



## Report:

Visual impact assessment for the proposed development of portion 91 of farm Matjes Fontein 304, Plettenberg Bay

**Reference:** LM3102023

**Prepared for:** Lizemarie Botha

**Revision:** 2

**3 November 2023**

# Report details

Document prepared by:

**Paul Buchholz**  
Postnet Suite 63  
Private Bag x 6590  
George  
6530

Comments should be directed to:

**Paul Buchholz**  
T +27 079 881 4447  
E p.buchholz@outlook.com

A person using this document or data accepts the risk of:

- a) Using the documents or data in electronic form without requesting and checking them for accuracy against the original hard copy version.
- b) Using the documents or data for any purpose not agreed to in writing by Paul Buchholz

Document control			
Report title		Visual impact assessment for the proposed development of portion 91 of farm Matjes Fontein 304, Plettenberg Bay	
Report status		Final	Report number LM3102023
Client		Lizemarie Botha	Client contact Lizemarie Botha
Rev	Date	Author	
1	3 November 2023	Paul Buchholz	

*The project deliverables, including the reported results, comments, recommendations, and conclusions, are based on the author's professional knowledge as well as available information. The author reserves the right to modify aspects of the report including the recommendations when new information may become available from ongoing research or further work in this field or about this investigation. Although the greatest care has been taken to ensure that the data used for the various maps in the report is up to date and spatially accurate, Paul-Werner Buchholz gives no warranty, express or implied, as to the accuracy, reliability, utility, or completeness of this information. Users of the data in this report assume all responsibility and risk for use of the data.*



## Author

Paul Buchholz is a geographic information science (GIS) and environmental specialist with more than 20 years of experience working on multidisciplinary environmental and engineering projects. He worked as a geographic information science and environmental specialist for two international multi-disciplinary engineering firms. He is currently an independent environmental and geographic information science consultant servicing a wide range of clients through consulting and project management support.

Paul has provided specialist input and project management support on projects in South Africa, Nigeria, Tanzania, Lesotho, Kenya, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Mauritius and Mozambique. He holds a master's degree in environmental management from the University of Stellenbosch and is a registered Professional Geographical Information Science Practitioner with The South African Geomatics Council (PGP 1323).

## Declaration of Independance

**Paul Buchholz (Visual Impact Assessment Specialist)**

- I, Paul Buchholz, declare that, in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), as amended and the Amended Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2017;
- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I will perform the work relating to the application in an objective manner, even if this results in views and findings that are not favourable to the applicant;
- I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing such work;
- I have expertise in conducting the specialist report relevant to this application, including knowledge of the Act, Regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;
- I will comply with the Act, Regulations and all other applicable legislation;
- I have no, and will not engage in, conflicting interests in the undertaking of the activity;
- I undertake to disclose to the applicant and the competent authority all material information in my possession that reasonably has or may have the potential of influencing - any decision to be taken with respect to the application by the competent authority; and - the objectivity of any report, plan or document to be prepared by myself for submission to the competent authority;
- All the particulars furnished by me in this report are true and correct; and
- I realise that a false declaration is an offence in terms of regulation 48 and is punishable in terms of section 24F of the Act.



**Signed**

3 November 2023

**Date**

---

## Copyright

Copyright © 2023 by Paul-Werner Buchholz except where expressly transferred by written agreement to the Client. Any unauthorised reproduction, adaptation, alteration, translation, publication, distribution or dissemination (including, but not limited to, performances in public, broadcasting and causing the work to be transmitted in a diffusion service) of the whole or any part of this Document in any manner, form or medium (including, but not limited to, electronic, oral, aural, visual and tactile media) whatsoever will constitute an act of copyright infringement in terms of the Copyright Act 98 of 1978 and will make the Doer/Transgressor liable to civil action and may in certain circumstances make the Doer/Transgressor liable to criminal prosecution. All trademarks and registered trademarks mentioned in this document are the property of their respective owners. Nothing contained in this document should be construed as granting any license or right to use any trademarks without the prior written permission of Paul-Werner Buchholz.

## Disclaimer

The contents of this document are based upon the information made available to Paul-Werner Buchholz at the date of this Document and on current local and international standards, codes, and technology as at the date of this Document. Every effort has been made to produce an accurate assessment and make realistic and practical recommendations. This Document, and information or advice, which it contains, is provided by Paul-Werner Buchholz solely for internal use and reliance by its Client in performance of Paul-Werner Buchholz duties and liabilities under its contract with the Client. Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this document.

Paul-Werner Buchholz cannot be held liable for any errors and/or omissions in this document nor for any damages, consequential or otherwise, which the client may sustain from the use or reliance upon this document and all information contained herein.

## Confidentiality Statement

This document contains confidential information belonging to Paul-Werner Buchholz and may not be used for any purpose other than that for which the information was provided. When disclosure to employees or agents of the Recipient is necessary, the Recipient shall ensure that the employees or agents shall be bound by equivalent duties of confidentiality and non-use. The Recipient shall take all reasonable care to ensure that this document is securely kept; and shall return, destroy or otherwise deal with it, as directed by the Provider. Furthermore, this document, its contents and intellectual property, may not be disclosed to any third part without the written consent of Paul-Werner Buchholz

## CONTENTS:

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 General	8
1.2 Methodology	8
1.2.1 The sequence of work employed in this study	8
1.2.2 Written and drawn material was made available	8
1.2.3 Receiving site	8
1.3 Assumptions and limitations	9
1.3.1 Data	9
1.3.2 Visualisation	9
<b>2. APPLICABLE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 The Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework (PSDF)	10
2.2 The Bitou Municipality Spatial Development Framework	10
2.3 Keurbooms and Environs Local Area Spatial Plan	10
2.4 The Garden Route Environmental Framework	10
2.5 Heritage and Scenic Resources: Inventory and Policy Framework for the Western Cape	11
2.6 DEA&DP Guideline for Management of Development on Mountains, Hills & Ridgelines	11
<b>3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>11</b>
3.1 Project location	11
3.2 Development description	13
<b>4. METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>20</b>
4.1 Observer locations	21
4.2 Visual sensitivity	21
4.3 Visual modification	23
<b>5. VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>25</b>
5.1 Description of the affected area and the scenic resources	25
5.2 Surrounding land uses	26
5.3 Topography	28
5.4 Local vegetation	28
5.5 Protected landscapes	29
<b>6. PROBABLE VIEW CATCHMENT AND LINE OF SIGHT</b>	<b>35</b>
6.1 Probable view catchment	35
6.2 Line of sight	36
<b>7. VISIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>37</b>
7.1 Zone of visual influence	37
7.2 Receptors	37



7.3	Visual exposure (sightline analysis)	57
7.3.1	View corridors	57
7.3.1.1	Observer location 1 view corridor	57
7.3.1.2	Observer location 2 view corridor	57
7.3.1.3	Observer location 3 view corridor	58
7.3.1.4	Observer location 4 view corridor	58
7.3.1.5	Observer location 5 view corridor	58
7.3.1.6	Observer location 6 view corridor	58
7.3.1.7	Observer location 7 view corridor	58
7.3.1.8	Observer location 8 view corridor	58
7.4	Visual sensitivity	58
7.5	Visual absorption capacity	59
7.6	Visual intrusion	59
<b>8.</b>	<b>POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>59</b>
8.1	Nature of the impact	59
8.2	Impact assessment criteria	60
8.2.1.1	The extent of the impact	60
8.2.1.2	Duration of the project	60
8.2.1.3	The intensity of the impact	60
8.2.1.4	The probability of the impact	60
8.2.1.5	Reversibility	60
8.2.1.6	Irreplaceable loss of resources	60
8.2.1.7	Cumulative effect	61
8.2.1.8	Significance	61
8.3	Conclusion	61
<b>9.</b>	<b>VISUAL CONSTRAINTS &amp; MITIGATION</b>	<b>61</b>
9.1	Visual mitigation measures	62
9.1.1	Reducing unnecessary disturbance	62
9.1.2	Colour selection	63
9.1.3	Reduce contrasts from earthworks	63
9.1.4	Glint and Glare	63
9.1.5	Limiting the footprints and heights of structures	64
9.1.6	Development and architectural guidelines	64
9.1.7	Landscaping	64
9.1.8	Lightning design	64
9.1.9	Restoration and reclamation	65
9.2	Monitoring program	65
<b>10.</b>	<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>66</b>

## Figures

Figure 1: Project location	12
Figure 2: Preferred development layout	14
Figure 3: Alternative 1 development layout	15
Figure 4: Alternative 2 development layout	16
Figure 5: Proposed floor plan	17
Figure 6: Proposed house 3D model A	18
Figure 7: Proposed house 3D model B	19
Figure 8: A view of the coastal area	25
Figure 9: Adjacent land uses	27
Figure 10: Local vegetation	29
Figure 11: Topography	30
Figure 12: Vegetation map	31
Figure 13: Preferred development layout protected landscapes	32
Figure 14: Alternative development 1 layout protected landscapes	33
Figure 15: Alternative development 2 layout protected landscapes	34
Figure 16: Terrain models	36
Figure 17: Preferred development layout probable view catchment	38
Figure 18: Alternative 1 development layout probable view catchment	39
Figure 19: Alternative 2 development layout probable view catchment	40
Figure 20: Observer location 1 sightlines	41
Figure 21: Observer location 2 sightlines	42
Figure 22: Observer location 3 sightlines	43
Figure 23: Observer location 4 sightlines	44
Figure 24: Observer location 5 sightlines	45
Figure 25: Observer location 6 sightlines	46
Figure 26: Observer location 7 sightlines	47
Figure 27: Observer location 8 sightlines	48
Figure 28: Observer location 1	49
Figure 29: Observer location 2	50
Figure 30: Observer location 3	51
Figure 31: Observer location 4	52
Figure 32: Observer location 5	53
Figure 33: Observer location 6	54
Figure 34: Observer location 7	55
Figure 35: Observer location 8	56
Figure 35: Visual exposure graph	57

## Tables

No table of figures entries found.

## Annexures

No Annexures

## GLOSSARY

Aesthetics	Relates to the pleasurable characteristics of a physical environment as perceived through the five senses of sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch.
Adverse visual impact	Any modification in landforms, water bodies, vegetation or any introduction of structures which negatively impacts the visual character of the landscape and disrupts the harmony of the basic elements (i.e. form, line, colour and texture).
Basic elements	The four design elements (form, line, colour and texture) which determine how the character of a landscape is perceived.
Contrast	Opposition or unlikeness of different forms, lines, colours or textures in a landscape and therefore the degree to which project components visually differs from its landscape setting.
Colour	The property of reflecting light of a particular intensity and wavelength (or a mixture of wavelengths) to which the eye is sensitive. It is the major visual property of surfaces.
Form	The mass or shape of an object(s) which appears unified, such as a vegetative opening in a forest, a cliff formation or a water tank.
Integration	The degree to which a development component can be blended into the existing landscape without necessarily being screened from view.
Interfluve	The area of higher ground which separates two rivers/watercourses which flow into the same drainage system
Key viewing locations	One or more points on a travel route, use area or a potential use area, where the view of a management activity would be most revealing.
Landscape character	The arrangement of a particular landscape as formed by the variety and intensity of the landscape features and the four basic elements of form, line, colour and texture. These factors give the area a distinctive quality which distinguishes it from its immediate surroundings.
Landscape features	Land and water form, vegetation and structures which compose the characteristic landscape.
Line	The path (real or imagined) that the eye follows when perceiving abrupt differences in form, colour or texture. Within landscapes, lines may be found as ridges, skylines, structures, changes in vegetative types or individual trees and branches.
Micro-topography	Small scale variations in the height and roughness of the ground surface; in the context of this report the definition includes structures such as buildings and larger-sized vegetation that can restrict views
Mitigation measures	Methods or procedures designed to reduce or lessen the adverse impacts caused by management activities.
Mountain, hill or ridge	Is a physical landscape feature, elevated above the surrounding landscape. It includes the foot/base, slopes and crest of the mountain, hill or ridge
Rehabilitation	A management alternative and/or practice which restores landscapes to a desired scenic quality.
Ridgelines	Ridgelines are defined as the line formed by the meeting of the tops of sloping surfaces of land. Significant ridgelines are ridgelines which, in general, are highly visible and dominate the landscape.



Scale	The proportionate size relationship between an object and the surroundings in which the object is placed.
Sense of place	The unique quality or character of a place, whether natural, rural or urban and relates to uniqueness, distinctiveness or strong identity. It is also sometimes referred to as genius loci meaning 'spirit of the place.
Texture	The visual manifestations of the interplay of light and shadow created by the variations in the surface of an object or landscape.
Visual modification	A measure of the visual interaction between a development and the landscape setting within which it is located.
Viewshed	The creation of a computer generated probable viewshed to define the extent to which the planned infrastructure is visible from key viewing locations.
Visual Sensitivity	The degree to which a change to the landscape will be perceived adversely.
Visual Impact	A measure of joint consideration of both visual sensitivity and visual modification

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 General

Visual impact assessments should not be an obstacle in the approval process of a proposed development. Visual input, especially at the early concept stage of the project, can play an important role in helping to formulate design alternatives, as well as minimising impacts, and possibly even costs, of the project

It is in the nature of visual and scenic resources to include abstract qualities and connotations that are by their nature difficult to assess or quantify as they often have cultural or symbolic meaning. An implication of this is that impact ratings cannot simply be added together. Instead, the assessment relies on the evaluation of a wide range of considerations, both objective and subjective, including the context of the proposed project within the surrounding area.

The analysis of the interaction between the existing visual environment and the planned infrastructure provides the basis for determining visual impacts and mitigation strategies. This visual impact assessment provides an overview of the landscape character of the locality and assesses the degree to which the proposed development would be visually appropriate.

## 1.2 Methodology

### 1.2.1 The sequence of work employed in this study

A desktop survey using 1:50,000 topographical survey maps, Google Earth, and ArcMap (Esri, ArcGIS software) was undertaken. Following the desktop information gathering process, a site visit was conducted to test the conclusions of the terrain analysis, identify receptors and appraise the local landscape.

The methodology employed by this visual assessment is based on the following methodologies:

- The United States Department of Agriculture: Forestry Service - *Landscape Aesthetics*;
- The United States Bureau of Land Management Visual Resources Management;
- The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment - Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment; and
- The Provincial Government of the Western Cape's Guideline for involving visual and aesthetic specialists in EIA processes and the Guidelines for Landscape

### 1.2.2 Written and drawn material was made available

- Architectural drawings and 3D models
- Site development plan
- Specialist reports

### 1.2.3 Receiving site

The receiving site was assessed, and areas of the locality from where the development appeared to be likely visible, adjacent lands, and local roads.

This study was conducted in October 2023. The weather on the days of the site visit was clear and open. A photographic survey of the site and surrounding areas was carried out.

The visual assessment was undertaken using standard criteria such as geographic view-sheds and viewing distances as well as qualitative criteria such as compatibility with the existing landscape character and settlement pattern. Potentially sensitive areas were assessed, and mitigation measures were evaluated.

### 1.3 Assumptions and limitations

It should be noted that the 'experiencing' of visual impacts is subjective and largely based on the perception of the viewer or receptor. The presence of a receptor in an area potentially affected by the proposed development does not thus necessarily mean that a visual impact would be experienced.

Value can be placed in a landscape in terms of its aesthetic quality, or in terms of its sense of identity or sense of place with which it is associated. If no such values are held with respect to a landscape, there is less likely to be a perception of a visual impact if the landscape becomes subject to visual alteration. Development within a landscape may not be perceived negatively at all if the development is associated with progress or upliftment of the human condition.

The perception of visual impacts is thus highly subjective and involves 'value judgements' on behalf of the receptor. The context of the landscape character, the scenic/aesthetic value of an area, and the types of land use practised tend to affect the perception of whether landscape change (through development) would be considered an unwelcome intrusion.

The abovementioned landscape values can be interlinked, but can also be conflicting, e.g. amenity values associated with a landscape held by a certain group of people as described above may conflict with economic values associated with the market or development possibility of the landscape that is held by others. It is in this context that visual impact associated with a potential development often arises as an issue in environmental impact assessments.

#### 1.3.1 Data

The best currently and readily available datasets were utilized for the visual impact assessment. It is important to note that variations in the quality, format and scale of available datasets could limit the scientific confidence levels of the visual impact assessment outcomes.

#### 1.3.2 Visualisation

It must be remembered that any visualisation (3D models, photomontages, photos and maps) of complex natural and man-made elements produce perceptions, interpretations and value judgements that are not always consistent with those that would be produced by actual encounters with the elements represented. Visualisations should, therefore, be considered an approximation of the three-dimensional visual experiences that an observer would receive in the field and must be subjected to subsequent field testing and verification

Photomontage is the superimposition of an image onto a photograph to create a realistic representation of proposed or potential changes to any view. The overall aim of photography and photomontage is to represent the landscape context under consideration and the proposed development, both as accurately as is practical. It must be kept in mind that the human eye sees differently than a camera lens, both optically and figuratively.

The focusing mechanisms of human eyes and camera lenses are different. Human vision is binocular, and dynamic compared to a camera that tends to flatten an image.

## 2. APPLICABLE POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

Several government policies and plans, guidelines, environmental management instruments and other decision-making instruments are relevant to the site and development and have been reviewed. These include:



## 2.1 The Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework (PSDF)

Makes provision for:

- the protection and sustainable use of Landscape and Scenic Resources,
- the protection, management and enhancement of the provinces Sense of Place, Heritage and Cultural Landscape

## 2.2 The Bitou Municipality Spatial Development Framework

The Bitou Spatial Development Framework (BSDF) 2021 was approved by Council in March 2022. The main objective of this development framework is to achieve a balance between development and the environment to ensure that growth is spatially just, financially viable and environmentally sustainable by working towards compact, vibrant, livable, and efficient settlements serving all communities.

The proposed project is located in the Keurbooms River and Environs. The BSDF describes the broad development rationale for this area as the following:

*"A strong holiday/resort character predominates the area. It is fairly homogenously developed with residential and resort uses, wedged between the sea and the coastal plateau slopes. Altering its character by permitting commercial and other non-residential development could detract from the areas attraction The theme should thus be a low-density residential one"*

## 2.3 Keurbooms and Environs Local Area Spatial Plan

The Keurbooms and Environs Local Area Spatial Plan (KELASP) is a Local Area Spatial Plan (LASP) for Keurbooms and its surrounding Environment, which will aid the Municipality in ensuring that the area is protected/conserved and managed/developed coherently and sustainably. It has been compiled in terms of the Municipal Systems Act (Act 32 of 2000) which will afford it formal legal status as a Policy Guideline document to be implemented in conjunction with the broader Bitou Spatial Development Framework (SDF) as well as Integrated Development Plan (IDP).

## 2.4 The Garden Route Environmental Framework

This document provides baseline data on the Topographical, Visual and 'Sense of Place' aspects in the Garden Route, the sensitivity, constraints and development guidelines for the area assist in informing decision-making.

Management Guidelines are provided for Ecologically Sensitive Geographical Areas. Of particular reference to this report are the guidelines for development in:

- Topographically Sensitive Geographical Areas;
- Conservation and Protected Areas; and
- Visually Sensitive Landscape Geographical Areas.

Risks include:

- Erosion of steep slopes;
- The potential for visual and light pollution;
- Destruction of visual topographical quality;
- Development impact of sensitive topographical features and landscapes;
- Inappropriate large-scale development;
- Sprawling urbanization; and
- Large-scale change of land use developments outside of the urban edge.

Objectives include:

- Maintain the integrity of the Garden Route Landscape;
- Limit development on steep slopes;
- Enhance and protect the topographical landscape backdrop to the Garden Route;
- Manage development on steep slopes, discouraging development;
- Limit development densities
- Retain the 'sense of place' of villages and hamlets;
- Enforce building control and aesthetics;
- Protect the 'sense of place' of the Garden Route;
- Protect and enhance the visual quality of prominent tourism routes, meanders and nodes;
- Protect the visual integrity of the South African National Park asset, as well as provincial nature reserves; and
- Limit and prohibit development on prominent visually sensitive and exposed features.

## 2.5 Heritage and Scenic Resources: Inventory and Policy Framework for the Western Cape

The study provides input on cultural and scenic resources and provides a guide for the identification and conservation of these resources. The report focuses on the broader regional scale rather than the local landscapes or individual site scales and is, therefore, an overview rather than a detailed inventory of cultural and scenic resources.

## 2.6 DEA&DP Guideline for Management of Development on Mountains, Hills & Ridgelines

Key decision-making criteria regarding development on mountains, hills and ridges, relevant to this visual impact assessments, are:

- to avoid inappropriate development (i.e. intrusive and consumptive development) on mountains, hills and ridges taking into account the character of the existing environment;
- to ensure that where development does take place, that its layout and design takes account of sensitive features and environmental constraints, thereby promoting environmentally sensitive development of projects on mountains, hills and ridges where development is authorized;
- to preserve landform features through ensuring that the siting of facilities is related to environmental resilience and visual screening capabilities of the landscape;
- to ensure that the scale, density and nature of the developments are harmonious and in keeping with the sense of place and character of the area.

Environmental characteristics such as steep slopes (steeper than 1:4) and development on the crest of a mountain, hill or ridge will serve as key indicators of environmental sensitivity.

# 3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

## 3.1 Project location

The proposed development will be located on portion 91 of the farm Matjes Fontein 304. The property is situated in the Keurboom area which is situated in the Bitou Municipal Area to the northeast of Plettenberg Bay. The property can be accessed directly from road PO349 which connects with the N2 via Divisional Road DR1888. The site is approximately 1.8km west of Keurboomstrand (Figure 1).

This study is presently used for a horse riding centre and is directly opposite the Milkwood Glen Residential Complex, which consists of about 50 Group Housing erven and communal open space.




Figure 1: Project location



### 3.2 Development description

The vision of this development is to create environmentally and economically sustainable housing products specifically targeting the middle-income group. The aim is to create a pleasant yet Sustainable residential neighbourhood where the average person can own a home and live with dignity. The architecture will be based on green principles which will include smaller but well-designed houses, which are more cost-efficient, energy-efficient and healthy.

The houses will be equipped with solar systems which require maximum exposure to the sun. In the Southern Hemisphere, houses should be orientated to face north. The layout design has as far as possible orientated erven, especially the smaller ones, in such a way that houses can be placed with their longer frontages to the north. The houses will be approximately 8m high.

The road network will consist of landscaped lanes. A great neighbourhood has safe and friendly streets where people can walk without fear of crime or being threatened by traffic. The streets in this neighbourhood will be private with low volume and speed and will function more like open spaces than traffic ways. The main road reserves are 12m wide which will allow for enough space to accommodate a road surface, services, sidewalks, and landscaping. All secondary Streets measure 10m in width.

The proposed open space system corresponds to the position of indigenous vegetation. These areas will be part of the landscaping plan of the development and will provide an opportunity for recreational areas such as walking trails, lookout points etc. These facilities will be formally laid out to avoid unnecessary informal path formation in the sensitive forest habitat.


The Keurboom Road is a scenic route and as such, the visual quality along the way is a relevant consideration. There is a 10m wide open space system proposed along this road. This strip of land will be densely vegetated to obscure the development. This vegetation buffer will allow for a visual barrier between the development and the Road, which will reduce the visual impact of the development, and reduce noise levels emanating from the road.

Three alternative development layouts are assessed here, the preferred development layout (Figure 2), alternative 1 development layout (Figure 3) and alternative 2 development layout (Figure 4). For the preferred development concept, a total of 60 group housing erven are proposed with an average erf size of 375m<sup>2</sup>

For the alternative 1 development layout, a total of 73 group housing erven are proposed with an average erf size of 375m<sup>2</sup> occupying a total area of 3.1 ha, approximately 1.2 ha of public roads, approximately 1.2 ha of private roads and services, and existing and rehabilitated forest area of approximately 8.6 ha

The alternative 2 development layout, a total of 19 single residential erven are proposed with an average erf size of 800m<sup>2</sup> occupying a total area of 1.9 ha, approximately 1.2 ha of public roads, approximately 2.4 ha of private open space, and existing and rehabilitated forest area of approximately 8.6 ha





**Figure 2:** Preferred development layout






Figure 3: Alternative 1 development layout





Figure 4: Alternative 2 development layout






Figure 5: Proposed floor plan





Figure 6: Proposed house 3D model A



Figure 7: Proposed house 3D model B

## 4. METHODOLOGY

It is in the nature of visual and scenic resources to include abstract qualities and connotations that are by their nature difficult to assess or quantify as they often have cultural or symbolic meaning. It is necessary therefore to include both quantitative criteria (such as viewing distances), and qualitative criteria (such as sense of place), in visual impact assessments.

An implication of this is that impact ratings cannot simply be added together. Instead, the assessment relies on the evaluation of a wide range of considerations, both objective and subjective, including the context of the proposed project within the surrounding area. The phrase “beauty is in the eye of the beholder” is often quoted to emphasize the subjectivity in undertaking a visual impact assessment

The analysis of the interaction between the existing visual environment (landscape character and sense of place) and the planned infrastructure provides the basis for determining visual impacts and mitigation strategies. This is completed by defining the visual effect of the planned infrastructure and visual sensitivity of viewing locations to determine impact.

The evaluation of the existing visual environment consists of the assessment of both the landscape setting and key viewing locations within it. The landscape setting can be defined in terms topography, vegetation, hydrology and land-use features. These elements define the existing visual character of the landscape with which the planned infrastructure interacts.

The use of the basic elements of form, line, colour and textures has become the standard in describing and evaluating landscapes. Modifications in a landscape which repeat the landscape’s basic design elements are said to be in harmony with their surroundings. Modifications which do not harmonize, often look out of place and are said to contrast or stand out in unpleasing ways.

Value can be placed in a landscape in terms of its aesthetic quality, or in terms of its sense of identity or sense of place with which it is associated. If no such values are held with respect to a landscape, there is less likely to be a perception of a visual impact if the landscape becomes subject to visual alteration. Development within a landscape may not be perceived negatively at all if the development is associated with progress or upliftment of the human condition.

The perception of visual impacts is thus highly subjective and thus involves ‘value judgements’ on behalf of the receptor. The context of the landscape character, the scenic / aesthetic value of an area, and the types of land use practised tend to affect the perception of whether landscape change (through development) would be considered to be an unwelcome intrusion. Sensitivity to visual impacts is typically most pronounced in areas set aside for the conservation of the natural environment (such as protected natural areas or conservancies), or in areas in which the natural character or scenic beauty of the area acts as a drawcard for visitors (tourists) to visit an area, and accordingly where amenity and utilitarian ecological values are associated with the landscape.

When landscapes have a highly natural or scenic character, amenity values are typically associated with such a landscape. Structural features such as power lines and other electricity transmission developments and related infrastructure are not a feature of the natural environment but are rather representative of human (anthropogenic) change to a landscape.

Thus, when placed in a largely natural landscape, such structural features can be perceived to be highly incongruous in the context of the setting, especially if they affect or change the visual quality of a landscape. It is in this context of incongruity with a natural setting that new developments are often perceived to be a source of visual impact.

## 4.1 Observer locations

Observer locations (views from communities, major roads, conservation areas etc.) are those areas where people (receptors) are likely to obtain a view of the planned infrastructure. These viewing locations have different significance based on numerous factors, collectively evaluated though land use and viewing distance to the planned infrastructure.

The selection of the key viewing locations is based on their location within the defined view-shed where they would have a clear view of the planned infrastructure.

Factors that will be considered in selecting the key viewing locations are:

- **The angle of observation** - The apparent size of a project is directly related to the angle between the viewer's line-of-sight and the slope upon which the planned infrastructure is to take place. As this angle nears 90 degrees (vertical and horizontal), the maximum area is viewable.
- **Numbers of viewers** - Areas seen and used by large numbers of people are potentially more sensitive. Protection of visual values usually becomes more important as the number of viewers increase.
- **Length of time the project is in view** - If the viewer has only a brief glimpse of the planned infrastructure, the contrast may not be of great concern. If, however, the planned infrastructure is subject to view for a long period, as from an overlook, the contrast may be very significant.
- **Distance from the project** - The greater the viewing distances, the lower the visual sensitivity. The visual modification of a development is assumed to be the highest when the observer is very close to it and has a direct line of sight. The visual modification then decreases with distance and is also known as distance decay (Hull & Bishop, 1988).
- **Field of vision** - The visual impact of a development can be quantified to the degree of influence on a person's field of vision both horizontally and vertically. The visual impact of a development will vary according to the proportion in which a development impacts on the central field of vision. Within the central field of vision images are sharp, depth perception occurs and colour discrimination is possible. Developments, which take up less than 5% of the central field of vision, are usually insignificant in most landscapes (Human Dimension and Design, 1979).
- **Visibility** - Viewed by the human eye 1.8 m from the ground across a "flat" surface such as the sea, the horizon will be of the order of 6 km distant, due to the curvature of the earth. Viewed at an elevation of 60 m, the horizon will be of the order of 32 km distant and from the top of a 1000 m mountain, the horizon will be at a distance of approximately 113 km. A tall structure standing above the horizon would, of course, increase these distances significantly; for example, for an observer at 1.8 m who is viewing a man-made structure 50 m tall, the effective distance to the horizon is 34 km and for a 100 m structure the distance is 46 km (Miller & Morrice, no date). In addition, mist, haze or other atmospheric conditions may significantly affect visibility (Hill et al, 2001).

## 4.2 Visual sensitivity

Visual sensitivity is a measure of how critically a change to the existing landscape is viewed by people from different land-use areas in the vicinity of a development.

The degree of visual sensitivity of an area is closely related to the aesthetic quality of the area, as well as to the value placed in the aesthetic quality of the landscape but is also related to the area's socio-economic profile. In this regard, residential, tourist and/or recreation areas generally have a higher visual sensitivity than other land use areas (e.g. industrial, agricultural or transport corridors), because they use the scenic amenity values of the surrounding landscape and may be used as part of a leisure experience and often over extended viewing periods.

It is important to note that the presence of natural / perceived natural and rural elements or areas within the landscape as viewed from the surrounds of the project area can engender perceptions of aesthetic quality or value to the landscape. Many studies of landscape conservation have highlighted the value placed by people in rural or

natural landscapes. A rural landscape can be defined as an area where an interaction between humans and nature over time has led to the development of a landscape that has its characteristics, and which is a middle ground between an urban landscape and wilderness, consisting of human activities that are related to the natural environment, such as agriculture and pastoral activities (Mazehan et al, 2013). A natural landscape, as defined in this report is close in appearance to how the landscape would appear without human alteration – i.e. mimicking or closely resembling that of a wilderness.

Placing value in a landscape is a psychological and cultural practice; values and meanings are not intrinsic to the landscape, but rather they are phenomena created by humans through their cultural practices (Pun, 2004). It is thus important to note that perceptions of a landscape may not be universally shared, and different individuals or groups of people may perceive or treat the same landscape differently, in turn ascribing different values and meanings to it (Pun, 2004). Values and meanings ascribed by local people may not be evident to an outsider.

There are different types of values that can be placed on a landscape; i.e. economic values (e.g. the relevance of the landscape for business enterprises, or the market possibility of products from the landscape), amenity values (values related to the non-material benefits associated with it) and security values (Pun, 2004). Amenity values can be subdivided into different sub-categories; “intrinsic” ecological value, scientific and educational value, aesthetical and recreational value, and orientational and identity value.

Landscapes and the viewing of landscapes have also been shown to have positive psychological and health benefits; Velarde et al (2007), have shown through an examination of various environmental psychology studies that visual exposure to natural landscapes (e.g. by means of viewing natural landscapes during a walk, or viewing from a window) generally has a beneficial impact on human health (e.g. reduced stress, facilitating recovery from illness, and behavioural changes that improve mood and general well-being).

Landscape as a source of beauty is prevalent within the arts and is a strong drawcard for recreational activities. In addition, the landscape is an element in the ability of people to orient themselves and is strongly related to people's cultural identity and sense of place. It is in this context that value is placed in natural or rural landscapes, and it follows that such value would be placed on views in an area such as the study area which is largely natural, and which has high aesthetic value by virtue of its scenic nature.

The above values can be interlinked, but can also be conflicting, e.g. amenity values associated with a landscape held by a certain group of people as described above may conflict with economic values associated with the market or development possibility of the landscape that is held by others. It is in this context that visual impact associated with a potential development often arises as an issue in environmental impact assessments.

The latter three sub-categories of amenity value described above – aesthetic, identity and psychological health value are typically involved in the perception of visual impact and constitute the elements of the ‘visual sensitivity’ associated with that landscape, as development within a landscape can change the landscape to the degree to which the amenity value associated with a landscape would be considered to be degraded or no longer present.

Visual sensitivity may range from high to low, depending on the following additional factors:

- **The visual absorption capacity** - The potential of the landscape to conceal the proposed project will reduce or increase visual sensitivity.
- **Viewing distance** – The greater the viewing distance, the lower the visual sensitivity. The visual modification of a development is assumed to be the highest when the observer is very close to it and has a direct line of sight. The visual modification decreases with distance and is also known as distance decay (Hull & Bishop 1988).
- **Length of time** the project is in view - If the viewer has only a brief glimpse of the planned infrastructure, the contrast may not be of great concern and the visual sensitivity low. If, however, the planned



infrastructure is subject to view for a long period, as from an overlook, the contrast may be very significant.

- **General orientation** - General orientation of residences to landscape areas affected by a project. Residential, tourist and/or recreation areas with a strong visual orientation towards the planned infrastructure (i.e. those with areas such as living rooms and/or verandas orientated towards it), will have a higher visual sensitivity than those not orientated towards the planned infrastructure.
- **Relative planned infrastructure size** - The contrast created by the project is directly related to its size and scale as compared to the surroundings in which it is placed.
- **Type of users** - Visual sensitivity will vary with the type of users. Recreational sightseers may be highly sensitive to any changes in visual quality, whereas workers who pass through the area regularly may not be as sensitive to change.
- **Numbers of viewers** - Areas seen and used by large numbers of people are potentially more sensitive. Protection of visual values usually becomes more important as the number of viewers increases.
- **Adjacent land uses** - The inter-relationship with land uses in adjacent lands can affect the visual sensitivity of an area. For example, an area within the view-shed of a residential area may be very sensitive, whereas an area surrounded by commercially developed lands may not be visually sensitive.
- **Special areas** - Management objectives for special areas such as natural areas, wilderness areas, conservation areas, scenic areas, scenic roads or trails frequently require special consideration for the protection of the visual values. This does not necessarily mean that these areas are scenic, but rather that one of the management objectives may be to preserve the natural landscape setting. The management objectives for these areas may be used as a basis for assigning sensitivity levels.

Landscapes are subdivided into three (3) distanced zones based on relative visibility from travel routes or observation points (receptors). The three zones are:

- **Foreground-Middle ground Zone** - This is the area that can be seen from each travel route for a distance of 0 to 5 kilometres where management activities might be viewed in detail. The outer boundary of this distance zone is defined as the point where the texture and form of individual plants are no longer apparent in the landscape. In some areas, atmospheric conditions can reduce visibility and shorten the distance normally covered by each zone.
- **Background Zone** - This is the remaining area which can be seen from each travel route to approximately 24 kilometres but does not include areas in the background which are so far distant that the only thing discernible is the form or outline. To be included within this distance zone, vegetation should be visible at least as patterns of light and dark.
- **Seldom-Seen Zone** - These are areas that are not visible within the foreground-middle ground and background zones and areas beyond the background zones.

Land-use areas are generally characterised in terms of low, moderate or high visual sensitivity, as follows:

- Low visual sensitivity - industrial areas, local roads, mining and degraded areas.
- Moderate visual sensitivity - tourist roads, major roads, sporting or recreational areas and places of work.
- High visual sensitivity - rural residences, recreation areas, conservation areas, scenic routes or trails.

#### 4.3 Visual modification

Visual modification is a measure of the level of visual contrast and integration of the planned infrastructure with the existing landscape.

An existing landscape has certain visual characteristics expressed through the visual elements of form, shape, line colour and texture. A development that has different visual characteristics than the existing landscape will create contrast with the existing landscape. If similar infrastructure already forms part of the existing landscape, the visual effects of the planned infrastructure will borrow visual character from these operations, reducing visual modification.



The degree to which the visual characteristics of the planned infrastructure contrast with the existing landscape will determine the level of visual modification. For example, a newly created mine will have a high visual modification due to strong contrast. An extension of operations in an existing mine will have a lesser visual modification. A successfully rehabilitated mine area will also have a lower visual modification due to limited contrast with the existing landscape.

Similarly, a project is said to be integrated with the existing landscape based on issues of scale, position in the landscape and contrast. High visual integration is achieved if a development is dominated by the existing landscape, and is of small scale and/or limited contrast.

The level of visual modification generally decreases with distance and is categorised as follows:

- **Negligible (or very low) level of visual modification** – where the development is distant and/or relates to a small proportion of the overall view-shed.
- **Low level of visual modification** - where there are minimal visual contrast and a high level of integration of form, line, shape, pattern, colour or texture values between the development and the landscape. In this situation, the development may be noticeable but does not markedly contrast with the landscape.
- **Moderate level of visual modification** - where a component of the development is visible and contrasts with the landscape, while at the same time achieving a level of integration. This occurs where surrounding topography, vegetation or existing modified landscape provide some measure of visual integration or screening.
- **High level of visual modification** - where the major components of the development contrast strongly with the existing landscape and demand attention.

The following factors must be considered when applying visual modification categories:

- **Length of time the project is in view** - If the viewer has only a brief glimpse of the project, the contrast may not be of great concern. If, however, the project is subject to view for a long period, from a viewing location, the contrast may be very significant.
- **Relative size or scale** - The contrast created by the project is directly related to its size and scale as compared to the surroundings in which it is placed.
- **Recovery time** - The amount of time required for successful re-vegetation should be considered. Recovery usually takes several years and goes through several phases (e.g. bare ground to grasses, to shrubs, to trees, etc.). It may be necessary to conduct contrast ratings for each of the phases that extend over long time periods. Those conducting contrast ratings should verify the probability and timing of vegetative recovery.
- **Atmospheric conditions** - The visibility of planned infrastructure due to atmospheric conditions, such as air pollution or natural haze, should be considered
- **Motion** - Movement such as waterfalls, vehicles or plumes draw attention to a project.
- **Form** - Contrast in form results from changes in the shape and mass of landforms or structures. The degree of change depends on how dissimilar the introduced forms are to those continuing to exist in the landscape.
- **Line** - Contrasts in line result from changes in edge types and interruption or the introduction of edges, bands, and silhouette lines. New lines may differ in their sub-elements (boldness, complexity, and orientation) from existing lines.
- **Colour** - Changes in value and hue tend to create the greatest contrast. Other factors such as chroma, reflectivity and colour temperature, also increase the contrast.
- **Texture** - Noticeable contrast in texture usually stems from differences in the grain, density and internal contrast. Other factors such as irregularity and directional patterns of texture should also be considered.

## 5. VISUAL ASSESSMENT OF THE SITE AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The DEA&DP Guideline for involving visual & aesthetic specialists in EIA processes Document provides a number of criteria that relate specifically to Visual Impact Assessments namely:

- Visibility of the project;
- Visual exposure;
- Visual sensitivity of the area;
- Visual sensitivity of receptors;
- Visual Absorption Capacity; and
- Visual Intrusion.

It is recommended that the proposed project should be assessed against these criteria before attempting to assess the visual impact of the proposed development.

### 5.1 Description of the affected area and the scenic resources

The development is situated in the Garden Route, in the southeastern extent (Plettenberg Bay) of the Western Cape (Figure 1). The area is a scenic, coastal area with a rich, visual diversity. This diverse and beautiful coastal area is a landscape formed over millions of years and numerous sea-level changes. (Figure 8).



**Figure 8:** A view of the coastal area

**From: The Garden Route Environmental Framework (2010)**

*“The landscape of the Garden Route comprises an intricate mosaic of landforms, which further supports its diverse ecological features. These features extend from coastal features, through to the lake system, framed by the backdrop of the high Outeniqua mountains. The area is similarly dissected by numerous rivers draining the highlands to the coast. The coastal landscape is characterised by sensitive foredune systems which are prone to erosion, and which perform*

---

critical ecological functions, and which similarly are sought after for residential property development. The area is characterised by cover sands on steep slopes surrounding the lakes and estuaries, which are unstable and unsuitable for development activity.

and

*The Garden Route has been named as such due to the visual and aesthetic quality attached to the region. Similarly, the region is considered as one of the most scenic in the country, attracting significant numbers of domestic and international tourist throughout the year. This asset is, unfortunately, one of the regions limiting factors. Due to the perceived high - quality of life associated with the region underpinned by scenic topography, quaint villages and hamlets, large tracts of natural open space systems supported by an extensive national park system (Garden Route National Park); the Garden Route has become the ideal location of retired individuals from the larger cities, as well as a growing international interest. This insatiable demand for development land for residential and tourism use is limited by the biophysical, physical and aesthetic constraints of the area. It is indeed the case of the “exact reasons for the attraction could become its downfall”.*


The proposed development takes full advantage of the Garden Routes scenic qualities as mentioned above (Figure 8).

## 5.2 Surrounding land uses

The proposed development is located in an area where a strong holiday/resort character predominates. It is fairly homogenously developed with residential and resort uses, wedged between the sea and the coastal plateau slopes (Figure 8).

The proposed development site is surrounded by natural areas, areas degraded by invasive alien trees, and small pockets of urban areas along the coastline. (Figure 8 & 9).





**Figure 9:** Adjacent land uses



### 5.3 Topography

All three proposed development layout alternatives are located on the flat area (4m above sea level) of the property and ridgelines are present on the steep section of the property. The property is enclosed by steep areas towards the north and the east with heights varying between 75-125m above sea level. Towards the west, the topography remains flat and on the south, the frontal dune system along the coast is approximately 25m above sea level. The average height of the property above sea level varies between 4 – 150m (Figures 11).

### 5.4 Local vegetation

The property contains invasive alien trees, forest, pastures, secondary vegetation and a few Milkwood trees. The proposed development will be predominantly located in the pasture area and some components in the secondary vegetation (Figures 10 & 12). Vegetation along the property boundary is approximately 4m high.







**Figure 10:** Local vegetation

## 5.5 Protected landscapes

The proposed development site lies within the Garden Route Biosphere Reserve. The property only contains areas of Critical Biodiversity Areas 1 (terrestrial, forest & aquatic). All three development layout options have erven that contain Critical Biodiversity Areas 1 (Figures 13-15). The aquatic compliance statement confirmed that no estuarine habitat is present in the remnant vegetation at the site, and no hydromorphic indicators in the soil that would indicate wetland conditions.






Figure 11: Topography








Figure 12: Vegetation map






**Figure 13:** Preferred development layout protected landscapes





**Figure 14:** Alternative development 1 layout protected landscapes





**Figure 15:** Alternative development 2 layout protected landscapes



---

## 6. PROBABLE VIEW CATCHMENT AND LINE OF SIGHT

### 6.1 Probable view catchment

Slope and aspect are very important in the context of views. Topography expressed in the form of slope and aspect can perform an important role in limiting views or 'focusing' views in a certain direction. Viewers located low down within an enclosed valley would experience a limited visual envelope or viewshed, as the rising topography around them would prevent wider views of the surrounding terrain beyond the immediate valley.


Similarly, an object placed lower down in such an enclosed valley would have a limited viewshed, being shielded or partly shielded by the terrain surrounding it. A viewer located on a hill slope with a certain aspect would only be able to view the surrounding terrain in the direction of the aspect of the slope. Conversely, a viewer on a higher-lying interfluvium will be exposed to potentially wide-ranging views over the surrounding terrain, and large objects placed in these terrain settings could similarly be visible from a wide area.

The micro-topography within the landscape setting in which the viewer and object are located is also important. The presence of micro-topographical features and objects such as buildings or vegetation that would screen views from a receptor position to an object can remove any visual impact factor associated with it.

Fischer (1995) analysed the effects of data errors on viewsheds (view catchment) calculated by Geographic Information Systems and has shown that the calculations are extremely sensitive to small errors in the data and the resolution of the data and the errors in viewer location and elevation. Other studies have also shown that a viewshed calculated using the same data but with eight different Geographic Information Systems can produce eight different results.

Hankinson (1999) also states that viewsheds are never accurate, and they contain several sources of error and may not always be feasible to separate these errors or to estimate their size and potential effects. It is, therefore, better to describe a viewshed analysis as a probable view catchment that must be subjected to subsequent field testing and verification.

A probable view catchment can be based on topography only and shows areas that will be screened by intervening hills, mountains etc. A probable topographic (digital terrain relief model) view catchment does not consider heterogeneous and complex natural and man-made elements in the surrounding landscape. A digital terrain model (DTM) can be created from existing contour data. A view catchment based on a digital surface model (DSM) does consider intervening vegetation, buildings or small variations in topography, such as road cuttings (Figure 16). Digital surface models are expensive and not a viable option for small projects.



**Figure 16:** Terrain models

Therefore, a probable catchment is a conservative assessment of those areas that may be visually impacted by the planned infrastructure. Increasing the sophistication/accuracy of the probable viewshed by the addition of data (DSM) on complex natural and man-made elements in the landscape is desirable, but it will introduce further errors of detail and interpretation in the view catchment analysis. The probable view catchments in Figures 17-19 is based on existing available topographic data (2m contours).

## 6.2 Line of sight

A line of sight is a line between two points that shows the parts of the surface along the line that are visible to or hidden from an observer. Creating a line of sight allows you to determine whether a given point (infrastructure) is visible from another point. If the terrain hides the target point, you can see where the obstruction is and what else is visible or hidden along the line of sight.

The line of sight is symbolized by the following colours:

- The black (●) dot represents the location of the observer.
- The blue dot (●) is the point of obstruction from the observer to the target.
- The red dot (●) indicates that the target location is not visible
- The green dot (●) indicates that the target location is visible
- Red lines are (—) obstructed areas from the observer point (not visible to the observer).
- Green lines are (—) visible areas from the observer point (visible to the observer).

A digital surface model was created for the line of sight analysis by combining topographic (contour lines) data with average vegetation height and the proposed development building footprints and heights.



## 7. VISIBILITY OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

### 7.1 Zone of visual influence

The geographical area from which the proposed development will theoretically be visible, or probable view catchment, is dictated by topography. Theoretically, the development site could be seen from the all surrounding areas. However, distance, developments, houses and vegetation will reduce the actual view catchment that the proposed development site will have, to a much smaller area (zone of visual influence).

Based on the information gathered from the various observer locations the zone of visual influence was determined for the preferred development layout (Figure 17). It spans an area of approximately 0.3 km south, 0.4 km west, 0.1 km north and 0.9 km to the east. According to the specific criteria for visual impact assessments, the visibility of the site is local, being visible from an area less than 5km away.

The alternative 1 development layout spans an area of approximately 0.3 km south, 0.4 km west, 0.1 km north and 0.9 km to the east (Figure 18). According to the specific criteria for visual impact assessments, the visibility of the site is local, being visible from an area less than 5km away.

The alternative 2 development layout spans an area of approximately 0.2 km south, 0.2 km west, 0.1 km north and 0.9 km to the east (Figure 19). According to the specific criteria for visual impact assessments, the visibility of the site is local, being visible from an area less than 5km away.

### 7.2 Receptors

The level of visual impact considered acceptable is dependent on the type of receptors. The following receptor sensitivity ratings were considered:

- High sensitivity – e.g. residential areas, nature reserves and scenic routes or trails
- Moderate sensitivity – e.g. sporting or recreational areas, or places of work
- Low sensitivity – e.g. industrial, or degraded areas

Highly sensitive receptors of the proposed development site include the small residential developments located on the opposite side of the PO394 road on the frontal dunes system (Figure 9).







Figure 17: Preferred development layout probable view catchment





**Figure 18:** Alternative 1 development layout probable view catchment






Figure 19: Alternative 2 development layout probable view catchment





Figure 20: Observer location 1 sightlines





Figure 21: Observer location 2 sightlines






Figure 22: Observer location 3 sightlines





**Figure 23:** Observer location 4 sightlines





**Figure 24:** Observer location 5 sightlines





Figure 25: Observer location 6 sightlines






Figure 26: Observer location 7 sightlines






Figure 27: Observer location 8 sightlines





**Figure 28:** Observer location 1





**Figure 29:** Observer location 2





Figure 30: Observer location 3





**Figure 31:** Observer location 4





**Figure 32:** Observer location 5





Figure 33: Observer location 6





Figure 34: Observer location 7





Figure 35: Observer location 8



### 7.3 Visual exposure (sightline analysis)

The visual impact of a development diminishes at an exponential rate as the distance between the observer and the object increases. Relative humidity and fog in the area directly influence the effect. Increased humidity also causes the air to appear greyer which diminishes detail. Thus, the impact at 1 km would be 25% of the impact as viewed from 500 m. At 2km, it would be 10% of the impact at 500 m. The inverse relationship between distance and visual impact is well-recognised in visual analysis literature (Hull and Bishop, 1998) and was used as an important criterion for this study.

Thus, visual exposure is an expression of how close receptors are expected to get to the proposed development regularly. For this assessment, close-range views (equating to a high level of visual exposure) are views over a distance of 500 m or less, medium-range views (equating to a moderate/medium level of visual exposure) are views of 500 m to 2 km, and long-range views are over distances greater than 2 km (low levels of visual exposure).




Figure 36: Visual exposure graph

Within the Zone of Visual Influence view corridors, viewpoints and receptors will experience “Visual Exposure” to the proposed development. The following visual exposure classes were considered during the assessment:

- High exposure – dominant or clearly noticeable
- Moderate exposure – recognisable to the viewer
- Low exposure – not particularly noticeable to the viewer

#### 7.3.1 View corridors

##### 7.3.1.1 Observer location 1 view corridor

The view corridor is located next to the Keurboomsriver road within the 3km distance zone. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation and buildings. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 17, 20 & 28).

##### 7.3.1.2 Observer location 2 view corridor

The view corridor is located at the Plettenberg Manor Estate within the 2km distance zone. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 18, 21 & 29).



#### 7.3.1.3 Observer location 3 view corridor

The view corridor is located at the Plettenberg Manor Estate between the 2km and 3km distance zones. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 19, 22 & 30).

#### 7.3.1.4 Observer location 4 view corridor

The view corridor is located on the PO394 road within the 1km distance zone. All three development options will be clearly visible and will therefore have a high exposure. The sightline analysis shows that both development options will be visible (Figures 20, 23 & 31).

#### 7.3.1.5 Observer location 5 view corridor

The view corridor is located on the PO394 road within the 1km distance zone. All three development options will be clearly visible and will therefore have a high exposure. The sightline analysis shows that both development options will be visible (Figures 21, 24 & 32).

#### 7.3.1.6 Observer location 6 view corridor

The view corridor is located on the PO394 road and within the 1km distance zone. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 22, 25 & 33).

#### 7.3.1.7 Observer location 7 view corridor

The view corridor is located on the DR1888 road and within the 1km distance zone. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 23, 26 & 34).

#### 7.3.1.8 Observer location 8 view corridor

The view corridor is located on the PO394 road and within the 2km distance zone. All three development options are not visible due to obstructive vegetation and topography. The sightline analysis shows that the proposed development will not be visible (Figures 24, 27 & 35).

### 7.4 Visual sensitivity

The inherent visibility of a project site's landscape is usually determined by a combination of topography, landform, vegetation cover, settlement pattern and special features. This translates into visual sensitivity. The following visual sensitivity classes were considered during the assessment:

- High visual sensitivity – highly visible and potentially sensitive areas in the landscape,
- Moderate visual sensitivity – moderately visible areas in the landscape,
- Low visual sensitivity – minimally visible areas in the landscape

Slope and aspect are very important in the context of views. Topography expressed in the form of slope and aspect can perform an important role in limiting views or 'focusing' views in a certain direction. Many of the viewers surrounding the hilltop on which the development is located are located on lower elevations and therefore would experience a limited visual envelope or viewshed, as the rising topography around them would prevent wider views of the surrounding terrain beyond the immediate low-lying areas.



The proposed development is located on a flat area that exposes it to some views from the south but topography and vegetation screen views from the east, west and north. None of the proposed buildings will be located on the prominent ridgelines (Figures 11 & 10). The high vegetation on the western, eastern and northern boundary screen views into the development (Figures 10, 30 & 33). All three development layout options will only be visible from the road for a short distance and low-density developments on the opposite side of the PO394 road located on the frontal dunes. Vegetation surrounding these developments will screen out many views of the proposed development. The proposed development, therefore has low visual sensitivity.

## 7.5 Visual absorption capacity

Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC) is the capacity of the landscape to conceal the proposed development. The VAC of a landscape depends on its topography, the type of vegetation and surrounding infrastructure (buildings, roads etc.) that occurs in the landscape. The size and type of development also play a role. The following visual absorption classes were considered during the assessment:

- High VAC – effective screening is provided by topography, vegetation and existing infrastructure
- Moderate VAC - partial screening is provided by topography, vegetation and existing infrastructure
- Low VAC - little screening is provided by topography, vegetation and existing infrastructure

Surrounding vegetation and the position and design of all three development layout options provide a high level of visual absorption for the proposed development (Figures 11, 10, 30 & 33).

## 7.6 Visual intrusion

Visual intrusion is defined as the level of compatibility or congruence of the project with the particular qualities of the area, or its sense of place. This is related to the idea of context and maintaining the integrity of the landscape or townscape. The following visual intrusion classes were considered during the assessment:

- High visual intrusion – the proposed development results in a noticeable change or is discordant with the surroundings
- Moderate visual intrusion – the proposed development partially fits into the surroundings but is clearly noticeable
- Low visual intrusion – the proposed development creates minimal change or blends in well with the surroundings

The proposed development's low visual impact design and use of appropriate cladding materials and colour selection materials allow it to blend in very well with its surroundings and create a minimal change in the landscape. The proposed development, therefore, has a low visual intrusion.

# 8. POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The assessment of visual impacts is based on a synthesis of criteria including nature of impact, extent, duration of the impact, intensity, probability of occurrence, reversibility, irreplaceable loss of resources, cumulative effect and level of significance.

## 8.1 Nature of the impact

The nature of the visual impacts will be the visual effect the activity would have on the receiving environment. These visual impacts will be:

Pre-construction phase:



- Removal of some vegetation will be required for earthworks. Some vegetation would also be cleared for building thereby increasing the visibility of the site and resulting in a loss of the vegetation visual resource.

Construction phase:

- During construction, earthworks would cause some visual scarring of the landscape.

Operational phase:

- A portion of the development site is currently undeveloped and covered in predominantly in pastures and some vegetation. The development would result in a small change in visual character from a landscape covered in vegetation and without buildings to a low-density well landscaped built landscape.

## 8.2 Impact assessment criteria

The assessment of visual impacts is based on a synthesis of criteria including nature of impact, extent, duration of the impact, intensity, probability of occurrence, reversibility, irreplaceable loss of resources, cumulative effect and level of significance.

### 8.2.1.1 The extent of the impact

The spatial or geographic area of influence of the visual impact: the extent of the impact for all three of the proposed development layout options is local (limited to the immediate surroundings).

### 8.2.1.2 Duration of the project

The predicted lifespan of the visual impact:

The duration of impacts for all three of the proposed development layout options ranges from short-term (duration of the construction phase) to medium-term (duration of screening vegetation to mature and other mitigation measures to be implemented).

### 8.2.1.3 The intensity of the impact

*The magnitude of the impact on views, scenic or cultural resources (intensity of the impacts):* the intensity of the impacts for all three development layout options will be low (visual and scenic resources are affected to a limited extent).

### 8.2.1.4 The probability of the impact

*The degree of possibility of the visual impact occurring (probability of the impact occurring):* the probability of the impact occurring for all three development layout options will be probable (most likely that the impact will occur).

### 8.2.1.5 Reversibility

The impact of all three development layout options is partially reversible by implementing the mitigation measures for the proposed development that includes the planting of indigenous vegetation to screen views into the development.

### 8.2.1.6 Irreplaceable loss of resources

The degree to which resources will be irreplaceably lost due to both the development layouts is low.



#### 8.2.1.7 Cumulative effect

An effect that in itself may not be significant but may become significant if added to other existing or potential impacts that may result from activities associated with the proposed development. The cumulative impacts of all three the development layout options before mitigation are medium and low after mitigation.

#### 8.2.1.8 Significance

The significance of impacts is determined through a synthesis of the assessment criteria. The significance of the impacts of all three the development layout options is low.

### 8.3 Conclusion

The well-positioned and designed development infrastructure allows for it to blend in very well with its surroundings and create minimal contrast in the landscape. The alternative 2 development layout option provides a slight advantage over the preferred and alternative 1 development layout options due to its lower density and more open space for landscaping to screen views from the road. But with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures the preferred and alternative 1 development layouts can also be screened effectively from the road.

## 9. VISUAL CONSTRAINTS & MITIGATION

Visual Garden Route Environmental Management Framework (GREMF) has identified the inappropriate placement of development infrastructure on prominent and exposed topographical features such as ridgelines as a risk to the visual landscape of the Garden Route.

The GREMF states that proposed developments within areas of outstanding natural beauty, scenic drives and panoramic views must be sensitive to the natural beauty and consider the following aspects when planning the development:

- Infrastructure should be visually unobtrusive
- Materials and colours used for the development should blend into the surrounding landscape
- Infrastructure should be grouped in clusters with open spaces between clusters
- Infrastructure should not interfere with the skyline (ridgelines), landmarks, major views and vistas
- The development should not increase light, noise or effluent pollution
- The development should correspond to the historical, architectural and landscape style of surrounding layout and buildings

Every attempt should be made to design the proposed development so that buildings, structures, and other improvements do not extend above the existing ridgelines (high visual sensitivity area) or alter the ridge profile significantly when viewed from the public streets, roads, water bodies or facilities.

Structures should be sited below the ridgeline to preserve a natural topographic and vegetative profile. Ridgelines and prominent hillsides should be retained as open space through appropriate clustering and/or transfer of density to other parts of the development site.

Infrastructure should be designed to conform to the natural topography and hillside setting of the project site. Buildings and associated infrastructure located on the hillsides below ridgelines should follow the contours of the site and blend with the existing terrain to reduce bulk and mass. Infrastructure should be positioned to allow adequate space for tree planting and other vegetation screening interventions. Roof forms and rooflines should



be broken into smaller building components to reflect the irregular forms of surrounding natural features. The slope of roofs should be oriented in the same direction as the natural slope.

## 9.1 Visual mitigation measures

General visual mitigation principles to reduce visual impact can be categorised as:

- On-site treatments to reduce visual effects; and
- Treatments at viewer locations to reduce visual sensitivity.

On-site treatments involve rehabilitation of landforms and land cover, while viewer location treatments involve a range of treatments to screen views, filter views and/or re-orientate primary views.

On-site treatments might include:

- Visual and ecological planting patterns of indigenous vegetation to achieve landscape patterns that emulate in part existing mixes of tree and grass cover in the surrounding landscape.
- Minimising exposure of work areas to sensitive receptors.
- Preparing an internal landscape plan for rehabilitation areas.

At viewer location treatments include:

- Landscape design and plantings for affected locations. This will require an appropriately qualified person to visit the affected locations and develop a landscape plan to screen or filter views of the project areas.

Design fundamentals are general design principles that can be used for all forms of activity or development, regardless of the resource value being addressed. Applying the following three fundamentals will assist with mitigation measures:

- Proper siting or location.
- Reducing unnecessary disturbance.
- Repeating the elements of form, line, colour and texture of the surrounding landscape.

Design strategies are more specific activities that can be applied to address visual design problems. The following strategies will not necessarily apply to every proposed activity or project:

- Colour selection
- Earthwork
- Vegetative manipulation
- Structures
- Reclamation/Restoration
- Linear alignment design considerations

The fundamentals and strategies mentioned above are all interconnected, and when used together, can help resolve visual impacts from proposed activities or developments.

### 9.1.1 Reducing unnecessary disturbance

As a general rule, reducing the amount of land disturbed during the construction of a project reduces the extent of visual impact. Measures relevant to the project include:

- Retain as much of the existing vegetation as possible and where practical screen construction activities from key viewing locations. This is also referred to as vegetation manipulation.
- Establish limits of disturbance that reflect the minimum area required for construction.
- Existing vegetation should be retained where possible through the use of retaining walls.



### 9.1.2 Colour selection

The selection of the best colour for the planned project will have the greatest impact on the visual success or failure of the project. Strong contrasts in colour create easily recognizable visual conflicts in the landscape. Measures relevant to the project include:

- The selection of colours that blend with or are in harmony with the surrounding landscape will drastically reduce the visual impact of the project
- Galvanized steel on structures should be darkened to prevent glare. Low-lustre paints should be used wherever possible to reduce glare.

### 9.1.3 Reduce contrasts from earthworks

The scars left by excessive cut and fill activities during construction often leave long-lasting negative visual impacts. Once the dark surface soil layer is disturbed, exposing the much lighter colour of the subsurface soil, a strong contrast is created that may take many years to recover.

There are several ways to reduce the contrasts created by earthwork construction. Proper location and alignment are the most important factors. Fitting the proposed project infrastructure to the existing landforms in a manner that minimizes the size of cuts and fills will greatly reduce visual impacts from earthwork. Other earthwork design techniques, such as balancing cut and fill or constructing with all fill or all cut should be considered, where appropriate, as methods to reduce strong visual impacts. Measures relevant to the project include:

- The scars left by excessive cut and fill activities during construction often leave long-lasting negative visual impacts. Where possible fitting the proposed project infrastructure to the existing landforms in a manner that minimizes the size of cuts and fills will greatly reduce visual impacts from earthwork.
- The dumping of excess rock and earth on downhill slopes should be limited.

### 9.1.4 Glint and Glare

Solar glint and glare i.e. reflected sunlight from shiny surfaces such as windows can affect safety and residential amenity in surrounding areas. Glint is a momentary flash of light, and may be produced as a direct reflection of the sun on a window. Glint effects are not restricted to just windows and can occur from any reflective surface including building facades.

Glare is a continuous source of excessive brightness. It could be experienced by a stationary observer located in the path of reflected sunlight from the face of a window. Glare can also be an issue for buildings with reflective/ glassy facades.

Glint and glare can cause a distraction or lead to an after-image being experienced by an observer. This can present a nuisance and, under some circumstances, a safety hazard. Solar glint and glare impact significance is categorised differently for varying observer types. For dwelling receptors, significance is predominantly defined by duration and separation distance. For road users, it is mostly down to the location of the glare relative to an observer's field of view.

Low emissivity windows (Low-E) are designed to reflect much more solar energy than standard glass panes. They block as much as 99% of the sun's ultraviolet rays, preventing interiors from fading and reducing the health risks posed by ultraviolet light. Low-E windows also block a large percentage of the sun's infrared light, which is chiefly responsible for solar heat gain inside a property; it is primarily for this reason that these windows are known as energy efficient. Most low-E windows are also quite well-insulated thanks to a double pane design, which further enhances their energy efficiency.



But all that UV and IR light reflected off Low-E windows has to go somewhere, and quite often it does so in the form of light beams (glare) intense enough to melt some materials or to pose a hazard to nearby humans and animals.

Anti-glare window film can be applied to windows prone to glare. They reduce the reflection without reducing the amount of light that reaches the room and without obstructing the view either. The roof of a building can also be extended to provide more shade and thereby reducing glare from windows.

#### 9.1.5 Limiting the footprints and heights of structures

Visual impact can be reduced by limiting the footprint of the buildings and hardscaping as well as the heights of buildings. Limiting the footprint of infrastructure will help to provide more greening areas in between buildings which will assist with screening and visual absorption of structures

#### 9.1.6 Development and architectural guidelines

Development and building guidelines need to address procedural, planning and aesthetic considerations required for the successful design and development of the property and the architectural ethos of the development. The purpose of design guidelines is to protect and safeguard the environment and scenic resources and guide the appropriate architectural character to protect the investment value of the development. The guidelines should not be restrictive conditions but should promote an overall design sensitivity whilst allowing flexibility for individual expression.

#### 9.1.7 Landscaping

A Landscape Plan must be drawn up by a professionally registered Landscape Architect. The objective of the Landscape Plan must be:

- To identify and retain indigenous trees and shrubs that will visually screen the development.
- To provide a planting plan of indigenous trees and shrubs for streets and open spaces that will allow for the medium – long-term visual screening of the development and enhance the living environment of the owners and residents.
- To draw up a management plan for phasing in indigenous trees and phasing out exotic trees such that the proposed development will always be screened from sensitive receptors, by trees. The plan should include the planting of fast-growing, pioneer-type trees, trees with a medium growth rate and those that have a slower growth rate. This management plan should be for a minimum of 20 years and should be monitored and revised every 5 years.
- To provide Landscape Guidelines for homeowners. Planting of lawn alone exacerbates the visibility of the units. The mix of lawn, shrubs and trees should be carefully designed with the importance of trees and large shrubs emphasized, to provide further greening of the built environment.
- To draw up a Landscape Operational Maintenance Plan for the Homeowners Association or owner to manage the shared open spaces beyond individual erf boundaries.
- To provide guidelines on visually permeable boundary treatments, using fencing for the most part and walls at entrances only. No precast concrete walls.

#### 9.1.8 Lightning design

Effective light management needs to be incorporated into the design of the lighting to ensure that the visual influence is limited to the power station, without jeopardising operational safety and security.

Several measures can be implemented to reduce light pollution and those relevant to the project are as follows:

- Where possible construction activities should be conducted behind noise/light barriers that could include vegetation screens.



- Low flux lamps and the direction of fixed lights toward the ground should be implemented where practical. Choose “full-cut off shielded” fixtures that keep light from going uselessly up or sideways. Full cut-off light fixtures produce minimum glare. They increase safety because you see illuminated people, cars, and terrain, not dazzling bulbs. If you can see the bright bulb from a distance, it’s a bad light. With a good light, you see lit ground instead of the dazzling bulb. “Glare” is light that beams directly from a bulb into your eye.
- The design of night lighting should be kept to a minimum level required for operations and safety
- The utilisation of specific frequency LED lighting with a green hue on perimeter security fencing.
- Where feasible, put lights on timers to turn them off each night after they are no longer needed

#### 9.1.9 Restoration and reclamation

Strategies for restoration and reclamation are very similar to the design strategies for earthwork, as well as the design fundamentals of repeating form, line, colour, and texture and reducing unnecessary disturbance. The objectives of restoration and reclamation include reducing long-term visual impacts by decreasing the amount of disturbed area and blending the disturbed area into the natural environment while still providing for project operations.

Though restoration and reclamation are separate parts of project design, they should not be forgotten or ignored. It is always a good idea to require a restoration/reclamation plan as part of the original design package. All areas of disturbance that are not needed for operation and maintenance should be restored as closely as possible to previous conditions. Measures relevant to the project include:

- The objective of restoration and reclamation efforts is to reduce the long-term visual impacts by decreasing the amount of disturbed area and blending the disturbed area into the natural environment while still providing for project operations.
- Topsoil should be stripped, saved, and replaced on earth surfaces disturbed by construction activities.
- Planting holes should be established on cut/fill slopes to retain water and seeds.
- Indigenous plant species should be selected to rehabilitate disturbed areas.
- Where possible rehabilitation efforts should emulate surrounding landscape patterns in terms of colour, texture and vegetation continuums.
- Replacing soil, brush, rocks and forest debris over disturbed earth surfaces when appropriate, thus allowing for natural regeneration rather than introducing an unnatural-looking grass cover.
- Revegetation of disturbed areas should occur as soon as practicable possible after the completion of various construction activities.

## 9.2 Monitoring program

The potential visual impacts and proposed mitigation thereof must be undertaken by a professionally registered landscape architect that must be part of the design team (including engineers and architects). The brief of the landscape architect (LA) must include:

- The LA must consult with both engineers and architects to ensure that sensitive earthwork and building design development occurs, which will allow for reducing the construction and operation phase visual impacts.
- The LA must work with the project surveyor, arborist and planners in establishing which trees are to remain on site for visual screening and taking this information into the design development of the civil and building works.
- The LA must prepare a landscape plan, design development thereof and monitoring implementation and thereafter maintenance. The plan must include the tree survey and what trees are, what indigenous vegetation is, to be retained, what is to be removed, the planting of indigenous trees, new trees and shrub planting along roadways and in open spaces in the built areas and a guideline document for private gardens within the development.



## 10. REFERENCES

- AEA Technology plc (AEAT). (1998). Power Generation and the Environment - a UK Perspective, Volume 1. Report AEAT 3776. Culham, Oxfordshire.
- Atkins Planning. (1986). First Report on the Visual Impact of Large Wind Turbines, Report ETSU-WN-1057/1.
- Bergsjö, A., Nilsson, K., & Skarback, E. (1982). Wind Power in the Landscape. Fourth Symposium on Wind Energy Systems, 21-24 September 1982, (p. Paper N2). Stockholm, Sweden.
- Bishop, I. D (no date). Determination of thresholds of visual impact: the case of wind turbines: Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design.
- British Wind Energy Association (BWEA). (1994). Best Practice Guidelines for Wind Energy Development. London.
- Council of Europe (2000). The European landscape convention. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- Fisher, P F (1995). An exploration of probable view-sheds in landscape planning. Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design 22, 527-546.
- Hankinson, Moira (1999). Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment. In Petts, Judith (Ed), Handbook of Environmental Impact Assessment. Volume 1. Blackwell Science, Oxford, pp347-373.
- Hill, M, Briggs, J, Minto, P, Bagnall, D, Foley, K & Williams, A (2001). Guide to Best Practice in Seascape Assessment. Maritime Ireland/Wales INTERREG Report No 5. The Marine Institute, Dublin.
- Hull, R. B. I., & Bishop, I. D. (1988). Scenic impacts of electricity transmission towers: the influence of landscape type and observer distance. Journal of Environmental Management, 27, 99-108.
- Mazehan, S.M., Shuib, B.K., and Hashim, H., 2013, Value of Rural Landscape from Public Perspectives, Proceedings of the International Conference on Social Science Research, ICSSR 2013 (e-ISBN 978-967- 11768-1-8). 4-5 June 2013, Penang, Malaysia
- McKenna, G., 2009. Techniques for creating Mining Landforms with Natural appearance. Techniques for creating mining landforms with natural appearance, Proceedings of Tailings and Mine Waste 2009 Conference. Banff, Alberta. November 1-4, 2009. The University of Alberta Geotechnical Centre, Edmonton.
- Miller, David R & Morrice, Jane G (no date). A Geographical Analysis of the Intervisibility of the Coastal Areas of Wales. Unpublished report, Macaulay Land Use Research Institute, Aberdeen.
- Oberholzer, B. (2005). Guideline for involving visual & aesthetic specialists in EIA processes: Edition 1. CSIR Report No ENV-S-C 2005 053 F. Republic of South Africa, Provincial Government of the Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning, Cape Town.
- Panero, Julius and Zelnik, Martin (1979). Human Dimension & Interior Space – A Source Book of Design Reference Standards, The Architectural Press Ltd. London.
- Pun, D.P., 2004, Rural Landscape Change: Landscape Practices, Values and Meanings. The Case of Jagatpur VDC, Chitwan Nepal, Master of Philosophy in Social Change - Department of Geography, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim, Norway
- Schor, H.J. and Gray, D.H., 2007. Landforming: an environmental approach to hillside development, mine reclamation and watershed restoration. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ. 35
- The Landscape Institute and the Institute of Environmental Management & Assessment - Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (2005). Second Edition. Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment.



Transport Research Board, National cooperative highway research program, Report 741, Evaluation of Methodologies for Visual Impact Assessments. Washington, D.C. (2013).

United States Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management (1984), Visual resource management: Washington, D.C., BLM Manual Handbook H-8400, Rel. 8-24.

United States Department of Agriculture - Forestry Service (1995). Landscape Aesthetics: A Handbook for Scenery Management. Handbook Number 701.

Velarde, M.D., Fry, G., and Tveit, B., 2007. Health effects of viewing landscapes – Landscape types in environmental psychology. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening 6 (2007) 199–212.

-----