

No	Association				Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report	
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity							Organization/Affiliation
<b>Comments during Initial Notification Phase/Registration Period</b>											
1	Mr	David	Foley	Ward Councilor	City of Johannesburg - Ward 94 (Adjacent ward)	Ward Councilor	22/10/2018	I&AP registration	Please register me as an I&AP.	Your email below has reference. We have registered you as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) and will notify you as the process unfolds.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
2	Mr	Sibusiso	Mthembu	Ward Councilor	City of Johannesburg - Ward 96 (Affected Ward)	Ward Councilor	22/10/2018	I&AP registration	An I&AP registration form was provided and noted that Mr Mthembu would like to participate in the process.	Thank you for your completed registration document. You have been added to the registered Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) Database and will be notified of the project as it unfolds.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Support	Your project is supported.	Noted.	
3	Mr	Jan	Mitchell		Eskom	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	22/10/2018	I&AP registration	Good day Nosipho. Please find application in your area.	Thank you for forwarding the email on. We will add Nosipho's details to the Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) database and she will be notified of the process as it unfolds.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
4	Mr	Helgardt	Slabbert	Project Manager	Valuemax	Adjacent Landowner	22/10/2018	I&AP registration	Please see attached completed form	Thank you for the completed document. We will add your comments to the comments and responses register. You have also been registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) for the proposed development and will be notified of the process as it unfolds.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Access and Roads	The proposed development is adjacent to the Riverside View Mega City Development. The development affects our temporary access to the Riverside View Mega City.	Noted. A detailed Traffic Impact Assessment will be included in the EIA Report when it becomes available and will provide more information on access to the proposed development as well as potential traffic impacts.	
								Traffic	It affects our temporary access from William Nicol Drive. The development might create traffic congestion on View Road and Porcupine Park Avenue.		
							Access and Roads	We want to see the traffic impact assessment and especially the access to the development. We want to see what the planning is for the William Nicol upgrade for the permanent access to be completed.		Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3)	
5	Mr	Calvin	Billet	Managing Director	Quantum Ready Mix Concrete	Adjacent Landowner	22/10/2018	I&AP registration	Herewith my details for future correspondence.	Thank you for your email and I&AP registration form. You have been added to the registered I&AP database and will be notified of the process as it unfolds.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Development layout	Require more information on the development layout.	Noted. More information on the layout of the development as well as associated services will be provided in the EIA Phase.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3)
6	Mr.	Julian	Shore	Property owner	Plot 19 Diepsloot Agricultural Holdings	General I&AP	24/10/2018	I&AP registration	Thanks for your mail. Please register me as an I&AP for the above mentioned development.	Thank you for your email. We will register you as an Interested and Affected Party and you will be notified of the process as it unfolds. Please feel free to contact me should you require any further information	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
7	Adv	Ntika	Maake	Transmission and Land Management	Eskom	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	12/12/2018	Services - existing and/or required	I refer to your application October 2018 and wish to inform you that Eskom Transmission (Tx's) proposed 2X Kyalami-Lulamisa 400KV power lines will be affected by this application. The extent and width of the Eskom servitude is 27.5 m on either side of the center line of the powerline (110m wide servitude). Eskom rights are held by Notarial Deed of Servitude K05948/2012 S, registered in General Terms.	Noted. The professional team is aware of the powerlines and associated servitude and designed the development accordingly.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.) Impacts to services included in Section 8.1.1. and all Eskom requirements will be incorporated into the EMPR when compiled.
									Eskom Tx will raise no objection to the proposed environmental authorization application provided the following terms are adhered to:	Noted. Eskom Tx's comments have been included in the Comments and Responses Report and will be incorporated into the EMPR.	
									1. Eskom Tx's rights and services must be acknowledged and respected at all times.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									2. Eskom Tx shall at all times retain unobstructed access to and egress from its servitudes.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									3. Eskom Tx's consent does not relieve the applicant from obtaining the necessary statutory, landowner or municipal approvals.	Noted. All necessary approvals will be put in place prior to commencement.	
									4. The applicant will adhere to all relevant environmental legislation. Any cost incurred by Eskom as a result of non-compliance will be charged to the applicant.	Noted. Prism EMS has been appointed to undertake all necessary environmental processes.	
									5. All work within Eskom servitude area shall comply with the relevant earthing standards in force at the time. This will also apply to steel fencing and palisading that may be erected in the future.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									6. No construction of excavation work shall be executed within 20 meters from any Eskom powerline structure.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									7. If Eskom TX has to incur any expenditure in order to comply with statutory clearances or other regulations as a result of the applicants activities or because of the presence of his equipment or installation within the servitude restriction area, the applicant shall pay such costs to Eskom Tx on demand.	Noted.	
									8. The use of explosives of any type within 500m of the Eskom Tx's services shall only occur with Eskom Tx's previous written permission. If such permission is granted, the applicant must give at least 14 working days prior notice of the commencement of blasting. This allows time for the arrangements to be made for supervision and/precautionary instructions to be issued in terms of the blasting process. It is advisable to make application separately in this regard.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									9. Changes in ground level may not infringe statutory ground to conductor clearances or statutory visibility clearances. After any changes in ground level, the surface shall be rehabilitated and stabilized so as to prevent erosion. The measures shall be to Eskom Tx's requirements.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									10. Eskom Tx shall not be liable for the death or of injury to any person or for the loss or damage to any property whether as a result of the encroachment or the use of the servitude area by the applicant, his/her agent, contractors, employees, successors in title and assignee. The applicant indemnifies Eskom Tx against loss, claims or damages including claims pertaining to consequential damages by 3rd parties and whether as a result of damage to or interference with Eskom Tx's services or apparatus or otherwise. Eskom Tx will not held responsible for damage to the applicant's equipment.	Noted.	
									11. No mechanical equipment including mechanical excavators or high lifting machinery shall be used in the vicinity of Eskom Tx's apparatus and/or services without prior written permission have been granted by Eskom Tx. If such permission is granted, the applicant must give at least 7 working day's notice prior to the commencement of work. This allows time for arrangements to be made for supervision and/or precautionary instructions to be issued by the Lines and Servitudes Manager. This allows time for arrangements to be made for supervision and/or precautionary instructions to be issued.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
									12. Eskom Tx's rights and duties in the servitude shall be accepted as having prior right at all times and shall not be obstructed or interfered with. Note: Where an electrical outage is required, at least 14 work days will be required to arrange it.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.	
13. Under no circumstances shall rubble, earth or other material be dumped within the servitude restriction area. The applicant shall maintain the area concerned to Eskom Tx's satisfaction. The applicant shall be liable to Eskom Tx for the cost of any remedial action which has to be carried out by Eskom Tx.	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.										
14. The clearances between Eskom Tx's live electrical equipment and the proposed construction work shall be observed as stipulated by Regulation 19 of Electrical Machinery Regulations 2011 (with Reference to SANS10280-1) of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act 85 of 1993).	Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPR.										

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
									<p>15. Equipment shall be regarded as electrically live and therefore dangerous at all times.</p> <p>16. In spite of restrictions stipulated by Regulation 15 of Regulation 19 of Electrical Machinery Regulations 2011 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act 85 of 1993), as an additional safety precaution, Eskom Tx will not approve the erection of houses or structures occupied or frequented by human beings under the powerlines or within the servitude restriction area.</p> <p>17. Eskom Tx may stipulate any additional requirements to eliminate any possible exposure to Customers or Public coming into contact or exposed to any dangers of the Eskom Tx plant.</p> <p>18. It is required of the applicant to familiarize himself with all safety hazards related to electrical plant.</p> <p>The individual title deeds of those erven (areas of open space) must be made subject to the Notarial Deeds registered in favor of Eskom Tx.</p> <p>An application should be submitted to this office before the commencement of any work on the site for approval within the servitude area.</p>	<p>Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. This will be undertaken.</p> <p>Eskom Tx's requirements will be adhered to and included in the EMPr.</p>	
<b>Comments during review of the Scoping Report</b>											
1	Mr	Helgardt	Stabbert	Property manager	Valuemax	Adjacent Landowner	7-Feb-20	General	<p>Please keep us informed with regards to the application and send us all of the specialist reports forming part of the application so that we can see what the implications will be in terms of infrastructure, traffic etc.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	<p>Good day Helgardt, Thank you for your email. We will keep you informed in regard to the proposed development. We are currently in the Scoping Phase and a copy of the Scoping report can be downloaded from <a href="http://www.prisemms.co.za/index.php/projects/pages">http://www.prisemms.co.za/index.php/projects/pages</a>. Please use the password 21637RV84 to access the document. Please note however that the Specialist studies will form part of the EIA report which is not yet available. You will however be notified of the review of the EIA Report when it is available. Please feel free to contact me should you require any further information</p> <p>Noted. No response required.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
2	Mr	Ziyanda	Mdoda		Eskom	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	12-Feb-20	General	<p>Good morning Vanessa, I see you already received an approval letter for this application. Has something changed in the EA that you are applying again?</p> <p>Good morning Vanessa, Comments provided still stand.</p>	<p>Good day Ziyanda, Thank you for your quick response. Much appreciated. No, there are no changes: Previously, we did the initial notification of the process and no report was available for review as part of that. Instead we circulated a Background Information Document (BID). We now have more information and were able to compile the Scoping Report. Due to the time since the initial notification, we re-notified all I&amp;APs so that they are aware of the project and can review the Scoping Report. We have noted your comments in the Comments and Responses Report and will include your requirements in the EMPr (which we will compile as part of the EIA Phase). However, you are of course welcome to provide further comments on the Scoping Report should you wish to however it is not a requirement as we have included your previous comments. Please feel free to contact me should you require any further information.</p> <p>Noted, Please refer to Comment 7 for full responses to comments received previously.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.) Impacts to services included in Section 8.1.1. and all Eskom requirements will be incorporated into the EMPr when compiled.
3	Mr	Bongani	Shabungu	SUE Admin Unit	GDARD	Competent Authority	12-Feb-20	General	<p>Please note the above mentioned Ref Number was submitted on 07/02/2020 However my challenge is that it now falls under old financial year you are advised to re start the process and you can still use the proof of payment that was used previously</p>	<p>There is no way that we can restart our process. We have notified I&amp;APs as part of the initial notification period (October 2018) and again in February 2020 as part of the review of the Scoping Report. All our notifications contained the reference number Gaut 002/17-18/E2040 which was indicated on the application form on the online system. We have also submitted copies of the Scoping Report to relevant authorities. If this was an issue then the online system would have needed to flag the date as an issue so that I could have rectified it prior to notification. Or the draft application would have needed to expire so that I was aware there was an issue. We cannot be expected to restart our process when an expiration on the application form has never been communicated. I have been trying to get hold of you to discuss this. Please give me a call urgently.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
4	Ms	Justine	Chan	Assistant Director: Strategic Admin Support	GDARD	Competent Authority	18-Feb-20	General	<p>have discussed your application 002/17-18/E2040 with Nhlanhla Makhathini. His unit is responsible for the admin processing of environmental and waste applications. We have agreed to process your application even though the reference number is from the 2017 and 2018 financial year which is the result of the application being lodged as a Draft on 2017-07-24 in the EIA Online System. Our reasons being: you have already done 2 rounds of public participation with 002/17-18/E2040 as the reference number, payment for the application was made on the 06 February 2020 and that you received the information necessary to finalize the Scoping Report and the application form in early 2020.</p>	<p>Good day Justine, Thank you for your email and for your assistance. I do appreciate it.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Project Description	<p>The Scoping Report dated February 2020 refers:</p> <p><b>Description of projection</b></p> <p>The project entails the development of Riverside View Ext 84 on Portions 185 and 124 of the Farm Diepsloot 388 JR. The proposed development will consist of mixed land use on approximately 29.4 ha. The site will be developed into three separate erven; Erf 1 and 2 to be zoned 'Special' for place of instruction, residential buildings and offices and ancillary uses and Erf 3 to be zoned 'Special for Private Open Space'. The site is currently zoned 'Undetermined'. A site visit was conducted on 14/02/2019.</p>	<p>Noted. No response required.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Legislation and policies	<p><b>Guidelines, by-laws and policies:</b></p> <p>The Report takes into account relevant policies, by laws and strategies. The site falls within Region A, Sub Area 1 whose objective is to promote the development of a sustainable long term spatial structure to ensure the efficiency in the City. The proposed development is also aligned with the SDF 2040 to create livable residential areas.</p>	<p>Noted. No response required.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Alternatives	<p><b>Description of alternatives:</b></p> <p>Two layout alternatives are assessed as part of this phase. The Proposal entails the development of 3 erven as mentioned above. Alternative 1 involves the development of 7 erven. Erf 1-4 will be zoned 'Special' for place of instruction, residential buildings and offices and ancillary uses, Erf 5-7 will be zoned 'Special' for Access, Private Roads and Private Open Space respectively. Furthermore, two alternatives are also being discussed for the placement of the attenuation facilities. The Proposal entails the attenuation pond be placed along the wetland boundary with multiple discharge points. Alternative 1 proposes the placement of the pond along the northern boundary of the site. A detailed assessment of the alternatives will be discussed as part of the EIA phase once the specialist studies have been undertaken.</p>	<p>Noted. This is correct. No response required.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Environmental sensitivity	<p><b>Description and assessment of the identified environmental issues:</b></p> <p>In terms of the Col Wetland Audit Layer 1 &amp; 2, the proposed development site is affected by a Hillslope Seep Wetland system. Furthermore, the Col Biodiversity Sector Plan also show the site mapped as Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and Ecological Support Areas (ESAs). CBAs are areas required to meet biodiversity patterns and/ or ecological processes targets. No alternative sites are available to meet these targets. Therefore the desired management of these areas is to maintain them in a natural state with limited or no biodiversity loss. Ecological Support Areas (ESAs) are areas important for maintaining landscape connectivity. They play an important role in supporting the ecological functioning of Critical Biodiversity Area in delivering associated ecosystem services, therefore, development in these areas should be planned in a manner that allows for faunal movement.</p> <p>The proposed development also triggers listed activities in terms of Section 21 of the National Water Act and therefore requires a Water Use License.</p>	<p>Noted. A Wetland Delineation has been undertaken and the wetland and associated buffer incorporated as Open space which will not be developed. A full Wetland Assessment will be included in the EIA Report to determine the impacts to the wetland and to provide necessary mitigation measures. Further, a Wetland Rehabilitation Plan will be compiled and implemented as part of the project to improve the status of the wetland which is currently degraded.</p> <p>In terms of the ESA and CBA, an Ecological Habitat Assessment will be undertaken and included in the EIA report to determine the current status of this area and to provide mitigation measures. It should be noted that from preliminary investigations, the site is fairly degraded by historic land use.</p> <p>A Water Use Licence Application in terms of Section 21 (c) and (l) of the National Water Act, 1998 will be undertaken and an integrated public participation process is planned whereby the WULA Technical Report will be available for review together with the EIA Report.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). The required specialist studies will also be included in the EIA Report.

No	Association				Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report	
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity							Organization/Affiliation
5	Ms	Mashudu	Ratshitanga	Assistant Director	City of Johannesburg: Impact Management and Compliance Monitoring	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	21-Feb-20	Mitigation	<p><b>Evaluation and presentation of mitigation measures:</b></p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation measures for each identified environmental impact will be included in the EIA Phase. An Ecological Habitat Assessment, Wetland Delineation, Heritage Impact Assessment, Geotechnical Impact Assessment and Traffic Impact Assessment specialist studies are proposed. Recommendations from these studies will inform the final layout plan and will be included in the EIA phase.</p>	Noted, the studies will be incorporated into EIA Report as discussed in the Scoping Report and as requested in the comments.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). All required specialist studies will be included in the EIA Report.
								Public Participation	<p><b>Public Participation:</b></p> <p>The Public Participation (PP) undertaken is in line with the requirements as specified in the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended.)</p>	Noted. No response required. Public participation for the EIA report will also be undertaken as per the requirements of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended)	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Specialist Studies	<p>The Department noted the proposed development and requires that the following be addressed in the EIA Phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A wetland delineation must be undertaken and be linked with the open space plan as well as stormwater management plan.</li> </ul>	Noted. A Wetland Delineation has been undertaken and the wetland and associated buffer incorporated as Open space which will not be developed. A full Wetland Assessment will be included in the EIA Report to determine the impacts to the wetland and to provide mitigation measures.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Townplanning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed layout provides for open space but does not distinguish between recreational and conservation open space. The wetland and its 30m buffer must be zoned public open space for conservation purposes and the development must also provide recreation open space in accordance with the City Open Space Framework.</li> </ul>	<p>The purpose of the township application is to obtain basic zoning and land use rights. The standard zoning rights for Open Space in the City of Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 do not distinguish between 'recreational' and 'conservation' open space - only between Public and Private Open Space. The difference lies in the ownership and therefore the maintenance of the open space area. These 2 kinds of Open Space are defined in the Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 as follows:</p> <p><i>"Public open space: Use of building/s and/or land which is under the ownership of the Council or other authority, ...."</i></p> <p><i>"Private Open space: Use of building/s and/or land, with or without access control and which can be used as a private ground for sports, play, rest and recreation, or as an ornamental garden; pleaser ground; golf course; or for buildings reasonably required in connection with such uses."</i></p> <p>The proposed Erf 2 is zoned Private Open Space, since it is the area affected by Wetlands. It could therefore be categorised as "conservation open space". We will add the words "Conservation open space" to the layout plan.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the draft Site Development Plan included in the Scoping Report (Figure 4-3 of the Scoping Report) indicates the sports fields for the school, which are "recreational open space", as required for the learners. Please note that since the draft architectural layout is not approved as part of the township establishment, it cannot be added to the township layout plan.</p> <p>In addition, the subject township is located adjacent to and directly north of the existing Steyn City Lifestyle estate, which is a private lifestyle estate, which makes provision for non-residential support uses within the estate. These include a golf course, retirement village, shopping centre, offices, filling station with convenience shop, gymnasium, heliport and school. Due to the extent of the residential component of this estate another school is required. The application site was identified for this use. The land was purchased after the original development of Steyn City Estate and therefore an extension to this estate which comprises the proposed township of Riverside View Ext 84. Initially the school will be open to people living outside the Steyn City, but eventually the residents of Steyn City will have first choice and therefore it will be a private school - similar to the existing Steyn City School in the southern section of the estate.</p> <p>The existing estate boundary wall will be extended to enclose the application site in order to be included in the Steyn City Estate boundaries. Since Steyn City Estate is a private estate all roads in the estate are private roads and all open spaces are private. Therefore the open space areas in the application site can only be zoned Private Open Space. However, like all other private schools, the sports fields are used for matches, which implies that the active open space areas will be utilized by more than only the Steyn City school.</p>	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No stormwater infrastructure should be developed within the riparian zone, buffer zone of the 1:100 year floodline or whichever is greatest in accordance with the City Catchment Management Policy.</li> </ul>	A stormwater management plan will be included in the EIA report. Stormwater attenuation has not been included in the wetland or wetland buffer area.	
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A stormwater management plan must be compiled for the site. Attention should be brought to Clause 44 of the City of Johannesburg Stormwater Bylaw which state that: The following requirements must, in addition to the requirements of section 38, be compiled with if stormwater from any development site discharges directly, or indirectly across any intervening property, into a wetland: (a) The quantity and velocity of any stormwater discharge must be controlled and treated to the extent that such discharge attains a quality in compliance with the requirements of the National Water Act, 1998, the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 and any other applicable law; (b) A stormwater discharge must maintain the frequency and flow of pre-development conditions, to the extent necessary to protect the characteristic functions of the wetland; (c) Prior to discharging to a wetland, any alternative discharge location and any natural water storage infiltration opportunity outside the wetland, must be evaluated by a professional engineer and utilized for the stormwater discharge if reasonably and practically possible.</li> </ul>	A stormwater management plan will be included in the EIA report. Stormwater attenuation has not been included in the wetland or wetland buffer area.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). The required technical studies and designs will also be included in the EIA Report.
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	Furthermore, all the bridges that crosses the wetland must be designed in such a manner that would have minimum impact on the hydrology. These crossings must also be authorised by the Department of Housing, Water and Sanitation.	Preliminary designs for the wetland crossing will be included in the EIA Report. A WULA process is being undertaken.	

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
6	Mr	Teboho	Leku	Control Environmental Office - B Impact Management	GDARD	Competent Authority	3/4/2020	General	COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED MIKUD-USE DEVELOPMENT ON PORTIONS 124 AND 185 OF THE FARM DIEPSLOOT 388-JR TO BE KNOWN AS RIVERSIDE VIEW EXTENSION 84, CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY.	Noted. No response required.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Project Description	The above-mentioned matter received by the Department on 07 February 2020 has reference. The proposal development of Portions 124 and 185 of the farm Diepsloot 388-JR will involve mixed use township establishment to cater for a place of 'Instructions', 'Residential' use and 'Commercial' including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops. One Erf will be set aside as a 'Private Open Space'. The subject site measures 29.30 hectares with the proposed development occupying an extent of 24.10 hectares. The applicant applied for Activity 19 of Listing Notice 1, Activity 15 of Listing Notice 2 and Activities 4, 12 and 14 of Listing Notice 3 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014. The Draft Scoping Report and plan of study submitted is noted and the Department would like to comment as follows:	Noted. No response required.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)
								Sustainability	1. Green buildings techniques should be applied to the proposed development process to make use of natural light and heat thereby reducing energy use and emission to the atmosphere. This will also reduce the impacts of climate change.	Noted. This comment has been provided to the design team and issues relating to sustainability and green building design will be discussed in the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Requirement to be discussed further in EIA Report.
								Sustainability	2. Rainwater harvesting methods should be incorporated into the development, to store water for irrigation purpose.	Noted. This comment has been provided to the design team and issues relating to rainwater harvesting will be discussed in the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Requirement to be discussed further in EIA Report.
								Waste Management	3. A Waste Management Plan that seeks to achieve high levels of separation of waste at source to reduce volumes disposed of at the landfill sites must be compiled.	Noted. A Waste Management Plan will be included in the EMPr that will be developed during the EIA Phase.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Requirement will be included in EMPR.
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	4. The stormwater management must be design in such a way that it will not dispense directly to the watercourse and its buffer zone and it must be submitted to the Johannesburg Roads Agency for consideration. Additionally, adequate slip/shoulder lanes must be incorporated into the road infrastructure design to accommodate public transport services. This must include shaded area in instances where its raining or to hot.	Noted. A stormwater management plan will be included in the EIA Report. Currently, the stormwater system has been designed outside the wetland and 32m wetland buffer and therefore does not discharge directly into a watercourse. Further, a Traffic Impact Assessment has been undertaken and will be included in the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Stormwater Management Plan will be included in EIA Report.
								Environmental sensitivity	5. The locality map and sketch layout plan has been included in the Draft Scoping. However, a legible, A2 Layout Plan overlain by a composite sensitivity map on site with a legend easily linked to activity components must be included in the Draft EIAR after the acceptance of the Final Scoping.	Noted. As requested, a A2 layout and sensitivity plan will be compiled once all necessary specialist studies have been undertaken and included in the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Requirement will be included in EIA Report.
								Development layout	6. The preliminary Site Development Plan indicates that these will be no crossing of the wetland. In view of this, the final Site Development Plan can involve minor alterations but not any crossings of the wetland.	This is not the case. The Site Development Plan included in Figure 4.3 and reiterated in Figure 4.7 clearly shows the wetland crossing near the north of the site (grey road). In addition, Section 4.3.6. specifically noted that a bridge over the wetland would be required and that more detail would be required in the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.). Additional information provided in Section 4.3.1., Section 4.3.6 and Section 2.2.1 to reiterate that a wetland crossing is included. More information on wetland crossing will be included in the EIA Report.
Public Participation	7. It is noted that the Draft Scoping Report (D Scoping Report) is currently being circulated for comment. The public participation process must be undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations, 2014.	Noted. No response required. Public participation for the EIA report will also be undertaken as per the requirements of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended)	Comments added to Comments and Response Report (Appendix 10.4.3) and I&AP included on I&AP Register (10.4.4.)								

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
<b>Comments received after submission of Scoping Report</b>											
7	Mr	Andrew	Salomon	Heritage Officer - Archaeology	SAHRA	Commenting Authority	27-Mar-20	General	Proposed development of Place of Instruction, Residential dwelling units, Residential buildings, Storage, Offices, including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops as well as Private Open Space on Portions 185 and 124 (a Portion of Portion 11) of the farm Diepsloot 388 JR, within Ward 96 of the City of Johannesburg, Gauteng Province	Noted. No response required.	Comment added to Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.). A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment is included in Appendix 14.6.3 of the EIR).
								Specialist studies	In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act, no 25 of 1999, heritage resources, including archaeological or palaeontological sites over 100 years old, graves older than 60 years, structures older than 60 years are protected. They may not be disturbed without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. This means that prior to development it is incumbent on the developer to ensure that a Heritage Impact Assessment is done. This must include the archaeological component (Phase 1) and any other applicable heritage components. Appropriate (Phase 2) mitigation, which involves recording, sampling and dating sites that are to be destroyed, must be done as required	Noted. A Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report has been compiled and is included as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment Report and will be uploaded to SAHRIS to provide SAHRA an opportunity to review and comment.	
								Specialist studies	The quickest process to follow for the archaeological component is to contract an accredited specialist (see the web site of the Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists www.asapa.org.za) to provide a Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report. This must be done before any large development takes place	The Heritage Specialist which undertook the Heritage Impact Assessment is registered with ASAPA (ASAPA #159).	
								Specialist studies	The Phase 1 Impact Assessment Report will identify the archaeological sites and assess their significance. It should also make recommendations (as indicated in section 38) about the process to be followed. For example, there may need to be a mitigation phase (Phase 2) where the specialist will collect or excavate material and date the site. At the end of the process the heritage authority may give permission for destruction of the sites	No heritage resources were identified by the study. Please see Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report for more information.	
								Specialist studies	Where bedrock is to be affected, or where there are coastal sediments, or marine or river terraces and in potentially fossiliferous superficial deposits, a Palaeontological Desk Top study must be undertaken to assess whether or not the development will impact upon palaeontological resources - or at least a letter of exemption from a Palaeontologist is needed to indicate that this is unnecessary. If the area is deemed sensitive, a full Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment will be required and if necessary a Phase 2 rescue operation might be necessary. Please note that a nationwide fossil sensitivity map is available on SAHRIS to assist applicants with determining the fossil sensitivity of a study area.	The Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report assessed the potential palaeontological impacts and noted that according to the SAHRIS PalaeoMap, the site is not sensitive.	
								Specialist studies	If the property is very small or disturbed and there is no significant site the heritage specialist may choose to send a letter to the heritage authority motivating for exemption from having to undertake further heritage assessments	Noted. This is not applicable. A full Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment Report has been compiled and is included in the EIR.	
								Specialist studies	Any other heritage resources that may be impacted such as built structures over 60 years old, sites of cultural significance associated with oral histories, burial grounds and graves, graves of victims of conflict, and cultural landscapes or viewscapes must also be assessed. Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header	Noted. The Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment includes an assessment of built environments, cultural significance, buildings over 60 years old, burial grounds and graves etc.	
8	Mr	Sibusiso	Company Owner	Riverside Sustainable Solutions	I&AP	3-Aug-20	I&AP registration	I tried to register on your website as an Interested and Affected Party in this project on your website, however I think its not doing properly. My name is Sibusiso residing in Riverside. My company is Riverside Sustainable Solutions company with focus on various community sustainable projects.	Thank you for the email. Please note that the public review of the Scoping Report ended 9 March 2020 and thus the report has been submitted to the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) for review and acceptance. We will however register you as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) with your email address and cell number and you will be notified of the review of the EIA Report when it is available. You will be given an opportunity to review and comment on the EIA Report at this time. We will also include your comments below in the Comments and Responses Report for the EIA Report.	Comments added to Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.) and I&AP registered on I&AP Database.	
							Legislation and policies	page 36 The focus of the consolidated Zone is 1) to create liveable lower to medium density suburban areas that are well-connected to the higher intensity areas through transit infrastructure and 2) address challenges in areas of deprivation page 37 - send clearer diagram fig 3-10	*Figure 3-10, the GSDP map, was unfortunately mislabeled accidentally in the report as it is from the City of Johannesburg SDP 2040. You can get a copy of the report from <a href="http://www.parkview.org.za/docs/townplanning/Johannesburg%20Spatial%20Development%20Framework%20202040.pdf">http://www.parkview.org.za/docs/townplanning/Johannesburg%20Spatial%20Development%20Framework%20202040.pdf</a> .		
							Development layout	Page 50 figure 4.3, figure 4.7	*A copy of the Draft SDP (Figure 4-3 and 4-7) is attached. Please note that this is a draft only and that it will only be finalized during the City of Johannesburg Site Development Plan approval process. The aim of SDP is only to provide the concept of the development.		
							Project description	What type of school will be built? Private school or public? Noting that there is another school at Riverside that is being built, Curro, Steyn City, Dainfern, Heldefort and pinnacle within a close vicinity. These in the main cater for private schools in the main.	*A private school is planned to provide the necessary schooling requirements for residents of Steyn City. It will initially be open to the public, but as Steyn City develops and the school becomes reaches capacity, the Steyn City residents will have first choice.		
							Sustainability	Any legacy self sustainable projects in the area, we would like to engage in solutions in this regard. Page 64 - local skills - 150 temporary jobs AND 150 operational jobs and and R15million? Is that sufficient for the community?	*Steyn City runs a number of community projects in the area. The values communicated in the Scoping Report are just the estimated costs of construction. This does not include all the additional projects that Steyn City does in the area. The activities and planned work will contribute to the community and the provision of jobs to the community. This will happen as per the standard operation procedures at Steyn City which specifically provides for community involvement in the work sector.		
							General	Page 69 - The Interested and Affected Party EIA participation - notifications of the scoping and review. Can you kindly send Page 81 copy of the background information document Appendix on page from page 96 are blank, can you please email, and the documents on the website are password protected.	*In terms of the documents, the password is 21637RV84. You will be able to review the annexures if you use this password. This includes larger and clearer versions of the maps we generated as well as a copy of the BID.		
<b>GDARD Acceptance of Scoping Report</b>											
9	Mr	Teboho	Leku	Control Environmental Office - B Impact Management	GDARD	Competent Authority	5-Aug-20	General	The above-mentioned matter received by the Department on 20 July 2020 has reference. The proposal development of Portions 124 and 185 of the farm Diepsloot 388-JR will involve mixed use township establishment to cater for a place of 'Instructions', 'Residential' use and 'Commercial' including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops. One Erf will be set aside as a 'Private Open Space'. The subject site measures 29.30 hectares with the proposed development occupying an extent of 24.10 hectares. The applicant applied for Activity 19 of Listing Notice 1, Activity 15 of Listing Notice 2 and Activities 4, 12 and 14 of Listing Notice 3 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014. The Scoping Report and plan of study submitted is noted and the Department would like to comment as follows:	Please note that the Scoping Report was submitted to the Department on 19 March 2020.  The listed activities and project description is correct.	Comments added to Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.). In addition, please refer to Table 1.3 of the EIR for information on how these comments have been addressed in the report.
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	Since the proposed site has a sizeable elevation difference, a comprehensive stormwater management system must be designed for implementation. The stormwater system must comply with the Sustainable Urban Drainage System Guideline of the Department	A comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan has been compiled. It is described in a number of places throughout the report.  In general, stormwater attenuation will make use of the following: •Grass lined attenuation ponds; •Use of the soccer field to attenuate stormwater and allow for ground water recharge; •Bio swales with stone filled sumps to allow for run-off retardation, encourage sheet flow and absorption into the underlying soil; •Throttled outlet structures; and •Energy dissipation slabs to limit erosion and encourage sheet flow at outlets.	
								Waste Management	A Waste Management Plan that seeks to achieve high levels of separation of waste at source to reduce volumes disposed of at the landfill sites must be compiled.	A Waste Management Plan has been compiled and included as part of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr).	
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	The stormwater management must be design in such a way that it will not dispense directly to the watercourse and its buffer zone and it must be submitted to the Johannesburg Roads Agency for consideration.	A comprehensive Stormwater Management Plan has been compiled. It is described in a number of places throughout the report.  Stormwater will be discharged over dry land and mitigation measures have been included in the design to ensure minimal impacts to the wetland and wetland buffer.	
								Access and Roads	Additionally, adequate slip/shoulder lanes must be incorporated into the road infrastructure design to accommodate public transport services. This must include shaded area in instances where its raining or to hot.	A Traffic Impact Assessment has been compiled and notes that as part of previous developments in the area (Steyn City and Valumax), pedestrian walkways have been built along View Road. Public transport lay-bys along Porcupine Park Road at its intersection with Yellowwood Boulevard were also built as part of the Valumax Development. These lay-bys are within walking distance from the development and will serve the development well.	
								Environmental sensitivity	The locality map and sketch layout plan has been included in the Final Scoping. However, a legible, A2 Layout Plan overlain by a composite sensitivity map on site with a legend easily linked to activity components must be included in the Draft EIA after the acceptance of the Final Scoping.	A composite sensitivity map has been compiled and is included in Section 11.1.	
								Environmental sensitivity	This layout must be informed by sensitivities located on site, especially a Wetland Delineation Assessment which must be undertaken and form part of the EIR.	A number of specialist studies have been undertaken to better understand site sensitivity including a Wetland Assessment. The delineated wetland and associated 32m buffer have been taken into account in the development layout and will not be developed.	
Development layout	The preliminary Site Development Plan indicates that these will be no crossing of the wetland. In view of this, the final Site Development Plan can involve minor alterations but not any crossings of the wetland.	This is not correct. As noted in our previous response to the Department's comments on the Scoping Report which was made available for public review, a wetland crossing is shown on the preliminary Site Development Plan. Please refer to Section 4.4.6. which provides more detail on the proposed wetland crossing.									

No	Association				Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report	
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity							Organization/Affiliation
<b>Comments during review of the EIA Report</b>											
1	Mr	Helgardt	Slabbert	Project Manager	Valuemax	Adjacent Landowner	11-Sep-20	Request for information	Can you please provide a copy of the Traffic Impact Assessment and Stormwater management plan. I would just like to see how access will affect me.	Please see the attached Traffic Impact Assessment and Stormwater Management Report	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								General	Thank you.	Noted. No response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
2	Mr	Calvin	Billet	Managing Director	Quantum Ready Mix Concrete	Adjacent Landowner	12-Sep-20	Traffic	Telephonic discussion - Mr Billet requested more information on the timeframes associated with the development and timeframes for the completion of the William Nicol Road Upgrades.	It was explained that the William Nicol Drive upgrades are a separate project and not part of the Riverside View Extension 84 development and thus information on timeframes was not available. The EAP also requested that Mr Billet send an email with any concerns or questions he may have so that a proper response could be provided.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
3	Mr	Sbusiso	Mthembu	Ward Councillor	City of Johannesburg - Ward 96 (Affected Ward)	Ward Councillor	15-Sep-20	Project Description	Steyn City Properties (Pty) Ltd. plans to develop Riverside View Ext 84 on portions 185 and 124 (a Portion of Portion 11) of the farm Diepsloot 388 JR within Ward 96 of the City of Johannesburg, Gauteng Province. The proposed development form parts of the Steyn City Parkland Residence which has been designed to be a modern, mixed land use and mixed income development. The extent of the proposed development is approximately 29.4 ha and the site will be developed into three separate erven. The proposed use zones of these erven are as follows: • Erf 1 and 2: Special (Primary Rights include: Place of Instruction, Residential dwelling units, Residential buildings, Storage, Offices, including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops); and • Erf 3: Special for Private Open Space.	Thank you for your email and the attached letter. We note your support and will take it into account in the Comments and Responses Report	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Support	As a ward councillor I have no objection on the application and I fully support it in the interest of job creation and growing the economy of the City of Johannesburg		
4	Mr	Gift	Mabasa	Administration Officer	City of Johannesburg: Impact Management and Compliance Monitoring	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	15-Sep-20	General	Please kindly send as a hard copy of the report on the below address	We delivered a USB for Mashudu's attention on Friday, 11 September 2020 (see attached proof of delivery). Prior to submission we did confirm with her that a USB was sufficient.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
5	Mr	Ziyanda	Mdoda		Eskom	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	15-Sep-20	General	Has anything changed in the development since the issuing of this approval?	Apologies for my delayed response. No, there are no extensive changes: Previously, we did the initial notification of the process, we then circulated the Scoping Report. We are now further in the process and are circulating the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report.  The project description in the EIA Report is as per the Scoping Report. There is just more information such as specialist studies (Biodiversity, Wetland and Heritage) and technical studies (Traffic, Stormwater and Outline Scheme Report). Additional documents such as the EMPr are also now included. In regard to this, we have included all Eskom's requirements in the EMPr. In addition, the Scoping Report detailed two types of alternatives (layout and stormwater). In the EIA Report, as part of the development of the stormwater management plan, the proposed stormwater attenuation (Stormwater Proposal) has been further refined. It still involves a number of stormwater attenuation ponds and multiple releases.  I hope this provides the necessary clarity. Please feel free to contact me should you require any further information	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
6	Mr	Andrew	Salomon	Heritage Officer - Archaeology	SAHRA	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	17-Sep-20	Project description	<b>Proposed development of Place of Instruction, Residential dwelling units, Residential buildings, Storage, Offices, including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops as well as Private Open Space on Portions 185 and 124 (a Portion of Portion 11) of the farm Diepsloot 388 JR, within Ward 96 of the City of Johannesburg, Gauteng Province.</b> <b>Van der Walt, J. April 2019. Heritage Impact Assessment For The Proposed Riverside View Extension 84 City Of Johannesburg, Gauteng Province.</b>  <b>The proposed development entails a mixed-use development that will include residential buildings, offices, schools and public open space areas.</b>	Noted in the Comments and Responses Report. No response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Heritage Sensitivity	The author notes that, in terms of the built environment large sections of the property was densely developed in the past. By 2015 all of these buildings were demolished apart from a residential dwelling (Feature 1) that is still standing. Based on historical maps of the study area the structure is not older than 60 years. No significant archaeological heritage resources were identified. The SA Palaeontological Sensitivity Map indicates that the study area has insignificant fossil sensitivity	Noted and in agreement. No significant heritage resources, burials or palaeontological sensitivity was identified by the Heritage Specialist.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Support	Final Comment The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit has no objections to this proposed development, provided that the recommendations in the specialist reports and this comment are adhered to, and in addition on the following conditions:	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Mitigation	- If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g., remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments and charcoal/ash concentrations) or palaeontological remains are found during the proposed activities, SAHRA must be alerted immediately, and a professional archaeologist or palaeontologist, based on the nature of the finds, must be contacted as soon as possible to inspect the findings. If the newly discovered heritage resources prove to be of significance a Phase 2 rescue operation might be necessary.	The Environmental Management Programme includes the following Heritage Mitigation Measures: • A Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken, and no heritage resources were identified however the following Change Find Procedure must be implemented if necessary: oChance find procedure: •If during the pre-construction phase, construction, operations or closure phases of this project, any person employed by the developer, one of its subsidiaries, contractors and subcontractors, or service provider, finds any artefact of cultural significance or heritage site, this person must cease work at the site of the find and report this find to their immediate supervisor, and through their supervisor to the senior on-site manager. •It is the responsibility of the senior on-site Manager to make an initial assessment of the extent of the find and confirm the extent of the work stoppage in that area. •The senior on-site Manager will inform the ECO of the chance find and its immediate impact on operations. The ECO will then contact a professional archaeologist for an assessment of the finds who will notify the SAHRA.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.). Mitigation is already included in the EMPr.
								Mitigation	Inclusion of a Chance Find Procedure for archaeological and palaeontological material as part of the Environmental Management Programme for the project.		
								Mitigation	If any unmarked human burials are uncovered and the archaeologist called in to inspect the finds and/or the police find them to be heritage graves, mitigation may be necessary and the SAHRA Burial Grounds and Graves (BGG) Unit must be contacted for processes to follow.		
Mitigation	Should the project be granted Environmental Authorisation, SAHRA must be notified and all relevant documents submitted to the case on SAHRIS.	As a registered I&AP, SAHRA will be notified of the decision and a copy uploaded to SAHRIS.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).								

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report	
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation							
								Project description	Your report dated 11 September 2020 refers.  Description of the project:  Steyn City Properties (Pty) Ltd. plans to develop Riverside View Ext 84 on Portions 124 and 185 of the farm Diepsloot 388 JR which measure about 29,27ha in extent. The proposed zoning of the development will be Special for: Place of Instructions, Residential buildings and Offices, including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops and aims to provide a school for 494 pupils. Private Open space measuring 5,107ha (17,45% is the site) will also be incorporated into the development which form parts of the Steyn City Parkland Residence. The proposed rights for the private open space are as per scheme, which allows development, and not for conservation purpose. The private open space is however the area affected by the 1:100 year floodline, wetland, and 32m buffer. The private open space rights must be aligned to the City of Johannesburg Land Use Scheme, 2018 i.e. must have the zoning of Private Open Space with a qualified use as Ecological Open Space. General conditions must also refer to the Aquatic Resource Rehabilitation and Plant Species Plan which is part of the report.  Riverside View Extension 84 will be developed in line with the Steyn City concept and will be incorporated into the Steyn City Development.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Legislation and policies	Guidelines, by-laws, Precinct Plans and policies:  The Report considers relevant policies, by-laws and strategies. The development is in line with the SDF 2040 and the RDSF for Region A, Sub Area 1, which states that the key-structuring element within the sub area is the Lanseria speciality node, which is surrounded by agricultural holdings and farm portions. Over half of the sub area is undevelopable due to the presence of large tracts of environmental conservation areas that are outside the Urban Development Boundary (UDB). The proposed Cradle City, which is a major development, straddles between Johannesburg, Tshwane and Mogale City. The proposed development (refer to the Cradle City Master Plan, 2008) is subject to the necessary infrastructure provision by the developer, which must be in line and adhere to GMS Principles. This Master Plan is to be treated as a guideline document in conjunction with the Lanseria Development Framework 2020 (2008).	Noted. However, there are some errors in this. As noted in the EIR, the development is located in Sub Area 3 (Diepsloot Precinct) not Sub Area 1 (Lanseria). The Lanseria Development Framework and Cradle City Master Plan is therefore not applicable. Instead in terms of the RDSF for Sub Area 3, the following is applicable:  <i>Sub Area 3 consists mainly of the Diepsloot Nature Reserve and the marginalized areas of Diepsloot West and Extensions. The key issues within the Diepsloot marginalised area are the need to foster local economic development. The limited number of business sites and key structuring elements (e.g. activity streets and mixed nodes) are hampering large scale local economic development. The haphazard proliferation of unregulated small home-based businesses within the marginalised area is also as a result of the above. The remainder of the sub area includes agricultural holdings and farm portions that fall within and outside the Urban Development Boundary. Development applications in this Sub Area are to be assessed in accordance with the Diepsloot Development Framework 2020, The Diepsloot Activity Street Framework, the Diepsloot Government Node Precinct and the Diepsloot District Node Framework, which should be read in conjunction with the Growth Management Strategy (GMS). Unless the availability of infrastructure and other bulk services can be confirmed by the relevant MOEs and core departments, applications for densification, land use intensification and/or other uses will not be supported. Diepsloot is a high priority area for public investment in terms of the GMS.</i>	Furthermore it can be noted that Johannesburg Water is in support of the application subject to conditions and therefore services are available.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Legislation and policies	Development applications in this sub area are to be assessed in accordance with the Lanseria Development Framework 2020 (2008), which should be read in conjunction with the Growth Management Strategy (GMS) noting that the area falls within the expansion areas and peri-urban areas.  Unless the availability of infrastructure and other bulk services can be confirmed by the relevant MOEs and core departments, applications for densification, land use intensification and/or other uses will not be supported.			
								Legislation and policies	The Gauteng Provincial Environmental Management Framework (GPEMF) was consulted. Whilst most of the development footprint does fall within Zone 1 - Urban Development Boundary, the site has a number of sensitivities and as such a Registration in terms of the GPEMF Standard, 2018 is not applicable. Zone one is intended to streamline urban development activities and to promote development infill, densification and concentration of urban development.	Noted. This has been included in the Comments and Responses Report and no further response is required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Legislation and policies	In terms of the City of Johannesburg Biodiversity Sector plan, part of the proposed development site is mapped as Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) and Ecological Support Area (ESA). CBAs are areas required to meet biodiversity patterns and/or ecological processes targets. No alternative sites are available to meet these targets. Therefore, the desired management of these areas is to maintain them in a natural state with limited or no biodiversity loss.  Ecological Support Areas has been split based on land cover- ESA 1 being in a largely natural state and ESA 2 areas (e.g. maintaining landscape connectivity). In addition, ecological support areas play an important role in supporting the ecological functioning of Critical Biodiversity Area in delivering associated ecosystem services. Consequently, development in these areas should be planned in a manner that allows for faunal movement	Noted. A Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment was undertaken and found that the site was degraded and had a low to low-medium sensitivity. The ESA noted by the letter relates to the wetland. A Wetland Assessment has been undertaken and has delineated the wetland and provided a 32m buffer. Approximately half of the degraded grassland habitat (1.3 ha) forms part of the wetland and wetland buffer and will be conserved and rehabilitated.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Legislation and policies	In terms of CoJ wetland audit, the site in question is within Wetland Management Zone 1 as identified in the draft COJ Wetland Protection and Management Plan 2009. The plan identifies this as a priority zone for stormwater management as it is vulnerable to erosion. In terms of key management concerns for Wetland Management Zone 1, management of sediments and water quality are both identified as key, while pre-emptive engineering is advocated whereby sufficient space is maintained for the systems to adjust with little active intervention to the changes in hydrology or that active engineering is applied so as to ensure that wetland management objectives are met	Noted. Stormwater management plan was compiled and included in the EIR. As part of this, a number of catchments within the site were determined. All run-off from the site will be routed to the attenuation ponds of each respective catchment. Each catchment area drains into an attenuation pond whereby the run-off from the area is throttled to release into the wetland and buffer zone at the 1:5 year pre-developed flow. As there are multiple smaller attenuation ponds, there will be multiple releases. Energy dissipating structures will be constructed at each outlet to limit any erosion and encourage sheet flow into the wetland area.  In general, stormwater attenuation will make use of the following: •Grass lined attenuation ponds; •Use of the soccer field to attenuate stormwater and allow for ground water recharge; •Bio swales with stone filled sumps to allow for run-off retardation, encourage sheet flow and absorption into the underlying soil; •Throttled outlet structures; and •Energy dissipation slabs to limit erosion and encourage sheet flow at outlets.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Legislation and policies	The City Catchment Management Policy, 2009 states that no development will be permitted below 1:100 year floodline, or with 30 meter buffer of the wetland/riparian zone, whichever is greatest. Provision has been made for a 30 meter wetland buffer. It should be noted that that the riparian zone/wetland and associated buffer zone of 30 metres from the outer edge of the wetland temporary zone (or greater if this be required) be designated as sensitive and no development be permitted within such wetland and buffer zone or within the 1:100 year floodline, whichever is the greatest. This includes roads, parking or any other hard surfacing. No relaxation of these provisions will be entertained	The wetland specialist proposed a 32m buffer not 30m buffer. No development is proposed in the wetland or associated buffer other than the wetland crossing which will allow access from Erf 1 to Erf 2. The wetland and associated buffer have been zoned as Private Open Space.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Legislation and policies	City of Johannesburg Bylaws:  The following By-laws have been published by the City of Johannesburg to provide a framework for its operation and management and must be adhered to by the proposed development.  •City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality: Water Services By-laws This by-law prescribes and elaborates on the use and related activities of water in the CoJ and must therefore be considered during any EIA process in the Johannesburg metropolitan area.  •City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality: Waste Management By-Laws This bylaw prescribes and elaborates on the use, disposal and related activities of waste in the CoJ, and must therefore be considered during any EIA or waste management application process in the Johannesburg area.  •City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality: Municipal Planning Draft By-Laws This bylaw applies to all land and land development applications within the jurisdiction of the City of Johannesburg and must therefore be considered during any EIA process to align with the set of requirements set out in the by-law.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Townplanning	Town Planning application comments  A land use application with the reference 03-19121 was circulated to the City of Johannesburg and the following key comments were received.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	
								Access and Roads	•Johannesburg Roads Agency:  JRA was unable to support the development based on the report dated October 2018 from the traffic point of view. This is also reflected in TIA. The updated JRA comments must be included in the final EIR.	Please refer to Appendix 1 of Addendum 1 to the Comments and Response Report which contains a copy of the updated JRA comments on the development. They note the following: <i>"It is considered that the proposed township can be supported from a traffic engineering viewpoint, provided that the recommendations made in this memo are implemented. A Site Traffic Assessment will have to be undertaken during the SDP submission stage."</i>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).	

No	Association				Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report	
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity							
7	Ms Mr	Nozipho Etienne	Maduse Allers	Head - Impact Management	City of Johannesburg: Impact Management and Compliance Monitoring	Commenting Authority/Service Provider	12-Oct-20	Services - existing and/or required	<p>•Johannesburg Water: Johannesburg Water is in support of the application subject to conditions.</p>	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Alternatives	<p>Description of alternatives: The submitted Draft EIR has identified alternatives for executing the proposal</p>	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Environmental sensitivity	<p>Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment: Based on the results and conclusions presented in this report, and the outcomes of the field survey, it is the opinion of the specialists that the proposed project can be favourably considered should all the mitigations measures and recommendations be adhered to.  The grassland section in the centre of the site is referred to as degraded grassland. It is however, acknowledged in the specialist study that the grassland nevertheless continues to perform an ecological function. In particular, it is likely to provide for foraging for the grass owl.  It is unclear therefore, why consideration has not been given to the rehabilitation of this important grassland area as part of the overall conservation area associated with the wetland. There seems to be a relationship between the grassland and wetland areas, something that is not uncommon, and it is often these transitional zones where the highest biodiversity is found. The grassland is described as being fragmented, but that is only in relation to other grassland, whereas it is currently not fragmented from the wetland system with which it is associated, hence in our view this is still likely to be performing an important role in terms of habitat, foraging and roosting. It is also unclear why a 30 meter buffer is considered acceptable along the wetland in view of the likelihood of the presence of the grass owl which in our view is not sufficient. It would be preferable as a compromise, then to at least conserve the primary grassland area, and seek to rather rehabilitate this as part of a conservation area including the wetland.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3 of Addendum 1 to the Comments and Responses Report for a detailed response. In summary, the specialist found that the degraded grassland had a low medium sensitivity. Furthermore, approximately half of this degraded grassland area falls partly in the wetland buffer area and thus approximately half of this area (around 1.3 ha) will be conserved. In addition, the wetland and wetland buffer area compromise approximately 5 ha the site (or roughly 20%). It thus provides sufficient habitat for foraging and roosting. Lastly, it is important to note that the specialist did not see any evidence of Grass Owl at the site. However, due to the possibility of occurrence, a number of mitigation measures have been included in the EIR as well as the EMPr. The most important aspect was related to the conservation and rehabilitation of the wetland and wetland buffer. The reason that this is a vital measure is that the Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment notes that the Grass Owls are known to forage and breed in Imperata cylindrica. The Wetland Specialist also identified Imperata cylindrica within the wetland and wetland buffer area. As this area includes almost half of the degraded grassland area (1.3ha) and is over 5 ha in extent.  Please note a 32m buffer is recommended not a 30m buffer.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Environmental sensitivity	<p>In terms of the report, wet areas were also identified within the recovering grassland habitat. It is however presumed that the source of the water in these areas is from an artificial source. An investigation must be done in the final EIR on this unnamed artificial source. The findings of the Geotechnical report must be taken into consideration and the investigation must include the relationship between the seepage areas and the high biodiversity area. One of the mitigation measures in the report states that "areas of indigenous vegetation should be delineated, and rehabilitation measures implemented in areas where the indigenous community is still present but degraded". The report however proposed development on the area of highest biodiversity</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 4 of Addendum 1 of the Comments and Responses Report for a detailed response. In summary, an assessment has been done utilizing Google Earth, information from the Geotechnical reports and the Wetland Specialist's experience with the area and found that the artificial source of water mentioned by the Ecologist relates to stormwater which drains from the remaining platforms on site along drainage channels to an earth dam which occurs in the centre of the degraded grassland area (identified by the Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment).  As indicated in both the Wetland Report (Prism EMS, 2020) and the summary included in Section 9.2. of the EIR, the Wetland Assessment utilized a desktop assessment followed by a field assessment. The field procedure for the wetland delineation was conducted according to the Guidelines for delineating the boundaries of a wetland set out by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF 2005/8) and included terrain unit indicators, soil wetness (auguring) and vegetation indicators. The Wetland has 17 years' experience and is a registered Professionally Registered Scientist. More than this, the specialist has been involved with the development for a number of years and has seen firsthand experience with the impact of stormwater on site. He was thus able to delineate the natural watercourse, disregarding the old earth dam which is impacted by stormwater.  The Geotechnical Studies were undertaken in 2010 and 2011 and thus were influenced by the existing development on site. The study for Portion 185 specifically notes: "The drainage feature has been modified due to stormwater trenches, runoff from large concrete paved areas and septic tank drainage fields. A stormwater drainage ditch runs through the central part of the holding into an earth dam on the central northern boundary with the golf driving range." The comments from COJ seem to disregard that the Geotechnical studies specifically indicate that the site is affected by stormwater and seepage.  Section 9.1.1.3.2. refers to the Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment and not the Wetland Assessment. However, as indicated in this Addendum, an assessment has been done utilizing Google Earth, information from the Geotechnical reports and the Wetland Specialist's experience with the area and found that the artificial source of water mentioned by the Ecologist relates to stormwater which drains from the remaining platforms on site along drainage channels to an earth dam. The fact that the Ecologist separately and independently came to the same conclusion corroborates the findings of the wetland study.  Further to the comments, it should be noted that the development will involve the rehabilitation of the wetland and associated wetland buffer in line with the Aquatic Resources Rehabilitation Plan. The current state of the wetland was found to be low and the wetland is highly modified. The wetland and buffer, once rehabilitated will be similar to the wetland systems included in the main Steyn City development.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Wetlands	<p>Wetland Assessment:  The wetland study appears to disregard the large seepage wetlands associated with the main valley bottom wetland and dismisses these. Given that the details of where verification was undertaken and the results of augur points are not provided, it is not clear how the conclusions that these seepage areas are artificially driven are arrived at.  Further, the geotechnical report by the engineering geologist confirms the presence of seasonal perched groundwater tables and/or saturated soil profiles, not confined to the riparian zone only. Figure 9-11 indicates extensive areas designated as Zone III which are noted to be wet and marshy. This would be consistent with the National Wetlands Map 5 (Van Deventer et al 2019) and the City's own indicative wetland layers. The historic vegetation maps appear to show these areas in existence. Furthermore, extensive seep wetlands associated with valley bottom wetlands is a common feature of the Halfway House Granites.  The statement under section 9.1.1.3.2. that wet areas associated with the grasslands can be presumed to be water from an artificial source' cannot be accepted at face value and without a thorough analysis. It is even possible that there may be changes to the hydrology as a result of the disruption of flow paths which has already taken place to parts of the wetland as a result of existing development such as roads etc. which appear to have encroached into, and destroyed parts of the wetland especially in the north western section.  In the absence of a proper hydrogeology report which characterizes the complex flow paths of this terrain, these conclusions cannot be accepted, and it is our view that the full extent of the wetlands including the seepage areas must be assessed in the FBAR. Auger points for the wetland delineation must be included and the wetlands must consider the Geotechnical report findings. All areas affected must be excluded from the developable portion.</p>	<p>The Geotechnical Studies were undertaken in 2010 and 2011 and thus were influenced by the existing development on site. The study for Portion 185 specifically notes: "The drainage feature has been modified due to stormwater trenches, runoff from large concrete paved areas and septic tank drainage fields. A stormwater drainage ditch runs through the central part of the holding into an earth dam on the central northern boundary with the golf driving range." The comments from COJ seem to disregard that the Geotechnical studies specifically indicate that the site is affected by stormwater and seepage.  Section 9.1.1.3.2. refers to the Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment and not the Wetland Assessment. However, as indicated in this Addendum, an assessment has been done utilizing Google Earth, information from the Geotechnical reports and the Wetland Specialist's experience with the area and found that the artificial source of water mentioned by the Ecologist relates to stormwater which drains from the remaining platforms on site along drainage channels to an earth dam. The fact that the Ecologist separately and independently came to the same conclusion corroborates the findings of the wetland study.  Further to the comments, it should be noted that the development will involve the rehabilitation of the wetland and associated wetland buffer in line with the Aquatic Resources Rehabilitation Plan. The current state of the wetland was found to be low and the wetland is highly modified. The wetland and buffer, once rehabilitated will be similar to the wetland systems included in the main Steyn City development.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5.).
								Geotechnical/Geohydrology	<p>The geotechnical report also alludes to the need for foundation precautionary measures. Based on the extensive research into the hydrology of the Halfway House Granites, it is possible that there are pathways for shallow groundwater which have not necessarily been accounted for within the wetland delineation report. In the absence of the full report and the test pits augured we cannot comment definitively on this aspect. However, based on experience of similar developments on sites with similar geo hydrological attributes, we believe that a cautionary approach would be responsible. In this regard, a comprehensive hydrogeology study is required to inform the entire development and layout and also engineering methods and designs to address residual groundwater risks, such that not only are the foundations for structures protected, but that simultaneously these foundations and associated infrastructure are designed in a manner which does not create secondary problems through displacement of groundwater to other areas or structures or alters the hydrology of the site to the extent that environmentally sensitive areas and wetland systems are negatively affected</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 5 of the Addendum to the Comments and Responses Report which notes that a Phase 2 Geotechnical Report will be undertaken as part of the detailed design. The EIR has been updated to include this as a condition of the EA to ensure that it is undertaken and to ensure that the results are sent to the Department.  In regards to Hydrogeology, a Wetland Assessment has been undertaken and includes an assessment of flow and flow accumulation. The detailed engineering design with be informed by the Wetland Assessment as well as the Phase 2 Geotechnical Study and will ensure that foundations and associated infrastructure are designed correctly. In addition, it should be noted that the current Phase 1 Geotechnical studies were undertaken in 2010 and 2011 and were thus influenced by the state of the site at the time. This included stormwater drainage channels and an earth dam which affected surface water flow. It is thus the opinion of the Wetland Specialist that no further studies will be required.</p>	
Wetlands	<p>The purpose of the township application is to obtain basic zoning and land use rights. The standard zoning rights for Open Space in the City of Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 do not distinguish between 'recreational' and 'conservation' open space - only between Public and Private Open Space. The difference lies in the ownership and therefore the maintenance of the open space area. These 2 kinds of Open Space are defined in the Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 as follows: *Public open space: oUse of building/s and/or land which is under the ownership of the Council or other authority, ...." *Private Open space: oUse of building/s and/or land, with or without access control and which can be used as a private ground for sports, play, rest and recreation, or as an ornamental garden; pleaser ground; golf course; or for buildings reasonably required in connection with such uses."</p> <p>The proposed Erf 2 is zoned Private Open Space, since it is the area affected by Wetlands. It could therefore be categorised as "conservation open space". The Townplanner has indicated that they will add the words "conservation open space" to their submission..</p> <p>In addition to the above, the draft Site Development Plan included in the EIR indicates the sports fields for the school, which are "recreational open space", as required for the learners.</p> <p>In addition, the subject township is located adjacent to and directly north of the existing Steyn City Lifestyle estate, which is a private lifestyle estate, which makes provision for non-residential support uses within the estate. These include a golf course, retirement village, shopping centre, offices, filling station with convenience shop, gymnasium, heliport and school. Due to the extent of the residential component of this estate another school is required. The application site was identified for this use. The land was purchased after the original development of Steyn City Estate and therefore an extension to this estate which comprises the proposed township of Riverside View Ext 84. Initially the school will be open to people living outside the Steyn City, but eventually the residents of Steyn City will have first choice and therefore it will be a private school - similar to the existing Steyn City School in the southern section of the estate.</p> <p>The existing estate boundary wall will be extended to enclose the application site in order to be included in the Steyn City Estate boundaries. Since Steyn City Estate is a private estate all roads in the estate are private roads and all open spaces are private. Therefore the open space areas in the application site can only be zoned Private Open Space. However, like all other private schools, the sports fields are used for matches, which implies that the active open space areas will be utilized by more than only the Steyn City school.</p>										



No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
								Wetlands	Monitoring Plan and Wetland Rehabilitation Plan:  This Monitoring Program aims to highlight environmental aspects that require monitoring based on findings from the specialist studies, at the discretion of the aquatic specialist. This, to suggest the appropriate monitoring requirements in the Water Use License. The recommended monitoring requirements are summarised in the above. The aquatic resources to be monitored includes the unchanneled valley-bottom wetland. Also, to be included are the foraging areas used by the African Grass-owl.	Noted. The Wetland and Grass Owl Foraging area are included in the Monitoring Plan.	
								Geotechnical/ Geohydrology	Geotechnical Assessment  A Geotechnical report for Portion 124 and another for Portion 185 is included. Among others the following is noted: •Seepage areas were identified on both portions with the one on Portion 185 being bigger than that on Portion 124. •Major factors influencing Geotech include the seasonal shallow perched water tables and surface seepage, flooding and surface seepage in the gully area (Ptn 124) and seasonal shallow ground water and/or perched water table and /or surface seepage and flooding in the watercourse (Ptn 185). •A residual granite profile occurring at a depth of 0.5m, which is slightly to very moist, has grey to greyish mottled orange and black, medium dense intact clayed sand with Fe and Mn nodules was found on Ptn 124. •The site is not dolomitic •It is requested that in the final BAR, the resolution be increased in order to improve the legibility of maps. Some of the maps are extremely difficult to read, e.g. Appendix 2- figure 2 (Where is TP 1 and 3 where seepage was encountered?), map concerning the catchments, and associated infrastructure for stormwater. •The reports also recommend that a phase II Geotechnical site investigation be done. The FEIR must confirm when this will be done or include it.	Please refer to Section 5 of the Addendum to the Comments and Responses Report which notes that a Phase 2 Geotechnical Report will be undertaken as part of the detailed design. The EIR has been updated to include this as a condition of the EA to ensure that it is undertaken and to ensure that the results are sent to the Department.  Unfortunately, the reports that were included are the only ones available and are scanned versions of hard copy reports. This does impact on the resolution. However, as noted, as a condition of the EA, a Phase 2 Geotechnical Report will be undertaken and will be made available to COJ as part of the SDP Planning process.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5). Requirement for a Phase 2 Geotechnical Study has been included in the EMPr.
								Heritage Sensitivity	Heritage Impact Assessment:  The property is severely disturbed and has been cultivated from prior to 1957. From 1975 onwards, numerous industrial structures and a few residential dwellings with access roads were developed. Currently the site is fallow, highly overgrown with the building rubble from demolished structures scattered over the study area.  No archaeological sites or material of significance was recorded during the survey. Based on the SAHRIS Paleontological Sensitivity Map, the area is of insignificant paleontological significance. Therefore, no further mitigation prior to construction is recommended in terms of Section 35 for the proposed development to proceed.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Access and Roads	Traffic Impact Assessment  It is recommended that any road crossings over the wetland or riparian areas should be constructed as a span bridge with the supports located outside of the riparian zone and buffer areas, and only minimal additional support pillars permitted as required to support the span, and subject to the detailed design being approved by both JRA AND Environmental Management. The conceptual drawings appear to only consider the primary wetland and not the buffer areas.	Please refer to Section 6 of the Addendum to the Comments and Responses Report. In summary, whilst conceptually a span bridge appears to reduce the impact, this is more in relation to riparian areas. From discussions with the Wetland Specialist, it should be noted that due to the nature of the wetland and surface flows, the pillars would need to be sunk to a level were a greater impact would be experienced. Instead, the engineers (in consultation with the specialist) have recommended a culvert which rests of a "rafts" of stone which will allow for continued subsurface flow. This reduces the impact to the wetland and wetland habitat. A span bridge is therefore not recommended from a wetland perspective.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Engineering aspects/stormwater	Stormwater Management Plan  The development will need to comply with the COJ Stormwater By-Laws 2010. Particular attention is drawn to Clause 44, which requires the following:  Wetlands 44. (1) The following requirements must, in addition to the requirements of section 38, be complied with if stormwater from any development site discharges directly, or indirectly across any intervening property, into a wetland: (a)The quantity and velocity of any stormwater discharge must be controlled and treated to the extent that such discharge attains a quality in compliance with the requirements of the National Water Act, 1998, the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 and any other applicable law; (b)A stormwater discharge must maintain the frequency and flow of pre-development conditions, to the extent necessary to protect the characteristic functions of the wetland; (c) prior to discharging to a wetland, any alternative discharge location and any natural water storage infiltration opportunity outside the wetland, must be evaluated by a professional engineer and utilised for the stormwater discharge if reasonably practically possible; prior to discharging to a wetland, any alternative discharge location and any natural water storage infiltration opportunity outside the wetland, must be evaluated by a professional engineer and utilised for the stormwater discharge if reasonably practically possible;	Please refer to Section 8 of the Addendum to the Comments and Responses Report.  In summary, a stormwater management plan has been compiled by a professional engineer and provides for discharge overland within the wetland buffer. The plan utilized SUDS and all run-off from the site will be routed to the attenuation ponds of each respective catchment. Each catchment area drains into an attenuation pond whereby the run-off from the area is throttled to release into the wetland and buffer zone at the 1:5 year pre-developed flow. Energy dissipating structures will be constructed at each outlet to limit any erosion and encourage sheet flow into the wetland area.  In addition, the stormwater system will include: •Grass lined attenuation ponds; •Use of the soccer field to attenuate stormwater and allow for ground water recharge; •Bio swales with stone filled sumps to allow for run-off retardation, encourage sheet flow and absorption into the underlying soil; •Throttled outlet structures; and •Energy dissipation slabs to limit erosion and encourage sheet flow at outlets.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Mitigation	Other:  The WULA Technical report is included. Mitigation measures are proposed for each identified environmental impact. The proposed mitigation measures are also included in an Environmental Management Program report contained in Appendix 14.8 and the WULA in Appendix 14.9.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. No further response required.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Mitigation	The WULA approval will need to be submitted together with the Site Development Plan.	Noted and included in the Comments and Responses Report. An item has been added to the EMPr.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								General	Departmental Comments:  The Department recommends that the following is included in the FEIR:	Noted. Please refer to specific responses to each item.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Floodlines	•The certified floodlines.	Certified floodlines are included on the layout and on the design drawings.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Access and Roads	•The proposed watercourse crossing must be undertaken in such a manner that it does not impact on the hydrological process; thus, a hydrological study must be undertaken to assess the impact of the proposed crossing. A span bridge is recommended.	A Wetland Assessment has been undertaken and includes an assessment of flow and flow accumulation. The detailed engineering design will be informed by the Wetland Assessment as well as the Phase 2 Geotechnical Study and will ensure that foundations and associated infrastructure are designed correctly. It is the opinion of the Wetland Specialist that no further studies are required. In addition, from discussions with the Wetland Specialist, it should be noted that due to the nature of the wetland and surface flows, the pillars of a span bridge would need to be sunk to a level were a greater impact would be experienced. Instead, the engineers (in consultation with the specialist) have recommended a culvert which rests of a "rafts" of stone which will allow for continued subsurface flow. This reduces the impact to the wetland and wetland habitat. A span bridge is therefore not recommended from a wetland perspective.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Traffic	•Final JRA comments on the Traffic Impact Assessment.	Please refer to Appendix 1 of Addendum 1 to the Comments and Response Report which contains a copy of the updated JRA comments on the development.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Specialist Studies	•Auger points for the wetland delineation must be included and the wetlands must consider the Geotechnical report findings. All areas affected must be excluded from the developable portion	It should be noted that the current Phase 1 Geotechnical studies were undertaken in 2010 and 2011 and were thus influenced by the state of the site at the time. This included stormwater drainage channels and an earth dam which affected surface water flow. The delineated wetland and 32m buffer have been excluded from the development footprint.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
								Development layout	<p>•Open space: The proposed zoning of Special, includes residential components. In this regard it should be noted that provision should be made within the proposed residential areas for useable and accessible recreational parks in compliance with the COJ Open Space Framework standards and requirements to the satisfaction of the Environmental Management Department of COJ at a ratio of 0,8 ha per 1000 population. No public open space contributions are to be accepted in lieu of parkland</p> <p>From the report, it would appear that consideration is being given to the design of open space which can simultaneously serve a stormwater drainage function and a recreation function, and we reserve the right to comment on the detailed stormwater management plans and site development plans in this regard. A separate open space erf for recreation purpose must be provided as part of the FEIR</p> <p>This would include parks, sports fields and hard open spaces such as urban squares, provided that such open spaces are easily accessible to the general public and not covered. It would however exclude traffic islands and parking areas, and also ecological and undeveloped open spaces such as protected areas high sensitivity vegetation and ridges. It would exclude the open space which forms part of the riparian zone which is to be conserved as a natural green belt in support of biodiversity.</p>	<p>The standard zoning rights for Open Space in the City of Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 do not distinguish between 'recreational' and 'conservation' open space - only between Public and Private Open Space. The difference lies in the ownership and therefore the maintenance of the open space area. These 2 kinds of Open Space are defined in the Johannesburg Land Use Scheme 2018 as follows:          •"Public open space: oUse of building/s and/or land which is under the ownership of the Council or other authority, ...."          •"Private Open space: oUse of building/s and/or land, with or without access control and which can be used as a private ground for sports, play, rest and recreation, or as an ornamental garden; pleaser ground; golf course; or for buildings reasonably required in connection with such uses."          The proposed Erf 2 is zoned Private Open Space, since it is the area affected by Wetlands. It could therefore be categorised as "conservation open space". The Townplanner has indicated that they will add the words "conservation open space" to their submission..          In addition to the above, the draft Site Development Plan included in the EIR indicates the sports fields for the school, which are "recreational open space", as required for the learners.          In addition, the subject township is located adjacent to and directly north of the existing Steyn City Lifestyle estate, which is a private lifestyle estate, which makes provision for non—residential support uses within the estate. These include a golf course, retirement village, shopping centre, offices, filling station with convenience shop, gymnasium, heliport and school. Due to the extent of the residential component of this estate another school is required. The application site was identified for this use. The land was purchased after the original development of Steyn City Estate and therefore an extension to this estate which comprises the proposed township of Riverside View Ext 84. Initially the school will be open to people living outside the Steyn City, but eventually the residents of Steyn City will have first choice and therefore it will be a private school – similar to the existing Steyn City School in the southern section of the estate.          The existing estate boundary wall will be extended to enclose the application site in order to be included in the Steyn City Estate boundaries. Since Steyn City Estate is a private estate all roads in the estate are private roads and all open spaces are private. Therefore the open space areas in the application site can only be zoned Private Open Space. However, like all other private schools, the sports fields are used for matches, which implies that the active open space areas will be utilized by more than only the Steyn City school.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Development layout	<p>•The proposed development only provides open space for conservation on the wetland area. The wetland and buffer zone must be zoned Private Open Space for conservation purposes</p>		
								Engineering aspects/Stormwater	<p>•The design of storm water management systems should be based on the Stormwater by-law, 2010, Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), and Water Sensitive Urban Design approaches (WSUDS) which enhance natural drainage through permeable surfacing and integrates landscaping with storm water in line with best practice storm water management. Although the report mentions some principles which are part of the Stormwater by-law, the attenuation ponds show single points on discharge into the buffer or the 1:100 year floodline. The stormwater must be discharged in manner that maximises wetland and open space functionality and limits potential erosion. Stormwater must be managed to the satisfaction of JRA and the Environment and Infrastructure Services Department.</p>	<p>A stormwater management plan has been compiled by a professional engineer and provides for discharge overland within the wetland buffer. The plan utilized SUDS and all run-off from the site will be routed to the attenuation ponds of each respective catchment. Each catchment area drains into an attenuation pond whereby the run-off from the area is throttled to release into the wetland and buffer zone at the 1:5 year pre-developed flow. Energy dissipating structures will be constructed at each outlet to limit any erosion and encourage sheet flow into the wetland area.</p> <p>In addition, the stormwater system will include:          •Grass lined attenuation ponds;          •Use of the soccer field to attenuate stormwater and allow for ground water recharge;          •Bio swales with stone filled sumps to allow for run-off retardation, encourage sheet flow and absorption into the underlying soil;          •Throttled outlet structures; and          •Energy dissipation slabs to limit erosion and encourage sheet flow at outlets.</p> <p>Please refer to Figure 12 of Addendum 1 which provides an overview of this plan and highlights that there are 6 separate releases along the wetland buffer at separate locations. It is not necessary to include multiple releases from each attenuation due to the fact that the site has been separated into small catchments and each catchment has its own release. It therefore has the same effect as having multiple releases from the same attenuation.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Request for information	<p>•An investigation must be done in the final EIR on the unnamed artificial source of water as per the Biodiversity Assessment. The findings of the Geotechnical report must be taken into consideration and the investigation must include the relationship between the seepage areas, high biodiversity area, and the wetland functionality.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 4 of Addendum 1 of the Comments and Responses Report for a detailed response. In summary, an assessment has been done utilizing Google Earth, information from the Geotechnical reports and the Wetland Specialist's experience with the area. The site is affected by drainage channels which channel water to an earth dam (the artificial source indicated in the Wetland and Biodiversity Studies).</p>	
								Request for information	<p>•Legible maps must be included. Some of the maps are not legible, e.g. Appendix 2: figure 2 (where is TP 1 and 3 where seepage was encountered?), map concerning the catchments, and associated infrastructure for stormwater.</p>	<p>The EAP only has scanned version of the original hard copy reports. A Phase 2 Geotechnical Study will be undertaken in the detailed design phase.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Request for information	<p>Other:          •A copy of the EA showing approval by GOARD must be forwarded to this Department.          •This Department should be informed of the date that construction on site would commence for the purpose of compliance monitoring.</p>	<p>Noted. These requirements have been added to the EMPr.</p>	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5). These requirements have also been added to the EMPr.

No	Association					Interest	Date	Category	Comments	Responses	Cross Reference in Scoping/EIA Report
	Title	Name	Surname	Capacity	Organization/Affiliation						
8	Mr	Teboho	Leku	Control Environmental Office - B Impact Management	Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD)	Competent Authority	26-Oct-20	Project description	<p>COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT EIAR: FOR THE PROPOSED MIXED DEVELOPMENT ON PORTIONS 124 AND 185 OF THE FARM DIEPSLOOT 388-JR TO BE KNOWN AS RIVERSIDE VIEW EXTENSION 84, CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY</p> <p>The above-mentioned matter received by the Department on 26 October 2020 has reference .</p> <p>The proposal entails three (3) Erf which involves mixed use development to cater for the place of Instructions, Residential, offices , including ancillary uses such as restaurants and shops and Erf 3 special for Private Open Space on the above mentioned site which measures 29.30 hectares with a developable of 24.10 hectares in extent. The applicant applied for Activity 19 of Listing Notice 1, Activity 15 of Listing Notice 2 and Activities 4, 12 and 14 of Listing Notice 3 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014.</p> <p>The Draft EIAR submitted is noted and the Department would like to comment as follows :</p>	Noted. The comments provided date 26 October 2020 have been included in the Comments and Responses Report. Please refer to responses to each item below.	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Access and Roads	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The activity 19 of listing notice was applied to cater for the bridge to access Erf 2 the plan bridge must be environmentally friendly so that the animals within the wetland will be able to migrate</li> </ul>	Noted. This will be undertaken and is shown in Appendix 14.3.4. Please also refer to Page 12 of the Stormwater Management Plan (Tekciv, 2020) that was included in the Appendix 14.6.9 which notes: "A road-bridge will be constructed which allows for the 1:100 year flow of 8.7 m <sup>3</sup> /s to pass under the road. The bridge is to be constructed of pre-cast portal culverts and will extend the full width of the flood line. To cater for animal crossings, smaller culverts will be placed above the flood line to allow for migration."	Included in Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5). The design already incorporates these requirements.
								Wetlands	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 41 on wetland report indicated as figure 6.4 it display the wetland on site as per the Departmental Information System (GIS) but when its delineated on page 45 as figure 6.8 the other part which is on Erf 1 it's no longer delineated as wetland a clarity must be provided because even on site visit even the reeds were observed on that part.</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to Addendum 2 for a detailed response. In summary, an assessment has been done utilizing Google Earth, information from the Geotechnical reports and the Wetland Specialist's experience with the area and found that the site is indicated by an artificial source of water (as mentioned in the Ecological Assessment). This artificial source relates to stormwater which drains from the remaining platforms on site along drainage channels to an earth dam which occurs in the centre of the degraded grassland area (identified by the Biodiversity Baseline and Impact Assessment).</p> <p>Further, as indicated in both the Wetland Report (Prism EMS, 2020) and the summary included in Section 9.2. of the EIR, the Wetland Assessment utilized a desktop assessment followed by a field assessment. The field procedure for the wetland delineation was conducted according to the Guidelines for delineating the boundaries of a wetland set out by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF 2005/8) and included terrain unit indicators, soil wetness (auguring) and vegetation indicators. The Wetland has 17 years' experience and is a registered Professionally Registered Scientist. More than this, the specialist has been involved with the development for a number of years and has seen firsthand experience with the impact of stormwater on site. He was thus able to delineate the natural watercourse, disregarding the old earth dam which is impacted by stormwater.</p> <p>The Reeds noted by the Department are Arundo donax (Giant Spanish Reed) which is invasive. In this case, it is indicative of the stormwater on site.</p>	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Services - existing and/or required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eskom servitudes is affected by the proposed development comments from Eskom must be adhered to</li> </ul>	Noted. The requirements from Eskom have been included in the EMPr.	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green buildings techniques should be applied to the proposed development process to make use of natural light and heat and thus reduce energy use and emission to the atmosphere so that impacts of climate change can be mitigated</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Energy saving measures for water heating (for example heat pumps or solar);</li> <li>LED lamps;</li> <li>General control switching (to minimise use of lights when not needed); and</li> <li>Energy saving appliances</li> </ul>	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rainwater harvesting methods should be incorporated into the development, to store water for irrigation purpose</li> </ul>	Noted, this will be passed on to the design team and taken into account (where possible) during the detail design phase.	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Mitigation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Waste Management Plan that seeks to achieve high levels of separation of waste at source to reduce volumes disposed of at the landfill sites must be compiled</li> </ul>	Noted, a Waste Management Plan is included in the EMPr and provides requirements for recycling of waste.	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
								Engineering aspects/stormwater	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stormwater management must be design in such a way that it will not dispense directly to the watercourse and its buffer zone and it must be submitted to the Johannesburg Roads Agency for consideration</li> </ul>	<p>A stormwater management plan has been compiled by a professional engineer and provides for discharge overland within the wetland buffer. The plan utilized SUDS and all run-off from the site will be routed to the attenuation ponds of each respective catchment. Each catchment area drains into an attenuation pond whereby the run-off from the area is throttled to release into the wetland and buffer zone at the 1:5 year pre-developed flow. Energy dissipating structures will be constructed at each outlet to limit any erosion and encourage sheet flow into the wetland area.</p> <p>In addition, the stormwater system will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grass lined attenuation ponds;</li> <li>Use of the soccer field to attenuate stormwater and allow for ground water recharge;</li> <li>Bio swales with stone filled sumps to allow for run-off retardation, encourage sheet flow and absorption into the underlying soil;</li> <li>Throttled outlet structures; and</li> <li>Energy dissipation slabs to limit erosion and encourage sheet flow at outlets.</li> </ul>	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).
Public participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is noted that the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) is currently being circulated for comment. The public participation process must be undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations, 2014</li> </ul>	Noted. Public review of the EIR took place between 11 September 2020 to 12 October 2020. All registered I&APs were notified of the review period and the report made available electronically.	Included in the Comments and Responses Report (Appendix 14.5.5).								