

WIND ENERGY FACILITY AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE

COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT: I&APs & STAKEHOLDERS

Comments Received during the review period of the Draft Scoping Report

No.	Issue	Raised by	Response
<i>General</i>			
1.	<p>This department re-confirm its support of renewable energy and regard wind energy facilities of strategic importance. This is reflected in that the Department has adopted a strategic approach in identifying sites at a regional level for development of wind energy facilities. We believe that the strategic approach taken by this Department will significantly contribute to the sustainable implementation of wind energy facilities in the long term.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the scoping report, the principles contained in this Department's strategic approach to wind energy and subsequent to the site visit, this Department is of the opinion that the site is not suitable site for a wind energy facility.</p>	<p>Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
2.	<p>Within District Municipality area of jurisdiction.</p>	<p>Doretha Kotze, Senior Town and Regional Planner, West Coast District Municipality, comment by letter, 7 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
3.	<p>Building of renewable energy facilities, its feasibility, the size, the process, the benefits, the negatives and problems for similar projects of this nature need to be investigated.</p>	<p>Andre Mostert, WNMDE Manager, Electricity, comment by fax, 21 April 2010</p>	<p>The EIA study provides information on the development of the wind energy facility, and potential environmental impacts (positive and negative) associated with the development. Technical-related investigations have been undertaken by the project developer.</p>

4.	This project falls within the Saldanha Bay Municipal area.	James Fortuin, Saldanha Bay Municipal Manager, comment by fax, 21 April 2010.	Comment noted.
5.	Regular visitor to Britannia Bay.	Wayne Schonegevel, Individual, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
6.	P.46 Figure 3.1 – named municipalities have been given in the blue trapezium. In line with this, is there any reason why the Western Cape Province can't be mentioned in the red trapezium?	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	Figure 3.1 shows the three tiers of government involved in the EIA process, i.e. the national, provincial and local spheres of government. The Western Cape Provincial Authorities which is referred to lie under the "provincial" sphere of government and the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) is listed under the "provincial" sphere in Figure 3.1 of the Scoping Report.
7.	Would it be possible to obtain a copy of the formal presentation?	Helmut Rohrer, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	The presentation has been appended to the minutes of the public meeting, which are included in the FSR.
8.	There is a need for cooperation amongst all wind energy developers on the West Coast to ensure the best sites are selected.	Alvin Roon, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
9.	Wind energy technology has matured well over the years and in Darling the power that's generated is fed into the local grid. Education about the wind energy industry will be crucial for understanding all aspects.	Herman Oelsner, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
10.	Liked the idea of a community upliftment programme and invited Terra Power Solutions and Savannah to attend a meeting in Paternoster to give the residents a better understanding of the project.	Andre Kleynhans, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	A meeting is being arranged with the Paternoster residents.
11.	How long will your wind monitoring study be?	Geoff Brown, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	The wind monitoring programme will be over a minimum of a 12 month period.

12.	What would be the correct technology for this area? How about using PV cells that are less visible?	Geoff Brown, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	The use of photovoltaic technology for this site/area would not provide the same power output as the proposed wind turbines.
13.	I'm in support of appropriate technology for the area with less of a visual effect.	Geoff Brown, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
14.	How will the project be financed with the current price of electricity?	Geoff Brown, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	It will be financed through Treasury and the REFIT Tariff.
15.	What does CDM mean?	Geoff Brown, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	CDM is the abbreviation for 'Cleaner Development Mechanism'. It is linked to carbon trading and the funding mechanism.
16.	P.17 Duyker Eiland Locality Map – please note that at 150% magnification the wording is just about at the limit of legibility. Is any improvement possible?	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	The resolution of the locality map was lost in the pdf electronic copy of the DSR and the original DSR is legible. Comment noted.
17.	At the public feedback meeting on the 7 April 2010, the land owner of the land voiced a threatening alternative that the land would be mined if the turbine facilities would not be granted We as the Botanical Society representatives found this to be very disturbing.	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
18.	Surely you would be looking at geotechnical issues for construction. I'm a retired geologist and know the granites in the area quite well.	Peter Siegfried, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	Terra Power Solutions will be investigating the geotechnical issues and concerns during the environmental impact assessment phase, and again in more detail once the environmental authorisation has been received.
19.	Is this already a Done Deal?	Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.	No, this is the start of a process. The detailed environmental impact assessment needs to be done as the next step.
20.	How long does it take a wind energy installation to repay its carbon foot print?	Alvin Roon, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	The pay back in terms of carbon credits and green energy mechanism is about 5 months.

21.	I own a plot on the golden mile and wish to retire there.	Suzette Plantema, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
22.	Own property in the Britannia Bay – Golden Mile area. Opposed to the construction of a wind farm so close to residential property.	Ralph Richardson, landowner Golden Mile, comments by e-mail, 10 April 2010.	Comment noted.
23.	Owner and resident on the Golden Mile – Britannia Bay.	June Perrett, landowner and estate agent Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
24.	Resident in Britannica Heights, St. Helena Bay with view towards the Remainder of Portion 7 and Portion 14 of Farm Duyker Island 6. Subject to breakdown in water supply during Eskom electricity outages. Due to booster pressure pump cutting out.	Meyer Adendorff, landowner Britannia Bay, comments at public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
Biodiversity			
25.	Resident on the Golden Mile at Britannia Bay. Concern and objection is regarding the effects the wind farm would have on the fauna/flora, aesthetics of the area and negative effects on property prices.	Robert Morley, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax, 10 April 2010.	The EIA phase will consider the significance of the environmental impacts of the wind energy facility in more detail. The EIA phase will include assessment of impacts through specialist studies including an Ecological Study (to cover flora and fauna) and Social Impact Assessment (SIA) (to cover socio-economic impacts).
26.	I have a house on Golden Mile Boulevard and will be moving there in the future and am concerned about the effects the wind farm will have on the fauna/flora, aesthetics of the area and property sales. Planning to contact Oceana Group (landowner) to rent land for a permaculture farm for disadvantage local people.	Rod Potter, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax 10 April 2010.	Comment noted.

27.	Full investigations and studies need to be done. We would like to see that the avifauna, heritage, botanical and visual studies be done with the input of local stakeholders.	Ludwig Slabig, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	The EIA phase will include assessment of impacts through specialist studies including an Ecological Study (to cover flora and fauna), and Avifauna Study, a Heritage Impact Assessment, and Visual Impact Assessment.
28.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The time frame to have a detailed field study and report done by July is not acceptable because the "flowering season" would be +/- from March to October. 2. We propose that local botanical enthusiast be identified by Botanical Society of South Africa West Coast Branch to give input with these field studies. We propose that CREW be approached for data from their field studies undertaken on the Britannia hills during 2007-2008. 3. The 3 vegetation types on the area cannot be relocated by transplanting as they are not adaptable to other areas and soil types. 	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The botanical specialist will undertake field work in the flowering season to confirm the nature and extent of the vegetation occurring on the site, and to confirm the presence of sensitive species. Field work will be supplemented by existing information from the study area, both from existing published sources and landowner information. "No go" and sensitive areas will also be identified during the EIA phase. 2. A local botanist, with appropriate experience in the Western Cape and specifically this area is undertaking the EIA specialist study. 3. The most appropriate measures to limit impacts on flora and fauna will be considered in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that will be undertaken during the EIA phase.
29.	The timing of the botanical studies is crucial. You cannot do botanical studies when there are no flowers in bloom. It should be done from March – September. Local botanist input should be used.	Ludwig Slabig, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	
30.	Once a spring survey of the site has been conducted, it should be possible to place the proposed 6 turbines in such a way to avoid areas of high conservation value and rare and endangered plant species. However, it is the construction and widening of access roads which has the potential to do the most damage and this impact needs to be assessed in more detail.	Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010	

<p>31.</p>	<p>Comments from CapeNature and Cape West Coast Biosphere as well as the vegetation and general ecology assessment report dated 19 February 2010 compiled by Nick Helme Botanical Surveys has identified the proposed wind energy facility site to be a Critical Biodiversity Area. The vegetation type on site includes Saldanha Limestone Strandveld, Saldanha Flats Strandveld and Saldanha Granite Strandveld which is considered to be endangered vegetation types. Therefore development in high sensitive areas must be avoided and is not recommended.</p>	<p>Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010</p>	<p>The vegetation and ecology of the area will be considered in more detail during the EIA phase for the proposed project through a specialist ecology study. The EIA study will also define “no-go” areas, sensitive areas and acceptable levels of environmental disturbance to inform the planning of the proposed development.</p>
<p>32.</p>	<p>The site is considered to be of a sensitive nature- summarised from provisional report by Nick Helme. The site is designated as a terrestrial Critical Biodiversity Area, and is considered to be an inappropriate area for development. There are 3 primary vegetation types on site, of which 80% is Limestone Strandveld which is classified as an endangered vegetation type in terms of SANBI national spatial biodiversity assessment. The on site offsets suggested as a contract reserve within the Cape Nature Stewardship Program, would be visually very inappropriate to be surrounded by 150m high white moving wind turbine blades. We feel that a further study of endemic species should be undertaken for future reference. There is evidence that the geological formations around St Helena Bay were at one stage an Island off the main land. This could have been a stimulus for a high percentage of endemic species.</p>	<p>Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p>	

<p>33.</p>	<p>According to the CAPE fine-scale mapping project, the proposed mast sites lie within Saldanha Limestone Strandveld, Saldanha Flats Strandveld or Saldanha Granite Strandveld. All of these vegetation types are considered to be endangered.</p> <p>The CAPE fine-scale mapping project has also determined parts of the property to be Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) because of the endangered vegetation types and edaphic interfaces present. Parts of the property which are degraded have also been included as part of the CBA as they form part of an important ecological corridor.</p> <p>The botanical specialist has identified areas of high ecological sensitivity. The wind turbines and roads should avoid these areas.</p>	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010</p> <p>Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010</p> <p>Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010</p>	
<p>34.</p>	<p>How will the wind energy facility affect the environment?</p>	<p>Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the Draft Scoping Report provides information of potential impacts of the wind energy facility on the environment.</p>

<p>35.</p>	<p>According to the CAPE Fine Scale Planning Project for the Saldanha Peninsula, the entire site is classified as a terrestrial critical biodiversity area (CBA). The vegetation types found on the site (CAPE FSP) consist of three endangered vegetation types (Saldanha Limestone Strandveld, Saldanha Granite Strandveld and Saldanha Flats Strandveld).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The footprint of the construction activities must be limited to the smallest area possible to minimise the impact on the sensitive, endangered vegetation. This includes all access roads and storage areas, which must be indicated in the EIA Report. 2. The Scoping Report does not specify locations for the wind towers. The wind towers should be located in the areas designated as low sensitivity in the vegetation specialist report. Areas of medium sensitivity could also be considered, but not areas of high sensitivity. The EIA Report must indicate the location of the towers in order to evaluate the suitability of their location. 	<p>Rhett Smart, Conservation Officer, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An EMP will be developed during the EIA phase for the development of the wind energy facility. The purpose of the EMP will be to limit or avoid negative environmental impacts through provision for appropriate mitigation measures. 2. Terra power Solutions will provide a preliminary turbine layout which will consider areas of identified environmental sensitivity. 3. The EMP will consider appropriate measures for rehabilitation during the development of the wind energy facility through the EMP that will be developed in the EIA phase. 4. The avifauna study will be done according to the methodology proposed in Chapter 7 of the Scoping Report: Plan of Study for the EIA. 5. It is most likely that bird monitoring will be a recommendation of the EIA study.
------------	---	---	--

	<p>3. Rehabilitation of the previously cultivated areas must be considered for the operational phase.</p> <p>4. The Avifauna Specialist Report should include information on potential flight paths of species with a diurnal or seasonal migration pattern and the likelihood that these species could be affected.</p> <p>5. A monitoring programme of bird mortality should be set up during the operational phase.</p>		
36	Noise and dust pollution of the development during the construction phase.	Doretha Kotze, Senior Town and Regional Planner, West Coast District Municipality, comment by letter, 7 April 2010	An EMP will be developed during the EIA phase for the development of the wind energy facility. The purpose of the EMP will be to limit or avoid negative environmental impacts through provision for appropriate mitigation measures. A Noise Impact Assessment will be undertaken in the EIA phase.
Wind Profile			
37.	<p>P.16 Last paragraph, quoting – <i>“The overarching objective of the wind facility planning process is to maximise electricity production through exposure to the wind resource, - - -”</i>.</p> <p>1. Although this is an admirable objective, I see no section or appendix in the DSR which gives any indication that any assessment of the wind resources is either being carried out or is proposed to be carried out.</p>	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	1. Refer to Page 13, Chapter 2 of the Draft Scoping Report which states that <i>“monitored data is planned to be recorded from an 80 m for approximately 12-24 months (a Basic Assessment Report has been submitted at to DEA under the reference number 12/12/20/1705)”</i> .

	<p>In the EIR for Eskom's 100 MW(e) wind generator facility about 120 km up the west coast from Cape Town, it is mentioned that wind data which had been collected indicated that it's efficiency would be around 26% That means for ~74% of the time the generators won't be working because the wind isn't in the right speed range. Direction could also have a bearing on wind availability. It is also known, from a number of years of operating experience, that Eskom's wind generator facility at Klipheuwel is only about 16% efficient. And there should by now also be adequate information on the average availability of the six wind generators located NW of Darling, adjoining the R27.</p> <p>2. We all know that the wind doesn't blow in the optimum speed range for large fractions of 24/7 only in a very few exceptional locations in the world. The question here is: what is special about this proposed site that there will be any difference from the norm without actual experimental data being available to demonstrate the truth of such claims?</p>		<p>2. Wind availability and the actual data are beyond the scope of the EIA. The site was selected due to the expected wind resources and suitability in terms of all existing regional studies. Actual wind data is proprietary information.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>38.</p>	<p>Now, it has to be understood that I am not making these comments to suggest in any way that there's any doubtful objective of having such a wind generating facility <i>per se</i> at this location - other aspects being excepted - but that it must be regarded pragmatically because, like it or not, if local users are expecting to have a more assured local generating capacity once this facility was to be operating, the reality is that assurance would need to be provided by importing electricity from the national grid when the wind generators aren't working.</p> <p>3. Therefore, I suggest that a new section needs to be added to this DSR which deals with the wind availability, the actual data being contained in another Appendix in the draft EIR, when that stage is reached. This DSR will presumably require a separate appendix (added to the FSR) to indicate the procedure to followed in order to obtain the necessary wind data.</p> <p>Just speculating: if one wanted 100 MW (e) of wind generated power to be guaranteed 24/7, it would probably need a minimum of four sites widely separated, say by about 100 km between each one, in order to provide the necessary guarantee, on the basis that at least one of them will be providing the necessary 100 MW (e) output at any one time. If more than one site is operating, there's no loss to anyone because the excess capacity can be sold to Eskom.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
------------	---	---	-----------------------

39.	<p>Ditto, 2nd paragraph, quoting – “Protecting the natural foundations of life for future generations: actions to reduce our disproportionate carbon footprint can play an important part in ensuring our role in preventing dangerous anthropogenic climate change; thereby securing the natural foundations of life for generations to come”.</p> <p>Although I don't disagree with these sentiments in general, one very important aspect appears to have been overlooked: with wind and solar power, the energy sources are available absolutely for free. There's no mining required, only the simple conversion of the natural free (quaintly referred to as “renewable”) energy into electricity. However, a major aspect must always be borne in mind: these energy sources are not continuous, and relying on wind power, in particular, would be disastrous from the point of view of supplying the constant base load requirements of commerce and industry.</p>		
-----	--	--	--

<p>40.</p>	<p>P.33 2nd paragraph, quoting – “(for example, an increase of average wind speed from 22 km/h to 36 km/h [6 m/s to 10 m/s] increases the amount of energy produced by over 130%)”</p> <p>Would it not be more meaningful to reword the above phrase as follows: “(for example, an increase of average wind speed from 22 km/h to 36 km/h [6 m/s to 10 m/s] increases the amount of energy available on demand by over 130%)”. It’s the demand which matters, surely, but obviously within the output limit of the generator.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>This sentence is intended to illustrate that the increase in energy production is not exponential to the increase in wind speed.</p>
<p>41.</p>	<p>Ditto 6th paragraph, quoting – “A wind resource measurement and analysis programme is being conducted by Terra Power Solutions for the proposed site, as only measured data will provide a robust prediction of the facility’s expected energy production over its lifetime”</p> <p>This answers my earlier point. Perhaps the wording of the introduction could be changed to indicate that work is in hand to obtain wind spectrum data.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Introduction, Chapter 1 of the Scoping Report states that wind monitoring is planned for the site.</p>
<p>42.</p>	<p>Ditto, last paragraph, quoting – “Turbines are able to operate at varying speeds”.</p> <p>If this is indeed the case, then is some mechanism provided to ensure that the variable frequency from the what I assume to be alternating current generators is kept constant and in phase with the grid supply?</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Modern day turbines all use electronic control gear to ensure any variability in their rotating speed does not effect the frequency on the grid.</p>

43.	Extremely worried as a homeowner on Golden Mile about the drop in property value due to increased noise level. The continual "drone" not suitable to retirement at the seaside – this is an exclusive development and we wish to remain as such.	Delene Malherbe, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax 12 April 2010.	The EIA phase will consider the significance of the environmental impacts of the wind energy facility in more detail. The EIA phase will include assessment of impacts through specialist studies including a Noise Impact Assessment, to model the noise levels and requirements and guidelines for permissible noise according to the South African Noise Standards. The potential noise impacts on surrounding residential areas will therefore be considered for evaluation in the EIA phase.
44.	I have a holiday home in Britannia Bay. This is a place that I have invested my life savings into. It is the most wonderful place, where my family escapes to, to enjoy peace and sanctuary. A wind energy facility will destroy the landscape, create noise, kill birds and devalue my property.	Chris Davis, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax 12 April 2010.	
Landscape Character and Visual Impacts			
45.	When considering a site for a wind energy facility one of the criteria to take into account is how vulnerable the landscape is to change. The sea and hills create the landscape character of the area in Britannia Bay. The proposed construction of these masts (<i>referring to wind turbines</i>) on the proposed site may result in a change to the current landscape character and a wind energy facility may not be appropriate for the site. The construction of the proposed masts on site will alter the sense of place.	Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010	The EIA phase will include assessment of visual impacts through the specialists Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) as well as aesthetic impacts/ impacts on the "sense of place" through the Social Impact Assessment (SIA). Once these detailed studies are conducted, the significance of these impacts can be evaluated.
46.	Opposed to the construction of a wind farm in such close proximity of a residential area due to noise impact and visual impact.	Peter Hohne, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	

47.	It feels like this is a done deal already. No alternatives were looked at and I'm totally against this development and will motivate the people of Paternoster to object to it. We support the idea of renewable energy, however not at the expense of our sense of place and landscape.	Andre Kleynhans, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	<p>Since the siting of a wind energy facility is dependent on the availability of the wind resource, it is accepted that site alternatives for developments of this nature would be limited. No site alternatives are therefore being investigated within the EIA process. The EIA will consider layout and design alternatives within the proposed development site in order to avoid identified sensitive areas. This approach to the consideration of alternatives is accepted by DEA, the competent authority for the proposed project. A Visual Impact Assessment and Social Impact Assessment will be done in more details during the EIA phase.</p> <p>Furthermore, a regional level assessment was done by Terra power Solutions using the methodologies proposed by the Provincial Government of the Western Cape and by mapping this site onto their maps – the definition is not that great- but gave a good indication for the assessment- Terra Power conclude the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » The site falls within the area designated as acceptable in the special output overlay. » The site falls within the acceptable area from the view shed overlay » The site falls within the acceptable or negotiable area from the landscape and capacity overlay. » The site falls within the preferred or negotiated areas of cumulative overlay.
Land Use			
48.	Possible impact of wind farms on land use.	Isak Malherbe, BKS, comment by fax, 13 April 2010.	The specialist Social Impact Assessment study will consider land-use impacts in more detail during the EIA phase.
49.	Impact on future residential development of seaside villages and the visual and noise etc.	Laurent Borel, Landowner Weskus See Plotte, comment by fax, 12 March 2010.	

50.	This application for the specific site cannot be seen in isolation, as many, surrounding farms would follow suite and there fore a precedent will be set.	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chapter 7: Plan of Study for the EIA of the Scoping Report provides details on which specialist studies will be considered further in the EIA Phase. The Geotechnical Specialist Report will consider erosion potential, however no separate agricultural potential or land capability study will be done as it has not necessary for this site. 2. The EIA study can assess cumulative visual impacts associated with existing or approved developments. Where projects are still in the planning phase, or not yet approved, the assessment of cumulative impacts presents a challenge as the risk of the impact being overstated is high as there is no certainty that each project will be implemented.
51.	Who is looking at the multiple cumulative effects of all the other wind energy facilities being proposed in the area?	Alvin Roon, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	
52.	<p>The proposed development is likely to have a high visual impact due to the nature of the landscape and its proximity to an area of high tourism value i.e. Britannia Bay, Shelly Point Golf Estate etc. Thorough public participation must be undertaken in these areas.</p> <p>Visibility of a silhouette against the horizon will result in a higher impact and must be taken account of. The visual impact assessment must use several simulations depending on location of the towers within the landscape.</p> <p>The economic impact on tourism in the area must be included in the Social Impact Assessment.</p>	Rhett Smart, Conservation Officer, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, comment by e-mail, 16 April 2010.	

<p>53.</p>	<p>1. A number of potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed project have been identified. These potential impacts will be assessed through the following specialist studies which include the erosion potential and impacts on agricultural areas; agricultural potential, and land capability. This office awaits these specialist studies.</p> <p>2. The document however does not refer to any cumulative impacts of developments of this nature. This office is of the opinion that wind energy facilities must be located as clustered developments in spatially acceptable locations where the impacts are lowest, rather than haphazardly placed facilities with a dispersed and uncontrolled layout. The cumulative impact of this development together with other proposed developments of this nature and/or in relation to the other proposed developments of the area; must also be evaluated.</p>	<p>Jan Smit, Department of Agriculture Land Care District Manager: West Coast, comments by e-mail and letter, 6 April 2010.</p>	
<p>54.</p>	<p>The influx of people who don't belong in the area/security!</p>	<p>Suzette Plantema, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax, 12 April 2010.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

55.	<p>A turbine is designed to operate continuously with low maintenance for more than 20 years. The possibility that the proposed land use does not constitute a permanent change of land use for the purpose of generating energy, does pose a challenge. The risk that other undesirable land uses may piggy back on this development exists. It is important that the land use reverts back to agriculture after decommissioning. Please explain how the risk of possible subsequent developments would be restricted in order to ensure that the natural resource would be conserved even after decommissioning.</p>	<p>Jan Smit, Department of Agriculture Land Care District Manager: West Coast, comments by e-mail and letter, 6 April 2010.</p>	<p>Currently, there are no agricultural activities on the proposed Farm portions. However, the land is zoned as agricultural. The land use rezoning will dictate the restrictions of possible subsequent developments after decommissioning of the facility. It is understood that the Western Cape DEA&DP is considering the rezoning of wind energy facilities to "agricultural with special use" limited to wind energy facilities. This will be confirmed should the project receive an authorisation and a rezoning application submitted.</p>
Avifauna			
56.	<p>The site covers the length of the slope up to the top of the high ground across a flight path used by birds travelling from the aquaculture pans and saltpan South of the site through to St. Helena Bay and the Berg River Estuary, which is an Important Bird Area (IBA SA 104). Some of the larger species, which can be involved, are Blue Crane, Ludwig's Bustard, Greater Flamingo and African Sacred Ibis. The situation requires an avifauna study including both daytime and night-time observation for all seasons of the year and not restricted to large birds because the Klipheuwel Study identified collisions with a Horus Swift and a Large-billed Lark.</p>	<p>Keith Harrison, West Coast Bird Club – Conservation, comments by e-mail, 2 April 2010.</p>	<p>A specialist Avifauna Study will be undertaken in the EIA phase and appropriate mitigation measures to mitigate potential bird impacts associated with the facility will be considered.</p>

	<p>Other Mitigations required: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Any cables above ground to be protected by “flashers”, for both Terra Power Solutions and Eskom lines. ii) Revolving objects like propellers produce retinal blur, causing some collisions. One blade should be painted black or striped. iii) Lighting, birds on cloudy and nights with poor visibility are attracted to “white lights”, any outside lighting should be “red or blue”. This site is subject to sea fogs. iv) Alignment of generation masts to run parallel with the flight paths. v) Sound can also assist in deterring bird collisions; a warning mechanism not audible to humans should be investigated. 		
57.	<p>Another major concern is the impact on birds and other wildlife in the area as well as the effect on the Fynbos.</p>	<p>Sandy Hurworth, landowner Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010</p>	<p>A specialist Avifauna Study and Ecology Study will be done in the EIA phase, according to the Plan of Study for the EIA phase, as proposed in Chapter 7 of the Scoping Report. It is most likely that bird monitoring will be a recommendation of the avifauna study.</p>

58.	The impacts of wind turbines on avifauna in South Africa are largely unknown. It is therefore imperative that the avifauna specialist study is expanded from a desktop study to include on-site observations of bird populations and flight patterns in the area prior to any development. If the wind turbines are authorised, budget must be set aside for frequent monitoring of bird collisions. If monitoring is not frequent enough, mortality counts can be inaccurate as scavengers remove bird carcasses. In the event that the wind turbines prove to be having high negative impacts on any species of avifauna, some or all of the wind turbines may have to be decommissioned. The possibility must be planned and budgeted for.	Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010	
59.	Environmental and ecological impact on coastal area, especially, birds and raptors.	Nicola Stewart, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax, 10 April 2010.	
60.	Negative effects on bird life in general, particularly the owls.	Robert Morley, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax, 10 April 2010.	
61.	Documented negative effects on hawks, eagles, owls, seabirds and migrating birds.	Rod Potter, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax 10 April 2010.	
62.	My concerns are about bird life endangerment and ecology.	Brian van der Spuy, landowner Golden Mile, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	
63.	Damage affect on birdlife.	June Perrett, landowner and estate agent Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	

64.	What is the impact of the wind energy facility on birds and bats?	Peter Hohne, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	A specialist Avifauna Study and Ecology Study will be done in the EIA phase, according to the Plan of Study for the EIA phase, as proposed in Chapter 7 of the Scoping Report to consider the avifauna impacts from wind energy facilities.
Visual & Noise Pollution			
65.	It is envisaged that the proposed masts would be visually exposed to surrounding towns such as St. Helena Bay, Vredenburg and Paternoster. The proposed masts will also be visible from a number of homesteads and farm settlements in the area as well as build up areas such as Britannia Bay and Stompneus Bay. Based on the visual assessment report dated 20 March 2010 and compiled by MetroGIS (Pty) Ltd. The visual impact associated with the proposed development will result in high visual impact. Since the proposed masts are proposed on an elevated site, this Department considers the facility as visually obtrusive.	Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010	A visual impact assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase of the process in order to determine the extent and significance of potential visual impacts associated with the proposed wind energy facility. This study will include a simulation of the proposed facility in order to provide an indication of what the facility will look like from various vantage points in the study area. A Noise Study will also be undertaken during the EIA phase of the process to determine the extent and significance of potential noise impacts associated with the proposed wind energy facility.
66.	Visual and noise pollution.	Geoff Brown, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax, 12 March 2010.	
67.	Visual Impact.	Andre Kleynhans, Landowner Paternoster, comment by fax, 5 April 2010.	
68.	The proposed site needs to be illustrated by using models and photos to show the turbines, powerlines and the substation.	Alvin Roon, Architect Paternoster, comment by fax, 8 April 2010.	

69.	Can you give me a guarantee that my property on the Golden Mile will not devalue due to the visual quality proposed industrial look and noise levels.	R.D & B.L. Nortje, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	
70.	Concerns surrounding visual impact of the project on aesthetics, as well as noise impact and negative impact on birds.	Wayne Schonegevel, Individual, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	
71.	Noise pollution.	Nicola Stewart, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax, 10 April 2010.	
72.	Britannia Bay is one of the few remaining pristine natural places on the West Coast. The noise factor concerns me and its effect on not only humans but on the fauna in the area such as whales and dolphins.	Suzette Plantema, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax, 12 April 2010.	
73.	Reduction of the natural beauty of the area and the noise levels to be expected relating to the south east wind in the area.	Robert Morley, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax, 10 April 2010.	
74.	Noise level to be expected with predominantly south easterly winds along the Golden Mile residential area.	Rod Potter, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax 10 April 2010.	
75.	Destruction of the natural beauty of the area.	Rod Potter, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax 10 April 2010.	
76.	My concerns are aesthetic damage done to the area and noise pollution.	Brian van der Spuy, landowner Golden Mile, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	
77.	Very concerned about: noise impact, visual impact and wildlife impact.	Ralph Richardson, landowner Golden Mile, comments by e-mail, 10 April 2010.	

78.	Noise from turbines.	June Perrett, landowner and estate agent Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	
79.	What is the visual and noise impacts on neighbouring residential areas?	Peter Hohne, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	
80.	Geographically in the landscape it would be visible from Saldanha Bay to Elands Bay. --150 m high turbines not suitable with low growth vegetation on landscape	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	
81.	Why erect a wind energy facility next to a residential area? Surely you could find a more remote area?	Chris Davis, landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	
82.	<p>I assume that the wind generators which Terra Power Solutions intends to construct are an existing type for which, presumably, their noise emissions – intensity and frequencies – are already well established from measurements obtained from existing installations in Europe. I assume also that there are no reasons why such data as are available shouldn't be made accessible to the noise specialist.</p> <p>Sound travels in the direction of the wind. I assume that the noise specialist will include a wind direction chart which can be used to assess the frequencies per year for which the sound from the wind generators and propellers is likely to be heard at local sites of habitation.</p>	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	

The Noise Impact Assessment will be undertaken according to the methodology proposed in Chapter 7: Plan of Study for the EIA of the Scoping Report.

83.	<p>The proposed wind farm site is far too close to current (and proposed future) residential areas. I have had experience of wind farms in the UK which are both visually and acoustically unacceptable when constructed near habitation. There are hundreds of kilometres of uninhabited coastline along the West Coast which would be eminently suitable for a project of this kind so why should this farm be built within a couple of kilometres of prime residential property? The nearest point appears to be 1 km from the houses along the Golden Mile. The noise will be totally unbearable in times of "full production"</p>	<p>Norman Blackham, landowner Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p>	
84.	<p>I'm quite concerned about the visual impact of this project on Paternoster and surrounds. We will lose a sense of place along this pristine coastline. Why here and not in an industrial zone like Saldanha Bay?</p>	<p>Marlouw Walters, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.</p>	<p>Wind energy turbines need to be erected where there is maximum wind availability and a close proximity to connect to the National Grid. Preliminary investigations indicate that the farm has good wind resources for power generation, combined with the fact that there will be a substation on the farm. Industrial areas such as the Saldanha Bay area have also been targeted by other wind developers.</p>
85.	<p>The visual pollution from the Britannia Bay wind farm will be huge. It will be visible from St. Helena Bay, Paternoster, Vredenburg and Saldanha Bay. We will lose a sense of place.</p>	<p>Marlouw Walters, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.</p>	<p>A visual impact assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase of the process in order to determine the extent and significance of potential visual impacts associated with the proposed wind energy facility. This study will include a simulation of the proposed facility in order to provide an indication of what the facility will look like from various vantage points in the study area.</p>
86.	<p>The facility will be visible from up the coast, Lamberts Bay, Klein Tafelberg, Bobbejaanberg and Redelinghuys.</p>	<p>Ludwig, Slabig, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.</p>	
87.	<p>Other concerns would be the visual impact of the full facility on the landscape, the impact of power lines on birds. The wind energy facilities cumulative effect on the entire area.</p>	<p>Alvin Roon, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.</p>	

88.	<p>The proposed land-use for the remainder of the site not occupied by the wind energy infrastructure must be stipulated. Conservation is the preferred land-use.</p> <p>The Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve has also commented on an application for a housing development for Portion 7 of Farm Duyker Eiland 6 and was in the Scoping Phase last year. In addition, there have been prospecting applications for the site. What is the current status of these applications and how does this impact the wind farm?</p>	Rhett Smart, Conservation Officer, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, comment by e-mail, 16 April 2010.	The layout of the turbines would take the possible housing development into account. The status of the prospecting and the proposed housing development projects are not known, but being investigated.
Conservation Stewardship			
89.	<p>The CWCBR is facilitating the Conservation Stewardship Programme on behalf of Cape Nature. The site is considered to be a highly suitable candidate for conservation stewardship. The landowner is therefore encouraged to enter into a stewardship agreement for the site.</p> <p>The rezoning of the site must take cognisance of the compatibility with a nature reserve.</p>	Rhett Smart, Conservation Officer, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010.	The land is currently zoned agricultural. It is understood that the Western Cape DEA&DP is considering the rezoning of wind energy facilities to "agricultural with special use" limited to wind energy facilities. This will be confirmed should the project receive an authorisation and a rezoning application submitted. The consideration of and decisions regarding a Stewardship Programme would be taken later in the project development process.
90.	If the wind turbines are approved, the remainder of the site should be formally conserved, possibly as a contract nature reserve through Cape Nature's stewardship programme. However, this will need to be decided upon by a stewardship review committee.	Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010	

Regional Context			
91.	<p>The scoping report states that this Department's regional methodology for wind energy site selection guideline was considered. However, the proposed site is not consistent with the guideline regarding the 4km buffer from the coastline. When applying this principle to the specific site, the following must be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proximity of the site to the coastline is less than 3km; • The proximity of residential development to the site (approximately 1.5 km south-east of Britannia Bay which is in close proximity to the coastline); and • That the hill forms a very prominent landscape feature that is visible from long stretches of the coast line. <p>In summary the receiving environment in this instance is sensitive from both a local as well as regional point of view.</p>	<p>Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010</p>	<p>The Western Cape's methodology for site selection is a guideline that has been considered through the planning stages of the project, together with legislated requirements (specifically relating to distances from coastlines).</p> <p>The sensitivity of parts of the site has been identified through the scoping phase and will be considered in detail in the EIA phase.</p> <p>The ability of the landscape to absorb the visibility of the wind energy facility will be considered as part of the Visual Impact Assessment and simulation.</p>

Alternatives, Footprint & Location			
92.	It must be noted that the selection of feasible and reasonable alternatives are linked to the impacts identified in the process as well as the issues identified. It is advised that an alternative site be investigated for the proposed masts as there is no mention in the scoping report that consideration is given to other sites for the masts. Sites in more open landscapes with the ability to absorb wind energy structures would be more appropriate and must be considered.	Anthony Barnes, Director: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B), Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, comment by fax 9 April 2010	The siting of a wind energy facility is dependent on the availability of the wind resource, it is accepted that site alternatives for developments of this nature would be limited. No site alternatives are therefore being investigated within the EIA process. The EIA will consider layout and design alternatives within the proposed development site in order to avoid identified sensitive areas. This approach to the consideration of alternatives is accepted by DEA. A Visual Impact Assessment, Social Impact Assessment and other specialist studies will consider impacts in more detail during the EIA phase. Refer to Chapter 7 of the Scoping Report: Plan of Study for the EIA.
93.	This proposed facility need to be compared with an alternative.	Alvin Roon, Architect Paternoster, comment by fax, 8 April 2010.	

<p>94.</p>	<p>The SIA states that no alternatives are being assessed! The Draft Scoping Report indicates that no alternative sites have been assessed. Based on the fact that as per the Ecological Specialist Report "the whole site is a terrestrial Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA)" (see page 3 & 4 of the report) alternative areas must be assessed. The Saldanha Limestone Strandveld is listed as endangered and of high sensitivity. Based on the fact that the specialist study recommends that no development be undertaken in certain parts of the proposed area, it goes without saying that alternative sites to locate the proposed wind farm must be assessed.</p>	<p>Peter Roux, Visitor to Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010.</p>	
<p>95.</p>	<p>I request the address and contact detail of the local and national competent authority in order to provide them directly with my comments on the remainder of the reports.</p>	<p>Peter Roux, Visitor to Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010.</p>	<p>The case officer at the Department of Environmental Affairs is Mr. Takalani Maswime.</p>
<p>96.</p>	<p>Project consultants presented with information of this nature should clearly be advocating the assessment of alternative sites. Should alternative sites not be proposed by the consultants it should be viewed as dereliction of duty and would call their impartiality in the process into dispute.</p>	<p>Peter Roux, Visitor to Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010.</p>	<p>The pre-feasibility siting process included the consideration of the results of the guideline document entitled <i>Strategic Initiative to Introduce Commercial Land Based Wind Energy Development to the Western Cape - Towards a Regional Methodology for Wind Energy Site Selection</i> (Western Cape Provincial Government, May 2006), which considers the suitability of areas for development from a strategic perspective. In addition, the EIA legislation requires that feasible alternatives are considered through the process, and these alternatives do not need to be limited to site alternatives alone.</p>

97.	A similar wind farm of approximately 55 turbines is being proposed at a site 6.5 km to the south. Why is there a need for a similar facility of only 20 turbines? Due to time constraints as a result of the inadequate consultation process and time period for comment to be included in the scoping report being submitted.	Peter Roux, Visitor to Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010.	The application of 55 turbines is proposed by a different wind developer. All the proposed projects are discrete projects, and are not related to one another. The application for authorisation in terms of the EIA Regulations is only one of the required authorisations or permits required in order for a project of this nature to reach development stage.
98.	How does this project tie in with the other proposed wind energy facilities in the West Coast Area?	Alvin Roon, Architect Paternoster, comment by fax, 8 April 2010.	All the proposed projects are discrete projects, and are not related to one another.
99.	According to information provided by the applicant at a site meeting on 30 March 2010, the applicant intends to place 6 masts on portions 7 and 14 of Farm Duyker Eiland No. 6. The original proposal stated that up to 20 masts were being considered although it is not yet clear whether the applicant or any other applicant has intention of placing additional turbines on adjacent properties. Cumulative impacts of all turbines in the area will need to be considered if additional turbines are proposed in close proximity to this site.	Alana Duffell-Canham, CapeNature Scientific Services, comment by e-mail, 9 April 2010	On the basis of the micro-siting exercise undertaken by TerraPower Solutions, it is not proposed that 6 turbines can feasibly be constructed on portions 7 and 14 of Farm Duyker Eiland, rather than 20 turbines. Should additional properties be included in this application for authorisation, this would be required to be added to the existing application.
100.	At the site meeting on the 30th march 2010 the indication of only 6 turbines was misleading, as it now transpires that there is requested planning for 20 turbines, which clearly would not fit on the 52% of low botanical impact area on specific site.	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	

101.	The document state that approximately 20 turbines will be constructed. At the site meeting only six locations were identified. Please explain.	Jan Smit, Department of Agriculture Land Care District Manager: West Coast, comments by e-mail and letter, 6 April 2010.	
	There is so much open space on the West Coast, hopefully an area that will suffer less impact can be found.	Sandy Hurworth, landowner Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010	The siting of a wind energy facility is dependent on the availability of the wind resource, access to the grid together with the availability of land.
	Devaluation of property, unsuitable location.	June Perrett, landowner and estate agent Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	
	Have other more remote areas been considered?	Peter Hohne, landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax, 12 April 2010.	

<p>102.</p>	<p>P.30 1st paragraph, quoting – “In addition, given that renewables can often be deployed in a de-centralised manner close to consumers, this is only feasible, of course, where consumers are already connected to the grid. Wind generators do not provide base-load supplies.</p> <p>P.34 1st paragraph after the arrowed points, quoting – “- - - where a turbine is behind another - - -”.</p> <p>This sentence needs a more in-depth explanation. Thus the wind won’t remain permanently unit-directional. Therefore, at some time or another, in relation to the wind direction every, but every, one or other turbine is always going to be behind another one. I do not understand why there’s an alleged difference in the concept of “difference [= spacing] apart” and “behind another one”, specifically iro continually changing wind directions and also their spacing.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>The report states “Increased energy security: The current electricity crisis in South Africa highlights the significant role that renewable energy can play in terms of supplementing the power available. In addition, given that renewables can often be deployed in a decentralised manner close to consumers, they offer the opportunity for improving grid strength and supply quality, while reducing expensive transmission and distribution losses.” Within this context, this paragraph reads correctly.</p>
-------------	--	---	---

103.	Why should the tower spacing be different within rows and between rows? I'm sure that there's a neat technical explanation: can it be provided, please?	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	Wind turbines typically need to be spaced approximately 2 to 3xD apart, and 5 to 7xD where a turbine is placed behind another turbine when facing the predominant wind direction (D = the diameter of the rotor blades). This is required to minimise the induced wake effect the turbines might have on each other. Considering a typical 2 MW capacity turbine whose rotor is approximately 90 m in diameter, each turbine would be separated by approximately 180 m to 300 m. The erection of turbines in parallel rows one behind another would require a distance between rows of 500 m to 700m to avoid wake effects from one turbine onto another.
104.	Do you have a final layout and design for the wind energy facility?	Helmut Rohrer, Public Meeting , 7 April 2010	A preliminary layout has been provided by TerraPower Solutions, and this will be refined during the environmental impact assessment phase.
105.	The proposed Sealand wind energy facility site at St. Helena Bay would be ideal as its hidden and out of view and it has large amounts of wind.	Helmut Rohrer, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
106.	Your first proposal was for 6 wind turbines, now we hear of 20 turbines. There is not enough space.	Ludwig Slabig, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	Terra Power Solutions are looking to expand the site to the west; and will then leave the sensitive areas of the site with highly sensitive plant cover as an offset area.
107.	Why have you chosen this site? What is the wind profile? You are only starting to do wind monitoring	Geoff Brown, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	We have some excellent results on wind in the area. When the 80m wind monitoring mast is erected, it will confirm our current measurements. We require wind data over a one year period to ensure projects are viable. If the wind data indicates that the site is not viable from a wind perspective, the project will not go ahead.

108.	What will the final footprint of the final design be?	R.D & B.L. Nortje, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	Each turbine has an approximate foundation of 10m*10m*4m. The extent of the farm could be expanded to the west.
Power Supply			
109.	Can the developer guarantee power supply when Eskom power is down?	Alvin Roon, Architect Paternoster, comment by fax, 8 April 2010.	The power generated by the wind energy facility would be supplied to the Eskom grid. If there is no electrical fault on the circuits connected to the wind facility and the substation in question – there is no reason why the electricity would not be available. If a customer wants to specifically buy green energy from the facility they can do so by buying green certificates.
110.	Would the power linked to the grid at Stompneus Bay substation be available to St. Helena Bay during Eskom electricity outages in the area?	Meyer Adendorff, landowner Britannia Bay, comments at public meeting, 7 April 2010.	
111.	We experience major electricity problems when Eskom power is down. The water booster pumps which supply water to our property switch off and water supply is halted. Will this project provide electricity to the local grid and boost it? Or will all the electricity generated be supplied to Eskom	Geoff Brown, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	
112.	Why will an Eskom substation be built at Duyker Eiland?	Marlouw Walters, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010	This substation will be built as part of Eskom's future planning and upgrade of the local electricity grid. The approval for the construction of this station has already been granted.
113.	You indicated that the electricity would be fed into the local grid. What do you do during load shedding as you require the distribution network to be alive?	Geoff Brown, Public Meeting, 7 April 2010.	During load shedding – the grid is interrupted at certain nodes nationally. If there is sufficient wind turbines and sufficient wind there will be sufficient power for the local load.
Tourism			
114.	I wish to register as I am concerned at the impact this facility will have on the beautiful, untouched and tranquil holiday coast which we all enjoy.	Sandy Hurworth, landowner Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010	The Scoping phase of the EIA is aimed at predicting potential environmental impacts at a desktop level. The EIA phase will focus on the significance of the environmental impacts of the wind energy facility in

<p>115.</p>	<p>Paternoster Village Tourism is highly concerned about the planned wind energy facility near Britannia Bay. The establishing of such farm would have a high impact on tourism in general in the region as tourism is one of the highest income sources in Paternoster. Paternoster itself has approx 20 guesthouses, 150 self catering units, 5 restaurants an about 500 employees, this means it gives an approx. turnover of nearly 50 million Rand/annum. If the wind farm would be build, the tourist would not be able to come out for the well-known charm and tranquillity of Paternoster as the wind mills would not only be an eyesore in the distance but also of high concern to visitors close to the wind farm (i.e. ongoing sun reflection and noise level). Therefore the visitors would also loose out on highlights of the region (Fynbos would be destroyed, wildlife would decrease). Paternoster Village Tourism sees the wind farm as a threat for all businesses in Paternoster as tourism would immediately decrease in numbers. Being only a little fishermen village, tourism is needed in town to make a living.</p>	<p>Marion Lubitz, Chairperson of Paternoster Village Tourism, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010</p>	
-------------	--	--	--

	<p>Farr Out is highly concerned about the planned wind energy facility near Britannia Bay. The establishing of such farm would have a high impact on tourism in general in the region as tourism is one of the highest income sources in Paternoster. Farr out is a small guest house with 4 rooms only, our guest come to enjoy the tranquillity and unspoilt surroundings of the area. Our yearly turnover would decrease drastically as visitors would not feel comfortable anymore. The wind farm would be visible in a distance and this is a huge intrusion to nature on its own never mind the noise level and sun reflections which comes with it. It would spoil the whole coastline of the area, would destroy a big deal of wildlife and to crown at all it would have a drastic effect on income. Being only a little fishermen village, tourism is needed in town to make a living.</p>	<p>Marion Lubitz & Deon van Schalkwyk, Farr Out Guest House Paternoster, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010</p>	
<p>116.</p>	<p>I am writing these comments in my personal, as well as, business capacities. I wish to make it clear that I am in no way opposed to wind energy as an alternative, energy source. I came to the West Coast in 1993 and have been involved in businesses allied to the tourist industry during this time. During 1993 I started Die Winkel at Paternoster, which I later sold. It was named 1 of the 10 tourist's icons in South Africa within 5 years of its beginning. In 1999 I opened Voorstrand Restaurant in Paternoster. We attract tourist from all over SA and abroad, as we specialize in seafood and are on the beach. I have also been involved in various property renovation and investments locally.</p>	<p>Hedwig Slabig, Voorstrandt Restaurant and Slabig Trust Paternoster, comment by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p>	

<p>117.</p>	<p>From my experience in Paternoster and the West Coast in the past 17 years, I wish to make the following comments on the proposed Wind Facility at Britannia Bay;</p> <p>1. The "magic" of Paternoster is an indefinable quality that makes visitors and residence feel special. If one were to analyze it, the traits of the area which we guard for the future are our unspoilt, accessible natural beauty, the human scale of our buildings and our landscape, and our people.</p> <p>The Municipality have imposed strict building codes and restrictions for all developments to maintain the fisherman's village atmosphere.</p> <p>We are surrounded by Tieties Bay nature reserve to our one side and to the Duyker Eiland side is Groot Paternoster Nature Reserve with its beautiful natural stone houses, to the Vredenburg side we have established farmlands.</p> <p>It would thus be totally unacceptable to have our horizon to the Britannia Bay side visually polluted by 150m high wind turbines.</p> <p>2. All of the above may sound very idyllic and of no practical value to anybody--but may I briefly state a few economic facts:</p> <p>a. Voorstrand Restaurant currently employs:</p>	<p>Hedwig Slabig, Voorstrandt Restaurant and Slabig Trust Paternoster, comment by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p>	
-------------	--	--	--

	<p>33 people in full time and 10 people in part time position's. Most are residents of Paternoster and rest from adjacent Vredenburg. b. 20% of the seafood for the restaurant is purchased from local traditional fishermen. c. Voorstrand Restaurant also support 2 local sport clubs, the crèche and the local school by donating annually and incepted the Christmas fund for children.</p> <p>3. This is but one business in Paternoster, but at a rough "guess-tamate" , if all other tourism facilities in Paternoster would be considered, the yearly turn over would be plus minus R100 mil per year and job opportunities already created, plus minus 500 people.</p> <p>All this has been done by private individuals with their own investments of time and money and for the love of a small village, called Paternoster.</p>	<p>Hedwig Slabig, Voorstrandt Restaurant and Slabig Trust Paternoster, comment by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p>	
Public Participation Process			
118.	Has an impact study been made available?	Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.	The draft Scoping Report was made available at public libraries and electronically on www.savannahSA.com for public comment.
119.	Has a public meeting been scheduled?	Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.	The first public meeting was held during the scoping phase on the 7 April 2010. A site visit and meeting was held for key stakeholders and authorities such as DEA&DP, Cape Nature etc. on 30 March 2010. Follow-up focus group meetings and another public meeting will be held during the impact assessment phase.

120.	Why have residents not been properly informed about the proposed project? I have just heard the news via our homeowners association (1 day before the cut off date, to lodge objections).	Chris Davis, landowner Britannia Bay, comments by fax 12 April 2010.	All homeowners associations were provided with background information documents along the Golden Mile, Britannia Bay and Shelly Point during the Scoping Review period.
------	---	--	---

<p>121.</p>	<p>1. Appendix D contains copies of adverts announcing the public participation process. The appendix only contains an advert placed in an Afrikaans newspaper with no name. No proof of any advertisement being placed in an English newspaper is provided.</p> <p>No date announcing a public meeting is detailed in any of these adverts.</p> <p>No adverts of any form announcing a meeting open to the public have been viewed and in this regard can only assume that none have been placed and that a meeting open to the public that has been freely advertised has not been held.</p> <p>2. Stakeholder comments placed on the website in Appendix E from Cape Nature (dated 08 December 2009 and Cape West Coast Biosphere (dated 6 January 2010) relate to the Draft Basic Assessment undertaken for the Wind Monitoring Mast. Where are the comments relating to the wind farm? In both commentaries there is concern of endangered vegetation types?</p>	<p>Peter Roux, Visitor to Britannia Bay, comment by e-mail, 13 April 2010.</p>	<p>1. Refer to Chapter 3, Subsection 3.3.2: Public Involvement Process (Page 39) of the Draft Scoping Report which states that "...the EIA process was advertised in the following newspapers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Die Burger on 19 January 2010; and * Die Weslander on 21 January 2010. <p>A second round of newspaper adverts informing the public on the public meeting and review period for the Scoping Report has been advertised in Die Burger and Die Weslander on 18 -19 March 2010".</p> <p>Appendix E of the Final Scoping Report includes a copy of the original adverts.</p> <p>A5 yellow flyers (250) were also distributed in the area and to post boxes to inform people about the public meeting. It is understood that these were indeed received, as persons attending the meeting were in possession of these flyers and brought them along to the meeting.</p> <p>2. At the time of releasing the Draft Scoping Report, no comments had been received from the public regarding the wind energy facility. However, during the Basic Assessment Process that was undertaken for the wind monitoring mast (November 2009 to January 2010), comments were received which made reference to the potential wind energy facility. These comments were, therefore, included in the Draft Scoping Report for completeness. Stakeholders have now submitted comments for the EIA process for the wind energy facility - these are included in Appendix E of the Final Scoping Report.</p>
-------------	---	--	---

<p>121</p>	<p>3. It is mentioned in correspondence below that the EIA will be sent to the National Authorities for review and required action to proceed to EIA. Due in this regard that the project commands national importance, the EIA and process should be advertised nationally. Die Burger is a regional newspaper limited to the Western Cape and the Weslander is a local newspaper limited to the Vredenberg area. Both newspapers are Afrikaans. Therefore, the English speaking communities rights to information regarding the project have been compromised. Of greater importance is that English is the national language and many residents in Britannia Bay do not speak Afrikaans. Furthermore, numerous property owners in very close vicinity to the project site live in areas outside of the Western Cape. These property owners have not had an opportunity to be informed of the project and therefore the consultation process to date is flawed!</p> <p>4. I have found no date indicating when the on-site notices were erected, or when the flyers were distributed, or when the notice was placed at a prominent supermarket. The onsite notice placed on the gate leading to the property is woefully inadequate.</p>		<p>3. An English advert was placed in Die Weslander (which is a bilingual newspaper) and an Afrikaans advert was placed in Die Burger. Please refer to Appendix D of the Final Scoping Report which contains scanned copies of the original adverts.</p> <p>The EIA Regulations, as contained in Government Notice 385, Section 56 (c) requires as a minimum that an advertisement shall be placed in one local newspaper or an official Gazette, which has been complied with. Furthermore, Section 56 (d) requires that an advert should be placed in one provincial newspaper; unless the impact extends beyond the boundaries of the metropolitan/local municipality, and then a national newspaper can be used. This project is located within one local and one district municipality therefore we consider the use of a local (Die Weslander) and a regional (Die Burger) newspaper appropriate for this project. In the EIA phase, both English and Afrikaans adverts will be placed in these newspapers.</p> <p>Please note that the public consultation process for the Basic Assessment for the Wind Monitoring Mast was active over the December period when holiday-makers may have been frequenting their homes. Extra effort was made at that time to notify persons (even distributing flyers to all post office boxes) who may not be resident in the area permanently.</p> <p>4. On-site notices have been placed at the entrance of the Farm Duyker Eiland that is on the fence of the site where the activity is proposed to be undertaken (as prescribed by the EIA Regulations).</p>
------------	--	--	--

121	<p>The only way that anyone will be able to see the notice is if they are turning onto the property and have to stop at the gate. Furthermore, the notices are obscured from any side view by bushes. It therefore indicates that no passing vehicle to or from Britannia Bay would be able to see the notice. No indication is given of how long the notices were left onsite and when they were removed. It is quite possible that they were put up, photographed for the purposes of including into the report, and removed.</p> <p>The proof of newspaper advert provided in Appendix D offers a date "Dinsdag 19.1.2010". It is well known that Britannia Bay has many owners who are not permanently resident and who make use of their properties over the December period. It can only be said that the placement of the advert (and I assume the onsite notices and flyers, as no proof of dates are provided) was designed in such a way so that as few people as possible would see the advert. This knowing full well that most people would have returned to their permanent residences by the 19th.</p>		
-----	---	--	--

<p>121.</p>	<p>5. I therefore contend that this public consultation process currently been undertaken is totally inadequate and in certain instances is bordering on design to let as few people as possible know about the project. Should this process have been undertaken in a manner that would have allowed all local residents and property owners to gain knowledge of the project the information should have been provided during the December' high occupancy period.</p> <p>The Draft Scoping Report on page iv provides: "In order to facilitate comments on the draft scoping report and provide feedback of the findings of the studies undertaken, a public meeting will be held during the review period for the Draft Scoping Report. All interested and affected parties are hereby invited to attend a public meeting to be held on 07 April 2010 at the St Helena By Community Hall." It is clearly evident that not all interested and affected parties have had access to the draft scoping report as the availability of the report has not been announced adequately (no advert in an English newspaper). Furthermore, in the Invitation to Comment on the Draft Scoping Report, the due date for comments is 13 April 2010 – 7 days. Draft reports and specialist studies of this nature require 30 days for review. The comment period of seven days is inadequate.</p>		<p>5. The public participation process has and will be (for the EIA phase) undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations and the public involvement process as provided in Chapter 3 of the Draft Scoping Report has included include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identification of I&APs & compile I&AP database b. Fixing Site Notices c. Placing Newspaper Advertisements d. Distribution of BIDs & Reply Forms e. Giving written notice (by means of a letter) to key interested and affected parties such as the local municipality, organs of state and surrounding residents. <p>Furthermore, the public involvement process has also included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Distributing 250 flyers to inform people of the project, availability of the Draft Scoping Report and invitation to the public meeting » Hosting a site meeting for key authorities and stakeholders on 30 May 2010 » Hosting a public meeting on 07 April 2010 to provide verbal feedback on the project (the meeting was well attended). » The public has been given a 30-day commenting period for the draft Scoping Report from 15 March 2010 to 13 April 2010 in line with the requirements of the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998. The Draft Scoping Report was available on the Savannah website (www.savannahSA.com) as well as the St. Helena Bay Library and Vredenburg Library, which are public venues.
-------------	--	--	---

121.	<p>It is clearly evident that due to the sensitivities surrounding wind farms and the interests of the client, the design of the consultation process has been such to allow for as few people as possible to know about the project. Had the consultants undertaken the public consultation process in a fair and free of bias manner to allow as many of the local property owners and residents the opportunity to be aware of the project, they would have a) advertised in a national newspaper in both Afrikaans and English, b) placed the site notice for maximum exposure, c) placed flyers, and adverts at the local supermarket during the December period with high occupancy of interested and affected parties, d) advertised a public meeting open to all members of the public in the related media. None of this has been undertaken.</p> <p>It appears based on the inadequacy of the process that the interests of the developer are being placed ahead of the affected parties, local residents and landowners.</p>		<p>The public participation process has been adequate through the Scoping phase. There has been extensive participation from stakeholders and I&APs from all sectors, which indicates that the process to date has been open, transparent and accessible.</p>
Employment & Local Benefit			
122.	What employment will it create in the area?	Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.	During construction local contractors will be employed. During the operation a local team will be needed to maintain the installation.
123.	How will we directly and indirectly benefit?	Tony Sanderson, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax 20 April 2010.	Britannia Bay landowners will be able associated with a green electricity production. Local Municipal projects for social upliftment will be introduced.
124.	Will there be any benefits to the local community?	Geoff Brown, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax, 12 March 2010.	

<p>125.</p>	<p>The project being only 5 turbines (possibly a maximum of 6), will not provide permanent jobs which is a criticism of high tech industries coming to the West Coast and that there are limited opportunities for upliftment within the PDI sector. The renewable energy industry will be coming to the West Coast due to available wind and industrial expansion planned for Saldanha.</p> <p>It would be prudent for Terra Power Solutions to show their commitment to the West Coast by now starting to select young people and to provide bursaries for their training.</p>	<p>Keith Harrison, West Coast Bird Club – Conservation, comments by e-mail, 2 April 2010.</p>	<p>Terra Power Solutions commits to engage with the community to identify which programs and projects are preferred.</p>
<p>126.</p>	<p>Penultimate arrowed point, quoting – “Employment creation: the sale, development, installation, maintenance and management of renewable energy facilities has significant potential for job creation in South Africa”. I trust that this statement will be expanded, fully supported by data, which will indicate the employment opportunities for this particular facility in order to demonstrate its significance where local employment opportunities are concerned.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

126.	<p>3rd paragraph, quoting – “In addition, the development of renewable energy beyond the 10 000 GWh target holds further employment benefits and would maximise the number of jobs created per TYWh (South Africa Renewable Energy feed-in tariff [REFIT] Regulatory Guideline published by NERSA, March 2009)”</p> <p>I am not convinced of the employment benefits being maximised merely by constructing a wind energy facility which, when operating, will most like require the minimum of maintenance, which could be carried by only a few permanent employees at, say, a facility generating 100 MW(e). Not being familiar with the NERSA tariff document, I cannot express any sensible opinion on its relevance to maximising jobs in this specific electricity generating industry. I would have thought that the opportunity to maximise jobs would rest in establishing a parallel manufacturing Indus-try, and selling the wind (and solar concentrating and photovoltaic) generators to other countries on the African continent. The African continent surely doesn't have to rely on a few manufacturers in the northern hemisphere?</p>	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	Comment noted.
Social, Economic and Planning			
127.	Industry in exclusive suburb.	June Perrett, landowner and estate agent Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
128.	What would the benefits be for the local communities from this development?	Pikkie Dond, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Terra Power Solutions are looking at a development plan for local community development and community upliftment in the area.

129.	Will it be cost effective? What is the payback?	Geoff Brown, Landowner Britannia Bay, comment by fax, 12 March 2010.	The project will only go ahead if it is economically viable.
130.	<p>Social study, p.9, Section 1.4.2 Limitations 1.4.2 Limitations, Demographic data, quoting – “The demographic data used in the study is [<i>sic</i>] largely based on the 2001 Census”.</p> <p>These census data were obtained nine years ago. Considering the apparent sparsity of the population density, which might not have changed very much in the intervening period, it may be quite practicable to visit the area in order to obtain more up-to-date information.</p>	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	A Social Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase of the project in line with the Plan of Study for the EIA as contained in Chapter 7 of the Draft Scoping Report. Note that the census is undertaken every 10 years, therefore this data is used. Site visit and interviews will be undertaken during the EIA phase which will be separate to the public consultation process for the EIA.
131.	<p>P.29 Section 3 Identification of Key issues, Sub-section 3.2 Identification of Key Social issues – in this section two key issues are listed, namely a) policy and planning related issues and b) local site specific issues.</p> <p>Now, I can see some sort of conflict arising here, because one cannot escape the fact that noise and visual impact are definitely social issues. The conflict could arise because these two subjects will be dealt with by two other specialists: will their reports be mainly biased on the technical aspects? So who will be dealing with the social aspects of these two issues when we have in this Appendix a specialist whose terms of reference are to deal specifically with it?</p>	Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	Noise and visual impacts are social issues under the umbrella of environmental issues (that is the natural, social and economic issues). There will be a level of collaboration between the Social, Visual and Noise specialists when considering these impacts.

<p>131.</p>	<p>I assume that the noise and visual impact assessments would include some commentary on what effects they might be anticipated have on the local inhabitants. But these would clearly be social impacts, not merely a technical assessment of noise levels iro their quality and intensity, and visual impact from computer-generated photographs. There remains the aspect of how the local inhabitants might react.</p> <p>However, there's the added problem in South Africa that there's very few operating wind generators at the present time, In fact I am only aware of the three at Klipheuwel and six just off the R27 at the junction of the R27 with the crossroad which goes to Yzerfontein and Darling.</p> <p>With the tens of thousands of wind generators which have been installed across Europe and the USA, I would imagine that there are many reports now available which give information about the impact these wind generators have had on local inhabitants. Here in South Africa there's hardly anyone anywhere near to these two sites from whom, I suspect, much useful information about their visual and noise impact could be obtained.</p> <p>There obviously needs to be some care taken with the collaboration that will be necessary, for which the logistics will need to be worked out in order to avoid any conflict with any possible contrary opinions.</p>	<p>Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	
-------------	--	---	--

Technology			
132.	What about safety? Not mentioned! Will the blades travel at maximum rpm in very strong wind when dislodged from turbine?	R.D & B.L. Nortje, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	The turbine is designed and automatically controlled to ensure that it respects and operates within its design parameters.
133.	You indicated various heights for the turbines. Please indicate the correct heights for the final design.	R.D & B.L. Nortje, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax 12 April 2010.	The turbines and their positions will be finalised when we have the data. All layouts at this stage are provisional. Depending on the turbine used they could be 140m to the tip and each turbine foundation height will depend on the ground level.
134.	How effective are wind turbines?	Peter Hohne, landowner Golden Mile, comments by fax, 12 April 2010.	Extremely effective – no carbon during operation.98% available. The wind is expected to be sufficient for 27% of the time – or 8hrs a day.
135.	P.31, 1 st paragraph, quoting – “Support to a new industry sector: the development of renew-able energy offers the opportunity to establish a new industry within the South African economy”. I would like to suggest that Atlantis would be a suitable industrial town where the development of manufacturing industries for renewable energy systems could be concentrated in South Africa. This would help to regenerate the industrial infrastructure of the town, as well as provide a commercial, technological and industrial centre in South Africa for the design and manufacture of renewable energy systems. Why does South Africa we have to import all these ideas and manufactured plant from abroad? Their complexity is miniscule in comparison with nuclear technology.	R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010	Comment noted.

<p>136.</p>	<p>P.32 Section 2.3 Wind Energy as a Power Generation Technology, 2nd paragraph, quoting – “Wind energy is one of the fastest growing electricity generating technologies and features in energy plans worldwide”</p> <p>Such statements need to be taken with some circumspection. In European countries already with hundreds or thousands of wind towers already installed, there is a gradual resistance to more being constructed, certainly on land, because of objections their visual insult on the environment. For that reason more and more are being constructed offshore. South Africa has very few wind towers at the present time, so it will be a long time before such objections start to make themselves felt, of course. And people in countries who have been indoctrinated about their advantages - no pollution or associated mining activities when operating, etc – finally become thoroughly disenchanted when they realise that there still needs to be different types of power station which can guarantee base load generating capacity 24/7, of which one technology is nuclear. This country is now 30 years behind the times in finding this out!</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
-------------	---	---	-----------------------

<p>136.</p>	<p>P.39 – the legend to the drawing of the horizontal axis turbine (what I refer to as the <i>generator</i>) gives no information on whether the output is a/c or d/c. What lies behind my point is, if it's the former and the propeller's speed is variable over a limited range, how is a constant frequency assured for the supply into the national grid? Absolutely nothing has been mentioned about these points.</p> <p>But surely this is an electrical <i>generator</i>, not a <i>turbine</i>? (Which in any case should be referred to as a <i>turbo generator</i>)? What is shown in the figure is a direct drive <i>generator</i>, i.e. it is being directly driven on its shaft from the propeller through the gearbox. In the case of a <i>turbo generator</i>, the driving energy first goes either to a totally enclosed water, gas, compressed air or steam <i>turbine</i>, with its shaft inline with, and normally directly connected to, the <i>generator</i>. It is clear in the figure from its legend that <i>generator</i> is referred to, not <i>wind turbine</i>, the latter being mentioned in the first line immediately below the figure. I have never before heard of an open propeller being referred to as a <i>turbine</i>! Is this the nomenclature which has been adopted in the wind generator industry? Then please let us be sensible and logical in South Africa and refer to the system as what it is: a wind driven electrical generator. Get the rest of the world on the right track! This also applies to the heading to Section 2.4.2 on this page.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Modern turbines are equipped with switchgear to ensure the output is compatible with the normal grid operation parameters for any generation plant.</p>
-------------	---	---	--

<p>136.</p>	<p>3rd paragraph, quoting – “At very high wind speeds, typically over 90 kph (25 m/s), the wind turbine will cease power generation and shut down”</p> <p>This sentence really has been unnecessarily over-simplified. Thus a wind generator cannot be “shut down” <i>per se</i>. The propeller blades require to be feathered to take the minimum force from the high winds, and I assume that it might also be necessary to yaw the head to be approximately at right angles to the direction of the wind, although this would increase the wind loading on the housing cover for the generator and gearbox. These actions need to be properly explained.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>This is the function of the control of the generator. The writer is quite correct and clearly technologically adept at the subject. Other members of the public would not understand any further information – hence the simplification.</p>
<p>136.</p>	<p>P.107 2nd Table, Positive impacts – although this refers to “economic impacts through development of renewable energy infrastructure - -”, won’t the only major economic impact of significance be that of generating electricity, although this is obviously a very important benefit? A few people might get experience in the maintenance of such a facility, but the number would be miniscule and be of little economic significance. So what is the reality of the potential impact of the concept which is envisaged by this statement? There is going to be no real economic impact if the wind generators units are going to be imported, with no manufacturing infrastructure established in South Africa. (I have indicated earlier that Atlantis could be the ideal industrial town in which to establish such an infrastructure).</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	<p>P.44 Section 2.7.2 Disassemble and Replace Existing Turbine – I suggest rewording to “Disassemble and Replace Existing Generator”</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Decommissioning</p>			
<p>137.</p>	<p>P.43 Section 2.7 project Decommissioning Phase – just a few thoughts about this phase, where the design life of the wind generators of 20 to 30 years is concerned. There is no mention about what it is anticipated will determine the life of these wind generators, whether rust of the support towers; wear of shaft bearings, gearbox wear, or whatever. Whether it will be cost- effective to replace these wind generators with new ones in 20 to 30 year’s time remains to be seen.</p> <p>However, this anticipated life is in stark contrast to that of nuclear power stations for which, typically in the USA, the life of their existing PWRs is being extended from the design life of 40 years to 60 years. The new generation of PWRs which Eskom expects to be having constructed will have a minimum design life of 60 years. The life of the two existing PWRs at Koeberg has already been extended to 50 years, although I fully expect this to be further extended to 60 years, minimum.</p>	<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood, Individual, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

	Bearing these facts in mind, I wonder what the economics will be in 20 years for the replacement of these worn out wind generators in comparison with the cost of new PWRs having a minimum life of 60 years? This question obviously can't be answered, yet, but it will be very interesting to see what the general reaction will be when the time comes for the wind generators to be shut down. However, I note that many components are considered to be recyclable, except the propeller blades		
Environmental Management Plan			
138.	The handling of waste, especially dangerous waste. Toilet facilities need to be provided during the construction phase. The environmental management plan needs to be comprehensive.	Doretha Kotze, Senior Town and Regional Planner, West Coast District Municipality, comment by letter, 7 April 2010	A comprehensive EMP will be drafted during the EIA phase, and will available for review with the DEIR.
139.	How will you deal with dust and noise during the construction phase? How will highly toxic waste be dealt with during operations? Stuff like transformer oils?	G.P. Benjamin, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	
140.	A full waste management plan needs to be developed for this site	G.P. Benjamin, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	
Transport and Traffic			
141.	Constant heavy traffic/heavy vehicles/dust pollution	Suzette Plantema, Landowner Golden Mile, comment by fax, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
142.	The compensation for the wear and tear of the surrounding area infrastructure e.g. roads, road verges. Etc.should is highly considered as a priority from the initial planning stage.	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	The surrounding roads will be upgraded where necessary and maintained- but there is no significant increase in usage after the commissioning

<p>143.</p>	<p>Please be advised that Minor Road 6772 (formerly Minor Road 91) as shown in blue on the attached image is affected by the proposed Britannia Bay wind farm.</p> <p>Minor Road 6772 has a proclaimed width 13 m. In terms of Section 17 of Ordinance 19 of 1976, a 5 m building line is applicable along Main Road 6762.</p> <p>Approval for any new accesses onto Minor Road 6762 shall be obtained from this Department.</p> <p>It should be that the department only has sufficient funds available to blade this road on an annual basis. Should any additional maintenance work be required on the road, particularly during the construction stages of the wind farm, such additional maintenance work will be for the account of the developer.</p>	<p>Lars Starke, Western Cape Department of Transport, District Roads Engineer, comments by e-mail, 7 March 2010.</p>	<p>The developer undertakes to stabilise the roads required for the transport of the turbines. The roads necessary will be maintained for the effective use of the general public to enable any future transport requirements of the facility.</p>
<p>144.</p>	<p>There is one point which you may have missed. Last year Martin started to comment upon the road damage which will be caused by the large weight vehicles of the transport used.</p>	<p>Rhett Smart, Conservation Officer, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, comment by e-mail, 16 April 2010.</p>	<p>As the facility would need permanent access for large equipment a program will be agreed with the local roads department.</p>
<p>145.</p>	<p>The transportation of units and materials to the site will damage the road surfaces; therefore for all vehicles used for construction and production, their registrations should be via the Vredenburg Traffic Department in order to contribute towards repairs.</p>	<p>Keith Harrison, West Coast Bird Club – Conservation, comments by e-mail, 2 April 2010.</p>	<p>It is not possible to register vehicles which work nationally in this department. There will be a negotiation and program set up to address all the roads issues.</p>

Support for the Proposed Project		
146.	<p>This position, namely Schoongezicht is probably one of the best positions for the establishment of a wind farm. The area lends itself to a wind farm due to the incredible winds that blow there throughout the year. This is a green initiative that I fully support.</p> <p>The ground in the area is absolutely dead sand. It is marginal ground that has very little or no value for an economic farming project. It therefore makes 100% sense from an economic perspective to use this ground for a wind farm.</p> <p>The wind farm will be erected with the greatest caution according to all national and international standards. It will therefore have very little impact on the natural environment.</p> <p>The fauna and flora has a big poisonous component which also restricts farming operations. A wind farm that is environmentally friendly and established with great consideration and good judgement will improve the conservation of the fauna and flora and ensure that it will not be almost completely destroyed as it would be should the land be used in a farming operation that has to be economically viable.</p>	<p>Beyers Du Bois, Land owner, Duyker Island, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

146.	<p>A small group of people who regard themselves as an elite group and are resident in Shelley Point, Britannia Bay and Golden Mile are opposing the project due to the visual impact. These people have already caused so much damage with the erection of their palatial homes where no respect was shown for nature, the environment or the visual impact that their palaces would have on the area. Most of these homes are a second or third home. Therefore the majority of these people seldom visit the area or are only temporarily there. Very few are permanent residents. They claim that they have an exclusive lifestyle which I don't believe can exist in South Africa anymore. They contribute very little to the economic improvement of the area or the local community. A wind farm will benefit all communities, create work opportunities and improve the whole area. This wind farm will not have a negative visual impact as regards the sea views to any persons. These people that are raising the objections are the prime destructors of the resources in the area whereas the wind farm will be a contributor to the resources of the area.</p>		
------	--	--	--

147.	I'm the landowner of the Farm Duyker Island. I've listened to all of you and your ideas and comments. As a landowner I sit with power lines and a substation on my land. Lots of disturbance. Why are you shooting this project down? It's being proposed to utilise a portion of my farm for the wind energy facility. What about the human impact of all the housing developments in the area? I remember the area of Shelley Point, Golden Mile and Britannia Bay as pristine areas; now look at all the hideous developments erected by developers along the coastline. All of these housing developments has placed so much pressure on the local environment and has changed it for ever and now you want to object to this project.	Beyers Du Bois – land woner, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
148.	Please note that the alternative to the proposed wind energy facility is the development of a huge lime mining operation on the hills above the Golden Mile, Britannia Bay and Shelley Point. Applications for mining have already been submitted.	Beyers Du Bois – land owner, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.
149.	We are not against wind turbines for renewable energy, and in fact, would support the drive for greener energy sources.	Marlouw Walters, Botanical Society – West Coast Branch, comments by e-mail, 12 April 2010.	Comment noted.
150.	We are not against the development of renewable energy projects. However we do not take kindly to the comment of mining the area. Our concerns are the size and the visual effects of the proposed wind energy facility.	Alvin Roon, Public meeting, 7 April 2010.	Comment noted.

151.	I am a home owner in Britannia Bay on the Golden Mile. I am a business owner in St. Helena Bay. We are very excited as to what new opportunities and investment the wind farm will bring. We are certain that we will be able to attract more investors to our area.	Rene Brandt, Remax Sunset Coast, comment by fax, 8 April 2010.	Comment noted.
Aviation			
152.	The South African Air Force(SAAFF) is responsible to assess new obstacles and developments around military aerodromes and within military airspace to ensure the safety of air operations and its mission is sustainability. Wind turbines are defined as significant structures in terms of their height and considered as obstacles hazardous to aviation.	Lt. Cl S.J Nel, Air Command, Directorate Aviation Safety (DAS), SAAF, comment by fax, 02 June 2010.	Comment noted.
153.	Documented studies have shown that wind turbines and wind farms have an impact on the performance of aerodrome radio communication, navigation and surveillance (CNS) equipment, especially radar. The SAAF complies with the SACAA policy that no wind farm should be closer than 35 kilometres of an aerodrome. This is to ensure protection from potential interferences of wind turbines on CNS equipment. The SAAF will however consider proposed wind farm developments closer than 35km on a case-by-case basis provided that such developments do not adversely affect the flight operations conducted at the aerodrome and /or will not degrade or compromise the operational performance of the CNS equipment.	Lt. Cl S.J Nel, Air Command, Directorate Aviation Safety, SAAF, comment by fax, 02 June 2010.	Comment noted.

154.	<p>The proposed Britannia Bay Wind Energy Facility is located north-west of the Air Force Base (AFB) Langebaanweg on the limit of the 35km radius. Although the proposed wind farm is outside the controlled airspace of AFB Langebaanweg and below the Langebaanweg Military Fyling Area (FAR45), the height of the proposed wind turbines may penetrate the protection surfaces of certain Instrument Flight Procedures associated with the base. DAS is also concerned about the collective effect of all the proposed wind farm developments within the Langebaanweg area on the performance of the CNS equipment at AFB Laangebaanweg.</p>	<p>Lt. Cl S.J Nel, Air Command, Directorate Aviation Safety, SAAF, comment by fax, 02 June 2010.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
155.	<p>In order to conduct a detailed obstacle assessment and determine the collective effect of all proposed wind farms within the area concerned, DAS requests that the developer supply the preliminary positions and vertical extent (inclusive of blade length) of the proposed wind turbines as stipulated in the letter from SAAF.</p> <p>The developer may be required to do an electromagnetic assessment to determine the impact of the proposed wind energy facility on the CNS equipment at AFB Langebaanweg. The SAAF will confirm whether or not such as assessment is required once the detailed obstacle assessment has been completed by DAS.</p>	<p>Lt. Cl S.J Nel, Air Command, Directorate Aviation Safety, SAAF, comment by fax, 02 June 2010.</p>	<p>Terra Power Solutions have sent the required information to SAAF. Once SAAF have officially stated their requirements Terra Power Solutions will endeavour to communicate with SAAF on any implications that the wind energy facility may have on the SAAF. An obstacle approval will be lodged with the CAA for the proposed project in order to determine their requirements for the proposed wind energy facility.</p>

155.	Developers are also reminded that it is a legal requirement to obtain approval from the Civil Aviation Authority before erecting and structure that may constitute an obstruction or potential hazard to aircraft. The CAA should also be consulted regarding the impact of the proposed wind energy facility on civilian flying activities in the area concerned.		
------	--	--	--