

Appendix E4: Comments & Responses Report

Table 1: Comments from Interested and Affected Parties on the Background Information Document (BID)

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response
Comments relating to the process		
J Baeyens - Capeco	The Background Information Document was only forwarded to Capeco on 18 February 2016, two working days before the deadline for comment.	[SRK] Please refer to Appendix E2 containing a delivery receipt for the BID forwarded per email to Capeco on 20 January 2016. The email of 18 February 2016 was a reminder of the deadline for comment on the BID, which expired at 12h00 on 22 February 2016. Capeco was thus afforded 32 calendar days to submit their initial comments. Further opportunities to comment will be provided on the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) as well as the Post-Application DBAR.
Cllr G Rautenbach – Ward 8 Councillor	Why was the ward 8 office not informed of the project?	[SRK] Please refer to Appendix E2 containing a delivery receipt for the BID serving as notice of the project and requesting initial comments, forwarded to the Ward 8 office on 20 January 2016. A reminder of the deadline was also forwarded on 18 February 2016. SRK has, incorporated the Councillor's comments received on 2 March 2016. Further opportunities to comment will be provided on the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) as well as the Post-Application DBAR.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Require the names and contact details of all IAPs and stakeholders.	[SRK] A list of all notified and registered parties appears in Appendix E5 of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report).
J Baeyens - Capeco	The BID does not specify crucial elements pertaining to electricity masts, location of servitudes, design etc.	[SRK] The purpose of the BID is to alert potential IAPs of the proposed project. More detailed information will be provided in the Pre-Application DBAR (this report).
M Crocker – Capeco W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Regulations pertaining to EIA state that applicant must first obtain written consent of landowner to undertake the activity before applying for environmental authorisation. No written consent has been sought or obtained in respect of erf 1226 Fairview. No servitude is registered in favour of the municipality or Eskom over the property and no special conditions in favour of Eskom is reflected on the title deed.	[SRK] According to regulation 39(2) of the NEMA 2014 EIA Regulations, written consent is not required for linear activities. In this Basic Assessment process all landowners were notified of the proposed activity and will have various opportunities to comment on the assessment. The registration of a servitude is a process that falls outside the EIA Regulations and will be conducted by the NMBM.
Cllr G Rautenbach – Ward 8 Councillor	When was the public consultation for the project conducted?	[SRK] The public participation process is still ongoing and commenced with the distribution of the BID. The BID (Appendix E1) contains a flow diagram which sets out the process and indicates further opportunities for public input.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response
Comments relating to design		
E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident	Section A to B should not require to be overhead as an underground pipe (conduit) exists.	[NMBM] The option of underground cables for additional sections of the route is not financially feasible. [SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR for a discussion on project alternatives.
M Crocker - Capeco	Capeco will not permit overhead cables to run through its property (erf 1126 Fariview), however will accommodate proposal if electrical supply is placed underground. We will consider option of underground installation from numbers G,E1 to E and GF to E respectively as you only need a servitude width of 1.5m.	[NMBM] Comment noted. The option of underground cables for additional sections of the route is not financially feasible. [SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR for a discussion on project alternatives.
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Underground cable is a better option.	[NMBM] The option of underground cables for additional sections of the route is not financially feasible. [SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR for a discussion on project alternatives.
R Odendaal – Ward 3 Councillor	Alternatives to high level masts must be investigated.	[NMBM] The option of underground cables for additional sections of the route is not financially feasible. [SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR for a discussion on project alternatives.
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident	Oppose the erection of petechane style towers in the area between points A & C.	[SRK] Comment noted.
R vanderlinden – Local Resident	Powerlines should be placed on the other side of the railway line towards Lorraine and not Lorraine Manor and Lovemore Heights.	[NMBM] The option of installing the powerline on the railway side was initially considered, but due to the plans of refurbishing the railway line this option is practically not feasible. Space is a limitation for the clearance between the proposed powerline and the railway line.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Eskom guideline provides that for a 132 kV powerline a minimum width is 18 m from the centerline of the powerline, thus minimum servitude distance of 36 m. However BID indicated a servitude width of 25 m.	[Bosch Stemele – Project Engineers] The Municipal By-Laws allow for a 25 m servitude.
Comments relating to the environment		
NR Jali – Local Resident	Presence of guinea fowl in the Overbaakens area that will be affected by the bush clearing.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including wildlife, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report), including proposed mitigation measures.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Aboveground powerlines will affect animals and birdlife in the area. Animals will suffer loss of habitat and environmental look would be unsightly.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including wildlife and avifauna, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) including proposed mitigation measures.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response
NR Jali – Local Resident	Area in Overbaakens is used by people as a dumping site.	[SRK] Comment noted. Please refer to section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) for a discussion on potential impacts, including waste management, as well as proposed mitigation measures.
J Baeyens - Capeco	The proposed alignment crosses over onto property owned by Capeco and classified as 'sensitive ecological areas' in our RoD.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including terrestrial and aquatic areas and resources, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report). An Aquatic Impact Assessment has also been conducted by a specialist and is included in Appendix D of the Pre-Application DBAR.
M Crocker - Capeco	Water channel along which the electrical supply is proposed to run is sensitive no-go area together with a 100 year floodline which has already encroached and minimized the footprints of our approved development rights (as per approved RoD ECm1/LN1&3/M/12-88)	[SRK] All potential impacts, including terrestrial and aquatic areas and resources, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report). An Aquatic Impact Assessment has also been conducted by a specialist and is included in Appendix D of the Pre-Application DBAR.
Comments relating to social impacts		
E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident	Open space is utilised by public for various recreational activities which overhead powerlines would interfere with.	[SRK] Comment noted. It is not clear from the comment what recreational activities are referred to. Please refer to section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) for a discussion on potential impacts as well as proposed mitigation measures.
NR Jali – Local Resident	Proposed alignment crosses over a path used by residents as a shortcut to the shops.	[SRK]. Comment noted. The proposed powerline will not impact on pedestrians visiting the nearby shops.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	A cultural heritage expert must be consulted. The natural landscape would be negatively affected by aboveground powerlines.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including archaeological and palaeontological impacts, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report). Specialist input is included in Appendix D of the Pre-Application DBAR. The report will be submitted to the heritage authorities, who will comment on the need to assess impact on cultural landscapes. To SRK's knowledge, the visual quality of the area does not enjoy special protection in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999).
Comments relating to the economic impacts		
R vanderlinden – Local Resident M Crocker – Capeco R Odendaal – Ward 3 Councillor	Depreciation of property values due to presence of overhead powerlines.	[SRK] Comment noted. Please refer to section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report) for a discussion on potential impacts, which includes impact assessment on property values.
M Crocker – Capeco W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Erf 1226 Fairview has approval for residential development and the potential for negative financial impact on the landowner must be considered.	[SRK] Comment noted.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response
M Crocker – Capeco R Odendaal – Ward 3 councillor	Construction of high level masts will have a negative impact on future growth and development in the area.	[SRK] A clear reason is not provided regarding how high level masts would limit future growth and development in the area. In terms of the electricity provision, the distribution network is critical to enhance development growth in the larger area.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Maintenance of aboveground powerlines is costly compared to underground cables.	[Bosch Steemele – Project Engineers] Maintenance cost of overhead line is not that much higher and if the capital cost of underground cable is considered, the maintenance cost of overhead lines becomes immaterial.
Comments relating to the visual impacts		
J Baeyens - Capeco	Since no pictures of the visual impact are included, IAPs cannot judge the necessity to register.	[SRK] The purpose of the BID is to alert potential IAPs of the proposed project. Further opportunities to comment are provided by the distribution of this Pre-application DBAR (this report), and following the commencement of the formal Basic Assessment process, the Post Application DBAR.
M Crocker - Capeco	Visual impact will impact viability of the area as a residential intensification and infill node. Will negatively impact character of the area.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including visual impacts, are evaluated and discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report), including proposed mitigation measures.
Comments relating to safety concerns		
M Crocker – Capeco R Odendall – Ward 3 Councillor	Concern regarding electromagnetic radiation from masts.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including the electromagnetic field (EMF), are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report).
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Aboveground powerlines create health risks which place cost and burden on the state.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including health risks associate with powerlines in general, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report). It is unclear whether this comment refers to health risks that are specific to overhead powerlines as opposed to health risks that are specific to underground powerlines.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Aboveground powerlines pose health danger to schools, residential areas and a soon-to-be hospital nearby.	[SRK] Note that no specifics are mentioned regarding the type of health dangers referred to in the comment. All potential impacts, including health risks associate with powerlines in general, are discussed in section D(2) of the DBAR (this report).
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Fire hazards would be negated by underground cables.	[SRK] All potential impacts, including fire, are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report), including proposed mitigation measures.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd A cultural heritage expert must be consulted. The natural landscape would be negatively affected by aboveground powerlines.	Aboveground powerlines will affect the functioning of hospital's equipment.	[SRK] It is not clear in what way the proposed powerline could affect equipment used in the hospital that is to be constructed. Also, it is unclear whether this comment refers to risks that are specific to overhead powerlines as opposed to risks that are specific to underground powerlines. Note that all potential impacts are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report), including proposed mitigation measures.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Discussion of foreign law pertaining to issue of electromagnetic frequency.	[SRK] This BA process is conducted according to South African legislation. No comparative legislation applies. All potential impacts, including electromagnetic field (EMF), are discussed in section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR (this report). An underlying assumption is that design standards, including buffers for powerlines, as applied by the NMBM, already incorporate health and safety considerations consistent with international standards.
Comments of a general nature		
E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident	All the residents of Macon Road object to an overhead line in front of our houses.	[SRK] Note that <u>no</u> signed petition was included to confirm that all residents of Macon Road object to the overhead powerline.
NR Jali – Local Resident	At this stage I do not know if I will be affected by the powerline however, point K is almost at my backyard.	[SRK] Please refer to map in Appedix A indicating property details in the surrounding area. The proposed powerline does not extend across your property.
M Crocker - Capeco	Provided hard copy of full objection submitted in respect of previous EIA carried out by Coastal and Environmental Services (CES).	[SRK] Noted and acknowledged. All objections contained in the document which are applicable and relevant to the current BA have been dealt with under the specific headings in this Comments & Responses Table.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Applicant must in terms of NEMA implement mitigation measures. Mitigation measure would be to construct an underground cable system.	[SRK] The option of installing an underground cable for the entire route has been eliminated during the design phase of the proposed development due to costs. Please see the discussion regarding alternatives in section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Applicant must consider any feasible and reasonable alternatives to the activity, such as underground cables.	[NMBM] The option of installing an underground cable for the entire route was eliminated during the design phase of the proposed development due to costs. [SRK] Please see the discussion regarding alternatives in section A(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd	Eskom is bound by the constitutionally guaranteed right to an environment which is not harmful to your health or wellbeing, which is not achieved by aboveground powerlines.	[SRK] Note that the NMBM is the applicant for this proposed powerline. The environmental basic assessment process is conducted to assess any potential impacts that could result from the proposed activity including impacts to health and well-being. Please refer to section D(2) of the Pre-Application DBAR for a discussion on all potential impacts, including recommended mitigation measures.

Table 2: Comments from Interested and Affected Parties on the Pre-Application Draft Basic Assessment Report (DBAR)

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
Comments relating to the process		
J Baeyens - Capeco	Who is the party driving the application, Eskom or the municipality?	[SRK] The NMBM is the applicant for the proposed powerline.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Who is the legal representative of the applicant (director, government official)?	[SRK] The Basic Assessment process (at this stage) is not litigious in nature, therefore no legal representative has been appointed for this purpose.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd	The delay in responding to clients' request for additional information as well as denying their request for an extended deadline for comment was aimed at frustrating their ability to submit full and comprehensive comments on the DBAR.	[SRK] Note that it is not SRK's intention to prevent any comments from any IAP or stakeholder. We welcome comments and all IAPs have been advised of the process and public comments periods. SRK advised the commenter per email on 17 May 2016 that their request for additional information would be reflected and addressed in the Post-Application DBAR (this report) and that they would have the opportunity to comment on our responses prior to any decision being made by the competent authority. The commenter confirms his knowledge of this in point 31 of his letter.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd	Requests a copy of any further report to be provided immediately once finalized.	[SRK] Noted.
Comments relating to design		
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Insist that powerline be underground.	[NMBM] The option of installing an underground cable for the entire route was eliminated during the design phase of the proposed development due to costs. [SRK] Please see the discussion regarding alternatives in section A(2) of the Post-Application DBAR.
E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident	It is stated that underground cabling is not financially feasible. Are you aware that there is currently a 3m deep trench available as they are laying stormwater pipes? With correct planning the same trench can be utilized for the cables (photos of trench attached),	[SRK] Note that the largest cost of the installation of underground cable is not the trenching but the actual cable.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd	We suggest that the information furnished by the applicant in relation to the relative cost of constructing the powerline underground as opposed to aboveground, be circulated to all interested parties and that the date for submission of comments be extended.	[SRK] Please refer to section section A(2) of the Post-Application DBAR where a cost breakdown has been provided.
J Baeyens - Capeco	What is the extra cost for (partly) putting the powerline under the ground?	[SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Post-Application DBAR where a cost breakdown has been provided.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd J Baeyens - Capeco	Request documentation supporting costs difference in respect of overhead and underground powerlines. A detailed cost breakdown is required from the involved engineers.	[SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Post-Application DBAR where a cost breakdown has been provided.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd	<p>The NMBM statement that it is not economically feasible to place the cabling underground due to budget restraints is misleading as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any additional cost incurred by underground cabling would be recoverable by an electricity tariff determined by NERSA; and • No consideration has been given to imposing a levy on the approval of the developments necessitating the additional capacity, to fund the cost of improvements to the NMBM electrical distribution network. 	[NMBM] Underground is extremely expensive compared to overhead cable (refer to the cost breakdown in the Post-Application DBAR) and the NMBM generally does not put 132 kV infrastructure underground due to the cost unless it is practically impossible to do otherwise. The cost of the underground will be borne by the NMBM which would mean recovery of the cost from the tariff leading to every customer would have to pay because of the demand of a single customer. Technically having a combination of underground and overhead poses problems in the reliability of supply as the overhead protection scheme poses risk of damage to the underground cable.
J Baeyens - Capeco	It is unclear where the powerline will run. The drawing is vague over a satellite picture. We need precise drawings where the powerlines would be running over (or under) and also the exact locations of the infrastructure on the ground (pilots in concrete).	[SRK] Maps indicating property numbers and boundaries are included in Appendix A. Exact positions of the pylons will only be determined in the detailed design phase. These will be design to avoid sensitive areas (e.g. wetlands) as described in the DBAR.
J Baeyens - Capeco	We are unable to assess the impacts with the proposed alignment co-ordinates provided in the DBAR (Appendix G). We need detailed architectural drawings of any infrastructure (pillars, concrete foundations, access roads, fences) that would be constructed.	[SRK] Exact positions of the pylons will only be determined in the detailed design phase. These will be design to avoid sensitive areas (e.g. wetlands) as described in the DBAR. Concerns regarding sensitive areas should be submitted as soon as possible for this to be included in the detailed design process.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
J Baeyens - Capeco	It is unspecified how and on what grounds these pillars would be placed on our land, how much land would be bought, at which conditions.	[NMBM] An 'Affected Properties' map is included in Appendix A of the Post-Application DBAR. Pillars will be placed more or less in line with the alignments showed on this map depending on the option chosen for development. The NMBM will appoint services providers to conduct the detailed design in due course. In addition, the NMBM Estate Division will arrange meetings with affected property owners.
J Baeyens - Capeco	What are the needs (from where to where) for which these line will cater and what causes the extra demand?	[SRK] Please refer to section A(9) of the Post-Application DBAR talk details the need and motivation for the project.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Why can the existing lines running alongside William Moffat on one side and Dijon on the other side of Circulare Drive not be upgraded to cater for extra capacity?	[NMBM] The existing lines are fed from the 66 kV network and the plans are to establish 132/11 kV transformation which will take care of the current load and future load growth. Upgrading the lines will not be a solution as long lengths of cable will have to be run to supply the load. Such action will cause voltage drops which are not a desired situation as it will lead to overheating.
J Baeyens - Capeco	We need a detailed study of what the alternative options were and how they were studied.	[SRK] Please refer to section A(2) of the Post-Application DBAR. Additional information has been added regarding the project alternatives as well as a cost breakdown of the above and below ground infracture requirements.
Comments relating to the environment		
J Baeyens - Capeco	The proposed powerline appears to run in /over a riverbed, with 100 year floodline.	[SRK] Please refer to section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Aquatic Specialist Study in Appendix D for a discussion regarding the watercourses in the area and potential impacts.
W Parker (JGS) – obo Stylestar Properties 191 (Pty) Ltd and Kirland Investments (Pty) Ltd	The DBAR does not indicate whether the placement of the powerline bases occurs within the 1:100 year flood line for the water courses along and in which the proposed powerline shall travel.	[SRK] Note that detailed design for the pylon positions has not been completed. The design will consider all recommendation in the DBAR as well as the Aquatic Specialist study in order to minimize imapct to the watercourses in the vicinity.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
Comments relating to the economic impacts		
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Residents are expected to absorb a loss in value to their property.	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts, including impact on property values have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D.
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident	There will be a definite drop in property values. What are the proposed mitigation measures for this?	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts, including impact on property values have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D. Recommendations for mitigation are included in this section as well.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Presence of powerlines will result in a loss of revenue/ land of Capeco because people will not buy units because of health concerns and aesthetic impact.	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts as well as health impacts have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D. Please specifically refer to the discussion in the Socio-Economic Specialist Report regarding sense of place.
Comments relating to the visual impacts		
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Natural appearance and tranquility of area will be lost.	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts, including impact on sense of place have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Residents are expected to live with ugly appearance of powerlines.	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts, including impact on sense of place have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D.
Comments relating to safety concerns		
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Risk and dangers associated with such wires in close proximity to residential homes.	[SRK] Potential safety-related impacts have been addressed in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Powerlines poses a health risk for future residents of Capeco development.	[SRK] Potential health-related impacts during the operational phase have been addressed in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
Comments relating to noise pollution		
R van Schalkwyk – Local Resident L Minnie – Local Resident M Elliot – Local Resident S Clegg – Local Resident T Swart – Local Resident L Pieters – Local Resident E van Wyngaardt – Local Resident H Gray – Local Resident M Reid – Local Resident K Steyn – Erstwhile Resident C Gagiano – Local Resident P Alberts – Local Resident R Vanderlinden – Local Resident	Residents are expected to live with noise associated with overhead powerlines.	[SRK] Potential noise impacts during the operational phase have been addressed in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR.
Comments of a general nature		
J Baeyens - Capeco	Please take into consideration the RoD on our land south of the river.	[SRK] Noted.
J Baeyens - Capeco	Please take into account the impact on erven/ units (people cannot and do not want to live directly under the lines)	[SRK] All potential socio-economic impacts, including impact on sense of place have been included in section D(2) of the Post-Application DBAR as well as the Socio-Economic Specialist Report included in Appendix D.