STATEMENT**
9. **MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME**
10. **REFERENCES/DATA SOURCES**

FIGURES

- Figure 1:** Regional locality of the study area.
Figure 2: Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels.
Figure 3: Aerial view of PV arrays.
Figure 4: Aerial view of a BESS facility.
Figure 5: Close up view of a BESS facility.
Figure 6: Typical vegetation occurring in the vicinity of the proposed solar energy facility.

- Figure 7:** Visual quality on the outskirts of the town of Dibeng, west of the proposed solar energy facility.
- Figure 8:** Visual quality of the receiving environment with railway line infrastructure evident in the foreground.
- Figure 9:** Low shrubland and grassland within the study area – low VAC.

MAPS

- Map 1:** Shaded relief map of the study area.
- Map 2:** Land cover and broad land use patterns.
- Map 3:** Satellite image.
- Map 4:** Viewshed analysis of the proposed San Solar PV facility.
- Map 5:** Cumulative visual exposure.
- Map 6:** Proximity analysis and potential sensitive visual receptors.
- Map 7:** Visual impact index and potentially affected sensitive visual receptors.

TABLES

- Table 1:** Level of confidence.
- Table 2:** Visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.
- Table 3:** Visual impact on observers in close proximity to the proposed PV facility structures.
- Table 4:** Visual impact of the proposed PV facility structures within a 1 – 3km radius.
- Table 5:** Impact table summarising the significance of visual impact of lighting at night on visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.
- Table 6:** Impact table summarising the significance of the visual impact of solar glint and glare as a visual distraction and possible air/road travel hazard.
- Table 7:** Impact table summarising the significance of the visual impact of solar glint and glare on static ground receptors.
- Table 8:** Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure.
- Table 9:** The potential impact on the sense of place of the region.
- Table 10:** The potential cumulative visual impact of the renewable energy facilities on the visual quality of the landscape.
- Table 11:** Management programme – Planning.
- Table 12:** Management programme – Construction.
- Table 13:** Management programme – Operation.
- Table 14:** Management programme – Decommissioning.

1. STUDY APPROACH

1.1. Qualification and experience of the practitioner

Lourens du Plessis (t/a LOGIS) is a *Professional Geographical Information Sciences (GISc) Practitioner* registered with The South African Geomatics Council (SAGC), and specialises in Environmental GIS and Visual Impact Assessments (VIA).

Lourens has been involved in the application of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) in Environmental Planning and Management since 1990. He has extensive practical knowledge in spatial analysis, environmental modeling and digital mapping, and applies this knowledge in various scientific fields and disciplines. His GIS expertise are often utilised in Environmental Impact Assessments, Environmental Management Frameworks, State of the Environment Reports, Environmental Management Plans, tourism development and environmental awareness projects.

He holds a BA degree in Geography and Anthropology from the University of Pretoria and worked at the GisLAB (Department of Landscape Architecture) from 1990 to 1997. He later became a member of the GisLAB and in 1997, when Q-Data Consulting acquired the GisLAB, worked for GIS Business Solutions for two years as project manager and senior consultant. In 1999 he joined MetroGIS (Pty) Ltd as director and equal partner until December 2015. From January 2016 he worked for SMEC South Africa (Pty) Ltd as a technical specialist until he went independent and began trading as LOGIS in April 2017.

Lourens has received various awards for his work over the past two decades, including EPPIC Awards for ENPAT, a Q-Data Consulting Performance Award and two ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute) awards for *Most Analytical* and *Best Cartographic Maps*, at Annual International ESRI User Conferences. He is a co-author of the ENPAT atlas and has had several of his maps published in various tourism, educational and environmental publications.

He is familiar with the "Guidelines for Involving Visual and Aesthetic Specialists in EIA Processes" (Provincial Government of the Western Cape: Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning) and utilises the principles and recommendations stated therein to successfully undertake visual impact assessments. Although the guidelines have been developed with specific reference to the Western Cape Province of South Africa, the core elements are more widely applicable (i.e. within the Northern Cape Province).

1.2. Assumptions and limitations

This assessment was undertaken during the planning stage of the project and is based on information available at that time.

1.3. Level of confidence

Level of confidence¹ is determined as a function of:

- The information available, and understanding of the study area by the practitioner:

¹ Adapted from Oberholzer (2005).

- 3: A high level of information is available of the study area and a thorough knowledge base could be established during site visits, surveys etc. The study area was readily accessible.
 - 2: A moderate level of information is available of the study area and a moderate knowledge base could be established during site visits, surveys etc. Accessibility to the study area was acceptable for the level of assessment.
 - 1: Limited information is available of the study area and a poor knowledge base could be established during site visits and/or surveys, or no site visit and/or surveys were carried out.
- The information available, understanding of the study area and experience of this type of project by the practitioner:
 - 3: A high level of information and knowledge is available of the project and the visual impact assessor is well experienced in this type of project and level of assessment.
 - 2: A moderate level of information and knowledge is available of the project and/or the visual impact assessor is moderately experienced in this type of project and level of assessment.
 - 1: Limited information and knowledge is available of the project and/or the visual impact assessor has a low experience level in this type of project and level of assessment.

These values are applied as follows:

Table 1: Level of confidence.

	Information on the project & experience of the practitioner			
	3	2	1	
Information on the study area	3	9	6	3
	2	6	4	2
	1	3	2	1

*The level of confidence for this assessment is determined to be **9** and indicates that the author's confidence in the accuracy of the findings is high:*

- The information available, and understanding of the study area by the practitioner is rated as **3** and
- The information available, understanding and experience of this type of project by the practitioner is rated as **3**.

1.4. Methodology

The study was undertaken using Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software as a tool to generate viewshed analyses and to apply relevant spatial criteria to the proposed facility. A detailed Digital Terrain Model (DTM) for the study area was created from topographical data provided by the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA), Earth Observation Research Centre, in the form of the ALOS Global Digital Surface Model "ALOS World 3D - 30m" (AW3D30) elevation model.

Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)

The VIA is determined according to the nature, extent, duration, intensity or magnitude, probability and significance of the potential visual impacts, and will

propose management actions and/or monitoring programs, and may include recommendations related to the facility layout/position.

The visual impact is determined for the highest impact-operating scenario (worst-case scenario) and varying climatic conditions (i.e. different seasons, weather conditions, etc.) are not considered.

The VIA considers potential cumulative visual impacts, or alternatively the potential to concentrate visual exposure/impact within the region.

The following VIA-specific tasks were undertaken:

- **Determine potential visual exposure**

The visibility or visual exposure of any structure or activity is the point of departure for the visual impact assessment. It stands to reason that if (or where) the proposed facility and associated infrastructure were not visible, no impact would occur.

The viewshed analyses of the proposed facility and the related infrastructure are based on a 30m resolution AW3D30 digital terrain model of the study area.

The first step in determining the visual impact of the proposed facility is to identify the areas from which the structures would be visible. The type of structures, the dimensions, the extent of operations and their support infrastructure are taken into account.

- **Determine visual distance/observer proximity to the facility**

In order to refine the visual exposure of the facility on surrounding areas/receptors, the principle of reduced impact over distance is applied in order to determine the core area of visual influence for this type of structure.

Proximity radii for the proposed infrastructure are created in order to indicate the scale and viewing distance of the facility and to determine the prominence of the structures in relation to their environment.

The visual distance theory and the observer's proximity to the facility are closely related, and especially relevant, when considered from areas with a high viewer incidence and a predominantly (anticipated) negative visual perception of the proposed infrastructure.

- **Determine viewer incidence/viewer perception (sensitive visual receptors)**

The next layer of information is the identification of areas of high viewer incidence (i.e. main roads, residential areas, settlements, etc.) that may be exposed to the project infrastructure.

This is done in order to focus attention on areas where the perceived visual impact of the facility will be the highest and where the perception of affected observers will be negative.

Related to this data set, is a land use character map, that further aids in identifying sensitive areas and possible critical features (i.e. tourist facilities, protected areas, etc.), that should be addressed.

- **Determine the visual absorption capacity of the landscape**

This is the capacity of the receiving environment to absorb the potential visual impact of the proposed facility. The VAC is primarily a function of the vegetation, and will be high if the vegetation is tall, dense and continuous. Conversely, low growing, sparse and patchy vegetation will have a low VAC.

The VAC would also be high where the environment can readily absorb the structure in terms of texture, colour, form and light / shade characteristics of the structure. On the other hand, the VAC for a structure contrasting markedly with one or more of the characteristics of the environment would be low.

The VAC also generally increases with distance, where discernible detail in visual characteristics of both environment and structure decreases.

- **Calculate the visual impact index**

The results of the above analyses are merged in order to determine the areas of likely visual impact and where the viewer perception would be negative. An area with short distance visual exposure to the proposed infrastructure, a high viewer incidence and a predominantly negative perception would therefore have a higher value (greater impact) on the index. This focusses the attention to the critical areas of potential impact and determines the potential **magnitude** of the visual impact.

Geographical Information Systems (GIS) software is used to perform all the analyses and to overlay relevant geographical data sets in order to generate a visual impact index.

- **Determine impact significance**

The potential visual impacts are quantified in their respective geographical locations in order to determine the significance of the anticipated impact on identified receptors. Significance is determined as a function of extent, duration, magnitude (derived from the visual impact index) and probability. Potential cumulative and residual visual impacts are also addressed. The results of this section are displayed in impact tables and summarised in an impact statement.

- **Propose mitigation measures**

The preferred alternative (or a possible permutation of the alternatives) will be based on its potential to reduce the visual impact. Additional general mitigation measures will be proposed in terms of the planning, construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the project.

- **Reporting and map display**

All the data categories, used to calculate the visual impact index, and the results of the analyses will be displayed as maps in the accompanying report. The methodology of the analyses, the results of the visual impact assessment and the conclusion of the assessment will be addressed in this VIA report.

- **Site visit**

A site visit was undertaken in December 2021 in order to verify the results of the spatial analyses and to identify any additional site-specific issues that may need to be addressed in the VIA report.

2. BACKGROUND

San Solar Energy Facility (Pty) Ltd is proposing the establishment of the **San Solar PV Energy Facility** on the remaining extent of the farm Wincanton 472, which lies approximately 16km north west of Kathu in the Northern Cape Province.

The proposed site for the San Solar PV Energy Facility is located east of a railway line that dissects the farm Wincanton 472. The portions 6 and 4 of this farm, located west of the railway line, host the operational Sishen Solar Energy Facility and the Kathu Solar Energy Facility respectively. Please refer to the maps displayed in this report for the location of the aforementioned solar energy facilities in relation to each other and in terms of their regional locality.

The proposed development site lies within the Gamagara Local Municipality within the John Taolo Gaetsewe District Municipality in the Northern Cape Province. It is located approximately 16km (at the closest) north-west of Kathu and roughly 6km north east of Dibeng.

Photovoltaic technology is used to generate electricity by converting solar radiation into direct current electricity using semiconductors (i.e. silicon) through the photovoltaic effect. PV technology refers to the use of multiple PV cells which are linked together to form PV panels. The proposed PV panels will have a tracking functionality which will allow them to follow the movement of the sun during the day.

The facility is proposed to have a maximum generating capacity of up to 100MW and will be comprised of photovoltaic (PV) panels strategically placed on a portion of the proposed site.

The San Solar PV facility project site is proposed to accommodate the following infrastructure, which will enable the facility to supply a contracted capacity of up to 100W:

- Solar PV array comprising PV modules and mounting structures.
- Inverters and transformers.
- Cabling between the panels, to be laid underground where practical.
- 33/132kV onsite facility substation.
- Cabling from the onsite substation to the collector substation (either underground or overhead).
- Electrical and auxiliary equipment required at the collector substation that serves that solar energy facility, including switchyard/bay, control building, fences, etc.
- Battery Energy Storage System (BESS).
- Site offices and maintenance buildings, including workshop areas for maintenance and storage.
- Laydown areas.
- Access roads and internal distribution roads (up to 8m wide).
- Grid connection solution including a 132kV facility substation, 132kV switching station to be connected via a Loop-in-Loop-out (LILO) connection to the Fox - Umtu 132kV overhead power line located east of the site.



Figure 1: Regional locality of the study area.

The solar PV facility is proposed in response to the identified objectives of the national and provincial government and local and district municipalities to develop renewable energy facilities for power generation purposes. It is the developer's intention to bid the San Solar PV Facility under the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy's (DMRE's) Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Procurement (REIPPP) Programme, with the aim of evacuating the generated power into the national grid. This will aid in the diversification and stabilisation of the country's electricity supply, in line with the objectives of the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) with the San Solar PV facility set to inject up to 100MW into the national grid. In addition to bidding into the REIPPP, the developer is also considering options such as Private Power Purchase Agreements and Wheeling agreements to deliver the generated power to private Off-takers.

The PV facility will take approximately four months to construct and the operational lifespan of the facility is estimated at up to 30 years.

The proposed properties identified for the PV facility and associated infrastructure are indicated on the maps within this report. Sample images of similar PV technology and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) facilities are provided below.



Figure 2: Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels. (Photo: SunPower Solar Power Plant – Prieska).



Figure 3: Aerial view of PV arrays. (Photo: Scatec Solar South Africa).



Figure 4: Aerial view of a BESS facility (Photo: Power Engineering International).



Figure 5: Close up view of a BESS facility (Photo: Greenbiz.com).

3. SCOPE OF WORK

This report is the undertaking of a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) of the proposed PV facility as described above.

The determination of the potential visual impacts is undertaken in terms of nature, extent, duration, magnitude, probability and significance of the construction and operation of the proposed infrastructure.

The study area for the visual impact assessment encompasses a geographical area of 252km² (the extent of the full page maps in this report). The study area includes a 6km buffer zone (area of potential visual influence) from the proposed development footprint.

The study area includes the small town of Deben, a long section of the R380 arterial road, the Sishen airfield and a number of farm dwellings or homesteads.

Anticipated issues related to the potential visual impact of the proposed PV facility include the following:

- The visibility of the facility to, and potential visual impact on, observers travelling along the R380 main road and the Deben secondary road.
- The visibility of the facility to, and potential visual impact on residents of dwellings within the study area, with specific reference to the farm residences in closer proximity to the proposed development.
- The potential visual impact of the facility on the visual character or sense of place of the region.
- The potential visual impact of the facility on tourist routes or tourist destinations/facilities (if present).
- The potential visual impact of the construction of ancillary infrastructure (i.e. internal access roads, buildings, etc.) on observers in close proximity to the facility.
- The visual absorption capacity of the natural vegetation (if applicable).
- Potential cumulative visual impacts (or consolidation of visual impacts), with specific reference to the placement of the PV facility within close proximity of two operational PV facilities.
- The potential visual impact of operational, safety and security lighting of the facility at night on observers residing in close proximity of the facility.
- Potential visual impact of solar glint and glare as a visual distraction and possible air/road travel hazard.
- Potential visual impact of solar glint and glare on static ground-based receptors (residents of homesteads) in close proximity to the PV facility.
- Potential visual impacts associated with the construction phase.
- The potential to mitigate visual impacts and inform the design process.

It is envisaged that the issues listed above may constitute a visual impact at a local and/or regional scale.

4. RELEVANT LEGISLATION AND GUIDELINES

The following legislation and guidelines have been considered in the preparation of this report:

- National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA);
- The Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (as amended);

- Guideline on Generic Terms of Reference for EAPS and Project Schedules (DEADP, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, 2011); and
- Guideline for involving visual and aesthetic specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1.

5. THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The identified site for the proposed San Solar PV facility is located on the remaining extent of Wincanton 472, measuring approximately 9km².

The site is located east of Deben and approximately 18km by road (along the R380 main road) north-west of Kathu in the Southern Kalahari of the Northern Cape Province.

The topography of the study area is described as *plains* and elevations range from 1,105m in the north-west to 1,195m in the south-east of the study area near the Sishen airfield. The entire study area has a very even (flat) slope from the south-east to the north-west. The site itself is located at an average elevation of 1,143m above sea level.

The Ga-Mogara non-perennial river (a dry river bed for most of the year) is the most prominent hydrological feature within this arid region. See **Map 1** for the shaded relief/topography map of the study area.

The region is sparsely populated (less than 5 people per km²), with the highest concentrations occurring in the towns of Kathu and Dibeng, and at the Sishen Mine. In addition to the towns and the mine settlements, a number of isolated homesteads occur throughout the study area. Some of these in the study area include:

- Bosaar²
- Flatlands
- Halliford
- Selsden
- Haakbosskerm homestead and restaurant
- Limebank
- Klein Landbank
- Curtis
- Dundrum

The Stokkiesdraai guesthouse is located adjacent (south-west) of the proposed San Solar PV facility site.

It is uncertain whether all of these farmsteads are inhabited or not. It stands to reason that farmsteads that are not currently inhabited will not be visually impacted upon at present. These farmsteads do, however retain the potential to be affected visually should they ever become inhabited again in the future. For this reason, the author of this document operates under the assumption that they are all inhabited.

Cattle and game farming is undertaken within the study area, with very little agricultural activity due to the scarcity of perennial water (for irrigated agriculture) and the low annual rainfall (for dryland agriculture).

² The names listed below are of the homestead or farm dwelling as indicated on the SA 1: 50 000 topographical maps and do not refer to the registered farm name.

Land cover is predominantly *grassland* and *low shrubland* with large areas of *open woodland* in the north-east of the study area, and also scattered throughout the south-west. The vegetation type is *Kathu Bushveld* of the *Eastern Kalahari Bushveld Bioregion*, within the *Savanna Biome*. Bare rock and soil also occur in places such as the dry Ga-Mogara floodplain.

Significant tracts of land south of the study area have been transformed by mining and prospecting activities. See **Map 2** for the broad land cover types map of the study area.

Infrastructure in the region is focussed around the Anglo America Kumba iron ore mine located south-west of Kathu. The expansion of the town of Kathu and most of the larger settlements within the study area are mainly attributed to the mine. Infrastructure closer to the proposed San Solar PV facility includes the Kathu Solar PV, Kathu Solar Energy Facility (SEF) and the Sishen Solar PV facilities.

In spite of the predominantly rural and natural character of the study area, there are a large number of overhead power lines in the study area, associated mainly with the Ferrum Substation located at the mine. These include:

- Ferrum-Wincanton 1 132kV
- Ferrum-Fox 1 132kV
- Adams-Ferrum 1 132kV
- Fox-Umtu 1 132kV
- Impala-Mamatwane 1 132

There are no designated protected areas within the region and no major tourist attractions or destinations (besides the Haakbosskerm restaurant and Stokkiesdraai guesthouse) were identified within the study area.³

The photographs below aid in describing the general environment within the study area and surrounding the proposed project infrastructure.

³ Sources: DEAT (ENPAT Northern Cape), NBI (Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland), NLC2018 (ARC/CSIR), REEA_OR_2021_Q1 and SAPAD2021 (DFFE), Wikipedia.




Figure 6: Typical vegetation occurring in the vicinity of the proposed solar energy facility.



Figure 7: Visual quality on the outskirts of the town of Dibeng, west of the proposed solar energy facility.




Figure 8: Visual quality of the receiving environment with railway line infrastructure evident in the foreground.



	Main Road		Proposed Infrastructure	SHADED RELIEF	
	Secondary Road		PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure	Elevation above sea level (m)	
	Power Line		Power Line		1105
	Substation		Collector Substation & BESS		1110
	Dwelling/Homestead				1115
	Non-perennial River				1120
	Dry Pan				1125
	Airfield				1130
	Existing PV Facility				1135
					1140
					1145
					1150
					1155
					1160
					1165
					1170
					1175
					1180
					1185
					1190
					1195


Map 1: Shaded relief map of the study area.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main Road Secondary Road Power Line Substation Dwelling/Homestead Non-perennial River Dry Pan Airfield Existing PV Facility 	<p>LAND COVER BROAD LAND USE PATTERNS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grassland Open Woodland Low Shrubland Bare Rock & Soil (Natural) Grass (Outdoor Recreation) Rural Residential Residential (Formal) Residential (Informal) Mining/Quarrying 	<p>PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PV FACILITY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure Power Line Collector Substation & BESS
--	--	---

1 0 2km

Map 2: Land cover and broad land use patterns.



- Main Road
- Secondary Road
- Power Line
- Substation
- Dwelling/Homestead
- Non-perennial River
- Dry Pan
- Airfield
- Existing PV Facility

- Proposed Infrastructure**
- PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure
 - Power Line
 - Collector Substation & BESS

SATELLITE IMAGE

PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PV FACILITY



Map 3: Satellite image.

6. RESULTS

6.1. Potential visual exposure

The result of the viewshed analysis for the proposed facility is shown on the map below (**Map 4**). The viewshed analysis was undertaken from a representative number of vantage points within the development footprint at an offset of 5m above ground level. This was done in order to determine the general visual exposure (visibility) of the area under investigation, simulating the maximum height of the proposed structures (PV panels, inverters, BESS, etc.) associated with the facility.

Map 4 also indicates proximity radii from the development footprint in order to show the viewing distance (scale of observation) of the facility in relation to its surrounds.

The viewshed analysis includes the effect of vegetation cover and existing structures on the exposure of the proposed infrastructure.

Results

It is clear that the relatively constrained dimensions of the PV facility would amount to a fairly limited area of potential visual exposure. The visual exposure would largely be contained within a 6km radius of the proposed development site, with the predominant exposure to the north-east.

The following is evident from the viewshed analyses:

0 – 1km

There are no residences (besides those associated with the Sishen Solar facility) within this zone. There is a section of the Deben secondary road traversing south of the proposed PV facility at distances of under one kilometre.

1 – 3km

This zone contains the Stokkiesdraai guesthouse, Haakbosskerm homestead and restaurant, the Flatlands and Halliford homesteads, and sections of the R380 main road. Other than these potential receptor sites, the rest of the visually exposed areas fall within vacant farmland or natural open space. It is expected that the PV facility would be clearly visible from these homesteads.

3 - 6km


Within a 3 – 6km radius, the visual exposure is more scattered and interrupted due to the undulating nature of the topography. Most of this zone falls within vacant open space and agricultural land, but does include some farm dwellings and residences (Limebank and Klein Landbank) and the eastern outlying parts of Deben. It appears as if the above homesteads may have been demolished.

> 6km

At distances exceeding 6km the intensity of visual exposure is expected to be very low and highly unlikely due to the distance between the object (development) and the observer. This zone contains a single potentially exposed receptor site, namely the Bosaar homestead.

Conclusion

In general terms it is envisaged that the structures, where visible from shorter distances (e.g. less than 1km and potentially up to 3km), and where sensitive visual receptors may find themselves within this zone, may constitute a high visual prominence, potentially resulting in a visual impact. This may include residents of the farm dwellings mentioned above, as well as observers travelling along the roads in closer proximity to the facility. The incidence rate of sensitive visual receptors is however expected to be very low, due to the remote location of the proposed infrastructure and the low number of potential observers.



- Main Road
- Secondary Road
- Power Line
- Substation
- Dwelling/Homestead
- Non-perennial River
- Dry Pan
- Airfield
- Existing PV Facility

- Proposed Infrastructure
- PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure
- Power Line
- Collector Substation & BESS


- VISIBILITY ANALYSIS**
- Potentially Visible
 - Not Visible
 - Proximity Radii to the Proposed Development Site

Notes:
 Visibility was calculated at a maximum offset of 5m above ground level (i.e. the approx. maximum height of the PV structures).

PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PV FACILITY



Map 4: Viewshed analysis of the proposed San Solar PV facility.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main Road Secondary Road Power Line Substation Dwelling/Homestead Non-perennial River Dry Pan Airfield Existing PV Facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Infrastructure PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure Power Line Collector Substation & BESS 	<p>CUMULATIVE VIEWSHED ANALYSIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed San Solar PV - Sishen Solar PV - Kathu SEF - Kathu Solar PV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4 - High Frequency of Exposure (Four SEFs potentially visible) 3 2 1 - Low Frequency of Exposure (Only one SEF potentially visible) Not Visible 	<p>PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PV FACILITY</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div>
--	--	---	--

Map 5: Cumulative visual exposure.

6.2. Potential cumulative visual exposure

There are three operational PV facilities within the study area. These are the Sishen Solar PV, the Kathu SEF and the Kathu Solar PV facilities. The former two PV facilities are located respectively 382m west and 2km south-west of the proposed San Solar PV facility. The Kathu Solar PV facility is located 6km east-south-east of the proposed San Solar PV site.

The physical development footprints of the proposed San Solar PV facility and the Sishen Solar PV, and the Kathu SEF are contained within an approximately 3km radius of each other, as shown on **Map 5**. This map also indicates the potential cumulative visual exposure of the three PV facilities, as well as the Kathu Solar PV further away. The relative long distance of the Kathu Solar PV from the formerly mentioned PV facilities is not expected to aggravate the potential cumulative visual exposure significantly.

The visibility analyses of the PV facilities were undertaken individually from each **of the proposed development sites from** a representative number of vantage points per development footprint at 5m above ground level. The results of these analyses were merged in order to calculate the combined visual exposure. The result of the combined visual exposure is indicated as a range from yellow to red, where yellow indicates that only one PV facility may be visible and red where all three may be visible.

Cumulative visual exposure occurs at varying distances from the sites, where one site might be in the foreground and the others further away in the distance. These areas of high frequency of visual exposure predominantly fall within vacant farmland, generally devoid of potential sensitive visual receptors.

Areas of moderate frequency of visual exposure (i.e. where two facilities may be visible) also predominantly fall within vacant farmland, with only a section of the Deben secondary road potentially exposed to two PV facilities.

The cumulative visual impact **of these three proposed PV facilities** is ultimately expected to be of moderate to low significance due to their remote locations and the general absence of potential sensitive visual receptors. It is further preferred that the proposed San Solar PV facility be placed in as close a proximity to the Sishen and Kathu SEFs as possible, as these two PV facility represent an existing visual disturbance, i.e. the visual amenity at this location has already been compromised.

6.3. Visual distance/observer proximity to the PV facility

The proximity radii are based on the anticipated visual experience of the observer over varying distances. The distances are adjusted upwards for larger solar energy facilities/technologies (e.g. more extensive infrastructure associated with power plants exceeding 100MW) and downwards for smaller plants (e.g. smaller infrastructure associated with power plants with less generating capacity such as the proposed 100MW San Solar PV facility). This methodology was developed in the absence of any known and/or accepted standards for South African solar energy facilities.

The principle of reduced impact over distance is applied in order to determine the core area of visual influence for these types of structures. It is envisaged that the nature of the structures and the predominantly rural and natural character of the study area would create a significant contrast that would make the facility visible and recognisable from greater distances.

The proximity radii for the proposed PV facility were created in order to indicate the scale and viewing distance of the facility and to determine the prominence of the structures in relation to their environment.

The proximity radii, based on the dimensions of the proposed development footprint are indicated on **Map 6**, and include the following:

- 0 - 1km. Very short distance view where the PV facility would dominate the frame of vision and constitute a very high visual prominence.
- 1 - 3km. Short distance view where the structures would be easily and comfortably visible and constitute a high visual prominence.
- 3 - 6km. Medium to longer distance view where the facility would become part of the visual environment, but would still be visible and recognisable. This zone constitutes a moderate visual prominence.
- > 6km. Long distance view of the facility where the structures are not expected to be immediately visible and not easily recognisable. This zone constitutes a lower visual prominence for the facility.

The visual distance theory and the observer's proximity to the facility are closely related, and especially relevant, when considered from areas with a high viewer incidence and a potentially negative visual perception of the proposed facility.

6.4. Viewer incidence/viewer perception

The number of observers and their perception of a structure determine the concept of visual impact. If there are no observers or if the visual perception of the structure is favourable to all the observers, there would be no visual impact.

It is necessary to identify areas of high viewer incidence and to classify certain areas according to the observer's visual sensitivity towards the proposed grid connection infrastructure. It would be impossible not to generalise the viewer incidence and sensitivity to some degree, as there are many variables when trying to determine the perception of the observer: regularity of sighting, cultural background, state of mind, purpose of sighting, etc. which would create a myriad of options.


Viewer incidence within the study area is anticipated to be the highest along the R380 main road and the Deben secondary road traversing near the proposed project infrastructure. Travellers using these roads may be negatively impacted upon by visual exposure to the PV facility infrastructure.

Additional sensitive visual receptors are located at the farm residences (homesteads) throughout the study area. It is expected that the viewer's perception, unless the observer is associated with (or supportive of) the PV facility, would generally be negative.

Due to the generally remote location of the proposed PV facility, and the ill populated nature of the receiving environment, there are only a limited number of potential sensitive visual receptor sites within closer proximity to the proposed development site. These receptor sites were listed in **Section 6.1**.

The potential sensitive visual receptor sites and areas of higher viewer incidence are indicated on **Map 6**.

The author (at the time of the compilation of this report) is not aware of any objections raised against the proposed San Solar PV facility.



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Main Road Secondary Road Power Line Substation Dwelling/Homestead Non-perennial River Dry Pan Airfield Existing PV Facility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Infrastructure PV Facility & Ancillary Infrastructure Power Line Collector Substation & BESS 	<p>POTENTIAL SENSITIVE VISUAL RECEPTORS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Residents of farm dwellings - Observers travelling along local roads <p>PROXIMITY ANALYSIS (Visual Distance)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short distance (< 1km) Medium distance (1 - 3km) Medium to longer distance (3 - 6km) Long distance (> 6km) 	<p>PROPOSED SAN SOLAR PV FACILITY</p> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> </div>
--	--	---	--

Map 6: Proximity analysis and potential sensitive visual receptors.

6.5. Visual absorption capacity

Land cover is predominantly *grassland* and *low shrubland* with large areas of *open woodland* in the north-east of the study area, and also scattered throughout the south-west. The vegetation type is *Kathu Bushveld* of the *Eastern Kalahari Bushveld Bioregion*, within the *Savanna Biome*. Bare rock and soil also occur in places such as the dry Ga-Mogara floodplain.

Overall, the Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) of the receiving environment is low by virtue of the limited height (or absence) of the vegetation and the overall low occurrence of buildings, structures and infrastructure. In addition, the scale and form of the proposed structures mean that it is unlikely that the environment will visually absorb them in terms of texture, colour, form and light/shade characteristics. Within this area the VAC of vegetation will not be taken into account, thus assuming a worst case scenario in the impact assessment.

Where homesteads and settlements occur, some more significant vegetation and trees may have been planted, which would contribute to the visual absorption capacity (i.e. shielding the observers from the infrastructure). As this is not a consistent occurrence, however, VAC will not be taken into account for any of the homesteads or settlements, thus assuming a worst case scenario in the impact assessment.



Figure 9: Low shrubland and grassland within the study area – low VAC.

6.6. Visual impact index

The combined results of the visual exposure, viewer incidence/perception and visual distance of the proposed PV facility are displayed on **Map 7**. Here the weighted impact and the likely areas of impact have been indicated as a visual impact index. Values have been assigned for each potential visual impact per data category and merged to calculate the visual impact index.

The criteria (previously discussed in this report) which inform the visual impact index are:

- Visibility or visual exposure of the structures
- Observer proximity or visual distance from the structures

- The presence of sensitive visual receptors
- The perceived negative perception or objections to the structures (if applicable)
- The visual absorption capacity of the vegetation cover or built structures (if applicable)

An area with short distance visual exposure to the proposed infrastructure, a high viewer incidence and a potentially negative perception (i.e. a sensitive visual receptor) would therefore have a **higher** value (greater impact) on the index. This helps in focussing the attention to the critical areas of potential impact and determining the potential **magnitude** of the visual impact.

The index indicates that **potentially sensitive visual receptors** within a 1km radius of the PV facility may experience a **very high** visual impact. The magnitude of visual impact on sensitive visual receptors subsequently subsides with distance to; **high** within a 1–3km radius (where/if sensitive receptors are present) and **moderate** within a 3–6km radius (where/if sensitive receptors are present). Receptors beyond 6km are expected to have a **low** potential visual impact.

Magnitude of the potential visual impact

0 – 1km

The majority of the exposed areas in this zone fall within vacant open space, generally devoid of observers or potential sensitive visual receptors. A section of the Deben secondary road (receptor site 1 on **Map 7**) may experience visual impacts of **very high** magnitude.

1 – 3km


The majority of the exposed areas in this zone fall within vacant open space, generally devoid of observers or potential sensitive visual receptors. A section of the R380 main road (site 2) may experience visual impacts of **high** magnitude. The Stokkiesdraai Guesthouse (site 3), Haakboskerm (site 4), the Halliford (site 5) and Flatlands (site 6) homesteads, may also experience visual impacts of **high** magnitude.

3 – 6km

There is a single potential sensitive receptor site within this zone, namely observers residing at the Limebank homestead (site 7). The magnitude of the visual impact is expected to be **moderate** (if the structure is in fact occupied as a residential dwelling).

Notes:

Where homesteads are derelict or deserted, the visual impact will be non-existent, until such time as it is inhabited again.



Map 7: Visual impact index and potentially affected sensitive visual receptors.

6.7. Visual impact assessment: impact rating methodology

The previous section of the report identified specific areas where likely visual impacts would occur and indicate the expected **magnitude** of potential impact. This section will attempt to quantify these potential visual impacts in their respective geographical locations and in terms of the identified issues (see **Section 3: SCOPE OF WORK**) related to the visual impact.

The methodology for the assessment of potential visual impacts states the **nature** of the potential visual impact (e.g. the visual impact on users of major roads in the vicinity of the proposed PV facility) and includes a table quantifying the potential visual impact according to the following criteria:

- **Extent** - long distance (very low = 1), medium to longer distance (low = 2), short distance (medium = 3) and very short distance (high = 4)⁴.
- **Duration** - very short (0-1 yrs. = 1), short (2-5 yrs. = 2), medium (5-15 yrs. = 3), long (>15 yrs. = 4), and permanent (= 5).
- **Magnitude** - None (= 0), minor (= 2), low (= 4), medium/moderate (= 6), high (= 8) and very high (= 10)⁵.
- **Probability** - very improbable (= 1), improbable (= 2), probable (= 3), highly probable (= 4) and definite (= 5).
- **Status** (positive, negative or neutral).
- **Reversibility** - reversible (= 1), recoverable (= 3) and irreversible (= 5).
- **Significance** - low, medium or high.

The **significance** of the potential visual impact is equal to the **consequence** multiplied by the **probability** of the impact occurring, where the consequence is determined by the sum of the individual scores for magnitude, duration and extent (i.e. **significance = consequence (magnitude + duration + extent) x probability**).

The significance weighting for each potential visual impact (as calculated above) is as follows:

- <30 points: Low (where the impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area)
- 30-60 points: Medium/moderate (where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area)
- >60: High (where the impact must have an influence on the decision to develop in the area)

⁴ Long distance = > 6km. Medium to longer distance = 3 – 6km. Short distance = 1 – 3km. Very short distance = < 1km (refer to Section 6.3. Visual distance/observer proximity to the PV facility).

⁵ This value is read from the visual impact index. Where more than one value is applicable, the higher of these will be used as a worst case scenario.

6.8. Visual impact assessment

The primary visual impacts of the proposed PV facility infrastructure are assessed below.

6.8.1. Construction impacts

6.8.1.1. Potential visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility and ancillary infrastructure

During construction, there may be a noticeable increase in heavy vehicles utilising the roads to the development site that may cause, at the very least, a visual nuisance to other road users and landowners in closer proximity (< 1 km) to the construction activities.

Construction activities may potentially result in a **moderate** (significance rating = 48), temporary visual impact, that may be mitigated to **moderate** (significance rating = 30).

Table 2: Visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.

Nature of Impact:		
Visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Very short distance (4)
Duration	Short term (2)	Short term (2)
Magnitude	Moderate (6)	Low (4)
Probability	Highly Probable (4)	Probable (3)
Significance	Moderate (48)	Moderate (30)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation:		
<u>Planning:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retain and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint. 		
<u>Construction:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure that vegetation cover adjacent to the development footprint (if present) is not unnecessarily removed during the construction phase, where possible. ➤ Plan the placement of laydown areas and temporary construction equipment camps in order to minimise vegetation clearing (i.e. in already disturbed areas) wherever possible. ➤ Restrict the activities and movement of construction workers and vehicles to the immediate construction site and existing access roads. ➤ Ensure that rubble, litter, and disused construction materials are appropriately stored (if not removed daily) and then disposed regularly at licensed waste facilities. ➤ Reduce and control construction dust using approved dust suppression techniques as and when required (i.e. whenever dust 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ becomes apparent). ➤ Restrict construction activities to daylight hours whenever possible in order to reduce lighting impacts. ➤ Rehabilitate all disturbed areas (if present/if required) immediately after the completion of construction works.
<p>Residual impacts: None, provided rehabilitation works are carried out as specified.</p>

6.8.2. Operational impacts

6.8.2.1. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors located within a 1km radius of the PV facility

The PV facility is expected to have a **moderate** visual impact (significance rating = 54) on observers travelling along the Deben secondary road, both before and after mitigation (significance rating = 42). There are no affected residences within a 1km radius of the proposed PV facility.

Mitigation of this impact is possible and both specific measures as well as general “best practice” measures are recommended in order to reduce/mitigate the potential visual impact. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 3: Visual impact on observers in close proximity to the proposed PV facility structures.

Nature of Impact:		
Visual impact on observers travelling along the Deben secondary road within a 1km radius of the PV facility structures		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Very short distance (4)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	Very high (10)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Probable (3)	Probable (3)
Significance	Moderate (54)	Moderate (42)
Status (positive, neutral or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation / Management:		
<u>Planning:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint, where possible. ➤ Consult adjacent landowners (if present) in order to inform them of the development and to identify any (valid) visual impact concerns. ➤ Investigate the potential to screen affected receptor sites (if applicable and located within 1km of the facility) with planted vegetation cover. 		
<u>Operations:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole. 		
<u>Decommissioning:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use. ➤ Rehabilitate all affected areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications. 		

Residual impacts:

The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.

6.8.2.2. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within a 1 – 3km radius

The operational PV facility could have a **moderate** visual impact (significance rating = 30) on observers (road users and resident/visitors to homesteads) within 1 – 3km radius of the PV facility structures. This impact may be mitigated to **low** (significance rating = 26).

Mitigation of this impact is possible and both specific measures as well as general “best practice” measures are recommended in order to reduce/mitigate the potential visual impact. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 4: Visual impact of the proposed PV facility structures within a 1 – 3km radius.

Nature of Impact:		
Visual impact on observers travelling along the R380 secondary road and residences within a 1 – 3km radius of the PV facility structures		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Short distance (3)	Short distance (3)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	High (8)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Improbable (2)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Moderate (30)	Low (26)
Status (positive, neutral or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	No, however best practice measures are recommended.	
Mitigation / Management:		
<u>Planning:</u>		
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint.		
<u>Operations:</u>		
➤ Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole.		
<u>Decommissioning:</u>		
➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.		
➤ Rehabilitate all affected areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.		
Residual impacts:		
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

6.8.2.3. Lighting impacts

Potential visual impact of operational, safety and security lighting of the facility at night on observers in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.

Lighting impacts relate to the effects of glare and sky glow. The source of glare light is unshielded luminaries which emit light in all directions and which are visible over long distances.

Sky glow is the condition where the night sky is illuminated when light reflects off particles in the atmosphere such as moisture, dust or smog. The sky glow intensifies with the increase in the number of light sources. Each new light source, especially upwardly directed lighting, contribute to the increase in sky glow. It is possible that the PV facility may contribute to the effect of sky glow within the environment which is currently undeveloped.

Mitigation of direct lighting impacts and sky glow entails the pro-active design, planning and specification of lighting for the facility. The correct specification and placement of lighting and light fixtures for the PV facility and the ancillary infrastructure (e.g. workshop and storage facilities) will go far to contain rather than spread the light.

The following table summarises the assessment of this anticipated impact, which is likely to be of **moderate** significance, and may be mitigated to **low**.

Table 5: Impact table summarising the significance of visual impact of lighting at night on visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.

Nature of Impact: Visual impact of lighting at night on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed PV facility.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Very short distance (4)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	High (8)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Probable (3)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Moderate (48)	Low (28)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation: <u>Planning & operation:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Shield the sources of light by physical barriers (walls, vegetation, or the structure itself). ➤ Limit mounting heights of lighting fixtures, or alternatively use foot-lights or bollard level lights. ➤ Make use of minimum lumen or wattage in fixtures. ➤ Make use of down-lighters, or shielded fixtures. ➤ Make use of Low Pressure Sodium lighting or other types of low impact lighting. ➤ Make use of motion detectors on security lighting. This will allow the site to remain in relative darkness, until lighting is required for security or maintenance purposes. 		
Residual impacts: The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility and ancillary infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

6.8.2.4. Solar glint and glare impacts

Potential visual impact of solar glint and glare as a visual distraction and possible air/road travel hazard

Glint and glare occur when the sun reflects off surfaces with specular (mirror-like) properties. Examples of these include glass windows, water bodies and potentially some solar energy generation technologies (e.g. parabolic troughs and CSP heliostats). Glint is generally of shorter duration and is described as “a momentary flash of bright light”, whilst glare is the reflection of bright light for a longer duration.

The visual impact of glint and glare relates to the potential it has to negatively affect sensitive visual receptors in relative close proximity to the source (e.g. residents of neighbouring properties), or aviation safety risk for pilots (especially where the source interferes with the approach angle to the runway). The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) of the United States of America have researched glare as a hazard for aviation pilots on final approach and may prescribe specific glint and glare studies for solar energy facilities in close proximity to aerodromes (airports, airfields, military airbases, etc.). It is generally possible to mitigate the potential glint and glare impacts through the design and careful placement of the infrastructure.

PV panels are designed to generate electricity by absorbing the rays of the sun and are therefore constructed of dark-coloured materials, and are covered by anti-reflective coatings. Indications are that as little as 2% of the incoming sunlight is reflected from the surface of modern PV panels (i.e. such as those proposed for the San Solar PV facility) especially where the incidence angle (angle of incoming light) is smaller i.e. the panel is facing the sun directly. This is particularly true for tracker arrays that are designed to track the sun and keep the incidence angle as low as possible.⁶

The proposed PV facility is located 6.7km north-west of the Sishen airfield. A glint and glare study was commissioned by the project proponent.⁷ According to the study the ocular impact of solar glare is quantified into three categories namely:

- Green - low potential to cause after-image (flash blindness);
- Yellow - potential to cause temporary after-image; and
- Red - potential to cause retinal burn (permanent eye damage).

The findings of the report are shown below:

"The glare analysis found no "yellow" glare (potential for after-image). Although some "green" glare was predicted, this was only for a configuration employing deeply textured glass. For configurations employing module surfaces with smooth or lightly textured glass, which is in line with the proposed configuration, no glint or glare was predicted."

The recommendation from the report stated that the application can be approved for the proposed PV plant configuration as presented in the report.

Based on this, the potential visual impact related to solar glint and glare as an air travel hazard is expected to be of **low** significance. No mitigation of this impact

⁶ Sources: Blue Oak Energy, FAA and Meister Consultants Group.

⁷ May 2022, San Solar Glint and Glare Report.

is required since the PV facility is not expected to interfere with aviation operations.

There are no major roads (i.e. the R380) within a 1km radius of the proposed PV facility. This approximate distance is recommended as a threshold within which the visual impact of glint and glare (if there is visual line of sight from the road) may influence road users.⁸ The potential visual impact related to solar glint and glare as a road travel hazard is therefore expected to be of **low** significance. No mitigation of this impact is required since the PV facility is not expected to interfere with, or impact the safety of road users.

Table 6: Impact table summarising the significance of the visual impact of solar glint and glare as a visual distraction and possible air/road travel hazard.

Nature of Impact: The visual impact of solar glint and glare as a visual distraction and possible air/road travel hazard		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	N.A.
Duration	Long term (4)	N.A.
Magnitude	Low (4)	N.A.
Probability	Improbable (2)	N.A.
Significance	Low (24)	N.A.
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	N.A.
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	N.A.
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	N.A.
Can impacts be mitigated?	N.A.	
Mitigation: N.A.		
Residual impacts: N.A.		

Potential visual impact of solar glint and glare on static ground-based receptors (residents of homesteads) in close proximity to the PV facility

There are no affected residences within a 1km radius of the proposed PV facility. The potential visual impact related to solar glint and glare on static ground-based receptors (residents of homesteads) is therefore expected to be of **low** significance, both before and after mitigation.

Mitigation of this impact is possible and both specific measures as well as general “best practice” measures are recommended in order to reduce/mitigate the potential visual impact. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 7: Impact table summarising the significance of the visual impact of solar glint and glare on static ground receptors.

Nature of Impact: The visual impact of solar glint and glare on residents of homesteads in closer proximity to the PV facility		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Very short distance (4)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)

⁸ December 2020, Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Guidance Third Edition.

Magnitude	Low (4)	Low (4)
Probability	Improbable (2)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Low (24)	Low (24)
Status (positive or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	Yes	
Mitigation: <u>Planning & operation:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Use anti-reflective panels and dull polishing on structures, where possible and industry standard. ➤ Adjust tilt angles of the panels if glint and glare issues become evident, where possible. ➤ If specific sensitive visual receptors are identified during operation, investigate screening at the receptor site, where possible. 		
Residual impacts: The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

6.8.2.5. Ancillary infrastructure

On-site ancillary infrastructure associated with the PV facility includes a collector substation, a 1.5km 132kV power line, BESS, inverters, low voltage cabling between the PV arrays, internal access roads, workshop, office buildings, etc.

No dedicated viewshed analyses have been generated for the ancillary infrastructure, as the range of visual exposure will fall within that of the PV arrays. The anticipated visual impact resulting from this infrastructure is likely to be of **low** significance both before and after mitigation.

Table 8: Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure.

Nature of Impact: Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure during the operation phase on observers in close proximity to the structures.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Very short distance (4)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	Low (4)	Low (4)
Probability	Improbable (2)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Low (24)	Low (24)
Status (positive, neutral or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	

Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:

Planning:

- Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint/power line servitude where possible.

Operations:

- Maintain the general appearance of the infrastructure.

Decommissioning:

- Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.
- Rehabilitate all affected areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.

Residual impacts:

The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the ancillary infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.

6.8.2.6. Secondary impacts

The potential visual impact of the proposed PV facility on the sense of place of the region.

Sense of place refers to a unique experience of an environment by a user, based on his or her cognitive experience of the place. Visual criteria, specifically the visual character of an area (informed by a combination of aspects such as topography, level of development, vegetation, noteworthy features, cultural / historical features, etc.), plays a significant role.

An impact on the sense of place is one that alters the visual landscape to such an extent that the user experiences the environment differently, and more specifically, in a less appealing or less positive light.

The greater environment has a predominantly rural, undeveloped character and a natural appearance. These generally undeveloped landscapes are considered to have a high visual quality, except where urban development and power generation/distribution infrastructure represents existing visual disturbances.

The anticipated visual impact of the proposed PV facility on the regional visual quality (i.e. beyond 6km of the proposed infrastructure), and by implication, on the sense of place, is difficult to quantify, but is generally expected to be of **low** significance.

Table 9: The potential impact on the sense of place of the region.

Nature of Impact:		
The potential impact on the sense of place of the region.		
	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Extent	Medium to longer distance (2)	Medium to longer distance (2)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	Low (4)	Low (4)
Probability	Improbable (2)	Improbable (2)
Significance	Low (20)	Low (20)
Status (positive, neutral or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	

mitigated?	
Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:	
<u>Planning:</u>	
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint/servitude, where possible.	
<u>Operations:</u>	
➤ Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole.	
<u>Decommissioning:</u>	
➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.	
➤ Rehabilitate all affected areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.	
Residual impacts:	
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.	

The potential cumulative visual impact of the PV facility on the visual quality of the landscape.

The cumulative visual impact of the proposed San Solar PV facility, and the existing Sishen, Kathu SEF and Kathu Solar PV facilities is expected to be of **moderate** significance due to their remote locations and the general absence of potential sensitive visual receptors.

Table 10: The potential cumulative visual impact of the renewable energy facilities on the visual quality of the landscape.

Nature of Impact:		
The potential cumulative visual impact of the PV facility on the visual quality of the landscape.		
	Overall impact of the proposed project considered in isolation (with mitigation)	Cumulative impact of the project and other projects within the area (with mitigation)
Extent	Very short distance (4)	Medium to longer distance (2)
Duration	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
Magnitude	Moderate (6)	Moderate (6)
Probability	Probable (3)	Probable (3)
Significance	Moderate (42)	Moderate (36)
Status (positive, neutral or negative)	Negative	Negative
Reversibility	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
Irreplaceable loss of resources?	No	No
Can impacts be mitigated?	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	

Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:

Planning:

- Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint where possible.

Operations:

- Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole.

Decommissioning:

- Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.
- Rehabilitate all affected areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.

Residual impacts:

The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the PV facility infrastructure is removed. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.

6.9. The potential to mitigate visual impacts

The primary visual impact, namely the layout and appearance of the PV panels is not possible to mitigate. The functional design of the PV panels cannot be changed in order to reduce visual impacts.

The following mitigation is however possible:

- It is recommended that vegetation cover (i.e. either natural or cultivated) immediately adjacent to the development footprint be maintained, both during construction and operation of the proposed facility. This will minimise visual impact as a result of cleared areas and areas denuded of vegetation.
- Existing roads should be utilised wherever possible. New roads should be planned taking due cognisance of the topography to limit cut and fill requirements. The construction/upgrade of roads should be undertaken properly, with adequate drainage structures in place to forego potential erosion problems.
- In terms of onsite ancillary buildings and structures, it is recommended that it be planned so that clearing of vegetation is minimised where possible. This implies consolidating this infrastructure as much as possible and making use of already disturbed areas rather than undisturbed sites wherever possible.
- Mitigation of lighting impacts includes the pro-active design, planning and specification of lighting for the facility. The correct specification and placement of lighting and light fixtures for the proposed PV facility and ancillary infrastructure will go far to contain rather than spread the light. Mitigation measures include the following:
 - Shielding the sources of light by physical barriers (walls, vegetation, or the structure itself);
 - Limiting mounting heights of lighting fixtures, or alternatively using foot-lights or bollard level lights;
 - Making use of minimum lumen or wattage in fixtures;
 - Making use of down-lighters, or shielded fixtures;
 - Making use of Low Pressure Sodium lighting or other types of low impact lighting.

- Making use of motion detectors on security lighting. This will allow the site to remain in relative darkness, until lighting is required for security or maintenance purposes.
- Mitigation of visual impacts associated with the construction phase, albeit temporary, would entail proper planning, management and rehabilitation of the construction site. Recommended mitigation measures include the following:
 - Ensure that vegetation adjacent to the development footprint (if present) is not unnecessarily cleared or removed during the construction period.
 - Reduce the construction period through careful logistical planning and productive implementation of resources wherever possible.
 - Plan the placement of laydown areas and any potential temporary construction camps in order to minimise vegetation clearing (i.e. in already disturbed areas) wherever possible.
 - Restrict the activities and movement of construction workers and vehicles to the immediate construction site and existing access roads.
 - Ensure that rubble, litter, and disused construction materials are appropriately stored (if not removed daily) and then disposed regularly at licensed waste facilities.
 - Reduce and control construction dust through the use of approved dust suppression techniques as and when required (i.e. whenever dust becomes apparent).
 - Restrict construction activities to daylight hours in order to negate or reduce the visual impacts associated with lighting wherever possible.
 - Rehabilitate all disturbed areas (if present/if required) immediately after the completion of construction works.
- Glint and glare impact mitigation measures include the following:
 - Use anti-reflective panels and dull polishing on structures, where possible and industry standard.
 - Adjust tilt angles of the panels if glint and glare issues become evident, where possible.
 - If specific sensitive visual receptors are identified during operation, investigate screening at the receptor site, where possible.
- During operation, the maintenance of the PV arrays and ancillary structures and infrastructure will ensure that the facility does not degrade, therefore avoiding aggravating the visual impact.
- Roads must be maintained to forego erosion and to suppress dust, and rehabilitated areas must be monitored for rehabilitation failure. Remedial actions must be implemented as and when required.
- Once the facility has exhausted its life span, the main facility and all associated infrastructure not required for the post rehabilitation use of the site should be removed and all disturbed areas appropriately rehabilitated, unless a new authorisation is granted for the plant to continue a new cycle. An ecologist should be consulted to give input into rehabilitation specifications.

- All rehabilitated areas should be monitored for at least a year following decommissioning, and remedial actions implemented as and when required.
- Secondary impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed PV facility (i.e. visual character and sense of place) are not possible to mitigate.
- Where sensitive visual receptors (if present), are likely to be affected it is recommended that the developer enter into negotiations with the property owners regarding the potential screening of visual impacts at the receptor site. This may entail the planting of vegetation, trees or the construction of screens. Ultimately, visual screening is most effective when placed at the receptor itself.

Good practice requires that the mitigation of both primary and secondary visual impacts, as listed above, be implemented and maintained on an ongoing basis.

7. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The construction and operation of the proposed San Solar PV facility and its associated infrastructure may have a visual impact on the study area, especially within a 1km radius (and potentially up to a radius of 3km) of the proposed facility. The visual impact will differ amongst places, depending on the distance from the facility.

The combined visual impact or cumulative visual impact of up to four solar energy facilities (i.e. the proposed San Solar, and three existing PV facilities) is expected to increase the area of potential visual impact within the region. The intensity of visual impact (number of PV arrays visible) to exposed receptors, especially those located within a 3km radius, is expected to be greater than it would be for a single solar energy facility. The cumulative visual impact is however still expected to be within acceptable limits, due to the limited potential sensitive visual receptors.

Overall, the significance of the visual impacts is expected to range from **moderate** to **low** as a result of the generally undeveloped character of the landscape and the remote location of the project infrastructure. There are a very limited number of potential sensitive visual receptors within a 3km radius of the proposed structures, although the possibility does exist for visitors to the region to venture in to closer proximity to the PV facility structures. These observers may consider visual exposure to this type of infrastructure to be intrusive.

A number of mitigation measures have been proposed (**Section 6.9**). Regardless of whether or not mitigation measures will reduce the significance of the anticipated visual impacts, they are considered to be good practice and should all be implemented and maintained throughout the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the proposed facility.

If mitigation is undertaken as recommended, it is concluded that the significance of most of the anticipated visual impacts will remain at or be managed to acceptable levels. As such, the PV facility and associated infrastructure would be considered to be acceptable from a visual impact perspective and can therefore be authorised.

8. IMPACT STATEMENT

The findings of the Visual Impact Assessment undertaken for the proposed 100MW PV facility is that the visual environment surrounding the site, especially within a 1km radius (and potentially up to a radius of 3km) of the proposed facility, may be visually impacted during the anticipated operational lifespan of the facility (i.e. a minimum of 20 years).

This impact is applicable to the individual San Solar PV facility and to the potential cumulative visual impact of the facility in relation to the other existing PV facilities, where the combined frequency of visual impact is expected to be greater. The potential area of cumulative visual exposure is however still deemed to be within acceptable limits, considering the PV facilities' relatively close proximity to each other, the generally remote location of the infrastructure, and the limited number of observers within the region.

The following is a summary of impacts remaining, assuming mitigation as recommended, is exercised:

- During construction, there may be a noticeable increase in heavy vehicles utilising the roads to the development site that may cause, at the very least, a visual nuisance to other road users and landowners in the area. Construction activities may potentially result in a **moderate**, temporary visual impact both before and after mitigation.
- The PV facility is expected to have a **moderate** visual impact on observers travelling along the Deben secondary road within a 1km radius of the infrastructure, both before and after mitigation. There are no residences within a 1km radius of the proposed PV facility.
- The operational PV facility could have a **moderate** visual impact on observers (road users and residents/visitors to homesteads) within a 1 – 3km radius of the PV facility structures. This impact may be mitigated to **low**.
- The anticipated impact of lighting at the PV facility is likely to be of **moderate** significance, and may be mitigated to **low**.
- The potential visual impact related to solar glint and glare as an air/road travel hazard is expected to be of **low** significance.
- There are no affected residences within a 1km radius of the proposed PV facility. The potential visual impact related to solar glint and glare on static ground-based receptors (residents of homesteads) is therefore expected to be of **low** significance, both before and after mitigation.
- The anticipated visual impact resulting from the construction of on-site ancillary infrastructure is likely to be of **low** significance both before and after mitigation.
- The anticipated visual impact of the proposed PV facility on the regional visual quality (i.e. beyond 6km of the proposed infrastructure), and by implication, on the sense of place, is difficult to quantify, but is generally expected to be of **low** significance.
- The cumulative visual impact of the proposed San Solar, and the existing Sishen, Kathu SEF and Kathu Solar PV facilities is expected to be of

moderate significance due to their remote locations and the general absence of potential sensitive visual receptors.

The anticipated visual impacts listed above (i.e. post mitigation impacts) range from **moderate** to **low** significance. Anticipated visual impacts on sensitive visual receptors (if and where present) in close proximity to the proposed facility are not considered to be fatal flaws for the proposed PV facility.

Considering all factors, it is recommended that the development of the facility as proposed be supported; subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures (**Section 6.9.**) and management programme (**Section 9.**).

9. MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

The following management plan tables aim to summarise the key findings of the visual impact report and suggest possible management actions in order to mitigate the potential visual impacts. Refer to the tables below.

Table 11: Management programme – Planning.

OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the planning of the proposed San Solar PV facility.		
Project Component/s	The solar energy facility and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. PV panels, access roads, transformers, security lighting, workshop, power line, etc.).	
Potential Impact	Primary visual impact of the facility due to the presence of the PV panels and associated infrastructure as well as the visual impact of lighting at night.	
Activity/Risk Source	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site (i.e. within 1km of the site) as well as within the region.	
Mitigation: Target/Objective	Optimal planning of infrastructure to minimise the visual impact.	
Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
Use anti-reflective panels and dull polishing on structures where possible and industry standard.	Project proponent / contractor	Early in the planning phase.
Plan the placement of laydown areas and temporary construction equipment camps in order to minimise vegetation clearing (i.e. in already disturbed areas) wherever possible.	Project proponent / contractor	Early in the planning phase.
Retain and maintain natural vegetation (if present) immediately adjacent to the development footprint.	Project proponent/ design consultant	Early in the planning phase.
Make use of existing roads wherever possible and plan the layout and construction of roads and infrastructure with due cognisance of the topography to limit cut and fill requirements.	Project proponent/ design consultant	Early in the planning phase.
Plan all roads, ancillary buildings and ancillary infrastructure in such a way that clearing of vegetation is minimised.	Project proponent/ design consultant	Early in the planning phase.
Consolidate infrastructure and make use of already disturbed sites rather than undisturbed areas.		
Consult a lighting engineer in the design and planning of lighting to ensure the	Project proponent / design consultant	Early in the planning phase.

correct specification and placement of lighting and light fixtures for the PV Facility and the ancillary infrastructure. The following is recommended:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shield the sources of light by physical barriers (walls, vegetation, or the structure itself). ○ Limit mounting heights of fixtures, or use foot-lights or bollard lights. ○ Make use of minimum lumen or wattage in fixtures. ○ Making use of down-lighters or shielded fixtures. ○ Make use of Low Pressure Sodium lighting or other low impact lighting. ○ Make use of motion detectors on security lighting, so allowing the site to remain in darkness until lighting is required for security or maintenance purposes. 		
Performance Indicator	Minimal exposure (limited or no complaints from I&APs) of ancillary infrastructure and lighting at night to observers on or near the site (i.e. within 3km) and within the region.	
Monitoring	Monitor the resolution of complaints on an ongoing basis (i.e. during all phases of the project).	

Table 12: Management programme – Construction.

OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the construction of the proposed San Solar PV facility.		
Project Component/s	Construction site and activities	
Potential Impact	Visual impact of general construction activities, and the potential scarring of the landscape due to vegetation clearing and resulting erosion.	
Activity/Risk Source	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.	
Mitigation: Target/Objective	Minimal visual intrusion by construction activities and intact vegetation cover outside of immediate construction work areas.	
Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
Ensure that vegetation cover adjacent to the development footprint (if present) is not unnecessarily removed during the construction phase, where possible.	Project proponent / contractor	Early in the construction phase.
Reduce the construction phase through careful logistical planning and productive implementation of resources wherever possible.	Project proponent / contractor	Early in the construction phase.
Restrict the activities and movement of construction workers and vehicles to the immediate construction site and existing access roads.	Project proponent / contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Ensure that rubble, litter, and disused construction materials are appropriately stored (if not removed daily) and then disposed regularly at licensed waste facilities.	Project proponent / contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Reduce and control construction dust through the use of approved dust suppression techniques as and when	Project proponent / contractor	Throughout the construction phase.

required (i.e. whenever dust becomes apparent).		
Restrict construction activities to daylight hours in order to negate or reduce the visual impacts associated with lighting, where possible.	Project proponent / contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Rehabilitate all disturbed areas (if present/if required) immediately after the completion of construction works.	Project proponent / contractor	Throughout and at the end of the construction phase.
Performance Indicator	Vegetation cover on and in the vicinity of the site is intact (i.e. full cover as per natural vegetation present within the environment) with no evidence of degradation or erosion.	
Monitoring	Monitoring of vegetation clearing during construction (by contractor as part of construction contract). Monitoring of rehabilitated areas quarterly for at least a year following the end of construction (by contractor as part of construction contract).	

Table 13: Management programme – Operation.

OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the operation of the proposed San Solar PV facility.		
Project Component/s	The solar energy facility and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. PV panels, access roads, workshop, etc.).	
Potential Impact	Visual impact of facility degradation and vegetation rehabilitation failure.	
Activity/Risk Source	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.	
Mitigation: Target/Objective	Well maintained and neat facility.	
Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
Adjust tilt angles of the panels if glint and glare issues become evident where possible.	Project proponent / operator	Throughout the operation phase.
If specific sensitive visual receptors are identified during operation, investigate screening at the receptor site.		
Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole, including the PV panels, servitudes and the ancillary structures.	Project proponent / operator	Throughout the operation phase.
Maintain roads and servitudes to forego erosion and to suppress dust.	Project proponent / operator	Throughout the operation phase.
Monitor rehabilitated areas, and implement remedial action as and when required.	Project proponent / operator	Throughout the operation phase.
Investigate and implement (should it be required) the potential to screen visual impacts at affected receptor sites.	Project proponent / operator	Throughout the operation phase.
Performance Indicator	Well maintained and neat facility with intact vegetation on and in the vicinity of the facility.	
Monitoring	Monitoring of the entire site on an ongoing basis (by operator).	

Table 14: Management programme – Decommissioning.

OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the decommissioning of the proposed San Solar PV facility.	
Project	The solar energy facility and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. PV panels, access

Component/s	roads, workshop, transformers, etc.).	
Potential Impact	Visual impact of residual visual scarring and vegetation rehabilitation failure.	
Activity/Risk Source	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.	
Mitigation: Target/Objective	Only the infrastructure required for post decommissioning use of the site retained and rehabilitated vegetation in all disturbed areas.	
Mitigation: Action/control	Responsibility	Timeframe
Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use of the site.	Project proponent / operator	During the decommissioning phase.
Rehabilitate access roads and servitudes not required for the post-decommissioning use of the site. If necessary, an ecologist should be consulted to give input into rehabilitation specifications.	Project proponent / operator	During the decommissioning phase.
Monitor rehabilitated areas quarterly for at least a year following decommissioning, and implement remedial action as and when required.	Project proponent / operator	Post decommissioning.
Performance Indicator	Vegetation cover on and in the vicinity of the site is intact (i.e. full cover as per natural vegetation within the environment) with no evidence of degradation or erosion.	
Monitoring	Monitoring of rehabilitated areas quarterly for at least a year following decommissioning.	

10. REFERENCES/DATA SOURCES

Blue Oak Energy, 2016. <https://www.blueoakenergy.com/blog/glint-and-glare-studies-for-commercial-and-industrial-solar->

Chief Directorate National Geo-Spatial Information, varying dates. *1:50 000 Topographical Maps and Data.*

CSIR, 2017. *Delineation of the first draft focus areas for Phase 2 of the Wind and Solar PV Strategic Environmental Assessment.*

CSIR, 2015. *The Strategic Environmental Assessment for wind and solar photovoltaic energy in South Africa.*

DFFE, 2018. *National Land-cover Database 2018 (NLC2018).*

DFFE, 2021. *South African Protected Areas Database (SAPAD_OR_2021_Q1).*

DFFE, 2021. *South African Renewable Energy EIA Application Database (REEA_OR_2021_Q1).*

DEA&DP, 2011. Provincial Government of the Western Cape. *Guideline on Generic Terms of Reference for EAPS and Project Schedules.*

Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEA&T), 2001. *Environmental Potential Atlas (ENPAT) for the Northern Cape Province.*

FAA, 2015. *Evaluation of Glare as a Hazard for General Aviation Pilots on Final Approach.*

Forge Solar PV Planning and Glare Analysis, 2019. *Guidance and information on using Forge Solar analysis tools.*

Global Green, 2022. *Glint and Glare Impact Assessment. San Solar Proposed PV Power Plant.*

JAXA, 2021. Earth Observation Research Centre. *ALOS Global Digital Surface Model (AW3D30).*

Meister Consultants Group, 2014.

http://solaroutreach.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Solar-PV-and-Glare-_Final.pdf

National Botanical Institute (NBI), 2004. *Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland (Unpublished Beta Version 3.0)*

Oberholzer, B. (2005). *Guideline for involving visual and aesthetic specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1.*

Pager Power Urban and Renewables, 2020. *Solar Photovoltaic and Building Development – Glint and Glare Guidance.*

The Environmental Impact Assessment Amendment Regulations. In Government Gazette Nr. 33306, 18 June 2010.