PROPOSED ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION FOR THE VANADIUM EXPANSION PROJECT FOR BUSHVELD VAMETCO ALLOYS, MADIBENG LOCAL MUNICIPALITY WARD 35, NORTH WEST PROVINCE

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

PREPARED FOR:

NSOVO ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING
CONTACT: REJOICE APHANE
TEL: 011 041 3689
WEB: WWW.NSOVO.CO.ZA
EMAIL: REJOICE@NSOVO.CO.ZA

ON BEHALF OF:

Bushveld Vametco Alloys (Pty) Ltd
Main Mothotlung Road
Mothotlung, Brits

PREPARED BY:

OUTLINE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS cc
815 Government Ave
Eastwood, Pretoria
0083

OCTOBER 2020 rev
OUTLINE REF: VIA BVA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nsovo Environmental Consulting was appointed by Bushveld Vametco Alloys, as the independent environmental consultant to undertake the Environmental Authorization (EA) for the proposed Vanadium Expansion Project of the Mine within the jurisdiction of Madibeng Local Municipality (Ward 35) in the North West Province.

Outline Landscape Architects was requested to compile a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the project. This VIA is a specialist study that addresses the visual effects of the proposed expansion of current mining activities.

DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

The study area is within the Madibeng Local Municipality, Ward 35 in the North-West Province. The mine is in the vicinity of several rural settlements. The largest of the settlements is Makau, with some residents living very close to the south-east border of the mine. Rankotia, another small settlement is located 500m to the west of the site. Mothotlung is 1.5km north of the mine and may also be visually impacted by the expansion of the mine. Larger towns include Brits, Soshunguve and Hartbeespoort.

The area containing the physical structures is estimated to be 3km in length and 4km in width.

ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
The expansion of the existing Slimes Dam 1	Slimes Dam 1 extended by approximately 108 hectares for additional slimes waste capacity towards the east.
The expansion of the magnetite dump	Expanded approximately 16.6 hectares north of the mine and approximately 20 hectares south of mine
The construction of two new Pollution Control Dams	Construct 2 new Pollution Control Dams, 1 x to service Magnetite Dump expansion (2.65ha) and 1 x to service plants (1ha)
Construction of one new Return Water Dams for existing Slimes Dam and Calcine dumps	A new Return Water Dam is proposed directly north of the Slimes dam area and Calcine dumps to accommodate return/polluted water from the proposed and existing slimes dam, as well as to accommodate stormwater within the mine, (approximately 5ha)
Construction of a Barren Dam	Construction of a Barren Dam to store barren and mother liquor solution +/-3 hectares.
Development of new Waste Rock Dump	Development of new Waste Rock Dump to reduce load and haul distance and facilitate easy backfill +/- 24 hectares

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VIEWER SENSITIVITY

Within the receiving environment, specific viewers (visual receptors) experience different views of the visual resource and value it differently. They will be affected because of alterations to their views due to the proposed project. The visual receptors included in this study are:

- Residents;
- Tourists; and

- Motorists.

SIGNIFICANCE OF VISUAL IMPACTS

VISUAL IMPACT ON RESIDENTS

The study area is moderately populated, with lower population in the rural settlements and farming communities, to higher populations in the towns. The residents close to the mine are in Mothothlung and Makau and may experience a *low* degree of visual intrusion.

VISUAL IMPACT ON TOURISTS

The entire study area is considered to have a low tourism potential, mostly because of the environmental degradation caused by the mining developments and human settlements. There is also no major thoroughfare to prominent tourist destinations.

The temporary exposure to possible unsightly views of the construction camps and the associated activity will be minimal and localised.

The proposed new developments will only have an impact on tourists in near proximity to the mine, which will be mostly along main transportation routes. The severity of the visual impact of the mining activities on tourists will be low, causing a *low* visual impact.

VISUAL IMPACT ON MOTORISTS

The major routes in the study area is the R566 connecting the towns, mines and farms, but is not passing the mine directly. The secondary road network in the study area carries a much lower volume of motorists. Many of the roads are gravel roads which are used by the local residents.

Motorists' visual exposure to the new extensions of the mine will be brief and the severity of visual impact will be *low*.

RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

In most cases, the landscape and visual impacts occurring during the construction phase can be mitigated effectively. Rehabilitation of the disturbed areas may cause a reduction in the negative visual impact of the study area.

Upon closure of the mine, and once rehabilitation has taken place, the visual aesthetics will dramatically improve. Therefore, there is an anticipated *low* significance of visual impact for the proposed development.

CONCLUSION

The activities have been rated in the table below, including the visual impact before mitigation measures and after mitigation measures have been applied.

Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Construction Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	1	2	4	3	21 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	4	3	21 low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	2	4	3	24 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	3	3	21 low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	2	4	3	24 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	3	3	21 low

Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Operation Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low

Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Closure Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	1	4	6	1	11 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	4	1	9 low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	3	3	27 low

The following Visual Impact Assessment Criteria (as utilised in table above) applies:

Status of Impact:
The visual impact is assessed as either having a:
Negative effect (i.e. at a cost to the environment),
Positive effect (i.e. a benefit to the environment), or
Neutral effect on the environment.

Extent of the Impact:
(1) Site (site only),
(2) Local (site boundary and immediate surrounds),
(3) Regional,
(4) National, or
(5) International.

Duration of the Impact:
The length that the impact will last for is described as either:
(1) Immediate (<1 year)
(2) Short term (1-5 years),
(3) Medium term (5-15 years),
(4) Long term (ceases after the operational life span of the project),
(5) Permanent.

Magnitude of the Impact:
The intensity or severity of the impacts is indicated as either:
(0) none,
(2) Minor,
(4) Low,

(6) Moderate (environmental functions altered but continue),
(8) High (environmental functions temporarily cease), or
(10) Very high / unsure (environmental functions permanently cease).

Probability of Occurrence:
The likelihood of the impact actually occurring is indicated as either:
(0) None (the impact will not occur),
(1) Improbable (probability very low due to design or experience)
(2) Low probability (unlikely to occur),
(3) Medium probability (distinct probability that the impact will occur),
(4) High probability (most likely to occur), or
(5) Definite.

Significance of the Impact:
Based on the information contained in the points above, the potential impacts are assigned a significance rating (S). This rating is formulated by adding the sum of the numbers assigned to extent (E), duration (D) and magnitude (M) and multiplying this sum by the probability (P) of the impact.
S= (E+D+M) P

The significance ratings are given below
(<30) low (i.e. where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),
(30-60) medium (i.e. where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated), (>60) high (i.e. where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

COMPARATIVE TABLES FOR VARIOUS PROPOSED STRUCTURES

Negative and positive impacts of the development of the waste rock

Development of the waste rock dump	
Negative impacts	**Positive impacts**
• An additional dump will be created on site	• Less trucks off site, hauling waste rock off site
• More dust pollution on site, which may be viewed from off-site viewers, emphasizing the mine	• Possible less dust pollution off site, which can affect the surroundings visually

Negative and positive impacts of the development of the Barren dam

Development of the Barren dam	
Negative impacts	**Positive impacts**
• The development of the Barren Dam will not have a negative visual impact as it will be seen by mining staff that associate the structure as part of the mine landscape	• Both proposed Barren Dam positions will be within the core operation buildings of the mine and will be seen by mining staff that will associate the structures as part of the mine landscape

Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives

Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives	
Return Water Dam Alternative 1	**Return Water Dam Alternative 2**
Return Water Dam alternative 1 is proposed to the east of the tailing storage facility. The dam is on a lower level of the existing Slimes dam, and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.	Return Water Dam alternative 2 is proposed to the north of the existing slimes dam and is on a much lower level to the existing Slimes dam, and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.
Viewers from Makau, a small settlement to the south of the mine, may be affected visually by the dam	There are few viewers looking onto the mine from the north, as it is mostly agricultural land, therefore this will have the least visual impact.
	Alternative 2 for the Return Water Dam is the preferred position.

Comparative analysis of Barren Dam Alternatives

Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives	
Barren Dam Alternative 1	**Barren Dam Alternative 2**
The proposed position for the Barren Dam alternative 1 is within the main mining facilities, the visual impact will be low, as the Barren Dam will blend in with the existing mining structures and will be associated with the mining landscape.	The proposed position for the Barren Dam alternative 2 is to the west of the main mining facilities, the visual impact will be low, as the Barren Dam will blend in with the existing mining structures, and will be associated with the mining landscape.
This Barren Dam is situated well within the mine, and from a visual aspect, this alternative is the preferred position.	This Barren Dam is closer to the boundary of the site and may be viewed by motorists and viewers from Rankotia.

TABLES OF CONTENTS

Page

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **2**

DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT **2**

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS **2**

VIEWER SENSITIVITY **2**

SIGNIFICANCE OF VISUAL IMPACTS **3**

VISUAL IMPACTS ON RESIDENTS 3

VISUAL IMPACTS ON TOURISTS 3

VISUAL IMPACTS ON MOTORISTS 3

RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES **3**

CONCLUSION **3**

TABLES OF CONTENTS **8**

LIST OF FIGURES **10**

LIST OF TABLES **10**

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS **10**

1. INTRODUCTION **11**

1.1. BACKGROUND AND BRIEF ***11***

1.2. STUDY AREA ***12***

2. STUDY APPROACH **15**

2.1. INFORMATION BASE ***15***

2.2. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS ***15***

2.3. LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE ***15***

2.4. METHOD ***15***

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION **16**

3.1. OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT ***166***

3.2. PROJECT COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES ***166***

3.2.1. CONSTRUCTION CAMPS AND LAY-DOWN YARDS 166

3.2.2. ACCESS ROADS 166

3.3. VISUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECT COMPONENTS ***166***

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT **177**

4.1. VISUAL RESOURCE ***177***

4.1.1. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER 17

4.1.2. VISUAL CHARACTER 177

4.1.2.1 Visual Value 188

4.1.2.2 Visual Quality 188

4.1.2.3 Visual absorption capacity 199

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT **26**

5.1. SIGNIFICANCE OF LANDSCAPE IMPACT ***26***

5.1.1. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY 26

5.1.2. SEVERITY OF POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE IMPACTS 27
5.2. SIGNIFICANCE OF VISUAL IMPACTS 29
5.2.1. VIEWER SENSITIVITY 29
5.2.1.1 Residents 30
5.2.1.2 Tourists 30
5.2.1.3 Motorists 30
5.2.2. SEVERITY OF POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS 30
5.2.2.1 Potential visual impacts on residents 32
5.2.2.2 Potential visual impacts on tourists 34
5.2.2.3 Potential visual impacts on motorists 36
6. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES 37
6.1. GENERAL 37
6.3. ACCESS ROUTES 37
6.4. CLEARED SERVITUDES 38
7. CONCLUSION 39
APPENDIX 1 43
LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE 49
VISUAL RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY 50
REFERENCES 51

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Locality Plan 13
Figure 2: Site Layout Map – Mine Infrastructure Development Map 14
Figure 3: Vegetation Map 21
Figure 4: Land Cover Map 22
Figure 5: Landscape character of study area 23
Figure 6: Existing Magnetite dump and extension of dump 24
Figure 7: Pollution Control Dam at Class A waste facility 24
Figure 8: View from the top of slimes dam to Return Water Dam 24
Figure 9: View of existing processing plant and area for new Rotary Kiln 25
Figure 10: Existing processing plant 25
Figure 11: View towards shaft furnace and area for new Bag Filter Unit 25
Figure 12: Visibility Analysis Slimes Dam 1 44
Figure 13: Visibility Analysis Magnetite Dump Expansion North 45
Figure 14: Visibility Analysis Magnetite Dump Expansion South 46

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Description of activities 16
Table 2: Criteria of Visual Quality (FHWA, 1981) 18
Table 3: Visual Quality of the regional landscape 19
Table 4: Regional Visual Absorption Capacity evaluation 19
Table 5: Significance of impacts 26
Table 6: Landscape character sensitivity rating (Adapted from GOSW, 2006) 27
Table 7: Landscape impact – Altering the landscape character 28
Table 8: Potential visual impacts on residents 32
Table 9: Potential visual impacts on tourists 34
Table 10: Potential visual impacts on motorists 36
Table 11: Evaluation of proposed activities during the Construction Phase 39
Table 12: Evaluation of proposed activities during the Operation Phase 40
Table 13: Evaluation of proposed activities during the Closure Phase 40
Table 14: Negative and positive impacts of the development of waste rock dump 42
Table 15: Negative and positive impacts of the development of the Barren dam 42
Table 16: Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam alternatives 42
Table 17: Comparative analysis of Barren Dam alternatives 43
Table 18: Confidence level chart and description 49
Table 19: Visual receptor sensitivity 50

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment.
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration of the United States Department of Transportation. The publishers of the guide "*Visual Impact Assessment for High Projects*" 1981.
LCA	Landscape Character Assessment.
LT	Landscape Type
VAC	Visual Absorption Capacity

VIA	Visual Impact Assessment.
ZVI	Zone of Visual Influence

1. INTRODUCTION

Nsovo Environmental Consulting was appointed by Bushveld Vametco Alloys, as the independent environmental consultant to undertake the Environmental Authorization (EA) for the proposed Vanadium Expansion Project of the Mine within the jurisdiction of Madibeng Local Municipality (Ward 35) in the North West Province.

Outline Landscape Architects was requested to compile a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the project. This VIA is a specialist study that addresses the visual effects of the proposed expansion of current mining activities.

Outline Landscape Architects is an independent sub-consultant and neither the author, nor Outline Landscape Architects will benefit from the outcome of the project decision-making.

Kathrin Hammel, the principal Landscape Architect and Visual Specialist from Outline Landscape Architects undertook this Visual Impact Assessment. She is a registered Professional Landscape Architect at the South African Council of Landscape Architects, SACLAP no 20162. Kathrin has been involved as Visual Impact Specialist since 2009

The study will assess the Visual Impact of the following activities that Bushveld Vametco Alloys proposes to undertake:

- The expansion of the existing Slimes Dam 1 by approximately 108 hectares to cater for additional slimes waste capacity towards the east.
- The expansion of the magnetite dump by approximately 17 and 20 hectares to the north and south of the mine respectively.
- The construction of two new Pollution Control Dams to service the Magnetite Dump Expansion (3ha) and to service plants (1ha).
- Development of one new Return Water Dam of 5ha sized to accommodate stormwater and return water from the tailing storage facilities.
- Construction of a Barren Dam to store barren and mother liquor solution.
- Development of a new Waste Rock Dump to reduce load and haul distance and facilitate easy backfill.

1.1. BACKGROUND AND BRIEF

This VIA will conform to the requirements of a Level Three assessment which requires the realisation of the following objectives (Adapted from Oberholzer (2005)):

- Determination of the extent of the study area;
- Description of the proposed project and the receiving environment;
- Identification and description of the landscape character of the study area;
- Identification of the elements of particular visual value and -quality that could be affected by the proposed project;

- Identification of landscape- and visual receptors in the study area that will be affected by the proposed project and assess their sensitivity;
- Indication of potential landscape- and visual impacts;
- Assessment of the significance of the landscape- and visual impacts;
- Recommendations of mitigation measures to reduce and/or alleviate the potential adverse landscape- and visual impacts.

1.2. STUDY AREA

The study area is within the Madibeng Local Municipality, Ward 35 in the North-West Province (Figure 1). The mine is located in a rural area is near to several rural settlements. The largest of the settlements is Makau, with some residents living very close to the south-east border of the mine. Rankotia, another small settlement is located 500m to the west of the site. Mothotlung is 1.5km north of the mine and may also be visually impacted by the expansion of the mine.

The site is 9km south-east of Brits, 18km north of Hartbeespoort and 23km west of Soshunguve.

The area containing the physical structures is estimated to be 3km in length and 4km in width. The report will discuss the visual impact beyond this area.

Figure 1: Hydrological Map/ Locality Map



Figure 2: Site Layout Map – Mine Infrastructure Development Map



2. STUDY APPROACH

2.1. INFORMATION BASE

This assessment was based on information from the following sources:

- Topographical maps and GIS generated data were sourced from the Surveyor General, and EcoGIS (2019) respectively
- Observations made and photographs taken during site visits
- Professional judgement based on experience gained from similar projects; and
- Literature research on similar projects.

2.2. ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS

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

- This level of assessment excludes surveys to establish viewer preference and thereby their sensitivity. Viewer sensitivity is determined by means of a commonly used rating system (Table 3).
- The site visit was conducted during June 2019 and the photographs used in this report illustrate the character of the landscape in the winter season.

2.3. LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE

The level of confidence assigned to the findings of this assessment is based on:

- The level of information available and/or understanding of the study area (rated 2); and
- The information available and/or knowledge and experience of the project (rated 3).

This visual impact assessment is rated with a general confidence level of 6. This rating indicates that the author's general confidence in the accuracy of the findings is *high* (Table 2). Where the confidence level of specific findings is not regarded as high, it is noted in the last column of each impact assessment table.

2.4. METHOD

A broad overview of the approach and methodology used in this assessment is provided below:

- The extent of the study area is determined and indicated in Figure 1.
- The site is visited to establish a photographic record of the site, views and areas of particular visual quality and or -value.
- The project components and activities are described and assessed as potential elements of visual and landscape impacts.
- The receiving environment is described in terms of its prevailing landscape- and visual character.
- Landscape- and visual receptors that may be affected by the proposed project are identified and described.
- Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce adverse impacts; and
- The findings of the study are documented in this Visual Impact Assessment.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1. OVERVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT

The table below indicates the description of the proposed activities that may have a visual impact.

Table 1: Description of Activities

ACTIVITY	DESCRIPTION
The expansion of the existing Slimes Dam 1	Slimes Dam 1 extended by approximately 108 hectares for additional slimes waste capacity towards the east.
The expansion of the magnetite dump	Expanded approximately 16.6 hectares north of the mine and approximately 20 hectares south of mine
The construction of two new Pollution Control Dams	Construct 2 new Pollution Control Dams, 1 x to service Magnetite Dump expansion (2.65ha) and 1 x to service plants (1ha)
Construction of one new Return Water Dams for existing Slimes Dam and Calcine dumps	A new Return Water Dam is proposed directly north of the Slimes dam area and Calcine dumps to accommodate return/polluted water from the proposed and existing slimes dam, as well as to accommodate stormwater within the mine, (approximately 5ha)
Construction of a Barren Dam	Construction of a Barren Dam to store barren and mother liquor solution +/-3 hectares.
Development of new Waste Rock Dump	Development of new Waste Rock Dump to reduce load and haul distance and facilitate easy backfill +/- 24 hectares

3.2. PROJECT COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES

Each project component and activity will affect the receiving environment differently and is therefore discussed separately. The following project components will occur during the construction and operational phases of the project and are identified as elements that may cause a potential landscape and/or visual impact:

3.2.1. CONSTRUCTION CAMPS AND LAY-DOWN YARDS

Temporary construction camps will be present for the duration of the construction period. The appointed contractor will set up a construction camp where practical for each activity. The material lay-down yards are expected to be located adjacent to the construction camps and will serve as storage areas for the construction material and equipment.

3.2.2. ACCESS ROADS

An access road will be made during construction but will remain for the lifetime of the mining activities as a maintenance routes for all items. Existing roads can be used as far as possible and the visual impact can be kept to a minimum.

3.3. VISUAL CHARACTERISTICS OF PROJECT COMPONENTS

It is proposed that the existing Slimes dams 1 be extended to cater for additional slimes waste over the next 20 years. Slimes dam 1 will be expanded by 108 hectares and the approximate height will be 35m.

The visual impact already exists and is associated with the mining landscape.

The extension of the Magnetite dumps will start with low mounds, growing in height as material increases. The expansion to the north of the existing dump will be 17 hectares and the height is expected to be 4.78m. The southern expansion will be 20 hectares and the height will be 1.69m. The visual impact will increase over time. The access/haul roads may have a visual impact.

New Pollution Control Dams will be constructed to the north of the proposed new Magnetite West 1 and 2 dumps and North 1 and 2 dumps and are at a lower level to the existing Slimes Dam and will have a low visual impact on surrounding areas.

One new large Return Water Dam is proposed for the new Magnetite 1 and 2 dumps on the west, the existing Slimes dam and the extension 1 and 2 of the slimes dam. These are on a lower level of the existing Slimes dam, and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.

A Barren Dam will be constructed to store barren and mother liquor solution. There are two proposed alternative positions. Both positions are proposed close to the main infrastructure of the mine. The Barren Dams are on a lower level to the existing Slimes dam and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.

A new Waste Rock Dump will be constructed to reduce haul distance and facilitate easy backfill. The visual impact will increase over time. The access/haul roads may have a visual impact. But the current visual impact may be decreased with less haul trucks leaving the mine.

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Landscape and visual impacts may result from changes to the landscape. A distinction should be made between impacts on the visual resource (landscape) and on the viewers. The former are impacts on the physical landscape that may result in changes to landscape character while the latter are impacts on the viewers themselves and the views they experience.

4.1. VISUAL RESOURCE

Visual resource is an encompassing term relating to the visible landscape and its recognisable elements, which through their co-existence; result in a particular landscape character.

4.1.1. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

The study area consists primarily of human settlements and agricultural land. The natural landscape is degraded, with minimal pristine landscape remaining. There is some vacant undeveloped land that was previously cultivated, as well as land used for subsistence farming. Mining in the area, is widespread and is one of the key land-uses and contributes significantly to the visual degradation of the study area.

The landscape character changes through the study area and there is change in elevation and topographical features. Landscape types are distinguished by differences in topographical features, vegetation communities and patterns, land use and human settlement patterns (Swanwick; 2002).

The broad scale vegetation type that has been identified in the study area is the Marikana Thornveld. Central Sandy Bushveld and Norite Koppies Bushveld are other vegetation types that have been identified near the site (Figure 3).

4.1.2. VISUAL CHARACTER

Visual character is based on human perception and the observer's response to the relationships between and composition of the landscape, the land uses and identifiable elements in the landscape. The description of the visual character includes an assessment of the scenic attractiveness regarding those landscape attributes that have aesthetic value and contribute significantly to the visual quality of the views, vistas and/or viewpoints of the study area.

The overall landscape varies between agricultural landscape, which is undulating to flat, to degraded, polluted landscapes around homesteads and towns. Large mines present a negative effect on the visual character of the landscape. Granite Koppies are present around the study area but have been environmentally degraded by mining of the rock.

4.1.2.1 Visual Value

Visual value relates to those attributes of the landscape or elements in the landscape to which people attach values that though not visually perceivable, still contribute to the value of the visual resource. These visual values are derived from ecological, historical, social and/or cultural importance and are described in terms of their uniqueness, scarcity, and naturalness and/or conservation status. The importance of visual value of a landscape or element in the landscape is measured against its value on an international, national and local level.

Very few parts of the study area have been left undisturbed and there is very little to no unspoilt pristine landscape remaining. These areas however remain under pressure and are vulnerable due to human settlement expansion and mining activities.

4.1.2.2 Visual Quality

Visual quality is a qualitative evaluation of the composition of landscape components and their excellence in scenic attractiveness. Many factors contribute to the visual quality of the landscape and are grouped under the following main categories (Table 2) that are internationally accepted indicators of visual quality (FHWA, 1981):

Table 2: Criteria of Visual Quality (FHWA, 1981)

INDICATOR	CRITERIA
Vividness	The memorability of the visual impression received from contrasting landscape elements as they combine to form a striking and distinctive visual pattern.
Intactness	The integrity of visual order in the natural and man-built landscape, and the extent to which the landscape is free from visual encroachment.
Unity	The degree to which the visual resources of the landscape join together to form a coherent, harmonious visual pattern. Unity refers to the compositional harmony of inter-compatibility between landscape elements.

The landscape is allocated a rating from an evaluation scale of 1 to 7 and divided by 3 to get an average. The evaluation scale is as follows: Very Low =1; Low =2; Moderately Low =3; Moderate =4; Moderately High =5; High =6; Very High =7;

The regional landscape is assessed against each indicator separately. All three indicators should be *high* to obtain a *high* visual quality. The evaluation is summarised in Table 3.

Table 3: Visual Quality of the regional landscape

VIVIDNESS	INTACTNESS	UNITY	VISUAL QUALITY
3	2	2	Low

The visual quality of the landscape is Low and can be attributed to the mining developments, environmental degradation and scattered towns and settlements.

4.1.2.3 Visual absorption capacity

Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) signifies the ability of the landscape to accept additional human intervention without serious loss of character and visual quality or value. VAC is founded on the characteristics of the physical environment such as:

- Degree of visual screening:
  A degree of visual screening is provided by landforms, vegetation cover and/or structures such as buildings. For example, a high degree of visual screening is present in an area that is mountainous and is covered with a forest compared to an undulating and mundane landscape covered in grass;
- Terrain variability:
  Terrain variability reflects the magnitude of topographic elevation and diversity in slope variation. A highly variable terrain will be recognised as one with great elevation differences and a diversity of slope variation creating talus slopes, cliffs and valleys. An undulating landscape with a monotonous and repetitive landform will be an example of a low terrain variability;
- Land cover:
  Land cover refers to the perceivable surface of the landscape and the diversity of patterns, colours and textures that are presented by the particular land cover (i.e. urbanised, cultivated, forested, etc.);

A basic rating system is used to evaluate the three VAC parameters. The values are relative and relate to the type of project that is proposed and how it may be absorbed in the landscape (Table 4). A three-value range is used; three (3) being the highest potential to absorb an element in the landscape and one (1) being the lowest potential. The values are counted together and categorised in a *high*, *medium* or *low* VAC rating.

Table 4: Regional Visual Absorption Capacity evaluation

ACTIVITY	VISUAL SCREENING	TERRAIN VARIABILITY	LAND COVER	VAC
The expansion of the existing Slimes Dam 1	2	2	2	moderate
The expansion of the Magnetite dump	2	3	2	moderate
The construction of two new Pollution Control Dams	2	2	2	moderate
Construction of new Return Water Dam for existing Slimes Dam and Magnetite dumps	2	2	2	moderate
Construction of Barren Dam	2	2	2	moderate
Development of new Waste Rock Dump	2	2	2	moderate

The VAC of the study area is considered moderate, for the development of all proposed activities and a moderate overall screening capacity is expected for this project.

The moderate VAC relates to the undulating topography and agricultural landscape with mostly monotonous vegetation. The new structures will be absorbed within the existing facilities and will be moderately absorbed into the landscape and topography.

The less prominent project components such as Pollution Control Dams, Slimes Return Water Dams and Barren Dam are expected to be visually absorbed to a large degree in the landscape.

Figure 3: Vegetation Map



Figure 4: Land Cover Map



Figure 5: Landscape Character of Study Area

The view from the southern side of the mine

Landscape character on route to the mine

View towards mine

Figure 6: Existing Magnetite discard dump and extension of discard dump

Figure 7: Pollution Control Dam at Class-A waste facility

Figure 8: View from the top of the Slimes Dam towards Return Water Dam

Figure 9: View of processing plant and area for new Rotary Kiln

Figure 10: Existing processing plant

Figure 11: View towards Shaft furnaces and area for new Bag Filter Unit

5. IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The significance of impacts is a comparative function relating to the severity of the identified impacts on the respective receptors. The significance of an impact is considered *high* should a *highly* sensitive receptor be exposed to a *highly* severe impact as indicated on Table 5 below.

Table 5: Significance of impacts

RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY	IMPACT SEVERITY		
	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH
LOW	No significance	Low	Low
MEDIUM	Low	Medium	Medium
HIGH	Low	Medium	High

5.1. SIGNIFICANCE OF LANDSCAPE IMPACT

5.1.1. LANDSCAPE CHARACTER SENSITIVITY

The sensitivity of the landscape character is an indication of "…the degree to which a particular landscape can accommodate change from a particular development, without detrimental effects on its character" (GLVIA, 2002). A landscape with a *high* sensitivity would be one that is greatly valued for its aesthetic attractiveness and/or have ecological, cultural or social importance through which it contributes to the inherent character of the visual resource.

The majority of the study area is considered to have moderate to low landscape character sensitivity due to the mostly developed landscape, environmental degradation and the minimal pristine condition of the landscape, the moderate visual quality and minimal tourism value. During the winter months, low visual screening is afforded by the landscape. The site falls within the summer rainfall zone, and during the winter months plants are dormant and low growing.

Previous human induced activities and interventions have impacted significantly on the original landscape character. In this case, mining and existing infrastructure, including power lines, roads, mine dumps, etc., can be classified as landscape disturbances and elements that cause a reduction in the condition of the affected landscape type and negatively affect the quality of the visual resource.

The assessment of the landscape is substantiated through professional judgement and informed reasoning which is based on the landscape character assessment in Section 4 above. A landscape sensitivity rating was adapted from GOSW (2006) (Table 6) and applied in the classification of the study area into different sensitivity zones.

Table 6: Landscape character sensitivity rating (Adapted from GOSW, 2006)

	DESCRIPTION
Low sensitivity	These landscapes are likely to: ° Have distinct and well-defined landforms; ° Have a strong sense of enclosure; ° Provide a high degree of screening; ° Have been affected by extensive development or man-made features; ° Have reduced tranquillity; ° Are likely to have little inter-visibility with adjacent landscapes; and ° Exhibit no or a low density of sensitive landscape features that bare visual value.
Moderate sensitivity	These landscapes are likely to: ° Have a moderately elevated topography with reasonably distinct landforms that provides some sense of enclosure; ° Have been affected by several man-made features; ° Have limited inter-visibility with adjacent landscapes; and ° Exhibit a moderate density of sensitive landscape features that bare visual value.
High sensitivity	These landscapes are likely to: ° Consist mainly of undulating plains and poorly defined landforms; ° Be open or exposed with a remote character and an absence of man-made features; ° Are often highly visible from adjacent landscapes; and ° Exhibit a high density of sensitive landscape features that bare visual value.

5.1.2. SEVERITY OF POTENTIAL LANDSCAPE IMPACTS

Landscape impacts are alterations to the fabric, character, visual quality and/or visual value which will either positively or negatively affect the landscape character. During the construction and operational phases, the project components are expected to impact on the landscape character of the landscape types it traverses. The magnitude/severity of this intrusion is measured against the scale of the project, the permanence of the intrusion and the loss in visual quality, -value and/or VAC.

Table 7: Landscape impact – Altering the landscape character

LANDSCAPE IMPACT								
Activity	**Nature of Impact**	**Extent of Impact**	**Duration of Impact**	**Severity of Impact**	**Probability of Impact**	**Significance without Mitigation**	**Significance with Mitigation**	**Level of Confidence**
Construction phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative Impacting on the visual quality of the landscape due to the presence of foreign elements and a loss of vegetation cover	Localised impacts over an extensive area	Permanent if not mitigated	Moderate	Definite	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Moderate	Definite	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Moderate	Probable	Low	Low	High
Operational phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative Impacting on the visual quality of the landscape.	Localised impact	Permanent if not mitigated	Moderate	Definite	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Moderate	Definite	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Improbable	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Moderate	Probable	Low	Low	High

Construction phase

The activities that are expected to cause landscape impacts and that are associated with the construction phase, are the establishment of construction camps and the construction of possible service roads. These activities will create surface disturbances which will result in the removal of vegetation, mostly through agricultural land and the exposure of the underlying soil. The exposed soil and change in texture will contrast severely with the intact vegetation around the disturbance footprint.

The extent of the disturbances will generally affect a relatively small footprint area.

The construction camps and lay-down yards are anticipated to disturb a much larger area. The size and location of the construction camps will play a major role in the severity

of the landscape impact. Accurate technical information is not available for the construction camps but due to the disturbed, industrial character of the area the construction camp will be easily associated with the mine and therefore mitigates the impact considerably.

Considering the moderate VAC throughout most of the study area, the developed condition of great parts of the landscape and the relatively high recovery rate of the endemic vegetation, the *severity of landscape impact* during the construction stage is expected to be *low* for proposed extensions. Surface disturbances are also minimised through, for example, utilising existing roads.

The *severity of the landscape impact* can be mitigated to a low severity for all the proposed items. Sensitive placement of the construction camps, limited surface disturbance and prompt rehabilitation are prerequisite conditions if the severity of impact is to be reduced.

The *severity of the landscape impact* for the extension of the Magnetite discard dump is expected to be low. All discard dump surface activities will be visible from a certain distance from the mine, however due to the existing mining activities the extension of the Magnetite discard dump will not change the current impact significantly.

Operational phase

All operational activities (dust, transportation trucks, waste stockpiles) will be visible from a certain distance from the mine. It will pose a visual impact to rural residents that look onto the site and road users that regularly use the main road.

Surface disturbances that occur during construction may remain for an extended period during the operational phase. These are seen as residual effects carried forward from the construction phase and can be completely or substantially mitigated if treated appropriately during the construction phase.

Dust pollution and movement of machinery will also cause a visual intrusion. The existing mining activities and visual association of the workings of a mine will help to reduce the impact.

Closure phase

Upon closure of the mining activities, rehabilitation of affected areas will take place and visual aesthetics will be improved. Minimal negative residual impact is expected on visual aspects.

5.2. SIGNIFICANCE OF VISUAL IMPACTS

5.2.1. VIEWER SENSITIVITY

Within the receiving environment, specific viewers (visual receptors) experience different views of the visual resource and value it differently. They will be affected because of alterations to their views due to the proposed project. The visual receptors are grouped according to their similarities. The visual receptors included in this study are:

- Residents;
- Motorists; and
- Tourists;

To determine visual receptor sensitivity a commonly used rating system is utilised. This is a generic classification of visual receptors and enables the visual impact specialist to establish a logical and consistent visual receptor sensitivity rating for viewers who are involved in different activities without engaging in extensive public surveys.

5.2.1.1 Residents

Residents of the affected environment are classified as visual receptors of *high* sensitivity owing to their sustained visual exposure to the proposed development as well as their attentive interest towards their living environment.

5.2.1.2 Tourists

These are regarded as visual receptors of exceptional *high* sensitivity. Their attention is focused on the landscape which they essentially utilise for enjoyment purposes and appreciation of the quality of the landscape.

5.2.1.3 Motorists

Motorists are generally classified as visual receptors of *low* sensitivity due to their momentary view and experience of the proposed development. As a motorist's speed increases, the sharpness of lateral vision declines, and the motorist tends to focus on the line of travel (USDOT, 1981). This adds weight to the assumption that under normal conditions, motorists will show *low* levels of sensitivity as their attention is focused on the road and their exposure to roadside objects is brief.

5.2.2. SEVERITY OF POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS

Severity of visual impact refers to the magnitude of change to specific visual receptor's views and/or experience of the landscape. Severity of visual impact is influenced by the following factors:

- The **viewer's exposure** to the project:
  - Distance of observers from the proposed project;
  - The visibility of the proposed project (ZVI);
  - Number of affected viewers; and
  - Duration of views to development experienced by affected viewers.
- Degree of **visual intrusion** created by the project.

Empirical research indicates that the visibility of the mine and hence the severity of visual impact, decreases as the distance between the observer and the mine increases. The landscape type, within which the mine exists, can mitigate the severity of visual impact through topographical or vegetative screening. Bishop *et al* (1988) noted that in some cases the mine may dominate the view for example, silhouetted against the skyline, or in some cases be absorbed in the landscape. A complex landscape setting with a diverse land cover and topographical variation has the ability to decrease the severity of visual impact more than a mundane landscape (Bishop *et al*, 1985).

The Zone of Visual Influence (ZVI) is determined through a Geographical Information System (GIS). The result reflects a shaded pattern which identifies the areas that are expected to experience views of the proposed mine developments. The ZVI is limited to 5 km from the proposed mine.

A visibility analysis and viewer sensitivity has been completed for the expansion of the Magnetite dumps, the expansion of the slimes dam 1 (Appendix 1). The new Return Water Dams, Pollution Control Dams and Barren Dam, are below surface level and no visibility analysis was done. According to Bishop *et al* (1988), visual receptors within 1 km from the structures are most likely to experience the highest degree of visual intrusion, hence contributing to the severity of the visual impact. This is considered as the zone of highest visibility after which the degree of visual intrusion decreases rapidly at distances further away.

In order to assess the extent and degree of visibility in the visual envelope, a Geographical Information System (GIS) was utilized. A visibility analysis was performed which provides the following information on Figure 12 – 19 below:

- The areas within the visual envelope that may experience views of the proposed project; and
- The degree of visibility in terms of the percentage of the proposed project that will be visible from a specific location.

The GIS performs an analysis for a series of elevated observer points which represents the height of the proposed new structures and the proposed extension of discard dumps and slimes dams in a digital elevation model (DEM). This results in a visibility map with the degree of visibility illustrated by a colour.

The visibility analyses consider worst-case scenarios, using line-of-sight, based on topography alone. The screening capability of vegetation is not captured in the base model of the DEM and is therefore not considered in these results.

5.2.2.1 Potential visual impacts on Residents

Table 8: Potential visual impacts on residents

VISUAL IMPACT ON RESIDENTS								
Activity	**Nature of Impact**	**Extent of Impact**	**Duration of Impact**	**Severity of Impact**	**Probability of Impact**	**Significance without Mitigation**	**Significance with Mitigation**	**Level of Confidence**
Construction phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – Construction camp and lay-down yard may cause unsightly views	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Moderate	Probable	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dump				Moderate	Probable	Moderate	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Development of Waste Rock Dump				Moderate	Probable	Low	Low	High
Operational phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – The presence of the proposed extension of mine and new structures that intrude on existing views and spoil the views of the landscape.	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Moderate	Definite	Moderate	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Moderate	Definite	Moderate	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Definite	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Development of Waste Rock Dump				Moderate	Probable	Low	Low	High
Closure phase								
All Alternatives	Upon closure of mine and after rehabilitation	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Low	Definite	Low	Low	High

The study area is moderately populated, with a higher population in the small settlements of Mothotlung and Makau. Farming communities surround the site. The towns and surrounding areas are generally degraded and not very scenic.

Farm residents will experience intrusion on their views due to the presence of the proposed new extensions. It is unpractical to discuss all, but they are recognised as the general population of the study area and are identified as affected visual receptors.

It can be concluded that the study area has a moderate density of residents that will be affected viewers.

Construction phase

During the construction phase, unsightly views may be created by the presence of the construction camp and the lay-down yards. The duration of the potential visual impact will be temporary which will result in an anticipated *low* significance of visual impact for all the alternatives. The visual exposure to the construction activity will be limited.

The cleared site, construction camp and material lay-down yards will appear unsightly and out of character. Large scale construction elements, such as cranes, will be highly visible and increase awareness of the construction activity over a considerable area. The visual intrusion caused during the construction stage will be moderate but will be temporary in nature.

Operational phase

The residents of the settlements and farming communities surrounding the mine may experience a low degree of visual intrusion.

The current presence of the mines in the visual field of the residents will reduce the impact experienced, and it is expected that the extension of the dump and dams, will visually blend in with the existing mining landscape.

The Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) of the landscape plays a role in the visibility of the proposed new mine extension. The landscape is gently undulating with some tall rocky outcrops. In summer when vegetation is higher, the VAC is higher than dry winter months when vegetation will be scarce.

The region is associated with large-scale existing mining activities which reduces the significance of the overall visual impact and can be regarded as moderately low.

Closure phase

The duration of the impact will only be as long as the mine is operational. Upon closure of mining activities, rehabilitation of all areas is anticipated, and the visual aesthetics will be improved. No negative residual impacts are expected on visual aspects.

5.2.2.2 Potential visual impacts on tourists

Table 9: Potential visual impacts on tourists

VISUAL IMPACT ON TOURISTS								
Activity	**Nature of Impact**	**Extent of Impact**	**Duration of Impact**	**Severity of Impact**	**Probability of Impact**	**Significance without Mitigation**	**Significance with Mitigation**	**Level of Confidence**
Construction phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – Construction camp and lay-down yard may cause unsightly views	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Operational phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – The presence of the proposed extension of mine and new structures that intrude on existing views and spoil the views of the landscape.	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Closure phase								
All Alternatives	Upon closure of mine and after rehabilitation	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High

The study area has very little tourist activity with interspersed pockets with natural bushveld landscapes. The areas surrounding the Hartbeespoort Dam has high tourism value but is 18km south of the site, with the Magaliesberg mountain range screening the area. The localized area is considered to have low tourism potential, mostly because of the agricultural landscape, large scale mining developments and overall environmental degradation. The surrounding roads are also not a main thoroughfare road used to reach prominent tourist destinations further to the north, where many Bushveld resorts exist.

Construction phase

The temporary duration of the construction phase is not expected to cause major visual impacts. The location, number and size of the construction camps and lay-down yards will be crucial in regulating the impact. Detail information is not available, and it is anticipated that the visual impact will occur localised and that a very small number of tourists will be adversely affected by these project components during construction.

Their exposure to possible unsightly views of the construction camps and the associated activity will however be minimal and localised.

The potential visual impact on tourists during the construction phase of the proposed project can be mitigated with relative ease. The greatest factor to consider is the location of the construction camp.

Operational phase

Very few tourists will be affected by the extension of the mine and the proposed new structures, considering the low numbers of tourists that visit the study area or pass through the study area. Although it is difficult to pinpoint particular locations in the study area that are of specific value, the areas next to the roads will be most important.

Closure phase

The duration of the impact will only be as long as the mine is operational. Upon closure of mining activities, rehabilitation of all areas is anticipated, and the visual aesthetics will be improved. No negative residual impacts are expected on visual aspects.

5.2.2.3 Potential visual impacts on motorists

Table 10: Potential visual impacts on motorists

VISUAL IMPACT ON MOTORISTS								
Activity	**Nature of Impact**	**Extent of Impact**	**Duration of Impact**	**Severity of Impact**	**Probability of Impact**	**Significance without Mitigation**	**Significance with Mitigation**	**Level of Confidence**
Construction phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – Construction camp and lay-down yard may cause unsightly views	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Moderate	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Moderate	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Moderate	Low Probability	Low	Low	High
Operational phase								
Expansion of slimes dam 1	Negative – The presence of the proposed extension of mine and new structures that intrude on existing views and spoil the views of the landscape.	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Moderate	Probable	Moderate	Low	High
Expansion of Magnetite Dumps				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
New Pollution Control Dams				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Return Water Dam				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Construction of Barren Dam				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Development of new Waste Rock Dump				Low	Probable	Low	Low	High
Closure phase								
All Alternatives	Upon closure of mine and after rehabilitation	Local	Lifetime of Mine	Low	Low Probability	Low	Low	High

The major routes within the study area is the R566 connecting the towns, mines and farms. The secondary road network in the study area carries a much lower volume of motorists. Many of the roads are gravel roads which are utilized by the local residents. Their duration of views will be temporary, and it is expected that the visual intrusion that they will experience will be low.

Construction phase

The potential visual impact that may be experienced by motorists during the construction phase is considered to be minimal. Limited information is available, and the number, location and size of the construction camps and lay-down yard are essential for accurately assessing the visual impact.

The presence of the construction camp and lay-down yard may create unsightly views. Motorists' visual exposure to the impact will be brief and the severity of visual impact will be *low*. The significance of potential visual impact is expected to be *low*.

Operational phase

The road passing the mine directly connects settlements locally and is no major thoroughfare. The severity and significance of visual impact for the proposed extension of mine dumps and vertical structures, on motorists will be low. The speed at which motorists travel and the association of the regional area with mines, also has a moderating effect on the severity of the visual impact and further reduces visual exposure.

Closure phase

The duration of the impact will only be as long as the mine is operational. Upon closure of mining activities, rehabilitation of all areas is anticipated, and the visual aesthetics will be improved. No negative residual impacts are expected on visual aspects.

6. RECOMMENDED MITIGATION MEASURES

The aim of mitigation is to reduce or alleviate the intrusive contrast between the proposed project components and activities, and the receiving landscape to a point where it is acceptable to visual and landscape receptors.

6.1. GENERAL

- Where areas are going to be disturbed through the destruction of vegetation, for example the establishment of the construction camp, the vegetation occurring in the area to be disturbed must be replanted with endemic, indigenous species, especially veld-grass and trees. A hydroseeding application is recommended in the disturbed areas as a measure of rehabilitation.
- It is recommended that a permeable steel structures be used for the structures of height, as far as possible, to create the lowest degree of visual obstruction;
- Plant fast-growing endemic trees along the boundaries of the mine. The trees will with time create a screen and increase the biodiversity of the area.
- It is also recommended that trees be planted in areas where the proposed extension of the Magnetite dump is most visible, to reduce the visual impact of viewers.

6.2. ACCESS ROUTES

- Make use of existing access roads where possible;
- Where new access roads are required, the disturbance area should be kept to a minimum. A two-track dirt road will be the most preferred option;
- Locate access routes so as to limit modification to the topography and to avoid the removal of established vegetation;

- Avoid crossing over or through ridges, rivers, pans or any natural features that have visual value. This also includes centres of floral endemism and areas where vegetation is not resilient and takes extended periods to recover;
- Road verges that need to be cleared should be kept to a minimum;
- Access routes should be located on the perimeter of disturbed areas such as cultivated/fallow lands as not to fragment intact vegetated areas; and
- If it is necessary to clear vegetation for a road, avoid doing so in a continuous straight line. Alternatively, curve the road in order to reduce the visible extent of the cleared corridor.

6.3. CLEARED SERVITUDES

- Locate the alignment and the associated cleared servitude so as to avoid the removal of established vegetation; and
- Avoid a continuous linear path of cleared vegetation that would strongly contrast with the surrounding landscape character. Feather the edges of the cleared corridor to avoid a clearly defined line through the landscape.

6.4. CONSTRUCTION CAMPS AND LAY DOWN YARDS

- If practically possible, locate construction camps in areas that are already disturbed or where it isn't necessary to remove established vegetation like for example naturally bare areas;
- Utilise existing screening features such as dense vegetation stands or topographical features to place the construction camps and lay-down yards out of the view of sensitivity visual receptors;
- Keep the construction sites and camps neat, clean and organised in order to portray a tidy appearance; and
- Screen the construction camp and lay-down yards by enclosing the entire area with a dark green or black shade cloth of no less than 2m height.

7. CONCLUSION

The proposed activities for the extension of the mine have been evaluated against internationally accepted criteria to determine the impact they will have on the landscape character and the viewers that have been identified in the study area.

Table 11: Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Construction Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	1	2	4	3	21 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	4	3	21 low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	2	4	3	24 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	3	3	21 low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	2	2	4	2	16 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	2	2	12low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	2	4	3	24 low
	Yes	Negative	2	2	3	3	21 low

Table 12: Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Operation Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	2	2	16 low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	2	20 low

Table 13: Evaluation of activities for mining extension during the Closure Phase

Visual Impact of Alternatives	Corrective Measures	Impact Rating Criteria					
		Nature	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Probability	Significance
Expansion of Slimes Dam 1	No	Negative	1	4	6	1	11 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	4	1	9 low
Expansion of Magnetite Dump	No	Negative	2	4	6	3	36 medium
	Yes	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
Construction of New Pollution Control Dams	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Construction of Return Water Dam	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Construction of Barren Dam	No	Negative	1	4	4	2	18 low
	Yes	Negative	1	4	2	2	14 low
Development of Waste Rock Dump	No	Negative	2	4	4	3	30 medium - low
	Yes	Negative	2	4	3	3	27 low

The activities for the Visual Impact Assessment Criteria for all impacts as indicated in Table 11-13 applies are rated as per below:

Status of Impact:
The visual impact is assessed as either having a:
Negative effect (i.e. at a cost to the environment),
Positive effect (i.e. a benefit to the environment), or
Neutral effect on the environment.

Extent of the Impact:
(1) Site (site only),
(2) Local (site boundary and immediate surrounds),
(3) Regional,
(4) National, or
(5) International.

Duration of the Impact:
The length that the impact will last for is described as either:
(1) Immediate (<1 year)
(2) Short term (1-5 years),
(3) Medium term (5-15 years),
(4) Long term (ceases after the operational life span of the project),
(5) Permanent.

Magnitude of the Impact:
The intensity or severity of the impacts is indicated as either:
(0) none,
(2) Minor,
(4) Low,
(6) Moderate (environmental functions altered but continue),
(8) High (environmental functions temporarily cease), or
(10) Very high / unsure (environmental functions permanently cease).

Probability of Occurrence:
The likelihood of the impact actually occurring is indicated as either:
(0) None (the impact will not occur),
(1) Improbable (probability very low due to design or experience)
(2) Low probability (unlikely to occur),
(3) Medium probability (distinct probability that the impact will occur),
(4) High probability (most likely to occur), or
(5) Definite.

Significance of the Impact:
Based on the information contained in the points above, the potential impacts are assigned a significance rating (S). This rating is formulated by adding the sum of the numbers assigned to extent (E), duration (D) and magnitude (M) and multiplying this sum by the probability (P) of the impact.
S= (E+D+M) P

The significance ratings are given below
(<30) low (i.e. where this impact would not have a direct influence on the decision to develop in the area),

(30-60) medium (i.e. where the impact could influence the decision to develop in the area unless it is effectively mitigated), (>60) high (i.e. where the impact must have an influence on the decision process to develop in the area).

7.1. COMPARATIVE TABLES FOR VARIOUS PROPOSED STRUCTURES

Table 14: Negative and positive impacts of the development of the waste rock

Development of the waste rock dump	
Negative impacts	**Positive impacts**
• An additional dump will be created on site	• Less trucks off site, hauling waste rock off site
• More dust pollution on site, which may be viewed from off-site viewers, emphasizing the mine	• Possible less dust pollution off site, which can affect the surroundings visually

Table 15: Negative and positive impacts of the development of the Barren dam

Development of the Barren dam	
Negative impacts	**Positive impacts**
• The development of the Barren Dam will not have a negative visual impact as it will be seen by mining staff that associate the structure as part of the mine landscape	• Both proposed Barren Dam positions will be within the core operation buildings of the mine and will be seen by mining staff that will associate the structures as part of the mine landscape

Table 16: Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives

Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives	
Return Water Dam Alternative 1	**Return Water Dam Alternative 2**
Return Water Dam alternative 1 is proposed to the east of the tailing storage facility. The dam is on a lower level of the existing Slimes dam, and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.	Return Water Dam alternative 2 is proposed to the north of the existing slimes dam and is on a much lower level to the existing Slimes dam, and the visual impact on surrounding areas is expected to be low.
Viewers from Makau, a small settlement to the south of the mine, may be affected visually by the dam	There are few viewers looking onto the mine from the north, as it is mostly agricultural land, therefore this will have the least visual impact.
	Alternative 2 for the Return Water Dam is the preferred position.

Table 17: Comparative analysis of Barren Dam Alternatives

Comparative analysis of Return Water Dam Alternatives	
Barren Dam Alternative 1	**Barren Dam Alternative 2**
The proposed position for the Barren Dam alternative 1 is within the main mining facilities, the visual impact will be low, as the Barren Dam will blend in with the existing mining structures and will be associated with the mining landscape.	The proposed position for the Barren Dam alternative 2 is to the west of the main mining facilities, the visual impact will be low, as the Barren Dam will blend in with the existing mining structures, and will be associated with the mining landscape.
This Barren Dam is situated well within the mine, and from a visual aspect, this alternative is the preferred position.	This Barren Dam is closer to the boundary of the site and may be viewed by motorists and viewers from Rankotia.

APPENDIX 1

Figure 12 to Figure 14 reflects the results of a viewer sensitivity visibility assessment, carried out using GIS software. The results provide a clear interpretation of the extent of the visual influence and also provide an indication of the land use that can be expected in the affected areas.

Figure 12: Visibility Analysis Slimes Dam 1



Figure 13: Visibility Analysis Magnetite Dump Expansion North



Figure 14: Visibility Analysis Magnetite Dump Expansion South



GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Aesthetics	The science or philosophy concerned with the quality of sensory experience. (ULI, 1980)
Horizon contour	A line that encircles a development site and that follows ridgelines where the sky forms the backdrop and no landform is visible as a background. This is essentially the skyline that when followed through the full 360-degree arc as viewed from a representative point on the site defines the visual envelope of the development. This defines the boundary outside which the development would not be visible.
Landscape characterisation/ character	This covers the gathering of information during the desktop study and field survey work relating to the existing elements, features, and extent of the landscape (character). It includes the analysis and evaluation of the above and the supporting illustration and documentary evidence.
Landscape condition	Refers to the state of the landscape of the area making up the site and that of the study area in general. Factors affecting the condition of the landscape can include the level maintenance and management of individual landscape elements such as buildings, woodlands etc and the degree of disturbance of landscape elements by non-characteristics elements such as invasive tree species in grassland or car wrecks in a field.
Landscape impact	Changes to the physical landscape resulting from the development that include; the removal of existing landscape elements and features, the addition of new elements associated with the development and altering of existing landscape elements or features in such as way as to have a detrimental effect on the value of the landscape.
Landscape unit	A landscape unit can be interpreted as an “outdoor room” which are enclosed by clearly defined landforms or vegetation. Views within a landscape unit are contained and face inward.
Sense of place	That distinctive quality that makes a particular place memorable to the visitor, which can be interpreted in terms of the visual character of the landscape. A more emotive sense of place is that of local identity and attachment for a place “*which begins as undifferentiated space* [and] *becomes place as we get to know it better and endow it with value*” (Tuan 1977)[1].
Viewer exposure	The extent to which viewers are exposed to views of the landscape in which the proposed development will be located. Viewer exposure considers the visibility of the site, the viewing conditions, the viewing distance, the number of viewers affected the activity of the viewers (tourists or workers) and the duration of the views.
Viewer sensitivity	The assessment of the receptivity of viewer groups to the visible landscape elements and visual character and their perception of visual quality and value. The sensitivity of viewer groups depends on their activity and awareness within the affected landscape, their preferences, preconceptions and their opinions.
Visual absorption capacity (VAC)	The inherent ability of a landscape to accept change or modification to the landscape character and/or visual character without diminishment of the visual quality or value, or the loss of visual amenity. A high VAC rating implies a high ability to absorb visual impacts while a low VAC implies a low ability to absorb or conceal visual impacts.

[1] Cited in Climate Change and Our 'Sense of Place', http://www.ucsusa.org/greatlakes/glimpactplace.html

Visual amenity The notable features such as hills or mountains or distinctive vegetation cover such as forests and fields of colour that can be identified in the landscape and described. Also included are recognised views and viewpoints, vistas, areas of scenic beauty and areas that are protected in part for their visual value.

Visual character This addresses the viewer response to the landscape elements and the relationship between these elements that can be interpreted in terms of aesthetic characteristics such as pattern, scale, diversity, continuity and dominance.

Visual contour The outer perimeter of the visual envelope determined from the site of the development. The two-dimensional representation on plan of the horizon contour.

Visual contrast The degree to which the physical characteristics of the proposed development differ from that of the landscape elements and the visual character. The characteristics affected typically include:

- Volumetric aspects such as size, form, outline and perceived density;
- Characteristics associated with balance and proportion such scale, diversity, dominance, continuity;
- Surface characteristics such as colour, texture, reflectivity; and
- Luminescence or lighting.

Visual envelope The approximate extent within which the development can be seen. The extent is often limited to a distance from the development within which views of the development are expected to be of concern.

Visual impact Changes to the visual character of available views resulting from the development that include: obstruction of existing views; removal of screening elements thereby exposing viewers to unsightly views; the introduction of new elements into the view shed experienced by visual receptors and intrusion of foreign elements into the view shed of landscape features thereby detracting from the visual amenity of the area.

Visual impact assessment A specialist study to determine the visual effects of a proposed development on the surrounding environment. The primary goal of this specialist study is to identify potential risk sources resulting from the project that may impact on the visual environment of the study area, and to assess their significance. These impacts include landscape impacts and visual impacts.

Visual quality An assessment of the aesthetic excellence of the visual resources of an area. This should not be confused with the value of these resources where an area of low visual quality may still be accorded a high value. Typical indicators used to assess visual quality are vividness, intactness and unity. For more descriptive assessments of visual quality attributes such as variety, coherence, uniqueness, harmony, and pattern can be referred to.

Visual receptors Includes viewer groups such as the local community, residents, workers, the broader public and visitors to the area, as well as public or community areas from which the development is visible. The existing visual amenity enjoyed by the viewers can be considered a visual receptor such that changes to the visual amenity would affect the viewers.

Zone of visual influence The extent of the area from which the most elevated structures of the proposed development could be seen and may be considered to be of interest (see visual envelope).

LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE

Table 18: Confidence level chart and description

CONFIDENCE LEVEL CHART				
	Information, knowledge and experience of the **project**			
Information, and knowledge of the **study area**		3b	2b	1b
	3a	9	6	3
	2a	6	4	2
	1a	3	2	1

3a – A *high* level of information is available of the **study area** in the form of recent aerial photographs, GIS data, documented background information and a thorough knowledge base could be established during site visits, surveys etc. The study area was readily accessible.

2a – A *moderate* level of information is available of the **study area** in the form of aerial photographs GIS data and documented background information and a moderate knowledge base could be established during site visits, surveys etc. Accessibility to the study area was acceptable for the level of assessment.

1a – *Limited* information is available of the **study area** and a poor knowledge base could be established during site visits and/or surveys, or no site visit and/or surveys were carried out.

3b – A *high* level of information and knowledge is available of the **project** in the form of up-to-date and detailed engineering/architectural drawings, site layout plans etc. and the visual impact assessor is well experienced in this type of project and level of assessment.

2b – A *moderate* level of information and knowledge is available of the **project** in the form of conceptual engineering/architectural drawings, site layout plans etc. and/or the visual impact assessor is moderately experienced in this type of project and level of assessment.

1b – *Limited* information and knowledge is available of the **project** in the form of conceptual engineering/architectural drawings, site layout plans etc. and/or the visual impact assessor has a low experience level in this type of project and level of assessment. (Adapted from Oberholzer. B, 2005)

VISUAL RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY

Table 19: Visual receptor sensitivity

VISUAL RECEPTOR SENSITIVITY	DEFINITION (BASED ON THE GLVIA 2ND ED PP90-91)
Exceptional	Views from major tourist or recreational attractions or viewpoints promoted for or related to appreciation of the landscape, or from important landscape features.
High	Users of all outdoor recreational facilities including public and local roads or tourist routes whose attention or interest may be focussed on the landscape; Communities where the development results in changes in the landscape setting or valued views enjoyed by the community; Residents with views affected by the development.
Moderate	People engaged in outdoor sport or recreation (other than appreciation of the landscape);
Low	People at their place of work or focussed on other work or activity; Views from urbanised areas, commercial buildings or industrial zones; People travelling through or passing the affected landscape on transport routes.
Negligible (Uncommon)	Views from heavily industrialised or blighted areas

REFERENCES

BLM (Bureau of Land Management). (1986). Handbook H-8431-1, Visual Resource Contrast Rating. U.S. Department of the Interior BLM. http://www.blm.gov/nstc/VRM/vrmsys.html

Government Office of the South West - England (2006). Using landscape sensitivity for renewable energy. Revision 2010 – Empowering the region [Online]. http://www.oursouthwest.com/revision2010/lca_methodology_windbiomass.doc [Accessed 8 November 2006]

Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Assessment and Management. (2002). Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA). Second Edition, E & FN Spon Press.

M. Hill, J. Briggs, P. Minto, D. Bagnall, K. Foley, A.Williams. (March 2001). Guide to Best Practice in Seascape Assessment. Maritime (Ireland / Wales) INTERREG Programme- Building Bridges.

Oberholzer, B. (2005). Guideline for involving visual and aesthetic specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1. CSIR Report No ENV-S-C 2005 053 R. Republic of South Africa, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, Cape Town.

Swanwick, C. Department of Landscape, University of Sheffield and Land Use Consultants. (2002). Landscape Character Assessment:: Guidance for England and Scotland. The Countryside Agency / Scottish Natural Heritage.

Van Riet, W., Claassens, P., Van Rensburg, J., Van Viegen, T., Du Plessis, L. 1997. *Environmental Potential Atlas for South Africa.* The Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism in conjunction with The Geographic Information Systems Laboratory CC and the University of Pretoria. J.L. van Schaik.

Van Rooyen, M.W. 2002. Management of the old field vegetation in the Namaqua National Park, South Africa: conflicting demands of conservation and tourism. Published paper from *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 168, No.3, September 2002, pp. 211-223.

U.S.D.O.T., Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environmental Policy. (March 1981). Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects. U. S. Department of Transportation Washington D. C.

Urban Land Institute, 1980. Visual Resource Management 0510-1: Environmental Comment (May 1980). Washington D.C.