

Appendix F – Comment and Response Reports

PROPOSED CALCUTTA PUBLIC CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL PARK

APPLICANT: Stellenbosch Local Municipality

POST APPLICATION BAR COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(EIA File Ref. No: 16/3/3/1/B4/45/1030/19)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	<p>Date: 24/04/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Armando Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of hand delivered letter dated 23 April 2019 and highlight of error in commenting closure period as listed in letter.</p> <p>ii. Reference to comments and queries as listed in pervious letter sent by I&AP, dated 28 March 2019.</p> <p>iii. Listing of further comments and queries as detailed below:</p> <p>a. I&AP is a most affected party since Unitspan 1037 and Calcutta 29 were previously one undivided unit;</p> <p>b. Dispute and question regarding the proceedings for rezoning, subdividing of Calcutta since over the last 20 years I&AP has repeatedly applied for rezoning/subdivision of their property which were refused and/or turned down on the grounds of Act 70 of 1970 limiting the rezoning/subdividing of agricultural land. Query regarding the application of the act and acknowledgement that this is more a Town Planners and/or Municipal Council issue;</p> <p>c. Concern regarding guarantee that groundwater will not be contaminated (and to what level) since borehole water is replied upon for domestic purposes/human consumption;</p> <p>d. Acknowledgement of the change in the proposed access to the project development from the more central position to one facing their existing access servitude.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Response email sent on 26/04/2019, thanking I&AP for pointing out the error in commenting closure period as listed in original notification letter and correcting closure date (Corrective emails and letters sent to all other recipients of incorrect information with an appropriate extension in commenting period to accommodate error).</p> <p>ii. Previous letter including in supporting documents in DBARs and FBAR and captured in preapplication C&R Trail Report.</p> <p>iii. After consultation with project's geohydrological specialists (GEOSS) and managing consultants/town planners (Rumboll and Associates), detailed response given to items listed by I&AP viz.</p> <p>a. Calcutta Farm 29 is currently considered a stand-alone farm which is zoned Agricultural.</p> <p>b. I&AP is correct: The application for rezoning on the property involves Town Planners and the Municipality. What the EAP is aware of, is that Act 70 of 70 is called the <i>Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act, No. 70 of 1970</i>. It should be noted that for the above proposed development, Calcutta Farm 29 is not being subdivided.</p> <p>c. The cd hand-delivered to the I&AP with the letter on the 23 April 2019, contained geohydrological, geotechnical and freshwater specialist studies undertaken by independent specialists in each field. These studies were used to assess if groundwater contamination would be an issue. According to the specialists, the majority of the site is classified as having a 'low/medium' groundwater vulnerability rating mainly due to</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
2	<p>Date: 29/04/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Rouvé Hlozek, Manager: Space, Stellenbosch Facilities Management</p>	<p>i. Email informing EAP that I&AP has no comments or objections to the proposed development.</p>	<p>the clay layer which acts as a barrier to contaminant migration. The southern portion of the site has been classified as 'medium', grading into a 'very high' vulnerability classification. The DBAR also on the cd, indicated the layout plan for the proposed development (in Appendix B) which has taken all of the above specialist reports into consideration: Traditional burial graves are confined to the north eastern section of the proposed public cemetery and memorial park i.e. the 'low/medium' groundwater vulnerability rating area. The southern and western portion of the site is where the park aspect of the proposed development is planned with no burial sites located in the south or west. In addition, the BAR and EMPR have been updated after consultation with GEOSS (as per email with GEOSS dated, 26 April 2019 included in Appendix F1 of the BAR). d. The cd as received by the I&AP also contained specialist studies/reasoning on the proposed access to the proposed development in the <u>Final Traffic Study (Appendix G11)</u> and Road Access Possibilities (Appendix G12).</p> <p>EAP: i. Acknowledgement of email response and reminder that they will be notified of issuing of FBAR.</p>
3	<p>Date: Letter not dated, fax dated 02/05/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of Application Form and letter on 18 April 2019. ii. Request to note the following advice pertaining to the application: a) Promulgation and coming into effect of April 2017 amendments to the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2014; b) DEA&DP's cognisance that the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) will be consulted with regards to a water use licence application (WULA) requirements and mention that the One Environmental System as per section 50A of NEMA and sections 41(5) and 163A of the National Water Act (NWA) requires the WULA and EIA processes to be synchronised as prescribed by the amended EIA and 2017 WULA regulations; c) Provision of written proof that the Municipality has sufficient capacity and availability for the required service provision to the proposed development;</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence. ii. (a) & (b) Synchronisation with DWS WULA process in terms of joint attendance of DWS pre-application meeting arranged on 31/05/2019 (as per Appendix F1 in FBAR); (c) Refer to Appendix E5 in FBAR; (d) & (e) Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence; iii. (a) Refer to the Executive Summary and Appendices G2, L and M in the FBAR: Initially, two alternative sites (De Novo and Calcutta) in the north of the Municipal district were considered but investigation revealed only Calcutta was reasonable and feasible since De Novo is now owned by the Municipality. Refer to Section E(1)(c) and Appendix B of the FBAR: Three alternative layouts were investigated besides the "no-go" option. Only one, the preferred alternative (Alternative 1) meets the</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>d) Advice that only the activities applied for will be considered for authorisation and the Applicant must ensure that all applicable activities are applied for and assessed as part of the EIA process;</p> <p>e) Ensure that all specialist reports contain all the information specified in Appendix 6 of the amended EIA regulations and are appended to the BAR;</p> <p>iii. Instruction to comply with the following requirements with regards to all applications for environmental authorisation (EA) in terms of the amended NEMA EIA regulations:</p> <p>a) Investigation of alternatives including the “no-go” option. DEA&DP may grant authorisation for an alternative or for the whole or part of the proposed project in the application. Alternatives include but are not limited to layout, design, operational and technological alternatives. If after investigation, no feasible and reasonable alternatives have been found then no comparative assessment of alternatives beyond the comparison of the preferred alternative and “no-go” option, is required during the EIA;</p> <p>b) The BAR must comply with Chapter 6 of the EIA regulations, 2014 (as amended) in terms of the public participation process (PPP). The EAP must submit a minimum of two printed copies of the DBAR to the Department for a 30-day comment period and the DBAR must be made available to all relevant state departments, with the EAP providing proof to DEA&DP of submission of same. A register of I&APs must be opened and maintained and submitted to DEA&DP. The EAP must record and respond to all comments received and capture same in a Comments and Responses (C&R) Report and must include the PPP followed in the BAR to be submitted for decision.</p> <p>iv. An environmental management programme (EMPr) in accordance with section 24N of NEMA and Regulation 19, as well as Appendix 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended).</p> <p>v. Request to take into account applicable Department guidelines when undertaking the EIA process.</p> <p>vi. Request to consider and report on the need and desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>vii. Request to show how the proposed development complies with NEMA Section 2 principles and sustainable development requirements.</p> <p>viii. The Bar must contain all information as per Appendix 1 of the EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended), as well as the information in DEA&DP’s letter. DEA&DP awaits receipt of the BAR within prescribed</p>	<p>geohydrological, geotechnical and freshwater specialist preliminary study requirements.</p> <p>(b) Compliance with the 2014 amended EIA PPP requirements is noted and website availability of the DBAR was made to all relevant state departments. CDs of the DBAR were also delivered to all relevant state departments (Refer to Appendix F2 in FBAR). The register of I&APs is attached to the FBAR as Appendix H. Four separate C&R Reports and supporting documentation, for the four PPP process held to date, are attached to the FBAR as Appendices F and F1, respectively.</p> <p>iv. Refer to Appendix O of the FBAR.</p> <p>v. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP’s request.</p> <p>vi. Refer to Section D and Appendix G10 of the FBAR.</p> <p>vii to ix. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP’s correspondence and requests.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
4	<p>Date: Letter not dated, fax dated 02/05/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, DEA&DP</p>	<p>timeframes calculated from 18 April 2019. Mention of request for extension of submission procedure. Warning regarding lapsing of application in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulation, 2014 (as amended). Two written and two cd/dvd copies of the BAR must be submitted to DEA&DP. ix. General comments regarding the use of the required reference number and a reminder that the activity may not commence prior to an EA being issued and the consequences thereof. i. Acknowledgement of receipt of DBAR dated April 2019, on 18 April 2019. ii. Commitment to provide comment within prescribed period. iii. Reminder that activity may not commence prior to an EA and consequences of same. iv. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence</p>
5	<p>Date: 02/05/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, DEA&DP</p>	<p>As for No. 3 above (letter was dated)</p>	<p>EAP: As for No. 3 above</p>
6	<p>Date: 23/05/2019 Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain (FSM)</p>	<p>i. Comment on Calcutta alternatives and joint assessments for all 'three' sites: a) Statement that the need for land for future burial space is understood and that since the land use for the 'three' sites under consideration is common, the footprint and total capacity of all three sites must be assessed together. Reference that this is the same comment as made within the separate Louw's Bos EIA pre-application phase. b) Statement that of the 'three' sites, Calcutta appears to be the least sensitive with respect to biodiversity. c) Comment that while it appears that Alternative 1 is preferred over Alternative 2 in the DBAR due to lower environmental impacts, Alternative 2 should be preferred to Alternative 1 at Calcutta since it allows for more burial sites, thereby possibly facilitating reduction in the number of burial sites needs at the Louw's Bos or De Novo sites (the joint assessment of all 'three' sites is considered a bigger picture approach based on the available botanical and hydrological information). d) Recommendation made to increase the footprint of Type C and Type D burial sites on Alternative 1 and decrease the traditional gravesite</p>	<p>EAP: i. As explained in Section A (2 – Project Description) of the DBAR: In the case of the proposed Calcutta public cemetery and memorial park, after a thorough preliminary process of investigating several sites in the Northern Stellenbosch region (refer to Appendices L, M and N in the BAR), two sites viz. De Novo and Calcutta remained as site alternatives (besides the no-go alternative). However, due to land ownership issues (the land is not owned by Stellenbosch Municipality and transfer of ownership from the state to the local municipality was not forthcoming), as well as several competing land uses at a national/state and local level which were already allocated to a property, and the fact that the biodiversity rating placed it as the most sensitive of the five shortlisted sites, De Novo was precluded from the shortlist of potential sites/alternative sites. Therefore, in the Northern Stellenbosch Municipal region, only one alternative site remained to provide a regional cemetery and memorial park for the area – Calcutta.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>(Type E) footprint. This is based on the scarcity of agricultural land and densification policies. It is stated that by doing so, a smaller total footprint for an equal carrying capacity would be created.</p> <p>e) Statement that the area marked F on Alternative 1 site plan may safely also be used for Type C and D burials without a significantly larger impacts on the western part of Calcutta.</p> <p>f) Reiteration that should items (c) to (e) above be implemented, it should be coupled to a decrease capacity and footprint implemented on De Novo and Louw's Bos sites (with the latter two sites showing layout for smaller footprints and compaction of burial area.</p> <p>g) Statement that agricultural land is scarce countrywide and high- and medium-quality land must, by government policy be conserved. Comment that DBAR should include a proper assessment of agricultural soil potential.</p> <p>h) Comment that closely related to land use issues is the matter of roads and traffic. Statement that within the parameters of Integrated Development Planning (IDP), the Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) and the Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan (CITP), human mobility should move away from unsustainable private car use to public transport and non-motorised transport which also point to the advantages of a more compact layout and smaller footprint.</p> <p>i) Statement that FSM are merely paraphrasing the principles and goals of the Stellenbosch land use policy, planning instruments and governing legislation.</p> <p>j) Mention that crematoria are an important component of the future land-frugal way of burial. If no crematoria are planned for Calcutta, then the overall planning should indicate where such crematorium services are and will be provided within WC024 (again pointing to the need for integrated assessment and planning).</p> <p>ii. Biodiversity and water:</p> <p>a) Agreement that the botanical assessment in Appendix G2 for De Novo and Louw's Bos assigns higher significance than for Calcutta. Mention of imperative for proper assessment and processes with respect to Calcutta itself.</p> <p>b) Agreement with CapeNature comment for the need for a spring botanical assessment. Statement that Calcutta appears to be the last area containing even a remnant of natural vegetation in the area. Quote from the 2017 biodiversity assessment which recommends a</p>	<p>Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager</p> <p>a) As explained in the BAR, the BAR focuses on the Northern Municipal region only since regional cemeteries allow for easier access by the various (and particularly poorer) communities in the region. Regional cemeteries also reduce the long-term 'operational' carbon footprint of the development due to shorter travel distances and times, thereby increasing the sustainability of the development. While the proposed land use for the northern and southern sites is common, refer to the Socio-economic Statement (Appendix G10 in the BAR) indicating the social/cultural and logistical need for two such amenities and the uniqueness of Calcutta site. Three sites do not exist in the Northern region of Stellenbosch Municipality (see point 'i' above), only one site exists.</p> <p>b) Three sites do not exist in the Northern region of Stellenbosch Municipality (see point 'i' above), only one site exists. Agreement with I&AP regarding the apparently low biodiversity sensitivity of the proposed Calcutta site.</p> <p>c) Alternative 1 does not take only the botanical and hydrological specialist information into account when being proposed as the preferred layout alternative – Appendices G7 (Geotechnical Assessment, <i>underlined to highlight its significance</i>), G3 to G5 i.e. Freshwater Assessments and Freshwater Rehabilitation Maintenance and Management Plan (FRMMP) and G8 (Heritage Impact Assessment), together with several other selection criteria (as detailed in Appendix L of the BAR) were considered resulting in the Alternative 1 being proposed as the preferred alternative.</p> <p>The afore-mentioned Appendices which highlight river rehabilitation, wetland restoration, biodiversity preservation (if threatened or protected flora are found on site and conserved, as proposed, in dedicated memorial park areas), as well as heritage preservation, together with the selection criteria mentioned in Appendix L, also limit the expansion of traditional burial area sites at Calcutta. This must also be viewed in the light of the Socio-economic Statement (Appendix G10 of the BAR) which details societal/cultural sentiment, as well as the physical amount of space required to accommodate current and projected death rates. In fact, these very reasons also necessitate the regional approach to the development of these public amenities.</p> <p>d) While it is generally agreed that an increase in the footprint and capacity of Type C and Type D burial sites on Alternative 1 and a decrease in the traditional (Type E) gravesite footprint is ideal in terms</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>spring botanical survey since populations of highly threatened spring flowering geophyte species often remain.</p> <p>c) Agreement with CapeNature's comment that the spring assessment should be carried out once alien invasive cover has been removed.</p> <p>d) Comment that a controlled burn should be carried out prior to the botanical assessment since many dormant indigenous species are stimulated for germination by fire. Statement that the EMPr must be adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>e) Comment that the conservancy tank should not be located close to the wetlands.</p> <p>f) Comment that the memorial park should only make use of indigenous and even only Wetlands-endemic species.</p> <p>g) Statement that FSM does not agree with the request from the owner of adjacent Farm Uitspan 1037 to tie the rezoning of Uitspan to the current process affecting Calcutta 20.</p>	<p>of the sustainability of such developments, the cultural/religious and social context of communities in the region of the the proposed development and which the amenity should serve, must also be considered, as stated in Appendix G10 of the BAR (Socio-economic Statement). Specifically, whilst cremation is standard practice amongst Hindus and common amongst Christians/Western culture, it is forbidden by Muslims and Orthodox Jews. Several African cultures, traditionally view cremation as undesirable (although not prohibited). The memorial park concept is also an attempt at educating and appealing to communities regarding the various alternate burial and remembrance options available (other than traditional graves).</p> <p>e) It is agreed that the area marked F on Alternative 1's site plan may be used for alternate burial methods, as indicated in the Alternative 1's layout plan – the area is marked as 'Informal Zone' intended for lawn graves, using trees as headstones, future cemetery expansion, parklands, eco-rehabilitation /education and Heritage interpretation/preservation.</p> <p>f) De Novo is not a proposed development site or alternative. Based on calculations in the Socio-economic report there is a socio-economic need for at least two approximately 20ha to 30ha amenities of this nature in the Municipal District.</p> <p>g) Cognisance taken of I&AP comment. It should be noted that the proposed development will improve and rehabilitate the current land and conserve any rare, threatened or protected plant species which may be found on site. The site is currently a neglected plantation of alien invasive trees and has been for several years (as per Appendix P of the BAR) with evidence that it is used for litter and building rubble dumping. The wetlands and ephemeral stream that runs through the western section of the property are also in need of restoration and rehabilitation to their natural state. There are no future plans from the owner/Municipality for agricultural development of this land.</p> <p>h) Cognisance taken of I&AP comments. Regional cemeteries also address the roads and traffic issue - Refer to Appendix G11 in the BAR (Final Traffic Study).</p> <p>i) Cognisance taken of I&AP comment.</p> <p>ii. Biodiversity and water:</p> <p>a) Agreement that the initial botanical assessment in Appendix G2 for De Novo and Louw's Bos assigns higher significance than for Calcutta.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
7	<p>Date: 02/05/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'imitri Matthews, DEA&DP</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of DBAR dated April 2019, on 18 April 2019.</p> <p>ii. Comments on DBAR:</p> <p>a) The FBAR must contain a FRMMP with frequency of maintenance activities to be carried out, method statements and access route information for the maintenance activities.</p> <p>b) Requirement for the freshwater specialist to conduct a (July/August) survey after alien plantation clearing and reassess wetland delineation since alien plant infestation may have lowered the water table. Issue remains unresolved and must be addressed in the form of a site development plan.</p> <p>c) CapeNature recommendation for a winter/spring (August/September) botanical site evaluation to take place after alien invasive trees have been cleared is outstanding and must be resolved.</p> <p>iii. Regulatory requirements:</p> <p>a) Proof of local newspaper advert and site notices to be provided.</p> <p>b) Proof of notices sent to I&APs for commenting purposes must be included in final BAR.</p> <p>c) Any new representations and comments received in connection with the application must be included in the final BAR.</p> <p>d) Any responses by the EAP to items in 'c' above must be tabulated in a comments and response report and included in the final BAR.</p>	<p>b) & (c) CapeNature's recommendation for a winter/spring (August/September) botanical site evaluation to take place after alien invasive trees have been cleared has been included in the FBAR and EMPr (with details regarding search and rescue of threatened indigenous plants into the memorial park areas, as required by the botanical specialist).</p> <p>d) Refer to email communication from botanical specialist dated 28/05/2019 as per Appendix F1 of the FBAR stating that "in this case there is almost no undergrowth left or shrub layer left that will carry a fire because of the dense stands of alien and invasive species (especially the <i>Eucalyptus</i> species).</p> <p>e) Alternate 1 (preferred Alternative) does not place the conservancy tank close to wetlands.</p> <p>f) Cognisance taken of I&AP comment. Refer to Appendices G5 and O of FBAR.</p> <p>g) Cognisance taken of I&AP comment. Refer to EAP response to point 1 above.</p> <p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>ii (a) Refer to FRMMP as included as Appendix G5 of the FBAR.</p> <p>b) Requirement for the freshwater specialist to conduct a (July/August) survey after alien plantation clearing and make appropriate recommendations is included in the FBAR, FRMMP (Appendix G5) and EMPr (Appendix O).</p> <p>c) Recommendation for a winter/spring (August/September) botanical site evaluation to take place after alien invasive trees have been cleared has been included in the FBAR and EMPr (Appendix O) with details regarding search and rescue of threatened indigenous plants into the memorial park areas, as required by the botanical specialist. Communication regarding same sent to CapeNature as per email dated 29/05/2019 as per Appendix F1 of the FBAR.</p> <p>iii to vi. Cognisance taken of comments.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>e) Minutes of meetings held by the EAP with I&APs and other roles players which record their views must be included in the final BAR.</p> <p>f) An original signed and dated applicant declaration is required to be submitted with the final BAR. Reminder of the applicant's legal obligations with signing the declaration.</p> <p>g) Request for original signed and dated EAP and specialist declarations to be submitted with the final BAR.</p> <p>h) Reminder that the BAR must contain all information as required by Appendix 1 and 4 of the EIA regulations, 2014.</p> <p>iv. Request to quote reference number in any future correspondence regarding application.</p> <p>v. The activity may not commence prior to an EA being granted.</p> <p>vi. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information</p>	
		<p>END OF TRAIL REPORT</p>	

PROPOSED CALCUTTA PUBLIC CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL PARK

APPLICANT: Stellenbosch Local Municipality

THIRD PRE-APPLICATION DBAR COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEA&DP Ref. No: 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1288/17)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	Date: 08/02/2019 Format: Email fax I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Acknowledgement of receipt of second pre-application draft basic assessment report (DBAR) dated 31 January 2019, on 01 February 2019. ii. Commitment to provide comment within prescribed period. iii. Reminder that activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation (EA) 	EAP: i. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence
2	Date: 27/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor for Manager, Cape Nature Scientific Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Email informing EAP that I&AP will be on leave from 28/02/2019 to 18/03/2019 and did not get a chance to comment on DBAR. ii. Commitment to provide comment as soon as I&AP returns from leave. 	EAP: i. Reminder to I&AP on 20/03/2019 that final BAR will be submitted to at the end of the month and additional comments on Calcutta's DBAR in good time before then, would be appreciated.
3	Date: 04/03/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, DEA&DP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Request for extension to submit comment on DBAR. 	EAP: i. Response email sent on 05/03/2019, after consultation with project managing consultants (Rumboll and Associates), that extension is granted.
5	Date: 11/03/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, DEA&DP	<p>Comments regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Pre-application DBAR dated November 2018 proposal for the establishment of the Calcutta public cemetery and memorial park with associated infrastructure; 	EAP: i. Note that DBAR date as mentioned by DEA&DP is incorrectly stated – preapplication DBAR was dated 31 January 2019. ii. After having consulted with the botanical specialist telephonically, it was confirmed that there was definitely less than 1ha of indigenous

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>ii. Request for confirmation as to the applicability of LN 1, Activity 27 during the formal application process and inclusion of the activity in the BAR and EMPr, if applicable.</p> <p>iii. Note that Concept Site Plan 1 does differ from Concept Site Plan 2 in terms of layout. Recommendation that the different concept site plans be included as alternatives with reasons for preferring or not preferring the concept. Note that Appendix L and M regards criteria for site selection.</p> <p>iv. Note that the proposed stormwater and sewage plan locates the conservancy tank in close proximity to the delineated wetland and request for DWS comment on the appropriateness of such, or an inclusion of an alternative location. Further note that swales are mentioned for stormwater discharge into the watercourse and request for confirmation regarding LN 1, Activity 19 applicability.</p> <p>v. Request for confirmation regarding access road location which must be clearly indicated on all concept plans.</p> <p>vi. Note that MMP will be included as part of WULA. Mention that the reason for including the MMP as part of the BA process is to adopt the MMP in terms on LN1, Activity 19. Instruction to include said activity since the access road will be crossing the watercourse which will require infilling.</p> <p>vii. Incorrect reference on declaration of understanding form in EMPr to "Vanrhynsdorp Solar PV Facility" must be excluded and only elements pertaining to Calcuttia proposal must be included in the BAR and EMPr.</p> <p>viii. Comments on regulatory requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proof of local newspaper advert and site notices to be provided. Proof of notices sent to I&APs for commenting purposes must be included in final BAR. Any new representations and comments received in connection with the application must be included in the final BAR. Any responses by the EAP to items in 'c' above must be tabulated in a comments and response report and included in the final BAR. Minutes of meetings held by the EAP with I&APs and other role players which record their views must be included in the final BAR. An original signed and dated applicant declaration is required to be submitted with the final BAR. Reminder of the applicant's legal obligations with signing the declaration. 	<p>vegetation on the proposed site, therefore, LN1 activity 27 is not applicable and not included.</p> <p>iii. Cognisance taken of comment and different layout options indicated as alternatives with reasons provided.</p> <p>iv. Layout plan changed based on comment received to place conservancy tank out of delineated wetland buffer area. LN 1, Activity 19 included in BAR and EMPr.</p> <p>v. Proposed alternatives 1 and 2 in post-application DBAR clearly indicate access road location. Original concept plan (kept as alternative 3 - the least preferred alternative) and does not indicate specific access road.</p> <p>vi. LN1, Activity 19 included in BAR and EMPr due to development in watercourses.</p> <p>vii. Error in declaration form in EMPr corrected and cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>viii to x. Cognisance taken of comments.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
6	<p>Date: 25/03/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Rheit Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor for Manager, Cape Nature Scientific Services</p>	<p>g. Request for original signed and dated EAP and specialist declarations to be submitted with the final BAR. h. Reminder that the BAR must contain all information as required by Appendix 1 and 4 of the EIA regulations, 2014. viii. Request to quote reference number in any future correspondence regarding application. ix. The activity may not commence prior to an EA being granted. x. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p> <p>Comments regarding: i. Cape Nature (CN) expressed thanks for opportunity to comment and noted that their comments would only be in terms of biodiversity related impacts and not the overall desirability of the proposed development. ii. CN noted their formal comment on the background information document and the pre-application (first draft) BAR, subsequent to which, a freshwater assessment and a botanical statement were compiled as recommended. iii. Freshwater Assessment - a. Note of the delineated freshwater features and recommended 15 m buffer, as well as the present ecological state of the freshwater features, with the findings that the watercourse has a PES category D (largely modified) and the mosaic of depression wetlands a PES category E (seriously modified). b. Query as to whether the buffer zone tool contained within the WRC guidelines was used to determine the buffer, or if only the minimum buffer according to the land use was applied. c. CN agrees in general with the findings and recommendations but queries the section where the watercourse enters the site which consists of an artificial channel, where it is evident that the upstream flow has been directed to this point. Query as to whether the best alternative would not be to return the natural flow entering the site and whether this would be feasible. d. Recommendation that there should be a follow-up site evaluation after alien clearing has taken place across the site during winter/spring. e. Satisfied that groundwater concerns in previous comments have been addressed. ix. Botanical Scan -</p>	<p>EAP: i to ii. Cognisance of comments taken. iii(a). Cognisance of observation made. Freshwater specialist: iii(b). to be confirmed by specialist. Note from EAP: the most recent layout plans, indicated as Alternative 1 (preferred alternative in the post-application DBAR) accommodate a 25m - 30m buffer zone – as requested by the EAP. iii(c). Freshwater rehabilitation, maintenance and management plan outline as included in post-application BAR (Appendix G5) indicates that stream will be rehabilitated to return the natural flow. EAP: iii(d). Recommendation made in BAR. iii(e). Comment noted. ix(a). Cognisance of comment taken. ix(b). Cognisance of comment taken. Applicant: ix(b). Telephonic communication with Piet Smit (Applicant representative) confirmed that historically the Municipality has always used the site as a woodlot/plantation and was last formally managed as such around 2005. EAP: ix(c). Cognisance of comment taken. ix(d). Cognisance of comment taken. ix(e). Cognisance of comment taken. ix(f) &(e). Requirement for botanical specialist to conduct a spring (August/September) survey after alien plantation clearing and make appropriate recommendations (if necessary) included in BAR and EMPr. x(a). Cognisance of comment taken.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation//&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>a. Mention of CN's provision of previous comments on the biodiversity screening study and that screening study has been updated to a botanical scan as recommended.</p> <p>b. Summary of the findings of the additional site survey and study mentioned and request for the applicant to confirm that the woodland covered the whole site as indicated in Google Earth imagery.</p> <p>c. Note that site survey was undertaken in a non-optimal time of year, for this vegetation type since many of the species present, including a high number of threatened species, are ephemeral and/or are only identifiable in late winter/spring.</p> <p>d. Mention of CN's previous comment that a site survey in August/September is required, remains relevant. Note that there are several records of highly threatened species within the direct vicinity of the site occurring on similarly highly degraded properties.</p> <p>e. Recommendation that a spring survey is still required in order to ensure that there are no threatened species present.</p> <p>f. Concerns related to the relevance of dense alien infestation to terrestrial biodiversity since access across the entire site is restricted and there may be species that only germinate once the alien cover is removed as the shading effect may be inhibiting growth. Request for botanical specialist to make appropriate recommendations following the spring survey.</p> <p>x. Development Proposal -</p> <p>a. Note that the proposed site layout included in the previous BAR has been revised.</p> <p>b. Comment that the revised layout plan indicates an area planted with vineyards and orchards which does not correlate with the project description in the BAR which indicates that this area will form part of the public park component of the memorial park proposal. Statement that CN prefers the option of a public park which can take the form of a combination of restoration of natural habitat and formally landscaped areas.</p> <p>c. Comment that the freshwater features and associated buffers should strictly be restored to natural vegetation with no infrastructure placed in these areas apart from foot bridges and boardwalks.</p> <p>d. Note that the layout of the cemetery component has been revised to mainly avoid the freshwater features and buffers. Requirement that the freshwater features be overlaid on the proposed layout as was done for the previous layout version, in order to verify this (specific reference to</p>	<p>x(b). Cognisance of comment taken and CN's preference to the memorial park option as mentioned in the BAR description.</p> <p>x(c). Layout plan changed so that only bridges as possibly walkways fall within delineated wetland buffer area.</p> <p>x(d). Cognisance of comment taken</p> <p>x(e) & x(f). Requirement for freshwater specialist to conduct a spring (August/September) survey after alien plantation clearing and make appropriate recommendations (if necessary) included in BAR and EMPr.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation//&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>potential area of conflict in Wetland A as indicated on Figure 18 of the freshwater assessment).</p> <p>e. Minimal information in BAR on stormwater management mentioned with only a rough indication of the stormwater and sewage layout proposal.</p> <p>f. Mention that pre-application DBAR appears to indicate that stormwater will be drained to a termination point at the watercourse and that sewage will be treated within the riparian zone. CN does not support this as it could impact on the freshwater systems.</p> <p>g. Request for the services for the development proposal to be included in the impact assessment and must in particular be assessed in the freshwater assessment.</p> <p>h. Request for more detail regarding the stormwater proposal, including stormwater detention ponds, if necessary.</p> <p>i. Request for details on the access road to be included in the impact assessment along with the other services.</p> <p>xi. Conclusion summarising issues raised by CN (as above) and reiterating that the site should be cleared of alien invasive trees, after which a site survey is required in August/September to inform the botanical assessment and freshwater assessment (survey in July/August). Further engagement with CN is required should this not be possible.</p> <p>xii. Request that both the botanical specialist and freshwater specialist provide responses to CN's comments and an assessment of the final development proposal should be included in both of the revised specialist reports.</p>	
7		END OF TRAIL REPORT	

SECOND PRE-APPLICATION COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEA&DP Ref. No: 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1288/17)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	<p>Date: 22/11/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Rudolph Röscher, Land Care Manager: Cape Winelands District, Western Cape Department of Agriculture</p>	<p>i. Query as to whether the application was in terms of the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act No. 43 of 1983, or the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act No. 70 of 1970.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email response sent on 25/04/2019 stating that- a. EnviroAfrica is only undertaking the NEMA application for the above project; b. It is thought that the application is not a CARA application since while the Municipality had previously used the farm, zoned Agriculture 1, as a plantation, it appears from Google Earth images that the property has not been cultivated/managed since around at least 2009/2010. c. This is also not an Act 70 of 70 subdivision application since an application for the rezoning of the entire property was lodged by Rumboll and Associates at Stellenbosch Municipality on 26 March 2019; d. The post-application DBAR for comment would be issued shortly.</p>
2	<p>Date: 28/11/2018 Format: Email fax I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of draft basic assessment report on 15 December 2018. ii. Commitment to provide comment within prescribed period. iii. Reminder that activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation (EA)</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence</p>
3	<p>Date: 05/12/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain (FSM)</p>	<p>i. FSM are largely in agreement with the draft Biodiversity Sensitivity Report (Appendix G1) and Critical Biodiversity ranking of the three sites assessed (De Novo, Louw's Bos Farm 502, and Calcutta Farm 29). ii. Of the three, Calcutta appears to be the best placement from a biodiversity point of view. iii. FSM have little to say about De Novo at this point.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Emailed acknowledgement response sent 06/12/2018 ii. Request from EAP to capture comments regarding Louw's Bos site under Low's Bos EIA process early in 2019.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
4	<p>Date: 11/12/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing FSM</p>	<p>iv. More detailed comment on Louw's Bos site</p> <p>i. Agreement from FSM that comments related to Low's Bos site do not need to be captured as part of this EIA process and may be left out of Calcutta DBAR.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Cognisance taken of I&AP's agreement and request.</p>
5	<p>Date: 20/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Andrea Lubbe (Financial Manager, Bellingan Group)</p>	<p>i. Thanks expressed for cd information delivered. ii. Conceptually have no problem with development. iii. Highlighted that the workers on their farm are very sensitive to living next to a cemetery. iv. Mention that it was not clear on the plans if a wall would be built between 'Vrede' and the cemetery (even if it is a 'viba-crete' wall)</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Telephonic conversation held to understand which of the two farms' workers felt sensitive about the proposed development. ii. Clarification that at this stage no specification regarding the type of boundary fence has been made. iii. Mention that, based on the I&AP's concern, a recommendation that some form of barrier wall be erected between 'Vrede' i.e. the farm on the northern boundary of the proposed development, and the proposed development site.</p>
6	<p>Date: 28/11/2018 Format: Email fax I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, DEA&DP</p>	<p>Comments regarding:</p> <p>i. Request for confirmation of the applicable activities to be included in the in-process draft BAR. ii. Note that only one alternative besides the no-go alternative was identified. Mention of the Guideline on Alternatives' (March, 2013) statement regarding a comparative assessment of feasible and reasonable alternatives which must be included in impact reports unless, after having identified and investigated alternatives, no feasible and reasonable alternatives were found, requiring no further comparative assessment of alternatives (besides the preferred and no-go alternative). iii. Mention that Biodiversity Sensitivity Maps were included in the report but no Botanical Impact Assessment was included. Confirmation from Cape Nature regarding the need for a Botanical Assessment must be included in in-process DBAR. iv. Comments on the EMPr: a. Incorrect reference to Bonnievale Renosterveld Thicket and Appendix 12 must be excluded. b. No site-specific recommendations from specialist reports have been included. c. It is noted that the site is heavily infested with alien invasive plant but the EMPr does not include any aspects regarding alien removal or management. d. The Operational Phase of the EMPr must be updated to include management activities and mitigation for all activities.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Activities to be confirmed in DBAR. ii. After having identified and investigated alternatives as indicated in Appendices L and M and other specialist comparative reports, no feasible and reasonable alternatives were found for the southern region. Therefore, no further comparative assessment of alternatives (besides the preferred and no-go alternative) has been undertaken in this DBAR. iii. A full Botanical Scan/Statement has been undertaken based on CN's comment during the previous public participation process. iv. a. Error corrected. b. Site-specific recommendations included. c. Alien invasive management included as point 7.10.11 d. Operational Phase information updated e. Error corrected f. Refer to site plan in Appendix B3 which indicates stormwater and sewage draft plan as an overlay to the concept layout plan. g. Refer to proposal in section 4 (Surface Water) of DBAR h. Corrected in line the Appendix 4 of EIA Regulations (2014) as amended. v. Complied with regulations. vi & vii. Cognisance taken of comment.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
7	<p>Date: 19/12/2018 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, Cape Nature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>e. Incorrect reference to Property Owners Association in terms of management during Operation Phase. f. A storm water management plan for the site must be included. g. A maintenance management plan for the structures/crossing the watercourse must be included. h. The EMPr does not fulfil the requirements of Appendix 4 of the EIA Regulations (2014) as amended and must be corrected. v. Reminder to comply with regulated requirements of BAR public participation process and timeframes in accordance, as well as to include original signed and dated declarations the FBAR. The FBAR is to contain all the* information as required by Appendix 1 and 4 of the EIA regulations, 2014. vi. The activity may not commence prior to an EA being granted. vii. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p> <p>Comments regarding: i. Background information document for proposed development in which Cape Nature (CN) agreed in general with the biodiversity sensitivity study and recommended that freshwater and groundwater specialist studies would be required to inform the suitability of the site as a cemetery. ii. Based on the initial freshwater assessment, five wetlands were delineated and buffer calculations were estimated to be 20m. CN recommends increasing these buffer distances for the cemetery. iii. The constraints of the geohydrological and geotechnical assessments undertaken, must be taken into account. iv. Geohydrology can impact on biodiversity but the findings of the assessment indicate that the surface water features are not influenced by groundwater in the vicinity of the site due to the low permeability and water holding capacity of the soils present. v. CN agrees with the recommendation of the initial biodiversity sensitivity screening study that a further botanical specialist scan is required before the site can be considered further. The study must be undertaken in August or September with a focus on locating any threatened plant species. Appropriate recommendations should be provided. vi. The site history must be taken into account to ensure potential plant species of conservation concern are not overlooked. vii. It is not apparent that the site concept plan has taken any of the identified constraints into consideration although the pre-application BAR does provide further clarity on the proposal.</p>	<p>EAP: i to iv. Cognisance of the comments and concerns raised has been taken and will be addressed in subsequent/final layout plans and reports. v & vi. Botanical Statement/Scan undertaken and included as Appendix G-2 of DBAR to address issues raised. vii. Concept plans will be refined for final layout of development, taking all constraints into better account. viii. Smallholding was indicated in error ... the region is for park development. ix. Forest zone was a reference to the garden of remembrance areas where indigenous and water wise shrubs and trees could be planted as a memorial to a loved one. Eventually the garden with the indigenous trees may resemble a forest but no actual forest is planned or proposed for the region. Note: More recent concept plans do not make reference to a forest. x. The Municipal Department responsible for the APO is the same Department i.e. Community Services Department, under which maintenance of the public cemetery and memorial park will fall. xi. Part of the purpose of a memorial park is to promote alternate interment methods other than traditional burials. Municipal by-laws will also need to be developed to promote maximum usage of burial space. A memorial wall/columbarium is planned for the development. xii. The 'Guideline on Alternatives' (March, 2013) states that in terms of NEMA EIA Regulations a comparative assessment of feasible and reasonable alternatives must be included in impact reports unless</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
8	<p>Date: Email received 19/12/2018 (letter dated 13/12/2018) Format: Email letter I&AP: Nelisa Ndobeni, Specialised Environmental Officer, Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS)</p>	<p>viii. The description includes a public park where the concept plan indicate smallholdings. A public park would not be objected to, but smallholdings would not be supported. ix. The concept plan also refers to a 'forest zone' which is not supported unless further explanation or motivation is provided. x. The site is on the Municipality's Annual Plan of Operations for alien plant removal and should remain on this plan and respond to it. xi. CN notes the exceptionally high need for cemetery space as well as the need to maximise the number of burials per unit area and utilize alternative to burials such as cremation. The columbarium is supported. xii. The alternative section refers to Appendix L & M. However, key factors should be summarised and compared between alternatives. Alternative layouts should also be explored taking into account cemetery space and biodiversity constraints.</p>	<p>(underline added for accent), after having identified and investigated alternatives, no feasible and reasonable alternatives were found, requiring no further comparative assessment of alternatives (besides the preferred and no-go alternative). This was the principle applied for excluding the De Novo site from the BAR since it is not a feasible or reasonable site due to several issues (least of which is the fact that the Municipality does not own the land).</p>
9	<p>Date: 08/01/2019 (Format: Email I&AP: Schalk van der Merwe, Environmental Planner, Community and Protection Services, Stellenbosch Municipality</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of pre-application DBAR. ii. Notification that the activity triggers the need for a water use licence application (WULA) iii. Instruction to arrange a pre-WULA meeting with DWS. iv. Further stipulations regarding location of the activity in terms of water. Careful +</p>	<p>EAP: i to iv. Cognisance of the comments and concerns raised has been taken and will be addressed in subsequent/final layout plans and reports. Freshwater specialist to take WULA process further.</p>
10		<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of pre-application DBAR notification email.</p>	<p>EAP: i Email response sent 09/01/2019</p>
END OF TRAIL REPORT			

PROPOSED CALCUTTA PUBLIC CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL PARK

APPLICANT: Stellenbosch Local Municipality

PRE-APPLICATION COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEADP Ref. No: 16/3/3/6/7/11/B4/45/1288/17)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	Date: 13/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain	i. Request for registration of organisation as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of organisation (represented by contact individual) as an I&AP)
2	Date: 15/02/2018 Format: Telephone call to Rumboll and Partners (Project Manager) I&AP: Mr. Adrian Simmers	i. Telephonic discussion regarding project background captured in Project Manager's email to I&AP	Project Manager: i. Telephonic and email communication with I&AP regarding maildrop with request to I&AP to register with EnviroAfrica to raise queries, concerns and/or comments in writing
3	Date: 26/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain	i. Request for receipt of registration email acknowledgement	EAP: i. Email response acknowledging registration with indication that pre-application public participation process is in its very early stages and is still under way
4	Date: 02/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Heritage Western Cape (HWC) represented by Yanga	i. Request for completion of HWC checklist, notice of intent to develop application form and relevant payment	EAP: i. Email forwarded to Project Manager for completion by appointed heritage specialist.

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
	Blom (Office of the CEO, Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport)		
5	Date: 15/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Adrian Simmers	i. Email response to EAP's written follow-up regarding registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Request to confirm registration as I&AP and subsequent acknowledgement of registration as I&AP
6	Date: 16/03/2018 Format: Telephonic I&AP: Mr. Emile van der Merwe	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Email response acknowledging registration with electronic provision of maildrop information for proposed development
7	Date: 20/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Andrea Lubbe (Financial Manager, Bellingan Group)	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and enquiring if besides the Bellingan Group, individual farms as mentioned within the Bellingan Group, should be registered.
8	Date: 21/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Tania Vergnani (Secretary, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association)	i. No request related to proposed Calcutta public cemetery and memorial park development. ii. Subsequent email from the Chairman of the Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association specifically the Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association is on the Municipal Register and should be notified of all development applications. See point 15 below.	EAP: i. Email response requesting clarification as to whether I&AP registration for proposed Calcutta development is required. ii. See point 15 below.
9	Date: 22/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Francois Malan (Managing Director, Simonsig Wine Estate)	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email response acknowledging registration.
10	Date: 07/04/2018 Format: Email (fax) to project management company I&AP: Mr. Armando Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd, owner of	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email response acknowledging registration.

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
	neighbouring farm (Uitspan 1037, Koelenhof)		
11	Date: 09/04/2018 Format: Telephonic I&AP: Mr. and Mrs. Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd	i. Two telephonic calls raising concerns about land use zoning and requesting registration of Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email response acknowledging registration.
12	Date: 10/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mrs. Claudine Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd	i. Thanks for correspondence received from EnviroAfrica; ii. Note that original fax was sent to EnviroAfrica after telephonic conversations.	EAP: i and ii. Noted.
13	Date: 10/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Angelika van der Merwe (General Manager, Stellenbosch Agricultural Society)	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.
14	Date: 17/04/2018 Format: Post I&AP: Mr. Armando Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd	Letter dated 28 March 2018, stating: i. Brief history of the property; ii. Mr. and Mrs. Baschiera representing Banisi Investments (Pty) Ltd would not oppose the proposed development provided the rezoning of their farm also be considered and supported; iii. Request for registration as an I&AP Concerns raised regarding:	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration and letter.
15	Date: 18/04/2018 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Francois Malan (Managing Director, Simonsig Wine Estate)	i. Potential dangerous traffic situations and the need for sufficient slip lanes in both directions on the R 304; ii. Water table/soil water contamination; iii. Treatment of sewage to prevent water contamination; iv. The runoff of water from the roads to enable/follow the natural drainage of storm water runoff towards the Klippies River; v. Visual/aesthetic impact of the proposed development particularly the entrance, parking and layout of the cemetery.	EAP: i & ii. Email response acknowledging correspondence and that cognisance of the concerns raised has been taken and will be addressed in subsequent reports.
14	Date: 19/04/2018 Format: Email letter	Comments regarding:	EAP:

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
	<p>I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, Cape Nature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>Comment</p> <p>i. Sections to the west and south of the property are classified as Critical Biodiversity Area 2 (CBA 2) according to the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (WCBSP);</p> <p>ii. There is a watercourse originating in the north west of the property and flowing in a south easterly direction;</p> <p>iii. According to the WCBSP, wetland conditions encroach in the north western corner of the property;</p> <p>iv. The remainder of the property is classified as an Ecological Support Area (ESA) 2;</p> <p>v. The entire site is considered highly degraded with dense infestations of alien species and minimally naturally occurring indigenous species present;</p> <p>iv. The most significant constraint to the development of the site is the freshwater resources on the site, both surface and groundwater. Therefore, specialist freshwater and groundwater studies would be required in order to inform the development proposal;</p> <p>v. Although the watercourse was mapped in the initial constraints mapping, this was done from a terrestrial perspective;</p> <p>vi. Recommendation that all the potential alternative sites for a cemetery for the municipality be considered as alternatives within the application and if additional applications proceed, they should also include other alternative sites;</p> <p>vii. Based on information received, there may be opportunity for development of a cemetery on part of the site depending on the outcome of the freshwater and groundwater studies.</p>	<p>i to vii. Email response acknowledging correspondence and that cognisance of the concerns raised has been taken and will be addressed in subsequent reports to be sent out for comment.</p>
15	<p>Date: 26/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. André Pelser (Chairman, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association)</p>	<p>i. Email with statement that the Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association is on the Municipal Register and should be notified of all development applications. Thanks expressed to EAP for specifically bringing the Calcutta project to the Association's attention.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration as per point 8 above and informing I&AP that and Mr. Pelser will be included on the I&AP register as a representative of the Association.</p>
	<p>END OF TRAIL REPORT</p>		