



 [info@soilza.co.za](mailto:info@soilza.co.za)

 [www.soilza.co.za](http://www.soilza.co.za)

 1A Wolfe St Wynberg  
Cape Town, 7800  
South Africa

---

**SITE SENSITIVITY VERIFICATION  
AND  
AGRICULTURAL COMPLIANCE STATEMENT  
FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT ON PORTION 50 OF FARM 202  
HANSMOESKRAAL, NEAR GEORGE,  
WESTERN CAPE**

**Report by  
Johann Lanz & David Lakey**

**12 March 2025**

## Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	3
1 Introduction.....	4
2 Project description .....	5
3 Terms of reference.....	5
4 Methodology of study .....	6
5 Assumptions, uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data .....	6
6 Applicable legislation and permit requirements .....	6
7 Baseline description of the agro-ecosystem .....	7
7.1 Assessment of the agricultural production potential .....	11
8 Site sensitivity verification.....	11
9 Assessment of the agricultural impact.....	14
9.1 Impact identification and assessment.....	14
9.2 Cumulative impact assessment.....	15
9.3 Assessment of alternatives .....	15
10 Mitigation .....	15
11 Additional aspects required in an agricultural assessment.....	16
11.1 Micro-siting.....	16
11.2 Confirmation of linear activity exclusion .....	16
12 Conclusion: Agricultural Compliance Statement.....	16
13 References .....	18
Appendix 1: Specialist Curriculum Vitae .....	19
Appendix 2: Specialist declaration form August 2023 .....	20
Appendix 3: SACNASP registration certificate .....	23
Appendix 4: Land type data .....	24

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the proposed development is acceptable because it leads to no loss of future agricultural production potential.

This assessment therefore disputes the high sensitivity classification of the site by the screening tool and verifies the entire site as being of medium agricultural sensitivity because of its assessed cropping potential.

Furthermore, factors other than soil capability also constrain the potential of the property to practically deliver agricultural produce and therefore influence its agricultural production potential.

These factors include:

- the small size of the property (3.4 ha) prevents economies of scale,
- municipal ownership of the land which would also discourage the necessary investment to establish cropland,
- the fact that land use planning designates the site for non-agricultural use.

For these reasons, the site will never be viably utilised for agricultural production and its potential is therefore assessed here as non-existent.

An agricultural impact is a change to the future agricultural production potential of land. This is primarily caused by the exclusion of agriculture from the footprint of the development. In this case, the entire property boundary is considered to be below the threshold for needing to be conserved as agricultural production land because of the limitations that make it unsuitable as viable cropland. The proposed development on this land will result in no loss of future agricultural production potential in terms of national food security. The overall negative agricultural impact of the development (loss of future agricultural production potential) is assessed here as being of low significance and as acceptable.

From an agricultural impact point of view, it is recommended that the proposed development be approved.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Environmental and change of land use authorisation is being sought for the proposed mixed use development on portion 50 of farm 202 Hansmoeskraal near George, Western Cape (see location in Figure 1). In terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998 - NEMA), an application for environmental authorisation requires an agricultural assessment. In this case, based on the medium agricultural sensitivity of the property boundary (see Section 7), the level of agricultural assessment required by the protocol is an Agricultural Compliance Statement.



**Figure 1.** Locality map of the property boundary (blue outline), southwest of George.

The purpose of an agricultural assessment is to answer the question:

Will the proposed development cause a significant reduction in agricultural production potential, and most importantly, will it result in a loss of arable land?

Section 9 of this report unpacks this question, particularly with respect to what constitutes a significant reduction. To answer the above question, it is necessary to determine the existing agricultural production potential of the land that will be impacted, and specifically whether it is viable arable land or not. This is done in Section 7 of this report. Sections 7 and 9 of this report directly address the above question and therefore contain the essence and most important part of the agricultural impact assessment.

## 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project is for the mixed-use development on portion 50 of farm 202, located within the community of Pacaltsdorp, south of the N2. The property boundary is located within the urban edge of the George Local Municipality, adjacent to Beach Road.

The project will cause the permanent exclusion of any potential future agricultural production from the entire site (as shown in Figures 2 and 6). Once agriculture is excluded from the site, there can be no further on-site agricultural impact. There is also no off-site agricultural impact. The design and layout of the development within the property is therefore of no relevance to agricultural impacts and it is unnecessary to consider it any further in this assessment. All that is of relevance is the loss of the total site to potential future agricultural production.

## 3 TERMS OF REFERENCE

The terms of reference for this study are to fulfill the requirements of the *Protocol for the specialist assessment and minimum report content requirements of environmental impacts on agricultural resources*, gazetted on 20 March 2020 in GN 320 (in terms of Sections 24(5)(A) and (H) and 44 of NEMA, 1998).

The terms of reference for an Agricultural Compliance Statement, as stipulated in the agricultural protocol, are listed below, and the section number of this report which fulfils each stipulation is given after it in brackets.

1. The Agricultural Compliance Statement must be prepared by a soil scientist or agricultural specialist registered with the South African Council for Natural Scientific Professions (SACNASP) (**Appendix 3**).
2. The compliance statement must:
  1. be applicable to the preferred site and proposed development footprint (**Figures 2 and 6**);
  2. confirm that the site is of “low” or “medium” sensitivity for agriculture (**Section 7**); and
  3. indicate whether or not the proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the agricultural production capability of the site (**Section 12**).
3. The Agricultural Compliance Statement must contain, as a minimum, the following information:
  1. details and relevant experience as well as the SACNASP registration number of the soil scientist or agricultural specialist preparing the statement including a curriculum vitae (**Appendix 1**);
  2. a signed statement of independence by the specialist (**Appendix 2**);

3. a map showing the proposed development footprint (including supporting infrastructure) with a 50 m buffered development envelope, overlaid on the agricultural sensitivity map generated by the screening tool **(Figure 6)**;
4. confirmation from the specialist that all reasonable measures have been taken through micro-siting to avoid or minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities **(Section 11.1)**;
5. a substantiated statement from the soil scientist or agricultural specialist on the acceptability, or not, of the proposed development and a recommendation on the approval, or not of the proposed development **(Section 12)**;
6. any conditions to which this statement is subjected **(Section 12)**;
7. in the case of a linear activity, confirmation from the agricultural specialist or soil scientist, that in their opinion, based on the mitigation and remedial measures proposed, the land can be returned to the current state within two years of completion of the construction phase **(Section 11.2)**;
8. where required, proposed impact management outcomes or any monitoring requirements for inclusion in the EMPr **(Section 10)**; and
9. a description of the assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data **(Section 5)**.

#### **4 METHODOLOGY OF STUDY**

The assessment was based on an on-site investigation conducted on 26 June 2025. It was also informed by existing climate, soil, and agricultural potential data for the site (see references). The aim of the on-site assessment was to verify current cropping status, agricultural land use, and agricultural conditions across the site. An assessment of soils and long-term agricultural potential is in no way affected by the season in which the assessment is made, and therefore the date on which this assessment was done has no bearing on its results. The level of agricultural assessment is considered entirely adequate for an understanding of on-site agricultural production potential for the purposes of this assessment.

#### **5 ASSUMPTIONS, UNCERTAINTIES OR GAPS IN KNOWLEDGE OR DATA**

There are no specific assumptions, uncertainties or gaps in knowledge or data that affect the findings of this study.

#### **6 APPLICABLE LEGISLATION AND PERMIT REQUIREMENTS**

This section identifies all applicable agricultural legislation and permit requirements over and above what is required in terms of NEMA.

The project is likely to require agricultural approval (or at least comment from Department of Agriculture) as part of the required approval in terms of applicable municipal land use legislation, as well as in terms of the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act (Act 70 of 1970 - SALA), because it is on land currently zoned for agriculture.

## 7 BASELINE DESCRIPTION OF THE AGRO-ECOSYSTEM

The purpose of this section is firstly to present the baseline information that controls the agricultural production potential of the site and then to assess that potential. Agricultural production potential, and particularly cropping potential, is one of three factors that determines the significance of an agricultural impact, together with size of footprint and duration of impact (see Section 9).

All the important parameters that control the agricultural production potential of the site are given in Table 1. Soil data is given in Appendix 4. A layout of the development site is given in Figure 2 and photographs of site conditions are shown in Figures 3 to 4.

The site is within a Protected Agricultural Area (PAA) (DALRRD, 2020). A PAA is a demarcated area in which the climate, terrain, and soil are generally conducive for agricultural production and which, historically, or in a regional context, has made important contributions to the production of the various crops that are grown across South Africa. Within PAAs, the protection of viable, arable land is considered a priority for the protection of food security in South Africa. However, PAAs are demarcated broadly, not at a fine scale, and there may therefore be much variation of agricultural production potential within a PAA. All land within these demarcated areas is not necessarily of sufficient agricultural potential to be suitable for crop production, due to finer scale terrain, soil, and other constraints. The proposed development footprint is located on land that is not viable for cropland (see Section 7.1). This land does not therefore deserve prioritised protection as agricultural production land (see Section 9.1), even though it is within a demarcated PAA.

**Table 1:** Parameters that control and/or describe the agricultural production potential of the site.

	Parameter	Value
Climate	Köppen-Geiger climate description (Beck <i>et al</i> , 2018)	Temperate, no dry season, warm summer
	Mean Annual Rainfall (mm) (Schulze, 2009)	800
	Reference Crop Evaporation Annual Total (mm) (Schulze, 2009)	930
	Climate capability classification (out of 9) (DAFF, 2017)	7 (high)

	Parameter	Value
Terrain	Terrain type	Urban residential
	Terrain morphological unit	Valley bottom
	Slope gradients (%)	0 to 1
	Altitude (m)	203
	Terrain capability classification (out of 9) (DAFF, 2017)	5 (moderate) to 6 (moderate-high)
Soil	Geology (DAFF, 2002)	Mainly gneissic granite and granodiorite.
	Land type (DAFF, 2002)	Db 33, Db114
	Description of the soils	Very shallow to moderately deep, very light to medium soils with underlying structured clay.
	Dominant soil forms	Escourt, Sterkspruit
	Soil capability classification (out of 9) (DAFF, 2017)	4 (low-moderate)
	Soil limitations	Drainage
Land use	Agricultural land use in the surrounding area	None
	Agricultural land use on the site	None
General	Long-term grazing capacity (ha/LSU) (DAFF, 2018)	72
	Land capability classification (out of 15) (DAFF, 2017)	8 (moderate) to 9 (moderate-high)
	Within Protected Agricultural Area (DALRRD, 2020)	Yes, Grootbrak George PAA, Rating B, Irrigated





**Figure 2.** *Satellite image map of the property boundary.*



**Figure 3.** *Typical site conditions.*





**Figure 4.** *Typical site conditions.*



**Figure 5.** Location of the development within the Grootbrak – George Protected Agricultural Area.

### 7.1 Assessment of the agricultural production potential

This assessment of the agricultural production potential of the site is based on an integration of the different parameters in Table 1 above.

Furthermore, factors other than soil capability also constrain the potential of the property to practically deliver agricultural produce and therefore influence its agricultural production potential.

These factors include:

- the small size of the property (3.4 ha) prevents economies of scale,
- municipal ownership of the land which would also discourage the necessary investment to establish cropland,
- the fact that land use planning designates the site for non-agricultural use.

For these reasons, the site will never be viably utilised for agricultural production and its potential is therefore assessed here as non-existent.

## 8 SITE SENSITIVITY VERIFICATION

A specialist agricultural assessment is required to include a verification of the agricultural sensitivity

of the development site as per the sensitivity categories used by the web-based environmental screening tool of the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE). The screening tool's classification of sensitivity is merely an initial indication of what the sensitivity of a piece of land might be. What the screening tool attempts to indicate is whether the land is suitable for crop production (high and very high sensitivity) or unsuitable for crop production (low and medium sensitivity). To do this, the screening tool uses two independent criteria, from two independent data sets, which are indicators of suitability for crop production but are limited in that the first is outdated and the second is fairly coarse, modelled data which is not accurate at site scale. The two criteria are:

1. Whether the land is classified as cropland or not on the field crop boundary data set (Crop Estimates Consortium, 2019). All classified cropland is, by definition, either high or very high sensitivity.
2. Its land capability rating as per the Department of Agriculture's updated and refined, country-wide land capability mapping (DAFF, 2017). Land capability is defined as the combination of soil, climate, and terrain suitability factors for supporting rain-fed agricultural production. The direct relationship between land capability rating, agricultural sensitivity, and rain-fed cropping suitability is shown in Table 2.

These two inputs operate independently, and the screening tool's agricultural sensitivity is simply determined by whichever of these two gives the highest sensitivity rating. The agricultural sensitivity of the site, as classified by the screening tool, is shown in Figure 6.

The true agricultural sensitivity of any land is equivalent to its suitability for crop production, which in turn directly determines how important it is to conserve that land as agricultural production land. To determine suitability for crop production, and hence sensitivity, requires a site-specific assessment rather than a reliance on limited data sets.


It is important to note that agricultural sensitivity is not necessarily correlated with the significance of an agricultural impact and is therefore often of very limited value for assessing agricultural impact. What is of importance to an agricultural assessment, rather than the site sensitivity verification, is its assessment of the impact significance.



**Table 2:** Relationship between land capability, agricultural sensitivity, and rain-fed cropping suitability.

Land capability value	Agricultural sensitivity	Rain-fed cropping suitability	
		Summer rainfall areas	Winter rainfall areas
1 - 5	Low	Unsuitable	Unsuitable
6	Medium		
7			Suitable
8	High	Suitable	
9 - 10			
11 - 15	Very High		

**Note:** There is an error in the screening tool whereby a land capability of 8 is classified as medium sensitivity, but according to NEMA's agricultural protocol, should in fact be classified as high sensitivity. This assessment follows the agricultural protocol definition and classifies a value of 8 as high sensitivity.



**Figure 6.** The assessed property (blue outline) overlaid on agricultural sensitivity, as given by the screening tool (green = low; yellow = medium; red = high; dark red = very high).

The screening tool classifies the assessed site as ranging from medium to high agricultural sensitivity

and therefore classifies the overall site sensitivity, which is the highest sensitivity encountered across the site, as high. The high sensitivity classification by the screening tool is due to some land being classified as high sensitivity because of its land capability rating (see Table 2). However, as shown in Section 7, the site is not at all suitable for viable crop production and its true sensitivity, as assessed on the ground, is therefore medium. This assessment therefore disputes the high sensitivity classification of the site by the screening tool and verifies the entire site as being of medium agricultural sensitivity because of its assessed cropping potential.

## **9 ASSESSMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL IMPACT**

### **9.1 Impact identification and assessment**

It should be noted that an Agricultural Compliance Statement is not required to formally rate agricultural impacts by way of impact assessment tables.

An agricultural impact is a change to the future agricultural production potential of land. In most developments, including the one being assessed here, this is primarily caused by the exclusion of agriculture from the footprint of the development. The significance of an agricultural impact is a direct function of the following three factors:

1. the size of the footprint of land from which agriculture will be excluded (or the footprint that will have its potential decreased)
2. the baseline production potential (particularly cropping potential) of that land
3. the length of time for which agriculture will be excluded (or for which potential will be decreased).

The most significant loss of agricultural land possible, for any development anywhere in the country, is of high yielding cropland, and the least significant possible, is of low carrying capacity grazing land.

Cropping potential is highlighted in factor 2 above, because the threshold, above which it is a priority to conserve land for agricultural production, is determined by the scarcity of arable crop production land in South Africa (approximately only 13% of the country's surface area) and the relative abundance of the rest of agricultural land across the country that is only good enough to be used for grazing. If land can support viable and sustainable crop production, then it is considered to be above the threshold and is a priority for being conserved as agricultural production land. If land is unable to support viable and sustainable crop production, then it is considered to be below the threshold and of much lower priority for being conserved.

In this case, the entire property boundary is considered to be below the threshold for needing to be

conserved as agricultural production land because of the limitations that make it unsuitable as viable cropland. The proposed development on this land will result in no loss of future agricultural production potential in terms of national food security. The overall negative agricultural impact of the development (loss of future agricultural production potential) is assessed here as being of low significance and as acceptable.

## **9.2 Cumulative impact assessment**

Specialist assessments for environmental authorisation are required to include an assessment of cumulative impacts. The cumulative impact of a development is the impact that development will have when its impact is added to the incremental impacts of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future activities that will affect the same environment. The potential cumulative agricultural impact of importance is a regional loss of future agricultural production potential.

Agricultural land throughout South Africa is under inevitable pressure from various non-agricultural land uses, including urban expansion. The cumulative impact of agricultural land loss is significant. However, the agricultural priority should be to conserve future agricultural production, not simply agriculturally zoned land. As has been shown above, the site has no current agricultural production and no capacity for future agricultural production. Therefore, it is a site which can be used for non-agricultural purposes with no loss of agricultural production potential. The cumulative agricultural impact of the proposed development is therefore assessed as being of low significance and therefore as acceptable. The development will not have an unacceptable negative impact on the agricultural production capability of the area, and it is therefore recommended, from a cumulative agricultural impact perspective, that the development be approved.

## **9.3 Assessment of alternatives**

Specialist assessments for environmental authorisation are required to include a comparative assessment of alternatives, including the no-go alternative. Because there is no viable cropland within the assessed site, the exact positions of all proposed infrastructure within it will make absolutely no difference to agricultural impacts. Any alternative layouts within the same assessed site will have equal agricultural impact and are assessed as equally acceptable.

The no-go alternative considers impacts that will occur to the agricultural environment in the absence of the proposed development. There are no agricultural impacts of the no-go alternative, but this is not significantly different from the impact of the development, and so from an agricultural impact perspective, there is no preferred alternative between the no-go and the development.

## **10 MITIGATION**

The most important and effective mitigation of agricultural impacts for any development is avoidance of viable croplands. This development has already applied this mitigation by selecting a site on which there are not viable croplands. No mitigation measures are required for the protection of agricultural production potential on the site because the development poses no degradation risk to agricultural resources.

## **11 ADDITIONAL ASPECTS REQUIRED IN AN AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT**

### **11.1 Micro-siting**

The agricultural protocol requires confirmation that all reasonable measures have been taken through micro-siting to minimize fragmentation and disturbance of agricultural activities. Because agriculture will be permanently excluded from the entire site, micro-siting will make no material difference to agricultural impacts and disturbance.

### **11.2 Confirmation of linear activity exclusion**

If linear infrastructure has been given exclusion from complying with certain requirements of the agricultural protocol because of its linear nature, the protocol requires confirmation that the land impacted by that linear infrastructure can be returned to the current state within two years of completion of the construction phase. No such exclusion applies to this project.

## **12 CONCLUSION: AGRICULTURAL COMPLIANCE STATEMENT**

The overall conclusion of this assessment is that the proposed development is acceptable because it leads to no loss of future agricultural production potential.

This assessment therefore disputes the high sensitivity classification of the site by the screening tool and verifies the entire site as being of medium agricultural sensitivity because of its assessed cropping potential.

Furthermore, factors other than soil capability also constrain the potential of the property to practically deliver agricultural produce and therefore influence its agricultural production potential.

These factors include:

- the small size of the property (3.4 ha) prevents economies of scale,
- municipal ownership of the land which would also discourage the necessary investment to establish cropland,



- the fact that land use planning designates the site for non-agricultural use.

For these reasons, the site will never be viably utilised for agricultural production and its potential is therefore assessed here as non-existent.

An agricultural impact is a change to the future agricultural production potential of land. This is primarily caused by the exclusion of agriculture from the footprint of the development. In this case, the entire property boundary is considered to be below the threshold for needing to be conserved as agricultural production land because of the limitations that make it unsuitable as viable cropland. The proposed development on this land will result in no loss of future agricultural production potential in terms of national food security. The overall negative agricultural impact of the development (loss of future agricultural production potential) is assessed here as being of low significance and as acceptable.

From an agricultural impact point of view, it is recommended that the proposed development be approved. The conclusion of this assessment on the acceptability of the proposed development and the recommendation for its approval is not subject to any conditions.

### 13 REFERENCES

Beck, H.E., N.E. Zimmermann, T.R. McVicar, N. Vergopolan, A. Berg, E.F. Wood. 2018. Present and future Köppen-Geiger climate classification maps at 1-km resolution, Nature Scientific Data. Available at: <https://gis.elsenburg.com/apps/cfm/>.

Crop Estimates Consortium, 2019. *Field Crop Boundary data layer, 2019*. Pretoria. Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

Department of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). 2018. Long-term grazing capacity map for South Africa developed in line with the provisions of Regulation 10 of the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, Act no 43 of 1983 (CARA), available on Cape Farm Mapper. Available at: <https://gis.elsenburg.com/apps/cfm/>

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). 2017. National land capability evaluation raster data layer, 2017. Pretoria.

Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). 2002. National land type inventories data set. Pretoria.

Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD). 2020. Protected agricultural areas – Spatial data layer. 2020. Pretoria.

Schulze, R.E. 2009. South African Atlas of Agrohydrology and Climatology, available on Cape Farm Mapper. Available at: <https://gis.elsenburg.com/apps/cfm/>

Soil Classification Working Group. 2018. Soil Classification: A Natural and Anthropogenic System for South Africa. ARC-Institute for Soil, Climate and Water, Pretoria.

## APPENDIX 1: SPECIALIST CURRICULUM VITAE

### Johann Lanz Curriculum Vitae

#### Education

M.Sc. (Environmental Geochemistry)	University of Cape Town	1996 - 1997
B.Sc. Agriculture (Soil Science, Chemistry)	University of Stellenbosch	1992 - 1995
BA (English, Environmental & Geographical Science)	University of Cape Town	1989 - 1991
Matric Exemption	Wynberg Boy's High School	1983

#### Professional work experience

I have been registered as a Professional Natural Scientist (Pri.Sci.Nat.) in the field of soil science since 2012 (registration number 400268/12) and am a member of the Soil Science Society of South Africa.

#### **Soil & Agricultural Consulting      Self employed      2002 - present**

Within the past 5 years of running my soil and agricultural consulting business, I have completed more than 170 agricultural assessments (EIAs, SEAs, EMPRs) in all 9 provinces for renewable energy, mining, electrical grid infrastructure, urban, and agricultural developments. I was the appointed agricultural specialist for the nation-wide SEAs for wind and solar PV developments, electrical grid infrastructure, and gas pipelines. My regular clients include: Zutari; CSIR; SiVEST; SLR; WSP; Arcus; SRK; Environamics; Royal Haskoning DHV; ABO; Enertrag; WKN-Windcurrent; JG Afrika; Mainstream; Redcap; G7; Mulilo; and Tiptrans. Recent agricultural clients for soil resource evaluations and mapping include Cederberg Wines; Western Cape Department of Agriculture; Vogelfontein Citrus; De Grendel Estate; Zewenwacht Wine Estate; and Goedgedacht Olives. In 2018 I completed a ground-breaking case study that measured the agricultural impact of existing wind farms in the Eastern Cape.

#### **Soil Science Consultant      Agricultural Consultants International (Tinie du Preez)      1998 - 2001**

Responsible for providing all aspects of a soil science technical consulting service directly to clients in the wine, fruit and environmental industries all over South Africa, and in Chile, South America.

#### **Contracting Soil Scientist      De Beers Namaqualand Mines      July 1997 - Jan 1998**

Completed a contract to advise soil rehabilitation and re-vegetation of mined areas.

#### Publications

- Lanz, J. 2012. Soil health: sustaining Stellenbosch's roots. In: M Swilling, B Sebitosi & R Loots (eds). *Sustainable Stellenbosch: opening dialogues*. Stellenbosch: SunMedia.
- Lanz, J. 2010. Soil health indicators: physical and chemical. *South African Fruit Journal*, April / May 2010 issue.
- Lanz, J. 2009. Soil health constraints. *South African Fruit Journal*, August / September 2009 issue.
- Lanz, J. 2009. Soil carbon research. *AgriProbe*, Department of Agriculture.
- Lanz, J. 2005. Special Report: Soils and wine quality. *Wineland Magazine*.

I am a reviewing scientist for the *South African Journal of Plant and Soil*.



## forestry, fisheries & the environment

Department:  
Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment  
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X447, Pretoria, 0001, Environment House, 473 Steve Biko Road, Pretoria, 0002 Tel: +27 12 399 9000, Fax: +27 86 625 1042

### APPENDIX 2: SPECIALIST DECLARATION FORM AUGUST 2023

Specialist Declaration form for assessments undertaken for application for authorisation in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended (the Regulations)

#### REPORT TITLE: THE PROPOSED PETROL STATION DEVELOPMENT ON ERF 7379, NEAR GEORGE, WESTERN CAPE

##### Kindly note the following:

1. This form must always be used for assessment that are in support of applications that must be subjected to Basic Assessment or Scoping & Environmental Impact Reporting, where this Department is the Competent Authority.
2. This form is current as of August 2023. It is the responsibility of the Applicant / Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to ascertain whether subsequent versions of the form have been published or produced by the Competent Authority. The latest available Departmental templates are available at <https://www.dffe.gov.za/documents/forms>.
3. An electronic copy of the signed declaration form must be appended to all Draft and Final Reports submitted to the department for consideration.
4. The specialist must be aware of and comply with '*the Procedures for the assessment and minimum criteria for reporting on identified environmental themes in terms of sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the act, when applying for environmental authorisation - GN 320/2020*', where applicable.

#### 1. SPECIALIST INFORMATION

Title of Specialist Assessment	Agricultural Assessment
Specialist Company Name	SoilZA – sole proprietor
Specialist Name	Johann Lanz
Specialist Identity Number	6607045174089
Specialist Qualifications:	M.Sc. (Environmental Geochemistry)
Professional affiliation/registration:	Registered Professional Natural Scientist (Pr.Sci.Nat.) Reg. no. 400268/12 Member of the Soil Science Society of South Africa
Physical address:	1a Wolfe Street, Wynberg, Cape Town, 7800
Postal address:	1a Wolfe Street, Wynberg, Cape Town, 7800
Telephone	Not applicable
Cell phone	+27 82 927 9018
E-mail	johann@soilza.co.za

## 2. DECLARATION BY THE SPECIALIST

I, **Johann Lanz** declare that –

- I act as the independent specialist in this application;
- I am aware of the procedures and requirements for the assessment and minimum criteria for reporting on identified environmental themes in terms of sections 24(5)(a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), 1998, as amended, when applying for environmental authorisation which were promulgated in Government Notice No. 320 of 20 March 2020 (i.e. “the Protocols”) and in Government Notice No. 1150 of 30 October 2020.
- 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 form 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 NEMA Act.



---

Signature of the Specialist

SoilZA (sole proprietor)

---

Name of Company:

18 February 2025

---

Date

3. UNDERTAKING UNDER OATH/ AFFIRMATION

I, **Johann Lanz**, swear under oath that all the information submitted or to be submitted for the purposes of this application is true and correct.



Signature of the Specialist

**SoilZA – sole proprietor**

Name of Company

**18/02/2025**

Date



Signature of the Commissioner of Oaths

**2023/02/18.**

Date



APPENDIX 3: SACNASP REGISTRATION CERTIFICATE



**herewith certifies that**

**Johan Lanz**

Registration Number: 400268/12

**is a registered scientist**

in terms of section 20(3) of the Natural Scientific Professions Act, 2003  
(Act 27 of 2003)

in the following field(s) of practice (Schedule 1 of the Act)


Soil Science (Professional Natural Scientist)

Effective 15 August 2012

Expires 31 March 2025



Chairperson



Chief Executive Officer



To verify this certificate scan this code

## APPENDIX 4: LAND TYPE DATA

**Table 3:** Land type soil data

Land type	Soil series (forms)	Depth (mm)	Clay % A horizon	Clay % B horizon	Depth limiting layer	% of land type
Db33	Es	250 - 700	3 - 12	30 - 65	pr	50,0
Db33	Ss	250 - 400	3 - 12	40 - 60	pr	13,0
Db33	Lo	500 - 800	6 - 15	20 - 35	sp	9,0
Db33	Kd	500 - 800	8 - 20	40 - 50	gc	8,5
Db33	Sw	200 - 500	10 - 20	40 - 60	vp	4,5
Db33	Wa	400 - 600	3 - 12		hp	4,1
Db33	We	300 - 500	6 - 15	10 - 35	sp	3,0
Db33	Gs	400 - 600	3 - 12	10 - 20	so	2,5
Db33	S					2,5
Db33	R					1,0
Db33	Ms	50 - 200	3 - 6		R	1,0
Db33	Hu	800 > 1200	10 - 25	20 - 45	R	0,9
Db114	Es	400 - 700	3 - 10	40 - 60	pr	51,4
Db114	Ss	250 - 500	6 - 15	35 - 55	pr	12,3
Db114	Kd	500 - 800	3 - 12	40 - 55	gc	8,7
Db114	Sw	200 - 500	10 - 20	30 - 60	vp	3,7
Db114	Gs	250 - 600	3 - 12	10 - 25	so	3,3
Db114	R					2,9
Db114	Lo	600 - 800	6 - 10	10 - 15	sp	2,8
Db114	Ms	50 - 200	6 - 12		R	2,6
Db114	Du	> 1200	10 - 15			2,4
Db114	Hu	600 > 1200	15 - 20	20 - 35	R	2,3
Db114	Wa	400 - 600	3 - 6		hp	2,0
Db114	S					1,8
Db114	We	500 - 700	8 - 15	10 - 35	sp	1,6
Db114	Fw	> 1200	3 - 6			1,1
Db114	Lt	> 1200	3 - 6	8 - 12		1,1



