



# Cape Environmental Assessment Practitioners (Pty) Ltd

Reg. No. 2008/004627/07  
VAT No 4720248386

Telephone: (044) 874 0365  
Facsimile: (044) 874 0432

17 Progress Street, George  
PO Box 2070, George 6530

Web: [www.cape-eaprac.co.za](http://www.cape-eaprac.co.za)

|                                |   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <b>MEETING SUMMARY</b>         | <p><b>Project Name:</b> Doornhoek PV Projects comprising of Doornhoek 1 PV and Doornhoek 2 PV and associated grid connection.</p> <p><b>Reference Number:</b> 2022-04-0001</p> <p><b>Date:</b> Tuesday, 10 May 2022</p> <p><b>Time:</b> 10:00 am</p> <p><b>Location:</b> Via MS Teams</p>   |
| <b>ATTENDEES:</b>              | Mr Herman Alberts (DFFE)<br>Mr Michael Johnson (Applicant)<br>Mr Dale Holder (EAP)  |
| <b>NON-ATTENDING INVITEES:</b> | Mr Coenrad Agenbach (DFFE)<br>Mr Muhammad Essop (DFFE)<br>Mr David Peinke (DFFE)  |
| <b>MEETING MEMO</b>            |   |
| Dale Holder                    | Welcomed & introduced all attendees   |
| Herman Alberts                 | Gave apologies for Mr Coenrad Agenbach and Mr Muhammad Essop  |
| Dale Holder                    | <p>Commenced with presentation and provided the following background to the project. In summary, the following main points were discussed.</p> <p><u>Introduction to Project</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cape EAPrac have been appointed as the independent EAP to facilitate the Environmental assessment processes (Basic Assessments) for two proposed PV Facilities (Doornhoek 1 PV and Doornhoek 2 PV) on Portion 18 of the Farm Doornhoek No. 372-IP.</li> <li>• Doornhoek 1 PV is proposed to have a maximum generation capacity of 115MW and Doornhoek 2 PV is proposed to have a maximum generation capacity of 50MW.</li> <li>• A Loop-in-Loop out (LILO) overhead 132kV power line is proposed between the Eskom switching station (adjacent to the IPP Substation) and the existing Watershed–Klerksdorp 1 132kV power line on the property.</li> <li>• The project is fully within the Klerksdorp REDZ and the Central EGI Strategic Corridor.</li> <li>• All specialists have already undertaken their SSV's and the layouts that will be presented in the DBAR's have already taken into account the outcomes of all specialist's assessments.</li> </ul> <p><u>Protected Area Status of Property</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SAPAD dataset lists the property as a protected Area (Private Nature Reserve)</li> <li>• Listed As Bosworth Nature Reserve and Promulgated in 1955.</li> <li>• No Proclamation document available.</li> <li>• Not listed as a Protected Area on NPAES</li> </ul> |

|                |   |
|----------------|---|
|                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not listed as a Protected Area on the City of Matlosana SDF.</li> <li>• Zoned Agriculture 1</li> <li>• Currently and Historically used for Grazing of livestock and not for any conservation purposes.</li> </ul> <p>The EAP posed the following Questions regarding the Protected Area Status of the property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None of the spatial planning documents (municipal and national) identify it as a protected area. Proclamation documents do not seem to be available. If it is depicted on the SAPAD register, is it automatically considered a protected area in terms of NEMPAA?</li> <li>• To our knowledge there is no designated management authority, nor management plan for the property in terms of NEMPAA. Are there any EIA implications relating to the absence of a management plan?</li> <li>• If it is considered to be a protected area (private nature reserve in terms of NEMPAA), are there any other NEMA EIA implications other than applying for and assessing the LN3 activities relating to protected areas?</li> <li>• The norms and standards for inclusion of private nature reserves in the register of protected areas includes criteria for private nature reserves in order to be included in the register. These include:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreements with landowners.</li> <li>• Management authority assigned.</li> <li>• Management plan in place.</li> </ul> <p>None of these are in place, Does this have any implications on the protected area status of the project?</p> </li> </ul> |
| Herman Alberts | Confirmed that he has noted the questions and that we will discuss after completion of the presentation.  |
| Dale Holder    | <p>Continued to discuss specialist protocols.</p> <p>Confirmed that two very high sensitivity themes were identified in the screening tool, namely Terrestrial Ecology and Landscape Visual.</p> <p>EAP confirmed that the recommended specialist studies have been undertaken..</p>  |
| Herman Alberts | Asked which specialist studies were undertaken.   |
| Dale Holder    | <p>Confirmed that the following specialist studies were undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Terrestrial Biodiversity Impact Assessment (including Plant and Animal Species Assessment)</li> <li>• Aquatic Biodiversity Impact Assessment (including Stormwater Management Plan)</li> <li>• Avifaunal Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Agricultural Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Visual and Landscape Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Social Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Heritage and Archaeology Impact Assessment</li> <li>• Paleontology Impact Assessment</li> </ul> <p>The only studies that were not undertaken were:</p>   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RFI Assessment. The EAP confirmed that the proposed project is outside of the Declared Astronomy Advantage Geographic Area and is approximately 500km from any SKA infrastructure. SKA-SA and SARAO will be approached to confirm the risk of the project.</li> <li>Defense Assessment (Low sensitivity) – The Department of Defense will be approached to provide comment.</li> <li>Civil Aviation Assessment. The project area is not in close proximity to any Civil Aviation Infrastructure. The applicant will submit an obstacle evaluation application to the Civil Aviation Authority.</li> </ul>   |
| Dale Holder           | Began to present the public participation plan that was submitted.   |
| Herman Alberts        | Advised that is no longer required to submit a public participation plan and that public participation must take place in terms of the regulations.  |
| Dale Holder           | Noted.   |
| Herman Alberts        | Confirmed the following with regards to the protected area status: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The status of the protected area will need to be confirmed with the Protected Areas Department.</li> <li>Will provide contact details for officials from the Protected Areas Department / Directorate.</li> <li>The DBAR must present all information relating to the various investigations that were undertaken to determine the PA status of the properties.</li> <li>If the property is a protected area, then the relevant listing notice 3 activities will have to be applied for and assessed.</li> </ul>   |
| Dale Holder           | Confirmed that he will contact the protected areas directorate once HA provides the contact details. DH furthermore confirmed that it is unlikely that the a formal response from the protected areas directorate will be received prior to the availability of the Draft BAR.<br><br>The suggested approach is therefore to submit the applications and Draft BAR's to include application and assessment of the activities on the assumption that the area is a protected area. If during the stakeholder engagement process, it is determined that the property is not a protected area, then a revised Application form will be submitted with the FBAR's to remove the relevant activities. |
| Herman Alberts        | Confirmed this approach to be in order.  |
| Michael Johnson       | Confirmed that this is a Bid window 6 project with very tight timeframes. Acknowledged the difficulty to host meetings over the Easter period where many officials are on leave etc. Requested that in light of the timeframes and that more than a month has passed since the submission of the pre application meeting request, that the Department assist in expediting the decision making as far as possible.   |
| Herman Alberts        | Cannot commit to an expedited decision making process, but takes note of the urgency of the project in relation to the bid window 6 timeframes.  |
| Dale Holder           | Concluded meeting  |
| <b>DECISIONS MADE</b> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Herman Alberts to provide contact details for Protected Areas Department.</li> <li>DH to submit applications and BAR's that include application and assessment of the LN3 activities relating to protected areas.</li> </ol>  |

|   | 3. DH to include details of investigations into the PA status of the properties and outline the ongoing discussions with the Protected areas Department. |             |
|---|--|-------------|
| <b>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>                                      | 1. No specific issues Identified.  |             |
| <b>APPENDICES</b>   | 1. Meeting Presentation.   |             |
|   |  |             |
| <b>Acceptance of Minutes</b>                                  |  |             |
| <b>PARTY</b>  | <b>Signature</b>   | <b>Date</b> |
| <b>CAPE EAPRAC</b>  |   | 10/05/2022  |
| <b>DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY, FISHERIES AND THE ENVIRONMENT.</b> |  |             |