

**PROPOSED ABERDEEN WIND FACILITY 1,  
EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**VISUAL ASSESSMENT**

**Produced for:**



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

**- February 2023 -**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1. STUDY APPROACH</b> .....	<b>5</b>
1.1 Qualification and experience of the practitioner.....	5
1.2 Assumptions and limitations .....	5
1.3 Legal framework .....	6
1.4 Information base .....	6
1.5 Level of confidence.....	6
1.6 Methodology.....	7
<b>2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>3. SCOPE OF WORK</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>4. THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>5. RESULTS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
5.1 Potential visual exposure .....	19
5.2 Cumulative visual assessment .....	21
5.3 Visual distance / observer proximity to the WEF.....	25
5.4 Viewer incidence / viewer perception .....	26
5.5 Visual absorption capacity .....	26
5.6 Visual impact index .....	28
<b>6. SHADOW FLICKER ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>7. PHOTO SIMULATIONS</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>8. VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b> .....	<b>38</b>
8.1 Impact rating methodology .....	38
8.2 Direct Impact Assessment.....	39
8.3 Indirect Impact Assessment .....	49
8.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment .....	50
8.5 The potential to mitigate visual impacts.....	50
<b>9. IMPACT STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>52</b>
<b>10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>53</b>
<b>11. MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME</b> .....	<b>55</b>
<b>12. REFERENCES / DATA SOURCES</b> .....	<b>58</b>
<b>13. APPENDIX 1: SITE SENSIVITY VERIFICATION REPORT</b> .....	<b>60</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Level of confidence .....	7
Table 1: Infrastructure and dimension breakdown of the proposed WEF .....	11
Table 2: Visual impact of construction on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF.....	39
Table 3: Visual impact on observers (residents and visitors) in close proximity to the proposed wind turbine structures .....	41
Table 4: Visual impact on observers travelling along roads in close proximity to the proposed wind turbine structures.....	42
Table 5: Visual impact of the proposed wind turbine structures within the region (5 – 10km) .	43
Table 6: Visual impact of the proposed wind turbine structures within the region (10 – 20km)	44
Table 7: Visual impact of shadow flicker on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF.....	45
Table 8: Impact table summarising the significance of visual impact of lighting at night on visual receptors in close to medium proximity (within 0-5km and potentially up to 10km) to the proposed WEF	47
Table 9: Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure.....	48
Table 10: The potential impact on the sense of place of the region .....	49
Table 11: The potential cumulative visual impact of wind farms on the visual quality of the landscape.....	50
Table 12: Management programme – Planning. ....	55
Table 13: Management programme – Construction.....	56
Table 14: Management programme – Operation.....	57
Table 15: Management programme – Decommissioning.....	58

## LIST OF MAPS

Map 1: Shaded relief map of the study area .....	17
Map 2: Land cover / broad land use map of the study area.....	18
Map 3: Viewshed analysis of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 .....	23
Map 4: Cumulative viewshed analysis of the proposed and authorised wind turbines within the study area.....	24
Map 5: Proximity analysis and potential sensitive visual receptors .....	27
Map 6: Visual impact index.....	31
Map 7: Likely areas of potential visual impact and potential sensitive visual receptors .....	32

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Regional locality of the study area .....	10
Figure 2: The town of Aberdeen as viewed from the N9 approaching from Graaf-Reinet. ....	12
Figure 3: The Camdeboo Mountains located to north-east of the proposed development site. .	12
Figure 4: Photograph showing the predominantly flat topography of the region.....	13
Figure 5: Low shrubland vegetation cover occurring on the development site. ....	13
Figure 6: The general environment within the study area. ....	14
Figure 7: Example of homesteads located within the study area. ....	14
Figure 8: View of the proposed development site from the R61. ....	15
Figure 9: View of the proposed development site from the N9.....	15
Figure 10: View over the Aberdeen Nature Reserve which is situated on the banks of the Kraai River. ....	15
Figure 11: Regional locality of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 in relation to the Beaufort West Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ) (Source: REEA_OR_2022_Q1) and other projects located therein. ....	16
Figure 12: Schematic representation of a wind turbine from 1, 2, 5 and 10km under perfect viewing conditions.	25
Figure 13: Low shrubland, grassland and bare soil within the study area – low VAC.....	26
Figure 14: Location of the photograph positions undertaken for the photo simulations of the entire Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster.....	34

Figure 15: Photo simulation 1 – before. Viewpoint from the N1 looking south west towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster. .... 35

Figure 16: Photo simulation 1 – after. The closest wind turbine in the cluster is 15.2km from this point..... 35

Figure 17: Photo simulation 2 – before. Viewpoint from the R61 looking east towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster. .... 36

Figure 18: Photo simulation 2 – after. The closest wind turbine in the Cluster is 2km from this point..... 36

Figure 19: Photo simulation 3 – before. Viewpoint from the secondary road at the base of the Kamdebooberg looking south towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster. .... 37

Figure 20: Photo simulation 3 – after. The closest wind turbine of the Cluster is 10.8km from this point..... 37

Figure 18: Aircraft warning lights fitted to the wind turbine hubs (Source:<http://www.pinchercreekecho.com/2015/04/29/md-of-pincher-creek-takes-on-wind-turbine-lights>)..... 46

Figure 19: Diagram of the functional principle of the needs-based night lights. .... 47

## DECLARATION

I, **Lourens du Plessis**, as an independent consultant who compiled this Visual Impact Assessment, declare that it correctly reflects the findings made at the time of the report's compilation. I further declare that I, act as an independent consultant in terms of the following:

- Do not have any financial interest in the undertaking of the activity, other than remuneration for the work performed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act107 of 1998);
- Undertake to disclose, to the competent authority, any material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the competent authority or the objectivity of any report, plan or document required in terms of the National Environmental Management Act,1998 (Act 107 of 1998);
- Based on information provided to me by the project proponent, and in addition to information obtained during the course of this study, will present the results and conclusion within the associated document to the best of my professional judgement.

---

Lourens du Plessis  
Professional GISc Practitioner

## 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 modelling, 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.

### 1.2 Assumptions and limitations

This Report has been prepared by LOGIS on behalf, and at the request, of Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd (hereby referred to as Genesis) to provide them with an independent specialist assessment. Unless otherwise agreed by LOGIS in writing, LOGIS does not accept responsibility or legal liability to any person other than the Genesis for the contents of, or any omissions from, this Report.

To prepare this Report, LOGIS utilised only the documents and information provided by Genesis or any third parties directed to provide information and documents by Genesis. LOGIS has not consulted any other documents or information in relation to this Report, except where otherwise indicated.

The findings, recommendations and conclusions given in this report are based on the author's best scientific and professional knowledge, as well as, the available information. This report is based on survey and assessment techniques which are limited by time and budgetary constraints relevant to the type and level of investigation undertaken. LOGIS reserve the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations if and when new information may become available from on-going research or further work in this field, or pertaining to this investigation.

Although LOGIS exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, LOGIS accepts no liability, and Genesis, by receiving this document, indemnifies LOGIS and its directors, managers, agents and employees against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with the services rendered, directly or indirectly by the use of the information contained in this document.

This report may not be altered or added to without the prior written consent of the author. This also refers to electronic copies of this report which are supplied for the purposes of inclusion as part of other reports. Similarly, any recommendations, statements or conclusions drawn from or based on this report must make reference to this report. If this report is used as part of a main report, the report in its entirety must be included as an appendix or separate section to the main report.

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

This Visual Impact Assessment and all associated mapping has been undertaken according to the worst-case scenario.

### 1.3 Legal framework

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

- **The National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA):** This report is in line with Appendix 6 of NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations (2014, as amended) which details the minimum requirements a specialist report must contain for an Environmental Impact Assessment.
- **Guideline for Involving Visual and Aesthetic Specialists in EIA Processes (DEADP, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, 2005):** This guideline was developed for use in the Western Cape, however in the absence of the development of any other guideline, this provides input for the preparation of visual specialist input into EIA processes. The guideline documents the requirements for visual impact assessment, typical issues that trigger the need for specialist visual input, the scope and extent of a visual assessment, information required, as well as the assessment and reporting of visual impacts and management actions.
- **Screening Tool as per Regulation 16 (1)(v) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 as amended:** a Screening report was generated for this proposed project, whereby a visual impact assessment was identified as one of the specialist studies that would be required.

### 1.4 Information base

This assessment was based on information from the following sources:

- Topographical maps and GIS generated data were sourced from the Surveyor General, Surveys and Mapping in Mowbray, Cape Town;
- Professional judgement based on experience gained from similar projects;
- Literature research on similar projects;
- Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on identified Environmental Themes in terms of Sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of NEMA

### 1.5 Level of confidence

Level of confidence<sup>1</sup> is determined as a function of:

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from Oberholzer (2005).

- **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 project 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 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 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 study area	Information on the project & experience of the practitioner			
		<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3</b>		9	6	3
<b>2</b>		6	4	2
<b>1</b>		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 Moderate to High:

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

## 1.6 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 NASA in the form of a 30m SRTM (Shuttle Radar Topography Mission) elevation model.

### The Plan of Study for the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) is stated below.

The VIA will be 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 wind turbine generator (WTG) layout.

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

The VIA will consider potential cumulative visual impacts, or alternatively the potential to concentrate visual exposure/impact within the region (if applicable).

The following VIA-specific tasks have been 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 SRTM 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 negative visual perception of the proposed facility.

- **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 would be exposed to the project infrastructure.

This is done in order to focus the 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 dataset, is a land use character map, that further aids in identifying sensitive areas and possible critical features (i.e. tourist facilities, national parks, etc. – if applicable), that should be addressed.

- **Determine the visual absorption capacity (VAC) 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 will be 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 is 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 and photo simulations**

A site visit was undertaken on the 13 July 2022 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. It should be noted that, from a visual perspective, the different seasons do not influence the results of the impact assessment, and as such regardless of the timing of the site visit, the level of confidence for the assessment and findings is high.

Photographs from strategic viewpoints were taken in order to simulate realistic post construction views of the Wind Energy Facility (WEF). This aids in visualising the perceived visual impact of the proposed WEF and place it in spatial context.


## 2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

**Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 (Pty) Ltd** is proposing the development of a commercial Wind Energy Facility and associated infrastructure on a site located approximately 20km west of the town of Aberdeen in the Eastern Cape Province. The site is located within the Dr Beyers Naude Local Municipality in the Sarah Baartman District Municipality. The project site comprises the following farm portions:

- The Farm Koppieskraal No 157
- Remainder of the Farm Doornpoort Number 93
- Portion 1 of the Farm Doorn Poort Number 93
- The Farm Kraanvogel Kuil No 155
- Portion 4 of Farm Sambokdoorns 92

The entire extent of the site falls within the Beaufort West Renewable Energy Development Zones (i.e. REDZ Focus Area 11). The undertaking of a basic assessment process for the project is in-line with the requirements stated in GNR 114 of 16 February 2018.

The project is planned as part of a larger cluster of renewable energy projects, which includes two adjacent up to 240MW Wind Energy Facilities (Aberdeen Wind Facility 2 and Aberdeen Wind Facility 3). This report consists of the visual impact findings of the **Aberdeen Wind Facility 1** only.



*Figure 1: Regional locality of the study area*

The Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 will have a contracted capacity of up to 240MW and comprise up to 41 wind turbines with a capacity of up to 8MW each. The project will have a preferred project site of approximately 9180 ha, and an estimated disturbance area of up to 62 ha.

The Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 project site is proposed to accommodate the following infrastructure:

- Up to 41 wind turbines with a maximum hub height of up to 200m, rotor diameter of up to 200m, blade length of up to 100m and have a rotor tip height of up to 300m. The turbine foundations will have a combined permanent footprint of 6ha and 13ha for all turbine crane hardstands is required.
- Medium-voltage (MV) power lines internal to the wind farm will be trenched and located adjacent to internal access roads, where feasible.
- Up to 132kV on-site facility substation up to 2ha in extent.
- Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) with a footprint of up to 5ha.
- A main access road of approximately 2.5km in length and up to 10m in width
- An internal road network between project components inclusive of stormwater infrastructure. A 12 m wide road corridor may be temporarily impacted during construction and rehabilitated to 6 m wide after construction
- Gate house and security: up to 0.5 ha
- Operation and Maintenance buildings (includes control centre, offices, warehouses, workshop, canteen, visitors centre, staff lockers, etc.): Up to 2 ha
- Site camp up to 1 ha
- Construction laydown areas up to 9ha

The power generated from the project will be sold to Eskom and will feed into the national electricity grid. Ultimately, the project is intended to be a part of the renewable energy projects portfolio for South Africa, as contemplated in the Integrated Resource Plan.

Table 2: Infrastructure and dimension breakdown of the proposed WEF

Infrastructure	Footprint and dimensions
Number of turbines	Up to 41 turbines
Hub Height	Up to 200m
Tower height	Up to 200m
Rotor Diameter	Up to 200m
Length of blade	~100m
Contracted Capacity	Up to 240MW (individual turbines up to 8MW in capacity each)
Tower Type	Full steel, full concrete, or hybrid
Area occupied by the on-site substation	Main Facility Substation of 2ha. The general height of the substation will be a maximum of 10 m, however will include switchgear portals up to 15 m in height and lightning masts up to 25 m in height
Capacity of on-site substation	132kV
Temporary infrastructure	Up to 51 ha. Temporary infrastructure, including laydown areas and hardstand, will be required during the construction phase. The construction period laydown area will be rehabilitated. The temporary hardstand area (boom erection, storage and assembly area) will also be rehabilitated. The preference for crane hardstands would be to leave them intact for unplanned maintenance/ replacement of the blades or nacelle.

### 3. SCOPE OF WORK

This report is the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) of the proposed **Aberdeen Wind Facility 1** 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 assessment encompasses a geographical area of approximately 3,843.174km<sup>2</sup> (the extent of the full-page maps displayed in this report) and includes a minimum 20km buffer zone from the proposed wind turbine structures.

Anticipated issues related to the potential visual impact of the proposed Wind Energy Facility (WEF) include the following:

- The visibility of the facility to, and potential visual impact on, observers travelling along the national, arterial or secondary roads within the study area.
- The visibility of the facility to, and visual impact on residents of homesteads within the study area.
- 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 (if present).
- The potential visual impact of the construction of ancillary infrastructure (i.e. substations) on observers in close proximity to the facility.
- The visual absorption capacity of the natural vegetation (if applicable).
- The potential cumulative visual impact of the proposed WEF and associated infrastructure in context of the other three (3) Aberdeen WEFs proposed, as well as, the three other authorised WEFs located within the study area, or potential consolidation of visual impacts.
- The potential visual impact of lighting of the facility in terms of light glare, light trespass and sky glow.
- Potential visual impacts associated with the construction phase.
- The potential visual impact of shadow flicker.
- 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. THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The project is proposed on the four farms that has a combined surface area of approximately 9180 ha. The final surface area to be utilised for the facility will be smaller, depending on the type of turbine selected, the final site layout and the placement of wind turbines and ancillary infrastructure. The farms are located in a rural area, currently zoned as agriculture, at a distance of approximately 25km west of the town Aberdeen.



Figure 2: The town of Aberdeen as viewed from the N9 approaching from Graaf-Reinet.

#### Topography, hydrology and vegetation

The study area occurs on land that ranges in elevation from approximately 750m (in the south-western corner of the study area) to 1,950m (at the top of the mountains north of the R61 arterial road). The terrain surrounding the proposed development area is predominantly flat with an even slope towards the south-west and north-east respectively. This valley, or large plain, known as the Plains of Camdeboo, is flanked to the north by the *Camdeboo Mountains (Kamdebooberg)* and the Oorlogspoortberge (further north-west of the development site and the R61).



Figure 3: The Camdeboo Mountains located to north-east of the proposed development site.

The proposed development site itself is located at an average elevation of 800 -850m above sea level. The site is predominantly flat, with limited undulation. The overall terrain morphological description of the study area is *Plains interrupted by some dolerite dykes, butts and mesas*. Refer to **Map 1** for a shaded relief map of the study area.



Figure 4: Photograph showing the predominantly flat topography of the region.

The larger region is known as the Great Karoo, consisting predominantly of plains framed by mountains to the north and lower hills in the east. Due to the flat topography and arid climate, the area is characterised by the occurrence of many non-perennial drainage lines traversing across the study area. The Kariega River is located in the western portion of the study area and flows from the north to the south. The non-perennial Kraai River also drains from the southern slopes of the Cambedoo Mountains to the east towards the Aberdeen Nature Reserve (also known as the Fonteinbos Nature Reserve) which features a natural spring. The perennial spring, known as *Die Oog* (The Eye), supplies water to the town of Aberdeen, as well as irrigation to a large area of arable land. A number of man-made farm dams are also scattered through the study area.

Vegetation cover in this semi-desert region is primarily *low shrubland and grassland, shrubland and bare rock and soil* (depending on the season). The vegetation types are described as *Eastern Lower Karoo* (along the plains), *Southern Karoo Riviere* (along the Kariega and Kraai River floodplains) and *Upper Karoo Hardeveld*, and *Karoo Escarpment Grassland* along the mountain ranges to the north of the development area. Refer to **Map 2** for the land cover map of the study area.



Figure 5: Low shrubland vegetation cover occurring on the development site.



*Figure 6: The general environment within the study area.*

### **Land use and settlement patterns**

The majority of the study area is sparsely populated (less than 3 people per km<sup>2</sup>) and consists of a landscape of wide-open spaces and very little development. The low rainfall and scarcity of water has as a consequence resulted that the region has not been transformed entirely by dryland agriculture or irrigated cultivation of crops. The study area is therefore largely in a natural state, with mainly sheep farming as the primary economic activity. The district is renowned for its wool and mohair production, being the largest mohair producing area in South Africa. Farm residences, or homesteads, dot the landscape at an irregular interval. These homesteads are generally located at great distances from each other (i.e. more than 5km apart).



*Figure 7: Example of homesteads located within the study area.*

The site is nestled between the N9 National Road (south of the site) linking Graaff-Reinet and Willowmore and the R61 arterial road west towards Beaufort West which both provide motorised access to the region from the town of Aberdeen. The N9 is a well-known national route linking travellers between Johannesburg and the Garden Route. Access to the site will most likely be from the R61 however another 30km gravel road situated between the R61 and N9 also provides access to the proposed development site.



*Figure 8: View of the proposed development site from the R61.*



*Figure 9: View of the proposed development site from the N9.*

There is only one designated protected area within the region, namely; the Aberdeen Nature Reserve (also known as the Fonteinbos Nature Reserve) which is situated on the banks of the Kraai River, 1km west of the town of Aberdeen and approximately 20km from the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1. The reserve covers an area of 1,500ha, and features a natural spring, which as mentioned above supplies water to the town of Aberdeen, as well as irrigation to an area of arable land.




*Figure 10: View over the Aberdeen Nature Reserve which is situated on the banks of the Kraai River.*

Other than this protected area, the other identified tourist attractions or destinations in closer proximity to the development site is the town of Aberdeen itself, as well as, the Karoo Secret Farm Stay (located on the farm known as Rooddraai). Aberdeen boasts a well-preserved architectural heritage with an array of examples of Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian, Art Nouveau, Gothic Revival and Flemish Revival styles of architecture interspersed with the typical Karoo style cottages throughout the town.<sup>2</sup> While Karoo Secret Farm Stay, located on the plains of Camdeboo to the north west of the site, is a working Karoo farm that has a variety of tourist accommodation offerings and activities available including, cycling and hiking trails, opportunities for birding, as well as, various activities for relaxation such as sundowners, swimming, tennis, etc.

Further to this, the entire proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 site is located within the Beaufort West Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ). Refer to **Figure 11** for the regional locality of the site in relation to the Beaufort West REDZ. REDZ are described as, "areas where large scale wind and solar PV energy facilities can be developed in terms of SIP 8 and in a manner that limits significant negative impacts on the environment, while yielding the highest possible socio-economic benefits to the country."<sup>3</sup>

**Figure 11** provides further detail as to the approved (Environmentally Authorised) Renewable Energy Environmental Applications (REEA) within the study area (as of 2022 1<sup>st</sup> quarter). Applications that have been approved include Aberdeen Wind.

Refer to **Map 4** for the location of the REEA\_OR\_2022\_Q1 applications listed above. It must be noted that the database is not always updated regularly and therefore some projects shown on **Error! Reference source not found.** may no longer be considered for development, or no longer have valid Environmental Authorisations. The data is displayed as provided and the author does not accept responsibility for the accuracy thereof.



*Figure 11: Regional locality of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 in relation to the Beaufort West Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ) (Source: REEA\_OR\_2022\_Q1) and other projects located therein.*

<sup>2</sup> Sources: DEAT (ENPAT Western Cape), NBI (Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland), NLC2013-14 (ARC/CSIR), REEA\_OR\_2022\_Q1 and SAPAD2021-22 (DEA).

<sup>3</sup> Source: <https://redzs.csir.co.za>





## 5. RESULTS

### 5.1 Potential visual exposure

A visibility analysis was undertaken from each of the wind turbine positions (41 in total) at an offset of 300m (approximate tip-height) above ground level. The result of the visibility analysis is displayed on **Map 3**.

The viewshed analysis does not include the effect of vegetation cover or existing structures on the exposure of the proposed WEF, therefore signifying a worst-case scenario.

The result of the viewshed analysis displays the potential areas of visual exposure, as well as the potential frequency of exposure. The frequency of exposure indicates the number of turbines that may be exposed i.e. more turbines may be visible in the darker orange areas than in the yellow areas. Land that is more elevated is typically more exposed to the proposed WEF, whilst lower lying areas such as valleys are shielded, or not as exposed.

The core, uninterrupted area of visual exposure of the wind turbines is likely to be experienced by sensitive receptors within a 0 - 10km radius of the structures. This is due to the generally flat nature of the topography. The frequency of visual exposure (number of turbines visible) is expected to be slightly reduced where the plains are interrupted by lower lying drainage lines located to the east and west of the proposed site. It is expected that the wind turbine structures will be highly visible from homesteads within this zone, as well as, from the R61 arterial road and secondary road traversing north and north-east of the project site respectively.

Additional visual exposure on the plains in between 10 – 20km of the turbine structures is slightly more scattered and primarily to the north and south respectively along the south-western facing slopes of the Kamdebooberg and the south-eastern facing slopes of the Oorlogspoortberge. The frequency of visual exposure (number of turbines visible) has become more reduced and it is expected that some wind turbines may only be partially visible i.e. mainly the blades. This is due to the mountains to the north-east and to the north-west of the proposed turbine layout, thereby largely restricting the visual exposure to the plains beyond these mountains, as well as, the numerous lower lying drainage lines located to the east and west of the proposed site.

The frequency of visual exposure beyond 20km from the turbine structures is once again expected to subside, as well as, the sections of wind turbines that may be exposed. Visibility of the turbine structures will be scattered throughout this area with visually screened areas lying beyond the Kamdebooberg and Oorlogspoortberge to the north-east, north-west respectively, as well as, a large visually screened area lying to the south-east.

The homesteads and roads expected to be visually influenced are listed below. The identification of these homesteads or farm dwellings are based on their locations as per the SA 1: 50 000 topographical maps<sup>4</sup>. Should a homestead / residence / institution not be listed in terms of the SA 1: 50 000 topographical maps, then it is assumed that the impacts will be similar to the other identified residences within the same proximity radii. It should also be noted that this section of the report focusses only on the potential visual exposure at varying distances and it does not yet refer to visual impact significance or any correlation thereto.

#### **Less than 5km from the wind turbines:**

- Maraiskraal (authorised Aberdeen Wind)
- Pretoriuskuil
- Springbokvlakte Noord
- Windermere (Aberdeen Wind Facility 2)
- Kraanvoëlkuil (Aberdeen Wind Facility 1)
- Observers travelling along the R61 arterial road
- Observers travelling along the secondary road traversing the north-eastern corner of the proposed WEF

---

<sup>4</sup> The names listed here 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.

**Located within a 5 - 10km radius:**

- Benekraal
- Kariegasfontein
- Teerputs
- Gannaleegte
- Skoongesig (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)
- Perseverance (2) (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)
- Observers travelling along the R61 arterial road
- Secondary roads

**Located within a 10 - 20km radius:**

- Kalkgat
- Kunna
- Ouplaas
- Dowefontein
- Tafelkop
- Klipstawel
- Waaikraal
- Mimosadale
- Uitkyk
- Klipdrift
- Die Kroon (authorised Aberdeen Wind)
- Hare Flats
- Fairview
- Kraairivier
- Karroorivier
- Fairview (2)
- Rooddraai – Karoo Secret Farm Stay
- Upper Kiewietskuil
- Fairwell
- Lower Kiewietskuil
- Kiewietskuil
- Mon Repos
- Kaapse Poortjie
- Klipkoppies
- Bakoond
- Van der Bergskuil
- Graafwater
- Steenbokvlakte
- Rooddam
- Sypher
- Benekuil
- Blouboskuil
- New Farm
- Spes Bona
- Wynlaagte
- Gannahoek
- Poffertjiesleegte
- Observers travelling along the R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads
- Observers travelling along portions of the N9 national road

**Located beyond 20km:**

- Glenclyff
- Windmere
- Highlands
- Waterkloof
- Vriespoort
- Sarelsrivier
- Vriespoort
- Oorlogspoort

- De Kruis
- Sandrivier
- Louisan
- Vaalvlei
- Maxton
- Belmont
- Nuwerus
- Vlakfontein
- Eureka
- Voorspoed
- Jongetjiesleegte
- Wapadsleegte
- Breipaal
- Dawn
- Rooirand
- Hoekdoorns
- Bekkersvlei
- Stoepies
- Aberdeen Nature Reserve
- Residents of the outskirts of the town of Aberdeen

*It must be noted that the sensitive visual receptors of farm and homesteads listed above, as indicated in parentheses, who could be affected visually by the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility are in fact located on properties involved in either the proposed WEF developments associated with the collective Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster or the adjacent authorised Aberdeen Wind Facility. This is particularly relevant to sensitive visual receptors located within 10km of the proposed site. It is therefore assumed that these sensitive receptors are in fact aware of, and to a certain extent accepting, of the visual intrusion associated with WEFs in general as a result of their involvement.*

It is envisaged that the structures, where visible from short to medium distances (e.g. less than 10km), may constitute a high visual prominence, potentially resulting in moderate to high visual impacts.

## **5.2 Cumulative visual assessment**

Cumulative visual impacts can be defined as the additional changes caused by a proposed development in conjunction with other similar developments or as the combined effect of a set of developments. In practice the terms 'effects' and 'impacts' are used interchangeably.

Cumulative visual impacts may be:

- Combined, where the wind turbines of several WEFs are within the observer's arc of vision at the same time;
- Successive, where the observer must turn his or her head to see the various WEF's wind turbines; and
- Sequential, when the observer must move to another viewpoint to see different developments, or different views of the same development (such as when travelling along a route).

The visual impact assessor is required (by the competent authority) to identify and quantify the cumulative visual impacts and to propose potential mitigating measures. This is often problematic as most regulatory bodies do not have specific rules, regulations or standards for completing a cumulative visual assessment, nor do they offer meaningful guidance regarding appropriate assessment methods. There are also not any authoritative thresholds or restrictions related to the capacity of certain landscapes to absorb the cumulative visual impacts of wind turbines.

To complicate matters even further, cumulative visual impact is not just the sum of the impacts of two developments. The combined effect of both may be much greater than the sum of the two individual effects, or even less.

The cumulative impact of the WEF development on the landscape and visual amenity is a product of:

- The distance between individual WEFs (or turbines);
- The distance over which the wind turbines are visible;
- The overall character of the landscape and its sensitivity to the structures;
- The siting and design of the WEFs themselves; and
- The way in which the landscape is experienced.

The specialist is required to conclude if the proposed development will result in any unacceptable loss of visual resource considering all the projects existing and proposed in the area.

For the purpose of this study, viewshed analyses were undertaken from all three (3) proposed WEFs as part of this development only. Authorised WEFs within a 30km radius of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1, were indicated on the map but not included in the analyses as a result of their layouts not been available. Authorised WEFs not included in this analysis but occurring in the study are Aberdeen Wind (adjacent north to the site).

Visibility analyses of the three (3) proposed Aberdeen Wind Facilities were undertaken individually from each of the WEF's wind turbine positions at an offset of 300m above ground level (the approximate/estimated tip-height). The results of these viewshed analyses were overlain in order to determine areas where all three WEFs may theoretically be visible, areas where three may be visible, areas where two may be visible and ultimately areas where turbines from only a single WEF may be visible.

The cumulative viewshed analysis is displayed on **Map 4** and the number of WEFs visible is indicated in the legend, e.g. an area where wind turbines from just one WEF is visible are indicated in yellow, and an area where wind turbines from all three WEFs may be visible are indicated in orange.

## Results


The approximate 123 wind turbine positions (excluding the already authorised WEFs located in the study area for which no layouts were available) are spread out across a very large surface area. The areas of highest potential cumulative visual exposure are located within and around the core area of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster site, within the Camdeboo Plains. This is due to the unobstructed vistas brought about by the flat topography of the plains. Terrain located within the valleys of the more mountainous landscapes or located within lower lying drainage lines are generally more shielded from the cumulative visual exposure of the wind turbine structures. The opposite effect occurs along the more elevated ridges and hills where the terrain may be exposed to more turbines, e.g. along the south-western facing slopes of the Kamdebooberg and the south-eastern facing slopes of the Oorlogspoortberge.

The areas of higher cumulative visual exposure (especially along the plains) contain sensitive visual receptors in the form of residents of homesteads and observers travelling along the national (N9), arterial (R61) and secondary roads traversing the plains. It is expected that should all 123 wind turbines of the Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster (and the additional turbines from the already authorised Aberdeen Wind) be constructed, the potential cumulative visual impacts may range from moderate (where observers are absent i.e. vacant natural land) to high significance (where observers are present i.e. at homesteads and along roads).

It is clear that the already authorised Aberdeen Wind is located on more elevated terrain adjacent to the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster (under assessment in this report). Should all these WEFs be constructed then these facilities will most likely be experienced as one facility by observers in the area.

It should be borne in mind however, that the cumulative visual exposure (and potential cumulative visual impact) is not an unintended consequence of renewable energy facility developments within the region, but rather a concerted effort to concentrate renewable energy facilities within the Beaufort West REDZ. This is an effort to prevent the scattered proliferation of renewable energy generation infrastructure beyond the REDZ and throughout the greater region. In light of this the potential cumulative visual impact is considered to be within acceptable limits.





Map 4: Cumulative viewshed analysis of the proposed and authorised wind turbines within the study area

### 5.3 Visual distance / observer proximity to the WEF


The proximity radii are based on the anticipated visual experience of the observer over varying distances. The distances are adjusted upwards for larger WEFs (e.g. more than 50 wind turbines) and downwards for smaller WEFs (e.g. less than 50 turbines). This methodology was developed in the absence of any known and/or accepted standards for South African WEFs.

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 rural 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 wind turbines 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. It should be noted that even though the proximity radii are indicated as (near) concentric circles from the wind turbines, the visual prominence of the structures will only apply where they are visible, as determined in the previous section (**Section 5.1**) of this report.

The proximity radii, based on the dimensions of the proposed development footprint are indicated on **Map 5**, and include the following:

- 0 - 5km. Short distance view where the WEF would dominate the frame of vision and constitute a very high visual prominence.
- 5 - 10km. Short to medium distance view where the structures would be easily and comfortably visible and constitute a high visual prominence.
- 10 - 20km. Medium to long 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.
- > 20km. 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.



*Figure 12: Schematic representation of a wind turbine from 1, 2, 5 and 10km under perfect viewing conditions.*

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.

## 5.4 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 WEF and its related 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 is calculated to be the highest along the public roads within the study area (N9 and R61). Travellers using these roads may be negatively impacted upon by visual exposure to the WEF. 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 WEF, would generally be negative.

Due to the remote location of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1, there are a relatively limited number of potential sensitive visual receptors located within a 20km radius of the proposed facility. These potentially affected sensitive visual receptors are listed in **Section 5.1**. It is expected that these landowners may experience visual impacts ranging from moderate to high significance, depending on their proximity to the wind turbine structures, and their potential sensitivity (aversion) to wind turbine infrastructure. Refer to **Map 5** for the location of the potential sensitive visual receptors discussed above.

The author is not aware of any specific objections raised against the construction and operation of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1.

## 5.5 Visual absorption capacity

The broader study area is located within the Succulent Karoo biome characterised by large open, *low shrubland*, grassland and bare soil in places (refer to **Figure 13**). Overall, the Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) of the receiving environment is deemed low by virtue of the nature of the vegetation and the low occurrence of urban development. 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.

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 facility). 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 13: Low shrubland, grassland and bare soil within the study area – low VAC.



## 5.6 Visual impact index

The combined results of the visual exposure, viewer incidence/perception and visual distance of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 are displayed on **Map 6**. 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 in order 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 5km radius of the WEF may experience a **very high** visual impact. The magnitude of visual impact on sensitive visual receptors subsequently subsides with distance to; **high** within a 5 – 10km radius (where sensitive receptors are present) and **moderate** within a 10 – 20km radius (where sensitive receptors are present). Receptors beyond 20km are expected to have a **low** potential visual impact.

Likely areas of potential visual impact and potential sensitive visual receptors<sup>5</sup> located within a 20km radius of the proposed WEF are displayed on **Map 7**.

### Magnitude of the potential visual impact

The WEF may have a visual impact of **very high** magnitude on the following identified observers within a 5km radius:

Residents of/visitors to:

- Maraiskraal (authorised Aberdeen Wind)
- Pretoriuskuil
- Springbokvlakte Noord
- Windemere (Aberdeen Wind Facility 2)
- Kraanvoëlkuil (Aberdeen Wind Facility 1)

**Note:** *The location of Windemere and Kraanvoëlkuil on the farms earmarked for the Aberdeen Wind Facilities 1 and 2 reduces the probability of this impact occurring on these receptors i.e. it is assumed that the landowners are supportive of the WEF developments on the affected properties.*

*Similarly with the residents of Maraiskraal located on the farm earmarked for the authorised Aberdeen Wind i.e. it is assumed that the landowner is supportive of WEF developments within the region based on their involvement with the already authorised wind energy development.*

Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- The secondary road traversing the north-eastern corner of the proposed WEF

---

<sup>5</sup> The names indicated on the map and listed below here 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. Should a homestead / residence / institution not be listed in terms of the SA 1: 50 000 topographical maps, then it is assumed that the impacts will be similar to the other identified residences within the same proximity radii.

The WEF may have a visual impact of **high** magnitude on the following identified observers within a 5 – 10km radius:

Residents of/visitors to:

- Benekraal
- Kariegasfontein
- Teerputs
- Gannaleegte
- Skoongesig (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)
- Perseverance (2) (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)

**Note:** *The location of Perseverance and Skoongesig on the farms earmarked for the Aberdeen Wind Facilities 3 reduces the probability of this impact occurring on these receptors i.e. it is assumed that these landowners is supportive of the WEF developments on the affected properties.*

Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads

The WEF may have a visual impact of **moderate** magnitude impact on the following identified observers located between a 10 – 20km radius of the wind turbine structures:

Residents of/visitors to:

- Kalkgat
- Kunna
- Ouplaas
- Dowefontein
- Tafelkop
- Klipstawel (authorised Camdeboo Wind)
- Waaikraal
- Mimosadale
- Uitkyk
- Klipdrift (authorised Camdeboo Wind)
- Die Kroon (authorised Aberdeen Wind)
- Hare Flats
- Fairview
- Kraairivier
- Karroorivier
- Fairview (2)
- Upper Kiewietskuil
- Roodraai – Karoo Secret Farm Stay
- Fairwell
- Lower Kiewietskuil
- Kiewietskuil
- Mon Repos
- Kaapse Poortjie
- Klipkoppies
- Bakoond
- Van der Bergskuil
- Graafwater
- Steenbokvlakte
- Rooddam
- Sypher
- Benekuil
- Blouboskuil
- New Farm
- Spes Bona
- Wynlaagte
- Gannahoek
- Poffertjiesleegte

Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads
- Portions of the N9 national road

**Note:** *The location of the residents of De Kroon located on the farm earmarked for the authorised Aberdeen Wind reduces the probability of this impact occurring on these receptors i.e. it is assumed that the landowners are supportive of WEF developments within the region based on their involvement with these already authorised wind energy developments.*

The WEF may have a visual impact of **low** magnitude impact on the following identified observers located beyond the 20km radius of the wind turbine structures:


Residents of/visitors to:

- Glenclyff
- Windmere
- Highlands
- Waterkloof
- Vriespoort
- Sarelsrivier
- Vriespoort
- Oorlogspoort
- De Kruis
- Sandrivier
- Louisan
- Vaalvlei
- Maxton
- Belmont
- Nuwerus
- Vlakfontein
- Eureka
- Voorspoed
- Jongetjiesleegte
- Wapadsleegte
- Breipaal
- Dawn
- Rooirand
- Hoekdoorns
- Bekkersvlei
- Stoepies
- Aberdeen Nature Reserve
- Residents of the outskirts of the town of Aberdeen


Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads
- Portions of the N9 national road

**Note:** *Where any of the above-mentioned homesteads are derelict or deserted, the visual impact will be non-existent, until such time as it is inhabited again.*



Map 6: Visual impact index



Map 7: Likely areas of potential visual impact and potential sensitive visual receptors

## 6. SHADOW FLICKER ASSESSMENT

Shadow flicker is an effect which is caused when the shadow of an object repeatedly passes or pulsates over the same point in the landscape. Shadow flicker can be caused by the wind turbines when the sun passes behind the hub or rotor blades of a wind turbine and casts a shadow that continually passes over the same point as the rotor blades of the wind turbine rotate. Shadow flicker only occurs when the sky is clear, and when the turbine rotor blades are between the sun and the receptor.

De Gryse in *Scenic Landscape Architecture* (2006) notes that "*shadow flickering associated with the rotation of the rotor blades has the potential to alter the viewed landscape, and to detract from the experience of people ...*". Therefore, the effect of shadow flicker is likely to be experienced by people situated directly within the shadow cast by the rotor blades of the wind turbine. As such, shadow flicker is expected to have an impact on people residing in homesteads located within close proximity of a wind turbine and at a specific orientation, particularly in areas where there is little screening present.

Since the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is located in the Southern Hemisphere it can be expected that shadow flicker will be experienced by sensitive receptors who are predominately located on the southern half of the potential flicker zones, namely to the west, south west, south, south east and east following the traction of the sun from east to west. It is expected that the shadow flicker zone of influence will be its greatest early in the mornings and later afternoons when the sun is at its lowest casting a longer shadow.

Shadow flicker may also be experienced by, and impact on motorists, if a wind turbine is located in close proximity to an existing road. It is however expected that the shadow flicker experienced by motorist traveling along roads will be fleeting and not constitute a shadow flicker visual impact of concern.

The impact of shadow flicker can be effectively mitigated by choosing the correct site and layout for the wind turbines, taking the orientation of the turbines relative to the nearby homesteads / roads and the latitude of the site into consideration. Tall structures and trees will also obstruct shadows and prevent the effect of shadow flicker from impacting on surrounding sensitive receptors, however, since this is not a consistent factor or given to occur around any of the structures within the study area it will not be considered in this assessment. It should also be noted that shadow flicker is only of concern on occupied residences, if any of the identified homesteads are derelict, deserted or not permanently occupied, the shadow flicker visual impact will be non-existent, and not constitute a shadow flicker visual impact of concern, until such time as they are inhabited again.

De Gryse found that "*most shadow impact is associated with 3-4 times the height of the object. While shadows may extend further than this, they become insignificant in their visual intrusion because of the reduced intensity of the shadow at such distances.*" Based on this research, the shadow flicker assessment for the proposed **Aberdeen Wind Facility 1** was undertaken on a likely 41 turbine layout using a 300m blade tip height (hub height of up to 200m and rotor diameter of 200m). As such, sensitive receptors are considered to be affected where shadows are predicted to occur within 1.2km of a turbine. As such, sensitive receptors who fall within this zone are likely to be impacted upon.

Based on the above, this study found that the users of the structure located at Kraanvoelkuil are likely to experience shadow flicker from one (1) turbines, labelled ABE037. Of note is that this homestead is located on a property involved in this development. Additionally, following consultation undertaken as a part of the Social Impact Assessment, it was determined that this dwelling is not a permanent homestead but rather a temporary dwelling that is used a maximum of two weeks of the year, during sheep shearing periods. It is therefore assumed that they are in fact aware of and to a certain extent accepting of the shadow flicker associated with these turbines thereby, not constituting a shadow flicker visual impact of concern for this receptor.

## 7. PHOTO SIMULATIONS

Photo simulations were undertaken (in addition to the above spatial analyses) in order to illustrate the potential **cumulative visual impact of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster**

within the receiving environment. The purpose of the photo simulation exercise is to support/verify the findings of the VIA, and is not an exercise to illustrate what the facilities will look like from all directions (i.e. it is not an artist's impression).

The photo simulations indicate the **anticipated cumulative visual alteration of the landscape** from various sensitive visual receptors located at different distances from the facility should the entire Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster be constructed and not just the Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility (as dealt with in this report). The simulations are based on the wind turbine dimensions and layout.

The photograph positions are indicated on **Figure 14** below and should be referenced with the photo simulation being viewed in order to place the observer in spatial context of the Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster.

The simulated views show the placement of the wind turbines during the long-term operation phase of the Clusters lifespan. It is assumed that the necessary post-construction phase rehabilitation and mitigation measures, as proposed by the various specialists in the environmental impact assessment reports, have been undertaken.

It is imperative that the natural vegetation be restored to its original (current) status for these simulated views to ultimately be realistic. The additional infrastructure (e.g. the proposed substation, access roads, etc.) associated with the Cluster are not included in the photo simulations.

The simulated wind turbines, as shown on the photographs, were adapted to the atmospheric conditions present when the original photographs were taken. This implies that factors such as haze and solar glare were also simulated in order to realistically represent the observer's potential view of the Cluster.

The photo simulations are displayed as "before" and "after" views of the affected landscape.




Figure 14: Location of the photograph positions undertaken for the photo simulations of the entire Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster



*Figure 15: Photo simulation 1 – before. Viewpoint from the N1 looking south west towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster.*



*Figure 16: Photo simulation 1 – after. The closest wind turbine in the cluster is 15.2km from this point.*



*Figure 17: Photo simulation 2 – before. Viewpoint from the R61 looking east towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster.*



*Figure 18: Photo simulation 2 – after. The closest wind turbine in the Cluster is 2km from this point.*



*Figure 19: Photo simulation 3 – before. Viewpoint from the secondary road at the base of the Kamdebooberg looking south towards the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster.*



*Figure 20: Photo simulation 3 – after. The closest wind turbine of the Cluster is 10.8km from this point.*

## 8. VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 8.1 Impact rating methodology

The previous section of the report identified specific areas where likely visual impacts would occur. 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**) 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 infrastructure) and includes a table quantifying the potential visual impact according to the following criteria:

**Extent** – The distance the visual impact extends from the proposed development and to what extent it will have the highest impact. In the case of this type of development the extent of the visual impact is most likely to have a higher impact on receptors closer to the development and decrease as the distance increases<sup>6</sup>.

- Long distance (very low = 1)
- Medium to longer distance (low = 2)
- Short distance (medium = 3)
- Very short distance (high = 4)

**Duration** – The timeframe in both the construction and operational phase over which the effects of the impact will be felt.

- Very short (0-1 yrs. = 1)
- Short (2-5 yrs. = 2)
- Medium (5-15 yrs. = 3)
- Long (>15 yrs. = 4)
- Permanent (= 5)

**Magnitude** – The severity or size of the impact. This value is read off the Visual Impact Index maps. Where more than one value is applicable, the higher of these will be used as a worst-case scenario.

- None (= 0)
- minor (= 2)
- low (= 4)
- medium/moderate (= 6)
- high (= 8)
- very high (= 10)

**Probability** – The likelihood of the impact occurring.

- Very improbable (= 1)
- Improbable (= 2)
- Probable (= 3)
- Highly probable (= 4)
- Definite (= 5)

**Status** - The perception of Interested and Affected Parties towards the proposed development.

- Positive
- Negative
- Neutral

**Reversibility** – The possibility of visual recovery of the impact following the decommissioning of the proposed development.

- Reversible (= 1)
- Recoverable (= 3)
- Irreversible (= 5)

---

<sup>6</sup> Long distance = > 20km. Medium to longer distance = 10 – 20km. Short distance = 5 – 10km. Very short distance = < 5km (refer to Section Visual distance / observer proximity to the WEF).

**Significance** - 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.

## 8.2 Direct Impact Assessment

The direct visual impacts of the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility are assessed as follows:

### 8.2.1. Construction Phase

During the construction period it is expected that any visual impact of concern on sensitive visual receptors within the study area will be temporary and limited to a short-term period (2-5 years). The below direct construction visual impacts of the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility are assessed as follows:

#### 8.2.1.1. Potential visual impact of construction activities on identified sensitive visual receptors in close proximity (within 0 – 5km) to the proposed WEF

During the construction period, there will be an increase in heavy vehicles utilising the roads to the construction sites that may cause, at the very least, a visual nuisance to other road users and landowners in the area in close proximity (within 5km). Additionally, dust as a result of the construction activities and construction equipment (i.e. cranes), temporary laydown areas, construction camps, etc. may also be visible at the site, resulting in a visual impact occurring during construction. Sensitive receptors in this zone consist of observers travelling along the R61 arterial road and the secondary road traversing the north-eastern corner of the proposed site, as well as, residents of various homesteads (refer to Section 5.6 for a full list).

Construction activities may potentially result in a **high** (significance rating = 64) temporary visual impact, that may be mitigated to **moderate** (significance rating = 42).

Table 3: Visual impact of construction on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF.

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact of construction activities on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF.		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Short term <b>(2)</b>	Short term <b>(2)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Very high <b>(10)</b>	High <b>(8)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Highly Probable <b>(4)</b>	Probable <b>(3)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	High <b>(64)</b>	Moderate <b>(42)</b>
<b>Status (positive or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	Yes	

<p><b>Mitigation:</b></p> <p><u>Planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Retain and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint, but within the project site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Construction:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Ensure that vegetation is not unnecessarily removed during the construction period.</li> <li>➤ Plan the placement of laydown areas and temporary construction equipment camps in order to minimise vegetation clearing (i.e. in already disturbed areas) where possible.</li> <li>➤ Restrict the activities and movement of construction workers and vehicles to the immediate construction site and existing access roads.</li> <li>➤ Ensure that rubble, litter, and disused construction materials are appropriately stored (if not removed daily) and then disposed of regularly at licensed waste facilities.</li> <li>➤ Reduce and control construction dust using approved dust suppression techniques as and when required (i.e. whenever dust becomes apparent).</li> <li>➤ Restrict construction activities to daylight hours whenever possible in order to reduce lighting impacts.</li> <li>➤ Rehabilitate all disturbed areas immediately after the completion of construction works.</li> </ul> <p><b>Residual impacts:</b></p> <p>None, provided that rehabilitation works are carried out as required.</p>
--

### **8.2.2. Operational Phase**

During the operational phase of the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility, it is generally accepted that the wind turbine structures associated with the proposed facility will constitute the largest visual impact of concern on sensitive visual receptors within the study area, as a result of their sheer scale in relation to other proposed infrastructure that may be located on the site. The below direct operational visual impacts of the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility are assessed as follows:

#### **8.2.2.1. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors (residents and visitors) located within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures**

The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is expected to have a **high** visual impact (significance rating = 90) on observers/visitors residing at homesteads within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures. These include amongst others, the following identified homesteads:

- Pretoriuskuil
- Springbokvlakte Noord

The following homesteads are provisionally included, due the presence of already authorised or proposed WEFs on their properties and their assumed support for WEF developments. The homestead's names are listed below.

- Maraiskraal (authorised Aberdeen Wind)
- Windermere (Aberdeen Wind Facility 2)
- Kraanvoëlkuil (Aberdeen Wind Facility 1)

No mitigation of this impact is possible (i.e. the structures will be visible regardless), but general mitigation and management measures are recommended as best practice. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Of note is that the impact dealt with in the table below only addressed the potential visual impact associated with the visual intrusion of wind turbines structures themselves. The impacts associated with any other potential visual impacts as a result of the proposed development, such as ancillary infrastructure, sense of place or lighting impacts are dealt with separately in below sections of this report.

Table 4: Visual impact on observers (residents and visitors) in close proximity to the proposed wind turbine structures

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact on observers (residents at homesteads and visitors/tourists) in close proximity (i.e. within 5km) to the wind turbine structures		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Very high <b>(10)</b>	Very high <b>(10)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Definite <b>(5)</b>	Definite <b>(5)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	High <b>(90)</b>	High <b>(90)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practice management measures can be implemented.	
<b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b>		
<u>Planning:</u>		
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.		
<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 areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b>		
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

#### 8.2.2.2. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors (observers travelling along roads) located within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures

During the entire operational lifespan of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 it is expected that daily commuters and possible tourists travelling along the various roads within 5km of the wind turbine structures may be negatively impacted upon by the visual exposure to the proposed infrastructure, however brief. It is assumed that the observers travelling along these roads will view the visual intrusion of the turbines in a negative light when compared with the rural and scenic quality of the surrounding landscape.

The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is expected to have a **high** visual impact (significance rating = 72) on observers traveling along the roads within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures. This includes observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- The secondary road traversing the north-eastern corner of the proposed WEF

Since observers traveling along these roads will only be exposed to the visual intrusion for a short period of time it is expected that this will reduce the probability of this impact occurring.

No mitigation of this impact is possible (i.e. the structures will be visible regardless), but general mitigation and management measures are recommended as best practice. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 5: Visual impact on observers travelling along roads in close proximity to the proposed wind turbine structures

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact on observers travelling along the roads in close proximity (i.e. within 5km) to the wind turbine structures		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Very high <b>(10)</b>	Very high <b>(10)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	High <b>(72)</b>	High <b>(72)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practice management measures can be implemented.	
<b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b>		
<u>Planning:</u>		
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.		
<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 areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b>		
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

### 8.2.2.3. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within the region (5 – 10km radius)

The Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 could have a **high** visual impact (significance rating = 60) on residents of (or visitors to) homesteads and observers travelling along the roads within a 5 - 10km radius of the wind turbine structures.

Amongst others, residents of/visitors to:

- Benekraal
- Kariegasfontein
- Teerputs
- Gannaleegte

Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads

The following homestead is provisionally included due to its location on a proposed development property and their assumed support for WEF developments within the region.

- Skoongesig (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)
- Perseverance (2) (Aberdeen Wind Facility 3)

No mitigation of this impact is possible (i.e. the structures will be visible regardless), but general mitigation and management measures are recommended as best practice. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 6: Visual impact of the proposed wind turbine structures within the region (5 – 10km)

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact on observers travelling along the roads and residents at homesteads within a 5 – 10km radius of the wind turbine structures		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Short distance <b>(3)</b>	Short distance <b>(3)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	High <b>(8)</b>	High <b>(8)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	High <b>(60)</b>	High <b>(60)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	
<b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b>		
<u>Planning:</u>		
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.		
<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 areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b>		
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

#### 8.2.2.4. Potential visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within the region (10 – 20km radius)

The Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 could have a **moderate** visual impact (significance rating = 48) on residents of (or visitors to) homesteads and observers travelling along the roads within a 10 - 20km radius of the wind turbine structures.

Amongst others, residents of/visitors to:

- Kalkgat
- Kunna
- Ouplaas
- Dowefontein
- Tafelkop
- Waaikraal
- Mimosadale
- Uitkyk
- Hare Flats
- Fairview
- Kraairivier
- Karroorivier
- Fairview (2)
- Rooidraai – Karoo Secret Farm Stay

- Upper Kiewietskuil
- Fairwell
- Lower Kiewietskuil
- Kiewietskuil
- Mon Repos
- Kaapse Poortjie
- Klipkoppies
- Bakoond
- Van der Bergskuil
- Graafwater
- Steenbokvlakte
- Rooddam
- Sypher
- Benekuיל
- Blouboskuil
- New Farm
- Spes Bona
- Wynlaagte
- Gannahoek
- Poffertjiesleegte

Observers travelling along the:

- The R61 arterial road
- Various secondary roads
- Portions of the N9 national road

The following properties are provisionally included, due the presence of an already authorised WEFs on their properties and their assumed support for WEF developments within the region.

- Die Kroon (authorised Aberdeen Wind)

No mitigation of this impact is possible (i.e. the structures will be visible regardless), but general mitigation and management measures are recommended as best practice. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 7: Visual impact of the proposed wind turbine structures within the region (10 – 20km)

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact on observers travelling along the roads and residents at homesteads within a 10 – 20km radius of the wind turbine structures		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Medium distance <b>(2)</b>	Medium distance <b>(2)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Moderate <b>(6)</b>	Moderate <b>(6)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	Moderate <b>(48)</b>	Moderate <b>(48)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	

<p><b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b></p> <p><u>Planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Operations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole.</li> </ul> <p><u>Decommissioning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.</li> <li>➤ Rehabilitate all areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Residual impacts:</b></p> <p>The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.</p>

### 8.2.2.5. Shadow flicker

Shadow flicker only occurs when the sky is clear, and when the turbine rotor blades are between the sun and the receptor (i.e. when the sun is low). De Gryse in Scenic Landscape Architecture (2006) found that “*most shadow impact is associated with 3-4 times the height of the object*”. Based on this research, an 1.2km buffer along the edge of the outer most turbines were identified as the zone within which there is a risk of shadow flicker occurring.

One structure, namely Kraanvoelkuil, is located within the 1.2km buffer of turbine ABE037. Of note is that this homestead is located on a property involved in this development. Additionally, following consultation undertaken as a part of the Social Impact Assessment, it was determined that this dwelling is not a permanent homestead but rather a temporary dwelling that is used a maximum of two weeks of the year, during sheep shearing periods, thereby reducing the probability of this impact occurring.

The significance of shadow flicker is therefore anticipated to be **low**, when this structure is in use.

Table 8: Visual impact of shadow flicker on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF

<b>Nature of Impact:</b>		
Visual impact of shadow flicker on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed WEF.		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Moderate <b>(6)</b>	Moderate <b>(6)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Improbable <b>(2)</b>	Improbable <b>(2)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	Low <b>(28)</b>	Low <b>(28)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	N.A. due to the low probability of occurrence	
<b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b>		
N.A.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b>		
N.A.		

### **8.2.2.6. Potential visual impact of operational, safety and security lighting of the facility at night**

The area immediately surrounding the proposed facility has a relatively low incidence of receptors and light sources, so light trespass and glare from the security and after-hours operational lighting for the facility will have some significance for visual receptors in the study area, especially those located in closer proximity to the wind turbine structures especially within 0-5km and potentially up to 10km.

Another source of glare light, albeit not as intense as flood lighting, is the aircraft warning lights mounted on top of the hub of the wind turbines. These lights are less aggravating due to the toned-down red colour, but have the potential to be visible from a great distance. This is especially true due to the strobing effect of the lights, a function specifically designed to attract the observer's attention. The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) prescribes these warning lights and the potential to mitigate their visual impacts have traditionally been very low other than to restrict the number of lights to turbines that delineate the outer perimeter of the facility.

Some ground-breaking new technology in the development of strobing lights that only activate when an aircraft is detected nearby may aid in restricting light pollution at night and should be investigated and implemented by the project proponent, if available and permissible by the CAA. This new technology is referred to as *needs-based night lights*, which deactivates the wind turbine's night lights when there is no flying object within the airspace of the WEF. The system relies on the active detection of aircraft by radar sensors, which relays a switch-on signal to the central wind farm control to activate the obstacle lights. See diagram in Figure 22 below.<sup>7</sup>



Figure 21: Aircraft warning lights fitted to the wind turbine hubs  
(Source:<http://www.pinchercreekecho.com/2015/04/29/md-of-pincher-creek-takes-on-wind-turbine-lights>)

<sup>7</sup> Source: Nordex Energy GmbH, 2019




Figure 22: Diagram of the functional principle of the needs-based night lights.

Last is the potential lighting impact known as sky glow. 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, contributes to the increase in sky glow.

This anticipated lighting impact is likely to be of **high** significance (rating = 60), and may be mitigated to **moderate** (rating = 45) especially within 0-5km and potentially up to 10km radius of the wind turbine structures.

Table 9: Impact table summarising the significance of visual impact of lighting at night on visual receptors in close to medium proximity (within 0-5km and potentially up to 10km) to the proposed WEF

<b>Nature of Impact:</b>		
Visual impact of lighting at night on sensitive visual receptors.		
	<b>No mitigation</b>	<b>Mitigation considered</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Short/Medium (3)	Short/Medium (3)
<b>Duration</b>	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
<b>Magnitude</b>	High (8)	High (8)
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable (4)	Probable (3)
<b>Significance</b>	High (60)	Moderate (45)
<b>Status (positive or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	Yes	
<b>Mitigation:</b>		
<u>Planning &amp; operation:</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Implement needs-based night lighting if considered acceptable by the CAA.</li> <li>➤ Limit aircraft warning lights to the turbines on the perimeter according to CAA requirements, thereby reducing the overall impact.</li> <li>➤ Shield the sources of light by physical barriers (walls, vegetation, or the structure itself).</li> <li>➤ Limit mounting heights of lighting fixtures, or alternatively use foot-lights or bollard level lights.</li> </ul>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Make use of minimum lumen or wattage in fixtures.</li> <li>➤ Make use of down-lighters, or shielded fixtures.</li> <li>➤ Make use of Low-Pressure Sodium lighting or other types of low impact lighting.</li> <li>➤ 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.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Residual impacts:</b> The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the facility and ancillary infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.</p>

**8.2.2.7. Ancillary infrastructure**

On-site ancillary infrastructure associated with the WEF includes a 132kV substation and collector substation, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), underground cabling between the wind turbines, internal access roads, gate house, Operation and Maintenance buildings (including a control centre, offices, warehouses, workshop, canteen, visitors centre, staff lockers, etc.). No dedicated viewshed analyses have been generated for the ancillary infrastructure, as the range of visual exposure will fall within (and be overshadowed by) that of the turbines. To this end, any of the substation alternatives would be acceptable from a visual impact perspective, as they all fall within the WEF’s wind turbine footprint.

The anticipated visual impact resulting from this infrastructure is likely to be of **low** significance both before and after mitigation.

Table 10: Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> Visual impact of the ancillary infrastructure on observers in close proximity to the structures.		
	<b>Without mitigation</b>	<b>With mitigation</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>	Very Short distance <b>(4)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	Low <b>(4)</b>	Low <b>(4)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Improbable <b>(2)</b>	Improbable <b>(2)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	Low <b>(24)</b>	Low <b>(24)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	
<b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b>		
<u>Planning:</u>		
➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.		
<u>Operations:</u>		
➤ Maintain the general appearance of the infrastructure.		
<u>Decommissioning:</u>		
➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.		
➤ Rehabilitate all areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b> The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the ancillary infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

### 8.3 Indirect Impact Assessment

The indirect visual impacts of the proposed Aberdeen 1 Wind Facility are assessed as follows:

#### 8.3.1. Operational Phase

##### 8.3.1.1. The potential impact 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.), play 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 currently has a rural, undeveloped character and a natural appearance. These generally undeveloped landscapes are considered to have a high visual quality. However, since the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is located within the Beaufort West REDZ it is expected that an accumulation of Renewable Energy Facilities (i.e. Wind and Solar), have already been and will continue to be constructed within the general region. This in turn will alter the unique experience of this environment by a user. It should be borne in mind that this alteration in the landscape is not an unintended consequence of renewable energy facility developments within the region, but rather a concerted effort to concentrate renewable energy facilities within the Beaufort West REDZ. This reduces the probability of this impact occurring.

Currently since none of the authorised developments in the region have been constructed the significance of the visual impacts on the sense of place within the region (i.e. beyond a 20km radius of the development and within the greater region) is expected to be of **high** significance. However, in the future should all the intended development be constructed it is expected that the significance of the visual impacts on the sense of place could be reduced to **moderate** significance.

No mitigation of this impact is possible (i.e. the structures will be visible regardless), but general mitigation and management measures are recommended as best practice. The table below illustrates this impact assessment.

Table 11: The potential impact on the sense of place of the region

<b>Nature of Impact:</b> The potential impact on the sense of place of the region.		
	<b>Current scenario</b>	<b>Future scenario</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Long distance <b>(1)</b>	Long distance <b>(1)</b>
<b>Duration</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>	Long term <b>(4)</b>
<b>Magnitude</b>	High <b>(8)</b>	Moderate <b>(6)</b>
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable <b>(4)</b>	Probable <b>(3)</b>
<b>Significance</b>	High <b>(52)</b>	Moderate <b>(33)</b>
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No, only best practise measures can be implemented	

<p><b>Generic best practise mitigation/management measures:</b></p> <p><u>Planning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Retain/re-establish and maintain natural vegetation in all areas outside of the development footprint/servitude, but within the project site.</li> </ul> <p><u>Operations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole.</li> </ul> <p><u>Decommissioning:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use.</li> <li>➤ Rehabilitate all areas. Consult an ecologist regarding rehabilitation specifications.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Residual impacts:</b></p> <p>The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.</p>

## 8.4 Cumulative Impact Assessment

### 8.4.1. The potential cumulative visual impact of wind farms on the visual quality of the landscape

The cumulative visual impact of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1, its other two associated WEFs in the Cluster, and an additional one authorised WEF (refer to **Section 5.2**) will primarily occur on the plains.

The cumulative visual impact is expected to be **high**, depending on the observer’s sensitivity to wind turbine structures. In spite of this, the cumulative visual impact is still considered to be within acceptable limits, due to its location within the Beaufort West REDZ.

Table 12: The potential cumulative visual impact of wind farms on the visual quality of the landscape

<b>Nature of Impact:</b>		
The potential cumulative visual impact of wind farms on the visual quality of the landscape.		
	<b>Overall impact of the proposed project considered in isolation</b>	<b>Cumulative impact of the project and other projects in the area</b>
<b>Extent</b>	Medium distance (2)	Medium distance (2)
<b>Duration</b>	Long term (4)	Long term (4)
<b>Magnitude</b>	High (8)	Very high (10)
<b>Probability</b>	Highly probable (4)	Highly probable (4)
<b>Significance</b>	Moderate (56)	High (64)
<b>Status (positive, neutral or negative)</b>	Negative	Negative
<b>Reversibility</b>	Reversible (1)	Reversible (1)
<b>Irreplaceable loss of resources?</b>	No	No
<b>Can impacts be mitigated?</b>	No	
<b>Mitigation measures:</b> N.A.		
<b>Residual impacts:</b>		
The visual impact will be removed after decommissioning, provided the WEF infrastructure is removed and the area rehabilitated. Failing this, the visual impact will remain.		

## 8.5 The potential to mitigate visual impacts

The primary visual impact, namely the appearance of the WEF (the wind turbines) is not possible to mitigate. The functional design of the turbines cannot be changed in order to reduce visual impacts.

Alternative colour schemes (i.e. painting the turbines sky-blue, grey or darker shades of white) are not permissible as the CAA's *Marking of Obstacles* expressly states, "*Wind turbines shall be painted bright white to provide the maximum daytime conspicuousness*".

Failure to adhere to the prescribed colour specifications will result in the fitting of supplementary daytime lighting to the wind turbines, once again aggravating the visual impact.

The overall potential for mitigation is therefore generally low or non-existent. The following mitigation is, however possible:

- It is recommended that vegetation cover (i.e. either natural or cultivated) be maintained in all areas outside of the actual development footprint (but still within the project site), both during construction and operation of the proposed WEF. 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. 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 the clearing of vegetation is minimised. This implies consolidating this infrastructure as much as possible and making use of already disturbed areas rather than undisturbed sites wherever possible.
- Install aircraft warning lights that only activate when the presence of an aircraft is detected, if permitted by the CAA, where deemed feasible.
- The Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) prescribes that aircraft warning lights be mounted on the turbines. However, it is possible to mount these lights on the turbines representing the outer perimeter of the facility. In this manner, fewer warning lights can be utilised to delineate the facility as one large obstruction, thereby lessening the potential visual impact.
- Mitigation of other lighting impacts includes the pro-active design, planning and specification lighting for the facility. The correct specification and placement of lighting and light fixtures for the proposed WEF 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 is not unnecessarily cleared or removed during the construction period.
  - Reduce the construction period through careful logistical planning and productive implementation of resources.
  - 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.
  - Rehabilitate all disturbed areas, construction areas, roads, slopes etc. immediately after the completion of construction works. If necessary, an ecologist should be consulted to assist or give input into rehabilitation specifications.
- During operation, the maintenance of the turbines and ancillary structures and infrastructure must be undertaken to ensure that the facility does not degrade, therefore 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 must be removed and all disturbed areas appropriately rehabilitated. An ecologist must 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 (indirect) impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed WEF (i.e. visual character and sense of place) are not possible to mitigate. There is also no mitigation to ameliorate the negative visual impacts on roads frequented by tourists and which provides access to tourist destinations within the region.

Where sensitive visual receptors (as identified in **Section 5.6**) are likely to be affected and where valid objections (as determined by the visual specialist) are raised by these receptors during the application process, it is recommended that the developer investigate the receptor's willingness (and the viability) of screening of visual impacts at the receptor site prior to construction commencing<sup>8</sup>. This may entail the planting of natural vegetation, natural trees or the construction of screens in the pre-dominant direction of impact likely to be experienced by the principal receptor at the site. Ultimately, visual screening is most effective when placed at the receptor itself and should be considered in this context only.

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

## 9. IMPACT STATEMENT

The findings of the Visual Impact Assessment undertaken for the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is that the visual environment surrounding the site, especially within a 5-10km radius (and potentially up to 20km), will be visually impacted upon for the anticipated operational lifespan of the facility (i.e. 20 - 25 years).

The following is a summary of impacts remaining:

- Construction phase activities may potentially result in a **high** temporary visual impact that may be mitigated to **moderate**.

---

<sup>8</sup> To this authors knowledge no objections pertaining to the visual impacts associated with the proposed development have been received.

- The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is expected to have a **high** visual impact on observers/visitors residing at homesteads within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures. No mitigation of this impact is possible.
- The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is expected to have a **high** visual impact on observers traveling along the public roads within a 5km radius of the wind turbine structures. No mitigation of this impact is possible.
- The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 could have a **high** visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within the region (5 - 10km radius of the wind turbine structures). No mitigation of this impact is possible.
- The operation of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 could have a **moderate** visual impact on sensitive visual receptors within the region (10 - 20km radius of the wind turbine structures). No mitigation of this impact is possible.
- The significance of shadow flicker is anticipated to be **low**, when the structure located at Kraanvoelkuil is in use.
- The anticipated night-time lighting impact is likely to be of **high** significance and may be mitigated to **moderate**, provided that *needs-based aircraft warning lights* (if permitted by the CAA and deemed feasible), is installed.
- The anticipated visual impact resulting from ancillary infrastructure is likely to be of **low** significance both before and after mitigation.
- Currently since none of the authorised developments in the region have been constructed the significance of the visual impacts on the sense of place within the region (i.e. beyond a 20km radius of the development and within the greater region) is expected to be of **high** significance. However, in the future should all the intended development be constructed it is expected that the significance of the visual impacts on the sense of place could be reduced to **moderate** significance.
- The cumulative visual impact of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1, its other two associated WEFs in the Cluster, and an additional one authorised WEFs is expected to be of **high** significance. In spite of this, the cumulative visual impact is still considered to be within acceptable limits, due to its location within the Beaufort West REDZ.

The anticipated visual impacts listed above (i.e. post mitigation impacts) range from **high** to **low** significance. Anticipated visual impacts on sensitive visual receptors in close proximity to the proposed facility remain high and are not possible to mitigate.

## 10. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The visual impact assessment (VIA) practitioner takes great care to ensure that all the spatial analyses and mapping is as accurate as possible. The intention is to quantify, using visibility analyses, proximity analyses, photo simulations and the identification of sensitive receptors, the potential visual impacts associated with the proposed **Aberdeen Wind Facility 1**. These processes are deemed to be transparent and scientifically defensible when interrogated.

However, visual impact is ultimately a subjective concept. The *subjects* in this case are the residents of, and visitors to the region. The author has attempted to accurately capture the location of these *subjects* (i.e. sensitive visual receptors and areas of likely visual impact) to the best of his ability, drawing on years of experience as a VIA practitioner. The VIA further adopts a risk averse approach in so far as to assume that the perception of most (if not all) of the sensitive visual receptors (bar the landowners of the properties earmarked for the development), would be predominantly negative towards the development of a WEF in the region.

There are likely to be supporters of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 (as renewable energy generation is a global priority) amongst the population of the larger region, but they are normally expected to be indifferent to the construction of the WEF and not as vocal in their support for the wind farm

as potential detractors thereof (should any be identified). To the knowledge of the author, no objections were raised.

However, it is expected that the construction and operation of the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 and its associated infrastructure, will have a **high visual impact on the study area**, especially within (but not restricted to) a 0 – 5km radius (and potentially up to a 10km radius) of the proposed facility. The visual impact will differ amongst places, depending on the distance from the facility, but will generally be restricted to the plains. Tourists travelling through the region and residents of homesteads will likely experience visual impacts where the wind turbine structures are visible.

Should all 123 wind turbines of the Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster (and the additional turbines from the Aberdeen WEF) be constructed, it is expected that the **potential cumulative visual impacts** may range from **moderate** (where observers are absent i.e. vacant natural land) to **high** significance (where observers are present i.e. at homesteads and along roads). It is clear that the Aberdeen Wind is located on more elevated terrain located adjacent to the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility Cluster (under assessment in this report). Should all these WEFs be constructed then these facilities will most likely be experienced as one facility by observers in the area.

It should be borne in mind however, that the cumulative visual exposure (and potential cumulative visual impact) is not an unintended consequence of renewable energy facility developments within the region, but rather a concerted effort to concentrate renewable energy facilities within the Beaufort West REDZ. In light of this, and the generally remote location of the REDZ, the **potential cumulative visual impact is considered to be within acceptable limits**.

Conventional mitigation (e.g. such as screening of the structures) of the potential visual impacts is highly unlikely to succeed due to the nature of the development and the receiving environment. A number of mitigation measures have been proposed (**Section 8.5** The potential to mitigate visual impacts). The proposed mitigation measures will primarily be effective in terms of mitigating lighting and construction phase visual impacts.

*Note: 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, should it be authorised.*

The DFFE screening tool generated for the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 indicated that the facility has a very high sensitivity owing to the fact that the site is located near a potential temporarily or permanently inhabited residence, slopes of between 1:4 and 1:10 and mountain tops and high ridges. Refer to **Appendix 1** for the full site sensitivity verification report.

Based on the Site Sensitivity Verification assessment, undertaken in Appendix 1, it was found that the sensitivity of the visual environment for the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is confirmed to be **moderate** due to:

- The avoidance of placement of turbines on any steep slopes, mountain tops or ridges
- Location of a homestead (not permanently occupied) within the 1.2km shadow flicker buffer
- Low occurrence of homesteads within 5km
- Low VAC of the receiving environment
- The placement of the development within the Beaufort REDZ
- Scenic R61 arterial road located more than 1km but within 2.5km
- Limited existing built infrastructure within the study area

Overall, the significance of the visual impacts associated with the proposed **Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 is expected to be high** as a result of the generally undeveloped character of the landscape. The facility would be visible within an area that contains certain sensitive visual receptors who could consider visual exposure to this type of infrastructure to be intrusive. Such visual receptors include people travelling along the national, arterial and secondary roads, as well as, residents of rural homesteads and tourists passing through or holidaying in the region.

According to the Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) Guideline for Involving Visual and Aesthetic Specialists in the EIA Process (Oberholzer, 2005), the criteria that determine whether or not a visual impact constitutes a potential fatal flaw are categorised as follows:

1. Non-compliance with Acts, Ordinances, By-laws and adopted policies relating to visual pollution, scenic routes, special areas or proclaimed heritage sites.
2. Non-compliance with conditions of existing Records of Decision.
3. Impacts that may be evaluated to be of high significance and that are considered by the majority of the stakeholders and decision-makers to be unacceptable.

In terms of the above and to the knowledge of the author the proposed development is compliant with all Acts, Ordinances, By-laws and adopted policies relating to visual pollution, scenic routes, special areas or proclaimed heritage sites, as well as, conditions of existing Records of Decisions.

Since no reported objections from stakeholders or decision-makers within the region have been communicated by the EAP to the author of this report, this assessment has adopted a risk averse approach by assuming that the perception of most (if not all) of the sensitive visual receptors (bar the landowners of the properties earmarked for the development), would be predominantly negative towards the development of a WEF in the region. While keeping in mind that there are also likely to be supporters of the Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 (as renewable energy generation is a global priority) amongst the population of the larger region, but they are largely expected to be indifferent to the construction of the WEF and not as vocal in their support for the wind farm as the detractors thereof.

Therefore, with the information available to the specialist at the time of writing this report, it cannot be empirically determined that the statistical majority of objecting stakeholders were exceeded. If evidence to the contrary surfaces during the progression of the development application, the specialist reserves the right to revise the statement below.

In spite of the predominantly high residual ratings (as assessed in **Section** Error! Reference source not found.) and the likelihood that the proposed development will be met with concern and objections from some of the affected sensitive receptors and landowners in the region, this report cannot categorically state that any of the above conditions were transgressed. As such these visual impacts are not considered to be fatal flaws for a development of this nature. It is, therefore, suggested that the proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1 as per the assessed layout be supported from a visual perspective, subject to the implementation of the suggested best practice mitigation measures, as provided in this report.

## 11. MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME

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

Table 13: Management programme – Planning.

**OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the planning of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1.**

<b>Project Component/s</b>	The WEF and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. turbines, access roads, substations and workshop).	
<b>Potential Impact</b>	Primary visual impact of the facility due to the presence of the turbines and associated infrastructure as well as the visual impact of lighting at night.	
<b>Activity/Risk Source</b>	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site (i.e. within 5-10km of the site) as well as within the region.	
<b>Mitigation: Target/Objective</b>	Optimal planning of infrastructure to minimise visual impact.	
<b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
Retain and maintain natural and / or cultivated vegetation in all areas outside of	Project proponent/ design consultant/ Engineering,	Early in the planning phase.

the development footprint, but within the project site.	Procurement and Construction (EPC) contractor	
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/EPC contractor	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/EPC contractor	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 correct specification and placement of lighting and light fixtures for the WEF and the ancillary infrastructure. The following is recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Install aircraft warning lights that only activate when an aircraft is detected (CAA regulations/conditions permitting, where deemed feasible).</li> <li>Limit aircraft warning lights for the proposed WEF to the turbines on the perimeter, thereby reducing the overall requirement (CAA regulations/conditions permitting).</li> <li>Shield the sources of light by physical barriers (walls, vegetation, or the structure itself);</li> <li>Limit mounting heights of fixtures, or use foot-lights or bollard lights;</li> <li>Make use of minimum lumen or wattage in fixtures;</li> <li>Making use of down-lighters or shielded fixtures;</li> <li>Make use of Low-Pressure Sodium lighting or other low impact lighting.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>	Project proponent/design consultant/EPC contractor	Early in the planning phase.
<b>Performance Indicator</b>	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 5-10km) and within the region.	
<b>Monitoring</b>	Not applicable.	

Table 14: Management programme – Construction.

**OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the construction of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1.**

<b>Project Component/s</b>	Construction site and activities		
<b>Potential Impact</b>	Visual impact of general construction activities, and the potential scarring of the landscape due to vegetation clearing and resulting erosion.		
<b>Activity/Risk Source</b>	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.		
<b>Mitigation: Target/Objective</b>	Minimal visual intrusion by construction activities and intact vegetation cover outside of immediate construction work areas.		
<b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	

Ensure that vegetation is not unnecessarily cleared or removed during the construction period.	Project proponent/ EPC contractor	Early in the construction phase.
Reduce the construction period through careful logistical planning and productive implementation of resources.	Project proponent/ EPC contractor	Early in the construction 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/ EPC contractor	Early in and throughout the construction phase.
Restrict the activities and movement of construction workers and vehicles to the immediate construction site and existing access roads.	Project proponent/ EPC 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/ EPC contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Reduce and control construction dust through the use of approved dust suppression techniques as and when required (i.e. whenever dust becomes apparent).	Project proponent/ EPC contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Restrict construction activities to daylight hours in order to negate or reduce the visual impacts associated with lighting.	Project proponent/ EPC contractor	Throughout the construction phase.
Rehabilitate all disturbed areas, construction areas, servitudes etc. immediately after the completion of construction works. If necessary, an ecologist should be consulted to assist or give input into rehabilitation specifications.	Project proponent/ EPC contractor	Throughout and at the end of the construction phase.
<b>Performance Indicator</b>	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.	
<b>Monitoring</b>	Monitoring of vegetation clearing during construction (by contractor as part of the 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 15: Management programme – Operation.

**OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the operation of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1.**

<b>Project Component/s</b>	The WEF and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. turbines, access roads, substations and workshop).	
<b>Potential Impact</b>	Visual impact of facility degradation (including operational wind turbines) and vegetation rehabilitation failure.	
<b>Activity/Risk Source</b>	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.	
<b>Mitigation: Target/Objective</b>	Well maintained and neat facility.	
<b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>
Maintain the general appearance of the facility as a whole, including the turbines, servitudes and the ancillary buildings.	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.
<b>Performance Indicator</b>	Well maintained and neat facility with intact vegetation on and in the vicinity of the facility.	

<b>Monitoring</b>	Monitoring of the entire site on an ongoing basis (by operator).
-------------------	--

Table 16: Management programme – Decommissioning.

**OBJECTIVE: The mitigation and possible negation of visual impacts associated with the decommissioning of the Proposed Aberdeen Wind Facility 1.**

<b>Project Component/s</b>	The WEF and ancillary infrastructure (i.e. turbines, access roads, substations and workshop).		
<b>Potential Impact</b>	Visual impact of residual visual scarring and vegetation rehabilitation failure.		
<b>Activity/Risk Source</b>	The viewing of the above mentioned by observers on or near the site.		
<b>Mitigation: Target/Objective</b>	Only the infrastructure required for post decommissioning use of the site retained and rehabilitated vegetation in all disturbed areas.		
<b>Mitigation: Action/control</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	
Remove infrastructure not required for the post-decommissioning use of the site. This may include the turbines, substations, ancillary buildings, masts etc.	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.	
<b>Performance Indicator</b>	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.		
<b>Monitoring</b>	Monitoring of rehabilitated areas quarterly for at least a year following decommissioning.		

## 12. REFERENCES / DATA SOURCES

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.*

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

DEA, 2014. *National Land-cover Database 2013-14 (NLC2013-14).*

DEA, 2019. *South African Protected Areas Database (SAPAD\_OR\_2019\_Q4).*

DEA, 2020. *South African Renewable Energy EIA Application Database (REEA\_OR\_2020\_Q3).*

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 Western Cape Province.*

<https://www.windpowerengineering.com/projects/site-assessment/assessing-cumulative-visual-impacts-for-wind-projects/>

<http://www.pinchercreekecho.com/2015/04/29/md-of-pincher-creek-takes-on-wind-turbine-lights>

Landscape Institute, 2018. *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*.

LUC (Environmental Planning, Design and Management), 2014. *Cumulative Landscape and Visual Assessment of Wind Energy in Caithness*.

NASA, 2018. *Earth Observing System Data and Information System (EOSDIS)*.

