VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Brandvalley Wind Energy Facility, Western Cape, South Africa

Peer Review of Specialist Assessment

March 2016

Author: *Henry Holland*Address: *8 Cathcart Street*

Grahamstown

6139

Cell. 082 2266689

CURRICULUM VITAE - HENRY HOLLAND

Profession:GIS ConsultantDate of Birth:26 December 1968

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Henry has been doing GIS related work since 1992 when he started his M.Sc. in Geology. Since finishing his Masters he worked in Angola establishing a GIS department for a diamond exploration company, after which he worked on a freelance basis for eight years doing GIS related work and computer programming. In 2005 he established the Mapthis Trust which provides geospatial services for a range of environmental and geological companies and projects. Henry has been involved in Visual Impact Assessments (VIAs) since 1997.

TERTIARY EDUCATION

1996 M. Sc. Geology/GIS Rhodes University

1986 B.Sc. Hons UOFS

KEY EXPERIENCE

Specialist Practitioner: 2005 - Present

The table below presents an abridged list of Henry's project experience relevant to this proposal:

Completion Date	Project description	Role	Client
2016	29 Solar Dealesville PV EIA, Free State – VIA Reports	Author	CSIR
2016	Mulilo Nieuwehoop PV Phase 2 EIA, Northern Cape – VIA Reports	Author	CSIR
2015	Scatec Kenhardt PV EIA, Northern Cape – VIA report	Author	CSIR
2015	Vredenburg Landfill Extension BA, Western Cape – VIA Report	Author	Jeffares & Green (Pty) Ltd
2015	Umgeni Lovu and Tongaat Desalination Plants EIAs, KwaZulu-Natal – VIA Reports	Author	CSIR
2015	Inyanda-Roodeplaat WEF, Uitenhage, EC – VIA Report	Author	SRK
2015	OTGC Oil Storage Terminal BA – Visual Impact, Durban, KZN	Author	CSIR
2014	Mainstream Dealesville Solar Plants VIA, Freestate Province – VIA Report	Author	CSIR
2014	Mulilo Nieuwehoop PV Phase 1, Northern Cape – VIA Report	Author	CSIR
2014	Frontier SRMOP EIA, Saldanha, WC	Author	CSIR
2013	Ishwati Emoyeni Wind Energy Facility VIA, Western Cape	Author	CSIR
2013	Venter Fert Composting and Fertiliser Plant – VIA Report	Author	Public Process Consultants
2013	Kipeto Power Line, Kenya – VIA Report	Author	Kipeto Energy Ltd.
2012	Ngqura Manganese Export Facility VIA, Coega, Eastern Cape	Author	CSIR
2012	Toliara Sands Mining Project VIA, Toliara, Madagascar	Author	CES
2012	Mkuze Biofuel Power Plant VIA, Mkuze, KwaZulu-Natal	Author	CSIR
2012	Vleesbaai WEF VIA, Western Cape	Author	CSIR
2012	Saldanha Desalination Plant VIA, Saldanha Bay, Western Cape	Author	CSIR
2012	Mossel Bay WEF, Western Cape - VIA	Author	CES

Completion Date	Project description	Role	Client
	Report		
2012	Keimoes Solar Energy Facility, NC – VIA Report	Author	CSIR
2012	Douglas Solar Energy Facility, NC – VIA Report	Author	CSIR
2012	Richards Bay WEF VIA, KZN	Author	CES
2012	Hluhluwe WEF VIA, KZN	Author	CES
2012	Plan8 Grahamstown Wind Farm VIA, Eastern Cape	Author	CES
2012	Kipeto Wind Farm VIA, Kenya	Author	Galetech Energy Developments Ltd.
2011	Coega IDZ Zone 12 Wind Farm – VIA Report	Author	CSIR
2011	Haverfontein Wind Farm, Mpumalanga – VIA Report	Author	CES
2011	Middleton Wind Farm, Cookhouse	Author	CES
2011	Broadlands PV Plant, Humansdorp	Author	CSIR
2011	Ubuntu Wind Farm, Jeffrey's Bay	Author	CSIR
2011	Lushington Park Wind Farm, East London	Author	CES
2011	Chaba Wind Farm, Komga	Author	CES
2010	Thomas River Wind Farm and PV Park VIA, Stutterheim	Author	CES
2010	Eskom Power Line VIA, Kouga	Author	CES
2010	Laguna Bay Resort VIA	Author	CES
2010	Kouga Wind Farm VIA	Author	Arcus GIBB
2010	Electrawinds Coega Wind Farm VIA	Author	CSIR
2010	Innowind Coega Wind Farm VIA	Author	CES
2010	Jeffrey's Bay Wind Farm VIA, Jeffrey's Bay	Author	CSIR
2010	Cookhouse Wind Farm VIA, Cookhouse	Author	CES
2009	Waainek Wind Farm VIA, Grahamstown	Author	CES
2009	Coega Wind Turbine BA (Visual Input)	Author	CSIR
2009	Sierra Leone Ethanol Plant VIA	Author	CSIR
2009	NamWater Desalination Plant VIA, Swakopmund, Namibia	Author	CSIR
2009	Nooitgedagt/Coega Water Supply VIA, Motherwell	Author	SRK
2009	CDM Brewery VIA, Nampula, Mozambique	Author	CES
2009	TankaTara Preliminary Visibility Analysis, Addo	Author	CES

I, the undersigned, certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief, these data correctly describe my qualifications, my experience, and me, and that I am available to work on this project.

Date: 18/05/16

Day/Month/Year

[Signature of staff member and authorized representative of the firm]
Full name of staff member: Henry Holland

Introduction

NEMA: EIA Regulations (Section 13(1)(2),(NEMA 2014)) requires specialist reports to be peer reviewed when they are undertaken in-house by the same company undertaking the environmental impact assessment. Peer reviews are required to validate the independence of the assessments undertaken as well as to evaluate the approach and methodology applied and the conclusions reached.

Henry Holland was appointed by EOH Coastal & Environmental Services as an independent visual impact assessment (VIA) practitioner to undertake a peer review of the proposed Brandvalley Wind Energy Facility Visual Impact Assessment.

Scope of Review

The review assessed the VIA report in terms of the minimum requirements as set out in the EIA Regulations (Appendix 6, Nema 2014) for specialist assessments and followed the DEA guidelines for the review of specialist input to EIA processes (Keatimilwe and Ashton 2005).

The reviewer was involved early on in the VIA and amendments, comments and suggestions were incorporated into the report from the draft stages.

Report Review

Review History

Initially a number of suggestions were made which would add clarity to the report. These included a suggestion to add a map with features that could help readers locate buildings and visual receptors on the viewshed map. Other suggestions related to the minimum requirements of NEMA 2014. These were incorporated into the report.

Furthermore, assessment of the effect of lighting of the facility on the nightscape of the region was added to the ToR.

In the section "Operations Phase Impact 1: Impact of wind turbines on sensitive visual receptors" the author rated the severity of the impact as moderate. The reviewer argued for a severe rating in this case since the visual intrusion is expected to be high and two of the identified sensitive visual receptors will potentially be moderate- to highly exposed to the wind turbines.

Further suggestions were made to include the number of sensitive visual receptors in choosing preferred alternative layouts and localities for construction camps, access roads and substations.

These changes and suggestions were incorporated into the final report.

Minimum Requirements NEMA 2014

The VIA report under review adequately addresses the minimum requirements for a specialist report of the 2014 NEMA regulations (Appendix 6).

Ethics

The specialist has conducted a number of visual impact assessments and has the required expertise to conduct the visual impact assessment. The report showed no indication of bias by the specialist and the methodology followed by the specialist aims to minimise subjective interpretation of results.

Adequacy of Information

The conclusions drawn in the report are based on relevant and detailed information. The comprehensive fieldwork supports these conclusions and provides a high level of confidence in them. The terms of reference (ToR) are standard terms for a wind energy project and adhere to guidelines for visual impact specialists (Oberholzer 2005) for a Level 4 VIA.

Clarity of Report

The report follows a standard layout and includes most, if not all, aspects suggested in the DEA guidelines (Keatimilwe and Ashton 2005) to improve its clarity.

Alternatives

Alternatives are clearly indicated and discussed in the report. Where possible preferred alternatives are indicated in terms of their potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors.

Mitigation Measures

Wind turbines are highly visible structures in most landscapes due to their height and size, and the fact that they are normally located on hills and ridges. As such they are the structures that cause most concern to interested and affected parties when a wind energy facility is proposed for an area. The colour and lighting of wind turbines are prescribed by the Civil Aviation Authority. There are therefore very little that can be suggested in terms of mitigation measures for the most significant visual impact that a wind energy facility is likely to cause. There are no specific highly sensitive visual receptors for which removal or change in location of a few turbines will lower the significance of the potential impact. The mitigation measures and recommendations in the VIA report address the issues related to a wind energy facility adequately.

Conclusions

The reviewer was involved in the visual impact assessment from an early stage. Amendments and comments to the draft report were incorporated into the latest version of the report and this reviewer is confident that the VIA report is unbiased and robust in its impact ratings and conclusions.

References

Keatimilwe, K., and P.J. Ashton. 2005. "Guideline for the Review of Specialist Input in EIA Processes: Edition 1." Guidelines ENV-S-C 2005 053 B. Series of Specialist Involvement Guidelines. Cape Town, South Africa: Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning.

NEMA. 2014. "R. 982 National Environmental Management Act (107/1998): Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014." *Government Gazette*, December 4, 38282 edition.

Oberholzer, Bernard. 2005. "Guideline for Involving Visual & Aesthetic Specialists in EIA Processes." Guidelines ENV-S-C 2005 053 F. Cape Town: CSIR, Provincial Government of the Western

Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development. http://www.capegateway.gov.za/Text/2005/10/5_deadp_visual_guideline_june05.pdf.