

## Appendix E3: 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
<b>Comments relating to the process</b>		
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
<b>Comments relating to design</b>		
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.
<b>Comments relating to the environment</b>		
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.
<b>Comments relating to social impacts</b>		
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).
<b>Comments relating to the economic impacts</b>		
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 Stemele – 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.
<b>Comments relating to the visual impacts</b>		
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.
<b>Comments relating to safety concerns</b>		
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.
<b>Comments of a general nature</b>		
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.