

**HANS MOES KRAAL  
PRT 112 OF FARM 202, GEORGE  
CELLULAR MAST**

**OPINION STATEMENT  
VISUAL ASSESSMENT**

**For consideration in the Basic Assessment**

**For**

**EnviroAfrica**

**PO Box 5367**

**Helderberg**

**7135**

**info@enviroafrica.co.za**

**Statement**

**31 October 2019**

**Compiled by:**

**S.C. Lategan**

**PO Box 535**

**Gansbaai**

**7220**

**Report history:**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Amendments</b>
Final Report Ref GEO-202-01	17/05/2019	
Addendum	31/10/2019	Assess removal of trees
Opinion Statement	12/12/2019	

Report to be cited: Statement to Visual Impact Assessment for Cellular Mast at  
Hans Moes Kraal, George, 2019

# Table of Contents

1 BACKGROUND.....	1
2 FINDINGS.....	1
3 MITIGATION MEASURES.....	2
4 STATEMENT.....	2

## 1. Index of Tables

Table 1: Summary of assessment of landscape scenarios and mast options.....	1
---	---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sarien Lategan was appointed to undertake the visual impact assessment of a 25m tower, to accommodate cell antennae, on portion 112 of farm 202, Hans Moes Kraal, George, as input to the Basic Assessment in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act no. 107 of 1998), as amended and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2017, undertaken by EnviroAfrica. The site is situated next to the gravel road Nr 1591 from Pacaltsdorp to Gwaingrивermouth, behind a cluster of trees.

Subsequently the removal of trees were considered and the addendum dealt with -

1. Visual significance in a scenario where the cluster of trees adjoining the proposed mast position will be removed and
2. The visual significance of different types of towers namely tree, lattice and monopole

The Addendum stated the anticipated visual impacts of the various mast options against the landscape scenario with and without trees.

This report summarizes the findings in an opinion statement.

Due to the topography and landscape elements, the area displays a high absorption level. With the removal of the trees, the tree type of mast becomes less desirable and a lattice or monopole should be considered. The assessment of the potential receptors indicated that the overall impact of both a lattice and monopole, respectively, is low and well within acceptable levels of change.

Given the fact that the trees may be removed in future or the configuration of trees may change, the mast type which would have an impact within acceptable levels of change with the least visual impact should be regarded as the preferred option. The assessment indicates that a lattice mast is within acceptable levels of change in both landscape scenarios and in the event that the trees are removed, remains the option with the least impact.

## 1 BACKGROUND

Sarien Lategan was appointed to assess the visual impact of the construction of a communication mast on portion 112 of farm 202, Hans Moes Kraal, George. This report should be read with the original “Final Visual Impact Assessment Report, May 2019”. and the Addendum (31/10/2019) thereto.

This report summarized the previous reports and provide a concise opinion statement regarding a recommendation

## 2 FINDINGS

The following summary was provided in the Addendum (31/10/2019)-

Comparing the various types of masts within two landscape scenarios namely with the existing cluster of trees remaining or with the trees removed, the significance varies from moderate-high to low. Table 9 provides a summary of the different options.

*Table 1: Summary of assessment of landscape scenarios and mast options*

	<b>Cluster of trees remain</b>	<b>Cluster of trees removed</b>
<b>Tree Mast</b>	The overall impact is low due to the screening effect of the trees	The tree structure becomes more prominent in the landscape and thus the obtrusive level increase.
<b>Monopole Mast</b>	The overall impact is low due to the screening effect of the trees. The mast form also fits with other infrastructure elements in the area	<u>Without Mitigation:</u> The mast is visible but the obtrusive level is moderate.
		<u>With Mitigation (colour):</u> Changing the mast colour can reduce the obtrusiveness and thus reduce the impact to moderate-low to low
<b>Lattice Mast</b>	The overall impact is low due to the screening effect of the trees. The mast form is not alien to the elements within this production landscape.	<u>Without Mitigation:</u> The mast is visible but the obtrusive level is moderate.
		<u>With Mitigation (colour):</u> Changing the mast colour can

	<b>Cluster of trees remain</b>	<b>Cluster of trees removed</b>
		reduce the obtrusiveness and thus reduce the impact to moderate-low

The scenario where the trees are retained provide the lowest impact regardless of the mast type. However, should the trees be removed the impact is increased and a monopole or lattice mast can be mitigated to reduce the impact to within acceptable levels of change.

### **3 MITIGATION MEASURES**

In a scenario where the trees are retained, a tree mast provides the best visual absorption. Since the options to mitigate such a mast type in the event that the cluster of trees are to be removed, the other mast options provide more appropriate options to mitigate the visual impact. Both monopole and lattice masts could be mitigated through colour. In this environment with a tendency to dark green, such dark colours will be suitable to reduce the obtrusiveness of the masts. Colours which can be considered are dark green or dark grey. The lattice mast provide the added advantage that due to the structure of the mast, it does not create a solid element but allow almost a transparency through the mast.

### **4 STATEMENT**

The following opinion statement is based on the above findings and proposed mitigation measures -

In a scenario where the trees are retained, the trees provide screening from the road and a backdrop against which a tower can be blend. In this scenario the visual impact of all three mast options are within acceptable levels of change and thus all three options can be recommended. However in this scenario a tree mast will have the least impact and as such be the preferred option.

In a scenario where the trees will be removed, the above findings indicate that the Tree mast option would be out of context and thus not recommended. The other mast options i.e. lattice and monopole are both within the acceptable levels of changes and can both be recommended. However since a lattice mast has the advantage that it does

not provide a solid element in the landscape, the visual impact with mitigation is slightly lower than a monopole. For this reason it can be argued that the lattice mast would be the preferred option.

Since the future of the trees may not be certain and the fact that the configuration of the stand of trees may change in the long term, a mast option which would fit best in both scenarios may be considered as the preferred option. In this regard the lattice mast option appears to be acceptable in both scenarios and be considered as the preferred option in the long term.