Comments-Responses Report

Pre-application Basic Assessment Report			
DEA&DP (31/07/2026)	2.1 *"The applicant declaration includes the incorrect details and is unsigned. In addition, no landowner's consent form was included. The duly completed and signed declarations and consent forms must be provided with the submission of the application and included in the DBAR.*	2.1 Noted	EnviroAfrica
	2.2 *In terms of the EIA Regulations and NEMA, the investigation of alternatives is mandatory. All alternatives identified must therefore be investigated to determine if they are feasible and reasonable. In this regard it must be noted that this Directorate may grant authorisation for an alternative as if it has been applied for or may grant authorisation in respect of all or part of the activity applied for. Alternatives are not limited to activity alternatives, but include layout alternatives, design, operational and technology alternatives. You are hereby reminded that it is mandatory to investigate and assess the option of not proceeding with the proposed activity (the "no-go" option) in addition to the other alternatives identified. Every EIA process must therefore identify and investigate alternatives, with feasible and reasonable alternatives to be comparatively assessed.* *If, however, after having identified and investigated alternatives, no feasible and reasonable alternatives were found, no comparative assessment of alternatives, beyond the comparative assessment of the preferred alternative and the option of not proceeding, is required during the assessment. What would, however, be required in this instance is that proof of the*	2.2 Noted	

	investigation undertaken and motivation indicating that no reasonable or feasible alternatives other than the preferred option and the no-go option exist must be provided to the Department. *Section H: Alternatives, Methodology and Assessment of Alternatives must be completed in full and must outline why no feasible and reasonable alternatives were found, with a clear motivation for the preferred alternative.* *2.3 Further to the above, the site verification by the botanical specialist confirmed that a few individuals of the endangered Leucadendron laxum, are growing within or very close to the proposed weir footprint area. Why was an adjustment to the development footprint not considered to address this potential impact, especially given the specialist findings that most Leucadendron species are difficult to transplant once established because of their fine root systems that are easily damaged. You are reminded of the mitigation hierarchy that must be implemented and that the final proposed alternatives must respond to the impact management measures, i.e. avoidance (firstly), and only after it has been found that the negative impacts cannot be avoided, alternatives must be investigated to reduce (mitigate and manage) unavoidable negative impact.*	An assessment of the alternatives considered for the proposed development is provided in Appendix J1.	

	2.4 *The following statement is included in the DBAR: "The fish barrier inside of the river will reduce the availability of water to downstream users of water for only the short period when the water level must rise sufficiently high to flow over the fish barrier before proceeding downstream. The agricultural productivity of the surrounding rural area will therefore not experience any kind of significant negative impact as a result of the short-term lower availability of water in the Paaskloof River when the river water is still rising sufficiently high to flow over the fish barrier. The desirability of the proposed fish barrier is therefore very high and significantly outweighs the small disadvantage of lower water availability during the short period when the water level will not yet have risen sufficiently high to flow over the fish barrier to downstream areas."* *How was this determination informed and what measures will be put in place to address this impact, especially during low flow periods. In addition, has the affected landowners been notified of the potential "short-term lower availability of water in the Paaskloof River.* 2.5 *Further to the above, comments must be obtained from the Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency ("BOCMA") and the Department of Agriculture in this regard.*	2.3 It is indicated in the Technical Designs Report on Page 12 that the fish barrier was initially to be established at the upstream end of a natural pool located next to a stand of gumtrees. However, the position of the proposed fish barrier was moved 10m upstream to the current position in order to allow the pool to remain in place as an aquatic habitat and in order to avoid the significantly higher financial costs of conducting construction work in submerged conditions. It is noteworthy that the riverside agricultural fields are ploughed right up to the riverbanks at the proposed position of the fish barrier. The Endangered terrestrial ecosystem at the current location of the proposed fish barrier is therefore in poor condition and this makes the current location of the proposed fish barrier suitable. Furthermore, it is only a single individual of *Leucadendron laxum* that is at risk of being impacted by the establishment of the proposed fish barrier. In order to prevent harm to the *Leucadendron laxum individual, the location of the plant will be cordoned off and marked as a 'no-go' area that construction activities will diligently be kept away from.* In light of the above, the current location of the	

	2.6 The Freshwater Impact Assessment ("FIA") must be amended to include a peat analysis to verify that Activity 24 of Listing Notice 2, 2014 (as amended), is not triggered. *2.7 It is stated in the Environmental Management Programme ("EMPr") that "If the weir becomes submerged during flooding, as is mentioned in the engineering design report, provision must be made to elevate the weir's height accordingly" creating the impression that the development can be changed, if and when required. This may constitute unlawful commencement since any changes to the development, if authorised, will be subject to the relevant legislative requirements. This must be rectified in the EMPr.* *2.8 Since Activity 19 of Listing Notice 1 is triggered by the proposed development, and future maintenance activities may be required within the identified watercourses, it is recommended that a Maintenance Management Plan ("MMP") forms a component of the EMPr. Should the Department adopt the proposed MMP, future maintenance work specified within the MMP would not require Environmental Authorisation prior to the undertaking thereof.* *2.9 Comment from, but not limited to the following Organs of State must be obtained:* *2.9.1 BOCMA (the incorrect contact person is included in the I&AP list* *2.9.2 CapeNature* *2.9.3 Department of Agriculture (the incorrect contact person is included in the I&AP list)*	proposed fish barrier is deemed the most optimal position. 2.4 The low flow period of the Paaskloof River is in summer when the river always stops flowing and the river water becomes small dispersed pools. The proposed fish barrier is therefore unlikely to alter the usual summer unavailability of water in the river in any kind of significant way. The water level in the river rises quickly when the floods of every winter normally arrive and so downstream users of the river water are unlikely to ever notice the short period of time when the water level must rise above the fish barrier. The volume of water impounded by the weir is very small and as long as the stream is flowing, water should spill over the spillway The public consultation process during the pre-application phase of the proposed development and the public consultation process during the application serve as the means of informing potential Interested and Affected Parties of the potential negative and positive impacts of the proposed development. 2.5 Noted	

		2.6 Noted	
	2.9.4 Theewaterskloof Municipality		
		2.7 The engineering report indicates that the weir will be 2m high and the height will not be adjustable. In light of this, the recommendation of adjusting the height of the fish barrier has been deleted from the Freshwater Impact Study Report and has also been deleted from the EMPr.	
	2.10 Comments from all the relevant state departments and organs of state must be obtained, included and addressed in the BAR.		
	2.11 The Public Participation Process must comply with the requirements of Regulation 41 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, and proof of compliance with all the steps undertaken must be included in the BAR.	2.8 A Maintenance Management Programme will be compiled for the proposed fish barrier.	
	2.12 Omission of any required information in terms of Appendices 1 and 4 of the EIA Regulations 2014, with regards to the final submission of the BAR and EMPr, respectively to this Directorate, may result in the application for Environmental Authorisation being refused.		
	2.13 Be advised that an original / electronically signed and dated applicant declaration is required to be submitted with the final BAR to this Directorate for decision-making. It is important to note that by signing this declaration, the applicant is confirming that they are aware and have taken cognisance of the contents of the report submitted for decision-making. Furthermore, through signing this declaration, the applicant is making a commitment that they are both willing and able to implement the necessary mitigation, management and	2.9 Noted 2.91. The contact person at the BOCMA is correct. 2.9.2 Noted 2.9.3 The Western Cape Department of Agriculture has indicated that comment must not now be requested from the	

	monitoring measures recommended within the report with respect to this application. *2.14 In addition to the above, please ensure that the original / electronically signed and dated Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") declaration is also submitted with the final BAR for decision-making.* *3. Please note that the activity may not commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by this Directorate. It is an offence in terms of Section 49A of the NEMA for a person to commence with a listed activity unless the Department has granted an Environmental Authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. Failure to comply with the requirements of Section 24F and 49A of the NEMA will result in the matter being referred to the Environmental Compliance and Enforcement Directorate of this Department for prosecution. A person convicted of an offence in terms of the above is liable to a fine not exceeding R10 million or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment".*	National Department of Agriculture instead. 2.9.4 The municipal authorities with jurisdiction over the proposed site are the Cape Agulhas Local Municipality and the Overberg District Municipality. 2.10 to 3. Noted	
CapeNature (26/07/2026)	1. **"*Screening Tool and Site Sensitivity Verification*** *A screening tool report dated 2 June 2025 indicates a very high sensitivity for terrestrial biodiversity and aquatic biodiversity, high sensitivity for animal species and medium sensitivity for plant species. The site sensitivity verification supports the sensitivity ratings in the screening tool and indicates that the terrestrial biodiversity study addresses the terrestrial biodiversity, plant species and animal species themes and an*	1. The Screening Tool Report has not specified any fishes under the Animal Species theme. In light of this and the fact that indigenous species of fish are aquatic organisms, the indigenous fishes that are to be protected by the proposed fish barrier have been dealt with separately from the biota that the Screening Tool Report has specified	EnviroAfrica

	aquatic biodiversity study addresses the aquatic biodiversity theme. The site sensitivity verification indicates that under the aquatic biodiversity theme, a specialist was appointed to provide input on the potential impact on indigenous fishes. We wish to highlight that a specialist study regarding indigenous fish would fall under the animal species theme.	under the Animal Species theme.	
	2. ***Terrestrial Biodiversity Compliance Statement*** *The terrestrial biodiversity compliance statement indicates the verified sensitivity for plant species should remain at medium sensitivity, however the sensitivity for terrestrial biodiversity and animal species is verified as low. The site sensitivity verification therefore differs from the site sensitivity verification report and therefore the latter should be amended accordingly. We further wish to note that according to the protocols, a compliance statement should be undertaken for a verified sensitivity of low sensitivity, however for a verified sensitivity of medium or high sensitivity an impact assessment must be undertaken. Therefore, the compliance statement is appropriate for animal species and terrestrial biodiversity, but an impact assessment should have been undertaken for plant species.* *The vegetation type mapped for the location is Elim Ferricrete Fynbos, listed as endangered. The compliance statement indicates that the original vegetation would have consisted of Cape Lowland Alluvial Vegetation (endangered) along the river surrounded by Elim Ferricrete Fynbos, however the indigenous vegetation has been lost to cultivation except directly*	2. The Site Sensitivity Verification Report indicates the view of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner which was informed by *inter alia*, the site visit of 13 February 2026. This in turn informed the specific specialist professionals to appoint for the compilation of specialist study reports for the proposed application and application. The sensitivity rating arrived at by a specialist professional concerning the theme that the specialist was appointed to deal with will always override the sensitivity rating of the EAP and is not grounds for amending the sensitivity ratings initially determined in the Site Sensitivity Verification Report. The terrestrial biodiversity specialist conducted another site visit on 21 August 2026 and has made amendments to the terrestrial biodiversity study report.	

	adjacent to the river. Cultivation at the proposed location of the weir has taken place right up to the river banks with the remnant riparian vegetation considered degraded, mainly restricted to reeds and sedges in the river bed and patches of indigenous shrubs. *Despite the limited extent of indigenous vegetation in a degraded condition, individuals of the endangered Leucadendron laxum were encountered within the proposed footprint of the weir and surroundings. The presence of the L. laxum individuals is the reason for the medium sensitivity for the plant species theme. As noted however, the fieldwork was undertaken at a sub-optimal time of year and therefore there is the potential for additional species of conservation concern (SCCs) to be present which could only be observed in winter/spring.* *The only potential constraint or impact identified in the compliance statement was the individuals of L. laxum at the location which is indicated in Figure 7. Only one specimen is considered likely to be lost as a result of the proposed weir. An assessment of impacts is not required for a compliance statement, however we recommend that it is required for the plant species theme due to the medium sensitivity prior to mitigation. The proposed mitigation is search and rescue of the L. laxum specimens that may be impacted, appointment of an environmental control officer and clearing of alien invasive species.* 3. ***Animal Species Theme*** *It should be stated up front that the primary objective of the project is to benefit indigenous fish species by creating a barrier*	The sole *L. Laxum* individual that the terrestrial biodiversity specialist had recommended be relocated for safety to beyond the reach of construction activities will no longer be relocated. The plant will instead be cordoned off and construction activities will be kept away from the plant. Please see the EMPr. 3. It has been made clear throughout the pre-application Basic Assessment Report that the	

	to alien invasive fish which predate on the indigenous fish. With regards to fauna, a general description of the fauna of the region is provided. The species flagged in the screening tool are evaluated with regards to the probability of occurrence, For the two species which utilize aquatic habitat, namely African Marsh Harrier (Circus ranivorus) and Cape platanna (Xenopus gilli), both species have a likelihood of occurrence and it is motivated that the proposed project could benefit the species due to the increase in aquatic habitat. For the species which tolerate disturbed habitat (e.g. Denham's Bustard (Neotis denhami)), the extent of the footprint is considered unlikely to have an impact related to the remaining habitat, while the other species are considered unlikely to occur due to the lack of suitable habitat. As a result the sensitivity was verified as low. *An evaluation of other potential SCCs which could occur not identified in the screening tool should also be undertaken. It is noted that there are iNaturalist records in the vicinity of the site of Denham's Bustard, Blue Cranes (Anthropoides paradiseus) and Cape platanna. Although the likelihood of observing a good representation of the faunal species present in a one day fieldwork is low, species observed should still be mentioned. A screening tool report compiled on 24 July 2026 indicated additional species to the screening tool report included as Appendix I. Most noteworthy in this regard is that in addition to the bird species flagged as high sensitivity, Pseudobarbus burchelli Heuningnes was flagged as high sensitivity, which is a threatened fish taxon discussed further below.*	proposed fish barrier is aimed at blocking alien fishes from migrating upstream of the proposed site. It has further been clarified in the said report that this will enable indigenous fishes to prosper upstream of the proposed fish barrier without being preyed on by alien fishes and without facing competition from alien fishes. Noted	

	4. ***Freshwater Report*** *The freshwater report provides an overview of the proposed project and the affected environment. The Paalskloof River is the river within which the weir is proposed. Photographs of habitats/features are provided, however the locations are not indicated on a map nor fully described. Pools within the Paalskloof River are referred to with regards to fish habitat. The Paalskloof River and riparian zone are reported as in good condition. The present ecological condition of the instream and riparian habitat of the Paalskloof River is rated as B (largely natural). The gum and black wattle infestation results in a poorer condition along the river banks further downstream. The ecological importance and sensitivity is rated as very high.*	4. Noted	
	The freshwater report is not framed within the context of the protocols, in which respect it should fulfil the purposes of an aquatic biodiversity assessment.	A detailed impact assessment is included in the Freshwater Impact Study Report.	
	The impacts of the weir are stated as small and localised, particularly in comparison to the agricultural impacts in the catchment. The impact significance is calculated numerically, with the result being a high significance, but again the impact is motivated to instead be small and localised. The discussion of the impacts indicates that there will be increased inundation upstream of the weir. The freshwater report does not however provide a detailed or explicit description of the potential change to the instream and riparian habitat at the location of the weir, which would in turn be the relevant impacts on aquatic habitat. *Apart from the impact on the habitat at the weir location, the*	The current freshwater habitat during the dry season is largely dry, as drainage lines in the region are in the winter rainfall region. According to expectation, at least some water will be retained behind the new wall during summer for the survival of the endangered fish. According to expectation the new pond won't run dry. The aquatic habitat will change from largely dry to submerged. This is logic, it does not require a "detailed or explicit description". The pond behind the new wall is small. Relative to the mean annual runoff, it won't take much winter rain to overtop the new pond's wall. According to Mr King's estimation, the pond will fill soon and abundantly	

	impact on hydrology is relevant, more specifically downstream flows. The conclusion states that the winter flows will pass over the weir, while currently in summer the river does not flow, but water remains in pools, with the weir potentially allowing a new permanent pool to form. *A risk matrix is included for which four activities were identified, and each was rated as low risk. As the purpose of the weir is as a fish barrier and not for water abstraction as is typically the case, Section 21 (a) water use is not applicable, only Sections 21 (c) and (i) for which the risk matrix is appliable. Therefore, only a General Authorisation is required with regards to the National Water Act.* 5. ***Fish Specialist Comment*** *The fish specialist comment indicates that fish surveys undertaken within the Paalskloof River by the applicant have revealed good populations of three indigenous fish taxa, namely the South Coast Clade of the Cape kurper (Sandelia capensis) and two Cape Galaxias lineages, namely the endangered and near endemic Agulhas Galaxias Galaxias sp. nov. 'Heuningnes' and the mountain Galaxias Galaxias sp. nov. 'nebula'. According to the landowner, the endangered and endemic Agulhas/Heuningnes redfin Pseudobarbus sp. 'Heuningnes' used to occur on the property up until 20 years ago, but was extirpated by alien invasive fish species, namely spotted bass (Micropterus punctulatus).* *The Paalskloof River was selected for rehabilitation as the only tributary in the Nuwejaars River system which is nearly free of alien invasive species, has good water quality and instream*	after the onset of the rainy season. The downstream farmers will probably not be aware of a delay in the arrival of winter flow past their properties. This is a matter that the Breede Olifants Catchment Management Agency as the licensing authority in termsof the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) will determine. 5. Indeed	

	habitat. Although the alien invasive fish species are likely not present upstream of the weir, if any are encountered, they will be eradicated using mechanical methods such as fyke, gill and seine nets, and electrofishing. Further potential objectives of the project will be to implement formal conservation for the section of river upstream of the weir and to reintroduce the Agulhas/Heuningnes redfin. We wish to note that the Agulhas/Heuningnes redfin appears to prefer pool habitat rather than runs and riffles habitat and therefore the habitat upstream of the weir will likely be suitable for this species if a conservation translocation is undertaken. *With regards to the impacts, the only negative impact identified is the prevention of access of indigenous fish species downstream of the weir to upstream sections, however most indigenous fish downstream have been eliminated by alien invasive fish and therefore would be a very minor impact. The creation of a permanent sanctuary for indigenous fish will be a significant positive impact.* *As stated above the fish specialist comment should have been framed within the context of the animal species theme and as indicated in the presence of the Agulhas/Heuningnes redfin in the screening tool and should conform to the requirements of the protocols. The outcome and recommendations are however supported. It should be noted that the implementation of barriers to invasive aquatic species have proven to be an effective intervention to prevent deleterious impacts on indigenous species locally and internationally, and as indicated in the fish specialist comment, the*	The indigenous fishes that the proposed fish barrier is aimed at protecting are not absent from under the Animal Species theme in the Screening Tool Report for the proposed development. In addition to this, indigenous fishes are aquatic biota.	

	proposed project is modelled on successful examples from the Cederberg (Rahel 2013). *The proposal for formal conservation is supported. As rivers are linear systems traversing multiple properties, conserving them can be more complicated than terrestrial systems. It is further noted that there is intact Elim Ferricrete Fynbos on the property to the south of the weir which has a high likelihood of being conservation-worthy. Potential options that can be investigated are the options within the CapeNature Stewardship Programme (Nature Reserve, Protected Environment, Biodiversity Agreement) or Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures (OECMs). While the site is already within the Nuwejaars Special Management Area (SMA) which has been approved as an OECM, a more targeted conservation measure may be appropriate for the project objectives.* 6. ***Design Report*** *The design report provides an overview of the proposed design of the weir which is also relevant in assessing the impacts, and is modelled on the successful Cederberg examples. The location of the weir was specifically selected to maximise the benefit to fish habitat upstream while minimizing the impact on riparian and instream habitat which also is more efficient for construction effort.* *A hydrological study was used to inform the project design. As indicated above, the summer flow is reduced to standing pools of water. It was initially proposed that the weir would be 1 m in height, however would not provide sufficient elevation as an invasive fish barrier during flood*	Noted 6. Indeed	

	conditions with the flat topography, therefore the height is designed at 2 m. The structure is mainly composed of gabions with a concrete foundation and capping to prevent undercutting and abrasion respectively. A stilling basin is proposed directly downstream to prevent erosion. A plastic membrane is placed on the upstream side of the structure to prevent formation of gaps which may allow fish to pass through.		
	As the design of the weir is aimed at providing an effective barrier for invasive fish species it is supported. One aspect we wish to query is whether there may be any reduction in the normal flow of water downstream of the weir outside of flood conditions and if this has been quantified. Also, an estimate of the expected increase in inundation area would be informative.	The volume of water impounded by the weir is very small, and as long as the stream is flowing, water should spill over the spillway	Hans King (author of the Design Report)
	The mitigation hierarchy must be applied in addressing impacts, in which regard the first step should be applied for the potential impact on the L. laxum individuals, namely avoid. We wish to note that experience of pre-construction search and rescue of fynbos shrubs to date has provided evidence of a high failure rate. Translocation is likely the least successful methodology and if it were to be implemented, propagation of seeds and cuttings is likely to be more successful. The preferred option is always avoidance and protection in situ. We therefore recommend that the individuals should be plotted and micro-siting of the weir to avoid the specimens should first be investigated. If individual cannot be avoided, the impact of the loss should be assessed. *It may however be useful to include a plan for propagation of*	The L. Laxum will be cordoned off and construction activities will be kept away from the plant. The plant will no longer be relocated.	

	the species if the property is proposed for formal conservation, which can aim for restoration of disturbed areas which will not be used for cultivation, including planting out of the L. laxum specimens. It should however first be established what the current population on the broader property is. We recommend that experts with proven experience in propagating the species should be consulted to ensure the best methodology is used, particularly since the species is an obligate reseeder/serotinous. 7. ***Conclusion*** *In conclusion, CapeNature supports the proposed weir as it will result in a positive impact on indigenous fish species at risk from alien invasive fish. However, we recommend that there is investigation of micro-siting of the weir to avoid impacting on the local L. laxum population in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy. The site sensitivity verification should be updated in accordance with the specialist studies and an up to date screening tool report, and there should be further evidence of compliance with the protocols".*	7. The L. Laxum will not be relocated and will instead be cordoned off for protection from construction activities. The Site Sensitivity Verification Report does not need any updating	
Overberg District Municipality **(24/07/2026)**	1. The Overberg District Municipality (ODM) has reviewed the Pre-Application Basic Assessment Report (BAR), Site Sensitivity Verification Report and the supporting specialist studies for the proposed construction of a fish barrier across the Paaskloof River within the Nuwejaars Nature Reserve. 2. The Municipality acknowledges that the proposed development is intended to enhance the conservation of indigenous freshwater fish by preventing the upstream migration of invasive alien fish species. The specialist	1 to 4. Noted	

	assessments indicate that the anticipated environmental impacts are predominantly localised and temporary in nature and can be mitigated to acceptable levels through the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. 3. The Municipality is satisfied that the proposed development addresses an important biodiversity conservation objective. Notwithstanding this, the development is located within an environmentally sensitive area, including an Aquatic Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), a National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Area (NFEPA), and threatened vegetation types. It is therefore imperative that the recommended mitigation measures and environmental management commitments are fully implemented to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the receiving environment. 4. Accordingly, the Overberg District Municipality has no objection to the proposed development in principle, subject to the following: • All mitigation measures and recommendations contained within the specialist studies are incorporated into the final Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and form part of the Environmental Authorisation. • In-stream construction activities are undertaken in accordance with the approved method statements and specialist recommendations to minimise impacts on the aquatic environment. • In-stream construction activities be restricted to the minimum footprint and duration necessary to minimise disturbance to aquatic fauna and freshwater habitats.		

	• The riparian buffer zone adjacent to the Paaskloof River be clearly demarcated prior to the commencement of construction and protected from unnecessary disturbance, vegetation clearing, material stockpiling and construction vehicle access, except where authorised for the approved works. • Measures be implemented to prevent contamination of the watercourse through fuels, oils, concrete wash water, hazardous substances and construction waste. • Appropriate erosion and sediment control, pollution prevention and invasive alien species management measures are implemented throughout the construction phase. • All disturbed areas are rehabilitated to the satisfaction of the Competent Authority using suitable indigenous vegetation. Subject to the above, the Overberg District Municipality supports the proposed development and reserves the right to revise its comments and request further information based on any information that may be received.		
Pre-application PPP- Round 1			
CapeNature **(17/03/2026)**	1. The application is for a weir to prevent the invasion of alien fish species. 2. The location is mapped as Critical Biodiversity Area 1 (CBA) in the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan. It is located on a tributary of the Uintjieskuil River, which has an associated narrow channelled valley bottom wetland according to the National Wetland Map. 3. The specialist studies for the Basic Assessment process will need to be determined in accordance	1. Indeed 2. Indeed. 3. Done	EnviroAfrica

	with the results from the National Web-based Screening Tool and the associated site sensitivity verification as per the protocols.		
	4. It is anticipated that an aquatic biodiversity specialist study and a faunal specialist study focused on fish will be required to inform the application. As terrestrial habitat will not be impacted, we do not anticipate that a terrestrial biodiversity specialist study will be required.	4. A freshwater specialist and a fish specialist have been appointed. Please refer to Appendix G2 and G4.1	
	5. In general, CapeNature supports the objective of the proposed weir, however it must be ensured that the impact on aquatic habitat during construction and operation is minimized and we will comment further during the Basic Assessment process in this regard.	5. Noted	
	We further wish to recommend that consideration is given to including a maintenance management plan (MMP) to cater for potential maintenance activities which require moving of sediment which would trigger relevant listed activities e.g. sedimentation following flood events.	6. Noted	