

**IMPACTS MATRIX: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

**Eenzaamheid**

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	4	5	3	4	2	4	3	1	3	2	4
2	3		4	4	2	4	3	1	3	4	1
3	3			3	2	5	3	4	3	2	5
4	3			4		3	3		4	4	2
5						4	3			2	1
6						5	3			2	5
7						3	3			2	
8						4	3			2	
9						4	3			4	
10						3	4				
11						3					
12						5					

Total client score **2,967.9**  
 Percentage score **55%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

**Nauwontkomen**

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	5	5	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	4
2	3		3	3	2	4	3	2	3	4	2
3	3			3	2	5	3	4	2	2	5
4	5			4		3	3		4	4	5
5						4	3			3	3
6						5	3			2	4
7						3	3			3	
8						4	3			4	
9						5	3			4	
10						4	4				
11						4					
12						4					

Total alternative score **3,179.0**  
 Percentage score **61%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

### Appelvlakte

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	2	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	2	3
2	2		4	2	2	4	3	2	5	4	4
3	2			3	1	4	3	4	4	3	3
4	4			2		3	3		3	2	5
5						4	3			3	5
6						4	3			2	2
7						5	3			2	
8						5	3			2	
9						5	3			2	
10						3	4				
11						5					
12						3					

Total alternative score **2,414.4**  
 Percentage score **40%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

### Nelsonskop

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	1	1	3	2	1	1	5	3	5	2	2
2	2		3	2	2	5	3	3	4	4	5
3	2			3	1	3	3	4	5	3	2
4	1			4		3	3		3	2	5
5						4	4			4	5
6						4	3			2	1
7						5	4			3	
8						5	3			2	
9						3	4			2	
10						5	4				
11						3					
12						3					

Total client score **2,217.9**  
 Percentage score **35%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

**IMPACTS MATRIX: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES - ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Eenzaamheid**

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	4	5	4	4	3	5	3	2	3	2	4
2	3	1	1	4	3	5	3	2	5	4	1
3	3	1	1	3	3	3	3	4	1	2	5
4	3	1	1	4	3	4	3	1	1	3	2
5	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	1	4	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	4	5
7	1	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score **3,236.3**  
 Percentage score **62%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

**Naauwontkomen**

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	5	5	3	3	3	5	3	3	4	2	4
2	3	1	1	3	3	5	3	3	2	4	2
3	3	1	1	3	4	4	3	4	1	3	5
4	5	1	1	4	4	5	3	1	1	4	5
5	1	1	1	3	1	4	3	1	1	4	3
6	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	4	4
7	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score **3,492.1**  
 Percentage score **69%**

Worst score **925**  
 Best Score **4625**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

**Appelvlakte**

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
Potential impacts											
1	2	2	4	1	3	4	4	3	4	3	3
2	2	1	1	2	3	5	3	3	5	3	4
3	2	1	1	3	3	3	3	4	1	2	3
4	4	1	1	2	3	5	3	1	1	2	5
5	1	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	5
6	1	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	2	2
7	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score 2,724.2  
Percentage score 49%

Worst score 925  
Best Score 4625

### Nelsonskop

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
Environmental Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
Potential impacts											
1	1	1	3	2	2	3	4	4	5	3	2
2	2	1	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	2	5
3	2	1	1	3	3	4	3	4	1	4	2
4	1	1	1	4	2	3	3	1	1	4	5
5	1	1	1	2	1	5	4	1	1	2	5
6	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	2	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	3	4	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score 2,447.0  
Percentage score 41%

Worst score 925  
Best Score 4625

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

### Droogeheuvl

Ranking	5	5	2	2	6	3	3	2	1	4	4
---------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	6	2	4	2	2	4	3	1	3	4	3
2	3	1	1	2	3	5	3	1	5	3	4
3	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	4	1	3	2
4	5	1	1	3	2	5	3	1	1	2	1
5	1	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	1	1	2
6	1	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	3	3
7	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1

Total alternative score **2,734.6**  
Percentage score **49%**

Worst score **925**  
Best Score **4625**

### Zongezien

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	1	2	2	3	1	3	2	4	3	4	2
2	2	1	1	2	3	4	2	4	5	2	5
3	2	1	1	2	3	4	3	4	1	4	1
4	5	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	1	2	2
5	1	1	1	4	1	5	3	1	1	2	1
6	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	1
7	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1

Total alternative score **2,353.7**  
Percentage score **39%**

Worst score **925**  
Best Score **4625**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

### Kuipersbult

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
----------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	1	5	3	3	3	5	3	2	2	3	4
2	2	1	1	3	3	5	3	2	5	4	1
3	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	1	2	5
4	1	1	1	2	3	4	3	1	1	2	1
5	1	1	1	4	1	3	3	1	1	2	2
6	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	5
7	1	1	1	1	1	5	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score **2,879.6**  
Percentage score **53%**

Worst score **925**  
Best Score **4625**

### Kromdraai

<b>Ranking</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Environmental Issue</b>	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact
<b>Potential impacts</b>											
1	2	3	3	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	4
2	2	1	1	3	3	5	3	2	5	4	2
3	2	1	1	3	3	4	3	3	1	3	5
4	1	1	1	4	3	5	3	1	1	2	5
5	1	1	1	4	1	4	3	1	1	2	2
6	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	3	5
7	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	1	1	1	1
8	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
9	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1
10	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	1

Total alternative score **2,804.2**  
Percentage score **51%**

Worst score **925**  
Best Score **4625**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

## IMPACTS MATRIX: TECHNICAL ISSUES

### Eenzaamheid

<b>Ranking</b>	2	1	1	1	2
<b>Technical Issue</b>	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>					
1	4	2	2	3	4

Total alternative score	575.0
Percentage score	57%

Worst score	175
Best Score	875

### Naauwontkomen

<b>Ranking</b>	2	1	1	1	2
<b>Technical Issue</b>	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>					
1	3	3	3	3	4

Total alternative score	575.0
Percentage score	57%

Worst score	175
Best Score	875

### Appelvlakte

<b>Ranking</b>	2	1	1	1	2
<b>Technical Issue</b>	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>					
1	4	4	4	4	3

Total alternative score	650.0
Percentage score	68%

Worst score	175
Best Score	875

### Nelsonskop

<b>Ranking</b>	2	1	1	1	2
<b>Technical Issue</b>	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>					
1	3	4	4	4	3

Total alternative score	600.0
Percentage score	61%

Worst score	175
Best Score	875

### Ratings

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact

**IMPACTS MATRIX: ENVIRONMENTAL AND TECHNICAL ISSUES**

**Eenzaamheid**

Ranking	6	6	3	2	7	4	4	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	1	2
Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>																
1	4	5	3	4	2	4	3	1	3	2	4	4	2	2	3	4
2	3		4	4	2	4	3	1	3	4	1					
3	3			3	2	5	3	4	3	2	5					
4	3			4		3	3		4	4	2					
5						4	3			2	1					
6						5	3			2	5					
7						3	3			2						
8						4	3			2						
9						4	3			4						
10						3	4									
11						3										
12						5										

Total alternative score **4,178.8**  
 Percentage score **55%**

Worst score **1300**  
 Best Score **6500**

**Naauwontkomen**

Ranking	6	6	3	2	7	4	4	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	1	2
Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>																
1	5	5	3	3	2	4	3	2	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	4
2	3		3	3	2	4	3	2	3	4	2					
3	3			3	2	5	3	4	2	2	5					
4	5			4		3	3		4	4	5					
5						4	3			3	3					
6						5	3			2	4					
7						3	3			3						
8						4	3			4						
9						5	3			4						
10						4	4									
11						4										
12						4										

Total alternative score **4,428.1**  
 Percentage score **60%**

Worst score **1300**  
 Best Score **6500**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact



**Appelvlakte**

Ranking	6	6	3	2	7	4	4	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	1	2
Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>																
1	2	2	3	1	1	3	3	2	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	3
2	2		4	2	2	4	3	2	5	4	4					
3	2			3	1	4	3	4	4	3	3					
4	4			2		3	3		3	2	5					
5						4	3			3	5					
6						4	3			2	2					
7						5	3			2						
8						5	3			2						
9						5	3			2						
10						3	4									
11						5										
12						3										

Total alternative score **3,603.1**  
 Percentage score **44%**

Worst score **1300**  
 Best Score **6500**

**Nelsonskop**

Ranking	6	6	3	2	7	4	4	3	1	5	4	2	1	1	1	2
Issue	Ecology	Heritage resources	Agric potential	Water	Air quality	Noise	Land use	Tourism	Transport	Visual impact	Social impact	Wind effect	Coal conveyors	Ash conveyors	Removal of infrastructure	Geotech
<b>Potential impacts</b>																
1	1	1	3	2	1	1	5	3	5	2	2	3	4	4	4	3
2	2		3	2	2	5	3	3	4	4	5					
3	2			3	1	3	3	4	5	3	2					
4	1			4		3	3		3	2	5					
5						4	4			4	5					
6						4	3			2	1					
7						5	4			3						
8						5	3			2						
9						3	4			2						
10						5	4									
11						3										
12						3										

Total alternative score **3,320.4**  
 Percentage score **39%**

Worst score **1300**  
 Best Score **6500**

- 1 = Not suitable for development (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)
- 5 = Ideal site for development, or positive impact