FRESHWATER COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

Portion 5 of Farm 296, Keurboomstrand.

Arch Rock Resort



Prepared for Cape EAPrac

by

Dr. Jackie Dabrowski

(Confluent Environmental)



DECLARATION OF CONSULTANTS INDEPENDANCE

I consider myself bound to the rules and ethics of the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (SACNASP);

• At the time of conducting the study and compiling this report I did not have any interest, hidden or otherwise, in the proposed development that this study has reference to, except for financial compensation for work done in a professional capacity;

• Work performed for this study was done in an objective manner. Even if this study results in views and findings that are not favourable to the client/applicant, I will not be affected in any manner by the outcome of any environmental process of which this report may form a part, other than being members of the general public;

• I declare that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity in performing this specialist investigation. I do not necessarily object to or endorse any proposed developments, but aim to present facts, findings and recommendations based on relevant professional experience and scientific data;

• I do not have any influence over decisions made by the governing authorities;

• I undertake to disclose 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 a competent authority to such a relevant authority and the applicant;

• I have the necessary qualifications and guidance from professional experts in conducting specialist reports relevant to this application, including knowledge of the relevant Act, regulations and any guidelines that have relevance to the proposed activity;

• This document and all information contained herein is and will remain the intellectual property of Confluent Environmental. This document, in its entirety or any portion thereof, may not be altered in any manner or form, for any purpose without the specific and written consent of the specialist investigators.

• All the particulars furnished by me in this document are true and correct.

brow

Jackie Dabrowski (Ph.D., Pr.Sci.Nat. Aquatic Science) SACNASP Registration Number 115166 Co-director: Confluent Environmental (Pty) Ltd

Qualifications: BSc, BSc Honours (Entomology), MSc & PhD (Veterinary Science)

Expertise: > 10 years' experience working on aquatic ecosystems across South Africa, with a focus on the Southern Cape in the last 3 years. Includes research and consulting expertise, having published > 10 water-related research articles and compiled > 80 aquatic specialist reports. Research and consulting have been in a range of sectors including agriculture, urban developments, linear structures, renewable energy, conservation, and mining.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT	2
1.2	SCOPE OF WORK	3
1.3	ASSUMPTIONS AND EXCLUSIONS	3
2.	APPROACH	3
3.	DESKTOP SURVEY	4
4.	SITE VISIT	5
5.	AQUATIC BIODIVERSITY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT	6
6.	REFERENCES	7

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Site development plan on Portion 5/296 Keurboomstrand.	.2
Figure 2: Location of the property in relation to mapped freshwater features.	5
Figure 3: Photographs indicating the vegetation on the site	.6



1. INTRODUCTION

Confluent Environmental was appointed by Cape EAPrac to undertake a site verification for the re-development of the Arch Rock resort, in Keurboomstrand, Plettenberg Bay, in the Western Cape (Figure 1). The site has been classified as having '**Low**' aquatic biodiversity by the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DFFE) screening tool.

The scope of work for this report is guided by the legislative requirements of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the National Water Act (NWA).





1.1 National Environmental Management Act

According to the protocols specified in GN 320 (Protocol for the specialist assessment and minimum report content requirements for environmental impacts on aquatic biodiversity) of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA; Act No. 107 of 1998), assessment and



reporting requirements for aquatic biodiversity are associated with a level of environmental sensitivity identified by the national web-based environmental screening tool (screening tool). An applicant intending to undertake an activity identified in the scope of this protocol on a site identified by the screening tool as being of:

- **Very High** sensitivity for aquatic biodiversity, must submit an Aquatic Biodiversity Specialist Assessment; or
- Low sensitivity for aquatic biodiversity, must submit an Aquatic Biodiversity Compliance Statement.

The screening tool classified the site as being of **Low** aquatic biodiversity as it is <u>not</u> located in a Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area (FEPA; Nel *et al.*, 2011), or a Strategic Water Source Area, and has no mapped watercourses (wetlands or drainage lines) in or near the property boundary.

According to the protocol, prior to commencing with a specialist assessment a site sensitivity verification must be undertaken to confirm the sensitivity of the site as indicated by the screening tool:

- Where the information gathered from the site sensitivity verification differs from the screening tool designation of **Very High** aquatic biodiversity sensitivity, and it is found to be of a **Low** sensitivity, an Aquatic Biodiversity Compliance Statement must be submitted.
- Similarly, where the information gathered from the site sensitivity verification differs from the screening tool designation of **Low** aquatic biodiversity sensitivity, and it is found to be of a **Very High** sensitivity, an Aquatic Biodiversity Specialist Assessment must be submitted.

1.2 Scope of Work

The objectives of this assessment included the following:

- To undertake a desktop analysis and site inspection to verify the sensitivity of aquatic biodiversity as **Very High** or **Low**; and
- Compile an Aquatic Biodiversity Compliance Statement or Aquatic Biodiversity Specialist Assessment based on the site verification of the sensitivity of the site.

1.3 Assumptions and exclusions

• Much of the present site has been transformed as a tourist resort and it is therefore not possible to determine whether any small watercourses were present on the site and subsequently transformed.

2. APPROACH

The following rationale was adopted to determine the sensitivity of aquatic biodiversity within the footprint of the site:

• In the event that unmapped watercourses are confirmed to fall within the development footprint then the site sensitivity is confirmed as **Very High** and a full specialist freshwater assessment is required; and



• In the event that no watercourses are identified within the development footprint the site sensitivity is confirmed as **Low** and an Aquatic Compliance statement is required.

The determination of the site sensitivity relied upon the following approaches:

- Interrogation of available desktop resources including:
 - DWS spatial layers;
 - National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas (NFEPA) spatial layers (Nel et al., 2011);
 - National Wetland Map 5 and Confidence Map (CSIR, 2018)
 - Western Cape Biodiversity and Spatial Plan (WCBSP) for Mossel Bay (CapeNature, 2017).
- A site visit was undertaken on 18 November 2021, during which time the following activities were undertaken:
 - Identification and classification of watercourses within the footprint of the site and within 500m of the site according to methods detailed in Ollis *et al.* (2013);
 - Soil augering to confirm the presence of soil indicators (DWAF, 2005) that may indicate the presence of a wetland (if applicable); and
 - Identification of hydrophilic plant species that may indicate the presence of wetland plant species (if applicable).

3. DESKTOP SURVEY

The site falls within quaternary catchment K70A. No freshwater features are indicated to occur within the footprint of the property or within close proximity to the property (Figure 2).





Figure 2: Location of the property in relation to mapped freshwater features.

4. SITE VISIT

The site was visited on 18 November 2021 which is considered early summer. The area has experienced good rainfall, and therefore any aquatic features at the site would be expected to be fully apparent. The entire site was inspected for evidence of a wetland, drainage line, or any other watercourse. The footprint of the site is already developed as a tourist resort, and the remaining natural areas were all terrestrial with elements of coastal dune and forest vegetation. Neighbouring properties on all sides were also inspected. No freshwater features were identified within the footprint of the property or within 500m of the property development.







Figure 3: Photographs indicating the vegetation on the site.

5. AQUATIC BIODIVERSITY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

Based on the results of the desktop review and the site survey, the sensitivity of aquatic biodiversity on Portion 5/296 can be regarded as **Low**. The main factors influencing the statement include the following:

- The development is not located in an area designated as a SWSA or a FEPA ;
- No freshwater features were identified within the footprint area of the site or within close proximity (i.e. at least 500 m) of the site.



6. REFERENCES

- Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR; 2018). National Wetland Map 5 and Confidence Map [Vector] 2018. Available from the Biodiversity GIS website, downloaded on 30 September 2020.
- Nel, J.L., Driver, A., Strydom, W.F., Maherry, A., Peterson, C., Hill, L., Roux, D.J., Nienaber, S., van Deventer, H., Swartz, E. and Smith-Adao, L.B. (2011) Atlas of freshwater ecosystem priority areas in South Africa: Maps to support sustainable development of water resources. Water Research Commission Report No. TT 500/11.
- Ollis, D., Snaddon, K., Job, N., & Mbona, N. (2013). Classification system for wetlands and other aquatic ecosystems in South Africa. South African National Biodiversity Institute.

