

Appendix F – Comment and Response Report

PROPOSED LOUW'S BOS PUBLIC CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL PARK

APPLICANT: Stellenbosch Local Municipality

2019 POST-APPLICATION BAR COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEA&DP Ref. No: 16/3/3/1/B4/45/1047/19)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	<p>Date: 20/06/2019 Format: Emails (EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence) I&AP: Mr. André Pelser, Chairperson, SRA</p>	<p>EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence directed from Mr Pelser to Committee Member Pieter Schaafsma and Deon (No comments directed at EAP but are noted for transparency purposes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mention that the SRA did submit comments and request to members to check that it is on EnviroAfrica's website. ii. Comment that area proposed for development is fertile agricultural land and that low value agricultural land is a better option. iii. Mention that Municipality has to investigate how to prevent cemetery sprawl and that there are examples in Europe. iv. Comment that expansion of Jamestown cemetery on fertile agricultural land is undesirable and should be resisted. v. Mention that the SRA needs to convey concern about Municipality delegating responsibility for notifications to I&APs to developers/planners/consultants since it is an important Municipal duty and I&APs have no way of knowing whether it has been done properly. 	<p>EAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Emails captured in records (Appendix F1 of FBAR).
2	<p>Date: 20/06/2019 Format: Email (EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence) I&AP: Mr. Pieter Schaafsma, Committee Member, SRA</p>	<p>EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence (Not all comments directed at EAP but are noted for transparency purposes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Mention of telephonic communication with EAP since I&AP could not find reference to the SRA letter in Appendix F of the DBAR. ii. Incorrect comment that EAP mentioned preferred site is on the northern side of Annandale Road. iii. Partially correct comment that of the 75ha site applied for development, only a 35ha will be set aside for development and only 19,5ha of that will be used for burial purposes with the remaining land being a memorial park to encourage the community to move away from burials. 	<p>EAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Email response sent to all parties copied I&AP mail on 20/06/2019. ii. Correction of information – preferred site is located on southern side of Annandale Road. iii. Note that the SRA's comments were received and captured in the comment and response trail report (item 15, Appendix F of BAR). iv. Comment that incorrect reference of Ms for SRA secretary will be corrected to Mr in future documents. v. Response that the original SRA letter was received although the email sent by Mr. Schaafsma was not directly received by EAP.

3	<p>Date: 20/06/2019 Format: Email (EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence) I&AP: Mr. André Pelser, Chairperson, SRA</p>	<p>iv. Comment that other site "Calcutta Bos" is situated on the R304 near Koelenhof and the two sites, if approved, should serve Stellenbosch for the next 50 years. v. Request to EAP to indicate if attached letter was received or if an edited form of it was received. vi. Comment that Rehanne Lambrechts is the Secretary of the SRA. EAP copied in on internal SRA correspondence from Mr. Pelser to Mr. Schaafsma (No comments directed at EAP but are noted for transparency purposes): i. Comment that I&AP would not 'put money on the 50 year guarantee' ii. Mention that the timeframe undermines any pressure to find alternative solutions to using fertile farmland for a cemetery. iii. Comment that the Municipality needs to be innovative and start marketing vaults for multiple interments such as in Europe and America. iv. Mention that cremation is common in India for good reason. v. Comment that cost must be a factor and that burial in nearby cemeteries is also an option. vi. Remark that I&AP wonders where the Pniel cemetery will expand to. vii. Comment that the issue is very sensitive and emotional and needs careful attention.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email captured in records (Appendix F1 of FBAR).</p>
4	<p>Date: 20/06/2019 Format: Emails I&AP: Karin Bedingfield, Environmental Practitioner, Legacy Environmental Management Consulting</p>	<p>i. Thanks for email received. ii. Request to update I&AP email address. iii. Request for direct link to DBAR documents and thanks for link.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email response sent 20/06/2019 that details have been updated. ii. Email response with link to website and stating that documents were available from 09h00 on 20/06/2019.</p>
5	<p>Date: 25/06/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Rehanne Lambrechts, Secretary, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association (SRA)</p>	<p>i. Thanks for communication and statement that contents thereof is duly noted.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email captured in records (Appendix F1 of FBAR).</p>
6	<p>Date: 19/07/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Hannes, Pretorius, Bock and Bryant (HPBB) representing Klein Moerbeij (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Reference to preceding telephonic conversation and request for an extension to submit comments in respect of the proposed development. Extension requested until 24/07/2019. ii. Confirmation that Mr. Hannes Pretorius was on leave and on return was involved in urgent litigation. iii. Indication that I&AP urgently awaits EAP's response.</p>	<p>EAP: i to iii. Email response sent on 19/07/2019 indicating that although legislated timeframe for submission of any comments or queries for propose development ends on 22/07/2019, EnviroAfrica will grant only the specific I&AP/email recipient an extension up until and including 24/07/2019.</p>

<p>Date: 22/07/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Email from Mr. D'mitri Matthews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning: Region 1 (DEA&DP); Letter signed by Head of Component (no individual name given), DEA&DP</p>	<p>i. Draft BAR dated June 2019 and received by the Department on 21/06/2019, refers. ii. Note that proposal is for the establishment of the Louw's Bos public cemetery and memorial park with associated infrastructure, south of Annandale Road. iii. Comments on the DBAR: a. Note that DEA&DP's comments dated 08/03/2019 were included in the pre-application DBAR but they were not responded to in the comments and responses report. Reminder that all comments and responses during pre-application and application phases must be included and responded to in the final BAR (FBAR). In addition, all issues requiring amendments to the BAR must be addressed. b. Appendices B1 and B2 both refer to the layouts as being the preferred layout. This must be amended to reflect which layout is preferred and which is not preferred. c. The coordinates on page 13 differ from those on page 37. Only the correct coordinates must be included in the FBAR. d. The EMPr must include recommendations that will be implemented for development e.g. 15m for wetland in north eastern corner of the site. e. Section E of the BAR, with respect to the Site Alternatives must be amended to include reasons why the various alternatives assessed are preferred or not preferred. f. Comment from the Department of Agriculture must be obtained with respect to the proposed development. g. Comment from the Department of Water and Sanitation has not been included in the DBAR. There is no proof of the submission of a water use licence authorisation (WULA) in terms of the National Water Act. Proof of submission to the DWS must be included in the FBAR. h. There is no comment from the DEA&DP's Waste and Pollution Management Directorates in the DBAR. Comment from these directorates must be included in the FBAR. i. Note that the development triggers section 38(1) of the National heritage Resources Act. A notice of intent to develop (NID) must be submitted to Heritage Western Cape (HWC). A copy of the NID must simultaneously be submitted to DEA&DP and the decision from HWC must be included in the FBAR. iv. Comments on regulatory requirements: a. Proof of local newspaper advert and site notices to be provided. b. Proof of notices sent to I&APs for commenting purposes must be included in FBAR. c. Any new representations and comments received in connection with the application must be included in the FBAR. d. Any responses by the EAP to items in 'c' above must be tabulated in a comments and response report and included in the FBAR.</p>	<p>EAP: i to ii. Cognisance taken of comments. iii (a). 2019 Pre-application Comments and Response Trail Report corrected to include DEA&DP's 08/03/2019 comments and response. (b) Corrected to indicate that B1 is the preferred layout and B2 is not preferred. (c) Co-ordinates corrected. (d) Recommendations were included in draft EMPr and current EMPr under section 3.6 (Site Specific Environmental Requirements & Impact Minimisation Recommendations). (e) Amendment made. (f) Comment obtained as per Appendix E5. (g) Comment obtained as per Appendix E3. Proof of a water use authorisation process (pre-application meeting attendance register and summary note/minutes) also in Appendix E3. (h) Comments obtained as per Appendices E7 and E8. (i) Final decision from HWC (and NID documentation) included in Appendix E4. iv to x. Cognisance taken of (and adherence to) comments.</p>
---	---	--

		<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 FBAR.</p> <p>f. An original signed and dated applicant declaration is required to be submitted with the FBAR. 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 FBAR.</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>v. Request to quote reference number in any future correspondence regarding application.</p> <p>ix. Reminder that the activity may not commence prior to an EA being granted.</p> <p>x. Comment that the Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p>	
8	<p>Date: 22/07/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, CapeNature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>i. Thanks for opportunity to comment on proposed development and note that comments only pertain to biodiversity related impacts and not overall desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>ii. Mention that CapeNature (CN) commented on the background information document and pre-application BAR in which CN indicated that there were no terrestrial biodiversity constraints and that CN does not object to the proposed development provided the wetland and buffer in the north-east corner or the site are not impacted on.</p> <p>iii. Comment that the proposed development layout in the pre-application BAR has now been refined significantly and allows for accurate interrogation of the potential impacts.</p> <p>iv. Mention that the freshwater assessment has been updated and used to inform the two development layout alternatives. The preferred layout has changed the access road to entering the property from the centre, whereas the non-preferred layout has the access road entering the property from the north-east corner.</p> <p>v. CN agrees with the selection of the preferred layout as this avoids any impact on the wetland and buffer in the north-eastern corner of the property by the access road.</p> <p>vi. Conclusion that CN does not object to the development proposal as indicated in the preferred layout, provided the EMP is implemented.</p> <p>vii. CN reserves the right to revise its initial comments and request further information based on any additional information it may receive.</p> <p>Comment on applicability of the Western Cape Land Use Planning Act, 2014:</p> <p>i. Proposed development will have significant impact on agriculture and the heritage of the area since not only is the proposed development of significant size but it would appear, in all likelihood, that should it be approved it will be further significantly expanded in the future.</p> <p>ii. Mention that page 12 of the BAR under the heading "site Description" indicates that the proposed site is approximately 487ha in</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of comments. Email captured in records.</p>
9	<p>Date: 24/07/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: HPBB representing Klein Moerbeij (Pty) Ltd</p>		<p>EAP: Email response indicating thanks for comments received and that comments have considered in FBAR - i. Statement and explanation that comment received is not a true reflection of the statement in the DBAR since expansion of the proposed development is not a given, therefore, use of the word 'will' is erroneous.</p>

	<p>size and the total development footprint will be approximately 74ha. Comment that considering</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the development footprint is more than 5ha; b. information in the DBAR (page 53 in particular) states that “the bulk of the land” has been cultivated or irrigated in the last 10 years. c. the proposed development cannot be regarded as an agricultural land use; <p>a statement that an approval in terms of section 53 of the Western Cape Land Use Planning Act (2014) is required.</p> <p>Comment on visual impact:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> iii. Quote of paragraph from page 16 of DBAR with I&AP underlining phrases for own emphasis. iv. Statement that paragraph from page 16 of DBAR is contradicted by paragraph on page 29 of DBAR which is misleading and leaves I&APs unable to make meaningful comment on visual impact. v. Statement that paragraph on page 29 of DBAR is nonsensical and impossible to comment on. vi. Comment that phrase on page 53 of DBAR contradicts findings as set out in points iii and iv above. vii. Comment that phrase on page 57 of DBAR contradicts findings as set out in points iii and iv above. viii. Partial quote of paragraph from page 48 of DBAR. ix. Comment that considering <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the South site is the preferred alternative; b. the preferred alternative will have a greater visual impact than the North site; c. the proposed development will have high visual impact on the landscape and will change the visual environment; d. visual impact is the greatest heritage related impact; e. the heritage screener (Appendix G8) was undertaken primarily for the North site and it recommended that a complete heritage impact assessment (HIA) is required; <p>a statement that a heritage screener and VIA should have been done for the preferred alternative site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> x. Statement that no HIA was provided for I&APs to comment on as per the letter to I&APs and therefore the public participation process is fatally flawed and should be redone. <p>Comment on impact on groundwater:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> xi. Quote of phrases from pages 53 and 54 of DBAR related to possible negative impact on groundwater and various specialist assessments indicating that the probability of this occurring is low. xii. Comment that the possibility of groundwater impact is a huge concern for agricultural operations in the area, particularly on grapes. <p>Comment on incomplete/nonsensical responses relating to the “No-Go” option:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Request for I&AP to note that the preferred site property, Louw’s Bos South, is approximately 487ha in size and includes several sections which are either privately owned or are being rented from the Municipality. It is correctly stated that 74ha is the total development footprint. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Agreement with I&AP comment. b. Statement that the bulk of the site was last ‘cultivated or irrigated’ approximately nine and a half years ago (as per Google Earth Images) from the date of the proposed application in June 2019. c. Agreement with I&AP comment. Note that a rezoning application has been lodged and town planners informed of the comment regarding approval in terms of section 53 of the Western Cape Land Use Planning Act, No. 3 of 2014. iii. Agreement with I&AP comment and thanks expressed for pointing out the grammatical error. iv. Explanation that the quoted used the term “moderate impact” as per the executive summary of the specialist visual impact assessment (VIA) report. Statement that the VIA is the same report used in both the post application and earlier pre-application phases of the project, and exact indication of where the VIA from both phases is still accessible to the public (i.e. public has had access to the specialist report/s since January 2019) has been may be found as an appendix within the heritage impact assessment (HIIA). v. Explanation that the paragraph referred to is in terms of the environmental and visual impact rating assessment (explained and attached as Appendix I of the DBAR and in the VIA). Statement that the paragraph makes specific reference to the development’s visual impact on the landscape using impact rating terminology which makes sense when read in conjunction with the impact assessment information presented in both the pre-application and post application DBARs. Thanks expressed for the comment and statement that the FBAR will clarify the paragraph by specifically indicating need to make reference to impact rating terminology. vi. Explanation and response that the statement made on page 53 of the DBAR relates to a holistic cultural/heritage related impact of the proposed development and not just to the visual impact and that paragraphs 3 and 4 of the comments received are specific to the visual impact of the development. vii. Explanation and response that DBAR statement does not deny that there will be a visual impact as stated in paragraphs 3 and 4 of the comments received but it specifically states that the design avoids potential visual impacts by aiming to create a green, park-like feature which (as per the layout design) should provide visual screening and softening of the visual impact of the proposed development. viii & ix. Response that a heritage screener is merely a filtering mechanism indicating whether a full HIA may be required. Explanation
--	--	--

xiii. Statement that paragraph on page 57 of the DBAR relating to the impact of the no-go option is not valid and should relate to impacts of the no-go option and not impacts on the Municipality.
 Comments on conditions and mitigation measures:
 xiv. Statement that comment provided on page 78 of the DBAR is unacceptable as I&APs have had no opportunity to comment on any proposed conditions or mitigation measures.

that no screener was undertaken for the preferred alternative site since a full HIA was conducted for the proposed development. This comprehensive HIA, comprising an archaeological impact assessment (AIA), paleontological impact assessment (PIA) and visual impact assessment (VIA), was made available to the public during the earlier, pre-application phase of the public participation process (as appendices G6 to G8 of the pre-application BAR) with the Heritage Screener as Appendix G9. Before commencement of the pre-application process, notices regarding availability of the DBAR on EnviroAfrica's website, were posted and delivered to all presumed I&APs and a newspaper advert of the same was placed in the local newspaper. The notice also requested registration of parties as I&AP's.
 Note that specific I&AP acknowledged receipt of pre-application information by registering for the process on 26 February 2019.
 Further note that the initial/pre-application DBAR and all appendices are still available on EnviroAfrica's website (under Projects/Current/Louw's Bos Public Cemetery and Memorial Park). The AIA, PIA and VIA were collated to form the HIA for the post application DBAR phase of the proposed development.
 x. Statement that the comment that no HIA was provided for I&APs to comment on, is not true. Besides the availability of the HIA information in the pre-application process mentioned in paragraph vii & ix above, the public participation process for the post application DBAR phase of the project involved:
 a. hand delivering electronic/cd copies of the DBAR and all appendices to immediate neighbours of the proposed development site;
 b. posting electronic/cd copies of the DBAR and all appendices to all registered non-governmental I&APs with postal addresses and who did not supply email addresses;
 c. posting electronic/cd copies of the DBAR and all appendices to organs of state and informing them via email of the availability of the same on EnviroAfrica's website and
 d. informing registered I&APs with email addresses of the availability of the DBAR and all appendices on EnviroAfrica's website (under Projects/For Public Participation)
 Further statement that the information for the post application DBAR phase would have been available on the public participation part of EnviroAfrica's website until the 23/24 July 2019 for public comment since the website system has been set up so that files are moved from the Projects/For Public Participation folder to the Projects/Current folder once the normal public participation period ends. EAP is unsure as to why HPBB was unable to view the HIA, however, the I&AP represented by HPBB was provided a hand delivered copy of all documents (including the HIA) which was acknowledged by the I&AP, Klein Moerbeij (Pty) Ltd. Evidence of receipt of documents provided to HPBB.

			<p>Note that none of the other I&APs who provided comprehensive comments mentioned that the HIA was unavailable and the post application DBAR and all appendices are still available on EnviroAfrica's website (under Projects/Current/ DBAR Louw's Bos Public Cemetery and Memorial Park).</p> <p>xi & xii. Cognisance taken of the concerns raised regarding groundwater users and note that the proposed development itself will probably use groundwater for water supply purposes.</p> <p>xiii. Cognisance taken of comment received and statement that FBAR will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>xiv. Statement that I&APs have had "no opportunity to comment on any proposed conditions or mitigation measure ..." (own emphasis) is not true. Request for I&AP to note that mitigation measures and conditions have been mentioned at several places throughout the DBAR (with a few example references). Response that section H(d) of the FBAR will include conditions (including mitigation measures) as mentioned earlier in the DBAR and will also make reference to those conditions and mitigation measures <u>already captured</u> in Appendix I and Appendix O of the DBAR/FBAR.</p>
10	<p>Date: 30/07/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Rudolph Röscher, LandCare Manager, Cape Winelands District Program: Sustainable Resource Management, Western Cape Department of Agriculture</p>	<p>i. Comment that since this is a land use change application (changing from Agricultural use to cemetery use – thus taken out of agriculture) CARA not relevant in my opinion but Act 70 Of 70.</p> <p>ii. Indication that Cor van der Walt at Eisenburg is responsible for Act 70 of 70 comments and that to confirm I&AP's opinion EAP must contact the national Department of Agriculture's (NDA's) office in Bellville.</p>	<p>EAP: Email response sent 30/07/2019 indicating -</p> <p>i. Thanks for reply received. (NB. Cor van der Walt deals with town planning development applications and comment was specifically referred to town planners to follow-up on through their application process).</p> <p>ii. Statement that EAP will follow up with NDA (as per email sent to NDA on 30/07/2019 and captured in Appendix F1 of FBAR).</p>
11	<p>Date: 30/08/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Email from Mr. Abdullah Suliman, DEA&DP (Waste Directorate); Letter signed by Mr. Lance McBain-Charles, Deputy Director: Waste Management Licensing; DEA&DP contact person: Etienne Roux (Waste Management Directorate)</p>	<p>i. The Sub-Directorate: Waste Management Licensing reviewed the BAR dated 19/06/2019 and received by the Directorate on 22/08/2019.</p> <p>ii. Comments on the DBAR:</p> <p>a. Comments and responses table includes summaries and comments raised and responses thereto. Request to ensure table accurately reflects exchanges between EAP and I&APs.</p> <p>b. During construction phase, any solid waste should be appropriately stored at the facility until such time as it can be disposed of at a licensed facility suitable of accepting such waste.</p> <p>c. Should more than 100m³ of general waste, or more than 80m³ of hazardous waste, be stored at the facility for a period exceeding 90 days, the facility will need to register in terms of, and adhere to, the NEM:WA Notional Norms and Standards for the Storage of Waste, as contained in GN 926 of 29 November 2013.</p> <p>d. Note that all fuels should be stored in a banded area, capable of holding 110% of the total volume of fuel stored.</p>	<p>EAP: Email response sent 02/09/2019 indicating -</p> <p>i to iii. Comments received and that cognisance has been taken of the Directorate's comments with those issues not already included in the EMPR, to be added.</p>

		<p>e. Should there be any spills of hazardous substances at the facility which could lead to environmental degradation, the management thereof should adhere to section 30 of the NEMA (as amended) including reporting responsibilities.</p> <p>f. No waste is allowed to be burn or buried on site.</p> <p>iii. Comment that the Department reserves the right to revise their initial comments and to request further information.</p>	
12	<p>Date: 02/09/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Email from Mr. Abdullah Daniels, Principal Technician, Development, Stellenbosch Municipality. Email forwarded to EAP by Mr. Schaik van der Merwe, Environmental Planner, Stellenbosch Municipality. Letter signed by Mr. Abdullah Daniels.</p>	<p>Comment that it is anticipated that the water and sewer demand will be limited to a few buildings only and it is not foreseen that these buildings will have a major impact on the bulk services. Further comment that:</p> <p>i. There is no municipal bulk water line servicing the area and that the development proposes to make use of borehole water.</p> <p>ii. Sewage from the proposed development will drain into conservancy tanks and the municipality will service the conservancy tanks if required.</p> <p>iii. Confirmation that the municipality will handle all solid waste as per their normal waste removal operations.</p> <p>iv. Contact number for Mr. Abdullah Daniels, Principal Technician, Development, Stellenbosch Municipality provided should there be any enquiries.</p>	<p>EAP: i to iv. Email response sent 02/09/2019 to Municipality expressing thanks for comments received.</p>
13	<p>Date: 05/09/2019 Format: Email faxed letter. Email dated 05/09/2019. Faxed letter signed 05/08/2019, stamped by DWS 03/09/2019 I&AP: Email from Mr. Mkonto Nkosinathi, Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS); Letter signed by Ms. Nelisa Ndobeni, Control Environmental Officer, Regional Head: Wester. DWS contact person: Mr. Mkonto Nkosinathi</p>	<p>Acknowledgement of receipt of BAR report dated 19/06/2019.</p> <p>i. Note that:</p> <p>a. Wetland B and the Bonte River will be impacted by the development. Activities occurring within these zones will constitute a water use in terms of section 21 (c) and (i) [of the NWA]. A water use authorisation (WUA) must be applied for and obtained before construction takes places and a risk matrix must be undertaken to determine the level of authorisation required.</p> <p>b. A pre-application WUA application meeting must be arranged with the DWS to determine what type of authorisation is required before commencement of the activity. DWS contact person details provided.</p> <p>ii. Note that the development should not be:</p> <p>a. located below the 1:100 year flood line or a river or in close proximity of water bodies such as wetlands, lakes, pans, estuaries and floodplains;</p> <p>b. situated on unstable areas like fault zones, seismic zones, dolomitic or karst areas where sinkholes and subsidence are likely;</p> <p>c. situated in or near sensitive ecological areas;</p> <p>d. situated in or on areas characterised by flat gradients, shallow or emergent groundwater;</p> <p>e. situated in areas characterised by steep gradients, shallow or shallow bedrock with little soil cover, where slope stability could be a problem;</p> <p>f. situated on areas of groundwater recharge on account of topography and/or highly permeable soils;</p>	<p>EAP: i(a)&(b). A pre-application WUA authorisation meeting was held on 23/08/2019 (please refer to Appendix E3 and F1 for evidence of pre-application meeting), as well as freshwater specialist report in Appendix G3 of FBAR. ii to iv. Cognisance taken of comments. DWS email forwarded to freshwater specialists.</p>

		<p>g. situated on areas overlaying or adjacent to important or potentially important aquifers where such aquifers are to be used for water supply purposes;</p> <p>h. the cemetery should be more than 200m from surface water resources and more than 300m from boreholes and wells used for human consumption without authorisation from this Department.</p> <p>iii. Comment that the Department reserves the right to revise their initial comments and to request further information.</p> <p>iv. Name of contact person, Mr. Mkonto Nkosinathi (DWS) given should there be any queries.</p>	
14	<p>Date: 06/09/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Email from Mr. Gunther Frantz, DEA&DP Pollution & Chemicals Directorate; Letter signed by Ms. Wilina Kloppers, Director: Pollution & Chemicals Management; DEA&DP contact person: Mr. Gunther Frantz</p>	<p>The Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management acknowledged receipt of the BAR on 29/08/2019 and has the following comments:</p> <p>i. Sanitation:</p> <p>a. the site layout plan (Appendix B1) shows various ablution (toilet) facilities located throughout the site. It is not clear from the layout plan or the DBAR if all ablution facilities will be connected to a common septic tank. This must be clarified in the next phase of the BAR;</p> <p>b. the position of the septic tank/s must be updated/displayed on the preferred site layout plan in Appendix B1;</p> <p>c. The applicant must devise a contingency plan, to be included in the operational phase of the EMPr, for the safe pumping of the septic tanks in the event that the municipality cannot service the septic tanks;</p> <p>d. Written confirmation must be sought from the Engineering and Technical Services Department of the Stellenbosch Municipality advising that adequate capacity exists at the Stellenbosch waste water treatment works to accept the sewage load from the development;</p> <p>ii. Geotechnical study:</p> <p>a. It is recommended that no traditional burials take place in the vicinity of trial pit 8 which had groundwater seepage at 1,5m, in order to reduce the risk of pathogenic contamination of groundwater resources.</p> <p>iii. Name of contact person, Gunther Frantz (DEA&DP, Pollution & Chemicals Directorate), provided should there be any enquiries.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">END OF TRAIL REPORT</p>	<p>EAP: Email response sent 09/09/2019 indicating - i to iii. Thanks for comments received and that cognisance has been taken of the Directorate's comments with those issues not already included in the DBAR and EMPr, will be addressed.</p>
15			

2019 PRE-APPLICATION COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEADP Ref. No: 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1341/18)

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
1	Date: 23/01/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Gunter Erich Henke, Director of Kumani Beleggings (Pty) Ltd	i. Opposition to the above proposed project.	EAP: i. Email correspondence sent on 25/01/2019 confirming registration of organisation (represented by contact individual) as an I&AP. Record of I&AP's opposition to proposed project kept.
2	Date: 25/01/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Mike Miller (Vice Chairman, Stellenbosch Flying Club)	i. Request for re-registration of the Stellenbosch Flying Club (SFC) as an I&AP.	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence on 29/01/2019 confirming same.
3	Date: 25/01/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Withers Environmental Consultants represented by Ms. Karin Neethling	i. Thanks for update in EIA process ii. Request to remain registered as an I&AP.	EAP: i. Email correspondence sent on 25/01/2019 confirming registration of I&AP.
4	Date: 28/01/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Aubrey Withers, Withers Environmental Consultants	i. Request for registration as an I&AP.	EAP: i. Email correspondence sent on 28/01/2019 confirming registration of I&AP.

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
5	<p>Date: 28/01/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Aubrey Withers, Withers Environmental Consultants</p>	<p>i. Comment that the alternative site opposite the Stellenbosch airport is on the proposed western bypass alignment. ii. Query as to whether an agricultural soils study and agricultural economic study has been undertaken for the preferred site. iii. Comment that preferred site is away from the 'centre of gravity' of the people to be buried and that the search for a site should be concentrated to the north of Stellenbosch somewhere between Klapmuts and Franschoek should be found.</p>	<p>EAP: i&ii. Email correspondence sent on 28/01/2019 acknowledging listed queries and comments. iii. Request for I&AP to note the Applicant's strategy to establish new cemeteries in two of the three Municipal regions and reference to the proposed Calcutta Public Cemetery and Memorial Park project (DEA&DP reference number 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1288/17) on EnviroAfrica's website regarding concern to service Klappmuts region.</p>
6	<p>Date: 29/01/2019 Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Prof. Hans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain (FSM)</p>	<p>i. Request to register FSM as an I&AP. ii. Clarification as to whether new material is available for the current application requiring FSM to reconsider pertaining comments.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response on 29/01/2019 acknowledging I&AP's registration and enquiring if comments submitted under a previous application should be captured 'as is'. iii. Email response on 29/01/2019 indicating availability of information pertinent to the current application.</p>
7	<p>Date: 01/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Francois Malan, Executive Director, Simonsig Wines, Stellenbosch</p>	<p>i. Note of registration as an I&AP for proposed Calcutta development for which concerns were submitted and feedback received. Statement not to be registered as an I&AP for Louw's Bos project.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email response acknowledging response and removal of name from Louw's Bos I&AP list.</p>
8	<p>Date: 04/02/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Mathews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of and reference to, Notice of Intent (NOI) received on 08/09/2017 and DEA&DP's correspondence dated 26/09/2017, as well as the pre-application meeting held on 10/10/2017 and the Department's correspondence dated 16/10/2017 and 13/09/2018 and the NOI received on 28/09/2018. ii. Note that a new NOI has been lodged with DEA&DP (DEA&DP reference number 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1341/18) and the older pre-application file has been closed for administration purposes. iii. Statement that DEA&DP reserves the right to revise or withdraw initial comments or request further information from EAP.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence. ii. Note of pre-application DEA&DP reference number (16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1341/18). iii. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's comment.</p>
9	<p>Date: 04/02/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Mathews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)</p>	<p>i. Acknowledgement of receipt of pre-application basic assessment report (BAR) on 25/01/2019. ii. Commitment to provide comment within prescribed period. iii. Request to quote DEA&DP reference number 16/3/3/6/7/1/B4/45/1341/18 in future correspondence in respect of the application. iv. Reminder that activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation (EA)</p>	<p>EAP: i to iv. Cognisance taken of DEA&DP's correspondence.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
10	<p>Date: 06/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Nelmare Williams, Ward Administrator: Ward 21 (on behalf of Councillor Rikus Badenhorst)</p>	<p>i. Note that the development property falls outside the Ward and therefore, the Councillor has no comments regarding the application.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Cognisance taken of I&AP's correspondence.</p>
11	<p>Date: 07/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Prof. Ronnie Donaldson, Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Stellenbosch University</p>	<p>i. Query as to whether there is an executive summary of the EIA process on the EnviroAfrica's website since I&AP is looking for actual recommended burial method. ii. Request for confirmation of receipt of letter and for future correspondence to be via email. iii. Objection to the proposed development based on - 1. Rezoning of land from Agricultural: a. The area ear-marked is agricultural b. There are many areas closer to Stellenbosch better suited for the proposed development and that the reason behind the rezoning appears to be an economic one c. It is felt that the establishment of a cemetery and memorial park will set a dangerous precedent for future application and developments in the Lynedoch and greater Stellenbosch region where agriculture is the predominant activity. d. Limberlost Property Holdings employs in excess of 600 persons from the region and has had discussions with the Applicant re. leasing the land in question for agriculture thereby creating in excess of 500 direct employment opportunities and contributing to the upliftment of the Lynedoch community. 2. Traffic: a. The proposed site would be on Annandale Road which connects the R44 to the R310 and is a single lane road from either side predominantly servicing the farms/residents thereof. b. The farms in question are grape/strawberry producers which utilise large fleets of tractors and inter-link trucks to transport the produce. c. It is felt that the additional use of Annandale road by mowers, visitors and funeral processions will disrupt traffic flow and impact on road safety. d. There is no street lighting on Annandale Road further impacting on road safety for visitors to the cemetery companies use transporters (i.e. inter-links) on 24-hour basis during season, as well as various tractors/trucks transporting staff and product during the year. e. Cars travelling in an easterly direction on Annandale Road have no right turn lane which would cause major backlogs in traffic.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email correspondence sent on 07/02/2019 thanking I&AP for response and confirming registration of I&AP and parties to whom the email was copied, as I&APs. Referral of I&AP to page on pre-application BAR with executive summary.</p>
12	<p>Date: 19/02/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Barry Zeller, Director, Limberlost Property Holdings (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Request for confirmation of receipt of letter and for future correspondence to be via email. ii. Objection to the proposed development based on - 1. Rezoning of land from Agricultural: a. The area ear-marked is agricultural b. There are many areas closer to Stellenbosch better suited for the proposed development and that the reason behind the rezoning appears to be an economic one c. It is felt that the establishment of a cemetery and memorial park will set a dangerous precedent for future application and developments in the Lynedoch and greater Stellenbosch region where agriculture is the predominant activity. d. Limberlost Property Holdings employs in excess of 600 persons from the region and has had discussions with the Applicant re. leasing the land in question for agriculture thereby creating in excess of 500 direct employment opportunities and contributing to the upliftment of the Lynedoch community. 2. Traffic: a. The proposed site would be on Annandale Road which connects the R44 to the R310 and is a single lane road from either side predominantly servicing the farms/residents thereof. b. The farms in question are grape/strawberry producers which utilise large fleets of tractors and inter-link trucks to transport the produce. c. It is felt that the additional use of Annandale road by mowers, visitors and funeral processions will disrupt traffic flow and impact on road safety. d. There is no street lighting on Annandale Road further impacting on road safety for visitors to the cemetery companies use transporters (i.e. inter-links) on 24-hour basis during season, as well as various tractors/trucks transporting staff and product during the year. e. Cars travelling in an easterly direction on Annandale Road have no right turn lane which would cause major backlogs in traffic.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email sent on 11/06/2019 acknowledging receipt of letter and request for email correspondence ii (1). Email stated that cognisance has been taken of issues and comments and queries have been forwarded to socio-economic specialist with specific request to address loss of agricultural land use issues. ii (2). Concerns/issues raised will be expanded upon in the draft basic assessment report (DBAR), specifically in the traffic study appended to the DBAR. ii (3) & (4). Concerns/issues raised will be expanded upon in the draft basic assessment report (DBAR), specifically in the heritage impact assessment (which include archaeological, palaeontological and visual studies) appended to the DBAR. ii (5). Concerns/issues raised will be expanded upon in the draft basic assessment report (DBAR), specifically in the geohydrological and geotechnical assessments appended to the DBAR. ii (6). Concerns/issues raised partially spoken to in the draft basic assessment report (DBAR), specifically in the freshwater, geohydrological and geotechnical assessments appended to the DBAR. Applicant: ii (6) (a). Awaiting feedback as requested by EAP from Applicant for inclusion in next revision of BAR. Freshwater Specialist: ii (6) (b) to (d). Awaiting feedback as requested by EAP from Specialist for inclusion in next revision of BAR. EAP:</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>f. No traffic study or estimated traffic flow rates studies have been available or completed to date to establish how the road, its surface and other vehicle and residents will be impacted.</p> <p>3. Heritage:</p> <p>a. The Stellenbosch region is well known for agriculture and as a source of superior local produce for our national retailer network. This has contributed to food security and is a significant source of employment in the Western Cape.</p> <p>b. Agricultural land that is developed for whatever reason, can never be used for agriculture again. In a country where food security and lack of suitable agricultural land is a reality, it would not be wise to use agricultural land for any other purpose.</p> <p>c. It is concerning that Municipal land (irrespective of its intended use), being situated so close to a critically important water source (the Eerste River) can be used for non-forming activities, specifically a cemetery, given that it will never be able to be relocated in the future.</p> <p>4. Additional impacts on heritage which will not conform with the surrounding heritage of the areas being of an agricultural nature, include:</p> <p>a. Security for the cemetery/memorial park</p> <p>b. Parking</p> <p>c. Ablution facilities</p> <p>d. Community hall/Place of worship</p> <p>e. Visual impact</p> <p>5. Groundwater contamination:</p> <p>a. A wide range of literature exists on the effects of cemeteries on ground water. Research points to potential disastrous consequences should ground water become contaminated. The Municipality/cemetery management have no control over how human remains are preserved and what chemicals are used. It is too dangerous and the consequences too great to place a cemetery in the centre of prime agricultural ground.</p> <p>b. Should any groundwater contamination be traced from the cemetery, it would have dire consequences for the environment and agricultural economy of Stellenbosch/Annandale Road who supply locally and abroad – the supply of close to 50% of the country's strawberries is spread throughout the Annandale corridor.</p> <p>6. Water use:</p> <p>a. It is queried as to why land with 4ha of existing water use rights is proposed when there is so much other Municipal land with no water rights.</p> <p>b. The water allocation in 6(a) above will be lost since it cannot be transferred and will be permanently lost to existing farmers and will impact on the expansion plans of farmers in the immediate vicinity since there may not be sufficient water allocation in the area when required.</p> <p>c. Given the recent drought, it would be detrimental to lose water rights when the land is situated so close to the Eerste River.</p>	<p>ii (7) & (8). Cognisance taken of I&AP's comment/concern.</p> <p>iii. Cognisance taken of I&AP's comment.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
13	<p>Date: 21/02/2019 Format: Telephonic conversation and follow up email letter I&AP: Ms. Susan McNaughton, Graceland Vineyards</p>	<p>d. A dam was constructed on the proposed land for agricultural purposes and would be available in the future should farming operations recommence on the property. e. A query was raised as to whether any boreholes exist on the property and whether any geotechnical or hydro census testing has been performed to determine if the area is suitable for development. 7. Property value: a. it is felt that should the proposed development proceed, it would reduce the value of surrounding properties since it does not suit the surround business environment i.e. agriculture. b. Many farmers in the area use external/debt financing which could be severely curtailed should land values decrease which would have a direct impact on expansion opportunities and employment going forward. 8. Other environmental concerns: a. The proposed development covers a large area and ground is typically not covered with vegetation which could result in large plumes of dust affecting the entire area and crops. iii. I&AP trusts that the comments will be considered and the proposed development be relocated elsewhere to allow the land to be used for its primary purpose of agriculture.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Subsequent email response sent 11/06/2019 acknowledging registration of I&AP. ii & iii. Email response addressed some of the specific statistical questions raised by I&AP and informed I&AP that cognisance has been taken of I&AP's comments/concern in the DBAR which will be issued for comment.</p>
14	<p>Date: 25/02/2019 Format: Email Letter I&AP: Mr. H. G. P. Brownell, Owner/ Director of Propalux 7 (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Thanks for information received regarding proposed development. ii. Request to be registered as an I&AP as Owner/ Director of Propalux 7 (Pty) Ltd which is the registered owner of Portion 4 of Farm 619, Stellenbosch. iii. Response email thanking EAP for registration.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Thanks noted. ii. Email correspondence sent on 25/02/2019 confirming registration of I&AP.</p>
15	<p>Date: 25/02/2019</p>	<p>i. Thanks for email received from EnviroAfrica on 25/01/2019.</p>	<p>EAP:</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
<p>Format: Email Letter I&AP: Mr. Rehanne Lambrechts, Secretary, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association (SRA)</p>	<p>ii. Comments: a. Only 13% of South Africa's land is suitable for agriculture and that agriculture makes a significant contribution to the Western Cape economy. The proposed development site is currently a vineyard. b. Wine estates and wine farming are important economically through wine production, sales and the tourism it attracts to Stellenbosch and surrounds. c. Horizontal expansion of cemeteries in and around Stellenbosch is a threat to our agricultural sector and sustainable development in the region. d. Stellenbosch must adopt forward thinking solutions regarding the demand for burial places, like elsewhere in the world (100% cremation rate in Japan; China following suit by expropriating coffins and burning them for fuel). On economic grounds, taking valuable, irreplaceable agricultural land for this purpose is short sighted. Our community will have to adapt and follow practises elsewhere in the world e.g. cremation and mausoleums must be considered in the future. If the demand for graves is unavoidable then land no suitable for agriculture should be identified and zoned for this purpose. e. The SRA realises the sensitivity of the issue but states that we need to address this issue sooner rather than later. f. The SRA requested that the EAP stress the "no go" option as the preferred alternative. g. Annexed article that agriculture could go the same route as Eskom without investment.</p>	<p>i. Thanks noted. ii (a) & (g). Email correspondence sent stating that cognisance has been taken of I&AP's comments.</p>	
<p>16 Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Prof. Frans Eggers, Secretary, FSM</p>	<p>i. Comment on urban structure and land use: a. The search for land for burial space is understood and that the pre-application BAR has <i>pro forma</i> addressed many aspects of the environmental and other impacts. Comment that the footprint of the proposed site is very large (more than 70ha) not taking into account the other Calcutta and De Novo sites or future expansion. The proposed footprint is very large compared to comparable land use units in rural areas. b. The proposed development inserts a clearly non-rural land use into a rural area in which land use is focused on agriculture. c. Background: The Stellenbosch Integrated Development Planning (IDP), as well as the Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) are clear on the principle of densification and Transit-Oriented Development, whereby urban development should be concentrated with the urban edge and urban sprawl becomes unacceptable. d. The large size of the proposed development and new land use implies that the project has local environmental and land use impacts. The BAR and any future studies must, therefore, include a proper land use study explicitly considering the spatial development context of the region, including the land use criteria of compactness and accessibility set out in the MSDF and elsewhere. e. Acknowledgement that the proposed development is not urban housing but still needs to consider the size of the footprint of any non-rural use in a rural</p>	<p>EAP: Email correspondence sent stating that cognisance has been taken of I&AP's comments. Specifically: i (a) & (e). of the approximately 74ha proposed for the total development, the actual cemetery footprint is around 34,53ha and of this only about 19.97ha are allocated for traditional graves/interment with 14.56ha being used for alternate/more modern burial trends. It should also be noted that there is only one site proposed for the northern region of the Municipality i.e. Calcutta which, due to various constraints, has an actual cemetery footprint of around 19ha – the Louw's Bos development is proposed for the southern region of the Municipal district. i (f). an agricultural soil assessment for the preferred site was undertaken as appended to the DBAR; ii (b). a TIA was undertaken as appended to the DBAR; ii (c). as stated in the pre-application and DBAR, access for all proposed development alternatives is from Annandale road; iii (a) to (c). the scope of this proposed development did not include crematoria and associated legislated air pollution/air</p>	

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>environment. Specifically: if the same number of graves and burial sites can be accommodated on an alternative with a smaller footprint, that alternative needs to be fully assessed</p> <p>f. Agricultural land is scarce countrywide. High-quality and even medium-quality land must, by government policy, be conserved. The requirement holds true even for land currently lying fallow. The DBAR should include a proper assessment of agricultural soil potential.</p> <p>ii. Comment on roads and traffic:</p> <p>a. Closely related to land use issues is the matter of roads and traffic. Within the parameters of IDP, the MSDP 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>b. The BAR is not complete without a proper traffic impact assessment (TIA). The Western Bypass has been shown to be unfeasible from the view of cost, traffic modelling and conformance with transport legislation. The TIA may not rely on the construction of the Western Bypass in doing any modelling.</p> <p>c. Comment that access from Annandale Road is the only option since the Western Bypass has been shown to be unfeasible</p> <p>iii. Comment on cremation, layout and costs:</p> <p>a. The issue of cremation has been entirely neglected in the BAR. While the older generation may prefer interment, the increasing shortage of agricultural land, the low density of land use and the long-term costs of maintaining large sites imply that the future of burial lies with crematoria. Mere reference to cultural preferences does not thereby settle the matter.</p> <p>b. Crematoria may be linked to memorial functions by means of more compact memorial walls and memorial park layouts in which urns and plaques may be housed.</p> <p>c. The BAR must consider an alternative (at Louw's Bos or elsewhere) which proposes the development of a more compact crematorium and urn-centred memorial park.</p> <p>d. The large footprint of a conventional cemetery and memorial park implies higher operating costs which will have to be recovered either from the Municipal budget or from burial fees (high fees would imply an impermissible barrier to burial for the poor). The BAR should include a section comparing the overall economic feasibility of a conventional cemetery and memorial park to that of a more compact alternative.</p> <p>e. The idea of "burying the ashes of a loved one at the foot of a tree" implies either a very low density of burial sites, or multiple root disturbances, making it neither economically, nor horticulturally feasible.</p> <p>iv. Comment on biodiversity and water:</p> <p>a. The creation of a large footprint memorial park is problematic from a water use point of view. The water shortage in the Western Cape makes relying on</p>	<p>quality related issues. 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>iii (d). the proposed development aims to promote a concept in an attempt to educate and appeal to communities regarding the various alternate burial and remembrance options available (other than traditional graves). A socio-economic assessment (including need and desirability) of the proposed development, is appended to the DBAR; A review and possible amendment to local by-law/s is also mentioned in the DBAR since this may be required to accommodate multiple interments in a single burial space, after sufficient time has lapsed between each interment.</p> <p>iii (e). the proposed idea will be used to promote alternative burial methods. The idea is that once the initial purchase of e.g. a 'family tree' is made, subsequent burial of ashes of loved ones will be in small, dedicated 'shafts' at specific points around the tree (so as not to affect tree growth/health), allowing multiple burial of ashes in one shaft;</p> <p>iv (d). addressed in the EAP recommendations and environmental management plan appended to the DBAR;</p> <p>iv (e). Louw's Bos North is not the preferred site;</p> <p>v. Refer to i (a) and i (e) above.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>borehole water to water many hectares of ornamental gardens not feasible or scientifically defensible.</p> <p>b. The low sensitivity indicated by both botanical assessments for Louw's Bos South site is agreed with. The western part of the Louw's Bos North site contains both CBAs and ESAs which are not feasible for incorporation into a memorial park since Renosterveld and conventional compost- and fertiliser-based gardens are not compatible.</p> <p>c. The CBAs on the Louw's Bos North site are adjacent to a very important larger CBA on portion 10 of Farm 502 (immediately west of the airfield) and should continue to form part of that complex.</p> <p>d. A proper botanical assessment of the CBAs must include multiple site visits over a number of months in spring and summer.</p> <p>e. The awkward geometry of the Louw's Bos North site precludes its suitability for inclusion in the cemetery-memorial park layout and it is recommended that Louw's Bos North be excluded from the proposal.</p> <p>v. Comment on different site:</p> <p>a. The pre-application BAR requests comments while in parallel, other processes are being conducted for Calcutta and De Novo. While the mechanisms of assessment must run their separate courses, an informed assessment must pertain to all sites simultaneously.</p> <p>vi. Comment on technical matters:</p> <p>a. The pre-application BAR is in a scanned pdf format which precludes electronic searching. It would be appropriate to provide the original pdf version.</p>	
17	<p>Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Leslie Zetler, Director, Five Zets Properties (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Objection to the proposed development based on -</p> <p>1. Rezoning from Agricultural:</p> <p>a. The area ear-marked for re-zoning is agricultural</p> <p>b. There are many areas closer to Stellenbosch better suited for the proposed development and that the reason behind the rezoning appears to be an economic one</p> <p>c. The proposed land is zoned agriculture and the loss of this agricultural land is detrimental to the region. The motivation report on record indicated the selection criteria for a site indicated a required erf size of 30ha. Query as to why is this proposal for 74ha.</p> <p>d. The loss of agricultural land could have significant impact on job creation and food security for the region.</p> <p>e. It is felt that the establishment of a cemetery and memorial park will set a dangerous precedent for future application and developments in the Lynedoch and greater Stellenbosch region where agriculture is the predominant activity.</p> <p>2. Traffic:</p> <p>a. To date, no traffic study or estimated traffic flow rates studies have been made available or completed to establish how the road, its surface and other vehicle and residents will be impacted. There are also insufficient public transport facilities in the vicinity of the development.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Email sent on 12/06/2019 acknowledging receipt of letter and that concerns/issues raised will be expanded upon in the draft basic assessment report (DBAR), specifically in the relevant specialist studies appended to the DBAR.</p> <p>Socio-economic Specialist: Awaiting feedback regarding socio-economic assessment related to loss of agricultural land (as requested by EAP from Specialist).</p> <p>Applicant: i (5) (a). Awaiting feedback as requested by EAP from Applicant for inclusion in next revision of BAR.</p> <p>Freshwater Specialist: i (5) (b) to (d). Awaiting feedback as requested by EAP from Specialist for inclusion in next revision of BAR.</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>3. Heritage:</p> <p>a. The Stellenbosch region is well known for agriculture and as a source of superior local produce for our national retailer network. This has contributed to food security and is a significant source of employment in the Western Cape.</p> <p>b. Agricultural land that is developed for whatever reason, can never be used for agriculture again. In a country where food security and lack of suitable agricultural land is a reality, it would not be wise to use agricultural land for any other purpose.</p> <p>c. It is concerning that Municipal land (irrespective of its intended use), being situated so close to a critically important water source (the Eerste River) can be used for non-forming activities, specifically a cemetery, given that it will never be able to be relocated in the future.</p> <p>d. Additional impacts on heritage which will need to be fully addressed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security for the cemetery/memorial park • Parking • Ablution facilities • Community hall/Place of worship • e. Visual impact <p>4. Groundwater contamination:</p> <p>a. A wide range of literature exists on the effects of cemeteries on ground water. Research points to potential disastrous consequences should ground water become contaminated. The Municipality/cemetery management have no control over how human remains are preserved and what chemicals are used. It is too dangerous and the consequences too great to place a cemetery in the centre of prime agricultural ground.</p> <p>b. Should any groundwater contamination be traced from the cemetery, it would have dire consequences for the environment and agricultural economy of Stellenbosch/Annandale Road who supply locally and abroad – the supply of close to 50% of the country's strawberries is spread throughout the Annandale corridor.</p> <p>5. Water use:</p> <p>a. It is queried as to why land with 4ha of granted/existing water use rights is proposed for development when there is so much other Municipal land with no water rights.</p> <p>b. The water allocation in 5(a) above will be lost since it cannot be transferred and will be permanently lost to existing farmers and will impact on the expansion plans of farmers in the immediate vicinity since there may not be sufficient water allocation in the area when required.</p> <p>c. Given the recent drought, it would be detrimental to lose water rights when the land is situated so close to the Eerste River.</p> <p>d. A dam was constructed on the proposed land for agricultural purposes and would be available in the future should farming operations recommence on the property.</p>	

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>e. A query was raised as to whether any boreholes exist on the property and whether any geotechnical or hydro census testing has been performed to determine if the area is suitable for development.</p> <p>6. Reduction in property values:</p> <p>a. It is felt that should the proposed development proceed, it would reduce the value of surrounding properties since it does not suit the surround business environment i.e. agriculture.</p> <p>7. Other environmental concerns:</p> <p>a. The proposed development covers a large area and ground is typically not covered with vegetation which could result in large plumes of dust affecting the entire area and crops.</p> <p>iii. I&AP trusts that the comments will be considered and the proposed development be relocated elsewhere to allow the land to be used for its primary purpose of agriculture.</p>	
18	<p>Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Email letter I&AP: Hannes, Pretorius, Bock and Bryant representing Klein Moerbeij (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Request to register Klein Moerbeij (Pty) Ltd as an I&AP represented by Hannes, Pretorius, Bock and Bryant.</p> <p>ii. Clarification that client is has no interest in the application but wishes to lodge an objection against the project.</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence on 12/06/2019 confirming same.</p> <p>ii. Cognisance taken of comment and objection.</p>
19	<p>Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Heidi Newton-King, Sustainability and HR Director, Spier Wine Estate</p>	<p>i. Request for to be registered as an I&AP with specified email contact addresses provided.</p> <p>ii. Request to see the research and proposals that have gone into addressing the extension of public cemeteries' footprints, in the longer term. Reference to grave recycling in Europe and green burials</p> <p>iii. Comment that the cemetery draft feasibility study on the record was published 13 years ago and is an insufficient basis on which to explore future options.</p> <p>iv. Comment that the proposed land in the preferred site is zoned agriculture and the loss of this agricultural land is detrimental to the region.</p> <p>v. Query as to why the proposal is for 74ha when the selection criteria for a site indicated an erf of 30ha as the required space.</p> <p>vi. Comment that the loss of agricultural land could have significant impacts on job creation and food security for the region should this not be utilised for its original zoning as productive agriculture – a Competing Use Impact Assessment would be significantly in favour of Agriculture for this identified area.</p> <p>vii. Other environmental considerations and concerns:</p> <p>a. Soil and Ground Water Contamination as a result of the burial practices- Coffins, embalming and decomposition of the bodies. These physical, chemical and micro-biological contaminations all present threats to the ground water and soils both in the area and surrounding farms.</p> <p>b. The Fresh Water and Geo-Hydrological Assessment has identified and delineated the water courses, groundwater and potential impacts, however there</p>	<p>EAP:</p> <p>i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence on 12/06/2019 confirming same.</p> <p>ii & iii. Although the draft feasibility study was published in 2006, the argument for the need for burial space and the evolution of the current proposal are captured in this report as well as Appendices L and M. The urgency of this need is even more critical than was highlighted in 2006. 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>iv. Cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>v. The <u>total</u> development footprint (include park areas and buffer zones but of the approximately 74ha proposed for the total development, the actual cemetery footprint is around 34,53ha and of this, only about 19,97ha are allocated for traditional graves/interment with 14,56ha being used for alternate/more modern burial trends.</p> <p>vi. Cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>Socio-economic Specialist:</p>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
20	<p>Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Elke Watson, Manager: Environment, De Zalze Winelands Golf Estate Home Owners Association (HOA)</p>	<p>is no mention of the impacts of the activities in the post-construction phase as mentioned in point 'a' above.</p> <p>viii. Traffic impact assessments:</p> <p>a. As indicated in your own Road Access Report a full TIA is required to understand the potential impacts on the area.</p> <p>b. A criterion for consideration of site selection talks to public accessibility and this area has limited public transport available.</p> <p>ix. Visual and Heritage Impact:</p> <p>a. With the current roadworks on Annandale road hindering a more comprehensive report of the visual impacts on heritage farmlands, this aspect is of major concern especially when coupled with considerations around security, lighting and buildings required.</p> <p>i. Request for De Zalze Winelands Golf Estate HOA to be registered as an I&AP.</p> <p>ii. Request for confirmation of receipt of letter and for future correspondence to be via email.</p> <p>iii. Comments/concerns raised:</p> <p>a. Noise Pollution - Funerals are held on weekends, often with large crowds of mourners attending, making use of megaphones, which may be classified as a nuisance. Will noise pollution and the management thereof be addressed in the assessment?</p> <p>b. Removal of indigenous vegetation: The area indicated may contain indigenous vegetation, such as Swartland Renosterveld (critically endangered), Boland Granite Fynbos (endangered) & Sand Fynbos (critically endangered). Are any of these, or other endangered vegetation found at the site, and if so, will these be identified and protected?</p> <p>c. Development of a road: Dust pollution may cause a further nuisance should any roads not be tarred, as well as parking areas. Will roads and parking areas be tarred and will management of this type of pollution be addressed?</p> <p>d. There is a perched water table due to the underlying clays derived from the weathered granite. During winter there is sub-surface runoff from the proposed burial site onto De Zalze, which has several wetlands and storage dams. What effect will a cemetery have on the ground water run-off to the Estate?</p> <p>e. Will the alteration of the characteristics of the water course have any negative effect on the Estate?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will there be run-off storm water onto the Estate, and if so, what actions will be taken to manage this? • Which water course is being referred to? <p>f. Security: Which actions will be put in place to ensure that the security of the Estate is not affected, during the building of the proposed cemetery as well as once it is operational?</p>	<p>Awaiting feedback regarding socio-economic assessment related to loss of agricultural land (as requested by EAP from Specialist).</p> <p>vii (a) & (b). Cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>viii (a). Final TIA appended to DBAR.</p> <p>vii (b). Cognisance taken of comment.</p> <p>ix. Full heritage impact assessment (including visual assessment) appended to DBAR.</p>
		<p>EAP:</p> <p>i & ii. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence on 12/06/2019 confirming same.</p> <p>iii. Cognisance taken of comment and objections, specifically:</p> <p>a & c. Dust and noise impacts during construction and operation have also been assessed as part of the environmental impact assessment process. Should the proposed development be approved, operational control measures would be put in place, as may be required, to manage any potential dust and noise issues.</p> <p>b. The preferred proposed development site (Alternative 1 in the DBAR) has also been assessed in terms of indigenous vegetation (and the potential removal thereof) as per the botanical assessments appended to the DBAR.</p> <p>d & e. Due to the location of the preferred proposed development site on the southern side of Annandale Road, neither stormwater and sub-surface run-off, nor ground water, or most other mentioned issues as related to the NWA, will be of relevance to the wetlands and storage dams on De Zalze Winelands Golf Estate. The watercourse referred to in the (not preferred) Louw's Bos North site, is a natural drainage line.</p> <p>f. During construction and operation, the proposed development itself will have measures put in place such as security guards, fencing and access control to ensure the security and protection of the potential unique features the development will have.</p>	

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
21	<p>Date: 26/02/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Dr D Harris, Resident, De Zalze Wineyards Golf Estate</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email correspondence sent on 12/06/2019 confirming registration of I&AP.</p>
22	<p>Date: 01/02/2019 Format: Email letter with attachments I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, CapeNature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>i. Request for electronic copy of pre-application BAR.</p>	<p>EAP: Directed I&AP to website for electronic copy of BAR and also offered a cd copy for collection or delivery to CapeNature, if required.</p>
23	<p>Date: 27/02/2019 Format: Email letter with attachments I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, CapeNature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>Comment regarding: i. original background information document (BID) which only indicated the Louw's Bos (LB) North site but now there are two alternative sites (LB South – preferred and LB North). ii. LB South footprint consists of 'No Natural' across it full extent according to the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (WCBSP) with no freshwater features mapped within the footprint. iii. LB North is classified as Critical Biodiversity Area 2 (CBA 2), with patches of CBA 1 and Ecological Support Area 2 (ESA 2), according to the WCBSP. There is a watercourse through the centre of LB North site with associated ESA and a small wetland in the north. iv. The vegetation type that would have occurred for both alternative sites, is Swartland Granite Renosterveld, listed as Critically Endangered. v. A botanical constraints analysis undertaken for LB South site provides a detailed description of the vegetation across the site – it is described as secondary vegetation that has established after the site lay fallow following ceasing of cultivation. The species present a weedy, pioneer species and cannot be considered as representative of Swartland Granite Renosterveld.</p>	<p>EAP: 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>

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
24	<p>Date: 08/03/2019 Format: Email faxed letter I&AP: Mr. D'mitri Matthews, Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP)</p>	<p>vi. Google Earth imagery confirms the description provided above with clear indication of cultivation across the entire site within the past 10 year with the eastern section still actively cultivated.</p> <p>vii. CapeNature agrees with the conclusion of the botanical constraints analysis that the vegetation on site is not of conservation value and therefore, there are no constraints to the development.</p> <p>viii. LB North site was not included in the botanical constraints analysis although it was part of the site screening which informed the BID. Although large portions of LB North site did not present constraints from a biodiversity perspective, there were patches of vegetation on LB North that needed to be avoided. Refer to CapeNature's comments on the BID.</p> <p>ix. A preliminary freshwater assessment was undertaken for both sites. Wetland delineation verified WCBSP information. It appears that the proposed development avoids the wetland but it is recommended that a 15m buffer should be implemented as a constraint for the proposed cemetery and memorial park.</p> <p>x. The preferred alternative for the development is LB South and a layout plan has only been compiled for this alternative. It appears that the layout plan avoids the wetland and observes the 15m buffer but this must be confirmed.</p> <p>xi. As biodiversity constraints have been taken into consideration, CapeNature does not have any objections to the proposed development. It is proposed, however, that the density of burials be maximised as far as possible due to the high demand for land for alternative land uses in addition to the demand for cemetery space.</p> <p>xii. In conclusion, CapeNature does not object to the proposed development. While both LB North and LB South present opportunities for the proposed development, CapeNature agrees that LB South (the preferred alternative) does not have any impacts on biodiversity or on any natural freshwater features.</p> <p>xiii. The environmental management plan must be strictly implemented and it is recommended that more detailed controls and measures are required for the operational phase.</p> <p>xiv. CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p> <p>Comments regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pre-application DBAR dated 25 January 2019; Proposal for the establishment of the Louw's Bos public cemetery and memorial park with associated infrastructure; Confirmation of applicable activities to be included in the DBAR; Coordinate on page 34 must be amended to reflect Louw's Bos site; If groundwater is to be extracted then proof of WULA submission must be provided; Issues to be addressed in EMPR: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to Bonnievale Renosterveld Thicket and the Botanical Assessment (Appendix 12) must be amended to reflect correct information; 	<p>EAP:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> to iii. Cognisance taken of comments. Co-ordinates corrected. Proof of WULA process attached in Appendix E. (a) to (f). EMPR errors and amendments/additions made. to x. Cognisance taken of comments.

No.	Comment Date, Comment Format, Organisation/I&AP	Comment	Response from EAP/Applicant/Specialist/Project Manager
		<p>b. EMPr does not include any aspect regarding alien removal/management; c. Operation phase must be updated to include management activities and mitigation for all activities. Section incorrectly refers to Property Owners Association. d. A storm water management plan must be included for the site; e. If applicable, a maintenance management plan for structures crossing the watercourse must be included; f. EMPr does not fulfil the requirements of Appendix 4 of the EIA regulation 2014 (as amended); vii. Comments on regulatory requirements: a. Proof of local newspaper advert and site notices to be provided. b. Proof of notices sent to I&APs for commenting purposes must be included in final I&AP. c. Any new representations and comments received in connection with the application must be included in the final BAR. 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. 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. 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. 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. Reminder that the activity may not commence prior to an EA being granted. x. Comment that the Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information.</p>	
25	<p>Date: 14/06/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Susan McNaughton, Graceland Vineyards</p>	<p>i. Thanks for information received and hope expressed that more modern methods of burial become the norm.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email captured in records.</p>
26	<p>Date: 14/06/2019 Format: Email I&AP: Prof. Hans Eggers, Secretary, FSM</p>	<p>i. Thanks for detailed answer/response received.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email captured in records.</p>
27	END OF TRAIL REPORT		

PROPOSED LOUW'S BOS PUBLIC CEMETERY AND MEMORIAL PARK

APPLICANT: Stellenbosch Local Municipality

2018 (OLD) PRE-APPLICATION BAR COMMENT AND RESPONSE TRAIL REPORT

(DEADP 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: 13/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Hans 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: 19/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Elke Watson representing De Zalze Home Owners Association (400 homeowners)	i. Request for registration of organisation as an I&AP ii. Clarification with regards to NWA section 21 water uses requested iii. Query regarding security of De Zalze Estate during and post proposed development iv. Request for receipt of email acknowledgement	EAP: i. Registration of organisation (represented by contact individual) as an I&AP ii. Email response acknowledging registration with indication of potential section 21 water use activities and that draft scoping report will address queries raised.
4	Date: 23/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Withers Environmental Consultants represented by Ms. Karin Neethling	i. Request for registration of organisation as an I&AP ii. Request for additional information	EAP: i. Registration of organisation (represented by contact individual) as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and that as information becomes available it will be made available. Maildrop/poster information sent electronically to I&AP.

5	<p>Date: 26/02/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Frans Eggers representing Friends of Stellenbosch Mountain</p>	<p>i. Request for receipt of registration email acknowledgement</p>	<p>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</p>
6	<p>Date: 02/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Heritage Western Cape (HWC) represented by Yanga Blom (Office of the CEO, Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport)</p>	<p>i. Request for completion of HWC checklist, notice of intent to develop application form and relevant payment</p>	<p>EAP: i. Email subsequently forwarded to Project Manager for completion by appointed heritage specialist.</p>
7	<p>Date: 05/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Orlando F (Manager, Spier Wine Farm)</p>	<p>i. Request to register as an I&AP ii. Request for electronic version of poster since displayed poster was damaged</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of individual and organisation as I&APs. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and that as information becomes available it will be made available. Maildrop/poster information sent electronically to I&AP.</p>
8	<p>Date: 05/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Heidi Newton-King (Sustainability, Spier Wine Farm)</p>	<p>i. Request to register as an I&AP ii. Query as to where full information on proposed project can be found</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of individual and organisation as I&APs ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and that as information becomes available it will be made available. Maildrop/poster information sent electronically to I&AP.</p>
9	<p>Date: 07/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Withers Environmental Consultants represented by Ms. Karin Neethling</p>	<p>i. Thanks for response received</p>	<p>EAP: i. Noted.</p>
10	<p>Date: 07/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Aubrey Withers, Withers Environmental Consultants</p>	<p>i. Several concerns raised related to other Municipal developments proposed for the area, the primary aquifer, site geology, identification of alternatives to service the district ii. Suggestion to start a programme to inform public to cremate rather than bury, their dead iii. Comment that the project should be 're-thought' and the process should be started anew since Withers Environmental Consultants has done many projects in terms of finding suitable cemetery sites</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of individual as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP that his consultancy is also registered as an I&AP. Response that cognisance of initial issues raised by I&AP were already addressed as a precursor to the pre-application process and will be expanded upon in the draft scoping report to be issued for public comment.</p>
11	<p>Date: 08/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Piet van Blerk representing ICE</p>	<p>i. Comment that ICE Group are the Engineering Consultants for the proposed Stellenbosch Western By-pass ii. Request to register as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of organisation as an I&AP ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and that as information</p>

	Group (proposed Stellenbosch Western By-pass Engineering Consultants)		becomes available it will be made available. Maildrop/poster information sent electronically to I&AP.
12	Date: 08/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Heidi Newton-King (Sustainability, Spier Wine Farm)	i. Thanks for response received	EAP: i. Noted.
13	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.
14	Date: 16/03/2018 Format: Telephonic I&AP: Mr. Emile van der Merwe (Town Planner)	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Email response acknowledging registration with electronic provision of maildrop information for proposed development.
15	Date: 19/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Schalk Visser	i. Request for registration as an I&AP	EAP: i. Registration of individual as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and listed activities which will be addressed (as per maildrop information).
16	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.
17	Date: 21/03/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Tania Vergnani (Secretary, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association)	i. Request for more detailed documentation	EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging request and informing I&AP of early stage of pre-application process and that as information becomes available it will be made available. I&AP also informed of registration.
18	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.
19	Date: 10/04/2018	i. Request for registration as an I&AP.	EAP:

<p>Format: Telephonic and Email I&AP: Mr. Mike Miller (Vice Chairman, Stellenbosch Flying Club)</p>	<p>ii. Concerns raised regarding the need for renewal (by the Municipality) of the Stellenbosch Flying Club (SFC) airfield's lease of the land iii. Information (as per telephonic discussion) regarding need and desirability of the current airfield and proposed future airfield expansion/development.</p>	<p>i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence confirming same. ii. Renewal of the airfield's lease does not conflict with the proposed new development since the region proposed for use by the cemetery and memorial park development is to the south/south-west of the airfield. Current airfield location, in fact, complements development of a cemetery and memorial park while softening the transition from the urban edge into agricultural lands. iii. From discussions, it appears that the current airfield land use as well as any future airfield expansion/development would complement the proposed cemetery and memorial park development project in line with the Municipal precinct plan for the region.</p>
<p>20</p> <p>Date: 11/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Mike Miller (Vice Chairman, SFC)</p>	<p>i. Re-request for registration as an I&AP to email address provided on site poster and information maildrops.</p>	<p>EAP: i. As per point 18 above.</p>
<p>21</p> <p>Date: 13/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Elke Watson representing De Zaize Home Owners Association</p>	<p>i. Conveyance of thanks for previous communication and information provided and note that I&AP will wait for the draft scoping report to provide comments.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Subsequent email response acknowledging correspondence.</p>
<p>22</p> <p>Date: 13/04/2018 Format: Email letter I&AP: Mr. Anton Meick (Director, Cluver Markkoter Inc.) representing Langverwacht Kwekery (Pty) Ltd</p>	<p>i. Letter indicating that client, Langverwacht Kwekery (Pty) Ltd, is a surrounding landowner and lessee. ii. Preliminary comments that the proposed land use is inappropriate because: a. the client considers the proposed site to have high agricultural potential; b. agricultural land resources in the area are limited; c. it will result in traffic challenges in an area where high traffic densities present a problem. iii. Request for client to be registered as an I&AP and for correspondence to be emailed directly to client and copied to Cluver Markkoter Inc.</p>	<p>EAP: i & ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging correspondence I&AP's registration. iii. Registration of entity as an I&AP.</p>
<p>23</p> <p>Date: 14/04/2018 Format: Email (with letters) I&AP: Ms. Elana Louw representing Roulou Boerdery Trust</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.</p>
<p>24</p> <p>Date: 14/04/2018 Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Mr. Wrench Louw representing Roulou Boerdery Trust</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.</p>
<p>25</p> <p>Date: 14/04/2018</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP:</p>

	<p>Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Ms. Helena Louw representing Roulou Boerdery Trust</p>		<p>i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.</p>
26	<p>Format: Emailed letter I&AP: Mr. Willem Louw representing Roulou Boerdery Trust</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.</p>
27	<p>Date: 16/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Bertho Van Der Westhuizen (Estate Manager, Alto Wine Estate)</p>	<p>i. Request for registration as an I&AP</p>	<p>EAP: i. Registration of entity as an I&AP. ii. Subsequent email response acknowledging I&AP's registration.</p>
28	<p>Date: 18/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. Mike Miller (Vice Chairman, SFC)</p>	<p>i. Provision of information regarding Stellenbosch Flying Club</p>	<p>EAP: i. Subsequent email response thanking I&AP and acknowledging receipt of information.</p>
29	<p>Date: 25/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Elana Louw representing Roulou Boerdery Trust</p>	<p>i. Response to EAPs request for telephonic contact numbers</p>	<p>EAP: i. I&AP list details updated.</p>
30	<p>Date: 26/04/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Mr. André Pelser (Chairman, Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association)</p>	<p>i. Email stating that the Stellenbosch Ratepayers Association is on the Municipal Register and should be notified of all development applications.</p>	<p>EAP: i. Subsequent email response acknowledging registration of the Association as per point 17 above and informing I&AP that Mr. Pelser's details will be included in the I&AP list as an additional representative of the Association.</p>

31	<p>Date: 17/05/2018 Format: Email letter with attachments I&AP: Mr. Rhett Smart, Scientist: Land Use Advisor (for Manager, Cape Nature Scientific Services)</p>	<p>Comment regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Sections to the far eastern section of the property are classified as Critical Biodiversity Area 2 (CBA 2), with patches of CBA 1 and Ecological Support Area 2 (ESA 2), according to the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (WCBSP); ii. The majority of the property is classified as "No Natural"; iii. The watercourse mapped in the centre of the property with associated ESA 2 and a small wetland area to the north of the property, according to the WCBSP; iv. The vegetation type occurring on the property is Swartland Granite Renosterveld, listed as Critically Endangered; v. The EAP undertook preliminary site screening and mapped site sensitivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The eastern section of the property contained a plantation which has been felled and contains restoring fynbos, most of which is mapped as CBA 2; b. The western section of the property has been transformed through cultivation and no natural vegetation remains in this area. The small CBA patches would not be verified based on ground truthing; c. A large area of CBA to the north of the site does contain intact natural vegetation; vi. The only sensitive areas on the site would be the watercourses and associated wetlands; vii. According to the information received, only the western section of the site is being investigated for the development of a cemetery. This area does not present constraints in terms of terrestrial biodiversity and no further botanical specialist studies are considered necessary, provided the area to the east of the airstrip is excluded; viii. The most significant constraint to the development of the site is the freshwater resources on the site, both surface water and groundwater. Specialist freshwater and groundwater studies would be required; ix. All the potential alternative sites for a cemetery for the municipality should be considered as alternatives within the application and if additional applications proceed, they should also include other alternative sites; x. Based on the information received 	<p>EAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.
32	<p>Date: 17/05/2018 Format: Email I&AP: Ms. Teresa Forrester, (Stellenbosch District Riding Club (SDRC) - Special Projects)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Request for a meeting regarding proposed development since riding club works symbiotically with the flying club. 	<p>EAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Registration of entity as an I&AP and subsequent email correspondence confirming same. ii. Mention that request will be sent to overall Project Managers (Rumboll and Partners). Request sent.
33	END OF TRAIL REPORT		