

Appendix E5: Comments and Responses Report

Table 1: Issues Raised by Interested and Affected Parties in response to the Notice of a new BA Process

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
A Shirley (CDC) G Taylor (CDC) C Barendse (Leads2Business) P Martin (Environmental Consultant)	Request to be registered as IAP	Registration was effected.
A Shirley (CDC)	How is this new process different from that one which was conducted in 2016?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A market analysis was conducted by a specialist in order to motivate (amongst other things) the need and desirability of the development; • Site Development Plans were developed by an architect indicating proposed infrastructure; and • A more detailed project description and consideration of project alternatives were added.
P Martin (Environmental Consultant)	Where is Erf 4603?	The Locality Plan for the site is included in Appendix A.
P Martin (Environmental Consultant)	Is the site already serviced or will civil infrastructure be required for a greenfields development?	The site is currently not serviced but plans for infrastructure are in place and have been addressed by Cabitech Civil Engineering Consultancy. Please see project description, the plan showing service connections in Appendix C as well as the Land Use Application in Appendix D.

Table 2: Issues Raised by Interested and Affected Parties in response to the DBAR

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
A Shirley - CDC	The DBAR provides for use of the access road into the NMBLP. The NMBLP access road does not make provision for an access point as provided by the two options noted in the DBAR.	<p>[Project Town Planner - Setplan]: No formal road access (neither a servitude nor formal proclaimed road) is currently available and the NMBM is obliged to enable formal road access to this privately owned site. The site is currently accessed via an informal dirt access road. Given the environmental and safety considerations associated with this current access it is desirable to enable access as shown in the BAR (i.e. intersect with the NMBLP access road). In the light of the longer term planning this access can be considered to be a temporary access until the NMBM have undertaken the necessary detailed road planning.</p> <p>The land to be utilised for the access road falls outside of the land allocated to the Logistics Park and in fact</p>

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
		<p>falls within the proposed alignment of the Stanford Road Extension. The layout of the Logistics Park specifically makes provision for a significant road intersection splay where the proposed intersection is to take place. The Logistics Park access road has therefore been planned to accommodate the intended intersection with the Stanford Road extension and can therefore easily accommodate the proposed temporary access from the proposed development on Erf 4603. It is incorrect to therefore intimate that the Logistics Park access road was not designed or intended to accommodate such access, intersection or traffic generation.</p> <p>The design of this access point will be to the satisfaction of the NMBM and the physical construction thereof and the associated traffic management infrastructure will be the responsibility of the landowner.</p> <p>The proposed access point will therefore have no negative effect on the accessibility or operations of the Nelson Mandela Bay Logistics Park over the long term.</p>
A Shirley - CDC	The two proposed road options will potentially encroach upon land set aside by the NMBM for the provision of bulk electrical services and long term PRASA rail services as contained within the Jachtlakte Precinct Plans.	<p>[Project Town Planner - Setplan]: The Logistics Park (NMBLP) planning, particularly Precinct B, overlooked the existence of the privately-owned Erf 4603. The layout planning for this proposed extension extends across the Erf without due consideration of the property being privately owned. The comments received have also been written in a manner which maintains this approach.</p> <p>It is clear that the layout planning of Precinct B therefore needs to be revised to accurately take cognisance of the existence of this Erf as well as its requirement for formal road access and access to the necessary services. Such revision will ensure that the NMBLP's planning does not negatively impact on the potential right of the landowner to undertake industrial development as set out in the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan.</p> <p>Development of Erf 4603 will have no negative impact on the development potential of the land allocated to the NMBLP.</p> <p>The electrical connection to the site can be made available to the site from the same supply that feeds the NMBLP. Mr R. Prinsloo from the NMBM (Munilec) has confirmed that recent upgrades have been undertaken at the supply point and that additional capacity has been made available from the site (see letter from NMBM Electricity and Energy Directorate, attached in Appendix G of the FBAR).</p>

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
		<p>During 2012 the Jachtlakte Precinct planning process concluded that the freight rail was not required through the study area, but that passenger rail could be accommodated. During 2013 Aurecon was appointed to determine the feasibility of implementing rail on the original 1960's alignment together with two alternative alignments through Jachtlakte. Critical obstructions were found on the section of the alignment between North End and Bloemendal, making the implementation of this rail linkage problematic. Given the fact that Stanford road is intended to serve as a primary Bus Rapid Transport Route, the likelihood of the implementation of heavy gauge passenger rail on the alignments through Jachtlakte is low. It has however been proposed that a light rail route could be accommodated in the primary alignment of Stanford Road in the long term.</p>
A Shirley - CDC	<p>The Master Planning Layouts for Precincts A and B of the NMBLP do not make provision for servicing of an industrial site on Erf 4603, Despatch. Any services to Erf 4603 cannot be accommodated within the NMBLP given current design and built specification for services.</p>	<p>[Project Town Planner - Setplan]: It is not proposed to service the site from within the NMBLP. Only the electrical supply will be obtained from the supply that currently feeds the NMBLP. The cables to the site will not traverse the land occupied by the Logistics Park (the connecting cables will follow a direct route to exit the NMBLP land).</p>
A Shirley - CDC	<p>The proposed development does not appear to have thoroughly considered the availability of services as planned for the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan. As the proposal stands, there are a number of conflicts with the LSDF for the area in respect to the provision of services.</p>	<p>[Project Town Planner - Setplan]:</p> <p>Proposed Usage:</p> <p>The NMBMM Spatial Development Framework and Jachtlakte Precinct Plan identify the site for Industrial development, with the intention being that it would be of a similar typology and supportive of the industries being undertaken within the NMBLP.</p> <p>The proposed use of the site is compatible with the NMBLP and will not negatively affect its operations. Uses on this site may in fact be complimentary.</p> <p>Services Planning:</p> <p>Firstly, it needs to be noted that the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan was primarily prepared to enable the development of residential areas between Bloemendal and KwaNobuhle. Detailed services investigation and assessment was undertaken in these southern portions of the study area, while high-level services planning was undertaken to the north and particularly the area around the NMBLP.</p> <p>The services report sets out the proposed services connections. These are proposed to connect into</p>

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
		<p>existing services lines or lines proposed in the associated services planning. No conflict exists under these circumstances.</p> <p>Electrical Supply:</p> <p>The electrical connection to the site can be made available to the site from the same supply that feeds the Logistics Park. Mr R. Prinsloo from the NMBM (Munilec) has confirmed that recent upgrades have been undertaken at the supply point and that additional capacity has been made available from the site.</p> <p>Transport Planning</p> <p>Road:</p> <p>A meeting between the project town planner and Conrad Bester from MSBA Engineers (appointed NMBM consultants undertaking the design of Stanford Road) concluded the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the current thinking at the NMBM regarding the relevant section of Stanford Road Extension is that it will not be a 60 m wide high order road as envisaged at the time of the preparation of the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan; • It will be a lower order road which will in all likelihood intersect with and terminate at the NMBLP access road (similar to this proposal for Erf 4603 proposal); • The lower order road classification results in a lower design speed, which means that it will probably be possible to have little impact on Erf 4603; • That there is no current NMBM budget to undertake a detailed design of this section of road, nor to construct it in the near future; • The long term rail and road networks as set out in the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan were provisional at best and did not take the outcomes of the recently completed Transportation Modelling Study (by Aurecon) into account. These studies reveal that the proposed Bloemendal Arterial will be able to accommodate the bulk of the West-East traffic, initially intended to be accommodated on this West-East extension of Stanford Road (<i>this was confirmed by Aurecon on 27 July 2017</i>); • That it will be undesirable to link a high order road into the Botha Street intersection as proposed in the Jachtlakte Precinct Plan (i.e. redesign will be required); • The proposed access road to the site falls within the proposed alignment of the final section of the

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
		<p>Stanford Road extension, which terminates at the Logistics Park access road; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the above it is likely that a realignment of this component of Stanford Road will be required. <p>It is understood that the acknowledgement of the privately owned Erf 4603 will require re-planning of NMBLP Precinct B in a similar fashion to the realignment of the proposed Stanford Road extension would require re-planning of this Precinct. There is therefore no negative impact on the proposed development of the NMBLP as Precinct B is in a planning phase and would be able to be adapted to accommodate the realignment of Stanford Road and the exclusion of Erf 4603 from its land allocation (design plan).</p> <p>Rail:</p> <p>During 2012 the Jachtlakte Precinct planning process concluded that the freight rail was not required through the study area, but that passenger rail could be accommodated. During 2013 Aurecon were appointed to determine the feasibility of implementing rail on the original 1960's alignment together with two alternative alignments through Jachtlakte. Critical obstructions were found on the section of the alignment between North End and Bloemendal, making the implementation of this rail linkage problematic. Given the fact that Stanford Road is intended to serve as a primary Bus Rapid Transport Route, the likelihood of the implementation of heavy gauge passenger rail on the alignments through Jachtlakte is low. It has however been proposed that a light rail route could be accommodated in the primary alignment of Stanford Road in the long term.</p>
A Shirley - CDC	Dust control must be effectively implemented during the construction phase. Existing investors in Precinct A of the NMBLP are sensitive receptors to airborne emissions.	The input regarding dust receptors is valuable for this impact assessment process. The potential dust impacts section in the FBAR has been amended to reflect this comment. Note that this impact (i.e. dust during the construction phase) is of a temporary nature and can be effectively mitigated should recommended dust suppression methods be followed (see EMP in Appendix F).
A Shirley - CDC	It is noted that Phase 2 (Precinct B) of the Logistic Park is proposed to extend west from Phase 1. South or south-west?	Noted and corrected. The proposed Phase 2 extends south-west from Phase 1.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
A Shirley - CDC	Recommend show the proposed services on the map and how they connect into the proposed site; i.e. roads, water, sewer, electricity.	Please refer to the latest Service Connections Plan in Appendix C of the FBAR for more clarity regarding the proposed services connections.
A Shirley - CDC	Recommend making rain water harvesting mandatory, and not just a consideration. For drinking purposes too.	The comment was incorporated in the Project Description section of the FBAR (Section A(1)). Note that the services infrastructure planned for the proposed development will address the need for potable water. The use of rainwater as potable water cannot be made mandatory as this source will not be adequate for the activities proposed on site. It can however be used to augment the municipal water supply, if required.
A Shirley - CDC	Did NMBM upgrade the existing electric supply to NMB Logistic Park by end of June 2017 as expected?	Yes. Please refer to the letter from the NMBM's Electricity and Energy Directorate confirming this (attached to Appendix G).
A Shirley - CDC	Where would the smoke mentioned under Air Quality come from? No open fires allowed on the site?	Noted. Removed from BAR and Executive Summary.
A Shirley - CDC	It could be argued that the impact for Air Quality / Dust is <i>medium</i> without mitigation, specifically due to the sensitive receptors in the adjacent NMBLP Precinct A.	As mentioned above, the input regarding dust receptors is valuable for this impact assessment process. Therefore, the potential dust impacts section in the FBAR has been amended accordingly.
A Shirley - CDC	Recommend where trenches are deeper than 3m, that a palaeontologist be afforded the opportunity of investigating the site to determine the presence of important fossiliferous material.	Please refer to Section B(6) of the BAR where the Palaeontological value of the area is described. According to the specialist report, the Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment for the Jachtvlakte Precinct, most of the sedimentary rocks underlying the study area to the south of Despatch are at most sparsely fossiliferous. This includes the Kirkwood Formation, which underlies the greater part of the area and is well exposed in abandoned quarries here, but only yielded low diversity trace fossils (invertebrate burrows). In light of the above, specialist monitoring during the construction phase should not be a requirement.
A Shirley - CDC	Will recycling be considered and promoted during the construction phase?	Yes. A specific mitigation measures was added to Section D(2) to make the requirement more clear reading as follows: <i>Where possible, recycling of waste should be encouraged by providing clearly marked bins for recyclable materials (i.e. glass, paper, etc.).</i>
A Shirley - CDC	Is the 1:100 year floodline shown on any of the maps in the BAR?	Yes, please refer to the Aquatic Systems map in Appendix A of the DBAR/ FBAR.

Interested and/or Affected Party	Issue raised	Response (by SRK unless otherwise specified)
A Shirley - CDC	Construction site camp should be within the development footprint.	This suggestion was added to the relevant mitigation measure.
A Shirley - CDC	Will removal and disposing of invasive alien plants be necessary if 75% of the site will be bush cleared? Recommend alien vegetation removal on the remaining 25% to be left undeveloped.	Yes. Even though 75% of the site will be cleared, more could be disturbed during the construction phase. Also, alien invasive species could still establish and bare seed on cleared or disturbed soil in the period between bulk civil works and the complete development of the site.
A Shirley - CDC	Report recommends that clearing activities during construction phase be monitored by an ECO at least twice a month. Construction or clearing activities? Clearing could take place quickly (in less than 2 weeks). Recommend ECO monitor construction activities either weekly or biweekly.	Both clearing and construction activities will be monitored by the ECO. The frequency of auditing is generally specified in the Environmental Authorisation (EA) by DEDEAT. However, site inspection twice a month is recommended for this development for all phases of construction. The contractor will be required to comply with all conditions of the EA and EMPr even when the ECO is not on site. During the pre-construction audit, the ECO should ensure that the contractor is fully aware of the relevant specifications.
A Shirley - CDC	Who would be trained to recognise palaeontological features during construction? If it's the ECO, then appropriate qualifications would be required.	The EMPr (Appendix F of the FBAR) contains a guideline to identify archaeological and palaeontological material during construction for use by the contractor's team. In addition, the contractor's Environmental Representative should ensure that the team is aware of the relevant conditions and management measures in the EMPr and be able to comply.
T Feni – Ward 46 Councillor	The ward is not Ward 4, but Ward 46.	The typographical error referenced has been corrected.
T Feni – Ward 46 Councillor	The Ward councillor should be involved at all stages.	The Ward Councillor will be provided with all notifications throughout the public participation process which ends at the end of the appeal period.
T Feni – Ward 46 Councillor	The report covers all stakeholders needed in this regard.	Noted with thanks.
T Feni – Ward 46 Councillor	It must be reflective of SMME's involvement in all processes leading to the start of work on site.	The SMME's involvement in the project will only start with the processes leading up to construction and the construction phase.
T Feni – Ward 46 Councillor	The report makes me see no problems with it.	Noted with thanks.