

## CHAPTER FIVE: ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

### 5.1 APPROACH TO THE ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

As per Guideline 5: Assessment of Alternatives and Impacts (June 2006) the regulations require that alternatives to a proposed activity be considered. Alternatives are different means of meeting the general purpose and need of a proposed activity. This may include the assessment of site alternatives, activity alternatives, process or technology alternatives, temporal alternatives or the no-go alternative.

The regulations indicate that alternatives that are considered in an assessment process be reasonable and feasible. I&APs must also be provided with an opportunity of providing inputs into the process of formulating alternatives. The assessment of alternatives should, as a minimum, include the following:

- The consideration of the no-go alternative as a baseline scenario
- A comparison of the selected alternatives; and
- The providing of reasons for the elimination of an alternative

The following alternatives have been identified for consideration in this assessment:

- “Go” Alternative – Project proposal as outlined in this report with consideration given to the following process alternatives:
  - Alternative bulk infrastructure options
  - Alternative layouts for the housing footprints
- No-go alternative - No development
- Additional alternatives as identified by I&APs and specialists - to date, no alternatives have been raised by I&APs or specialists

The purpose of this section of the report is to provide clarity on the scope of alternatives that will be considered in the EIA process.

### 5.2 NO-GO OPTION

The No-Go alternative represents the baseline against which all project related impacts are assessed. The no-go option would entail maintaining the current status quo, i.e. the retention of the pre-dominantly exotic vegetation, as well as the existing structures that are currently on the site. The site would not be subdivided and no additional dwellings would be constructed. The No-Go option will be assessed in full as part of the EIA process.

### 5.3 GO OPTION

The Go option would include the implementation of the project as outlined in Chapter Two of this Report. This will include consideration of the following alternatives:

#### 5.3.1 Alternative Bulk Infrastructure Options

The following bulk infrastructure options have been considered and will be further outlined in the EIA phase of the assessment:

**Sanitation**

The project proponent proposes to construct a sewage conservancy tank for each dwelling unit within the development, and to make it a condition of the development that a home owner will be compelled to enter into a legal contract with a recognized entity, which will empty the conservancy tanks on a regular basis. However, alternative sewage disposal methods exist and entail, amongst others, on-site sewage treatment package plants for individual dwelling units; or package plants where the sewage of all units of a development is treated in a specific location on-site. Alternative waste water treatment options will be considered in the assessment.

**Water**

The Engineer's preliminary investigations revealed that potable water is available to the proposed development through the Municipality's existing water reticulation network. Rainwater harvesting will be considered as an alternative source of water for domestic use; or to augment municipal supply.

**5.3.2 Alternative Layouts**

The project proponent proposes to leave the positioning of the permissible 3000m<sup>2</sup> (max) disturbance footprint to the owner of each of the 10 stands. However, the outcome of the specialist biophysical assessment, and the findings in terms of opportunities and constraints within the proposed development, may require from the project proponent to incorporate the geographical coordinates of the disturbance footprint of affected stands into the deed of sale as a condition of development.