

Comments And Response Report as part of the Draft Basic Assessment Report and EMPr for the proposed Lotus Gardens Retail Development on Portion 539 of the Farm Pretoria Town and Townlands 351 JR, Gauteng

An EOH Company



EQH

Technical Report: CRR-2016-11-23

Prepared for: Espero Properties (Pty) Ltd Prepared by: Exigo Sustainability (Pty) Ltd



An EOH Company

Email info@exigo3.com

Tel +27 012 751 2160 Fax +27 086 607 2406 The Village Office Park (Block E), 309 Glenwood Road, Faerie Glen,

Pretoria, 0043

Postnet Suite 74, Private Bag X07, Arcadia, 0007

Vat nr: 4910184854 Registration nr: 2006/011434/07

Innovation in Sustainability

www.exigo3.com

Comments And Response Report as part of the Draft Basic Assessment Report and EMPr for the proposed Lotus Gardens Retail Development on Portion 539 of the Farm Pretoria Town and Townlands 351 JR, Gauteng

23 November 2016

Conducted on behalf of:

Espero Properties (Pty) Ltd

Compiled by:

Chantal Uys (BHCS Hons Archaeology)

Reviewed by:

M Grobler (B.Sc.Hons, M. Org Leadership, (Pr.Sci.Nat))

Although Exigo exercises due care and diligence in rendering services and preparing documents, Exigo accepts no liability, and the client, by receiving this document, indemnifies Exigo and its directors, managers, agents and employees against all actions, claims, demands, losses, liabilities, costs, damages and expenses arising from or in connection with services rendered, directly or indirectly by Exigo and by the use of the information contained in this document.

This document contains confidential and proprietary information of Exigo and is protected by copyright in favour of Exigo and may not be reproduced, or used without the written consent of Exigo, which has been obtained beforehand. This document is prepared exclusively for Espero Properties (Pty) Ltd and is subject to all confidentiality, copyright and trade secrets, rules, intellectual property law and practices of South Africa.

In compliance with the Protection of Personal Information Act, No. 37067 of 26 November 2013, any personal information provided herein has been provided exclusively for use as part of the public participation registration process, and may therefore not be utilised for any purpose, other than that for which it was provided. No additional copies may be made of documents containing personal information unless permission has been obtained from the owner of said information. All documentation containing personal information must be destroyed, as soon as the purpose for which the information was collected has run out.







REPORT DISTRIBUTION LIST

Name	Institution
Monique Pieterse	Espero Properties (Pty) Ltd
Registered I&APs	See I&AP database

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Report no	Date	Version	Status
CRR-2016-11-23	23 November 2016	1.0	Draft for I&AP review



	Table of Contents	
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	PROCESS FOLLOWED	2
2.1.	NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT	2
2.2.	SITE NOTICE	2
2.3.	DIRECT NOTIFICATION OF IDENTIFIED I&APS	2
2.4.	PUBLIC AND FOCUS GROUP MEETING	3
2.5.	RAISING OF ISSUES FOR INVESTIGATION BY I&AP	3
2.6.	DRAFT BAR	3
2.7.	FINAL BAR	4
3.	COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REGISTER	4
4.	CONCLUSIONS	18
	List of Tables	
Tab	ole 1: Comments and Response Register	5



1. INTRODUCTION

Public Participation is one of the most important aspects of the environmental authorisation process. This stems from the requirement that people have the right to be informed about potential decisions that may affect them and that they must be afforded an opportunity to influence those decisions. Effective public participation also improves the ability of the competent authority to make informed decisions and result in improved decision-making as the views of all parties are considered.

The Public Participation Process:

- Provides an opportunity for interested and affected parties (I&AP's) to obtain clear, accurate and comprehensive information about the proposed activity, its alternatives or the decisions and the environmental impacts thereof;
- Provides I&AP's with an opportunity to indicate their viewpoints, issues and concerns regarding the activity, alternatives and/or the decisions;
- Provides I&AP's with the opportunity of suggesting ways of avoiding, reducing or mitigating negative impacts of an activity and for enhancing positive impacts;
- Enables an applicant to incorporate the needs, preferences and values of the affected parties into the activity;
- Provides opportunities to avoid and resolve disputes and reconcile conflicting interests;
- Enhance transparency and accountability in decision making

Public Participation therefore allows I&AP's the opportunity to give their viewpoints and influence the process and the decisions of the competent authority.



2. PROCESS FOLLOWED

The following process was undertaken to facilitate the public participation for the proposed project:

2.1. NEWSPAPER ADVERTISEMENT

Advertisements, notifying the public of the Environmental Impact Assessment application and Basic Assessment process, and requesting I&APs to register their comments with Exigo, will be placed in the Laudium Sun on Friday, 25 November 2016. This advertisement will be placed in accordance with regulation 41(2) (c) of the EIA Regulations of 2014.

2.2. SITE NOTICE

In order to inform surrounding communities and adjacent landowners of the proposed development, site notice boards in accordance with regulation 41(2)(a) and 41(3) of the EIA Regulations was erected on Friday, 25 November 2016 at the following locations:

- 2 notices on site
- 1 notice at the Omar H.S. Ebrahim Lotus Gardens Primary School

2.3. DIRECT NOTIFICATION OF IDENTIFIED I&APS

Key stakeholders, who included the following sectors, were informed by means of hand deliveries, emails, faxes or registered post of the proposed development:

- The owners, persons in control of, and occupiers of land adjacent to the site where
 the activity is or is to be undertaken or to any alternative site where the activity is to
 be undertaken;
- City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (CTMM) Environmental Management & Open Space Management;
- CTMM Ward 7 Municipal Councillor;
- City of Tshwane Services Infrastructure Department Energy and Electricity Development Division;
- Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport;
- Gauteng Department of Water and Sanitation;
- Gauteng Department of Economic Development;
- Department of Public Works;
- SANRAL;
- SAHRA; and
- Plankonsult Townplanners.



2.4. PUBLIC AND FOCUS GROUP MEETING

A pre-application meeting was held with the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5 of the Draft BAR for the minutes of the meeting.

2.5. RAISING OF ISSUES FOR INVESTIGATION BY I&AP

I&APs were granted an opportunity to raise issues either in writing, by telephone or email. Notifications requesting I&AP's to register on the project was delivered by hand, email, post and sms on the 16th of September 2016. The 30 day registration process took place from the 16th of September 2016 to the 19th of October 2016. All the issues raised by I&APs during this period was captured in this Comment and Response Report which is appended to the Draft BAR, and the I&APs received responses acknowledging their contributions.

The following key issues were raised by I&AP's during the registration period:

- Guideline documents be considered:
 - o Tshwane Bioregional Plan
 - Tshwane Open Space Framework Document
- SUDS principles to be incorporated in cement stormwater channel cement channel
 could be recreated into a SUDS canal with a retention pond at the discharge point
 should this channel be used for the discharge of stormwater. Following consultation
 this is no longer required as the development's stormwater will be managed via
 existing municipal stormwater infrastructure. Refer to Section D (1) of the Draft BAR
 and Appendix F.5: Stormwater Management Plan
- Chemical storage on site, such as fuel
- Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) for the development
- General Authorisation (GA) to be applied for in terms of new gazette (GN 1180 in GG 39458 of 27 November 2015), not yet promulgated, for Section 21 (c) and (i) water uses
- Requirement of an Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPr)
- Sewerage Services/sewerage system crossing the watercourse
- Job creation
- Improvement in security in the area

2.6. DRAFT BAR

The EIA Regulations specify that I&APs must have an opportunity to verify that their issues have been captured. A period of 30 days will be made available to allow for public comment on the Draft BAR. The availability of the Draft BAR will be announced via personal notification



letters, emails, and/or SMS's to all the registered I&APs on the distribution list on the 25th of November 2016. The following methods will be made available for I&APs to access the reports:

- Published on the Dropbox website
- Hard Copies and Electronic copies will be distributed upon request.

2.7. FINAL BAR

A Comments and Response report will be prepared following receipt of comments on the Draft BAR. The Draft BAR will be updated to accommodate all received comments. This Final BAR will be submitted to the GDARD.

3. COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REGISTER

The following table forms the core of the Comments and Response Report as part of the Public Participation process for the project.



Table 1: Comments and Response Register

Organisation/Company/ Individual	Contact Person	Notification	Comments	Response
Local Authorities				
City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality (CTMM) – Environmental Management	Rudzani Mukhele (Deputy Director)	Via telephone & email: On 10 May 2016 Ms Uys contacted Ms Mukhele and informed her of the project. She also asked to be provided with the City of Tshwane's requirements and guidelines that we need to consider when compiling the Basic Environmental Assessment Report (BAR). She further informed her that she had been registered as an Interested and Affected Party on the project on behalf of the CTMM's Environmental Management Department, and will be kept up to date with any progress on the project as well as notified of the availability of reports for review.	Via email: On 12 May 2016 Ms Mukhele requested that the following guideline documents be considered: Tshwane Bioregional Plan Tshwane Open Space Framework Document She also requested that 2 hard copies and 2 cd's of the report be delivered to the Environmental Management Services (EMS) Department.	Please note that the Tshwane Bioregional Plan was taken into account in the Biodiversity Impact Assessment Study conducted for the project. Likewise the Tshwane Open Space Framework Document was taken into account in the compilation of the BAR.
		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the local authority.	No further comment received to date.	
City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality – Open Space Management	Mr Johannes Prinsloo	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the local authority.	No comment received to date.	
Ward Councillor: Ward 7 (City of Tshwane	Councillor Simon Motsaneng	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a	No comment received to date.	



Lotus Gardens Retail Centre. CRR							
Metropolitan Municipality)		notification was sent to the ward councillor.					
City of Tshwane Services Infrastructure Department Energy and Electricity Development Division	P Victoria Manganye Engineering Technician Snr: New Connections	Via email: On 7 October 2016 Ms Uys informed Ms Manganye of the commencement of the Environmental Authorisation process for the project. She informed her that the Draft Basic Assessment Report will be made available for review and comment in due course, of which she will be notified in advance. She provided Ms Manganye with a notification and stated that they looked forward to receiving her comments.	Via email: On 17 October 2016 Ms Manganye informed Ms Uys that she felt the application was sent to her by mistake. She stated that she would request her superior to advise where to take it or forward to relevant personnel. She apologised for the late response as she was on leave and only came back on the day.	Via email: On 17 October 2016 Ms Uys informed Ms Manganye that she had received her contact details from Cobus Human at Claassen Auret (Pty) Ltd. It was her understanding from Mr Human that they lodged an application for power supply with Ms Manganye for the e project and they therefore wished to bring the application for Environmental Authorisation to her attention in order to afford her the opportunity to provide them with comments (if any). She attached correspondence between Ms Manganye and Mr Human. She further asked that Ms Manganye please let her know should she not be the relevant person and kindly provide her with the relevant person in this matter.			
	Khathu J. Nyamande Mervin Govender William M. Matlija		Via email: On 17 October 2016 Ms Manganye that she was the relevant contact person only where the connection application is concerned but doesn't provide comments. She stated that Mr Human was supposed to place an RM6 on site which was handled by Mervin /William from Township Development. She only handled the meter placement which she received the proof of payment for, but was still waiting to be notified when the RM6 is connected. She asked Mr Govender and Mr Matjila to check who was handling the township or even the Erf for the CTMM	Via email: On 18 October 2016 Ms Uys thanked Ms Manganye for the feedback. She informed her that she will wait for further feedback as to the responsible person to comment on the Environmental Authorisation process.			
			Via email: Ms Manganye informed Ms Uys to speak to the consultant/townplanner who did the application for comment from their side	Via email: On 18 October 2016 Ms Uys thanked her and stated that she would follow-up with them.			



	ı	i		
			previously although approval is not finalises bur they should have feedback for her.	
			but they should have reedback for her.	Please refer to Appendix E of the Draft BAR for correspondence from the CTMM with regards to the electrical supply to the development.
Provincial Authorities				
Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No comment received to date.	
Gauteng Department of Water and Sanitation	Bashan Govender	Via telephone and email: On 25 May 2016 Ms Uys contacted Mr Govender and gave him an overview of the project and enquired whether he was the relevant DWS official for the project area. She requested the relevant contact details for the DWS official responsible for the project area. She informed him that the project site occurs within Quaternary Catchment A23D and within the Crocodile West Marico WMA. She provided him with a kmz file for the project site. She informed him that they will also contact Dr Wietsche Roets to discuss the potential Section 21c) and i) water uses.	Via email: On 25 May 2016 Mr Bashan informed Ms Uys that the area manager for the Crocodile- West – Marico is Ms Lilian Siwelane. He copied Ms Siwelane on the email and provided Ms Uys with her office telephone number.	



Ms Lilian Si (Crocodile-\ Marico)	
	Via email: On 8 August 2016 a reminder was sent to Ms Siwelane for the meeting request on the 15th of August with DWS Sub Directorate Instream Water Use.
	Via email: On 11 August 2016 Ms Uys informed Ms Siwelane that they were informed by Mr Bashan Govender that she is the responsible official for the Crocodile West Marico WMA. She had been unable to get into contact with Ms Siwelane.
	She informed her that they had secured a meeting with the Department of Water and Sanitation: In-stream Water Use for Monday, the 15th of August 2016, at 09:00 am, and that the Department had requested that the regional representative also attend the
	meeting. She informed her that she had sent calendar invites in this regard but have not yet received a response. She enquired whether Ms Siwelane will be attending the meeting.



		Via telephone: On 12 August 2016 Ms Uys reached Ms Siwelane on her mobile number and informed her of the meeting on the 15 th of August.	Ms Siwelane agreed to attend the meeting.	
		Meeting: A pre-application meeting was held with the Department on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5 of the Draft BAR for the minutes of the meeting.	 The following comments were raised during the meeting: Ms Siwelane asked whether the consultants would compile the additional information and submit as requested for the Department to assess. Mr Grobler asked for any inputs from Ms Siwelane. She stated that as long as the Instream Water Use Sub-Directorate is satisfied she had no problem with the approach. 	The following responses were given during the meeting: 1. Mr Michael Grobler answered in the affirmative. 2. Noted.
		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No further comment received to date.	
	Pieter Ackerman Sub Directorate Instream Water Use Dr. Wietsche Roets. Specialist Scientist: In- stream Water Use	Via email: On 29 June 2016 Ms Uys asked Mr Ackerman's opinion on the project as the site is 220m from the Skinnerspruit and the DWS external guideline (DWAF 2007) required that any development within 500 m of a wetland requires a Water Use Licence Application (WULA) in terms of Section 21 (c) and (i). She	Via email: On 5 July 2016 Mr Roets replied to Ms Uys and suggested a meeting be scheduled with a regional representative present. He asked Mr Ackerman to provide Ms Uys with a date.	Via email: On 25 July 2016 Ms Uys followed-up and requested dates for such a meeting. She informed them that Ms Lilian Siwelane (cc's in the email) wa the area manager for the Crocodile-West Marico WMA.



Lotus Gardens Retail Centre.	- Critic		
	requested whether a risk matrix could be used to assess the impact and whether the water use could be registered in terms of a General Authorisation even though the proposed amended GA Regulations (GN R 1199) has not yet been promulgated.		
		Via email: On 26 July 2016 Mr Ackerman suggested the 15 th of August at 09:00 am.	Via email: On 26 July 2016 Ms Uys thanked Mr Ackerman for the feedback and informed him that the meeting on the 15 th of August at 09:00 am will be suitable and that she would be sending out calendar invites to the relevant parties soonest.
	Meeting: A pre-application meeting was held with the Department on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5 of the Draft BAR for the minutes of the meeting.	 The following comments were raised during the meeting: Mr Pieter Ackerman stated that the SUDS principles could be incorporated in the cement channel and then a licence would possibly not be required. He clarified that the cement channel could be recreated into a SUDS canal with a retention pond at the discharge point. He further stated that in the submission the consultants could motivate for a low risk and a GA. 	 The following responses were given during the meeting: Noted. Mr Michael Grobler stated this would not be difficult as the entire channel is not cemented only where it crosses under the road. Dr Buks Henning stated that from the impact assessment which was done for the wetland most of the impacts were considered low.
Sub	A pre-application meeting was held with the Department on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5	Skinner Spruit.	The following responses were given during the meeting: 1. The closest development appeared to be hostels.



Lotus Gardens Retail Centr	e. Chh							
	of th			or the	2.	He asked whether there was a wetland	2.	Dr Buk Henning answered in the
	minute	s of the	meeting.			to the east of the site.		negative and indicated a drainage
					3.	He why the error cost of the site was not		which flowed approximately 1 km
					Э.	He why the area east of the site was not previously developed.		east of the site on the map.
							3.	Dr Buks Henning answered that he
					4.	Will any chemicals be stored on site, such as fuel as this was considered a		did not know why it had not
						high risk substance.		previously been developed but that it was old subsistence farming land.
						mgn non odbolanoo.		it was old subsistence familing fand.
					5.	Does the development have a Storm	4.	Mr Michael Grobler answered in
						Water Management Plan (SWMP). This		the negative and explained that the
						will be important to look at.		development was a regular
								regional centre.
]								



			6.	He stated that a GA could be done in terms of the new gazette (GN 1180 in GG 39458 of 27 November 2015) but that these had not yet been promulgated. This approach would be risk based.	5.6.	Refer to Appendix F.5 of the Draft BAR. "Noted. An IWULA will be submitted to the Department along with the Final BAR
				He stated that an Environmental Management Programme (EMP) will be required as this will act as a legal document for how the development should be operated. He stated that it will be important to indicate in the EMP that there will be no fuel station on site and therefore no harmful associated spillages. PM stated that he does not see any problem in issuing a GA considering the low risk due to the existing road, degraded state of the wetland due to alien invasive species, existing impacts, etc.	7.	Noted. Please refer to Appendix G of the Draft BAR Noted. Mr Grobler stated he was not sure.
		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No	further comment received to date.		
	Lumka Kuse Sub Directorate Instream Water Use	Meeting: A pre-application meeting was held with the Department on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5 of the Draft BAR for the minutes of the meeting.	the	e following comments were raised during meeting: Ms Lumka Kuse asked about the sewerage services.	The dur 1.	e following responses were given ing the meeting: Mr Michael Grobler explained that the retail centre will connect to the existing municipal sewerage system.



		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.		
	Ronald Mulaudzi Sub Directorate Instream Water Use	Meeting: A pre-application meeting was held with the Department on the 15th of August 2016. Please refer to Appendix D.5 of the Draft BAR for the minutes of the meeting.	The following comments were raised during the meeting: 1. Mr Ronald Mulaudzi asked whether the sewerage system would cross the watercourse.	The following responses were given during the meeting: 1. Mr Michael Grobler answered in the negative. He explained that the retail centre sewage connection will connect with the municipal sewage connection on the site.
		Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No further comment received to date.	
Gauteng Department of Economic Development	Economic & Development Planning	Via fax: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No comment received to date.	
Gauteng Department of Social Development	Ms Nandi Mayathula-Khoza MEC for Social Development	Via fax: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	Via telephone: On 16 September 2016 Ms Uys was contacted by the Department who stated that they had no interest in the development and asked to be removed from the stakeholder register.	The Department has subsequently been removed from the stakeholder database.
	Ms Shoki Tshabalala Head of Department: Social Development	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	Via telephone: On 16 September 2016 Ms Uys was contacted by the Department who stated that they had no interest in the development and asked to be removed from the stakeholder register.	The Department has subsequently been removed from the stakeholder database.
Department of Public Works	Head Office: Public Works Office of the DG	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the	No comment received to date.	



	DG: Mr Mziwonke Dlabantu	Department.		
	Mr Mbuyi Dondashe (Acting)	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No comment received to date.	
SANRAL	Izak van der Linde	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No comment received to date.	
SAHRA	Andrew Salomon	Via email: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the Department.	No comment received to date.	
Adjacent Landowners				
Portion 524 of the farm Pretoria Town and Townlands 351	City Of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	Refer to notification details above	No comment received to date.	
Erf 1361, Lotus Gardens	Rittah Ntombi Kayise Van Rooi (Letsoalo)	Via email and sms: On 16 & 19 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	Via telephone: On 18 November 2016 Ms Letsoalo contacted Ms Uys to enquire after the sms she had received with regards to the Lotus Gardens Retail Centre development. Ms Uys provided her with a brief description of the proposed project and informed her that the DBAR will be made available during the following week for comment. She asked Ms Letsoalo to confirm her email address so that she could provide her with a notification of the availability of the DBAR for comment, once the report became available	
Erf 1362, 70 Hazelnut Street, Lotus Gardens	Ngoanapitseng Martha Tema	Via sms and hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	No comment received to date.	
Erf 1363, Lotus Gardens	Rasihalli Ismail	Via sms and hand delivery:	No comment received to date.	



	Khairoonisah Ismail	On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	
Erf 1364, 62 Hazelnut Street, Lotus Gardens	Lesibana Daniel Aphane Makhotso Maribe	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.
Erf 1365, Lotus Gardens	Phuti Mavis Mashilo	Via hand delivery and registered post: On 16 & 19 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.
Erf 1366, 54 Hazelnut Street, Lotus Gardens	Mohamed Ally Shireen Ally	Via sms, hand delivery and registered post: On 16 & 19 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	No comment received to date.
Erf 1367, Lotus Gardens	City Of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	Refer to notification details above	No comment received to date.
Erf 1368, Lotus Gardens	City Of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality	Refer to notification details above	No comment received to date.
Erf 1369, 153 Hazelnut Street, Lotus Gardens	Juwayria Amod	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.
Erf 6876, 190 Dijon Street, Lotus Gardens	Ntsako Martin Mabunda	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.
Erf 6877, Coriander Street, Lotus Gardens	Linda Mxenge	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	No comment received to date.



Erf 6878, 311 Dijon Street, Lotus Gardens	Mahgabo Sethelo	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.	
Erf 7130, Coriander Street, Lotus Gardens	Given Sono	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	No comment received to date.	
Erf 7131, Coriander Street, Lotus Gardens	Nakedi Hendrick Moremi	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.	
	Tlabo Esther Moremi			
Erf 7132, Coriander Street, Lotus Gardens	Mosalashuping Klaas Seelamo	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.	
Erf 7133, Coriander Street, Lotus Gardens	Kokonini Rachel Choma	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.	
Erf 7640, Lotus Gardens EXT 11	Malose Winnie Teffo Madire Moshe Makena	Via hand delivery and registered post: : On 16 & 19 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.	
Erf 7687, Lotus Gardens EXT 11	Vusi Lucas Matshika Nthaba Tshepo Terminal Operator National Operations Department: Engen Sales &	Via sms and hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	Via email: On 18 October 2016 Mr Matshika provided the following comment on the project: He welcomed the development and stated that it would create more jobs. He also stated that it was going to improve security in the area.	Via email: On 18 October 2016 Ms Uys thanked Mr Tshepo for sending the comments. She informed him that Mr Matshika's comments will be included and addressed in the Draft Basic Assessment report, which will be made available for review to I&AP's, and of which they will be notified of in advance.



	Marketing Division			She asked that they contact her should they have any queries. The benefits of the project are discussed in Section E (2) and (9) of the DBAR.	
Erf 7688, Lotus Gardens EXT 11	Musiiwa Nemusimbori	Via sms and hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder	No comment received to date.		
Erf 7689, Lotus Gardens EXT 11	Mampago Patricia Bahula	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.		
Erf 7690, Lotus Gardens EXT 11	Mohale Daniel Kekana	Via hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.		
Erf 7691, Lotus Gardens EXT 11 101 Tamarind	Thomas Mashapha	Via sms and hand delivery: On 16 September 2016 a notification was sent to the stakeholder.	No comment received to date.		
Other					
Plankonsult Townplanners	Anna-Marie Potgieter	Via email: On 16 & 19 September 2016 a notification was sent to the town planners.	Via email: On 20 September 2016 Ms Potgieter thanked Ms Uys for her email and informed that she was the town planner working with this township and took note of the information. She asked to be kept informed with the progress of the ROD as it was the only outstanding information for the approval of the township.	Via email: On 20 September 2016 Ms Uys took note of the information provided by Ms Potgieter and thanked her. She informed her that she will be kept updated of the progress going forward.	



4. CONCLUSIONS

Public participation was conducted to allow I&AP's to comment on the Lotus Gardens Retail Centre Development. In order to facilitate an open and transparent process, I&AP's were identified and notified of the proposed development, in accordance with the legislation. Comments/concerns received were incorporated and addressed in this Comments and Response Report to be provided to the GDARD. Assessing the comments/concerns received during the public participation process, it is evident that the main points are:

- Guideline documents be considered:
 - Tshwane Bioregional Plan
 - Tshwane Open Space Framework Document
- SUDS principles to be incorporated in cement stormwater channel cement channel could be recreated into a SUDS canal with a retention pond at the discharge point should this channel be used for the discharge of stormwater. Following consultation this is no longer required as the development's stormwater will be managed via existing municipal stormwater infrastructure. Refer to Section D (1) of the Draft BAR and Appendix F.5: Stormwater Management Plan
- · Chemical storage on site, such as fuel
- Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) for the development
- General Authorisation (GA) to be applied for in terms of new gazette (GN 1180 in GG 39458 of 27 November 2015), not yet promulgated, for Section 21 (c) and (i) water uses
- Requirement of an Environmental Management Programme Report (EMPr)
- Sewerage Services/sewerage system crossing the watercourse
- Job creation
- Improvement in security in the area