



**BASIC ASSESSMENT (BA) FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THE BEAUFORT WEST RADIO MAST, LOCATED ON THE AUTHORISED BEAUFORT WEST CLUSTER OF WIND DEVELOPMENTS (14-12-16-3-3-2-925-1 / 12-12-20-1784-2) IN THE WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE**

**MINUTES OF PRE-APPLICATION MEETING (MICROSOFT TEAMS) WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING (DEA&DP)**

<b>DATE:</b>	19 September 2022
<b>TIME:</b>	11H00 – 12H00
<b>VENUE:</b>	Microsoft Teams
<b>PROJECT:</b>	Basic Assessment (BA) for the Proposed development of the Beaufort West Radio Mast, located on the authorised Beaufort West cluster of wind developments (14-12-16-3-3-2-925-1 / 12-12-20-1784-2) in the Western Cape Province
<b>SLR COMPANY:</b>	SLR Consulting (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd (SLR)
<b>PROJECT NUMBER:</b>	720.13101.00018
<b>PURPOSE:</b>	<p>The purpose of the meeting was (please refer to Agenda attached in Pre-Application Meeting Request) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide an overview of the proposed Radio Mast project;</li><li>• Present the approach for the project being proposed;</li><li>• Present &amp; confirm the approach for specialist input / assessment &amp; work to be undertaken as part of the application for EA;</li><li>• Present an overview of the public participation process to be undertaken (i.e., how I&amp;APs / stakeholders are to be engaged);</li><li>• Confirm any technical and process related queries; and</li><li>• Confirm the approach for the BA Process &amp; way forward.</li></ul>

<b>ATTENDANCE<sup>1</sup>:</b>	<p><b>SLR Consulting (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd ('SLR') – Environmental Consultant</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liandra Scott-Shaw (LSS) – Associate Environmental Consultant</li> <li>Katherine Wiles (KW) – Associate Environmental Consultant</li> <li>Humayrah Bassa (HB) - Associate Environmental Consultant (Registered EAP : 2019/1272)</li> <li>Andisiwe Mkhize (AM) – Environmental Consultant</li> </ul> <p><b>Apologies:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stuart Heather-Clark – Power Lead and EAP</li> </ul> <p><b>Beaufort West Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd – Applicant</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephan Jacobs (SJ) - Junior Development Executive</li> </ul>	<p><b>Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&amp;DP) – Competent Authority</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Danie Swanepoel (DS) – Deputy Director</li> <li>Malcolm Fredericks (MF) - Control Environmental Officer</li> <li>Dorien Werth (DW) - Case Officer</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	---	---

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<b>1</b>	<b>Agenda, Project Team and Applicant Details and Overview of Proposed Projects</b>		
<b>1.1</b>	<b><u>Welcome, Agenda and Project Team Details</u></b>		
1.1.1	<p>Katherine Wiles (KW) from SLR Consulting (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd ('SLR') opened the meeting, gave a brief introduction, and allowed the meeting attendees to introduce themselves.</p> <p>KW explained that the applicant is a special purpose vehicle (SPV); namely Beaufort West Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd, and that they are a subsidiary of Mainstream, represented by Mr Stephan Jacobs (SJ) at this meeting.</p>	<p>Refer to attached Presentation.</p> <p>Comments and/or queries were raised at the end of the presentation and are responded to further below.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> A copy of the attendance register is included in **Appendix 1**.

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>With regards to specialist input / assessments, since the proposed radio mast will be placed on an authorised linking station footprint (14-12-16-3-2-925-1 / 12-12-20-1784-2), SLR has consulted with the original specialists who undertook assessments for the authorised linking station. Most have confirmed that the proposed radio mast will not change their original impact assessments. This will be discussed further with WC DEA&amp;DP in the presentation.</p> <p>The key points of discussion are included in the sections below.</p>		
<b>1.2</b>	<p><b><u>Presentation – Project Overview &amp; Location</u></b></p>		
1.2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW gave a summary of the proposed radio mast project with the following key aspects:</li> <li>• Beaufort West Wind Farm are proposing to install one (1) radio mast of up to 90 metres in height, on an authorized linking substation footprint.</li> <li>• KW showed with the use of a locality map, that the proposed site for the radio mast falls within the authorised Beaufort West Cluster of Wind Farms, located near the town of Beaufort West.</li> <li>• The radio mast is required by Eskom Holdings Ltd. (Eskom) to provide communication via radio frequency to other linking stations in the area.</li> <li>• KW shared the technical components of a typical radio mast. It is proposed that the applicant will use a tapered steel lattice structure with either a four leg or a three-leg structure.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Post-meeting note from Applicant:</u></b></p> <p>The requirements/specifications for the radio tower being proposed is what was requested by Eskom, based on their requirements / standards. There are no design / technology alternatives for the radio tower as the applicant was provided with the Scope of Works (SoW) for the radio tower from Eskom and must adhere to this (applicant must adhere to Eskom Standard).</p>	
<b>1.3</b>	<p><b><u>Presentation – Overview of Authorised Beaufort West Cluster</u></b></p>		
1.3.1	<p>KW provided an overview of the Environmental Authorisations (EAs) which have been issued for the project site and associated</p>		

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>amendments granted for the Beaufort West Wind Farm Cluster of developments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>March 2012:</b> Authorisation of the larger wind farm, namely the Beaufort West Wind Farm (<u>12-12-20-1784</u>).</li> <li>• <b>2017:</b> The wind farm was split into the Beaufort West and Trakas Wind Farms (<u>12-12-20-1784-1</u> &amp; <u>12-12-20-1784-2</u>).</li> <li>• <b>January 2017:</b> Supporting powerlines, linking station &amp; onsite substation infrastructure authorised for both respective wind farms (<u>14-12-16-3-2-925</u>).</li> <li>• <b>March 2020:</b> EAs amended to increase the turbine hub heights and rotor diameters (Beaufort West Wind Farm: <u>12-12-20-1784-1-AM5</u> &amp; Trakas Wind Farm: <u>12-12-20-1784-1-AM1</u>).</li> <li>• <b>March 2020:</b> Administrative changes as well in terms of changing the holder of the EA, adding Battery Energy Storage Facilities and brief project description changes (Beaufort West Wind Farm: <u>12-12-20-1784-1-AM2</u> &amp; Trakas Wind Farm: <u>12-12-20-1784-2-AM2</u>).</li> <li>• <b>April 2021:</b> The authorisation was split and assigned each substation and power line to the respective wind farms (<u>14-12-16-3-2-925-1</u> &amp; <u>14-12-16-3-2-925-2</u>).</li> <li>• <b>May 2022:</b> Beaufort West Wind Farm recently received EAs for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>14/1216/3/3/1/2464</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Additional 33/132 kilovolt (kV) onsite Substation</li> <li>– One (1) Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)</li> <li>– One (1) laydown area</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.4	<p><b><u>Presentation – Legal Opinion and Proposed Process</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW indicated that the radio mast project only triggers one (1) listed activity under Listing Notice 3 (<i>The development of masts or towers of any material or type used for telecommunication broadcasting or radio transmission purposes where the mast or tower— a) is to be placed on a site not previously used for this purpose; and (b) will exceed 15 metres in height. (i) Western Cape (i.) All areas outside urban areas; ) and as such, a Basic Assessment (BA) process would be followed.</i>)</li> <li>• The project is linked to the Beaufort West and Trakas Wind Farms (<u>12-12-20-1784-1</u> &amp; <u>12-12-20-1784-2</u>), which are both Strategic Infrastructure Projects (SIPs). KW requested guidance from WC DEA&amp;DP to confirm whether this project would be reduced to the 57 day decision making timeframe.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to responses provided by WC DEA&amp;DP.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note from Applicant:</b> The Beaufort West Wind Farm (12-12-20-1784-1-AM2) and Trakas Wind Farm (12-12-20-1784-2-AM2) received Preferred Bidder status as part of the Round 5 Renewable Energy Producer Independent Power Procurement Programme (REIPPPP). These wind farms have now become Strategic Infrastructure Projects (SIPs) (i.e., SIPs 8 and 10) and therefore a reduced 57-day decision-making timeframe for the competent authority is now applicable. SIPs 8 and</p>	<p>MF from WC DEA&amp;DP raised concern over the 57 day decision making timeframe and indicated that they currently do not have the capacity to review in 57 days.</p> <p>WC DEA&amp;DP have however confirmed that a pre-application process circulation of the Draft BAR will not be required, given the timeframes.</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KW also requested clarity from WC DEA&amp;DP regarding their pre-application phase, which she understands is not a mandatory process. Due to the project being linked to SIPs, it's critical that the pre-application phase not be undertaken since this would delay the project further.</li> </ul>	<p>10 target the development of sustainable green energy initiatives in support of the South African economy and the expansion of electricity transmission and distribution networks respectively.</p>	
<b>1.5</b>	<p><b>Presentation – DFFE Screening Tool Results</b></p>		
1.5.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>KW emphasized that the linking substation on which this radio mast will be placed has been <b>authorised already (14-12-16-3-3-2-925-1 / 12-12-20-1784-2), and that the footprint has been assessed extensively by specialists.</b></li> <li>The DFFE screening tool results showed High sensitivity in terms of Animal species and Very High in terms of the Palaeontology Theme and Terrestrial Biodiversity Theme.</li> <li>The Terrestrial Biodiversity theme was flagging as Very High as it falls very partially within an Ecological Support Area (ESA) 2.</li> <li>The High sensitivity for Animal Species was due to the potential presence of the Ludwig's Bustard, Martial Eagle, and Southern Black Korhaan and Medium sensitivity for Riverine Rabbit, and Karoo Padloper.</li> <li>KW explained that it's not 100% certain the exact location of the radio mast at this stage, and as such the substation footprint was provided as a worst-case scenario for the screening tool (since it covers a larger area).</li> </ul>	<p>Danie Swanepoel (DS) from WC DEA&amp;DP suggested that the Screening Tool be re-run on the exact location of the authorised linking substation.</p>	<p><b>Post meeting note from EAP:</b> The suggestion has been noted and the screening tool will be re-run on the exact location of the authorised linking substation. The screening tool report will be submitted as part of the application.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note from Applicant:</b> Although the exact location of the radio mast is not certain at this stage (since the substation footprint covers a larger area), it will be constructed on top of the authorised linking substation.</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<b>1.6</b> 1.6.1	<p><b>Presentation – Specialist Input</b></p> <p>KW emphasized that the EAP would like to motivate to <u>not</u> undertake extensive specialist studies, since the project area has been assessed extensively and timing is critical for the applicant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Therefore, the requirement of any further field-based screening or site investigations by specialists is not anticipated, as the radio mast will be constructed on an approved project site which has previously been assessed by those specialists and has received authorisation.</li> <li>• It is proposed that specialists involved in the original BA process provide input into the proposed radio mast development               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ by way of motivational cover letters (specifically visual/avifauna)</li> <li>○ Other specialist input will form part of original studies, and will be submitted as part of this radio mast application (where applicable)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• KW enquired whether additional site investigations will be required by WC DEA&amp;DP, given the site history.</li> </ul>		
<b>1.7</b>	<p><b>Presentation – Public Participation Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW noted that written notifications using existing databases for that area would be provided and that a substantial Interested and/or Affected Parties (I&amp;APs)/Stakeholder database for the area already exists. In addition, potential new I&amp;APs/stakeholders would be obtained / provided an opportunity to register,</li> </ul>	<p>No additional suggestions in terms of potential stakeholders and key commenting authorities provided by WC DEA&amp;DP.</p>	

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.8	<p>through the placement of newspaper adverts (local) and site notices.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KW showed a list of potential stakeholders and key commenting authorities and welcomed additional suggestions by WC DEA&amp;DP.</li> </ul>		
1.4.1	<p><b>Presentation – Discussion/Questions</b></p> <p>KW opened the session for discussion and/or questions.</p>		
1.4.2	<p>DS stated that he understood the radio mast was required by Eskom for the Wind Farm development. He enquired whether the radio mast would only be developed/constructed once the Wind Farm is developed, or whether it will be constructed as a first phase.</p>		<p>Liandra Scott-Shaw (LSS) from SLR responded and explained that the radio masts are usually included on the linking stations or substations, and it is normally constructed after construction of the linking stations/substations. Eskom more recently require this as part of the authorization when it gets transferred over to them after construction.</p> <p>The radio mast would normally be constructed after the substation is constructed, and before it goes into operation. It is a requirement for the Main Transmission Substation (MTS) to function.</p> <p>It was also discussed that certain provinces had different requirements in terms of the triggering of radio mast activities.</p> <p>DS explained that in his understanding, it applies in the WC province, in all areas outside urban areas. The fact that there will be a linking station doesn't make it an urban area. Another exclusion would have been if it's placed on a site previously used for that purpose.</p>



NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.4.3	DS explained that the themes the DFFE Screening Tool generates is dependent on the activity included. He suggested to re-run the screening tool using activity 3 of Listing Notice 3 (see Row 1.5.1).		LSS confirmed that the screening tool was run for the radio mast specific activity. As mentioned, the screening tool will be re-run on the exact location of the authorised linking substation and the screening tool report will be submitted as part of the application (see Row 1.5.1).
1.4.4	DS enquired whether the results of sensitivities identified in the screening tool for the radio mast were different from the wind farm.		LSS stated that the wind farm within which the radio mast will be constructed was authorised before the screening tool existed, however, the EAP recently ran the tool for powerlines and 33/132kV substations. The results were similar. The location of powerlines and substations investigated indicated high sensitivity for palaeontology rather than very high because they are offset by a couple of kilometres.
1.4.5	DS recommended that it was necessary for the specialist that compiled the original specialist reports to confirm the findings of the Screening Tool for the proposed addition of the radio mast.		LSS explained that the proposed addition of the radio mast had been discussed with the specialists as they had been on site recently for other powerline and substation and substation developments on the same site (for a separate on-going part 2 amendment process).  The specialists would prefer to not undertake any compliance statements since this has no bearing on the fact that the area has already been authorized for the linking station. Therefore, themes such as Agriculture, Animal and Aquatic have all been extensively assessed and approved.  The only two (2) specialists who have been asked to compile a letter or compliance statement include the Visual specialist (since the mast is the tallest thing on the MTS) and the Avifauna specialist. While the radio mast doesn't propose a risk as far as collision and

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>electrocution (for avifauna), it could be a favourable habitat for some birds to nest, in which case the specialist may recommend anti-perching devices on the radio mast (to be confirmed).</p> <p>LSS further discussed that in this regard, it would be best to obtain official input from the Visual and Avifauna specialists.</p> <p>LSS enquired whether the department agreed with their proposed process to obtain letters from the Visual and Avifauna specialists.</p> <p>LSS further explained that the applicant had already received civil aviation permits from the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) and that they have also received input from Heritage Western Cape (HWC), as well as input from the South African National Defence Force. No issues have been raised by these stakeholders to date, however, they will be provided with an opportunity to comment (if required) as part of the BA process for the radio mast.</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.4.6	DS further explained that if the reports were done for the same site, they can be used again if they are updated for the proposed activity.	LSS enquired whether it was possible to append the original documentation of studies already done. The last time they were looked at was 2019.  LSS further enquired whether it was possible to obtain a comment letter from the relevant specialists which contain the project description and confirmation whether the specialists agree. Any additional mitigation will also be added, should this be required.	DS agreed and confirmed that the EAP could use the comment letters containing the description of the additional proposed development and confirmation from the specialists who undertook the study that the findings are still relevant.
1.4.7	LSS enquired whether Site Sensitivity Verification Reports (SSVRs) along with the comment letter would be required, or whether the comment letter along with the original reports would be sufficient? She was enquiring from a legal compliance perspective.		DS stated that the screening tool report and SSVRs will have to be done, as these will be the motivation for why the compliance statement and new specialist studies wouldn't need to be undertaken.  DS further explained that the Department would respond to this in writing and advise on the way forward. DS also noted that if the specialist had been to site, they should be able to compile the SSVR.
1.4.8	DS enquired whether the letter from CAA was specifically for the radio mast.  DS requested that comments from the CAA and HWC be obtained in writing for the project.		LSS explained that the letter from CAA was for the wind farm and all the related infrastructure. LSS had however previously discussed this project verbally with Liezel Stroh (SA CAA) and it was communicated that she felt it wouldn't be an issue, as they had permitted for the wind farm. LSS mentioned that CAA would however be consulted as part of the public participation process.

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.4.9	<p>Malcom Fredericks (MF) from the WC DEA&amp;DP emphasized that the SSVR wasn't included in the submitted Notice of Intent (NOI). He requested that it be included.</p> <p>MF raised his concern for the visual impacts, considering the proximity of the radio mast from the N12. He stated that reliance must not only be on the specialist's statement but should be guided by from I&amp;APs/stakeholders. The EAP/applicant is advised to obtain their opinion on the potential visual impact of the radio mast, as the Karoo is a scenic, open, wide stretched landscape. MF explained that this was to thoroughly deal with any potential concerns in that respect, because that will also pose the question regarding the need and desirability.</p>		<p>LSS and KW agreed that although confirmation had been received verbally, the EAP will attempt to obtain this in writing.</p> <p>LSS agreed on visual intrusions needing to be investigated. She also explained that turbines at hub height will be approximately 200 meters in height, with the turbine blades further on top of that. Therefore the 90-metre radio mast is small in comparison to the rest of the facility within which it will be constructed and will be dwarfed by the other infrastructure. LSS however further stated that the specialists will revise the original impact assessment, should this be required.</p>
1.4.10	<p>MF further enquired whether the radio mast was needed for the wind farm to be operational, or whether it was an additional requirement? MF also enquired whether alternative communication methods can be considered as alternatives?</p>		<p>LSS explained that she was not too familiar with the technicalities around the mast, but as mentioned it was a requirement from Eskom to allow communication.</p> <p>LSS noted that there were no alternative communication methods at this stage. She mentioned that when she was on site, she saw many of these masts on MTSs, so there doesn't seem to be an alternative communication method. This can be confirmed.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note from Applicant:</b> The requirements/specifications for the radio mast being proposed is what was requested by Eskom, based on their requirements/standards. This is based on</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>specific requirements following a communications study undertaken by Eskom.</p> <p>There are no design/technology alternatives for the radio mast as the applicant was provided with the Scope of Works (SoW) for the radio mast from Eskom and must adhere to this (applicant must adhere to Eskom Standard). Eskom advised that the mast needs to be at least 85 metres in height</p> <p>It should be noted that there is no fibre on the Eskom line and no fibre alternatives, and therefore the requested mast needs to be a radio mast.</p> <p>There will be no guy wires used and the radio mast will be a self-supporting structure.</p>
1.4.11	<p>Stephan Jacobs (SJ) from Mainstream (applicant) added that it is his understanding that this was a specific request from Eskom. He wasn't certain if Eskom have insisted on using the type of radio mast, but on other projects it has been a standard radio mast, like what is being proposed for this project. Therefore, it might be an Eskom standard that has been requested, however, this will be confirmed, and confirmation will be added as part of the minutes – <b>See Row 1.4.10 above for confirmation from the applicant regarding the radio mast design/technology</b></p>		<p>MF confirmed that he was satisfied with this, and that the department are looking at the merits of each application.</p> <p>MF further stated that he took note of the height of the turbines for the authorised wind farm, however, cumulative impacts must be assessed and reported on for the infrastructure added to existing establishments as well as whether anything can be mitigated. MF added that the department would also see what comes out from the public participation process for the radio mast.</p>
1.4.12	<p>MF enquired about the newspaper advert and requested clarity on exactly what report needs to be advertised, as according to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, it should be the Draft Basic Assessment Report (DBAR) and <u>not</u> the</p>		<p>KW in response stated that the EAP would advertise the BA process for the radio mast and the circulation of the DBAR for comment, as well as allow further canvassing of potential I&amp;APs/stakeholders to be registered on the</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<p>Background Information Document (BID). It was emphasized that all potential parties must have the opportunity to participate in the process and not only those registered.</p> <p>Dorien Werth (DW) from the WC DEA&amp;DP agreed and asked for clarity on the public participation process, specifically clarity on what will be advertised in the newspaper.</p>		<p>database. All potential I&amp;APs/stakeholders will thus be provided the opportunity to participate in the process, and not only those registered on the database.</p>
1.4.13	<p>KW indicated that because the radio mast is being constructed on an already authorised linking substation, there is no need for the EAP/applicant to investigate full alternatives as part of the BA Process, however, it is understood that in terms of the legislative requirements alternatives must be investigated.</p>	<p><b>See Row 1.4.10 above for confirmation from the applicant regarding the radio mast design/technology</b></p>	<p>DS explained that it is important to consider alternatives in order to avoid potential impacts. He gave the example of visual impacts which may be a significant impact.</p> <p>DS mentioned that he did not know where the project site for the radio mast was in relation to the turbines but noticed from the map that it wasn't far from the internal road.</p> <p>DS enquired whether it was feasible/ possible to place the radio mast somewhere else (in another location), where it will have lesser of a visual impact? DS further enquired whether the mast had to be 90m high, or whether it could be lower?</p> <p>KW discussed that the EAP would consider this and address it as part of the BA Report, such as, for example, looking at possible designs which may be visually less intrusive than others.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note from Applicant:</b> As mentioned in Row 1.4.10, the requirements/specifications for the radio mast being proposed is what was requested by Eskom, based on their requirements/standards. There are no</p>






NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
			<p>design/technology alternatives for the radio mast as the applicant was provided with the SoW for the radio mast from Eskom and must adhere to this (applicant must adhere to Eskom Standard). Eskom advised that the mast needs to be at least 85 metres in height and thus it cannot be lower than this</p> <p>It should be noted that there is no fibre on the Eskom line and no fibre alternatives, and therefore the requested mast needs to be a radio mast. In addition, there will be no guy wires used and the radio mast will be a self-supporting structure.</p>
1.4.14	<p>MF requested that a motivation for why the no-go option is not considered must be included as part of the BA Report.</p>		<p>The request was duly noted. The EAP will ensure that a motivation for not considering the no-go option is included as part of the BA Report.</p>
1.4.15	<p>KW emphasized that in terms of infrastructure services, there will be no additional services required. All authorized buildings will be used. KW noted that the project did not trigger a Water Use License Application (WULA), whoever, comments from the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) will be obtained in that regard as part of the BA process.</p>	<p>DS enquired whether the access road to the site crossed any water courses?</p>	<p>KW clarified that the access road is not part of this project, and that it has already received authorization as part of another project on the same site. Beaufort West Wind Farm (12-12-20-1784-1-AM2)</p>
1.4.16	<p>KW enquired whether the Department could confirm if a pre-application process for this project would be required.</p>		<p>MF agreed that a pre-application process for this project would not be required and confirmed that he was comfortable with this.</p> <p>MF raised a concern about the reference made to the 57 day decision making timeframe. MF stated that the department have capacity constraints at this stage, as everything on their desk at the moment is a priority. MF further added that he was not sure to what extent they would be able to comply with the 57 day timeframe.</p>

NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.5	<p><b>Way Forward and Closure</b></p> <p>KW closed the meeting by summarizing that the proposed radio mast project will be treated as a normal application and BA process and as such, the intention is to submit the application form and BA Report to the DEA&amp;DP once input from the specialists have been received. The following has been noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The screening tool would be re-run for the radio mast location specifically on LN3 trigger, to provide confirmation in terms of the specialist requirements.</li> <li>• Input in terms of comment letters or Site Sensitivity Verification Reports (SSVRs) would be obtained from the relevant specialists.</li> <li>• Clarity on design alternatives to be sought (<b>see Row 1.4.10 for information in this regard</b>) and information regarding alternatives to be provided as part of BA Report.</li> </ul>		<p><b>Post meeting note from Applicant:</b> As mentioned, the Beaufort West Wind Farm (12-12-20-1784-1-AM2) and Trakas Wind Farm (12-12-20-1784-2-AM2) received Preferred Bidder status as part of the Round 5 REIPPPP and these wind farms have now become SIPs (i.e., SIPs 8 and 10). Construction of the larger wind farm development (which the radio mast forms part of) should therefore not result in further delays. The applicant is aware that the department has time constraints, however, would appreciate urgency with regards to the decision-making period.</p>



NO.	NOTES	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regards to the public participation process, the process in terms of the legislation will be followed.</li> </ul> <p>Meeting ended at 11:55am</p>		

## APPROVAL OF FINAL MEETING MINUTES

Name and Surname	Organisation	Role	Signature for approval of minutes	Date
Liandra Scott-Shaw	SLR Consulting (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd ('SLR') – Environmental Consultant	Associate Environmental Consultant		20 October 2022
Katherine Wiles		Associate Environmental Consultant		20 October 2022
Humayrah Bassa		Associate Environmental Consultant: Registered EAP (2019/1272)		20 October 2022
Andisiwe Mkhize		Environmental Consultant		18 October 2022
Stephan Jacobs	Beaufort West Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd - Applicant	Junior Development Executive		18 October 2022
Danie Swanepoel	Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) – Competent Authority	Deputy Director		
Malcom Fredericks		Control Environmental Officer		
Dorien Werth		Case Officer		