

**21949 – PORTION 260 OF THE FARM RIETFontein 189  
GDARD ONLINE MEETING**

<b>PROJECT</b>	21949 – Portion 260 of the Farm Rietfontein 189
<b>DATE</b>	5 November 2020
<b>TIME</b>	14h15
<b>MEETING NOTES</b>	
<b>INTRODUCTIONS AND WELCOME</b>	<p>Vanessa Stippel (VS) opened the meeting and thanked Mr Tendani Rambuda (TR) for making the time to have the meeting via Microsoft Teams. TR explained that Ms Edith Ngoma sent her apologies but was unable to attend. This was noted.</p> <p>VS explained that Prism Environmental Management Services (Prism EMS) had been appointed to undertake the Basic Assessment and Water Use Licence Application (WULA) process in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998. She further explained that that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss and gain clarity on the comments received from the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) dated 22 October 2020 and to explain the process to date.</p>
<b>OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT AND BASIC ASSESSMENT PROCESS</b>	<p>VS provided a brief overview of the proposed development including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Activity description</li> <li>• Locality and properties</li> <li>• Basic Assessment and WULA process</li> <li>• Alternatives</li> <li>• Specialist Studies</li> <li>• Impact Assessment</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Sensitivity Map</li> <li>• Recommendation of EAP</li> </ul> <p>She noted that a copy of the BAR including the specialist studies and Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) was submitted to the Department on the online system on 21 September 2020. A hard copy was also provided. TR noted this and acknowledged the letter did include some errors in regard to the submission of information.</p>
<p><b>DISCUSSION</b></p>	<p>A discussion took place and centred around the Departments comments. The following was noted</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>1. <u>Alternatives</u></b></p> <p>In terms of Alternatives, VS clarified that the alternatives assessed dealt with how the development as a whole would deal with sewer and as such 2 sewer line routes were assessed. She further noted that the application was for the development as a whole including all necessary roads and services. She added that the EIA Regulations, 2014 did not require that alternatives for each component be assessed.</p> <p>However, due to comments received from affected landowners, the layout had been amended slightly to reduce the Floor Area Ratio (FAR). This had the affect of reducing traffic and as such, the full extent of Road B was no longer required. In light of the Departments comments, layouts would be added as alternatives. This was agreed.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>2. <u>Proposed Sewer line and Wetland</u></b></p> <p>TR requested clarity on whether it was possible to move the sewer line outside the wetland. It was noted that the proposed sewer line had been developed to reduce the impact to the wetland but the location was constrained by 3 issues. 1.) the road reserve of the K56, 2.) the location of the existing sewer line and 3.) the fact that the sewer was a gravity line. TR noted</p>

	<p>that the Department's specialists would do a site visit and De Wet Botha (DB) requested that he was notified so that he could attend. This was agreed.</p> <p><b>3. <u>Agricultural Land</u></b></p> <p>A discussion regarding the site's agricultural potential took place. It was noted that the site was not used for agriculture but that adjacent landowners mowed the grass and used the feed for their horses. VS added that the site did not have a high agricultural potential in terms of the Gauteng Agricultural Potential Atlas.</p> <p><b>4. <u>Stormwater</u></b></p> <p>TR noted that stormwater would need to be attenuated outside the 32m buffer. This was noted and it was explained that a very environmentally friendly design was implemented which included earth berms.</p> <p>.</p>
<p><b>WAY FORWARD AND CLOSE</b></p>	<p>VS thanked TR for his time and input. It was agreed that the wetland specialist from the Department would be in contact with the EAP to arrange a site visit.*</p>

*\* Note it was later explained on 23 November 2020 that the Departmental specialists did a site visit and then provided comments. These comments were provided to the EAP on 24 November 2020.*