APPENDIX H: Impact Rating Procedure & Summary

Impact Rating Procedure

The significance of an impact is defined as a combination of the consequence of the impact occurring and the probability that the impact will occur. The criteria used to determine impact consequences are presented in Table I-1 below.

Table I-1: Criteria used to determine the Consequence of the Impact

| Rating | Definition of Rating | Score | |
|---------------------|---|-------|--|
| A. Extent– the are | A. Extent– the area over which the impact will be experienced | | |
| None | | 0 | |
| Local | Confined to project or study area or part thereof (e.g. site) | 1 | |
| Regional | The region, which may be defined in various ways, e.g. cadastral, catchment, topographic | 2 | |
| (Inter) national | Nationally or beyond | 3 | |
| B. Intensity– the m | nagnitude of the impact in relation to the sensitivity of the receiving environment | | |
| None | | 0 | |
| Low | Site-specific and wider natural and/or social functions and processes are negligibly altered | 1 | |
| Medium | Site-specific and wider natural and/or social functions and processes continue albeit in a modified way | 2 | |
| High | Site-specific and wider natural and/or social functions or processes are severely altered | 3 | |
| C. Duration- the ti | me frame for which the impact will be experienced | • | |
| None | | 0 | |
| Short-term | Up to 2 years | 1 | |
| Medium-term | 2 to 15 years | 2 | |
| Long-term | More than 15 years | 3 | |

The combined score of these three criteria corresponds to a Consequence Rating, as follows:

Table I-2: Method used to determine the Consequence Score

| Combined Score (A+B+C) | 0 – 2 | 3 – 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 – 9 |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------|-----|--------|------|-----------|
| Consequence Rating | Not significant | Very low | Low | Medium | High | Very high |

Once the consequence has been derived, the probability of the impact occurring will be considered using the probability classifications presented in Table I-3.

Table I-3: Probability Classification

| Probability- | the likelihood of the impact occurring |
|--------------|--|
| Improbable | < 40% chance of occurring |
| Possible | 40% - 70% chance of occurring |

| Probability– the likelihood of the impact occurring | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| Probable | > 70% - 90% chance of occurring | |
| Definite | > 90% chance of occurring | |

The overall significance of impacts will be determined by considering consequence and probability using the rating system prescribed in the table below.

Table I-4: Impact Significance Ratings

| Significance Rating | Possible Impact Combinations | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|---|-------------|--|
| | Consequence | | Probability | |
| Insignificant | Very Low | & | Improbable | |
| | Very Low | & | Possible | |
| Very Low | Very Low | & | Probable | |
| | Very Low | & | Definite | |
| | Low | & | Improbable | |
| | Low | & | Possible | |
| Low | Low | & | Probable | |
| | Low | & | Definite | |
| | Medium | & | Improbable | |
| | Medium | & | Possible | |
| Medium | Medium | & | Probable | |
| | Medium | & | Definite | |
| | High | & | Improbable | |
| | High | & | Possible | |
| High | High | & | Probable | |
| | High | & | Definite | |
| | Very High | & | Improbable | |
| | Very High | & | Possible | |
| Very High | Very High | & | Probable | |
| | Very High | & | Definite | |

Finally, the impacts will also be considered in terms of their status (positive or negative impact) and the confidence in the ascribed impact significance rating. The system for considering impact status and confidence (in assessment) is laid out in the table below.

Table I-5: Impact status and confidence classification

| Status of impact | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Indication whether the impact is adverse (negative) or | + ve (positive – a 'benefit') | |
| beneficial (positive). | - ve (negative - a 'cost') | |
| Confidence of assessment | | |

| The degree of confidence in predictions based on available information, SRK's judgment and/or specialist knowledge. | Low |
|---|--------|
| | Medium |
| information, of the judgment and of openiation modge. | High |

The impact significance rating should be considered by authorities in their decision-making process based on the implications of ratings ascribed below:

Insignificant: the potential impact is negligible and will not have an influence on the decision regarding the proposed activity/development.

Very Low: the potential impact is very small and should not have any meaningful influence on the decision regarding the proposed activity/development.

Low: the potential impact may not have any meaningful influence on the decision regarding the proposed activity/development.

Medium: the potential impact should influence the decision regarding the proposed activity/development.

High: the potential impact will affect the decision regarding the proposed activity/development.

Very High: The proposed activity should only be approved under special circumstances.

Practicable mitigation measures will be recommended and impacts will be rated in the prescribed way both with and without the assumed effective implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures will be classified as either:

Essential: must be implemented and are non-negotiable; or

Optional: must be shown to have been considered and sound reasons provided by the proponent, if not implemented.

"No-Go" alternative

In the case of the "No-Go" alternative, no additional construction or clearing of vegetation would occur and the site would remain in its current condition until/ unless any other development is approved.

In most cases, the "No-Go" alternative approximates the baseline situation. In the sections assessing specific impacts below, the "No-Go" alternative is only assessed where the baseline descriptions do not fully capture current impacts.