



Simon Todd Pr.Sci.Nat
 Director & Principle Scientist
 C: 082 3326502
 Simon.Todd@3foxes.co.za
 23 De Villiers Road
 Kommetjie
 7975

Ecological Solutions for
 People & the Environment

3Foxes Biodiversity Solutions
 23 De Villiers Road
 Kommetjie
 7975
 10 August 2021

ATT: Jo-Anne Thomas
 Savannah Environmental

RE: Poortjies WEF – Part 2 Amendment Application

Mainstream South Africa is proposing changes to the turbine specifications at the Poortjies Wind Energy Facility near Pofadder. As part of the required part II amendment process, Savannah Environmental has requested comment from 3Foxes Biodiversity Solutions regarding the potential terrestrial biodiversity implications of the proposed changes, which are detailed below.

Scope & Background to the Proposed Amendments

The following layout and turbine changes are proposed for the Poortjies WEF:

Component	Approved	Amendment
Number of Turbines	50 turbines	24 turbines
Rotor/blade diameter	140m	Up to 200m
Hub height	140m	Up to 200m
Blade tip height	-	300m

Scope of the Amendment

In order to address the above proposed changes to the authorised layout of the development, this amendment statement letter provides an evaluation of the ecological impacts associated with the development with regards to the following:

1. An assessment of all impacts related to the proposed change, including a comparison with those impacts predicted in the EIA.
2. Advantages and disadvantages associated with the proposed change
3. Measures to ensure avoidance, management and mitigation of impacts associated with the proposed change
4. Any changes to the EMP

1. An assessment of all impacts related to the proposed change, including a comparison with those impacts predicted in the EIA.

The revised layout is similar to the original layout in terms of the location of access roads and turbine locations. In addition, the change in turbine specifications would not increase the overall footprint of the development as compared to that already authorised. In addition, there are not likely to be any new or novel impacts on terrestrial ecology associated with the change in turbine specifications. As such, there would not be any changes to the impacts as originally assessed.

2. Advantages and disadvantages associated with the proposed change

The changes to the layout would not entail any significant ecological advantages or disadvantages for the development. The lower number of turbines would be advantageous in some respects, but this would be largely offset by the increase in the rotor diameter. With the result that these two changes are likely to largely cancel one another out, with little net overall change in impact. Consequently, there are no significant advantages or disadvantages of the changes that would affect the impacts of the development as assessed.

3. Measures to ensure avoidance, management and mitigation of impacts associated with the proposed change

The changes to the layout are within the original assessed development footprint and would not result in any new, novel or increased impacts. As such, there are no additional changes to the mitigation and avoidance measures that were recommended and in the original study. In addition, the cumulative impacts associated with the amendment are considered to be the same as those as assessed and thus there would be no changes to the overall cumulative impacts associated with the changes. All of the mitigation and avoidance measures as recommended in the EIA are held up by the current study and should be applicable to the amendment as well.

4. Any changes to the EMP

There are no recommended changes to the EMP and all of the mitigation and avoidance measures as recommended in the EIA are applicable to the amended layouts.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The change to the layout and turbine specifications for the Poortjies Wind Energy Facility would not generate novel impacts or increase the severity of existing impacts associated with the Poortjies WEF. No additional mitigation or avoidance measures, beyond those already recommended in the EIA study are required for the amendment. As such, there are no reasons to oppose the proposed amendment and it can therefore be supported from an ecological point of view.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Simon Todd". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial 'S' and a distinct 'T'.

Simon Todd

Director

3Foxes Biodiversity Solutions
