

San Kraal Wind Power (Pty) Ltd

# **ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

for the

**Proposed 390MW San Kraal wind energy facility near  
Noupoort, Northern and Eastern Cape**



*Study done for:*



*Prepared by:*



P.O. Box 2047, Garsfontein East, 0060  
Tel: 012 – 004 0362, Fax: 086 – 621 0292, E-mail: [info@eares.co.za](mailto:info@eares.co.za)

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE**

Enviro-Acoustic Research (EARES) was contracted by Arcus Consulting (the consultant or EAP) to determine the potential noise impact on the surrounding environment due to the proposed development of the San Kraal WEF. This facility will be located on various farms just east of Noupoot in the Northern and Eastern Cape Province.

This report briefly describes ambient sound levels in the area, potential worst-case noise rating levels and the potential noise impacts that the facility may have on the surrounding sound environment, highlighting the methods used, potential issues identified, findings and recommendations.

This study considered local regulations and both local and international guidelines, using the terms of reference as proposed by SANS 10328:2008 to allow for a comprehensive Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA).

### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

San Kraal Wind Power (Pty) Ltd (the project company) proposes the establishment of a 390MW commercial Wind Energy Facility (WEF) and associated infrastructure on various farms just east of Noupoot in the Northern and Eastern Cape Province.

The proposed WEF would consist of up to 78 turbines, each with a generation capacity between 3 – 5 MW and a rotor diameter of up to 150 m, a hub height of up to 150 m and blade length of up to 75 m.

The developer has been evaluating several turbine models, however the selection will only be finalised at a later stage once a most optimal wind turbine are identified (factors such as meteorological data, price and financing options, guarantees and maintenance costs, etc.). As the noise propagation modelling requires the details of a wind turbine, it was selected to use the sound power emission levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 which would represent a worst-case scenario.

### **BASELINE ASSESSMENT**

Ambient sound levels were measured at a number of locations during April 2016. Three class-1 Sound Level Meters as well as a portable weather station was used for measurements. Two instruments were used for semi-continuous, longer measurements

(2 night-time periods) with one instrument used for shorter measurements (10 minutes each). The sound level meters would measure “average” sound levels over a time period, save the data and start with a new measurement till the instrument was stopped.

The data indicate that traffic is a major source of the noise in the area, but the road traffic will only influence the sound levels in an area up to 1,000m from the road. Away from the roads (N9 and N10), the area have a high potential to be very quiet during low wind conditions. Birds, faunal and wind-induced noises does influence sound levels and considering the data collected, wind-induced noises significantly influences sound levels as wind speeds increases.

As most of the area were considered naturally quiet, it was selected to assign an acceptable noise rating level of a rural noise district (as per SANS 10103:2008).

### **NOISE IMPACT DETERMINATION AND FINDINGS**

As most of the area were considered naturally quiet, it was selected to assign an acceptable noise rating level of a rural noise district (as per SANS 10103:2008). This allows daytime noise limits of 52 dBA with night-time noise limits of 42 dBA (during lower wind conditions as increased wind speeds would increase ambient sound levels).

The potential noise impact was evaluated using a sound propagation model. Conceptual scenarios were developed for a construction and operational phases. Using the precautionary principle, there may be a medium significance of a noise impact during the construction of OHL route alternative 1. The significance of the noise impact is low for the construction of the preferred and second alternative OHL route alignments (preferred route options in terms of acoustics).

The output of the construction and operational modelling indicated that there is low risk of a noise impact for most of the activities during the construction and operational phases (wind turbines construction and operation) and the project can be authorized from a noise perspective.

### **NEED AND DESIRABILITY OF PROJECT**

The proposed renewable power generation activities (worst-case evaluated) will raise the noise levels at a number of potential noise-sensitive developments slightly. There is no alternative location where the wind farm can be developed as the presence of a viable wind resource determines the viability of a commercial WEF. While the location cannot be move, the wind turbines within the WEF can be moved around, although this layout is the

result of numerous evaluations and modelling to identify the most economically feasible and environmentally friendly layout.

The proposed layout will result in increased se noises, but the noise levels will be low and are highly unlikely to impact on the quality of living for the surrounding receptors. In terms of acoustics, there is no benefit to the surrounding environment (closest receptors). The potential noise impacts are very low and the significance will be low.

The project will greatly assist in the provision of energy, which will allow further economic growth and development in South Africa and locally. The project will generate short and long-term employment and other business opportunities and promote renewable energy in South Africa and locally. People in the area that is not directly affected by increased noises will have a positive perception of the project and will see the need and desirability of the project.

### **MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION OF NOISE IMPACT**

Using the precautionary principle, there may be a medium significant of a noise impact during night-time construction of the OHL pylons (only for alternative 1 route option). Mitigation is available and proposed to ensure that any potential noise impacts are minimised during the construction phase should the developer prefer this option. No routine measurements are requires, but measurement frequencies and procedures are provided as a guideline for the developer to consider should there be any noise complaints.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The latest layout locates the wind-turbines further than 1,000m from the closest NSD, well further than 400m (as per the Strategic Initiative, Western Cape). Yet it is important that the potential noise impact be evaluated should the layout be changed with any wind turbines located closer than 1,000m from a confirmed NSD. While this project will have a noise impact on a number of the closest noise-sensitive receptors (layouts as reviewed), these impacts are of low significance and can be considered insignificant.

It is the opinion of the Author that the increases in noise levels are of minor low significance. It is therefore recommended that the project should be authorized (from a noise impact perspective).



## **CONTENTS OF THE SPECIALIST REPORT – CHECKLISTS**

<b>Contents of this report in terms of Regulation GNR 982 of 2014, Appendix 6</b>	<b>Cross-reference in this report</b>
(a) details of – the specialist who prepared the report; and the expertise of that specialist to compile a specialist report including a curriculum vitae;	<b>Section 13</b>
(b) a declaration that the specialist is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority;	<b>Section 14</b> <i>(also separate document to this report)</i>
(c) an indication of the scope of, and the purpose for which, the report was prepared; - an indication of the scope of, and age of base data used for the specialist report; - a description of existing impacts of the site, cumulative impacts of the proposed development and levels of acceptable change.	<b>Section 1.1</b>  <b>Section 3.1 and 3.4</b>
(d) the duration, date and season of the site investigation and the relevance of the season to the outcome of the assessment;	<b>Section 3.1 and 3.4</b>
(e) a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process inclusive of equipment and modelling used;	<b>Section 1.6</b>
(f) details of an assessment of the specific identified sensitivity of the site related to the proposed activity or activities and its associated structures and infrastructure inclusive of a site plan identifying site alternatives;	<b>Sections 3.1 , 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4</b>
(g) an identification of any areas to be avoided, including buffers;	Not relevant and required.
(h) a map superimposing the activity including the associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the site including areas to be avoided, including buffers;	Buffers not required.
(i) a description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;	<b>Section 6</b>
(j) a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives on the environment or activities;	<b>Sections 7 and Sections 8</b>
(k) any mitigation measures for inclusion in the EMPr;	<b>Sections 9.3.1</b>
(l) any conditions for inclusions in the environmental authorization;	<b>Sections 9.3.2</b>
(m) any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr or environmental authorization;	<b>Section 11.1</b>
(n) a reasoned opinion - whether the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorized regarding the acceptability of the proposed activity or activities; and	<b>Section 12</b>

- if the opinion is that the proposed activity, activities or portions thereof should be authorized, any avoidance, management and mitigation measures that should be included in the EMPr, and where applicable, the closure plan;	
(o) a description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of the preparing the specialist report;	No consultation required or were undertaken
(p) a summary and copies of any comments received during any consultation process and where applicable all responses thereto; and	Nothing requested
(q) any other information requested by the competent authority.	Nothing requested

<b>Contents of this report in terms of Regulation GNR 982 of 2014, Appendix 3 - Environmental Impact Assessment Process</b>	<b>Cross-reference in this report</b>
Describe any policies or legislation relevant to your field that the applicant will need to comply with.	<b>Sections 2.2</b>
Comment on need/desirability of the proposal in terms your field and in terms of the proposal's location.	<b>Section 8.6</b>
Determine the-- (i) nature, significance, consequence, extent, duration and probability of the impacts occurring to inform identified preferred alternatives; and (ii) degree to which these impacts- (aa) can be reversed; (bb) may cause irreplaceable loss of resources, and (cc) can be avoided, managed or mitigated;	<b>Sections 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5</b>
Determine what the most ideal location within the site for the activity is in terms of your field.	<b>Section 8.6</b>
Identify suitable measures to avoid, manage or mitigate identified impacts.	<b>(i) planning, design and pre-construction;</b> Section 8.1 <b>(iii) construction;</b> Section 8.2 <b>(iv) operation;</b> Section 8.3 <b>(v) decommissioning, closure &amp; rehabilitation.</b> Section 8.5
Identify residual risks that need to be managed and monitored.	There will be no residual risks after closure.
Include a concluding statement indicating a preferred alternative in terms of your field.	The project has been through a number of layouts with the most feasible selected.

**This report should be sited as:**

De Jager, M. (2017): “*Environmental Noise Impact Assessment for the proposed 390MW San Kraal wind energy facility near Noupoort, Northern and Eastern Cape*”. Enviro-Acoustic Research CC, Pretoria

**Client:**

Arcus Consulting  
for  
San Kraal Wind Power (Pty) Ltd

Office 211 Cube Workspace  
Cnr Long Street and Hans Strijdom  
Road  
Cape Town  
8001

**Report no:**

AC-SKWEF/ENIA/201709-Rev 0

**Author:**

*M. de Jager* (B. Ing (Chem))

**Review:**

*Shaun Weinberg* (B.Sc. Applied Mathematics in Physics Stream – in process)

**Date:**

September 2017

**COPYRIGHT WARNING**

This information is privileged and confidential in nature and unauthorised dissemination or copying is prohibited. This information will be updated as required. San Kraal Wind Power (Pty) Ltd claims protection of this information in terms of the Promotion of Access to Information Act, (No 2 of 2002) and without limiting this claim, especially the protection afforded by Chapter 4.

The document is the property of Enviro Acoustic Research CC. The content, including format, manner of presentation, ideas, technical procedure, technique and any attached appendices are subject to copyright in terms of the Copyright Act 98 of 1978 (as amended by the respective Copyright Amendment Acts No. 56 of 1980, No. 66 of 1983, No. 52 of 1984, No. 39 of 1986, No. 13 of 1988, No. 61 of 1989, No. 125 of 1992, Intellectual Property Laws Amendment Act, No. 38 of 1997 and, No. 9 of 2002) in terms of section 6 of the aforesaid Act, and may only be reproduced as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment process by Arcus Consulting (Pty) Ltd.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	page
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>CONTENTS OF THE SPECIALIST REPORT – CHECKLISTS.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction and Purpose .....	1
1.2 Brief Project Description.....	1
1.3 Study area .....	2
1.3.1 Topography.....	2
1.3.2 Surrounding Land Use .....	3
1.3.3 Roads and rail roads.....	5
1.3.4 Residential areas.....	5
1.3.5 Other industrial and commercial processes.....	5
1.3.6 Ground conditions and vegetation .....	5
1.3.7 Existing Ambient Sound Levels .....	5
1.4 Potential Noise-sensitive Receptors (Developments) and no-go areas .....	5
1.5 Comments regards to noise received during this project .....	8
1.6 Terms of Reference (ToR) .....	8
<b>2 LEGAL CONTEXT, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
2.1 The Republic of South Africa Constitution Act (“the Constitution”) .....	10
2.2 The Environment Conservation Act (Act 73 of 1989).....	10
2.2.1 National Noise Control Regulations: GN R154 of 1992 (NCR) .....	10
2.3 The National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) .....	12
2.4 National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (Act 39 of 2004) ....	12
2.4.1 Model Air Quality Management By-law for adoption and adaptation by Municipalities (GN 579 of 2010) .....	13
2.5 Noise Standards.....	13
2.6 International Guidelines.....	14
2.6.1 Guidelines for Community Noise (WHO, 1999) .....	14

2.6.2	<i>Night Noise Guidelines for Europe (WHO, 2009)</i> .....	15
2.6.3	<i>The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (ETSU, 1997)</i> .....	15
2.6.4	<i>Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms (MoE, 2008)</i> .....	17
2.6.5	<i>Equator Principles</i> .....	18
2.6.6	<i>IFC: General EHS Guidelines – Environmental Noise Management</i> .....	19
2.6.7	<i>National and International Guidelines - Appropriate limits for game parks and wilderness</i> .....	20
2.6.8	<i>Environmental Management Systems</i> .....	21
2.6.9	<i>European Parliament Directive 2000/14/EC</i> .....	21
<b>3</b>	<b>CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL SOUND CHARACTER</b> .....	<b>23</b>
3.1	Effect of Season on sound levels .....	23
3.1.1	<i>Effect of wind on sound propagation</i> .....	23
3.1.2	<i>Effect of temperature on sound propagation</i> .....	24
3.1.3	<i>Effect of humidity on sound propagation</i> .....	24
3.2	Effect of wind speeds on vegetation and sound levels .....	24
3.3	Influence of wind on Noise Limits .....	25
3.4	Ambient Sound Measurements Procedure.....	26
3.4.1	<i>Measurement Point INWEFLTASL01: Mrs. Eleanore van der Merwe</i> .....	28
3.4.2	<i>Measurement Point INWEFLTASL02: Mr. Taljard</i> .....	33
3.4.3	<i>Single measurements around project area</i> .....	38
3.5	Ambient Sound Levels – Summary .....	38
<b>4</b>	<b>POTENTIAL NOISE SOURCES</b> .....	<b>43</b>
4.1	Potential Noise Sources: Construction Phase .....	43
4.1.1	<i>Construction equipment</i> .....	43
4.1.2	<i>Material supply: Concrete batching plants and use of Borrow Pits</i> .....	45
4.1.3	<i>Traffic</i> .....	45
4.1.4	<i>Blasting</i> .....	49
4.2	Potential Noise Sources: Operational Phase .....	49
4.2.1	<i>Wind Turbine Noise: Aerodynamic sources</i> .....	50
4.2.2	<i>Wind Turbine: Mechanical sources</i> .....	52
4.2.3	<i>Transformer noises (Substations)</i> .....	53
4.2.4	<i>Transmission Line Noise (Corona noise)</i> .....	54
4.2.5	<i>Low Frequency Noise</i> .....	55
4.2.6	<i>Amplitude modulation</i> .....	57
4.2.7	<i>Summary Conclusions on Wind Turbine Noise</i> .....	60
<b>5</b>	<b>METHODS: NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE</b> .....	<b>63</b>

5.1	Noise Impact on Animals.....	63
5.1.1	Domestic Animals.....	63
5.1.2	Wildlife .....	64
5.2	Why noise concerns communities.....	64
5.3	Impact Assessment Criteria.....	65
5.3.1	Overview: The common characteristics .....	65
5.3.2	Noise criteria of concern .....	65
5.3.3	Determining appropriate Zone Sound Levels.....	67
5.3.4	Other Factors that must be considered for Wind Energy Facilities .....	69
5.3.5	Other noise sources of significance.....	71
5.3.6	Determining the Significance of the Noise Impact.....	71
5.4	Representation of noise levels .....	75
<b>6</b>	<b>ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>76</b>
6.1	Measurements of Ambient Sound Levels .....	76
6.2	Calculating noise emissions Adequacy of predictive methods .....	78
6.3	Adequacy of Underlying Assumptions .....	79
6.4	Uncertainties associated with mitigation measures .....	79
6.5	Uncertainties of Information Provided.....	79
<b>7</b>	<b>PROJECTED NOISE RATING LEVELS.....</b>	<b>81</b>
7.1	Current Noise Levels (Conceptual) .....	81
7.2	Proposed Construction Phase Noise Impact .....	81
7.2.1	Description of Construction Activities Modelled.....	81
7.3	Operational Phase Noise Impact.....	88
7.4	Potential Cumulative Noise Impacts.....	91
7.5	Decommissioning and Closure Phase Noise Impact.....	92
<b>8</b>	<b>SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NOISE IMPACT.....</b>	<b>95</b>
8.1	Planning Phase Noise Impact.....	95
8.2	Construction Phase Noise Impact .....	95
8.3	Operational Phase Noise Impact.....	96
8.4	Cumulative noise impact.....	96
8.5	Decommissioning Phase Noise Impact .....	96
8.6	Evaluation of Alternatives.....	96
8.6.1	Alternative 1: No-go option .....	96
8.6.2	Alternative 2: Proposed Renewable Power Generation activities .....	96
8.6.3	Overhead Power Line Options .....	97

<b>9</b>	<b>MITIGATION OPTIONS .....</b>	<b>105</b>
9.1	Construction Phase Mitigation Measures.....	105
9.1.1	<i>Mitigation options available to reduce Construction Noise Impact .....</i>	<i>105</i>
9.2	Operational Phase Mitigation Measures .....	106
9.2.1	<i>Mitigation options available to reduce Operational Noise Impact.....</i>	<i>106</i>
9.3	Special Conditions.....	106
9.3.1	<i>Mitigation options that should be included in the EMP .....</i>	<i>106</i>
9.3.2	<i>Special conditions that should be included in the Environmental Authorization.....</i>	<i>106</i>
<b>10</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PLAN .....</b>	<b>108</b>
11.1	Measurement Localities and Procedures .....	108
11.1.1	<i>Measurement Localities.....</i>	<i>108</i>
11.1.2	<i>Measurement Frequencies.....</i>	<i>108</i>
11.1.3	<i>Measurement Procedures.....</i>	<i>108</i>
11.2	Relevant Standard for Noise Measurements.....	109
11.3	Data Capture Protocols .....	109
11.3.1	<i>Measurement Technique .....</i>	<i>109</i>
11.3.2	<i>Variables to be analysed .....</i>	<i>109</i>
11.3.3	<i>Database Entry and Backup.....</i>	<i>109</i>
11.3.4	<i>Feedback to Receptor .....</i>	<i>109</i>
11.4	Standard Operating Procedures for Registering a Complaint .....	110
<b>12</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>THE AUTHOR .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE .....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>116</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1: Summary of Sound Level Limits for Wind Farms (MoE) .....	page 17
Table 2-2: IFC Table .7.1-Noise Level Guidelines .....	20
Table 3-1: Equipment used to measure sound levels at INWEFLTASL01.....	28
Table 3-2: Noises/sounds heard during site visits at receptor INWEFLTASL01 .....	28

Table 3-3: Sound levels considering various sound level descriptors at INWEFLTASL01 .29

Table 3-4: Equipment used to measure sound levels at INWEFLTASL02.....33

Table 3-5: Noises/sounds heard during site visits at receptor INWEFLTASL02 .....33

Table 3-6: Sound levels considering various sound level descriptors at INWEFLTASL02 .34

Table 3-7: Equipment used to do singular measurements .....38

Table 3-8: Summary of singular noise measurement.....39

Table 4-1: Potential maximum noise levels generated by construction equipment.....46

Table 4-2: Potential equivalent noise levels generated by various equipment .....48

Table 5-1: Acceptable Zone Sound Levels for noise in districts (SANS 10103:2008) .....67

Table 7-1: Octave Sound Power Emission Levels used for modelling: Acciona AW125/3000.....88

Table 7-2: Noise rating levels at a 6 m/s wind speed .....89

Table 8-1: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of the Access Roads .....98

Table 8-2: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the Access Roads .....98

Table 8-3: Impact Assessment: Noises from daytime construction traffic.....99

Table 8-4: Impact Assessment: Noises from night-time construction traffic .....99

Table 8-5: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of the OHL (all 3 alignment options) ..... 100

Table 8-6: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (preferred option) 100

Table 8-7: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (Alternative option 1) ..... 101

Table 8-8: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (Alternative option 2) ..... 101

Table 8-9: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of Wind Turbines ..... 102

Table 8-10: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of Wind Turbines ..... 102

Table 8-11: Impact Assessment: Daytime operation of Wind Turbines..... 103

Table 8-12: Impact Assessment: Night-time operation of Wind Turbines ..... 103

Table 8-13: Impact Assessment: Potential Cumulative Noise Impact from daytime operation of Wind Turbines ..... 104

Table 8-14: Impact Assessment: Potential Cumulative Noise Impact of Wind Turbines due to night-time operation ..... 104

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure 1-1: Map indicating the regional location of the San Kraal WEF page  
4

Figure 1-2: Aerial image indicating potentially noise-sensitive receptors identified during the Scoping Noise Assessment 6



Figure 1-3: Aerial image indicating potentially noise-sensitive receptors confirmed during the EIA Site Assessment	7
Figure 2-1: Summary of Sound Level Limits for Wind Turbines (MoE Canada)	18
Figure 3-1: Localities of where ambient sound levels were measured	27
Figure 3-2: Ambient Sound Levels at INWEFLTASL01	30
Figure 3-3: Maximum, minimum and statistical values at INWEFLTASL01	30
Figure 3-4: Spectral frequencies – INWEFLTASL01, Night 1	32
Figure 3-5: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Day 2	32
Figure 3-6: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Night 2	32
Figure 3-7: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Day 3	32
Figure 3-8: Ambient Sound Levels at INWEFLTASL02	35
Figure 3-9: Maximum, minimum and statistical values at INWEFLTASL02	35
Figure 3-10: Spectral frequencies – INWEFLTASL02, Day 1	37
Figure 3-11: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Night 1	37
Figure 3-12: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Day 2	37
Figure 3-13: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Night 2	37
Figure 3-14: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL01	40
Figure 3-15: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL02	40
Figure 3-16: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL03	40
Figure 3-17: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL04	40
Figure 3-18: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL05	41
Figure 3-19: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFLTASL06	41
Figure 3-20: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL07	41
Figure 3-21: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL08	41
Figure 3-22: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL09	42
Figure 3-23: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL10	42
Figure 3-24: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL11	42
Figure 3-25: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL12	42
Figure 4-1: Noise Emissions Curve of a number of different wind turbines (figure for illustration purposes only)	51
Figure 4-2: Octave sound power emissions of various wind turbines	52
Figure 4-3: Third octave band sound power levels at various wind speeds at a location where wind induced noises dominate	56
Figure 4-4: Example time-sound series graph illustrating AM as measured by Stigwood ( <i>et al</i> ) (2013)	58
Figure 4-5: Word map of terms used to describe the sound of AM (source: Stigwood ( <i>et al</i> ) (2013))	59
Figure 5-1: Criteria to assess the significance of impacts stemming from noise	66
Figure 5-2: Ambient sound levels – quiet inland location (A-Weighted)	69

Figure 5-3: Percentage of annoyed persons as a function of the day-evening-night noise exposure at the façade of a dwelling	71
Figure 7-1: Proposed Wind Turbine Locations – San Kraal Wind Farm Layout Rev. 4.1 (as modelled)	83
Figure 7-2: Proposed Wind Turbine Locations – San Kraal Wind Farm Layout Rev. 5.1 (latest layout)	84
Figure 7-3: Other proposed infrastructure – Roads, Power lines and Sub-stations	85
Figure 7-4: Projected conceptual construction noise levels – Decay of noise from construction activities	86
Figure 7-5: Projected conceptual construction noise levels – Decay over distance from linear activities	87
Figure 7-6: Projected noise rating levels at NSDs at different wind speeds	89
Figure 7-7: Projected conceptual night-time noise rating levels during operation – Acciona WTG at 6 m/s wind speed	90
Figure 7-8: Effect of distance between wind turbines – potential cumulative noise	93
Figure 7-9: Projected cumulative noise rating levels – worst-case (at a 6 m/s wind speed)	94

## **GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS**

DoE	Department of Energy
EARES	Enviro Acoustic Research cc
ECA	Environment Conservation Act (Act 78 of 1989)
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
FEL	Front End Loader
i.e.	that is
IFC	International Finance Corporation
km	kilometres (measurement of distance)
LHD	Load haul dumper
m	meters (measurement of distance)
m <sup>2</sup>	Square meter
m <sup>3</sup>	Cubic meter
mamsl	Meters above mean sea level
m/s	meters per second
NEMA	National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act 107 of 1998)
NCR	Noise Control Regulations (under Section 25 of the ECA)
OHL	Overhead Power Line

---

SABS	South African Bureau of Standards
SANS	South African National Standards
TLB	Tip Load Bucket
ToR	Terms of Reference
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
WHO	World Health Organisation
WEF	Wind Energy Facility
WTG	Wind Turbine Generators

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Enviro-Acoustic Research (EARES) was contracted by Arcus Consulting (the consultant or EAP) to determine the potential noise impact on the surrounding environment due to the proposed development of the San Kraal Wind Energy Facility (WEF). This facility will be located on various farms just east of Noupoot in the Northern Cape (see **Figure 1-1**).

This report briefly describes ambient sound levels in the area, potential worst case noise rating levels and the potential noise impact that the facility may have on the surrounding sound environment, highlighting the methods used, potential issues identified, findings and recommendations.

This study considered local regulations and both local and international guidelines, using the terms of reference (ToR) as proposed by SANS 10328:2008 to allow for a comprehensive Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA).

## 1.2 BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

San Kraal Wind Power (Pty) Ltd (the developer) proposes the establishment of a commercial 390 MW WEF and associated infrastructure on various farms just east of Noupoot in the Northern Cape (see **Figure 1-1**). A part of the WEF does fall within the Eastern Cape Province.

The proposed San Kraal WEF would consist of the following infrastructural components:

- Up to 78 turbines with a generation capacity between 3 – 5 MW and a rotor diameter of up to 150 m, a hub height of up to 150 m and blade length of up to 75 m;
- Foundations (up to 25 x 25 m) and hardstands associated with the wind turbines;
- Internal access roads of between 8 m (during operation) and 14 m (during construction) wide to each turbine;
- Medium voltage underground electrical cables will be laid to transmit electricity generated by the wind turbines to the on-site switching station or substation;
- Overhead medium voltage cables between turbine rows where necessary;
- An on-site switching station (10 000 m<sup>2</sup>);
- An 4 km medium voltage overhead line connecting the on-site switching station with the on-site medium voltage/132 kV substation;

- An on-site substation and OMS complex (180 000 m<sup>2</sup>) to facilitate stepping up the voltage from medium to high voltage (132 kV) to enable the connection of the WEF to the proposed Umsobomvu 132/400 kV Substation to allow the generated power to be fed into the national grid;
- A 23 km 132 kV high voltage overhead power line from the on-site substation to the proposed 400 kV Umsobomvu substation to the national grid;
- A 100 m corridor surrounding Umsobomvu substation so that the grid connection can turn into the substation from any direction;
- Two 90 000 m<sup>2</sup> alternative areas for batching plants, temporary laydown area and construction compound;
- Temporary infrastructure including a site camp; and
- A laydown area approximately 7500 m<sup>2</sup> in extent, per turbine.

The total size of the land portions within which the proposed development will be located is 105 km<sup>2</sup>. The footprint of the proposed development is estimated to be less than 1% of this area.

The developer has been evaluating several turbine models, however the selection will only be finalised at a later stage once a most optimal wind turbine are identified (factors such as meteorological data, price and financing options, guarantees and maintenance costs, etc.). As the noise propagation modelling requires the details of a wind turbine, it was selected to use the sound power emission levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 which would represent a worst-case scenario.

### **1.3 STUDY AREA**

The proposed WEF will mainly be located in the Umsobomvu Local Municipality (Pixley ka Seme District – Northern Cape), although a small portion does fall within the Inxuba Yethemba Local Municipality (Chris Hani District – Eastern Cape). The study area is further described in terms of environmental components that may contribute to or change the sound character in the area.

#### **1.3.1 Topography**

ENPAT<sup>1</sup> (1998) classifies the area as low mountains. Due to the height of the wind turbines as well as the position where they will be developed (on top of the hills and

---

<sup>1</sup> Van Riet, W. Claassen, P. van Rensburg, J. van Viegen & L. du Plessis, "Environmental Potential Atlas for South Africa", Pretoria, 1998.

ridges) it's unlikely that topographical features will limit the propagation of sound from the wind turbines.

### **1.3.2 Surrounding Land Use**

Land use is mostly wilderness, with residential small holdings identifiable surrounding the outskirts of the town of Noupoort, as well as the residential area of Noupoort itself (west of the proposed WEF).




Figure 1-1: Map indicating the regional location of the San Kraal WEF

### **1.3.3 Roads and rail roads**

There are no major roads or rail roads in the vicinity of the proposed WEF, with the local community using gravel roads to access their properties. Traffic volumes are low and existing traffic noises would be of no significance in this area.

### **1.3.4 Residential areas**

Excluding potentially noise-sensitive developments identified in **Section 1.4**, there are no formal residential areas, communities or towns close to the facility.

### **1.3.5 Other industrial and commercial processes**

The operational Noupport WEF is located just north-east of the proposed San Kraal WEF. The Phezukomoya WEF is proposed to the west of the San Kraal WEF.

### **1.3.6 Ground conditions and vegetation**

Most of the area falls within the Grassland biome with the vegetation typical of Karroid Danthonia Mountain Veld. Ground surface is important as it can reflect, partially or completely absorb certain frequencies hitting it.


### **1.3.7 Existing Ambient Sound Levels**

The area has a rural developmental character, with night-time sound levels typical of a rural area. Onsite measurements and the existing soundscape are discussed in more detail in **Section 3**.

## **1.4 POTENTIAL NOISE-SENSITIVE RECEPTORS (DEVELOPMENTS) AND NO-GO AREAS**


Potentially sensitive receptors, also known as noise-sensitive developments (NSDs), located within or close to the WEF's were identified using Google Earth® during the Scoping Phase (see **Figure 1-2**). This was supported by a site visit to confirm the status of the identified dwellings (see **Figure 1-3**). As only NSD closer than 2,000m from a WTG (1,000m for construction activities) are considered, the number of NSD reduced from the scoping to the EIA phase.





**Figure 1-2: Aerial image indicating potentially noise-sensitive receptors identified during the Scoping Noise Assessment**





**Figure 1-3: Aerial image indicating potentially noise-sensitive receptors confirmed during the EIA Site Assessment**

## 1.5 COMMENTS REGARDS TO NOISE RECEIVED DURING THIS PROJECT

No comments were received from any Interested and Affected Parties with regards to noise concerns from this wind farm.

## 1.6 TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

A noise impact assessment must be completed for the following reasons:

- If there are potential noise-sensitive receptors staying within 2,000m from any wind turbine (SANS 10328:2008)
- It is a controlled activity in terms of the NEMA regulations and a ENIA is required, because:
  - It may cause a disturbing noise that is prohibited in terms of section 18(1) of the Government Notice 579 of 2010; and
- It is generally required by the local or district authority as part of the environmental authorization or planning approval in terms of Regulation 2(d) of GN R154 of 1992.

In addition, Appendix 6 of GN 982 of December 2014 (Gov. Gaz. 38282), issued in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, No. 107 of 1998 also defines minimum information requirements for specialist reports.

In South Africa the document that addresses the issues specifically concerning environmental noise is SANS 10103:2008. It has recently been thoroughly revised and brought in line with the guidelines of the World Health Organisation (WHO). It provides the maximum average ambient noise levels during the day and night to which different types of developments indoors may be exposed.

In addition, the SANS 10328:2008 standard specifies the methodology to assess the potential noise impacts on the environment due to a proposed activity that might impact on the environment. This standard also stipulates the minimum requirements to be investigated for Scoping purposes. These minimum requirements are:

1. The purpose of the investigation;
2. A brief description of the planned development or the changes that are being considered;
3. A brief description of the existing environment;

4. The identification of the noise sources that may affect the particular development, together with their respective estimated sound pressure levels or sound power levels (or both);
5. The identified noise sources that were not taken into account and the reasons why they were not investigated;
6. The identified noise-sensitive developments and the estimated impact on them;
7. Any assumptions made with regard to the estimated values used;
8. An explanation, either by a brief description or by reference, of the methods that were used to estimate the existing and predicted rating levels;
9. The location of the measurement or calculation points, i.e. a description, sketch or map;
10. Estimation of the environmental noise impact;
11. Alternatives that were considered and the results of those that were investigated;
12. A list of all the interested or affected parties that offered any comments with respect to the environmental noise impact investigation;
13. A detailed summary of all the comments received from interested or affected parties as well as the procedures and discussions followed to deal with them;
14. Conclusions that were reached;
15. Recommendations, i.e. if there could be a significant impact, or if more information is needed, a recommendation that an environmental noise impact assessment be conducted; and
16. If remedial measures will provide an acceptable solution, which would prevent a significant impact, these remedial measures should be outlined in detail and included in the final record of decision if the approval is obtained from the relevant authority. If the remedial measures deteriorate after a certain time and a follow-up auditing or maintenance programme (or both) is instituted, this programme should be included in the final recommendations and accepted in the record of decision if the approval is obtained from the relevant authority.

## 2 LEGAL CONTEXT, POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

### 2.1 THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA CONSTITUTION ACT (“THE CONSTITUTION”)

The environmental rights contained in section 24 of the Constitution provide that everyone is entitled to an environment that is not harmful to his or her well-being. In the context of noise, this requires a determination of what level of noise is harmful to well-being. The general approach of the common law is to define an acceptable level of noise as that which the reasonable person can be expected to tolerate under the particular circumstances. The subjectivity of this approach can be problematic, which has led to the development of noise standards (see **Section 2.5**).

“Noise pollution” is specifically included in Part B of Schedule 5 of the Constitution, which means that noise pollution control is a local authority competence, provided that the local authority concerned has the capacity to carry out this function.

### 2.2 THE ENVIRONMENT CONSERVATION ACT (ACT 73 OF 1989)

The Environment Conservation Act (“ECA”) allows the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (“now the Ministry of Water and Environmental Affairs”) to make regulations regarding noise, among other concerns.

#### 2.2.1 National Noise Control Regulations: GN R154 of 1992 (NCR)

In terms of section 25 of the ECA, the national noise-control regulations (GN R154 in *Government Gazette* No. 13717 dated 10 January 1992) were promulgated. The NCRs were revised under Government Notice Number R. 55 of 14 January 1994 to make it obligatory for all authorities to apply the regulations.

Subsequently, in terms of Schedule 5 of the Constitution of South Africa of 1996 legislative responsibility for administering the NCR was devolved to provincial and local authorities. Most of the properties that form part of the wind farm are located in the Northern Cape Province, however a few wind turbines lie within the Eastern Cape Province. Neither the Northern nor the Eastern Cape Province has promulgated their own noise control regulations and the national regulations will be in effect.

The National Noise Control Regulations (GN R154 1992) define:

**"controlled area"** as:

a piece of land designated by a local authority where, in the case of--

- c) industrial noise in the vicinity of an industry-

- i. the reading on an integrating impulse sound level meter, taken outdoors at the end of a period of 24 hours while such meter is in operation, exceeds 61 dBA; or
- ii. the calculated outdoor equivalent continuous "A"-weighted sound pressure level at a height of at least 1,2 meters, but not more than 1,4 meters, above the ground for a period of 24 hours, exceeds 61 dBA;

**"disturbing noise" as:**

noise level which exceeds the zone sound level or, if no zone sound level has been designated, a noise level which exceeds the ambient sound level at the same measuring point by 7 dBA or more.

**"zone sound level" as:**

a derived dBA value determined indirectly by means of a series of measurements, calculations or table readings and designated by a local authority for an area. *This is the same as the Rating Level as defined in SANS 10103.*

***In addition:***

In terms of Regulation 2 -

"A local authority may –

*(c): if a noise emanating from a building, premises, vehicle, recreational vehicle or street is a disturbing noise or noise nuisance, or may in the opinion of the local authority concerned be a disturbing noise or noise nuisance, instruct in writing the person causing such noise or who is responsible therefor, or the owner or occupant of such building or premises from which or from where such noise emanates or may emanate, or all such persons, to discontinue or cause to be discontinued such noise, or to take steps to lower the level of the noise to a level conforming to the requirements of these Regulations within the period stipulated in the instruction: Provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply in respect of a disturbing noise or noise nuisance caused by rail vehicles or aircraft which are not used as recreational vehicles;*

*(d): before changes are made to existing facilities or existing uses of land or buildings, or before new buildings are erected, in writing require that noise impact assessments or tests are conducted to the satisfaction of that local authority by the owner, developer, tenant or occupant of the facilities, land or buildings or that, for the purposes of regulation 3(b) or (c), reports or certificates in relation to the noise impact to the satisfaction of that local authority are submitted by the owner, developer, tenant or occupant to the local authority on written demand";*

In terms of Regulation 4 of the Noise Control Regulations:

*"No person shall make, produce or cause a disturbing noise, or allow it to be made, produced or caused by any person, machine, device or apparatus or any combination thereof".*

### **2.3 THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT (ACT 107 OF 1998)**

The National Environmental Management Act ("NEMA") defines "pollution" to include any change in the environment, including noise. A duty therefore arises under section 28 of NEMA to take reasonable measures while establishing and operating any facility to prevent noise pollution occurring. NEMA sets out measures which may be regarded as reasonable. They include the following measures:

1. to investigate, assess and evaluate the impact on the environment;
2. to inform and educate employees about the environmental risks of their work and the manner in which their tasks must be performed in order to avoid causing significant pollution or degradation of the environment;
3. to cease, modify or control any act, activity or process causing the pollution or degradation;
4. to contain or prevent the movement of the pollution or degradation;
5. to eliminate any source of the pollution or degradation; and
6. to remedy the effects of the pollution or degradation.

In addition, Appendix 6 of GN 326 of December 2014, as amended 7 April 2017 (Gov. Gaz. 40772), issued in terms of this Act, has general requirements for EAPs and specialists. It also defines minimum information requirements for specialist reports.

### **2.4 NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT: AIR QUALITY ACT (ACT 39 OF 2004)**

Section 34 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (Act 39 of 2004) makes provision for:

- (1) the Minister to prescribe essential national noise standards -
  - (a) for the control of noise, either in general or by specified machinery or activities or in specified places or areas; or
  - (b) for determining -
    - (i) a definition of noise
    - (ii) the maximum levels of noise
- (2) When controlling noise the provincial and local spheres of government are bound by any prescribed national standards.

This section of the Act has been promulgated, but no such standards have yet been issued. Draft regulations have however, been promulgated for adoption by Local Authorities.

An atmospheric emission licence issued in terms of Section 22 may contain conditions in terms of noise. This, however, is not relevant to the project as no atmospheric emissions will take place.

#### **2.4.1 Model Air Quality Management By-law for adoption and adaptation by Municipalities (GN 579 of 2010)**

Model Air Quality Management By-Laws for adoption and adaptation by municipalities was published by the Department of Water and Environmental Affairs in the Government Gazette of 2 July 2010 as Government Notice 579 of 2010.

The main aim of the model air quality management by-law is to assist municipalities in the development of their air quality management by-law within their jurisdictions. It is also the aim of the model by-law to ensure uniformity across the country when dealing with air quality management challenges. Therefore, the model by-law is developed to be generic in order to deal with most of the air quality management challenges. With Noise Control being covered under the Air Quality Act (Act 39 of 2004), noise is also managed in a separate section under this Government Notice.

- **IT IS NOT** the aim of the model by-law to have legal force and effect on municipalities when published in the Gazette; and
- **IT IS NOT** the aim of the model by-law to impose the by-law on municipalities.

Therefore, a municipality will have to follow the legal process as set out in the Local Government: Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act No. 32 of 2000) when adopting and adapting the model by-law to its local jurisdictions.

## **2.5 NOISE STANDARDS**

There are a few South African scientific standards (SABS) relevant to noise from mines, industry and roads. They are:

- SANS 10103:2008. 'The measurement and rating of environmental noise with respect to annoyance and to speech communication';
- SANS 10210:2004. 'Calculating and predicting road traffic noise';



- SANS 10328:2008. 'Methods for environmental noise impact assessments'.
- SANS 10357:2004. 'The calculation of sound propagation by the Concave method';
- SANS 10181:2003. 'The Measurement of Noise Emitted by Road Vehicles when Stationary'; and
- SANS 10205:2003. 'The Measurement of Noise Emitted by Motor Vehicles in Motion'.

The relevant standards use the equivalent continuous rating level as a basis for determining what is acceptable. The levels may take single event noise into account, but single event noise by itself does not determine whether noise levels are acceptable for land use purposes. With regards to SANS 10103:2008, the recommendations are likely to inform decisions by authorities, but non-compliance with the standard will not necessarily render an activity unlawful *per se*.

## **2.6 INTERNATIONAL GUIDELINES**

While a number of international guidelines and standards exist, those selected below are used by numerous countries for environmental noise management.

### **2.6.1 Guidelines for Community Noise (WHO, 1999)**

The World Health Organization's (WHO) document on the *Guidelines for Community Noise* is the outcome of the WHO- expert task force meeting held in London, United Kingdom, in April 1999. It is based on the document entitled "Community Noise" that was prepared for the World Health Organization and published in 1995 by the Stockholm University and Karolinska Institute.

The scope of WHO's effort to derive guidelines for community noise is to consolidate actual scientific knowledge on the health impacts of community noise and to provide guidance to environmental health authorities and professionals trying to protect people from the harmful effects of noise in non-industrial environments.

Guidance on the health effects of noise exposure of the population has already been given in an early publication of the series of Environmental Health Criteria. The health risk to humans from exposure to environmental noise was evaluated and guidelines values derived. The issue of noise control and health protection was briefly addressed.

The document uses the  $L_{Aeq}$  and  $L_{AMax}$  noise descriptors to define noise levels. It should be noted that a follow-up document focusing on Night-time Noise Guidelines for Europe was published in 2009 (WHO, 2009).

### **2.6.2 Night Noise Guidelines for Europe (WHO, 2009)**

Refining previous Community Noise Guidelines issued in 1999, and incorporating more recent research, the World Health Organization has released a comprehensive report on the health effects of night time noise, along with new (non-mandatory) guidelines for use in Europe. Rather than a maximum of 30 dB inside at night (which equals 45-50 dB max outside), the WHO now recommends a maximum year-round outside night-time noise average of 40 db to avoid sleep disturbance and its related health effects. The report notes that only below 30 dB (outside annual average) are *"no significant biological effects observed,"* and that between 30 and 40 dB, several effects are observed, with the chronically ill and children being more susceptible; however, *"even in the worst cases the effects seem modest."* Elsewhere, the report states more definitively, *"There is no sufficient evidence that the biological effects observed at the level below 40 dB (night, outside) are harmful to health."* At levels over 40 dB, *"Adverse health effects are observed"* and *"many people have to adapt their lives to cope with the noise at night. Vulnerable groups are more severely affected."*

The 184-page report offers a comprehensive overview of research into the various effects of noise on sleep quality and health (including the health effects of non-waking sleep arousal), and is recommended reading for anyone working with noise issues. The use of an outdoor noise standard is in part designed to acknowledge that people do prefer to leave windows open when sleeping, though the year-long average may be difficult to obtain (it would require longer-term sound monitoring than is usually budgeted for by either industry or neighbourhood groups).

While recommending the use of the average level, the report notes that some instantaneous effects occur in relation to specific maximum noise levels, but that the health effects of these *"cannot be easily established."*

### **2.6.3 The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms (ETSU, 1997)**

This report describes the findings of a Working Group on Wind Turbine Noise, facilitated by the United Kingdom Department of Trade and Industry. It was developed as an Energy Technology Support Unit<sup>2</sup> (ETSU) project. The aim of the project was to provide

---

<sup>2</sup> ETSU was set up in 1974 as an agency by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority to manage research programmes on renewable energy and energy conservation. The majority of projects managed by ETSU were

information and advice to developers and planners on noise from wind turbines. The report represents the consensus view of a number of experts (experienced in assessing and controlling the environmental impact of noise from wind farms). Their findings can be summarised as follows:

1. Absolute noise limits applied at all wind speeds are not suited to wind farms; limits set relative to the background noise (including wind as seen in **Figure 5-2**) are more appropriate
2.  $LA_{90,10min}$  is a much more accurate descriptor when monitoring ambient and turbine noise levels
3. The effects of other wind turbines in a given area should be added to the effect of any proposed wind energy facility, to calculate the cumulative effect
4. Noise from a wind energy facility should be restricted to no more than 5 dBA above the current ambient noise level at a NSD. Ambient noise levels is measured onsite in terms of the  $LA_{90,10min}$  descriptor for a period sufficiently long enough for a set period
5. Wind farms should be limited to within the range of 35 dBA to 40 dBA (day-time) in a low noise environment. A fixed limit of 43 dBA should be implemented during all night time noise environments. This should increase to 45 dBA (day and night) if the NSD has financial investments in the wind energy facility
6. A penalty system should be implemented for wind turbine/s that operates with a tonal characteristic (an audible tone, see Appendix A)

This is likely the guideline used in the most international countries to estimate the potential noise impact stemming from the operation of a Wind Energy Facility. It also recommends an improved methodology (compared to a fixed upper noise level) on determining ambient sound levels in periods of higher wind speeds, critical for the development of a wind energy facility. Because of its international importance, the methodologies used in the ETSU R97 document will be considered in this EIA Report for implementation should projected noise levels (from the proposed WEF at NSDs) exceed the zone sound levels as recommended by SANS 10103:2008.

The document uses the  $LA_{eq,f}$  and  $LA_{90}$  descriptors to define noise levels using the "Fast"-time weighting.

---

carried out by external organizations in academia and industry. In 1996, ETSU became part of AEA Technology plc which was separated from the UKAEA by privatisation.

#### 2.6.4 Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms (MoE, 2008)

This document establishes the sound level limits for land-based wind power generating facilities and describes the information required for noise assessments and submissions under the Environmental Assessment Act and the Environmental Protection Act, Canada.

The document defines:

- Sound Level Limits for different areas (similar to rural and urban areas), defining limits for different wind speeds at 10 m height, refer also **Table 2-1**<sup>3</sup>
- The Noise Assessment Report, including;
  - Information that must be part of the report
  - Full description of noise sources
  - Adjustments, such as due to the wind speed profile (wind shear)
  - The identification and defining of potential sensitive receptors
  - Prediction methods to be used (ISO 9613-2)
  - Cumulative impact assessment requirements
  - It also defines specific model input parameters
  - Methods on how the results must be presented
  - Assessment of Compliance (defining magnitude of noise levels)


**Table 2-1: Summary of Sound Level Limits for Wind Farms (MoE)**

Wind speed (m/s) at 10 m height	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Wind Turbine Sound Level Limits, Class 3 Area, dBA	40	40	40	43	45	49	51
Wind Turbine Sound Level Limits, Class 1 & 2 Areas, dBA	45	45	45	45	45	49	51

The document used the  $L_{Aeq,1hr}$  noise descriptor to define noise levels. It is not clear whether the instrument must be set to the “Fast” or “Impulse” time weighing setting, but, as the “Fast” setting is used in most international countries it is assumed that the instrument will be set to the “Fast” setting.

---

<sup>3</sup>The measurement of wind induced background sound level is not required to establish the applicable limit. The wind induced background sound level reference curve was determined by correlating the A-weighted ninetieth percentile sound level (L90) with the average wind speed measured at a particularly quiet site. The applicable Leq sound level limits at higher wind speeds are given by adding 7 dB to the wind induced background L90 sound level reference values



**Figure 2-1: Summary of Sound Level Limits for Wind Turbines (MoE Canada)**

It should be noted that these Sound Level Limits are included for the reader to illustrate the criteria used internationally. Due to the lack of local regulations specifically relevant to wind energy facilities this criteria will also be considered during the determination of the significance of the noise impact.

### 2.6.5 Equator Principles

The **Equator Principles** (EPs) are a voluntary set of standards for determining, assessing and managing social and environmental risk in project financing. Equator Principles Financial Institutions (EPFIs) commit to not providing loans to projects where the borrower will not or is unable to comply with their respective social and environmental policies and procedures that implement the EPs.

The Equator Principles were developed by private sector banks and were launched in June 2003. The banks chose to model the Equator Principles on the environmental standards of the World Bank and the social policies of the International Finance Corporation (IFC). 67 financial institutions (October 2009) have adopted the Equator Principles, which have become the de facto standard for banks and investors on how to assess major development projects around the world. The environmental standards of the World Bank

have been integrated into the social policies of the IFC since April 2007 as the International Finance Corporation Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) Guidelines.

#### **2.6.6 IFC: General EHS Guidelines – Environmental Noise Management**

These guidelines are applicable to noise created beyond the property boundaries of a development that conforms to the Equator Principle.

It states that noise prevention and mitigation measures should be applied where predicted or measured noise impacts from a project facility or operations exceed the applicable noise level guideline at the most sensitive point of reception. The preferred method for controlling noise from stationary sources is to implement noise control measures at source.

It goes as far as to proposed methods for the prevention and control of noise emissions, including:

- Selecting equipment with lower sound power levels;
- Installing silencers for fans;
- Installing suitable mufflers on engine exhausts and compressor components;
- Installing acoustic enclosures for equipment casing radiating noise;
- Improving the acoustic performance of constructed buildings, apply sound insulation;
- Installing acoustic barriers without gaps and with a continuous minimum surface density of 10 kg/m<sup>2</sup> in order to minimize the transmission of sound through the barrier. Barriers should be located as close to the source or to the receptor location to be effective;
- Installing vibration isolation for mechanical equipment;
- Limiting the hours of operation for specific pieces of equipment or operations, especially mobile sources operating through community areas ;
- Re-locating noise sources to less sensitive areas to take advantage of distance and shielding;
- Placement of permanent facilities away from community areas if possible;
- Taking advantage of the natural topography as a noise buffer during facility design;
- Reducing project traffic routing through community areas wherever possible;
- Planning flight routes, timing and altitude for aircraft (airplane and helicopter) flying over community areas; and
- Developing a mechanism to record and respond to complaints.

It sets noise level guidelines (see **Table 2-2**) as well as highlighting the certain monitoring requirements pre- and post-development. It adds another criterion in that the

existing background ambient noise level should not rise by more than 3 dBA. This criterion will effectively sterilize large areas of any development. It is, therefore, the considered opinion that this criterion was introduced to address cases where the existing ambient noise level is already at, or in excess of the recommended limits.

**Table 2-2: IFC Table .7.1-Noise Level Guidelines**

Receptor type	One hour $L_{Aeq}$ (dBA)	
	Daytime 07:00 - 22:00	Night-time 22:00 - 07:00
<b>Residential; institutional; educational</b>	55	45
<b>Industrial; commercial</b>	70	70

The document uses the  $L_{Aeq,1\text{ hr}}$  noise descriptors to define noise levels. It does not determine the detection period, but refers to the IEC standards, which requires the fast detector setting on the Sound Level Meter during measurements for Europe.

### 2.6.7 National and International Guidelines - Appropriate limits for game parks and wilderness

The United States National Park Services identifies that “intrusive” un-natural sounds are of concern for the National Park Services (United States<sup>4</sup>) as many visitors go to parks to enjoy the soundscape (interpreted as natural soundscape). Naturally quiet places will not mean (as per interpretation of the author and available information) that the noise levels in the area will be low but rather that the soundscape contributors are of a natural origin (faunal communication, wind, water etc.).

These natural events could include the dawn chorus when songbirds start to sing at the start of a new day or frogs croaking after a rainfall event. Although game park visitors, receptors in “natural” areas and hospitality industries may not seek intrusive un-natural sounds, the operation of the game park/hospitality industry or receptors dwelling itself is source of anthropogenic noise (vehicles, game park electrical and mechanical infrastructure etc.). National Parks do though implement their own guidelines/rules regarding noise created by park visitors.

Natural sounds can contribute a meaningful magnitude<sup>5</sup> to the ambient soundscape depending on season, time, faunal species, habitat and habitat fragmentation etc. Although the magnitude may be loud, natural sounds may contain harmonics<sup>6</sup> and other pleasant sounds that visitors seek when going to parks or wilderness areas.

<sup>4</sup> National Park Services, “Soundscape Preservation and Noise Management”, 2000, p. 1.

<sup>5</sup> Environ. We Int. Sci. Tech, “Ambient noise levels due to dawn chorus at different habitats in Delhi”, 2001, p. 134.

<sup>6</sup> Panatcha Anusasananan, Suksan Suwanarat, Nipon Thangprasert, “Acoustic Characteristics of Zebra Dove in Thailand”, p. 4.

Certain International states have tried implementing laws regarding external environmental “un-natural” noise sources into areas with natural sounds. In USA there exists numerous state and local laws to encourage industries near parks to keep within limits set out by the local authorities<sup>7</sup>. The United States National Park Service’s efforts include attempts to reduce the flights over the Grand Canyon due to the introduction of non-natural impulsive noise events at the park.

### **2.6.8 Environmental Management Systems**

Many organisations implement their own Environmental Management Systems tools for planning, implementing and maintaining policy for environmental protection. The more popular International system is highlighted below.

#### *2.6.8.1 ISO 14000*

ISO 14000 is a family of standards related to environmental management that exists to help organizations:

- minimize how their operations (processes etc.) negatively affect the environment (i.e. cause adverse changes to air, water, or land);
- comply with applicable laws, regulations, and other environmentally oriented requirements, and
- continually improve in the above.

The term continual improvement refers to an on-going process of performance enhancement. In the context of this environmental standard, it means that you need to enhance your organization’s overall environmental performance by enhancing its environmental management system and by improving its ability to manage the environmental aspects of its activities, products, and services. Continual improvements can be achieved by carrying out internal audits, performing management reviews, analysing data, and implementing corrective and preventive actions.

### **2.6.9 European Parliament Directive 2000/14/EC**

Directive 2000/14/EC relating to the noise emission in the environment by equipment for use outdoors was adopted by the European Parliament and the Council and first published in May 2000. The Directive was applied from January 3rd, 2002. The directive placed sound power limits on equipment to be used outdoors in a suburban or urban setting. Failure to comply with these regulations may result in products being prohibited from being placed on the EU market. Equipment list is vast and includes machinery such as compaction machineries, dozers, dumpers, excavators etc. Manufacturers as a result

---

<sup>7</sup> E.g. State of Oregon’s Environmental Standards for Wilderness Areas



started to consider noise emission levels from their products to ensure that their equipment will continue to have a market in most countries.

## 3 CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL SOUND CHARACTER

### 3.1 EFFECT OF SEASON ON SOUND LEVELS

Natural sounds are a part of the environmental noise surrounding humans. In rural areas the sounds from insects and birds would dominate the ambient sound character, with noises such as wind flowing through vegetation increasing as wind speed increase. Work by Fégeant (2002) stressed the importance of wind speed and turbulence causing variations in the level of vegetation generated noise. In addition, factors such as the season (e.g. dry or no leaves versus green leaves), the type of vegetation (e.g. grass, conifers, deciduous), the vegetation density and the total vegetation surface all determine both the sound level as well as spectral characteristics.

Ambient sound levels are significantly affected by the area where the sound measurement location is situated. When the sound measurement location is situated within an urban area, close to industrial plants or areas with a constant sound source (ocean, rivers, etc.), seasons and even increased wind speeds have an insignificant to massive impact on ambient sound levels.

Sound levels in undeveloped rural areas (away from occupied dwellings) however are impacted by changes in season for a number of complex reasons. The two main reasons are:

- Faunal communication during the warmer spring and summer months as various species communicate in an effort to find mates; and
- Seasonal changes in weather patterns, mainly wind (also see **section 3.2**).

For environmental noise, weather plays an important role; the greater the separation distance, the greater the influence of the weather conditions; so, from day to day, a road 1,000 m away can sound very loud or can be completely inaudible.

Other, environmental factors that impact on sound propagation includes wind, temperature and humidity, as discussed in the following sections.

#### 3.1.1 Effect of wind on sound propagation

Wind alters sound propagation by the mechanism of refraction; that is, wind bends sound waves. Wind nearer to the ground moves more slowly than wind at higher altitudes, due to surface characteristics such as hills, trees, and man-made structures that interfere with the wind. This wind gradient, with faster wind at higher elevation and slower wind at lower elevation, causes sound waves to bend downward when they are traveling to a location

downwind of the source and to bend upward when traveling toward a location upwind of the source. Waves bending downward means that a listener standing downwind of the source will hear louder noise levels than the listener standing upwind of the source. This phenomenon can significantly impact sound propagation over long distances and when wind speeds are high.

Over short distances, wind direction has a small impact on sound propagation as long as wind velocities are reasonably slow, i.e. less than 3 – 5 m/s.

### **3.1.2 Effect of temperature on sound propagation**

On a typical sunny afternoon, air is warmest near the ground and temperature decreases at higher altitudes. This temperature gradient causes sound waves to refract upward, away from the ground and results in lower noise levels being heard at a measurement location. In the evening, this temperature gradient will reverse, resulting in cooler temperatures near the ground. This condition, often referred to as a temperature inversion will cause sound to bend downward toward the ground and results in louder noise levels at the listener position. Like wind gradients, temperature gradients can influence sound propagation over long distances and further complicate measurements.

Generally sound propagate better at lower temperatures (down to 10°C), and with everything being equal, a decrease in temperature from 32°C to 10°C would decrease the sound level at a listener 600 m away by 3 dB (at 1,000 Hz).

### **3.1.3 Effect of humidity on sound propagation**

The effect of humidity on sound propagation is quite complex, but effectively relates how increased humidity changes the density of air. Lower density translates into faster sound wave travel, so sound waves travel faster at high humidity. With everything being equal, an increase in humidity from 20% to 80% would increase the sound level at a listener 600 m away by 3 dB (at 1,000 Hz).

## **3.2 EFFECT OF WIND SPEEDS ON VEGETATION AND SOUND LEVELS**

Wind speed is a determining factor for sound levels at most rural locations. With no wind, there is little vegetation movement that could generate noises, however, as wind speeds increase, the rustling of leaves increases which subsequently can increase sound levels. This directly depends on the type of vegetation in a certain area. The impact of increased wind speeds on sound levels depends on the vegetation type (deciduous versus conifers), the density of vegetation in an area, seasonal changes (in winter deciduous

trees are bare) as well as the height of this vegetation. This excludes the effect of faunal communication as vegetation may create suitable habitats and food sources.

### 3.3 INFLUENCE OF WIND ON NOISE LIMITS

Current local regulations and standards do not consider changing ambient (background) sound levels due to natural events such as can be found near the coast or areas where wind-induced noises are prevalent. This is unfeasible with wind energy facilities as these facilities will only operate when the wind is blowing. It is therefore important that the contribution of wind-induced noises be considered when determining the potential noise impact from such as a facility. Care should be taken when taking this approach due to other factors that complicate noise propagation from wind turbines.

While the total ambient sound levels are of importance, the spectral characteristics also determine the likelihood that someone will hear external noises that may or may not be similar in spectral characteristics to that of the vegetation that created the noise. Bolin (2006) did investigate spectral characteristics and determined that annoyance might occur at levels where noise generated by wind turbine noise exceeds natural ambient sounds with 3 dB or more.

Low frequency noises can also be associated with some wind turbines. Separating the potential low frequency noise from wind turbines from that generated by natural sources as well as other anthropogenic sources can and will be a challenge.

There are a number of factors that determine how ambient sound levels close to a dwelling (or the low-frequency noise levels inside the house) might differ from the ambient sound levels further away (or even at another dwelling in the area), including:

- Type of activities taking place in the vicinity of the dwelling;
- Equipment being used near the dwelling, especially equipment such as water pumps, compressors and air conditioners;
- Whether there are any windmills ("*windpompe*") close to the dwelling as well as their general maintenance condition;
- Type of trees around dwelling (conifers vs. broad-leaved trees, habitat that it provides to birds, food that it may provide to birds);
- The number, type and distance between the dwelling (measuring point) and trees. This is especially relevant when the trees are directly against the house (where the branches can touch the roof);

- Distance to large infrastructural developments, including roads, railroads and even large diameter pipelines;
- Distances to other noise sources, whether anthropogenic or natural (such as the ocean or running water);
- The material used in the construction of the dwelling;
- The design of the building, including layout and number of openings;
- How well the dwelling is maintained; and
- The type and how many farm animals are in the vicinity of the dwelling.


### 3.4 AMBIENT SOUND MEASUREMENTS PROCEDURE

The measurement of ambient sound levels is defined by the South African National Standard SANS 10103:2008 as: "***The measurement and rating of environmental noise with respect to land use, health, annoyance and to speech communication***".

The standard specifies the acceptable techniques for sound measurements including the type of equipment, minimum duration of measurement, microphone positions, calibration procedures and instrument checks and weather conditions. This includes:

- The calibration of the sound measuring equipment directly before and directly after the measurements was collected.
- The use of a windshield specifically designed for outdoor use during increased wind speeds;
- Areas where measurements were recorded was selected so as to limit the risks of direct impacts by the wind on the microphone;
- Noise data was synchronised with the wind data measured onsite using an anemometer at a 1.5 m height.

Ambient sound levels were measured at a number of locations from 26 to 28 April 2016. Three class-1 Sound Level Meters as well as a portable weather station was used for measurements. Two instruments were used for semi-continuous, longer measurements (2 night-time periods) with one instrument used for shorter measurements (10 minutes each). The sound level meters would measure "average" sound levels over a time period, save the data and start with a new measurement till the instrument was stopped. Locations used to measure ambient (background) sound levels are presented in **Figure 3-1**. Photos taken during the measurement date is presented in [Appendix B](#).



**Figure 3-1: Localities of where ambient sound levels were measured**



### 3.4.1 Measurement Point INWEFLTASL01: Mrs. Eleanore van der Merwe

This location is approximately 20 km from the proposed San Kraal WEF and the data is used as the sound character is considered typical of the dwellings in the area. The equipment defined in **Table 3-1** was used for gathering data. Measured sound levels are presented in **Figure 3-2** and **Figure 3-3** and defined in **Table 3-2**.

**Table 3-1: Equipment used to measure sound levels at INWEFLTASL01**

Equipment	Model	Serial no	Calibration Date
SLM	Svan 977	34849	May 2015
Microphone	ACO Pacific 7052E	55974	May 2015
Calibrator	Quest CA-22	J 2080094	June 2016

\* Microphone fitted with the RION WS-03 outdoor all-weather windshield.

The SLM was erected in an open area in the garden adjacent to the house. There were dogs on the site but they were quiet. Refer to [Appendix B](#) for a photo of this measurement location. Sounds heard during the period the instrument was deployed and collected (approximately 60 – 80 minutes) are defined in **Table 3-2**.

**Table 3-2: Noises/sounds heard during site visits at receptor INWEFLTASL01**

		During Deployment	During Collection
<b>Magnitude Scale Code:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barely Audible</li> <li>• Audible</li> <li>• Dominating or clearly audible</li> </ul>	<b>Faunal and natural</b>	Bird calls dominated. Bleating sheep clearly audible. Insect communication at times.	Bird call. Bleating sheep clearly audible.
	<b>Residential</b>	Dogs at house but they were relatively silent.	
	<b>Industrial &amp; transportation</b>	Vehicles clearly audible during passing.	-

**Impulse equivalent sound levels (South African legislation):** **Figure 3-2** illustrates how the impulse-weighted 10-minute equivalent values changes over time with **Table 3-3** defining the average values for the time period. This sound descriptor is mainly used in South Africa to define sound and noise levels. The instrument is set to measure the impulse time-weighted sound levels.

**Fast equivalent sound levels (International guidelines):** Fast-weighted 10-minute equivalent (average) sound levels for the day and night-time periods are shown on **Figure 3-2** with **Table 3-3** defining the average values for the time period. Fast-weighted equivalent sound levels are included in this report as this is the sound descriptor used in most international countries to define the Ambient Sound Level.

**Statistical sound levels (L<sub>A90,f</sub>):** The L<sub>A90</sub> level is presented in this report as it is used to define the “background ambient sound level”, or the sound level that can be expected if there were little single events (loud transient noises) that impacts on the average sound level. L<sub>A90</sub> is a statistical indicator that describes the noise level that is exceeded 90% of the time and frequently used to define the background sound level internationally. The instrument is set to fast time-weighting. It is illustrated against time on **Figure 3-3** and defined in **Table 3-3**.


**Measured maximum and minimum sound levels:** These are statistical sound descriptors that can be used to characterise the sound levels in an area along with the other sound descriptors. These sound level descriptors are defined in **Table 3-3** and illustrated in **Figure 3-3**.

**Table 3-3: Sound levels considering various sound level descriptors at INWEFLTASL01**


	L <sub>Amax,i</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>Aeq,i</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>Aeq,f</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>A90,f</sub> (dBA90)	L <sub>Amin,f</sub> (dBA)	Comments
<b>Day arithmetic average</b>	-	44	40	30	-	-
<b>Night arithmetic average</b>	-	29	27	18	-	-
<b>Day minimum</b>	-	19	18	-	16	-
<b>Day maximum</b>	85	62	54	-	-	-
<b>Night minimum</b>	-	17	17	-	16	-
<b>Night maximum</b>	77	56	48	-	-	-
<b>Day 1 equivalent</b>	-	50	43	-	-	Late afternoon and evening only
<b>Night 1 Equivalent</b>	-	39	33	-	-	8 hour night equivalent average
<b>Day 2 equivalent</b>	-	49	45	-	-	16 hour day equivalent average
<b>Night 2 Equivalent</b>	-	42	35	-	-	8 hour night equivalent average
<b>Day 3 equivalent</b>	-	49	41	-	-	Early morning only

The data indicate an area with increased noise levels, but the noises are mainly from natural origin. As such the area can be considered naturally quiet.





**Figure 3-2: Ambient Sound Levels at INWEFLTASL01**



**Figure 3-3: Maximum, minimum and statistical values at INWEFLTASL01**

Third octaves were measured and are displayed in the following Figures. Wind-induced noises had a significant impact on the data for the first day, night and most of the second day (the relatively smooth curves).

**Lower frequency (20 – 250 Hz)** – Noise sources of significance in this frequency band would include nature (wind and surf especially – indicated by a relative smooth curve) and sounds of anthropogenic origin and vehicles (engine sounds and electric motors – erratic

bumps at certain frequencies). Lower frequencies tend to travel further through the atmosphere than higher frequencies.

There was no specific character identifiable at this location. There are various sources of sounds that generate acoustic energy in this frequency band.

**Third octave surrounding the 1,000 Hz (200 – 2,000 Hz)** – This range contains energy mostly associated with human speech (350 Hz – 2,000 Hz; mostly below 1,000 Hz) and dwelling noises (including sounds from larger animals such as chickens, dogs, goats, sheep and cattle). Road-tyre interaction (from vehicular traffic) normally features in 630 – 1,600 Hz range.

As with the low frequency component, there were little measurements that indicated sounds from any specific sound source. There were a few measurements at night that indicated noise in the 500 and 1,000Hz frequency bands.

**Higher frequency (2,000 Hz upwards)** – Smaller faunal species such as birds, crickets and cicada use this range to communicate and hunt etc.

As with the other frequencies bands, there were little significant sounds in this frequency band. Night-time was especially quiet, with a few measurements indicating sounds in the 2,500Hz (mainly afternoon) and 4,000 – 5,000Hz band (likely birds).

**Compliance with international guidelines:** Sound levels are typical of a rural area and the acceptable zone rating level would be typical of a rural area (35 dBA at night and 45 dBA during the day) as defined in SANS 10103.




Figure 3-4: Spectral frequencies – INWEFLTASL01, Night 1




Figure 3-5: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Day 2




Figure 3-6: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Night 2




Figure 3-7: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL01, Day 3

### 3.4.2 Measurement Point INWEFLTASL02: Mr. Taljard

This location is approximately 4.5 km from the centre of the San Kraal WEF, around 1,400m from the closest wind turbine. The equipment defined in **Table 3-4** was used for gathering data. Measured sound levels are presented in **Figure 3-8** and **Figure 3-9** and defined in **Table 3-6**.

**Table 3-4: Equipment used to measure sound levels at INWEFLTASL02**

Equipment	Model	Serial no	Calibration Date
SLM	SVAN 977	34160	May 2015
Microphone	ACO Pacific 7052E	54645	May 2015
Calibrator	Quest CA-22	J 2080094	June 2016

\* Microphone fitted with the RION WS-03 outdoor all-weather windshield.

The SLM was erected in an unused kraal approximately 100m from the main residential dwelling, mainly due to the presence of dogs around this residence. There was livestock (cattle) roaming in the area of the kraal. Refer to [Appendix B](#) for a photo of this measurement location. Sounds heard during the period the instrument was deployed and collected (approximately 60 – 80 minutes) are defined in **Table 3-5**.

**Table 3-5: Noises/sounds heard during site visits at receptor INWEFLTASL02**

		During Deployment	During Collection
<b>Magnitude Scale Code:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barely Audible</li> <li>• Audible</li> <li>• Dominating or clearly audible</li> </ul>	<b>Faunal and natural</b>	Bird calls. Insects at times.	Wind-induced noises. Bird call.
	<b>Residential</b>	-	-
	<b>Industrial &amp; transportation</b>	Two petrol engines (driving pumps).	-

**Impulse equivalent sound levels (South African legislation):** **Figure 3-8** illustrates how the impulse-weighted 10-minute equivalent values changes over time with **Table 3-3** defining the average values for the time period. This sound descriptor is mainly used in South Africa to define sound and noise levels. The instrument is set to measure the impulse time-weighted sound levels.

**Fast equivalent sound levels (International guidelines):** Fast-weighted 10-minute equivalent (average) sound levels for the day and night-time periods are shown on **Figure 3-8** with **Table 3-6** defining the average values for the time period. Fast-weighted equivalent sound levels are included in this report as this is the sound descriptor used in most international countries to define the Ambient Sound Level.


**Statistical sound levels (LA<sub>90,f</sub>):** The LA<sub>90</sub> level is presented in this report as it is used to define the “background ambient sound level”, or the sound level that can be expected if there were little single events (loud transient noises) that impacts on the average sound level. LA<sub>90</sub> is a statistical indicator that describes the noise level that is exceeded 90% of the time and frequently used to define the background sound level internationally. The instrument is set to fast time-weighting. It is illustrated against time on **Figure 3-9** and defined in **Table 3-6**.

**Measured maximum and minimum sound levels:** These are statistical sound descriptors that can be used to characterise the sound levels in an area along with the other sound descriptors. These sound level descriptors are defined in **Table 3-6** and illustrated in **Figure 3-9**.


**Table 3-6: Sound levels considering various sound level descriptors at INWEFLTASL02**

	L <sub>Amax,i</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>Aeq,i</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>Aeq,f</sub> (dBA)	L <sub>A90,f</sub> (dBA90)	L <sub>Amin,f</sub> (dBA)	Comments
<b>Day arithmetic average</b>	-	49	43	35	-	-
<b>Night arithmetic average</b>	-	33	29	22	-	-
<b>Day minimum</b>	-	24	20	-	9	-
<b>Day maximum</b>	79	65	57	-	-	-
<b>Night minimum</b>	-	19	16	-	9	-
<b>Night maximum</b>	65	51	43	-	-	-
<b>Day 1 equivalent</b>	-	50	44	-	-	Evening only
<b>Night 1 Equivalent</b>	-	43	34	-	-	8 hour night equivalent average
<b>Day 2 equivalent</b>	-	54	47	-	-	16 hour day equivalent average
<b>Night 2 Equivalent</b>	-	34	29	-	-	8 hour night equivalent average
<b>Day 3 equivalent</b>	-	54	47	-	-	Early morning only

The data indicate an area with increased noise levels during the day but that are very quiet at night. Daytime noises are the combination of wind-induced noises and sound typical of a working farm, with night-time sound levels being typical of a rural noise district. It should be noted that the quiet night-time measurements may also be due to the location being away from the typical vegetation and habitats found close to a residential dwelling, although, these sound levels are comparable to the sound levels measured at INWEFLTASL01.



**Figure 3-8: Ambient Sound Levels at INWEFLTASL02**



**Figure 3-9: Maximum, minimum and statistical values at INWEFLTASL02**

Third octaves were measured and are displayed in the following Figures. Wind-induced noises had a significant impact on the data for the first day, night and most of the second day (the relatively smooth curves).

**Lower frequency (20 – 250 Hz)** – Noise sources of significance in this frequency band would include nature (wind and surf especially – indicated by a relative smooth curve) and

sounds of anthropogenic origin and vehicles (engine sounds and electric motors – erratic bumps at certain frequencies). Lower frequencies tend to travel further through the atmosphere than higher frequencies.

Night-time measurements were generally devoid of sounds in this frequency band. Daytime measurements indicate various sources of sounds with acoustic energy in this frequency band. The second day indicates at least 3 distinctive sound sources, namely:

- Wind induced noises during the second day and third;
- A sound source with energy in the 20, 80 and 100Hz frequency bands, operational early morning;
- A sound source with energy in the 25, 50, 80 and 100 - 160Hz frequency bands, operational late afternoon and evening after the wind died down.

**Third octave surrounding the 1,000 Hz (200 – 2,000 Hz)** – This range contains energy mostly associated with human speech (350 Hz – 2,000 Hz; mostly below 1,000 Hz) and dwelling noises (including sounds from larger animals such as chickens, dogs, goats, sheep and cattle). Road-tyre interaction (from vehicular traffic) normally features in 630 – 1,600 Hz range.

Sounds in this frequency band were generally masked by wind-induced noises during the day, although afternoon, evening and night-time data indicating various sources of acoustical energy. The sound sources were relatively far from the microphone and are likely cattle.

**Higher frequency (2,000 Hz upwards)** – Smaller faunal species such as birds, crickets and cicada use this range to communicate and hunt etc.

Night-time measurements indicated a quiet area with little sound sources that communicated in this frequency band. A few measurements indicated peaks in the 4,000 and 20,000Hz frequencies. Daytime data indicate significant acoustic energy in the 2,500 – 5,000Hz frequency band, likely due to bird calls.

**Compliance with international guidelines:** While the daytime sound levels are elevated and higher than the sound levels typical of a rural area, night-time data indicate a quiet environment, typical of a rural noise district. Considering the developmental character of the area, the acceptable zone rating level would be typical of a rural area (35 dBA at night and 45 dBA during the day) as defined in SANS 10103.






Figure 3-10: Spectral frequencies – INWEFLTASL02, Day 1




Figure 3-11: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Night 1




Figure 3-12: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Day 2




Figure 3-13: Spectral frequencies - INWEFLTASL02, Night 2



### 3.4.3 Single measurements around project area

A number of single measurements were collected to gauge the ambient sound character and levels around the project site. Equipment used at these locations is defined in the following table. Refer to [Appendix B](#) for photos of some of the measurement locations.

**Table 3-7: Equipment used to do singular measurements**

Equipment	Model	Serial no	Calibration
SLM	RION NA-28	00901489	May 2015
Microphone	UC-59	02087	May 2015
Calibrator	Quest CA-22	J 2080094	June 2016

**Note:** SLM fitted at all times with appropriate windshield

The data collected and information about the measurement locations are presented in **Table 3-8<sup>8</sup>**.

### 3.5 AMBIENT SOUND LEVELS – SUMMARY

The data indicate that traffic is a major source of the noise in the area, but the road traffic will only influence the sound levels in an area 500 – 1,000m from the road. Away from the roads (N9 and N10), the area have a high potential to be very quiet. Birds, faunal and wind-induced noises does influence sound levels and considering the data collected, wind-induced noises significantly influences sound levels as wind speeds increases.

There is a high confidence in the ambient sound levels measured and the subsequent Rating Levels determined. For the purpose of this Environmental Noise Impact Assessment study, the strictest rating level (rural) will be used as defined in SANS 10103 (35 dBA at night, 45 dBA during the day during low wind conditions) for all the receptors living in the area.

<sup>8</sup> Note:


L<sub>Aeq,i</sub> - Equivalent (average) A-weighted impulse-time-weighted noise level

L<sub>Aeq,f</sub> - Equivalent (average) A-weighted fast-time-weighted noise level


L<sub>A90</sub> - Noise level that is exceeded 90% or more of the time, A-weighted fast-time-weighted noise level

**Table 3-8: Summary of singular noise measurement**


Measurement location	L <sub>Aeq,i</sub> level (dBA)	L <sub>Aeq,f</sub> level (dBA)	L <sub>A90</sub> Level (dBA90)	Spectral character	Comments
INWEFSTASL01	27	22	19	<b>Figure 3-14</b>	Next to road in rural area near entrance gate of Holbrook farm. Very quiet with sound of insects audible. Birds audible in distance. No wind.
INWEFSTASL02	33	27	19	<b>Figure 3-15</b>	Next to road in rural area. Birds dominant sound. Insects. Some wind gusts at times.
INWEFSTASL03	34	30	26	<b>Figure 3-16</b>	Lots more vegetation. Birds dominating. Some insects. Soft wind but little (audible) wind induced noises.
INWEFSTASL04	24	22	19	<b>Figure 3-17</b>	Wind induced noises dominates. Birds audible. Quiet location.
INWEFSTASL05	22	19	16	<b>Figure 3-18</b>	Birds audible. Quiet location. Low wind.
INWEFSTASL06	22	19	18	<b>Figure 3-19</b>	Birds audible. Quiet location. Low wind.
INWEFSTASL07	71	68	37	<b>Figure 3-20</b>	Wind induced noises. 22 cars, 3 trucks first measurement, 20 cars, 1 truck second measurement.
	70	67	32		
INWEFSTASL08	74	71	24	<b>Figure 3-21</b>	Noise from passing vehicles dominating during event. Dogs barking constant background. Voices. 16 cars first measurement, 20 cars second measurement.
	68	65	25		
INWEFSTASL09	55	52	29	<b>Figure 3-22</b>	Some wind induced noises. Insect sounds at time. 4 cars first measurement, 7 cars second measurement.
	68	63	26		
INWEFSTASL10	66	63	44	<b>Figure 3-23</b>	Dog at dwelling constant barking. Dove in distance. Sound level of 35 dBA due to dog. Max noise due to truck. 24 cars, 2 trucks first measurement, 14 cars and 2 trucks second measurement.
	66	62	42		
INWEFSTASL11	55	51	47	<b>Figure 3-24</b>	Wind induced noises dominate. Little traffic. Birds at times. 4 cars first measurement, 5 cars second measurement.
	62	59	49		
INWEFSTASL12	41	38	30	<b>Figure 3-25</b>	Wind induced noises dominate. Little traffic. Birds at times. 2 cars first measurement, 4 cars and 1 truck second measurement.
	60	54	27		




**Figure 3-14: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL01**




**Figure 3-15: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL02**




**Figure 3-16: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL03**




**Figure 3-17: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL04**




**Figure 3-18: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL05**




**Figure 3-19: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFLTASL06**




**Figure 3-20: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL07**




**Figure 3-21: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL08**




**Figure 3-22: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL09**



**Figure 3-23: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL10**



**Figure 3-24: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL11**



**Figure 3-25: Spectral frequencies recorded at INWEFSTASL12**

## 4 POTENTIAL NOISE SOURCES

Increased noise levels are directly linked to various activities associated with the construction of the facility and related infrastructure as well as the operational phase of the activity.

### 4.1 POTENTIAL NOISE SOURCES: CONSTRUCTION PHASE

#### 4.1.1 Construction equipment

It is estimated that construction will take approximately 18 - 24 months subject to the final design of the WEF, weather and ground conditions, including time for testing and commissioning. The construction process will consist of the following principal activities:

- Site survey and preparation;
- Establishment of site entrance, internal access roads, contractors compound and passing places;
- Civil works to sections of the public roads to facilitate with turbine delivery;
- Site preparation activities will include clearance of vegetation at the footprint of each turbine as well as crane hard-standing areas. These activities will require the stripping of topsoil which will need to be stockpiled, backfilled and/or spread on site;
- Construct foundations – due to the volume of concrete that will be required, an on-site batching plant will be required to ensure a continuous concreting operation. The source of aggregate is yet undefined but is expected to be derived from an offsite source or brought in as ready-mix. If the stones removed during the digging of foundations are suitable as an aggregate this can be used as the aggregate in the concrete mix.
- Transport of components & equipment to site – all components will be brought to site in sections by means of flatbed trucks. Additionally, components of various specialized construction and lifting equipment are required on site to erect the wind turbines and will need to be transported to site. The typical civil engineering construction equipment will need to be brought to the site for the civil works (e.g. excavators, trucks, graders, compaction equipment, cement trucks, etc.). The transportation of ready-mix concrete to site or the materials for onsite concrete batching will result in temporary increase in heavy traffic (one turbine foundation = 100 concrete trucks, and is undertaken as a continuous pour). The components

required for the establishment of the OHL (including towers and cabling) will be transported to site as required;

- Establishment of laydown & hard standing areas - laydown areas will need to be established at each turbine position for the placement of wind turbine components. Laydown and storage areas will also be required to be established for the civil engineering construction equipment which will be required on site. Hard standing areas will need to be established for operation of the cranes. Cranes of the size required to erect turbines are sensitive to differential movement during lifting operations and require a hard standing area;
- Erect turbines - a crane will be used to lift the tower sections into place and then the nacelle will be placed onto the top of the assembled tower. The next step will be to assemble or partially assemble the rotor on the ground; it will then be lifted to the nacelle and bolted in place. A small crane will likely be needed for the assembly of the rotor while the large crane will be needed to put it in place;
- Construct substation - the underground cables carrying the generated power from the individual turbines will connect at the substation. The construction of the substation would require a site survey; site clearing and levelling (including the removal / cutting of rock outcrops) and construction of access road/s (where required); construction of a substation terrace and foundation; assembly, erection and installation of equipment (including transformers); connection of conductors to equipment; and rehabilitation of any disturbed areas and protection of erosion sensitive areas;
- Establishment of ancillary infrastructure - A workshop as well as a contractor's equipment camp may be required. The establishment of these facilities/buildings will require the clearing of vegetation and levelling of the development site and the excavation of foundations prior to construction. A laydown area for building materials and equipment associated with these buildings will also be required;
- An OHL to connect to the existing Eskom Hydra B substation; and
- Site rehabilitation - once construction is completed and all construction equipment are removed; the site will be rehabilitated where practical and reasonable.

There are a number of factors that determine the audibility as well as the potential of a noise impact on receptors. Maximum noises generated can be audible over a large distance, however, are generally of very short duration. If maximum noise levels however exceed 65 dBA at a receptor, or if it is clearly audible with a significant number of instances where the noise level exceeds the prevailing ambient sound level with more than 15 dB the noise can increase annoyance levels and may ultimately result in noise complaints. Potential maximum noise levels generated by various construction equipment as well as the potential extent of these sounds are presented in **Table 4-1**.

Average or equivalent sound levels are another factor that impacts on the ambient sound levels and is the constant sound level that the receptor can experience. Typical sound power levels associated with various activities that may be found at a construction site are presented **Table 4-2**.

The equipment likely to be required to complete the above tasks will typically include:

- excavator/graders, bulldozer(s), dump trucks(s), vibratory roller, bucket loader, rock breaker(s), drill rig, flatbed truck(s), pile drivers, TLB, concrete truck(s), crane(s), fork lift(s) and various 4WD and service vehicles.

#### **4.1.2 Material supply: Concrete batching plants and use of Borrow Pits**

The project description states that a batching plant is planned on the site, with two alternative locations proposed.

#### **4.1.3 Traffic**

A significant source of noise during the construction phase is additional traffic to and from the site, as well as traffic on the site. This will include trucks transporting equipment, cement (possibly aggregate) as well as various components used to develop the wind turbine.

Construction traffic is expected to be generated throughout the entire construction period, however, the volume and type of traffic generated will be dependent upon the construction activities being conducted, which will vary during the construction period. Noise levels due to additional traffic will be estimated using the methods stipulated in SANS 10210:2004 (Calculating and predicting road traffic noise).



**Table 4-1: Potential maximum noise levels generated by construction equipment**

Equipment Description <sup>9</sup>	Impact Device?	Maximum Sound Power Levels (dBA)	Operational Noise Level at given distance considering potential <b>maximum</b> noise levels (Cumulative as well as the mitigatory effect of potential barriers or other mitigation not included – simple noise propagation modelling only considering distance) (dBA)											
			5 m	10 m	20 m	50 m	100 m	150 m	200 m	300 m	500 m	750 m	1000 m	2000 m
Auger Drill Rig	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Backhoe	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Chain Saw	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Compactor (ground)	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Compressor (air)	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Concrete Batch Plant	No	117.7	92.7	86.7	80.6	72.7	66.7	63.1	60.6	57.1	52.7	49.2	46.7	40.6
Concrete Mixer Truck	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Concrete Pump Truck	No	116.7	91.7	85.7	79.6	71.7	65.7	62.1	59.6	56.1	51.7	48.2	45.7	39.6
Concrete Saw	No	124.7	99.7	93.7	87.6	79.7	73.7	70.1	67.6	64.1	59.7	56.2	53.7	47.6
Crane	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Dozer	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Drill Rig Truck	No	118.7	93.7	87.7	81.6	73.7	67.7	64.1	61.6	58.1	53.7	50.2	47.7	41.6
Drum Mixer	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Dump Truck	No	118.7	93.7	87.7	81.6	73.7	67.7	64.1	61.6	58.1	53.7	50.2	47.7	41.6
Excavator	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Flat Bed Truck	No	118.7	93.7	87.7	81.6	73.7	67.7	64.1	61.6	58.1	53.7	50.2	47.7	41.6
Front End Loader	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Generator (>25KVA)	No	116.7	91.7	85.7	79.6	71.7	65.7	62.1	59.6	56.1	51.7	48.2	45.7	39.6
Generator (<25KVA)	No	104.7	79.7	73.7	67.6	59.7	53.7	50.1	47.6	44.1	39.7	36.2	33.7	27.6
Grader	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Impact Pile Driver	Yes	129.7	104.7	98.7	92.6	84.7	78.7	75.1	72.6	69.1	64.7	61.2	58.7	52.6
Jackhammer	Yes	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Man Lift	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Mounted Impact Hammer	Yes	124.7	99.7	93.7	87.6	79.7	73.7	70.1	67.6	64.1	59.7	56.2	53.7	47.6

<sup>9</sup> Equipment list and Sound Power Level source: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction\\_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/noise/construction_noise/handbook/handbook09.cfm)



Equipment Description <sup>9</sup>	Impact Device?	Maximum Sound Power Levels (dBA)	Operational Noise Level at given distance considering potential <b>maximum</b> noise levels (Cumulative as well as the mitigatory effect of potential barriers or other mitigation not included – simple noise propagation modelling only considering distance) (dBA)											
			5 m	10 m	20 m	50 m	100 m	150 m	200 m	300 m	500 m	750 m	1000 m	2000 m
Paver	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Pickup Truck	No	89.7	64.7	58.7	52.6	44.7	38.7	35.1	32.6	29.1	24.7	21.2	18.7	12.6
Pumps	No	111.7	86.7	80.7	74.6	66.7	60.7	57.1	54.6	51.1	46.7	43.2	40.7	34.6
Rivit Buster/Chipping Gun	Yes	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Rock Drill	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Roller	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Sand Blasting (single nozzle)	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Scraper	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Sheers (on backhoe)	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Slurry Plant	No	112.7	87.7	81.7	75.6	67.7	61.7	58.1	55.6	52.1	47.7	44.2	41.7	35.6
Slurry Trenching Machine	No	116.7	91.7	85.7	79.6	71.7	65.7	62.1	59.6	56.1	51.7	48.2	45.7	39.6
Soil Mix Drill Rig	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Tractor	No	118.7	93.7	87.7	81.6	73.7	67.7	64.1	61.6	58.1	53.7	50.2	47.7	41.6
Vacuum Excavator	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Vacuum Street Sweeper	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Ventilation Fan	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Vibrating Hopper	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Vibratory Concrete Mixer	No	114.7	89.7	83.7	77.6	69.7	63.7	60.1	57.6	54.1	49.7	46.2	43.7	37.6
Vibratory Pile Driver	No	129.7	104.7	98.7	92.6	84.7	78.7	75.1	72.6	69.1	64.7	61.2	58.7	52.6
Warning Horn	No	119.7	94.7	88.7	82.6	74.7	68.7	65.1	62.6	59.1	54.7	51.2	48.7	42.6
Welder/Torch	No	107.7	82.7	76.7	70.6	62.7	56.7	53.1	50.6	47.1	42.7	39.2	36.7	30.6

**Table 4-2: Potential equivalent noise levels generated by various equipment**

Equipment Description	Equivalent (average) Sound Levels (dBA)	Operational Noise Level at given distance considering equivalent (average) sound power emission levels (Cumulative as well as the mitigatory effect of potential barriers or other mitigation not included – simple noise propagation modelling only considering distance) (dBA)											
		5 m	10 m	20 m	50 m	100 m	150 m	200 m	300 m	500 m	750 m	1000 m	2000 m
Bulldozer CAT D10	111.9	86.9	80.9	74.9	66.9	60.9	57.4	54.9	51.3	46.9	43.4	40.9	34.9
Bulldozer CAT D11	113.3	88.4	82.3	76.3	68.4	62.3	58.8	56.3	52.8	48.4	44.8	42.3	36.3
Bulldozer CAT D9	111.9	86.9	80.9	74.9	66.9	60.9	57.4	54.9	51.3	46.9	43.4	40.9	34.9
Bulldozer CAT D6	108.2	83.3	77.3	71.2	63.3	57.3	53.7	51.2	47.7	43.3	39.8	37.3	31.2
Bulldozer CAT D5	107.4	82.4	76.4	70.4	62.4	56.4	52.9	50.4	46.9	42.4	38.9	36.4	30.4
Bulldozer Komatsu 375	114.0	89.0	83.0	77.0	69.0	63.0	59.5	57.0	53.4	49.0	45.5	43.0	37.0
Bulldozer Komatsu 65	109.5	84.5	78.5	72.4	64.5	58.5	54.9	52.4	48.9	44.5	41.0	38.5	32.4
Diesel Generator (Large - mobile)	106.1	81.2	75.1	69.1	61.2	55.1	51.6	49.1	45.6	41.2	37.6	35.1	29.1
Dumper/Haul truck - CAT 700	115.9	91.0	85.0	78.9	71.0	65.0	61.4	58.9	55.4	51.0	47.5	45.0	38.9
Dumper/Haul truck - Terex 30 ton	112.2	87.2	81.2	75.2	67.2	61.2	57.7	55.2	51.7	47.2	43.7	41.2	35.2
Dumper/Haul truck - Bell 25 ton (B25D)	108.4	83.5	77.5	71.4	63.5	57.5	53.9	51.4	47.9	43.5	40.0	37.5	31.4
Excavator - Cat 416D	103.9	78.9	72.9	66.8	58.9	52.9	49.3	46.8	43.3	38.9	35.4	32.9	26.8
Excavator - Hitachi EX1200	113.1	88.1	82.1	76.1	68.1	62.1	58.6	56.1	52.6	48.1	44.6	42.1	36.1
Excavator - Hitachi 870 (80 t)	108.1	83.1	77.1	71.1	63.1	57.1	53.6	51.1	47.5	43.1	39.6	37.1	31.1
Excavator - Hitachi 270 (30 t)	104.5	79.6	73.5	67.5	59.6	53.5	50.0	47.5	44.0	39.6	36.0	33.5	27.5
FEL - CAT 950G	102.1	77.2	71.2	65.1	57.2	51.2	47.6	45.1	41.6	37.2	33.7	31.2	25.1
FEL - Komatsu WA380	100.7	75.7	69.7	63.7	55.7	49.7	46.2	43.7	40.1	35.7	32.2	29.7	23.7
General noise	108.8	83.8	77.8	71.8	63.8	57.8	54.2	51.8	48.2	43.8	40.3	37.8	31.8
Grader - Operational Hitachi	108.9	83.9	77.9	71.9	63.9	57.9	54.4	51.9	48.4	43.9	40.4	37.9	31.9
Grader	110.9	85.9	79.9	73.9	65.9	59.9	56.4	53.9	50.3	45.9	42.4	39.9	33.9
JBL TLB	108.8	83.8	77.8	71.8	63.8	57.8	54.3	51.8	48.3	43.8	40.3	37.8	31.8
Road Transport Reversing/Idling	108.2	83.3	77.2	71.2	63.3	57.2	53.7	51.2	47.7	43.3	39.7	37.2	31.2
Road Truck average	109.6	84.7	78.7	72.6	64.7	58.7	55.1	52.6	49.1	44.7	41.1	38.7	32.6
Vibrating roller	106.3	81.3	75.3	69.3	61.3	55.3	51.8	49.3	45.8	41.3	37.8	35.3	29.3
Water Dozer, CAT	113.8	88.8	82.8	76.8	68.8	62.8	59.3	56.8	53.3	48.8	45.3	42.8	36.8

#### **4.1.4 Blasting**

Blasting may be required as part of the civil works to clear obstacles or to prepare foundations. However, blasting will not be considered during the EIA phase for the following reasons:

- Blasting is highly regulated, and control of blasting to protect human health, equipment and infrastructure will ensure that any blasts will use the minimum explosives and will occur in a controlled manner. The breaking of obstacles with explosives is also a specialized field and when correct techniques are used, causes significantly less noise than using a hydraulic rock-breaker.
- People are generally more concerned about ground vibration and air blast levels that might cause building damage than the impact of the noise from the blast. However, these are normally associated with close proximity mining/quarrying.
- Blasts are an infrequent occurrence, with a loud but a relative instantaneous character. Potentially affected parties generally receive sufficient notice (siren) and the knowledge that the duration of the siren noise as well as the blast will be over relative fast results in a higher acceptance of the noise. Note that with the selection of explosives and blasting methods, noise levels from blasting is relatively easy to control.

#### **4.2 POTENTIAL NOISE SOURCES: OPERATIONAL PHASE**

The proposed development would be designed to have an operational life of up to 20 years, as set out in the current REIPPP by the DoE. There is the possibility to further expand the lifetime by an extra 20 years. During operation of the development, the large majority of the WEF sites will continue with agricultural use as it is currently. The only development related activities on-site will be routine servicing and unscheduled maintenance. The noise impact from maintenance activities is insignificant, with the main noise source being the wind turbine blades and the nacelle (components inside).

Noise emitted by wind turbines can be divided in two types of noise sources. These are aerodynamic sources due to the passage of air over the wind turbine blades and mechanical sources that are associated with components of the power train within the turbine, such as the gearbox and generator and control equipment for yaw, blade pitch, etc. These sources generally have different characteristics and can be considered separately. In addition there are other lesser noise sources, such as the substations themselves, traffic (maintenance) as well as transmission line noise.

#### 4.2.1 Wind Turbine Noise: Aerodynamic sources<sup>10</sup>

Aerodynamic noise is emitted by a wind turbine blade through a number of sources such as:

1. Self-noise due to the interaction of the turbulent boundary layer with the blade trailing edge
2. Noise due to inflow turbulence (turbulence in the wind interacting with the blades)
3. Discrete frequency noise due to trailing edge thickness
4. Discrete frequency noise due to laminar boundary layer instabilities (unstable flow close to the surface of the blade)
5. Noise generated by the rotor tips

Noise due to aerodynamic instabilities (mechanisms 3 and 4) can be reduced to insignificant levels by careful design. The other mechanisms are an inescapable consequence of the aerodynamics of the turbine that produces the power and between them they will make up most, if not all, of the aerodynamic noise radiated by the wind turbine. The relative contribution of each source will depend upon the detailed design of the turbine and the wind speed and turbulence at the time.

The mechanisms responsible for tip noise (mechanism 5) are currently under investigation, but it appears that methods for its control through design of the tip shape might be available. Self-noise (mechanism 1) is most significant at low wind speeds, whereas noise due to inflow turbulence (mechanism 2) becomes the dominant source at the higher wind speeds. Both mechanisms increase in strength as the wind speed increases, particularly inflow turbulence. The overall result is that at low to moderate wind speeds, the noise from a fixed speed wind turbine increases at a rate of 0.5-1.5 dBA /m/s up to a maximum at wind speeds of 7 -12 m/s (noise generated by the WTG does not increase significantly at wind speeds above 12 m/s).

Therefore, as the wind speed increases, noises created by the wind turbine also increases. At a low wind speed the noise created by the wind turbine is generally (relatively) low, and increases to a maximum at a certain wind speed when it either remains constant, increase very slightly or even drops as illustrated in **Figure 4-1**. The sound power emissions (in octave sound power levels) as used in this report are presented in **Table 7-1**.

The developer is investigating a number of different wind turbine models; not excluding the possibility of larger models that are not yet available in the commercial market.


---

<sup>10</sup>Renewable Energy Research Laboratory, 2006; ETSU R97: 1996


Therefore, for the purpose of this noise assessment a worse-case scenario will be investigated, making use of the sound power emission levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 turbine (refer to **Figure 4-1**).

The developer is also considering the use of the Vestas V126 3.45/3.6 MW and the Acciona AW125/3000. While the sound power emission levels of the Vestas V126 3.45/3.6 are similar to the Vestas V117 3.3 MW, the sound power emission levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 is approximately 2 dB higher than either the Vestas WTGs.

The propagation model makes use of various frequencies, because these frequencies are affected in different ways as it propagates through air, over barriers and over different ground conditions providing a higher accuracy than models that only use the total sound power level. The octave sound power levels for various wind turbines are presented on **Figure 4-2**.



**Figure 4-1: Noise Emissions Curve of a number of different wind turbines (figure for illustration purposes only)**



**Figure 4-2: Octave sound power emissions of various wind turbines**

**4.2.1.1 Control Strategies to manage Noise Emissions during operation**

In addition to blade technologies (such as serrated edges) that assist in noise reduction, wind turbine manufacturers also provide their equipment with control mechanisms to allow for a certain noise reduction during operation that can include:

- A reduction of rotational speed, and/or
- the increase of the pitch angle and/or reduction of nominal generator torque to reduce the angle of attack.

These mechanisms are used in various ways to allow the reduction of noise levels from the wind turbines, although this also results in a reduction of power generation.

**4.2.2 Wind Turbine: Mechanical sources<sup>11</sup>**

Mechanical noise is generally perceived within the emitted noise from wind turbines as an audible tone(s) that is subjectively more intrusive than a broad band noise of the same sound pressure level. Sources for this noise are generally associated with the gearbox and the tooth mesh frequencies of the step up stages; generator noise caused by coil flexure of the generator windings that is associated with power regulation and control; generator noise caused by cooling fans; and control equipment noise caused by hydraulic compressors for pitch regulation and yaw control.

<sup>11</sup>Renewable Energy Research Laboratory, 2006; ETSU R97: 1996; Audiology Today, 2010; HGC Engineering, 2007

*Tones are noises with a narrow sound frequency composition (e.g. the whine of an electrical motor). Annoying tones can be created in numerous ways: machinery with rotating parts such as motors, gearboxes, fans and pumps often create tones. An imbalance or repeated impacts may cause vibration that, when transmitted through surfaces into the air, can be heard as tones. Pulsating flows of liquids or gases can also create tones, which may be caused by combustion processes or flow restrictions. The best and most well-known example of a tonal noise is the buzz created by a flying mosquito.*

Where complaints have been received due to the operation of wind farms, tonal noise from the installed wind turbines appears to have increased the annoyance perceived by the complainants and indeed has been the primary cause for complaint.

However, tones were normally associated with the older models of turbines. All turbine manufacturers have started to ensure that sufficient forethought is given to the design of quieter gearboxes and the means by which these vibration transmission paths may be broken. Through the use of careful gearbox design and/or the use of anti-vibration techniques, it is possible to minimise the transmission of vibration energy into the turbine supporting structure.

The benefits of these design improvements have started to filter through into wind farm developments which are using these modified wind turbines. ***New generation wind turbine generators should not emit any clearly distinguishable tones.***

#### **4.2.3 Transformer noises (Substations)**

Also known as magnetostriction; this is when the sheet steel used in the core of the transformer tries to change shape when being magnetised. When the magnetism is taken away, the shape returns, only to try and deform in a different manner when the polarity is changed.

This deformation is not uniform; consequently it varies all over a sheet. With a transformer core being composed of many sheets of steel, these deformations are taking place erratically all over each sheet, and each sheet is behaving erratically with respect to its neighbour. The resultant is the "hum" frequently associated with transformers. While this may be a soothing sound in small home appliances, various complaints are logged in areas where people stay close to these transformers. At a voltage frequency of 50 Hz, these "vibrations" takes place 100 times a second, resulting in a tonal noise at 100 Hz. This is normally not an issue if the substation is further than 200 meters from a potentially sensitive receptor.



**This is a relatively easy noise to mitigate with the use of acoustic shielding and/or placement of the transformer equipment and will not be considered further in the EIA study.**

#### **4.2.4 Transmission Line Noise (Corona noise)**

Corona noise is caused by the partial breakdown of the insulation properties of air surrounding the conducting wires. It can generate an audible and radio-frequency noise, but generally only occurs in humid conditions as provided by fog or rain. A minimum line potential of 70 kV or higher is generally required to generate corona noise depending on the electrical design. Corona noise does not occur on domestic distribution lines.

Corona noise has two major components: a low frequency tone associated with the frequency of the AC supply (100 Hz for 50 Hz source) and broadband noise. The tonal component of the noise is related to the point along the electric waveform at which the air begins to conduct. This varies with each cycle and consequently the frequency of the emitted tone is subject to great fluctuations. Corona noise can be characterised as broadband 'crackling' or 'buzzing', but fortunately it is generally only a feature during fog or rain.

It will not be further investigated, as corona discharges results in:

- Power losses
- Audible noises
- Electromagnetic interference
- A purple glow
- Ozone production
- Insulation damage

In addition this is associated with high voltage transmission lines, and not the lower voltage distribution lines proposed for construction by the developer.

**As such, Electrical Service Providers (such as Eskom) go to great lengths to design power transmission equipment to minimise the formation of corona discharges. In addition, it is an infrequent occurrence with a relative short duration compared to other operational noises. At the relative low voltages proposed for this project Corona noises would not be an issue.**

## 4.2.5 Low Frequency Noise<sup>12</sup>

### 4.2.5.1 Background and Information

Low frequency sound is the term used to describe sound energy in the region below ~200 Hz. The rumble of thunder and the throb of a diesel engine are both examples of sounds with most of their energy in this low frequency range. Infrasound is often used to describe sound energy in the region below 20 Hz.

Almost all noise in the environment has components in this region although they are of such a low level that they are not significant (wind, ocean, thunder). See also **Figure 4-3**, which indicates the sound power levels in the different octave bands from measurements taken at different wind speeds with no other audible noise sources. Sound that has most of its energy in the 'infrasound' range is only significant if it is at a very high level, far above normal environmental levels.

Low frequency noise from wind turbines has in the last few years become more prominent, with various studies and articles covering this subject.

### 4.2.5.2 The generation of Low Frequency Sounds

Due to the low rotational rates of the blades of a WTG as well as the size of these blades, significant acoustic energy is radiated by large wind turbines in the infrasonic range.

### 4.2.5.3 Detection of Low Frequency Sounds

The levels of infrasound radiated by the largest wind turbines are very low in comparison to other sources of acoustic energy in this frequency range such as sonic booms, shock waves from explosions, etc. The danger of hearing damage from wind turbine low-frequency emissions is non-existent. However, sounds in a frequency range less than 100 Hz can, under the right circumstances, be responsible for annoying nearby residents. However, except very near the source, most people outside cannot detect the presence of low-frequency noise from a wind turbine, and low-frequency noise from natural events (especially wind related) already exist all over and as illustrated in **Figure 4-3**.

It should be noted that a number of studies highlighted that these sounds are below the threshold of perception (BWEA, 2005), although this should be clarified. Most acousticians would agree that the low frequency sounds are inaudible to most people, yet, there are a number of studies that highlight that it can be more perceptible to people inside their houses as well as people that are more sensitive to low frequency sounds.


---

<sup>12</sup>Renewable Energy Research Laboratory, 2006; DELTA, 2008; DEFRA, 2003; HGC Engineering, 2006; Whitford, Jacques, 2008; Noise-con, 2008; Minnesota DoH, 2009; Kamperman, 2008, Van den Berg, 2004; Bolin, 2011; Thorne, 2010; Ambrose, 2011; Møller, 2010; O'Neal, 2011

Thorne (2011) notes that;

"Low frequency sound and infrasound are normal characteristics of a wind farm as they are the normal characteristics of wind, as such. The difference is that "normal" wind is laminar or smooth in effect whereas wind farm sound is non-laminar and presents a pulsing nature."

Residents studied by Thorne often report that the low frequency sound is noticeably worse in their homes than it is outside<sup>13</sup>.



**Figure 4-3: Third octave band sound power levels at various wind speeds at a location where wind induced noises dominate**

#### 4.2.5.4 Measurement, Isolation and Assessment of Low Frequency Sounds<sup>14</sup>

There remains significant debate regarding the noise from WTGs, public response to that noise, as well as the presence or not of low frequency sound and how it affects people. While low frequency sounds can be measured, it is far more difficult to isolate low frequency sounds due to the numerous sources that generate these sounds.

There isn't a standardised test, nor an assessment procedure available for the assessment of low frequency sounds, neither is there an accepted methodology on how low frequency sounds can be modelled or predicted. This is because low frequency sound can travel large

<sup>13</sup> Hubbard, 1990; Thorne, 2010; Ambrose, 2011

<sup>14</sup> Hessler, 2011; James,

distances, and are present all around us, with a significant component generated by nature itself (ocean, wind, etc.).

SANS 10103 proposes a method to identify whether low frequency noise could be an issue from an operating facility. It proposes that if the difference between the measured A-frequency weighted and the C-frequency weighted equivalent continuous ( $L_{Aeq} >> L_{Ceq}$ ) sound pressure levels is greater than 10 dB, a predominant low frequency component **may** be present. However, in all cases existing acoustic energy in low frequencies associated with wind must be considered.

#### 4.2.5.5 Summary: Low Frequency Noise<sup>15</sup>

Low frequency noise is always present around us as it is produced by both man and nature. While problems have been associated with older downwind wind turbines in the 1980s, this has been considered by the wind industry and modern upwind turbines do not suffer from the same problems. Low Frequency Noise however has been very controversial in the last few years with the anti-wind fraternity claiming measurable impacts, with governments and wind-energy supporter studies indicating no link between low-frequency sound and any health impacts. This study notes the various claims and as such follow a more precautionous approach.


#### 4.2.6 Amplitude modulation<sup>16</sup>

Although considered rare, there is one other characteristic of wind turbine sound that increases the sleep disturbance potential above that of other long-term noise sources. The amplitude modulation (AM) of the sound emissions from the wind turbines creates a repetitive rise and fall in sound levels synchronised to the blade rotation speed, sometimes referred to as a “swish” or “thump”.

---

<sup>15</sup>BWEA, 2005

<sup>16</sup>Renewable Energy Research Laboratory, 2006; Audiology Today, 2010; HGC Engineering, 2007; Whitford, 2008; Noise-con, 2008; DEFRA, 2007; Bowdler, 2008; Smith (2012); Stigwood (2013); Tachibana (2013)




**Figure 4-4: Example time-sound series graph illustrating AM as measured by Stigwood<sup>17</sup> (et al) (2013)**

Pedersen (2003) highlighted a weak correlation between sound pressure level and noise annoyance caused by wind turbines. Residents complaining about wind turbines noise perceived more sound characteristics than noise levels. People were able to distinguish between background ambient sounds and the sounds the blades made. The noise produced by the blades lead to most complaints. Most of the annoyance was experienced between 16:00 and midnight. This could be an issue as noise propagation modelling would be reporting an equivalent, or “average” sound pressure level, a parameter that ignores the “character” of the sound.

The word map (**Figure 4-5**) below categorises some of the many terms used by affected residents to describe AM, including physical likeness of the sound and musical terms describing the character of AM.

<sup>17</sup> Stigwood (et al) (2013): “Audible amplitude modulation – results of field measurements and investigations compared to psycho-acoustical assessments and theoretical research”; Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise, Denver 28 – 30 August 2013



**Figure 4-5: Word map of terms used to describe the sound of AM (source: Stigwood (et al) (2013))**

The mechanism of amplitude modulated noises is not known although various possible reasons have been put forward. Although the prevalence of complaints about amplitude modulation is relatively small, it is not clear whether this is because it does not occur often enough or whether it is because housing is not in the right place to observe it. Furthermore, the fact that the mechanism is unknown means that it is not possible to predict when or whether it will occur.

Bowler (2008) concludes that there are probably two distinct mechanisms in operation to create AM. The first is swish which is a function of the observers position relative to one turbine. The second is thump which is due to turbine blades passing through uneven air velocities as they rotate. In the second case the uneven air may be due to interaction of other turbines, excessive wind shear or topography. These two mechanisms are entirely separate though it is possible that they interact.

Stigwood (et al) (2013) also measured amplitude modulation at distances up to 1000 meters from the closest wind turbines at a number of wind farms in the United Kingdom and have summarized that:

- AM is more common than previously reported.

- AM should be measured during evening (after sunset), night time or early morning periods.
- Meteorological effects, such as atmospheric stability, which lead to downward refraction resulting from changes in the sound speed gradient alter the character and level of AM measured.
- AM is generated by all wind turbines including single turbines.
- Propagation conditions, mostly affected by meteorology and the occurrence of localised heightened noise zones determine locations that will be affected.
- Findings confirm that AM occurrence is frequent (at the eleven wind farms investigated) and can readily be identified in the field by measuring under suitable conditions and using appropriate equipment and settings.
- Audible features of AM including frequency content and periodicity vary both within and between wind farms.
- Noise character can differ considerably within a short time period. The constant change in AM character increases attention and cognitive appraisal and reappraisal, inhibiting acclimatisation to the sound.

That AM can be a risk and significantly increase the annoyance with wind energy facilities cannot be disputed. It has been reported with a number of recent studies confirming this significant noise characteristic. However, even though there is thousands of wind turbine generators in the world, amplitude modulation are still one subject receiving the least complaints and due to this very few complaints, little research went into this subject. Studies as recently as 2012 (Smith, 2012) highlight the need for additional studies and data collection.

However, because of these unknown factors (low frequency noises and AM), this noise study adopts a precautionous stance and will consider the worst-case scenario.

#### **4.2.7 Summary Conclusions on Wind Turbine Noise**

Wind turbines do generate sound in both the inaudible and audible frequency range. However, the manner how this sound is perceived by people would range between people, communities as well as the surrounding environmental conditions in which they live. There are some studies<sup>18</sup> that shows correlations between noise annoyance and a dislike to the facility, with other studies showing a link between wind turbines and increased annoyance levels<sup>19</sup>. Annoyance levels can be further subdivided into people that are annoyed by

---

<sup>18</sup> Gibbons, 2014; Crichton, 2014; Atkinson-Palumbo, 2014; Chapman, 2013; Pedersen, 2003.

<sup>19</sup> Thorne, 2010; Ambrose, 2011; Pierpont, 2009; Nissenbaum, 2012; Knopper, 2011; Kroesen, 2011; Philips, 2011; Shepherd, 2011a; Shepherd, 2011b; Pedersen, 2011; Wang, 2011; Cooper, 2012; McMurtry, 2011; Havas, 2011; Jeffery, 2013

increased noise levels to the point where people report having to leave their houses to get relieve from the noise.

How widespread annoyance and health issues reports are, are yet to be defined, as there has not been an industry wide scientific study covering noise from wind turbines. Values of 5 – 15% appear to be the most cited, although it depends on the source (it must be reiterated that these are simply reports<sup>20</sup>).

A search on the internet identifies groups that scour the internet for studies, reports and articles about wind energy; some focusing on the positive stories yet others gathering everything mentioned about the negatives, unfortunately also reporting all the negatives as fact without considering all the data. There are numerous wind farms where there has been no noise complaints (a UK study suggest that about 20% of wind farms generated noise complaints, (Cummings, 2011), yet there has been no study assessing the differences between these wind farms.

Cummings (2012) also reports that:

*"it's notable that in ranching country, where most residents are leaseholders and many live within a quarter to half mile of turbines, health and annoyance complaints are close to non-existent; some have suggested that this is evidence of an antidote to wind turbine syndrome: earning some money from the turbines. More to the point, though, the equanimity with which turbine sound is accommodated in ranching communities again suggests that those who see turbines as a welcome addition to their community are far less likely to be annoyed, and thus to trigger indirect stress-related effects. Equally important to consider, ranchers who work around heavy equipment on a daily basis are also likely to be less noise sensitive than average, whereas people who live in the country for peace and quiet and solitude are likely more noise-sensitive than average. And, there are some indications that in flat ranching country, turbine noise levels may be more steady, less prone to atmospheric conditions that make turbines unpredictably louder or more intrusive. When considering the dozens of wind farms in the Midwest and west where noise complaints are minimal or non-existent, it remains true that the vast majority of U.S. wind turbines are built either far from homes or in areas where there is widespread tolerance for the noise they add to the local soundscape."*

However, on the other hand, there are reports of significant annoyance (that can lead to increased stress levels that can result in other health problems or increase existing problems) from individuals and communities, frequently from people that value the rural quiet and sense of place.

---

<sup>20</sup> Cummings, 2012



Therefore, when assessing the potential noise impacts one has to consider:

- the complex characteristic of noise from wind turbines (numerous factors that are not yet fully understood);
- the numerous reports about noise impacts;
- the rural character and existing sense of place from a noise perspective;
- the recommendations from recognised acousticians.

The assessment methodology does consider these factors as discussed in the following section.

## 5 METHODS: NOISE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SIGNIFICANCE

### 5.1 NOISE IMPACT ON ANIMALS<sup>21</sup>

A great deal of research was conducted in the 1960's and 1970's on the effects of aircraft noise on animals. While aircraft noise have a specific characteristic that might not be comparable with industrial noise, the findings should be relevant to most noise sources.

Overall, the research suggests that species differ in their response to:

- Various types of noise;
- Durations of noise; and
- Sources of noise.

A general animal behavioural reaction to aircraft noise is the startle response. However, the strength and length of the startle response appears to be dependent on:

- which species is exposed;
- whether there is one animal or a group; and
- whether there have been some previous exposures.

Unfortunately, there are numerous other factors in the environment of animals that also influence the effects of noise. These include predators, weather, changing prey/food base and ground-based disturbance, especially anthropogenic. This hinders the ability to define the real impact of noise on animals.

From these and other studies the following can be concluded:

- Animals respond to impulsive (sudden) noises (higher than 90 dBA) by running away. If the noises continue, animals would try to relocate.
- Animals of most species exhibit adaptation with noise, including aircraft noise and sonic booms.
- More sensitive species would relocate to a more quiet area, especially species that depend on hearing to hunt or evade prey, or species that makes use of sound/hearing to locate a suitable mate.
- Noises associated with helicopters, motor- and quad bikes significantly impact on animals.

#### 5.1.1 Domestic Animals

It has been observed that most domestic animals are generally not bothered by noise, excluding most impulsive noises.

---

<sup>21</sup>Report to Congressional Requesters, 2005; USEPA, 1971; Autumn, 2007; Noise quest, 2010

### 5.1.2 Wildlife

Studies showed that most animals adapt to noises, and would even return to a site after an initial disturbance, even if the noise is continuous. The more sensitive animals that might be impacted by noise would most likely relocate to a quieter area. Noise impacts are therefore very highly species dependent.

## 5.2 WHY NOISE CONCERNS COMMUNITIES<sup>22</sup>

Noise can be defined as "unwanted sound", and an audible acoustic energy that adversely affects the physiological and/or psychological well-being of people, or which disturbs or impairs the convenience or peace of any person. One can generalise by saying that sound becomes unwanted when it:

- Hinders speech communication;
- Impedes the thinking process;
- Interferes with concentration;
- Obstructs activities (work, leisure and sleeping); and
- Presents a health risk due to hearing damage.

However, it is important to remember that whether a given sound is "noise" depends on the listener or hearer. The driver playing loud rock music on their car radio hears only music, but the person in the traffic behind them hears nothing but noise.

Response to noise is unfortunately not an empirical absolute, as it is seen as a multi-faceted psychological concept, including behavioural and evaluative aspects. For instance, in some cases, annoyance is seen as an outcome of disturbances, in other cases it is seen as an indication of the degree of helplessness with respect to the noise source.

Noise does not need to be loud to be considered "disturbing". One can refer to a dripping tap in the quiet of the night, or the irritating "thump-thump" of the music from a neighbouring house at night when one would like to sleep.

Severity of the annoyance depends on factors such as:

- Background sound levels, and the background sound levels the receptor is used to;
- The manner in which the receptor can control the noise (helplessness);
- The time, unpredictability, frequency distribution, duration, and intensity of the noise;
- The physiological state of the receptor; and
- The attitude of the receptor about the emitter (noise source).

---

<sup>22</sup>World Health Organization, 1999; Noise quest, 2010; Journal of Acoustical Society of America, 2009

## 5.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

### 5.3.1 Overview: The common characteristics

The word "noise" is generally used to convey a negative response or attitude to the sound received by a listener. There are four common characteristics of sound, any or all of which determine listener response and the subsequent definition of the sound as "noise". These characteristics are:

- Intensity;
- Loudness;
- Annoyance; and
- Offensiveness.

Of the four common characteristics of sound, intensity is the only one which is not subjective and can be quantified. Loudness is a subjective measure of the effect sound has on the human ear. As a quantity it is therefore complicated, but has been defined by experimentation on subjects known to have normal hearing.


The annoyance and offensive characteristics of noise are also subjective. Whether or not a noise causes annoyance mostly depends upon its reception by an individual, the environment in which it is heard, the type of activity and mood of the person and how acclimatised or familiar that person is to the sound.

### 5.3.2 Noise criteria of concern

The criteria used in this report were drawn from the criteria for the description and assessment of environmental impacts considering the latest EIA Regulations, SANS 10103:2008 as well as guidelines from the World Health Organization.

There are a number of criteria that are of concern for the assessment of noise impacts. These can be summarised in the following manner:

- *Increase in noise levels:* People or communities often react to an increase in the ambient noise level they are used to, which is caused by a new source of noise. With regards to the Noise Control Regulations (promulgated in terms of the ECA), an increase of more than 7 dBA is considered a disturbing noise. See also **Figure 5-1**.
- *Zone Sound Levels:* Previously referred to as the acceptable rating levels, it sets acceptable noise levels for various areas. See also **Table 5-1**.
- *Absolute or total noise levels:* Depending on their activities, people generally are tolerant to noise up to a certain absolute level, e.g. 65 dBA. Anything above this level will be considered unacceptable.



**Figure 5-1: Criteria to assess the significance of impacts stemming from noise**

In South Africa, the document that addresses the issues concerning environmental noise is SANS 10103:2008 (See also **Table 5-1**). It provides the equivalent ambient noise levels (referred to as Rating Levels),  $L_{Req,d}$  and  $L_{Req,n}$ , during the day and night respectively to which different types of developments may be exposed.

While acoustical measurements indicated an area where the ambient sound levels are slight higher than typically associated for a rural area, the potential noise impact will be evaluated in terms of (i.t.o.) the rural acceptable rating level as well as the IFC noise-limits as defined below:

- “Rural Noise Districts” (45 and 35 dBA day/night-time Rating i.t.o. SANS 10103:2008).
- “Equator principles” (55 and 45 dBA day/night-time limits i.t.o. IFC Noise Limits).

SANS 10103:2008 also provides a guideline for estimating community response to an increase in the general ambient noise level caused by an intruding noise. If  $\Delta$  is the increase in sound level, the following criteria are of relevance:

- **$\Delta \leq 3$  dBA:** An increase of 3 dBA or less will not cause any response from a community. It should be noted that for a person with average hearing acuity an increase of less than 3 dBA in the general ambient noise level would not be noticeable.
- **$3 < \Delta \leq 5$  dBA:** An increase of between 3 dBA and 5 dBA will elicit ‘little’ community response with ‘sporadic complaints’. People will just be able to notice a change in the sound character in the area.

- **5 < Δ ≤ 15 dBA:** An increase of between 5 dBA and 15 dBA will elicit a ‘medium’ community response with ‘widespread complaints’. In addition, an increase of 10 dBA is subjectively perceived as a doubling in the loudness of a noise. For an increase of more than 15 dBA the community reaction will be ‘strong’ with ‘threats of community action’.

Note that an increase of more than 7 dBA is defined as a disturbing noise and prohibited (National and Provincial Noise Control Regulations).

**Table 5-1: Acceptable Zone Sound Levels for noise in districts (SANS 10103:2008)**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Type of district	Equivalent continuous rating level ( $L_{Req,T}$ ) for noise dBA					
	Outdoors			Indoors, with open windows		
	Day/night $L_{R,dn}^a$	Daytime $L_{Req,d}^b$	Night-time $L_{Req,n}^b$	Day/night $L_{R,dn}^a$	Daytime $L_{Req,d}^b$	Night-time $L_{Req,n}^b$
a) Rural districts	45	45	35	35	35	25
b) Suburban districts with little road traffic	50	50	40	40	40	30
c) Urban districts	55	55	45	45	45	35
d) Urban districts with one or more of the following: workshops; business premises; and main roads	60	60	50	50	50	40
e) Central business districts	65	65	55	55	55	45
f) Industrial districts	70	70	60	60	60	50

**5.3.3 Determining appropriate Zone Sound Levels**

SANS 10103:2008 does not cater for instances when background ambient sound levels change due to the impact of external forces. Locations close (closer than 500 meters from coastline) from the sea for instance always has an ambient sound level exceeding 35 dBA, and, in cases where the sea is rather turbulent, it can easily exceed 45 dBA. Similarly, noise induced by high winds is not considered in the SANS standard.

Setting noise limits relative to the ambient sound level is relatively straightforward when the prevailing ambient sound level and source level are constant. However, wind turbines only start to operate when wind speeds exceed 3 m/s. Noise emissions therefore relates to the wind speed and similarly, the environment in which they are heard also depends upon the strength of the wind and the noise associated with its effects. It is therefore necessary to derive an ambient sound level that is indicative of the noise environment at the

receiving property for different wind speeds so that the turbine noise level at any particular wind speed can be compared with the ambient sound level in the same wind conditions.

### 5.3.3.1 Using International Guidelines to set Noise Limits

When assessing the overall noise levels emitted by a Wind Energy Facility, it is necessary to consider the full range of operating wind speeds of the wind turbines. This covers the wind speed range from around 3-5 m/s (the turbine cut-in wind speed) up to a wind speed range of 25-35 m/s measured at the hub height of a wind turbine. However, ETSU-R97 (1996) proposes that noise limits only be placed up to a wind speed of 12 m/s for the following reasons:


1. Wind speeds are not often measured at wind speeds greater than 12 m/s at 10 m height;
2. Reliable measurements of background ambient sound levels and turbine noise will be difficult to make in high winds due to the effects of wind noise on the microphone and the fact that one could have to wait several months before such winds were experienced;
3. Turbine manufacturers are unlikely to be able to provide information on sound power levels at such high wind speeds for similar reasons; and
4. If a wind farm meets noise limits at wind speeds lower than 12m/s, it is most unlikely to cause any greater loss of amenity at higher wind speeds. Turbine noise levels increase only slightly as wind speeds increase; however, background ambient sound levels increase significantly with increasing wind speeds due to the force of the wind.

Ambient sound vs. wind speed data is presented in **Figure 5-2**<sup>23</sup>. This is a quiet (as per the opinion of the author) location<sup>24</sup> where there were no apparent or observable sounds that would have impacted on the measurements, presenting the A-Weighted sound levels at an inland area. The figures clearly indicate a trend where sound levels increase if the wind speed increases. This has been found at all locations where measurements have been done for a sufficiently long enough period of time (more than 30 locations – more than 38,000 measurements).

---

<sup>23</sup> The sound level measuring instruments were located at a quiet location in the garden of the various houses. Data was measured in 10-minute bins and then co-ordinated with the 10 m wind speed derived from the wind mast of the developer. This wind mast normally was not close to the dwelling, at times being further than 5,000 meters from the measurement location. It is possible that the wind may be blowing at the location of the wind mast with no wind at the measurement location, resulting in low sound levels recorded.

<sup>24</sup> Different area where longer measurements were collected.



**Figure 5-2: Ambient sound levels – quiet inland location (A-Weighted)**

Considering this data as well as the international guidelines (IFC, see **2.6.6**; MOE, see **Section 2.6**), noise limits starting at 40 dB that increases to more than 45 dB (as wind speeds increase) is acceptable. The MOE guideline does not state daytime limits.

In addition, project participants (land owners benefitting from the project) could be exposed to noise levels up to 45 dBA (ETSU-R97) at lower wind speeds.

### 5.3.3.2 Using local regulations to set noise limits

Noise limits as set by the National Noise Control Regulations (GN R154 of 1992 – **section 2.2.1**) defines a "**disturbing noise**" as the noise that:

- exceeds the rating level by 7 dBA;
- exceeds the residual noise level (where the residual noise level is higher than the rating level); or
- in the case of a low-frequency noise, exceeds the level specified in Annex B of SANS 10103;

Accepting that the area is a rural district, night-time rating levels would be 35 dBA and a noise level exceeding 42 dBA could be a disturbing noise (therefore the noise limit). The daytime rating level is 45 dBA (52 dBA for a disturbing noise).

## 5.3.4 Other Factors that must be considered for Wind Energy Facilities

### 5.3.4.1 Relationship between wind speed at different levels and noise at ground level

Generally, as the height above ground level increases, wind speed also increases. For acoustical purposes prediction of the wind speed at hub height is based on the wind speed



$v_{ref}$  at the reference height (normally 10 meters) for wind speed measurements, extrapolated to a wind speed  $v_h$  at hub height, using the widely used formula:

$$v_h = v_{ref} \times \frac{\log\left(\frac{h}{m}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{h_{ref}}{m}\right)}$$

However, depending on topographical layout, this relationship may not be true at all times. Authors such as Van den Berg (2003) indicated that wind speeds at hub height could be significantly higher than expected, at the same time being significantly higher than ground level wind speeds. In these cases, the wind turbines are operational and emitting noise, yet the wind induced ambient sound levels is less than expected (less masking of turbine noise).

This should be considered when evaluating the significance of the impact, especially when the wind turbines are situated on a hill, with the prevailing wind direction being in the direction of potential sensitive receptors living in a valley downwind of the wind energy facility. It is proposed by this author that the precautionary approach be considered, and when there is one or more turbine within 1,000 metres from a downwind receptor(s), that the probability of this impact occurring be elevated with at least one step/factor (e.g. from **Likely** to **Highly Likely**).

Similarly, if the area frequently experience weather phenomena such as temperature inversion<sup>25</sup>, the developer should consider this. Generally, this information is site specific and not available for remote areas and as a result it is difficult to consider in this study.

#### 5.3.4.2 Annoyance associated with Wind Energy Facilities<sup>26</sup>

Annoyance is the most widely acknowledged effect of environmental noise exposure, and is considered to be the most widespread. It is estimated that less than a third of the individual noise annoyance is accounted for by acoustic parameters, and that non-acoustic factors play a major role. Non-acoustic factors that have been identified include age, economic dependence on the noise source, attitude towards the noise source and self-reported noise sensitivity.


On the basis of a number of studies into noise annoyance, exposure-response relationships were derived for high annoyance from different noise sources. These

---

<sup>25</sup>[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inversion\\_\(meteorology\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inversion_(meteorology))

<sup>26</sup>Van den Berg, 2011; Milieu, 2010.

relationships, illustrated in **Figure 5-3**, are recommended in a European Union position paper published in 2002, stipulating policy regarding the quantification of annoyance.



**Figure 5-3: Percentage of annoyed persons as a function of the day-evening-night noise exposure at the façade of a dwelling**

This can be used in Environmental Health Impact Assessment and cost-benefit analysis to translate noise maps into overviews of the numbers of persons that may be annoyed, thereby giving insight into the situation expected in the long term. It is not applicable to local complaint type situations or to an assessment of the short-term effects of a change in noise climate.

### 5.3.5 Other noise sources of significance

In addition, other noise sources that may be present should also be considered. During the day, people are generally bombarded with the sounds from numerous sources considered "normal", such as animal sounds, conversation, amenities and appliances (TV/Radio/CD playing in background, computer(s), freezers/fridges, etc.). This excludes activities that may generate additional noise associated with normal work.

At night, sounds that are present are natural sounds from animals, wind as well as other sounds we consider "normal", such as the hum from a variety of appliances (magnetostriction) drawing standby power, freezers and fridges.

### 5.3.6 Determining the Significance of the Noise Impact

The level of detail as depicted in the EIA regulations was fine-tuned by assigning specific values to each impact. In order to establish a coherent framework within which all impacts could be objectively assessed, it was necessary to establish a rating system, which was applied consistently to all the criteria.

The significance of environmental impacts is a function of the environmental aspects that are present and to be impacted on, the probability of an impact occurs and the consequence of such an impact occurring before and after implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

For such purposes each aspect was assigned a value as defined in the third column in the tables below.

5.3.6.1 Extent (spatial scale) of impact

<b>L</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>H</b>
Impact is localized within site boundary	Widespread impact beyond site boundary; Local	Impact widespread far beyond site boundary; Regional / national

Factors with regards to extent that will be considered include:

- Access to resources (amenity);
- Threats to lifestyles, traditions and values; and
- Cumulative impacts, including possible changes to land uses at and around the site.

5.3.6.2 Duration of noise impact

<b>L</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>H</b>
Quickly reversible, less than project life, short term (0-5 years)	Reversible over time; medium term to life of project	Long term; beyond closure; permanent; irreplaceable or irretrievable commitment of resources

Factors with regards to extent that will be considered include the cost – benefit, both economically and socially (e.g. long or short term costs/benefits).

5.3.6.3 Intensity (severity or magnitude) of noise impact

<b>Type of Criteria</b>	<b>Negative noise impact</b>		
	<b>H-</b>	<b>M-</b>	<b>L-</b>
Qualitative	Substantial deterioration, death, illness or injury, loss of habitat/diversity or resource, severe alteration or disturbance of important processes.	Moderate deterioration, discomfort, Partial loss of habitat/biodiversity/resource or slight or alteration	Minor deterioration, nuisance or irritation, minor change in species/habitat/diversity or resource, no or very little quality deterioration.
Quantitative	Measurable deterioration, recommended level will often be violated (e.g. pollution)	Measurable deterioration, recommended level will occasionally be violated	No measurable change; Recommended level will never be violated

Community response	Vigorous	Widespread complaints	Sporadic complaints
--------------------	----------	-----------------------	---------------------

Type of Criteria	Positive noise impact		
	L+	M+	H+
Qualitative	Minor improvement, restoration, improved management	Moderate improvement, restoration, improved management, substitution	Substantial improvement, substitution
Quantitative	No measurable change; Within or better than recommended level.	Measurable improvement	Measurable improvement
Community response	No observed reaction	Some support	Favourable publicity

Factors with regards to intensity that will be considered include:

- Cost – benefit economically and socially (e.g. high net cost = substantial deterioration);
- Impacts on human-induced climate change;
- Impacts on future management (e.g. easy/practical to manage with change or recommendation).

5.3.6.4 Probability of occurrence:

L	M	H
Unlikely; low likelihood; Seldom.	Possible, distinct possibility, frequent.	Definite (regardless of prevention measures), highly likely, continuous.
No known risk or vulnerability to natural or induced hazards.	Low to medium risk or vulnerability to natural or induced hazards.	High risk or vulnerability to natural or induced hazards.

5.3.6.5 Consequence of noise impact

Based on a synthesis of the information contained in sub-sections 5.3.6.1 to 5.3.6.4 above, it will be possible to calculate a significance of the potential noise impacts in terms of the following criteria:

Intensity = Low				
Duration	H	Medium	Medium	Medium
	M	Low	Low	Medium
	L	Low	Low	Medium
Intensity = Medium				
Duration	H	Medium	High	High
	M	Medium	Medium	High
	L	Low	Medium	High
Intensity = High				

<b>Duration</b>	<b>H</b>	High	High	High
	<b>M</b>	Medium	Medium	High
	<b>L</b>	Medium	Medium	High
		L	M	H
<b>Extent</b>				

Positive impacts would be ranked in the same way as negative impacts, but result in high, medium or low positive consequence.

### 5.3.6.6 Overall Significance of Impacts

Combining the product of the Consequence with the Probability of the impact occurring provides the overall significance (risk) of the potential noise impact as outlined below:

<b>Probability</b>	<b>H</b>	Medium	Medium	High
	<b>M</b>	Medium	Medium	High
	<b>L</b>	Low	Low	Medium
		<b>L</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>H</b>
		<b>Extent</b>		

## 5.4 REPRESENTATION OF NOISE LEVELS

Noise rating levels are calculated in this ENIA report using the appropriate sound propagation models as defined. It is therefore important to understand the difference between sound or noise level as well as the noise rating level (also see Glossary of Terms, [Appendix A](#)).

Sound or noise levels generally refer to a level as measured using an instrument, whereas the noise rating level refers to a calculated sound exposure level to which various corrections and adjustments were added. These noise rating levels are further processed into a 3D map illustrating noise contours of constant rating levels or noise isopleths. In this ENIA it is used to illustrate the potential extent of the calculated noises of the complete project and not noise levels at a specific moment in time.

## 6 ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

### 6.1 MEASUREMENTS OF AMBIENT SOUND LEVELS

- Ambient sound levels are the cumulative effect of innumerable sounds generated at various instances both far and near. High measurements may not necessarily mean that noise levels in the area are high. Similarly, a low sound level measurement will not necessarily mean that the area is always quiet, as sound levels will vary over seasons, time of the day, faunal characteristics, vegetation in the area and meteorological conditions (especially wind). This is excluding the potential effect of sounds from anthropogenic origin. It is impossible to quantify and identify the numerous sources that influenced one 10-minute measurement using the reading result at the end of the measurement. Therefore trying to define ambient sound levels using the result of one 10-minute measurement will be very inaccurate (very low confidence level in the results) for the reasons mentioned above. The more measurements that can be collected at a location the higher the confidence levels in the ambient sound level determined. The more complex the sound environment, the longer the required measurement. It is assumed that the measurement locations represent other residential dwellings in the area (similar environment), yet, in practice this can be highly erroneous as there are numerous factors that can impact on ambient sound levels, including;
  - the distance to closest trees, number and type of trees as well as the height of trees;
  - available habitat and food for birds and other animals;
  - distance to residential dwelling, type of equipment used at dwelling (compressors, air-cons);
  - general maintenance condition of house (especially during windy conditions); and
  - a number and type of animals kept in the vicinity of the measurement locations.
- Measurement locations for this project were selected to be in a relative quiet area, away from the residential dwelling to minimize the potential of extraneous noises impacting on the ambient sound levels,
- Exact location of a sound level meter in an area in relation to structures, infrastructure, vegetation and external noise sources will influence measurements. It may determine whether one is measuring anthropogenic sounds from a receptors dwelling, or environmental ambient soundscape contributors of significance (faunal, roads traffic, railway line movement etc.). At times there are extraneous noises that cannot be heard during deployment, or not operational, that can significantly impact on readings (such as water pumps, transformers, faunal communication, etc.);

- Determination of existing road traffic and other noise sources of significance are important (traffic counts etc.) – when close to any busy or significant roads. Traffic however is highly dependent on the time of day as well as general agricultural activities taking place during the site investigation. Traffic noise is one of the major components in urban areas and could be a significant source of noise during busy periods. This study found that traffic in the area was very low, yet it cannot be assumed that it is always low.
- Measurements over wind speeds of 3 m/s could provide data influenced by wind-induced noises. While the windshields used limit the effect of fluctuating pressure across the microphone diaphragm, the effect of wind-induced noises in the trees in the vicinity of the microphone did impact on the ambient sound levels. The site visit unfortunately coincided with a relatively windy period;
- Ambient sound levels are dependent not only time of day and meteorological conditions, but also change due to seasonal differences. Ambient sound levels are generally higher in summer months when faunal activity is higher and lower during the winter due to reduced faunal activity. Winter months unfortunately also coincide with lower temperatures and very stable atmospheric conditions, ideal conditions for propagation of noise. Many faunal species are more active during warmer periods than colder periods. Certain cicada species can generate noise levels up to 120 dB for mating or distress purposes, sometimes singing in synchronisation magnifying noise levels they produce from their tymbals<sup>27</sup>;
- Ambient sound levels recorded near rivers, streams, wetlands, trees and bushy areas can be high. This is due to faunal activity which can dominate the sound levels around the measurement location. This generally is still considered naturally quiet and understood and accepted as features of the natural soundscape, and in various cases sought after and pleasing;
- Considering one or more sound descriptor or equivalent can improve an acoustical assessment. Parameters such as  $L_{Amin}$ ,  $L_{Aeq}$ ,  $L_{AFeq}$ ,  $L_{Ceq}$ ,  $L_{AMax}$ ,  $L_{A10}$ ,  $L_{A90}$  and spectral analysis forms part of the many variables that can be considered; and
- As a residential area develops the presence of people will result in increased sounds. These are generally a combination of traffic noise, voices, animals and equipment (incl. TV's and Radios). The result is that ambient sound levels will increase as an area matures.

---

<sup>27</sup> Clyne, D. "Cicadas: Sound of the Australian Summer, Australian Geographic" Oct/Dec Vol 56. 1999.



## 6.2 CALCULATING NOISE EMISSIONS ADEQUACY OF PREDICTIVE METHODS

The noise emissions into the environment from the various sources as defined are calculated for the operational phase in detail, using the sound propagation model described in ISO 9613-2.

The following was considered:

- The octave band sound pressure emission levels of processes and equipment;
- The distance of the receiver from the noise sources;
- The impact of atmospheric absorption;
- The operational details of the proposed project, such as projected areas where activities will be taking place;
- Topographical layout,
- Acoustical characteristics of the ground. 50% soft ground conditions were modelled, as the area where the activity would be taking place is acceptably vegetated and sufficiently uneven to allow the consideration of relatively soft ground conditions. This is because the use of hard ground conditions could represent a too precautionary situation.

The noise emission into the environment due to additional traffic is calculated using the sound propagation model described in SANS 10210. Corrections such as the following are considered:

- Distance of receptor from the road;
- Road construction material;
- Average speeds of travel;
- Types of vehicles used;
- Ground acoustical conditions

It is important to understand the difference between sound or noise level as well as the noise rating level (also see Glossary of Terms).

Sound or noise levels generally refers to a sound pressure level as measured using an instrument, whereas the noise rating level refers to a calculated sound exposure level to which various corrections and adjustments were added. These noise rating levels are further processed into a 3D map illustrating noise contours of constant rating levels or noise isopleths. In this project it illustrates the potential extent of the calculated noises of the complete project and not noise levels at a specific moment in time. It is used to define potential issues of concern and not to predict a noise level at a potential noise-sensitive receptor. For this the selected model is internationally recognised and considered adequate.

### **6.3 ADEQUACY OF UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS**

Noise experienced at a certain location is the cumulative result of innumerable sounds emitted and generated both far and close, each in a different time domain, each having a different spectral character at a different sound level. Each of these sounds are also impacted differently by surrounding vegetation, structures and meteorological conditions that result in a total cumulative noise level represented by a few numbers on a sound level meter.

As previously mentioned, it is not the purpose of noise modelling to accurately determine a likely noise level at a certain receptor, but to calculate a noise rating level that is used to identify potential issues of concern.

### **6.4 UNCERTAINTIES ASSOCIATED WITH MITIGATION MEASURES**

Any noise impact can be mitigated to have a low significance, however, the cost of mitigating this impact may be prohibitive, or the measure may not be socially acceptable (such as the relocation of a NSD), or the mitigation may result in the project not being economically viable. These mitigation measures may be engineered, technological or due to management commitment.

For the purpose of the EIA (determination of the significance of the noise impact) mitigation measures have been selected that are feasible, mainly focussing on management of noise impacts using rules, policy and require a management commitment. This however does not mean that noise levels cannot be reduced further, only that to reduce the noise levels further may require significant additional costs (whether engineered, technological or management).

It will be assumed the mitigation measures proposed for the construction phase are implemented and continued during the operational phase.

### **6.5 UNCERTAINTIES OF INFORMATION PROVIDED**

While it is difficult to define the character of a measured noise in terms of numbers (third octave sound power levels in this case), it is as difficult to accurately model noise levels at a receptor from any operation. The projected noise levels are the output of a numerical model with the accuracy depending on the assumptions made during the setup of the model. Assumptions include:

- The octave sound power levels selected for processes and equipment accurately represent the sound character and power levels of this processes/equipment. The determination of these levels in itself is subject to errors, limitations and assumptions with any potential errors carried over to any model making use of these results;
- Sound power emission levels from processes and equipment change depending on the load the process and equipment is subject too. While the octave sound power level is the average (equivalent) result of a number of measurements, this measurement relates to a period that the process or equipment was subject to a certain load. Normally these measurements are collected when the process or equipment is under high load. The result is that measurements generally represent a worst-case scenario;
- As it is unknown which processes and equipment will be operational (and when operational and for how long), modelling considers a scenario where all processes and equipment are under full load for a set time period. Modelling assumptions comply with the precautionary principle and operational time periods are frequently overestimated. The result is that projected noise levels would likely over-estimate noise levels;
- Ambient sound levels vary over time of day, season and largely depend on the complexity and development character of the surrounding environment. To allow the calculation of change in ambient sound levels, a potential ambient sound level of 35 dBA is assumed. This level represents a quiet environment;
- Modelling cannot capture the potential impulsive character of a noise that can increase the potential nuisance factor;
- The impact of atmospheric absorption is simplified and very uniform meteorological conditions are considered. This is an over-simplification and the effect of this in terms of sound propagation modelling is difficult to quantify; and
- Acoustical characteristics of the ground are over-simplified with ground conditions accepted as uniform. 75% hard ground conditions will be modelled even though the area is where the facility will be located is relatively well vegetated and uneven, this will allow a worse-case scenario.

## 7 PROJECTED NOISE RATING LEVELS

### 7.1 CURRENT NOISE LEVELS (CONCEPTUAL)

The Ambient sound levels were low and the area is considered naturally quiet. It is too far from any roads or any other significant noise sources to consider the potential cumulative impacts. As the night-time environment is of interest other activities in the area are highly unlikely to influence night-time sound levels. The larger project area is considered to have a sound character typical of a rural noise district.

### 7.2 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION PHASE NOISE IMPACT

This section investigates the conceptual construction activities as discussed in **section 4.1**. Construction activities are highly dependent on the final operational layout. The layout as modelled is presented in **Figure 7-1**, with the latest layout presented in **Figure 7-2**. There are minimal changes between these two layouts and it will not be required to remodel the latest layout. Roads and the power line options are presented in **Figure 7-3**. As can be seen from these layouts, a number of different activities might take place close to potentially sensitive receptors, each with a specific potential impact.

#### 7.2.1 Description of Construction Activities Modelled

The following construction activities could take place simultaneously and were considered<sup>28</sup>:

- General work at a temporary workshop area. This would be activities such as equipment maintenance, off-loading and material handling. All vehicles will travel to this site where most equipment and material will be off-loaded (general noise, crane). Material, such as aggregate and building sand, will be taken directly to the construction area (foundation establishment). It was assumed that activities will be taking place for 16 hours during the 16 hour daytime period.
- Surface preparation prior to civil work. This could be the removal of topsoil and levelling with compaction, or the preparation of an access road (bulldozer/grader). Activities will be taking place for 8 hours during the 16 hour daytime period.
- Preparation of foundation area (sub-surface removal until secure base is reached – excavator, compaction, and general noise). Activities will be taking place for 10 hours during the 16 hour daytime period.
- Pouring and compaction of foundation concrete (general noise, electric generator/compressor, concrete vibration, mobile concrete plant, TLB). As foundations

---

<sup>28</sup> Note: These assumptions are only for modelling purposes and do not reflect actual operational times.

must be poured in one go, the activity is projected to take place over the full 16 hour day time period.

- Erecting of the wind turbine generator (general noise, electric generator/compressor and a crane). Activities will be taking place for 16 hours during the 16 hour daytime period.
- Traffic on the site (trucks transporting material, aggregate/concrete, work crews) moving from the workshop/store area to the various activity sites. All vehicles to travel at less than 60 km/h, with a maximum of ten (10) trucks and vehicles each per hour travelling to the areas where work is taking place (green dotted line). The blue line is the projected noise levels for the same 20 vehicles travelling at 100km/h on a tar road.

There will be a number of smaller equipment, but the addition of the general noise source (at each point) covers most of these noise sources. It is assumed that all equipment would be operating under full load (generate the most noise) at a number of locations and that atmospheric conditions would be ideal for sound propagation. This is likely the worst case scenario that can occur during the construction of the facility.

As it is unknown where the different activities may take place it was selected to model the impact of the noisiest activity (laying of foundation totalling 113.6 dBA cumulative noise impact – various equipment operating simultaneously) at all locations (over the full daytime period of 16 hours) where wind turbines (or power pylons) may be erected for both layouts, calculating how this may impact on noise levels at potential noise-sensitive developments (see **Figure 7-4**). Noise created due to linear activities (roads) was also evaluated and plotted against distance as illustrated in **Figure 7-5**<sup>29</sup>.

Even though construction activities are projected to take place only during day time, it might be required at times that construction activities take place during the night (particularly for a large project). Construction activities that may occur during night time:

- Concrete pouring: Large portions of concrete do require pouring and vibrating to be completed once started, and work is sometimes required until the early hours of the morning to ensure a well-established concrete foundation. However the work force working at night for this work will be considerably smaller than during the day.
- Working late due to time constraints: Weather plays an important role in time management in construction. A spell of bad weather can cause a construction project to fall behind its completion date. Therefore, it is hard to judge beforehand if a construction team would be required to work late at night.

---

<sup>29</sup> Sound level at a receiver set at a certain distance from a road – 10 trucks per hour gravel and tar roads




Figure 7-1: Proposed Wind Turbine Locations – San Kraal Wind Farm Layout Rev. 4.1 (as modelled)








Figure 7-2: Proposed Wind Turbine Locations – San Kraal Wind Farm Layout Rev. 5.1 (latest layout)





**Figure 7-3: Other proposed infrastructure – Roads, Power lines and Sub-stations**





**Figure 7-4: Projected conceptual construction noise levels<sup>30</sup> – Decay of noise from construction activities**

<sup>30</sup> The SPL Receiver graph can also be used for the construction of the overhead power line (OHL) to allow connection to the ESKOM grid. Any activities further than 500 m from any receiver will have a noise impact of low significance.




Figure 7-5: Projected conceptual construction noise levels – Decay over distance from linear activities

### 7.3 OPERATIONAL PHASE NOISE IMPACT

While the significance of daytime noise impacts were considered, times when a quiet environment is desired (at night for sleeping, weekends etc.) are more critical. Surrounding receptors would desire and require a quiet environment during the night-time (22:00 – 06:00) timeslot and ambient noise levels are critical. It should be noted that maintenance activities normally take place during the day, but normally involve one or two light-delivery vehicles moving around, an insignificant noise source. As such maintenance activities will not be considered.

The layout presented in **Figure 7-1** was modelled and evaluated using the sound power emission levels for the Acciona AW125/3000 (refer to **Figure 4-1**). Being a “loud” wind turbine, this will represent the worst case scenario as the author is not aware of another wind turbine with higher sound power emission levels. This layout was subsequently changed as illustrated in **Figure 7-2**, but the changes are minimal and will not change the findings or outcome of the original model. All the NSD are located further than 1,000m from the closest WTG, significantly further than the 400m setback recommended by CNdV Africa (2006).


The calculated octave sound power levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 wind turbine as used for modelling are presented in **Table 7-1**, considering the 6 m/s wind speed for the noise contours. The difference between the proposed height of the nacelle (up to 150 m) and height used for modelling (87.5 m) will have a negligible impact on the results because changes in hub-height generally do not change the sound power emission level (for the same wind turbine), or the change is insignificantly small.

**Table 7-1: Octave Sound Power Emission Levels used for modelling: Acciona AW125/3000**

<a href="#">Wind Turbine: Acciona AW125/3000 at hh87.5</a>										
Source Reference: Acciona Windpower. General Document DG200383, Rev B dated 04/12/13										
Maximum expected A-weighted Octave Sound Power Levels										
	16	31.5	63	125	250	500	1000	2000	4000	8000
Lpa (dB)	108	109	112.3	111.7	111.7	104.6	102.9	98.0	89.5	82.1
L <sub>WA</sub> (dBA)	51.6	69.1	86.1	95.5	102	104.6	104.1	99	88.4	82.1
A-Weighted Sound Power Levels										
Wind speed at 10m height						Sound power level (dBA)				
4						101.4 *				
5						105.3 *				
6						108.4				
7						109.2				
8						109.1				
9						108.9				
10						108.8				

\* Estimated sound power level considering curves of the Vestas V136-3.45 (see **Figure 4-1**)


The calculated noise rating levels are illustrated in **Figure 7-6** with the total noise rating level contours presented in **Figure 7-7**. Noise levels at a 6 m/s wind speed are defined in **Table 7-2**. As can be seen from **Figure 7-6**, projected noise levels are not higher than the estimated ambient sound levels and well below the recommended MoE noise level. The projected noise rating levels will not be disturbing.



**Figure 7-6: Projected noise rating levels at NSDs at different wind speeds**

**Table 7-2: Noise rating levels at a 6 m/s wind speed**

Receptor	Noise Rating Level – San Kraal WEF (dBA)	Noise Rating Level – Cumulative (dBA)
NSD01	< 30	31.4
NSD02	34.8	39.0
NSD03	< 30	35.9
NSD04	38.1	38.2
NSD05	38.0	38.2
NSD06	< 30	< 30
NSD07	< 30	40.9
NSD08	< 30	37.2
NSD09	< 30	< 30
NSD10	< 30	< 30



**Figure 7-7: Projected conceptual night-time noise rating levels during operation – Acciona WTG at 6 m/s wind speed**



## 7.4 POTENTIAL CUMULATIVE NOISE IMPACTS

There are a number of existing and proposed noise sources that may cumulatively add to noise levels in the area. This includes sources such as the traffic noises from N9 road as well as renewable projects. There are a number of Photo-voltaic plants in the area, although the status of these is not known. Environmental noise studies are generally not conducted for Photo-voltaic projects due to the low risk of a noise impact from such facilities. The N9 road is too far from this project to cumulatively increase noise levels in the vicinity of the San Kraal Wind Farm.

At the time of the writing of this report, the author is aware of the proposed Umsobomvu and Phezukomoya facilities as well as the existing Mainstream Noupoot WEF. The Environmental Noise Impact Assessments are available for these projects and were evaluated and considered<sup>31</sup>.

Cumulative noise impacts generally only occur when noise sources (such as other wind turbines) are closer than 2,000m from each other (around 1,000m from the conceptual receptor located between them). The cumulative impact also only affects the area between the wind turbines of the various wind farms.

If the wind turbines of one wind farm are further than 2,000m from the wind turbines of the other wind farm, the magnitude (and subsequently the significance) of the cumulative noise impact is reduced. If the distance between the wind turbines of two wind farms are further than 4,000m, cumulative noise impacts are non-existent (see also **Figure 7-8**).

The only projects that may increase the noise levels cumulatively are the Mainstream Noupoot WEF and the Phezukomoya Wind Farms. At more than 5,000m from the wind turbines of the San Kraal WF, there is no risk of a cumulative impact from the Umsobomvu WEF.

Cumulative noises will be calculated considering the sound power emission levels of the Acciona AW125/3000 for the San Kraal and Phezukomoya WEFs and the Siemens SWT-2.3-101 wind turbine for the Mainstream Noupoot WEF. Cumulative noise rating level contours are illustrated in **Figure 7-9**.

---

<sup>31</sup> References 18, 19 and 75

## **7.5 DECOMMISSIONING AND CLOSURE PHASE NOISE IMPACT**

The potential for a noise impact to occur during the decommissioning and closure phase will be much lower than that of the construction and operational phases and noise from the decommissioning and closure phases will not be investigated further.





Figure 7-8: Effect of distance between wind turbines – potential cumulative noise





**Figure 7-9: Projected cumulative noise rating levels – worst-case (at a 6 m/s wind speed)**

## 8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NOISE IMPACT

### 8.1 PLANNING PHASE NOISE IMPACT

No noise is associated with the planning phase and this will not be investigated in further.

### 8.2 CONSTRUCTION PHASE NOISE IMPACT

The impacts for the various construction activities are described in **Section 4.1** and the magnitude defined in **section 7.2**. The expected ambient sound levels are around 40 dBA (and higher) with night-time ambient sound levels around 30 dBA (see **Table 3-3** and **Table 3-6**) during low wind conditions.

#### 8.2.1.1 Construction of Access Roads

The noise levels associated with the construction of the access roads can be estimated using **Figure 7-4**. The significance of the potential daytime noise impacts are presented in **Table 8-1**, with **Table 8-2** presenting the significance of the potential noise impact for the night-time period.

#### 8.2.1.2 Noise from construction traffic

The noise levels associated with construction traffic can be estimated using **Figure 7-5**, assuming that the construction traffic will travel on a gravel road at 60 km/h. The significance of the potential daytime noise impacts are presented in **Table 8-3**, with **Table 8-4** presenting the significance of the potential noise impact for night-time construction traffic.

#### 8.2.1.3 Construction of Overhead Power Line Pylons

The noise levels associated with the construction of the OHL (to allow connection to the grid) can be estimated using **Figure 7-4**. Three alignment options are evaluated for the OHL as presented in **Figure 7-3**. The significance of the potential daytime noise impacts are presented in **Table 8-5** (relevant for all three options), with **Table 8-6** presenting the significance of the potential noise impact for the preferred alternative with night-time construction activities. **Table 8-7** and **Table 8-8** assess the significance for the three alternative options.

#### 8.2.1.4 Construction of Wind Turbine Generators

The noise levels associated with the construction of the wind turbine generators can also be estimated using **Figure 7-4**. The significance of the potential daytime noise impacts

are presented in **Table 8-9**, with **Table 8-10** presenting the significance of the potential noise impact for the night-time period.

### **8.3 OPERATIONAL PHASE NOISE IMPACT**

The noise levels associated with the operational phase is illustrated in **Figure 7-6** (different wind speeds) and defined for a 6 m/s wind in **Table 7-2**. The significance of the potential daytime noise impacts are presented in **Table 8-11**, with **Table 8-12** presenting the significance of the potential noise impact for the night-time period.

### **8.4 CUMULATIVE NOISE IMPACT**

Considering the cumulative noise impact from the San Kraal, Phezukomoya and the operational Mainstream Noupoort WEFs, the significance of the noise impact is considered to be low on all receptors. This is assessed and summarized in **Table 8-13** for daytime operation, with **Table 8-14** presenting the noise impact significance for night-time operation.

### **8.5 DECOMMISSIONING PHASE NOISE IMPACT**

Final decommissioning activities will have a noise impact lower than either the construction or operational phases. This is because decommissioning and closure activities normally take place during the day using minimal equipment (due to the decreased urgency of the project). While there may be various activities, there is a very small risk for a noise impact.

## **8.6 EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES**

### **8.6.1 Alternative 1: No-go option**

The ambient sound levels will remain as is (relatively low).

### **8.6.2 Alternative 2: Proposed Renewable Power Generation activities**

The proposed renewable power generation activities (worse-case evaluated) will raise the noise levels at a number of potential noise-sensitive developments slightly. There is no alternative location where the wind farm can be developed as the presence of a viable wind resource determines the viability of a commercial WEF. While the location cannot be moved, the wind turbines within the WEF can be moved around, although this layout is

the result of numerous evaluations and modelling to identify the most economically feasible and environmentally friendly layout.

The proposed layout will result in increased noises, but the noise levels will be low and are highly unlikely to impact on the quality of living for the surrounding receptors. In terms of acoustics, there is no benefit to the surrounding environment (closest receptors). The potential noise impacts are very low and the significance will be low.

The project will greatly assist in the provision of energy, which will allow further economic growth and development in South Africa and locally. The project will generate short and long-term employment and other business opportunities and promote renewable energy in South Africa and locally. People in the area that are not directly affected by increased noises will have a positive perception of the project and will see the need and desirability of the project.

### **8.6.3 Overhead Power Line Options**

Three different route alignment options were considered as depicted in **Figure 7-3**. The significance of the noise impact is low for the preferred and second alternative route alignment. The significance of the noise impact is medium for alternative route option 1.

**Table 8-1: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of the Access Roads**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. There are no receptors within 400m from any access roads and noises from construction of access roads will not increase noise levels higher than 45 dBA during the day.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-2: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the Access Roads**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. There are no receptors within 1,000m from any access roads and noises from construction of access roads will not increase noise levels higher than 35 dBA at night.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-3: Impact Assessment: Noises from daytime construction traffic**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. There are no receptors within 60m from any access roads and noises from construction traffic will not increase noise levels higher than 45 dBA during the day.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-4: Impact Assessment: Noises from night-time construction traffic**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. There are no receptors within 700m from any access roads and noises from construction traffic will not increase noise levels higher than 35 dBA at night.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-5: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of the OHL (all 3 alignment options)**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. There are no receptors within 250m from any locations where the pylons may be constructed and construction noises will not increase noise levels higher than 45 dBA during the day.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
- No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-6: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (preferred option)**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. NSD08 are approximately 560m from a location where a pylon may be constructed (within 0 - 1,000m from the proposed corridor), and these construction activities may raise the noise level to approximately 38 dBA. Considering potential low ambient sound levels (low wind conditions) the noise will be audible during low-wind conditions (low ambient sound levels) and could be considered disturbing.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Yes.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When constructing pylons closer than 350m from any receptor, the construction should be planned to take place during the day.</li> <li>- If possible, the pylons can be relocated further from the receptors (further than 350m).</li> <li>- Minimize simultaneous construction activities, making use of smallest (or quietest equipment) available for the task.</li> </ul>							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			Noise impact can be managed, not further assessments required.				



**Table 8-7: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (Alternative option 1)**

**Potential impact description:** Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. NSD08 are approximately 300m from a location where a pylon may be constructed (within 0 - 760m from the proposed corridor), and these construction activities may raise the noise level to higher than 42 dBA at night. Considering potential low ambient sound levels, the noise will be audible during low-wind conditions (low ambient sound levels) and would be disturbing.

	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	High	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	Negative	Medium
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Yes.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When constructing pylons closer than 350m from any receptor, the construction should be planned to take place during the day.</li> <li>- If possible, the pylons can be relocated further from the receptors (further than 350m).</li> <li>- Minimize simultaneous construction activities, making use of smallest (or quietest equipment) available for the task.</li> </ul>							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			Noise impact can be managed, not further assessments required.				

**Table 8-8: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of the OHL (Alternative option 2)**

**Potential impact description:** Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. NSDs 2, 3 and 9 are approximately 650m from a location where a pylon may be constructed, and these construction activities may raise the noise level to just higher than 35 dBA. Considering the low ambient sound levels the noise may be audible during low-wind conditions (low ambient sound levels).

	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Medium	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Yes.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No mitigation required.</li> </ul>							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No further noise impact assessment required.				



**Table 8-9: Impact Assessment: Daytime construction of Wind Turbines**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. There are no receptors within 400m from any location where wind turbines are proposed and noises from construction activities will not increase noise levels higher than 45 dBA during the day.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-10: Impact Assessment: Night-time construction of Wind Turbines**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night. There are no receptors within 1,000m from any location where wind turbines are proposed and noises from construction activities will not increase noise levels higher than 35 dBA at night. Due to the low ambient sound levels measured onsite, it is possible that the construction activities may be heard.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-11: Impact Assessment: Daytime operation of Wind Turbines**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. Projected noise levels are significantly less than 45 dBA at all the surrounding receptors.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
- No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-12: Impact Assessment: Night-time operation of Wind Turbines**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night due to the operation of the wind turbines. There are no receptors within 1,000m from any location where wind turbines are proposed, but projected noise levels could be as high as 39 dBA ( <b>Figure 7-6</b> ). While there is only a few measurements at higher wind speeds, considering <b>Figure 5-2</b> , ambient sound levels could be higher than 40 dBA. Wind turbines may be audible during quiet periods.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b>							
- No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for noise impact				

**Table 8-13: Impact Assessment: Potential Cumulative Noise Impact from daytime operation of Wind Turbines**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors during the day. Projected cumulative noise levels are significantly less than 45 dBA at all the surrounding receptors. There is no potential of a daytime cumulative noise impact.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Low	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			High confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for a cumulative noise impact				

**Table 8-14: Impact Assessment: Potential Cumulative Noise Impact of Wind Turbines due to night-time operation**

<b>Potential impact description:</b> Increase in noise levels at potential noise-sensitive receptors at night due to the operation of the wind turbines. There are no receptors within 1,000m from any location where wind turbines of the San Kraal WEF are proposed, but projected noise levels could be as high as 42 dBA at NSD07, however, these noises will be due to the operation of the proposed Phezukomoya. While there is only a few measurements at higher wind speeds, considering <b>Figure 5-2</b> , ambient sound levels could be higher than 40 dBA at higher wind speeds. Wind turbines are likely to be audible but this would not be a disturbing sound.							
	Severity	Extent	Duration	Consequence	Probability	Status	Significance
<b>Without Mitigation</b>	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>With Mitigation</b>	Low	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Negative	Low
<b>Confidence in the findings.</b>			Medium confidence level in the findings.				
<b>Can the impact be reversed?</b>			Yes, the noise impact is fully reversible.				
<b>Will impact cause irreplaceable loss or resources?</b>			No, the noise impact will not result in an irreplaceable loss of resource.				
<b>Can impact be avoided, managed or mitigated?</b>			Not required to mitigate the noise impact.				
<b>Mitigation measures to reduce residual risk or enhance opportunities:</b> - No mitigation required.							
<b>Impact to be addressed/ further investigated and assessed</b>			No potential for a cumulative noise impact				

## 9 MITIGATION OPTIONS

### 9.1 CONSTRUCTION PHASE MITIGATION MEASURES

The study considers the potential noise impact on the surrounding environment due to construction activities during the day- and night-time periods. It was determined that the potential noise impact could be of medium significance (worse-case scenario for NSD08 during night-time construction of the OHL for the alternative 1 option – very precautionary scenario). Mitigation measures are available to minimise this potential noise impact.

The developer must know that community involvement needs to continue throughout the project. Annoyance is a complicated psychological phenomenon; as with many industrial operations, expressed annoyance with sound can reflect an overall annoyance with the project, rather than a rational reaction to the sound itself. At all stages surrounding receptors should be informed about the project, providing them with factual information without setting unrealistic expectations. It is counterproductive to suggest that the activities (or facility) will be inaudible. The magnitude of the noise levels will depend on a multitude of variables and will vary from day to day and from place to place with environmental and operational conditions. Audibility is distinct from the sound level, because it depends on the relationship between the sound level from the activities, the spectral character and that of the surrounding soundscape (both level and spectral character).

#### 9.1.1 Mitigation options available to reduce Construction Noise Impact

Mitigation options included both management measures as well as technical changes, with the following measures proposed to manage the potential noise impact associated with the construction of the OHL. General measures that should be applicable for the construction phase includes:

- The preferred and alternative 2 OHL route options are favoured of the three OHL route options;
- Minimize simultaneous construction activities where possible, using the smallest/quieter equipment when operating near receptors (within 350m);
- Where possible only operate during the day. If night-time activities is required, do not operate closer than 350m from any receptors (prevent noise impact of medium significance)
- Ensure a good working relationship between the developer/contractor and all potentially noise-sensitive receptors. Communication channels should be established to ensure prior notice to the sensitive receptor if work is to take place

close to them (especially if work is to take place within 500m from them at night).

Information that should be provided to potentially sensitive receptor(s) includes:

- Proposed working dates, the duration that work will take place in an area and working times;
  - The reason why the activity is taking place;
  - The construction methods that will be used; and
  - Contact details of a responsible person where any complaints can be lodged should there be an issue of concern.
- Ensure that equipment is well maintained and fitted with the correct and appropriate noise abatement measures if available. Engine bay covers over heavy equipment could be pre-fitted with sound absorbing material. Heavy equipment that fully encloses the engine bay should be considered, ensuring that the seam gap between the hood and vehicle body is minimised.

## **9.2 OPERATIONAL PHASE MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **9.2.1 Mitigation options available to reduce Operational Noise Impact**

All the NSD are located further than 1,000m from the closest WTG, significantly further than the 400m setback recommended by CNdV Africa (2006). The significance of noise during the operational phase is therefore low and additional mitigation measures are not required. Similarly there is no risk of a cumulative noise impact.

## **9.3 SPECIAL CONDITIONS**

### **9.3.1 Mitigation options that should be included in the EMP**

No mitigation measures are recommended for inclusion in the EMP or Environmental Authorization.

### **9.3.2 Special conditions that should be included in the Environmental Authorization**

1. The potential noise impact must again be evaluated should the layout be changed where any wind turbines are located closer than 1,000m from a confirmed NSD.
2. The developer must investigate any reasonable and valid noise complaint if registered by a receptor staying within 2,000 m from location where construction activities are taking place or from an operational wind turbine.

## **10 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES**

Environmental Management Objectives is difficult to be defined for noise because ambient sound levels would slowly increase as developmental pressures increase in the area. This is due to increased traffic associated with increased development, human habitation, agriculture and even eco-tourism and is irrespective whether the activity starts. While these increases in ambient sound levels may be low (and insignificant) it has the effect of cumulatively increasing the ambient sound levels.

The moment the facility stops ambient sound levels will drop similar to the pre-WEF levels (typical of other areas with a similar developmental character).

## **11 ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING PLAN**

Environmental Noise Measurement can be divided into two distinct categories, namely:

- Passive measuring – the registering of any complaints (reasonable and valid) regarding noise; and
- Active measuring – the measurement of noise levels at identified locations.

No active environmental noise monitoring is recommended due to the low significance for a noise impact to develop. However, should a reasonable and valid complaint about noise be registered, it is the responsibility of the developer to investigate this complaint as per the following sections. It is recommended that the noise investigation be done by an independent acoustic consultant.

While this section recommends a noise monitoring programme, it should be used as a guideline as site specific conditions may require that the monitoring locations, frequency or procedure be adapted.

### **11.1 MEASUREMENT LOCALITIES AND PROCEDURES**

#### **11.1.1 Measurement Localities**

No routine noise measurements or locations are recommended. Noise measurements must be conducted at the location of the person that registered a valid and reasonable noise complaint. The measurement location should consider the direct surroundings to ensure that other sound sources cannot influence the reading. A second instrument must be deployed at a control point away from the potential noise source during the measurement period.

#### **11.1.2 Measurement Frequencies**

Once-off measurements if and when a reasonable and valid noise complaint is registered. Results and feedback must be provided to the complainant. If required and recommended by an acoustic consultant, there may be follow-up measurements or a noise monitoring programme can be implemented.

#### **11.1.3 Measurement Procedures**

Ambient sound measurements should be collected as defined in SANS 10103:2008. Due to the variability that naturally occurs in sound levels at most locations, it is recommended that semi-continuous measurements are conducted over a period of at

least 24 hours, covering at least a full day- (06:00 – 22:00) and night-time (22:00 – 06:00) period. Measurements should be collected in 10-minute bins defining the 10-minute descriptors such as  $L_{Aeq,I}$  (National Noise Control Regulation requirement),  $L_{A90,f}$  (background noise level as used internationally) and  $L_{Aeq,f}$  (Noise level used to compare with IFC noise limit). Spectral frequencies should also be measured to define the potential origin of noise. When a noise complaint is being investigated, measurements should be collected during a period or in conditions similar to when the receptor experienced the disturbing noise event.

## **11.2 RELEVANT STANDARD FOR NOISE MEASUREMENTS**

Noise measurements must be conducted as required by the National Noise Control Regulations (GN R154 of 1992) and SANS 10103:2008. It should be noted that the SANS standard also refers to a number of other standards.

## **11.3 DATA CAPTURE PROTOCOLS**

### **11.3.1 Measurement Technique**

Noise measurements must be conducted as required by the National Noise Control Regulations (GN R154 of 1992) and SANS 10103:2008.

### **11.3.2 Variables to be analysed**

Measurements should be collected in 10-minute bins defining the 10-minute descriptors such as  $L_{Aeq,I}$  (National Noise Control Regulation requirement),  $L_{A90,f}$  (background noise level as used internationally) and  $L_{Aeq,f}$  (Noise level used to compare with IFC noise limit). Noise levels should be co-ordinated with the 10-m wind speed. Spectral frequencies should also be measured to define the potential origin of noise.

### **11.3.3 Database Entry and Backup**

Data must be stored unmodified in the electronic file saved from the instrument. This file can be opened to extract the data to a spread sheet system to allow the processing of the data and to illustrate the data graphically. Data and information should be safeguarded from accidental deletion or corruption.

### **11.3.4 Feedback to Receptor**

A measurement report must be compiled considering the requirements of the National Noise Control Regulations (GN R154 of 1992) and SANS 10103:2008. The facility must



provide feedback to the potential noise-sensitive receptors using the channels and forums established in the area to allow interaction with stakeholders, alternatively in a written report.

#### **11.4 STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES FOR REGISTERING A COMPLAINT**

When a noise complaint is registered, the following information must be obtained:

- Full details (names, contact numbers, location) of the complainant;
- Date and approximate time when this non-compliance occurred;
- Description of the noise or event;
- Description of the conditions prevalent during the event (if possible).

## 12 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Enviro-Acoustic Research CC was contracted by Arcus Consultancy Services (the EAP) to conduct an Environmental Noise Impact Assessment (ENIA) to determine the potential noise impact on the surrounding environment due to the development of the San Kraal Wind Farm close to Noupoort, Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces.

Ambient sound levels were measured at a number of locations during April 2016. Three class-1 Sound Level Meters as well as a portable weather station was used for measurements. Two instruments were used for semi-continuous, longer measurements (2 night-time periods) with one instrument used for shorter measurements (10 minutes each). The sound level meters would measure “average” sound levels over a time period, save the data and start with a new measurement till the instrument was stopped.

The data indicate that traffic is a major source of the noise in the area, but the road traffic will only influence the sound levels in an area up to 1,000m from the road. Away from the roads (N9 and N10), the area has a high potential to be very quiet during low wind conditions. Birds, faunal and wind-induced noises does influence sound levels and considering the data collected, wind-induced noises significantly influences sound levels as wind speeds increases.

As most of the area was considered naturally quiet, it was selected to assign an acceptable noise rating level of a rural noise district (as per SANS 10103:2008). This allows daytime noise limits of 52 dBA with night-time noise limits of 42 dBA (during lower wind conditions as increased wind speeds would increase ambient sound levels).

The potential noise impact was evaluated using a sound propagation model. Conceptual scenarios were developed for construction and operational phases.

The output of the construction and operational modelling indicated that there is low risk of a noise impact for most of the activities during the construction and operational phases. The significance of the noise impact is low for the construction of the preferred and alternative 2 OHL route alignments (preferred route options in terms of acoustics). The significance of the noise impact is medium for alternative route option 1.

Due to the low significance of a noise impact, no routine noise measurement programme is recommended. Measurement locations, frequencies and procedures are provided as a guideline for the developer to consider should there be a noise complaint.

Due to economic and environmental advantages, renewable power generation does provide valuable employment, business opportunities and green energy. It must be noted when such projects are close to potential noise-sensitive receptors, consideration must be given to ensuring a compatible co-existence. The potential sensitive receptors should not be adversely affected and yet, at the same time wind energy facilities need to reach an optimal scale in terms of layout and production.

This does not suggest that the sound from the facility should not be audible under all circumstances. This is an unrealistic expectation that is not required or expected from any other agricultural, commercial, industrial or transportation related noise source, but rather that the sound due to the power generation activities should be at a reasonable level in relation to the ambient sound levels.

While this project will have a very slight noise impact at a number of the closest noise-sensitive receptors, these impacts are of low significance (including construction of OHL with mitigation) and can be considered insignificant. This is because all the NSD are located further than 1,000m from the closest WTG, significantly further than the 400m setback recommended by CNdV Africa (2006). It is however important that the potential noise impact be evaluated should the layout be changed where any wind turbines are relocated closer than 1,000m from a confirmed NSD.

It is therefore the opinion of the Author that the increases in noise levels are of minor significance. It is therefore the recommendation that the project be authorized (from a noise impact perspective).

## 13 THE AUTHOR

The Author started his career in the mining industry as a bursar Learner Official (JCI, Randfontein), working in the mining industry, doing various mining related courses (Rock Mechanics, Surveying, Sampling, Safety and Health [Ventilation, noise, illumination etc] and Metallurgy. He did work in both underground (Coal, Gold and Platinum) as well as opencast (Coal) for 4 years. He changed course from Mining Engineering to Chemical Engineering after his second year of his studies at the University of Pretoria.

After graduation he worked as a Water Pollution Control Officer at the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry for two years (first year seconded from Wates, Meiring and Barnard), where duties included the perusal (evaluation, commenting and recommendation) of various regulatory required documents (such as EMPR's, Water Licence Applications and EIA's), auditing of licence conditions as well as the compilation of Technical Documents.

Since leaving the Department of Water Affairs, Morné has been in private consulting for the last 15 years, managing various projects for the mining and industrial sector, private developers, business, other environmental consulting firms as well as the Department of Water Affairs. During that period he has been involved in various projects, either as specialist, consultant, trainer or project manager, successfully completing these projects within budget and timeframe. During that period he gradually moved towards environmental acoustics, focusing on this field exclusively since 2007.

He has been interested in acoustics as from school days, doing projects mainly related to loudspeaker design. Interest in the matter brought him into the field of Environmental Noise Measurement, Prediction and Control. He has been doing work in this field for the past 8 years, and was involved with the following projects in the last few years:

### Wind Energy Facilities

Zen (Savannah Environmental – SE), Goereesoe (SE), Springfontein (SE), Garob (SE), Project Blue (SE), ESKOM Kleinzee (SE), iNca Gouda (Aurecon SA), Kangnas (Aurecon), Walker Bay (SE), Oyster Bay (SE), Hidden Valley (SE), Happy Valley (SE), Deep River (SE), Saldanha WEF (Terramanzi), Loeriesfontein (SiVEST), Noupoort (SiVEST), Prieska (SiVEST), Plateau East and West (Aurecon), Saldanha (Aurecon), Veldrift (Aurecon), Tsitsikamma (SE), AB (SE), West Coast One (SE), Namakwa Sands (SE), Dorper (SE), VentuSA Gouda (SE), Amakhala Komsberg (SE), Klipheuwel (SE), Cookhouse (SE), Cookhouse II (SE), Canyon Springs (Canyon Springs), Rhebokfontein (SE), Suurplaat (SE), Karoo Renewables (SE), Outeniqwa (Aurecon), Koningaas (SE), Eskom Aberdene (SE), Spitskop (SE), Rhenosterberg (SiVEST), Bannf (Vidigenix), Wolf WEF (Aurecon)

### Mining and

BECSA – Middelburg (Golder Associates), Kromkrans Colliery (Geovicon)

<p><b>Industry</b></p>	<p><i>Environmental), SASOL Borrow Pits Project (JMA Consulting), Lesego Platinum (AGES), Tweefontein Colliery (Cleanstream), Evraz Vametco Mine and Plant (JMA), Goedehoop Colliery (Geovicon), Hakra Project (Prescali Environmental), Der Brochen Platinum Project (J9 Environment), Delft Sand (AGES), Brandbach Sand (AGES), Verkeerdepan Extension (CleanStream), Dwaalboom Limestone (AGES), Jagdlust Chrome (MENCO), WPB Coal (MENCO), Landau Expansion (CleanStream), Stuart Coal – Weltevreden (CleanStream), Otjikoto Gold (AurexGold), Klipfontein Colliery (MENCO), Imbabala Coal (MENCO), ATCOM East Expansion (Jones and Wagner), IPP Waterberg Power Station (SE), Kangra Coal (ERM), Schoongesicht (CleanStream), EastPlats (CleanStream), Chapudi Coal (Jacana Environmental), Generaal Coal (JE), Mopane Coal (JE), Boshhoek Chrome (JMA), Langpan Chrome (PE), Vlakpoort Chrome (PE), Sekoko Coal (SE), Frankford Power (REMIG), Strahrae Coal (Ferret Mining), Transalloys Power Station (Savannah), Pan Palladium Smelter, Iron and PGM Complex (Prescali)</i></p>
<p><b>Road and Railway</b></p>	<p><i>K220 Road Extension (UrbanSmart), Boskop Road (MTO), Sekoko Mining (AGES), Davel-Swaziland-Richards Bay Rail Link (Aurecon), Moloto Transport Corridor Status Quo Report and Pre-Feasibility (SiVEST), Postmasburg Housing Development (SE), Tshwane Rapid Transport Project, Phase 1 and 2 (NRM Consulting/City of Tshwane)</i></p>
<p><b>Airport</b></p>	<p><i>Oudtshoorn Noise Monitoring (AGES), Sandton Heliport (Alpine Aviation), Tete Airport Scoping</i></p>
<p><b>Noise monitoring</b></p>	<p><i>Peerboom Colliery (EcoPartners), Thabametsi (Digby Wells), Doxa Deo (Doxa Deo), Harties Dredging (Rand Water), Xstrata Coal – Witbank Regional, Sephaku Delmas (AGES), Amakhala Emoyeni WEF (Windlab Developments), Oyster Bay WEF (Renewable Energy Systems), Tsitsikamma WEF (Cennergi and SE), Hopefield WEF (Umoya), Wesley WEF (Innowind), Ncora WEF (Innowind), Boschmanspoort (Jones and Wagner), Nqamakwe WEF (Innowind), Dassiesfontein WEF Noise Analysis (BioTherm), Transnet Noise Analysis (Aurecon)</i></p>
<p><b>Small Noise Impact Assessments</b></p>	<p><i>TCTA AMD Project Baseline (AECOM), NATREF (Nemai Consulting), Christian Life Church (UrbanSmart), Kosmosdale (UrbanSmart), Louwlandia K220 (UrbanSmart), Richards Bay Port Expansion (AECOM), Babalegi Steel Recycling (AGES), Safika Slag Milling Plant (AGES), Arcelor Mittal WEF (Aurecon), RVM Hydroplant (Aurecon), Grootvlei PS Oil Storage (SiVEST), Rhenosterberg WEF, (SiVEST), Concerto Estate (BPTrust), Ekuseni Youth Centre (MENCO), Kranskop Industrial Park (Cape South Developments), Pretoria Central Mosque (Noman Shaikh), Soshanguve Development (Maluleke Investments), Seshego-D Waste Disposal (Enviroxcellence), Zambesi Safari Equipment (Owner), Noise Annoyance Assessment due to the Operation of the Gautrain (Thornhill and Lakeside Residential Estate), Upington Solar (SE), Ilangaletu Solar (SE), Pofadder Solar (SE), Flagging Trees WEF (SE), Uyekraal WEF (SE), Ruuki Power Station (SE), Richards Bay Port Expansion (AECOM), Babalegi Steel Recycling (AGES), Safika Ladium (AGES), Safika Cement Isando (AGES), Natref (NEMAI), RareCo (SE), Struisbaai WEF (SE)</i></p>
<p><b>Project reviews and amendment reports</b></p>	<p><i>Loperberg (Savannah), Dorper (Savannah), Penhoek Pass (Savannah), Oyster Bay (RES), Tsitsikamma (Cennergi), Amakhala Emoyeni (Windlab), Spreeukloof (Savannah), Spinning Head (Savannah), Kangra Coal (ERM), West Coast One (Moyeng Energy), Rhebokfontein (Moyeng Energy)</i></p>

## 14 DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

I, Morné de Jager declare that:

- I act as the independent environmental practitioner in this application
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting environmental impact assessments, including knowledge of the National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998), the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations of 2010, and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I will take into account, to the extent possible, the matters listed in regulation 8 of the regulations when preparing the application and any report relating to the application;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- I will ensure that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the application is distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties is facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties will be provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments on documents that are produced to support the application;
- I will ensure that the comments of all interested and affected parties are considered and recorded in reports that are submitted to the competent authority in respect of the application, provided that comments that are made by interested and affected parties in respect of a final report that will be submitted to the competent authority may be attached to the report without further amendment to the report;
- I will keep a register of all interested and affected parties that participated in a public participation process; and
- I will provide the competent authority with access to all information at my disposal regarding the application, whether such information is favourable to the applicant or not
- all the particulars furnished by me in this form are true and correct;
- will perform all other obligations as expected from an environmental assessment practitioner in terms of the Regulations; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 71 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.

**Disclosure of Vested Interest**

- I do not have and will not have any vested interest (either business, financial, personal or other) in the proposed activity proceeding other than remuneration for work performed in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2010.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the environmental practitioner:

**Enviro-Acoustic Research cc**

Name of company:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date:

## 15 REFERENCES

In this report reference was made to the following documentation:

1. Acoustics, 2008: *A review of the use of different noise prediction models for wind farms and the effects of meteorology*
2. Acoustics Bulletin, 2009: *Prediction and assessment of wind turbine noise*
3. Ambrose, SE and Rand, RW, 2011. The Bruce McPherson Infrasound and Low Frequency Noise Study: Adverse health effects produced by large industrial wind turbines confirmed. Rand Acoustics, December 14, 2011.
4. Audiology Today, 2010: *Wind-Turbine Noise – What Audiologists should know*
5. Autumn, Lyn Radle, 2007: *The effect of noise on Wildlife: A literature review*
6. Atkinson-Palombo, C and Hoen, B. 2014: *Relationship between Wind Turbines and Residential Property Values in Massachusetts – A Joint Report of University of Connecticut and Lawrence Berkley National Laboratory*. Boston, Massachusetts
7. Bakker, RH et al. 2011: *Effects of wind turbine sound on health and psychological distress*. Science of the Total Environment (in press, 2012)
8. Bolin et al, 2011: *Infrasound and low frequency noise from wind turbines: exposure and health effects*. Environ. Res. Lett. 6 (2011) 035103
9. Bowdler, Dick, 2008: *Amplitude modulation of wind turbine noise: a review of the evidence*
10. Bray, W and James, R. 2011. Dynamic measurements of wind turbine acoustic signals, employing sound quality engineering methods considering the time and frequency sensitivities of human perception. Noise-Con 2011.
11. BWEA, 2005: *Low Frequency Noise and Wind Turbines – Technical Annex*
12. Chapman et al. 2013: Spatio-temporal differences in the history of health and noise complaints about Australian wind farms: evidence for the psychogenic, “communicated disease” hypothesis. Sydney School of Public Health, University of Sydney
13. Chief Medical Officer of Health, 2010: *The Potential Health Impact of Wind Turbines, Canada*
14. Chittenden, D et al, 2006: “Towards a Regional Methodology for Wind Energy Site Selection: Report 2: Methodology 1: Criteria Based Assessment”. Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Cape Town
15. Cooper, 2012: *Are Wind Farms too close to communities*, The Acoustic Group (date posted on Wind-watch.org: Referenced on various anti-wind energy websites)
16. Crichton et al. 2014: *Can expectations produce symptoms from infrasound associated with wind turbines?. Health Psychology, Vol 33(4), Apr 2014, 360-364*

17. Cummings, J. 2012: Wind Farm Noise and Health: Lay summary of new research released in 2011. Acoustic Ecology Institute, April 2012 (online resource: [http://www.acousticecology.org/wind/winddocs/AEI\\_WindFarmsHealthResearch2011.pdf](http://www.acousticecology.org/wind/winddocs/AEI_WindFarmsHealthResearch2011.pdf))
18. Cummings, J. 2009: *AEI Special Report: Wind Energy Noise Impacts*. Acoustic Ecology Institute, (online resource: <http://acousticecology.org/srwind.html>)
19. De Jager, M. (2011): "*Noise Impact Study for Environmental Impact Assessment: Establishment of Wind Energy Facility on various farms near the town of Noupoort, Northern Cape.*". M2 Environmental Connections CC, Pretoria
20. De Jager, M. (2017): "*Environmental Noise Impact Assessment for the proposed 315MW Phezukomoya wind energy facility near Noupoort, Northern and Eastern Cape.*". Enviro-Acoustic Research CC, Pretoria
21. DEFRA, 2003: *A Review of Published Research on Low Frequency Noise and its Effects*, Report for Defra by Dr Geoff Leventhall Assisted by Dr Peter Pelmeare and Dr Stephen Benton
22. DEFRA, 2007: *Research into Aerodynamic Modulation of Wind Turbine Noise: Final Report*
23. DELTA, 2008: *EFP-06 project: Low Frequency Noise from Large Wind Turbines, a procedure for evaluation of the audibility for low frequency sound and a literature study*. Danish Energy Authority
24. Delta, 2014: *Measurement of Noise Emission from a Vestas V117-3.3 MW-Mk2-IEC2A-50Hz in Mode 0 wind turbine; serial no 201303, Performed for Vestas Wind Systems A/S*. Delta, Denmark. Report ID. DANAK 100/1854 Rev 2.
25. Duncan, E. and Kaliski, K. 2008: *Propagation Modelling Parameters for Wind Power Projects*
26. Enercon GmbH, 2014: *Sound Power Level of the ENNERCON E-115, Operational Mode 0 / OM 0 (Data Sheet)*. ENERCON GmbH, Germany. Doc. D0331018-3.doc, Rev. 1.2
27. Enertrag, 2008: *Noise and Vibration*. Hemphall Wind Farm (<http://www.enertraguk.com/technical/noise-and-vibration.html>)
28. ETSU R97: 1996. '*The Assessment and Rating of Noise from Wind Farms: Working Group on Noise from Wind Turbines*'
29. Garrad Hassan, 2013: *Summary of results of the noise emission measurement, in accordance with IEC 61400-11, of a WTGS of the type N117/3000*. Doc. GLGH-4286 12 10220 258-S-0002-A (extract from GLGH-4286 12 10220 258-A-0002-A)
30. Gibbons, S. 2014: *Gone with the Wind: Valuing the Visual Impacts of Wind turbines through House Prices*, Spatial Economics Research Centre



31. Hanning, 2010: *Wind Turbine Noise, Sleep and Health*. (referenced on a few websites, especially anti-wind energy. No evidence that the study has been published formally.)
32. Havas, M and Colling, D. 2011: *Wind Turbines Make Waves: Why Some Residents Near Wind Turbines Become Ill*. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society* published online 30 September 2011
33. Hessler, D. 2011: Best Practices Guidelines for Assessing Sound Emissions From Proposed Wind Farms and Measuring the Performance of Completed Projects. Prepared for the Minnesota Public Utilities Commission, under the auspices of the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC)
34. HGC Engineering, 2006: *Wind Turbines and Infrasound*, report to the Canadian Wind Energy Association
35. HGC Engineering, 2007: *Wind Turbines and Sound*, report to the Canadian Wind Energy Association
36. HGC Engineering, 2011: *Low frequency noise and infrasound associated with wind turbine generator systems: A literature review*. Ontario Ministry of the Environment RFP No. OSS-078696.
37. ISO 9613-2: 1996. 'Acoustics – Attenuation of sound during propagation outdoors – Part 2: General method of calculation'
38. Jeffery *et al*, 2013: Adverse health effects of industrial wind turbines, *Can Fam Physician*, 2013 May. 59(5): 473-475
39. *Journal of Acoustical Society of America*, 2009: *Response to noise from modern wind farms in the Netherlands*
40. Kamperman, GW. and James, RR, 2008: *The "How to" guide to siting wind turbines to prevent health risks from sound*
41. Knopper, LD and Ollsen, CA. 2011. Health effects and wind turbines: A review of the literature. *Environmental Health* 2011, 10:78
42. Kroesen and Schreckenber, 2011. A measurement model for general noise reaction in response to aircraft noise. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am.* 129 (1), January 2011, 200-210.
43. McMurtry, RY. 2011: *Toward a Case Definition of Adverse Health Effects in the Environs of Industrial Wind Turbines: Facilitating a Clinical Diagnosis*. *Bulletin of Science Technology Society*. August 2011 vol. 31 no. 4 316-320
44. Minnesota Department of Health, 2009: *Public Health Impacts of Wind Farms*
45. Ministry of the Environment, 2008: *Noise Guidelines for Wind Farms, Interpretation for Applying MOE NPC Publications to Wind Power Generation Facilities*

46. Møller, H. 2010: Low-frequency noise from large wind turbines. *J. Acoust. Soc. Am*, 129(6), June 2011, 3727 - 3744
47. Nissenbaum, A. 2012: *Effects of industrial wind turbine noise on sleep and health*. *Noise and Health*, Vol. 14, Issue 60, p 237 – 243.
48. Noise-con, 2008: *Simple guidelines for siting wind turbines to prevent health risks*
49. Noise quest, Aviation Noise Information &Resources, 2010: <http://www.noisequest.psu.edu/pmwiki.php?n=Main.HomePage>
50. Norton, M.P. and Karczub, D.G.: *Fundamentals of Noise and Vibration Analysis for Engineers*, Second Edition, 2003
51. Oud, M. 2012:: Low-frequency noise: a biophysical phenomenon ([http://www.leefmilieu.nl/sites/www3.leefmilieu.nl/files/imported/pdf\\_s/2012\\_OudM\\_Low-frequency%20noise\\_0.pdf](http://www.leefmilieu.nl/sites/www3.leefmilieu.nl/files/imported/pdf_s/2012_OudM_Low-frequency%20noise_0.pdf)) (unpublished webresource)
52. O'Neal, et al. 2011: *Low frequency noise and infrasound from wind turbines*. *Noise Control Eng. J.* 59 (2), March-April 2011.
53. Pedersen, Eja; Halmstad, Höskolan I, 2003: '*Noise annoyance from wind turbines: a review*'. Naturvårdsverket, Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, Stockholm
54. Pedersen, E. 2011: "*Health aspects associated with wind turbine noise—Results from three field studies*", *Noise Control Eng. J.* 59 (1), Jan-Feb 2011
55. Phillips, CV, 2011: "*Properly Interpreting the Epidemiologic Evidence About the Health Effects of Industrial Wind Turbines on Nearby Residents*". *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society* 2011 31: 303 DOI: 10.1177/0270467611412554
56. Pierpont, N. 2009: "*Wind Turbine Syndrome: A Report on a Natural Experiment*", K Select Books, 2009
57. Punch, et al. 2010: *Wind Turbine Noise. What Audiologists should know*. *Audiology Today*. JulAug2010
58. Renewable Energy Research Laboratory, 2006: *Wind Turbine Acoustic Noise*
59. Report to Congressional Requesters, 2005: *Wind Power – Impacts on Wildlife and Government Responsibilities for Regulating Development and Protecting Wildlife*
60. SANS 10103:2008. 'The measurement and rating of environmental noise with respect to annoyance and to speech communication'.
61. SANS 10210:2004. 'Calculating and predicting road traffic noise'.
62. SANS 10328:2008. 'Methods for environmental noise impact assessments'.
63. SANS 10357:2004 'The calculation of sound propagation by the Concave method'.
64. Sheperd, D and Billington, R. 2011: *Mitigating the Acoustic Impacts of Modern Technologies: Acoustic, Health, and Psychosocial Factors Informing Wind Farm Placement*. *Bulletin of Science Technology & Society* published online 22 August 2011, DOI: 10.1177/0270467611417841

65. Shepherd, D *et al.* 2011: *Evaluating the impact of wind turbine noise on health related quality of life*. Noise & Health, September-October 2011, 13:54,333-9.
66. Smith, M (*et al*) (2012): "Mechanisms of amplitude modulation in wind turbine noise"; Proceedings of the Acoustics 2012 Nantes Conference
67. Stigwood (*et al*) (2013): "Audible amplitude modulation – results of field measurements and investigations compared to psycho-acoustical assessments and theoretical research"; Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise, Denver 28 – 30 August 2013
68. Tachibana, H (*et al*) (2013): "Assessment of wind turbine noise in immission areas"; Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Wind Turbine Noise, Denver 28 – 30 August 2013
69. Thorne *et al*, 2010: *Noise Impact Assessment Report Waubra Wind Farm Mr & Mrs N Dean Report No 1537 - Rev 1*
70. Thorne, 2010: The Problems with "Noise Numbers" for Wind Farm Noise Assessment. Bulletin of Science Technology and Society, 2011 31: 262
71. USEPA, 1971: *Effects of Noise on Wildlife and other animals*
72. Van den Berg, G.P., 2003. 'Effects of the wind profile at night on wind turbine sound'. Journal of Sound and Vibration
73. Van den Berg, G.P., 2004. 'Do wind turbines produce significant low frequency sound levels?'. 11<sup>th</sup> International Meeting on Low Frequency Noise and Vibration and its Control
74. Wang, Z. 2011: *Evaluation of Wind Farm Noise Policies in South Australia: A Case Study of Waterloo Wind Farm*. Masters Degree Research Thesis, Adelaide University 2011
75. Whitford, Jacques, 2008: *Model Wind Turbine By-laws and Best Practices for Nova Scotia Municipalities*
76. Williams, B., (2015). "Proposed Umsobomvu Wind Energy Project, Eastern Cape Province: Noise Impact Specialist Study". Safetech, Port Elizabeth, South Africa
77. World Health Organization, 2009: *Night Noise Guidelines for Europe*
78. World Health Organization, 1999: *Protection of the Human Environment; Guidelines for Community Noise*

# APPENDIX A

## Glossary of Acoustic Terms, Definitions and General Information

<i>1/3-Octave Band</i>	A filter with a bandwidth of one-third of an octave representing four semitones, or notes on the musical scale. This relationship is applied to both the width of the band, and the centre frequency of the band. See also definition of octave band.
<i>A – Weighting</i>	An internationally standardised frequency weighting that approximates the frequency response of the human ear and gives an objective reading that therefore agrees with the subjective human response to that sound.
<i>Air Absorption</i>	The phenomena of attenuation of sound waves with distance propagated in air, due to dissipative interaction within the gas molecules.
<i>Alternatives</i>	A possible course of action, in place of another, that would meet the same purpose and need (of proposal). Alternatives can refer to any of the following, but are not limited hereto: alternative sites for development, alternative site layouts, alternative designs, alternative processes and materials. In Integrated Environmental Management the so-called “no go” alternative refers to the option of not allowing the development and may also require investigation in certain circumstances.
<i>Ambient</i>	The conditions surrounding an organism or area.
<i>Ambient Noise</i>	The all-encompassing sound at a point being composed of sounds from many sources both near and far. It includes the noise from the noise source under investigation.
<i>Ambient Sound</i>	The all-encompassing sound at a point being composite of sounds from near and far.
<i>Ambient Sound Level</i>	Means the reading on an integrating impulse sound level meter taken at a measuring point in the absence of any alleged disturbing noise at the end of a total period of at least 10 minutes after such a meter was put into operation. In this report the term Background Ambient Sound Level will be used.
<i>Amplitude Modulated Sound</i>	A sound that noticeably fluctuates in loudness over time.
<i>Applicant</i>	Any person who applies for an authorisation to undertake a listed activity or to cause such activity in terms of the relevant environmental legislation.
<i>Assessment</i>	The process of collecting, organising, analysing, interpreting and communicating data that is relevant to some decision.
<i>Attenuation</i>	Term used to indicate reduction of noise or vibration, by whatever method necessary, usually expressed in decibels.
<i>Audible frequency Range</i>	Generally assumed to be the range from about 20 Hz to 20,000 Hz, the range of frequencies that our ears perceive as sound.
<i>Ambient Sound Level</i>	The level of the ambient sound indicated on a sound level meter in the absence of the sound under investigation (e.g. sound from a particular noise source or sound generated for test purposes). Ambient sound level as per Noise Control Regulations.
<i>Broadband Noise</i>	Spectrum consisting of a large number of frequency components, none of which is individually dominant.
<i>C-Weighting</i>	This is an international standard filter, which can be applied to a pressure signal or to a <i>SPL</i> or <i>PWL</i> spectrum, and which is essentially a pass-band filter in the frequency range of approximately 63 to 4000 Hz. This filter provides a more constant, flatter, frequency response, providing significantly less adjustment than the A-scale filter for frequencies less than 1000 Hz.
<i>Controlled area (as per National Noise Control Regulations)</i>	a piece of land designated by a local authority where, in the case of- (a) road transport noise in the vicinity of a road- (i) the reading on an integrating impulse sound level meter, taken outdoors at the end of a period extending from 06:00 to 24:00 while such meter is in operation, exceeds 65 dBA; or (ii) the equivalent continuous "A"-weighted sound pressure level at a height of at least 1,2 metres, but not more than 1,4 metres, above the ground for a period extending from 06:00 to 24:00 as calculated in accordance with SABS 0210-1986, titled: "Code of Practice for calculating and predicting road traffic noise", published under

	<p>Government Notice No. 358 of 20 February 1987, and projected for a period of 15 years following the date on which the local authority has made such designation, exceeds 65 dBA;</p> <p>(b) aircraft noise in the vicinity of an airfield, the calculated noisiness index, projected for a period of 15 years following the date on which the local authority has made such designation, exceeds 65 dBA; or</p> <p>(c) industrial noise in the vicinity of an industry-</p> <p>(i) the reading on an integrating impulse sound level meter, taken outdoors at the end of a period of 24 hours while such meter is in operation, exceeds 61 dBA; or</p> <p>(ii) the calculated outdoor equivalent continuous "A"-weighted sound pressure level at a height of at least 1,2 metres, but not more than 1,4 metres, above the ground for a period of 24 hours, exceeds 61 dBA;</p>
<i>dB(A)</i>	Sound Pressure Level in decibel that has been A-weighted, or filtered, to match the response of the human ear.
<i>Decibel (db)</i>	A logarithmic scale for sound corresponding to a multiple of 10 of the threshold of hearing. Decibels for sound levels in air are referenced to an atmospheric pressure of 20 $\mu$ Pa.
<i>Diffraction</i>	The process whereby an acoustic wave is disturbed and its energy redistributed in space as a result of an obstacle in its path, Reflection and refraction are special cases of diffraction.
<i>Direction of Propagation</i>	The direction of flow of energy associated with a wave.
<i>Disturbing noise</i>	Means a noise level that exceeds the zone sound level or, if no zone sound level has been designated, a noise level that exceeds the ambient sound level at the same measuring point by 7 dBA or more.
<i>Environment</i>	The external circumstances, conditions and objects that affect the existence and development of an individual, organism or group; these circumstances include biophysical, social, economic, historical, cultural and political aspects.
<i>Environmental Control Officer</i>	Independent Officer employed by the applicant to ensure the implementation of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and manages any further environmental issues that may arise.
<i>Environmental impact</i>	A change resulting from the effect of an activity on the environment, whether desirable or undesirable. Impacts may be the direct consequence of an organisation's activities or may be indirectly caused by them.
<i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i>	An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) refers to the process of identifying, predicting and assessing the potential positive and negative social, economic and biophysical impacts of any proposed project, plan, programme or policy that requires authorisation of permission by law and that may significantly affect the environment. The EIA includes an evaluation of alternatives, as well as recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures for minimising or avoiding negative impacts, measures for enhancing the positive aspects of the proposal, and environmental management and monitoring measures.
<i>Environmental issue</i>	A concern felt by one or more parties about some existing, potential or perceived environmental impact.
<i>Equivalent continuous A-weighted sound exposure level (<math>L_{Aeq,T}</math>)</i>	The value of the average A-weighted sound pressure level measured continuously within a reference time interval $T$ , which have the same mean-square sound pressure as a sound under consideration for which the level varies with time.
<i>Equivalent continuous A-weighted rating level (<math>L_{Req,T}</math>)</i>	The Equivalent continuous A-weighted sound exposure level ( $L_{Aeq,T}$ ) to which various adjustments has been added. More commonly used as ( $L_{Req,d}$ ) over a time interval 06:00 – 22:00 ( $T=16$ hours) and ( $L_{Req,n}$ ) over a time interval of 22:00 – 06:00 ( $T=8$ hours). It is a calculated value.
<i>F (fast) time weighting</i>	<p>(1) Averaging detection time used in sound level meters.</p> <p>(2) Fast setting has a time constant of 125 milliseconds and provides a fast reacting display response allowing the user to follow and measure not too</p>

	rapidly fluctuating sound.
<i>Footprint area</i>	Area to be used for the construction of the proposed development, which does not include the total study area.
<i>Free Field Condition</i>	An environment where there is no reflective surfaces.
<i>Frequency</i>	The rate of oscillation of a sound, measured in units of Hertz (Hz) or kiloHertz (kHz). One hundred Hz is a rate of one hundred times per second. The frequency of a sound is the property perceived as pitch: a low-frequency sound (such as a bass note) oscillates at a relatively slow rate, and a high-frequency sound (such as a treble note) oscillates at a relatively high rate.
<i>Green field</i>	A parcel of land not previously developed beyond that of agriculture or forestry use; virgin land. The opposite of Greenfield is Brownfield, which is a site previously developed and used by an enterprise, especially for a manufacturing or processing operation. The term Brownfield suggests that an investigation should be made to determine if environmental damage exists.
<i>G-Weighting</i>	An International Standard filter used to represent the infrasonic components of a sound spectrum.
<i>Harmonics</i>	Any of a series of musical tones for which the frequencies are integral multiples of the frequency of a fundamental tone.
<i>I (impulse) time weighting</i>	(1) Averaging detection time used in sound level meters as per South African standards and Regulations. (2) Impulse setting has a time constant of 35 milliseconds when the signal is increasing (sound pressure level rising) and a time constant of 1,500 milliseconds while the signal is decreasing.
<i>Impulsive sound</i>	A sound characterized by brief excursions of sound pressure (transient signal) that significantly exceed the ambient sound level.
<i>Infrasound</i>	Sound with a frequency content below the threshold of hearing, generally held to be about 20 Hz. Infrasonic sound with sufficiently large amplitude can be perceived, and is both heard and felt as vibration. Natural sources of infrasound are waves, thunder and wind.
<i>Integrated Development Plan</i>	A participatory planning process aimed at developing a strategic development plan to guide and inform all planning, budgeting, management and decision-making in a Local Authority, in terms of the requirements of Chapter 5 of the Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000).
<i>Integrated Environmental Management</i>	IEM provides an integrated approach for environmental assessment, management, and decision-making and to promote sustainable development and the equitable use of resources. Principles underlying IEM provide for a democratic, participatory, holistic, sustainable, equitable and accountable approach.
<i>Interested and affected parties</i>	Individuals or groups concerned with or affected by an activity and its consequences. These include the authorities, local communities, investors, work force, consumers, environmental interest groups and the general public.
<i>Key issue</i>	An issue raised during the Scoping process that has not received an adequate response and that requires further investigation before it can be resolved.
<i>L<sub>A90</sub></i>	the sound level exceeded for the 90% of the time under consideration
<i>Listed activities</i>	Development actions that is likely to result in significant environmental impacts as identified by the delegated authority (formerly the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism) in terms of Section 21 of the Environment Conservation Act.
<i>L<sub>AMin</sub> and L<sub>AMax</sub></i>	Is the RMS (root mean squared) minimum or maximum level of a noise source.
<i>Loudness</i>	The attribute of an auditory sensation that describes the listener's ranking of sound in terms of its audibility.
<i>Magnitude of impact</i>	Magnitude of impact means the combination of the intensity, duration and extent of an impact occurring.
<i>Masking</i>	The raising of a listener's threshold of hearing for a given sound due to the presence of another sound.



<i>Mitigation</i>	To cause to become less harsh or hostile.
<i>Negative impact</i>	A change that reduces the quality of the environment (for example, by reducing species diversity and the reproductive capacity of the ecosystem, by damaging health, or by causing nuisance).
<i>Noise</i>	a. Sound that a listener does not wish to hear (unwanted sounds). b. Sound from sources other than the one emitting the sound it is desired to receive, measure or record. c. A class of sound of an erratic, intermittent or statistically random nature.
<i>Noise Level</i>	The term used in lieu of sound level when the sound concerned is being measured or ranked for its undesirability in the contextual circumstances.
<i>Noise-sensitive development</i>	developments that could be influenced by noise such as: a) districts (see table 2 of SANS 10103:2008) 1. rural districts, 2. suburban districts with little road traffic, 3. urban districts, 4. urban districts with some workshops, with business premises, and with main roads, 5. central business districts, and 6. industrial districts; b) educational, residential, office and health care buildings and their surroundings; c) churches and their surroundings; d) auditoriums and concert halls and their surroundings; e) recreational areas; and f) nature reserves. In this report Noise-sensitive developments is also referred to as a Potential Sensitive Receptor
<i>Octave Band</i>	A filter with a bandwidth of one octave, or twelve semi-tones on the musical scale representing a doubling of frequency.
<i>Positive impact</i>	A change that improves the quality of life of affected people or the quality of the environment.
<i>Property</i>	Any piece of land indicated on a diagram or general plan approved by the Surveyor-General intended for registration as a separate unit in terms of the Deeds Registries Act and includes an erf, a site and a farm portion as well as the buildings erected thereon
<i>Public Participation Process</i>	A process of involving the public in order to identify needs, address concerns, choose options, plan and monitor in terms of a proposed project, programme or development
<i>Reflection</i>	Redirection of sound waves.
<i>Refraction</i>	Change in direction of sound waves caused by changes in the sound wave velocity, typically when sound wave propagates in a medium of different density.
<i>Reverberant Sound</i>	The sound in an enclosure which results from repeated reflections from the boundaries.
<i>Reverberation</i>	The persistence, after emission of a sound has stopped, of a sound field within an enclosure.
<i>Significant Impact</i>	An impact can be deemed significant if consultation with the relevant authorities and other interested and affected parties, on the context and intensity of its effects, provides reasonable grounds for mitigating measures to be included in the environmental management report. The onus will be on the applicant to include the relevant authorities and other interested and affected parties in the consultation process. Present and potential future, cumulative and synergistic effects should all be taken into account.
<i>S (slow) time weighting</i>	(1) Averaging times used in sound level meters. (2) Time constant of one [1] second that gives a slower response which helps average out the display fluctuations.
<i>Sound Level</i>	The level of the frequency and time weighted sound pressure as determined by a sound level meter, i.e. A-weighted sound level.
<i>Sound Power</i>	Of a source, the total sound energy radiated per unit time.



<i>Sound Pressure Level (SPL)</i>	Of a sound, 20 times the logarithm to the base 10 of the ratio of the RMS sound pressure level to the reference sound pressure level. International values for the reference sound pressure level are 20 micropascals in air and 100 millipascals in water. SPL is reported as $L_p$ in dB (not weighted) or in various other weightings.
<i>Soundscape</i>	Sound or a combination of sounds that forms or arises from an immersive environment. The study of soundscape is the subject of acoustic ecology. The idea of soundscape refers to both the natural acoustic environment, consisting of natural sounds, including animal vocalizations and, for instance, the sounds of weather and other natural elements; and environmental sounds created by humans, through musical composition, sound design, and other ordinary human activities including conversation, work, and sounds of mechanical origin resulting from use of industrial technology. The disruption of these acoustic environments results in noise pollution.
<i>Study area</i>	Refers to the entire study area encompassing all the alternative routes as indicated on the study area map.
<i>Sustainable Development</i>	Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts: the concept of "needs", in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and the future needs (Brundtland Commission, 1987).
<i>Tread braked</i>	The traditional form of wheel brake consisting of a block of friction material (which could be cast iron, wood or nowadays a composition material) hung from a lever and being pressed against the wheel tread by air pressure (in the air brake) or atmospheric pressure in the case of the vacuum brake.
<i>Zone of Potential Influence</i>	The area defined as the radius about an object, or objects beyond which the noise impact will be insignificant.
<i>Zone Sound Level</i>	Means a derived dBA value determined indirectly by means of a series of measurements, calculations or table readings and designated by a local authority for an area. This is similar to the Rating Level as defined in SANS 10103:2008.

# APPENDIX B

Photos of measurement locations



**Photo 1: Measurement Location INWEFLTASL01 (Eleanore van der Merwe)**



**Photo 2: Measurement Location INWEFLTASL02 (Mr. Gerhard Taljard)**





**Photo 3: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL01 (SKSTALS01)**



**Photo 4: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL02 (SKSTASL02)**



**Photo 5: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL03 (SKSTASL03)**



**Photo 6: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL04 (SKSTASL11)**





**Photo 7: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL11**



**Photo 8: Measurement Location INWEFSTASL12**

End of Report