

DRAFT SCOPING REPORT

Comments & Response Document

Issues Trail – Northgate Property Development

Biophysical		
Fauna		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson - Wessa	The botanical/plant specialist study is not appended in the DSR. The sections describing the flora of the biophysical environment and the impact assessment (sect. 6.3.5) are not adequate, and for the EIA report they need to be more detailed and done by a plant specialist	The detailed specialist study will be completed in EIA phase as indicated in the PoS
T Anderson - Wessa	Under the biophysical setting description (1.10.2), the sensitivity of the Kamfers Dam ecosystem and fact that portions of the Northgate site are part of its catchment area should be discussed. The extent of the Kamfers Dam ecosystem should also be mapped in the figure	This aspect will be dealt with in the EIA phase with detailed impacts.
T Anderson - Wessa	Under section 6.3.6 impact on fauna, the extent of the impact should be ranked as 'international' not 'local/regional' for both 'with' and 'without mitigation', as the development is expected to impact on Lesser Flamingo breeding events and this can significantly affect the threatened global population.	The impact will be altered to reflect this request
N Birch	No information is provided on possible Red Data Floral species occurring in this area. Although a detailed study is provided for the fauna no specific information is provided to the floral assessment, other than general vegetation descriptions for the veld types.	As indicated in the DSR the flora study is on-going and will be provided for in the EIA phase with associated impacts.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Who will undertake a specialist botanical study? The FET believes that, even though the area may appear to be overgrazed and degraded, only a trained eye will identify small succulent plants and forbs, some of which may be threatened. Sensitive habitats must be mapped and a specialist botanist should assist with the mapping of open/green spaces.	Mr. H Erasmus is undertaking the specialist study and will be completed in the EIA phase
Flamingo Environmental Trust	What evidence is there that the Prosopis trees on the property are a source for seed germinations elsewhere (p. 15)?	One form of seed dispersion is through water run-off. In overgrazed areas the retention capacity is lowered and therefore seeds are not trapped locally but rather dispersed over a wider area.
Fauna		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson - Wessa	The vertebrate fauna specialist study needs to be extended in the EIA.	The specialist study will be integrated into the EIA with detailed impacts.

T Anderson - Wessa	The avifauna specialist study needs to be updated now that the flamingos have bred on the island and in terms of the alternatives that were assessed.	Marianne de Villiers has been commissioned to add to the specialist study in light of the new developments on the island.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	16 – comments on Avifauna study	This is being attended to in the EIA phase with an addendum by the specialist
J Hohne	The now internationally successful and applauded flamingo breeding island is clearly positioned directly in the path of the recorded mean average prevailing wind W NW and N that will carry smoke smell and noise from the proposed construction and thereafter population.	The island is directly west of the development which receives approximately 6% of the yearly wind direction. North and NW winds will miss the island and they receive 39% of the wind direction. See Map Addendum B.
Light		
Author	Comment	Response
Flamingo Environmental Trust	In the EIA for the flamingo island reference was made to the impact of light pollution on Kamfers Dam's flamingos. It was stated in this document, and in a television programme on the flamingo island, that this was one of the reasons why the flamingos did not breed on the southern side of the dam. This matter needs mention and perhaps evaluation in the report.	Light pollution will be evaluated. The EMP will also provide strict guidelines with regard to downward facing light.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	How would light pollution in the area to north-west and north of the dam interfere with the ability of flamingos to navigate when flying between Kamfers Dam and other wetlands?	Light pollution will be evaluated. The EMP will also provide strict guidelines with regard to downward facing light.
Noise		
Author	Comment	Response
N Smith Birdlife South Africa	It is clearly indicated that blasting will take place on site. This is totally unacceptable in that it may frighten away the Flamingos.	The various forms of blasting and their associated impacts will be assessed in the EIA phase.
N Smith Birdlife South Africa	It is our experience that developments of this nature create many impacts, particularly from noise, therefore the risk of disturbing the Flamingo population is unacceptably high under any circumstances. We also do not believe that these kind of impacts can be properly managed.	The development is the same distance from the island as the national road and train line is with continuous noise. The impacts of blasting noise will be assessed in the EIA.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	There needs to be a more thorough examination of noise effects on Kamfers Dam's population of Lesser Flamingos.	This is being conducted in the EIA phase
Water & sewage		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson - Wessa	A hydrological specialist needs to look into the surface water runoff, groundwater flow in the drainage line and towards Kamfers Dam and the consequences of water level rises in Kamfers Dam (this is also recommended in the avifauna report).	If required a specialist will be appointed to assess the impacts and this will be conducted in the EIA phase.
T Anderson - Wessa	In the EIA report there should be details under the water sections on the exact engineering design of how water runoff and storm water will	The storm water details will be integrated into the EIA phase of the project.

	be diverted away from Kamfers Dam and prevented from flowing along the drainage line into Kamfers Dam	
T Anderson - Wessa	Under the surface water impact evaluation (6.3.4) the impacts of storm water runoff into Kamfers Dam without and with mitigation (diversion, etc.) must also be assessed, preferably by the hydrologist	The impact assessment phase will take a detailed look at the various impacts.
T Anderson - Wessa	In section 4.10.4 where the HWTP is discussed, it must be stipulated exactly how much the Northgate development will contribute to the upgrade of the HWTP and if there is enough funding from the municipality and other sources to cover the total cost. Also, include the info and costs requested for the different scenarios mentioned in point 6 of our comments of 17 January.	The consultant is not sure this forms part of an EIA study as the assessment should reflect the impact of a non-upgraded plant as compared to an upgraded plant.
N Birch	A comprehensive and detailed analysis of the ground and surface water is required. Ground water: A detailed geo-hydrological report is required, Information is required on the depth of the water table, quality and use, information of the ground water zones which are likely to be affected by the development Surface water. A detailed hydrology report is required, drainage direction, run-off coefficients, how much water is entering Kamfersdam etc. Current water quality entering the system	If required a specialist will be appointed to assess the impacts and this will be conducted in the EIA phase.
N Birch	Issues that should be also be considered in the EIA phase should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Impact of additional storm water (the amount and quality of this water) entering the Kamfersdam System. What would the impact be in terms of an extreme rainfall event. o The impact of additional sewerage (from phase one) on the existing infrastructure. As approval has been granted without stipulating any upgrades that are required for this phase. 	If required a specialist will be appointed to assess the impacts and this will be conducted in the EIA phase. As mentioned, will be attended to in EIA phase.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	The major concerns regarding any developments, especially large developments such as Northgate, in Kimberley are a) the capacity of the Vaal River to sustain the water requirements of Kimberley's unprecedented growth and b) the capacity of Kimberley's water treatment works to purify effluent to acceptable standards and the disposal of such effluent to a sustainable receiving environment. It is the contention of the Flamingo Environmental Trust (FET) that the water treatment works (especially Homevale in this case) do not presently have the capacity to adequately purify and dispose of the quantity of effluent generated within Kimberley. This fact is important enough to serve as a fatal flaw in the	Page 50 – 52 clearly states that Homevale needs to be upgraded in order to accommodate new developments.

	EIA process for any developments until the water treatment works have been upgraded to handle all future demands. Due to the threats of excess water of a poor quality to the biodiversity and infrastructure in and around Kamfers Dam, we can presently not support any development that would exacerbate the problem.	
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Paved surface will increase water flow to Kamfers Dam (with a potential rise in water level) and this must be adequately considered by a hydrologist. Water balance models have been developed in the past that could be used. Potential pollution through stormwater must also be evaluated.	This is mentioned in the report. Dr Jan Roos's study will be used in the EIA phase and referenced.
N Birch	Water provision within South Africa is always a major issue. Although infrastructure does seem to be available, the supply issue is not tackled at all. In this regard it would be expected that a detailed water balance study will be done inclusive of demand and actual and realistic future supply. It needs to be investigated whether the growth and demand of this and other developments in the area would ultimately result in water restrictions in Kimberley.	Refer to page 47 – 49 in DSR
N Birch	Water storage: where will the 5,0 Ml reservoir be situated?	Final design has not been determined as final impacts have not been determined which will occur in the impact assessment phase.
N Birch	Stormwater: The generation of stormwater and its run-off is of great concern for Kamfersdam and the Flamingos. The information provided in the engineering services report does not provide any details with respect to the storm water. Engineering calculations in terms of the change in the run-off co-efficient for the site once the development has been completed are required. The actual amounts of storm water generated needs to be determined in order to be properly assessed in terms of impacts to Kamfersdam. The municipality states that storm water drainage should be developed to cater for at least a 1/10 year rain water storm. What will the drainage be designed to cater for? If it is a 1/10 year rain water storm, what happens if there is a 1/20 year rain storm what will the impacts of this be to the development and the neighbouring Kamfersdam?	Storm water is clearly stated in the SR as a major concern. It will be addressed in the EIA phase and notably in the EMP
Soil - geotechnical		
Author	Comment	Response
Flamingo	The report states that "Great care was taken to	The green areas allocated in the

Environmental Trust	include as much public open space and green areas around the Kamfers Dam heritage site and to ensure a flowing design on to the open area” (p. 12). We understand that these areas have a high clay content and cannot be developed in any case. Green areas have therefore been allocated through necessity and not design.	development have clay content, however the amount of clay present does not preclude building on it. Refer to geotechnical report. In this regard the last sentence of the statement is incorrect.
---------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Biodiversity offsets

Author	Comment	Response
--------	---------	----------

Flamingo Environmental Trust	Various biodiversity offsets are proposed by Northgate. Some of these proposed “offsets” (e.g. perimeter wall, electric fencing and security camera, contributory relationship with the FET are not true biodiversity offsets as it does not really compensate for the potential harm to the biodiversity, especially the flamingos of Kamfers Dam. Proper biodiversity offsets must be indentified and investigated during the EIA process. Such offsets could possibly include the construction of a second flamingo breeding island.	The off-set as indicated on Pg8 (F) can be viewed as a biodiversity off-set.
------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Flamingo Environmental Trust	<p>Some of the proposed financial “offsets” are allocated to the FET without any prior discussions. The FET feels uncomfortable with this situation and may not want to accept some of these “offsets” (e.g. the management of a general Eco Centre not located at Kamfers Dam) as it falls outside of the main objectives of the FET.</p> <p>It must be stressed that an Eco Centre is not seen as biodiversity offset or even a mitigation measure. The FET may also not be able to take on the protection of the flamingos on private property (through the appointment of wardens) as it will be dependent on agreements with the landowner.</p>	<p>No allocations have been made, other than a stated commitment to make the funds available t the FET. As is understood the FET is set up for the protection and conservation of flamingos at Kamfers Dam. The allocation of funds would be for this purpose. If the FET does not want the funds it should indicate such in a letter to the developer and an alternate recipricant will be sort.</p> <p>The land owner has indicated at the public meeting that they are in discussion with the authorities to have the area receive protection status.</p> <p>The developer has agreed to have the eco-centre constructed on the N12 side of the dam or at a location otherwise decided upon.</p>
------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

T Anderson - Wessa	Phase1 and Phase 2- 8 (a) – (e) are not biodiversity offset measures. Points (a) – (c) are mitigating measures which have nothing to do with biodiversity offsets, and (d) & (e) are ‘tourism’ offsets. Only point (f) can be considered a possible biodiversity offset.	Point 1.4 in the DSR is Group 1’s statement of commitment to conservation measures within the Kamfersdam area.
--------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

General - biophysical

Author	Comment	Response
--------	---------	----------

Flamingo	Of great concern is that the Northgate housing	This is extensively mentioned in
----------	------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------

	ensure it is a sustainable venture?	between the FET and Group 1. At this stage the FET has indicated whether it wishes to own the centre or not.
T Anderson - Wessa	Sect. 5.2 and 7.2 mention an informal settlement on a portion of the Northgate site. What will happen to these people, will they be able to afford rental of above R1100 per month and move into the flats? If not, what are the mitigating measures for this social impact? The impact on these people as well as the negative social impacts must also be assessed in the impact table along with the positive effects.	The specialist social impact assessment will document these impacts. There is no informal settlement on the Northgate site. The informal settlement is on adjacent municipal property.
N Birch	Northern Cape Ranchers who are direct neighbours conduct hunting and culling operations on the property. Hunting and culling require high powered rifles, the range of the bullets from these rifles can exceed 2km. If a residential development is to be placed a mere 40m from the boundary fence of a property that currently undertakes hunting operations, this could result in the occupants of the residential area being in danger of being shot by a stray bullet. These issues need to be addressed in terms of : Who will be liable should someone be shot (and possible killed). Will it be the Municipality of Sol Plaatje or the Developer or the hunting operator? In terms of The Firearms Control Act (Act 60 of 2000) section 120 (7), discharging of a firearm in a built area is illegal. The hunting farm will be a mere 40m from a built up area.	This will be attended to in the social specialist report. However it must be mentioned that the potential impacts of hunting in the area of breeding flamingos may have a significant effect on the birds. The close proximity of sporadic rifle shots and the potential of wounded animals being close to the shoreline is potentially a greater impact. This impact will be alluded to in the EIA report.
Alternatives		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson - Wessa	Alternative sites 1-3 not valid alternatives as Group 1 is not the developer.	The alternative sites are for sale and even though a EIA process is on the go, had the property been bought by Group 1 a new EIA would have to be launched. Please refer to point 5 under General in Wessa comments, relating to EIA's and new owners.
T Anderson - Wessa	Consideration of private property as an alternative	Private property can only be considered in an alternative if the owner is willing to sell or be part of the development. The property in question is private property and has been purchased by the developer. The developer has not purchased any of the other properties as they feel that this is the most suitable.
T Anderson - Wessa	Evaluation of environmental factors not adequate	The scoping report has assessed the broader site alternatives. The impact assessment phase as mentioned in the PoS will undertake a detailed assessment.

T Anderson - Wessa	The no-go option	The impact assessment phase will detail the no-go option.
N Birch	In terms of investigating alternatives for an EIA a “reasonable” range of alternatives need to be investigated as part of the EIA process.	The full range will be assessed in detail in the EIA phase.
N Birch	Firstly it would have been useful if the locality of the alternative sites were presented on a suitably scaled map. These alternative sites should also be shown relevant to the proposed development site.	This will be done in the alternatives assessment in the EIA phase. A detailed assessment of all related alternatives will be undertaken including environmental impacts thereof.
N Birch	These are the only alternatives listed for the project, the extent to which these alternatives have been investigated within the scoping report falls short of a true investigation of any of these alternatives. No further reference is made to further exploring alternatives within the document, nor in the plan of study for the EIA. Are we to assume then that no alternatives will be investigated as part of the EIA?	A full assessment of alternatives will be undertaken in the EIA phase. The PoS in the SR does indicate this intent. The assumption is incorrect.
N Birch	Referring the reader to an EIA that is currently with DTEC (options 1-3) does not adequately address the pro & cons for a comparison within the context of this scoping report, and does not explore the proposed alternatives to any reasonable depth that would allow for a realistic comparison for an informed decision making process. Although reasons are given as to why some of these alternatives are not feasible these reasons are not substantiated	Referring the reader is imparting information to the extent that a detailed environmental assessment of the stated development exists and does not form of this document.
N Birch	In reference to all statements on alternatives.	The EIA phase will document all required alternatives as required by the regulations
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Point 13 – comments on alternatives	The full range will be assessed in detail in the EIA phase.
Public Participation		
Author	Comment	Response
N Birch	No background information document In terms of notification and information distribution there has been no BID for this project (no mention is made of the bid in the process described in “process to date” pages 32 -35. and no BID is attached in the appendices).	The draft scoping report was provided at the public meeting as a full information document. If required to meet the need of a scaled down 3 page version it will be provided.
N Birch	Advertising and notification although the application was advertised there is no mention of how and where the public meeting was advertised, if at all. Nor is there any mention of how and where the Draft Scoping Report was advertised for review. Notification of these aspects are important and one would expect that the public meeting would have been widely advertised and that not only the registered I&APs were notified.	See PPP in report
N Birch	Site notices A photo is provided of the on-	The details and time frames were

	site posters in Appendix H. However no close up is provided to inform of the details provided on the site notice. Nor is there any indication of time frame that the noticed was displayed for (according to the scoping report it was erected on 10 October 2007)	as required by regulations.
N Birch	Time Frames no clear time frames are provided as to when documentation was released for review and when comments need to be received by.	This was clearly stated at the public meeting. Refer to DVD
N Birch	No I&AP register Although the comments and requests to be registered from the I&APs are provided no I&AP register is provided.	This is provided in SR
N Birch	Advertising: The commencement of the EIA should be advertised in local newspapers. Indications from the scoping report and the public meeting held show a distinct lack of representation from the communities situated directly adjacent to the proposed development, namely residents of Roodepan an attempt should be made to engage with members of this community and obtain their comments as they will be directly affected by the development. Public open day	The commencement of the EIA phase cannot be advertised yet as the authorities have not given the go-ahead to proceed with the EIA phase. The scoping report identified a number of directly related social issues that need to be addressed. The community involvement of the local residents will be particularly taken into account in the specialist report. This will also include a significant public participation information program in three languages, English, Afrikaans, and Setswana. If the authorities require a public open day it will be done.
B Booth	I was not sent the minutes when they became available. I had to request them when I heard, by chance, that they had been distributed.	The first draft of minutes was inadequate; these had been sent to a number people for comment. Thereafter the minutes were re-done to be more comprehensive and sent to all I&AP's
B Booth	While minutes by very definition imply summarizing, this should not be done at the cost of losing the import and gist of what was said. I am sure that this has occurred with many of the comments made by I&A parties. It certainly applies to what I and our legal representative, Mr AB Horwitz, said.	The proceedings of the meeting were filmed in order to prevent the allegation as alluded to. A copy of the DVD is appended to this report.
B Booth	In the interests of accuracy I wish to correct the minutes	The corrections as wished have been included in the SR.
B Booth	I feel a very inaccurate picture is conveyed by the minutes regarding what was said by Dr van Vrede among others.	The DVD recording of the meeting is a very accurate record of what was said. The minutes are a summary.
B Booth	Perhaps the video footage should be circulated – legally that too is a document and as I&A's we are entitled to all documentation.	The DVD is available, and will be included in the SR. All future meetings will be similarly

		recorded.
J van de Vreede	<p>I have received the minutes of the above meeting today at 6:45pm via a third party and I am informed that comments have to be submitted before the 7th Inst.</p> <p>This is not acceptable as we were assured that all parties would receive the minutes in good time for comments to be made.</p>	<p>The first draft of minutes was inadequate, these had been sent to two people for comment. Thereafter the minutes were re-done to be more comprehensive and sent to all I&AP's</p> <p>The scoping report has a full 30 days for comment. The minutes will form part of that report as well as the DVD.</p>
J van de Vreede	<p>I said that the I speculated that the proposed bypass would run from Eagle Street through our property through the proposed new development and connect up the the Johannesburg road.</p> <p>2. I stated that I had been made an offer from Group 1 to purchase our property and as they were not prepared to purchase at our price, we were however offerd shares in the new company to compensate for the reduced price offered.</p> <p>3. Mr. M. Anderson asked me in the meeting if I had already sold the property to Group 1, my answer was NO.</p> <p>Please ammend these comments in the minutes and PLEASE let me have a copy via e-mail</p>	A copy of the DVD will be provided as well as a transcript.
T Anderson - Wessa	Comments (comprising 4 pages) submitted by Dr A. Berruti, Diamond Birding Route, on 27 November 2007 are not appended with the other I & AP comments. All the issues he raised must also be addressed.	This will be taken care of in the EIA phase. All comments will be addressed in this phase.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	There is no mention of correspondence with the Diamond Birding Route in the public participation process (p. 33-34.)	See correspondence – Addendum E
Bulk services		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson - Wessa	Sect. 1.7.2 schedule for development states that once the RoD is issued, the alienation process with regards to change of ownership will begin. In sect. 1.1 it states that the properties were already purchased in 2006. Did the properties not change ownership then, or what change of ownership does this refer to?	The former refers to change of ownership in terms of sale in units to the general public. The latter to the purchase of the development property
N Birch	Electricity: Electricity supply has become a national crisis. Given the current situation with load shedding a detailed explanation as to the capacity for Kimberley is required. A number of system upgrades are recommended in the engineering services report. It is assumed that	Refer to bulk services report.

	the impacts of upgrading these facilities will be dealt with within this EIA.	
N Birch	Waste: No clear indication of waste removal is given. Will the municipality collect from very erven and street in the proposed development, or will transfer stations be used? This aspect must be investigated and reported on with possible locations of such transfer stations.	The municipality will collect. The provisions will be stipulated in the EMP as reported on page 50 of DSR
N Birch	Sewerage: The DSR clearly states that none of the existing sewer infrastructure can accommodate the proposed Northgate Development and that the existing Homevale WTP has to be upgraded or a new plant built for the development. What is not highlighted however is that the municipality has in fact approved phase one "Triangle Mall & Estate, and that they have stated that the sewer effluent from phase one be pumped to the Roodepan gravity outfall pipeline. However this is in direct contravention of the Engineering Service report produced for this development that states that the Roodepan Gravity outfall pipeline does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any effluent from the proposed development. Thus an already over capacity system will have to accommodate additional sewerage. Therefore the impacts related to this issue have to be tackled within the EIA.	The impacts of sewage will be independently assessed in the EIA phase.
N Birch	Roads: Comments from the Traffic Services Department with regard to this proposed development state that they would like the developer "to consider the development of an alternate route as the Midlands and Barkley Road is oversaturated" The traffic impact study states that the main, and initial access, to the development will be at the Roodepan Road / Eagle Street intersection but that it would be difficult to accommodate all trips generated by the development through the Barkly Road corridor, an additional access to the N12 will have to be established. This additional route must be indicated on the design layout and it associated impacts comprehensively assessed as part of the EIA.	These impacts will assessed in EIA phase of the project
B Childress IUCN	Do you think the 2.1 m electrified wall will be enough to keep the children and dogs out of the Kamfersdam conservation area?	Yes. At present no wall exists. So this should be seen as a positive development and a necessary requirement.
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Who will be responsible for managing security, especially access to Kamfers Dam, through the security camera monitoring system?	The security cameras will be managed at the access to Northgate. There is no planned access to Kamfers Dam. Northgate is not responsible for people entering the Dam area from the N12 side through the Booth's property.

Flamingo Environmental Trust	The EIA should include the details of the perimeter wall (height, materials used, depth into ground, etc.). Who will be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the wall?	Details will be included in final design
Flamingo Environmental Trust	The document does not provide adequate information on electricity requirements for the project. Would electricity requirements for the project result in further load shedding within the Sol Plaatje Municipality? If this is the case it will impact on all residents and businesses. The impacts of potential load shedding must be evaluated against the benefits of a new development.	The reason being that it is documented in the bulk services report.
J Hohne	No information is provided in the scoping report on the quantity and availability of electricity. The following consumption is expected with 5,667 total units requiring simultaneous peak supply availability of only 20 amps each spread over 3 phases equates to a supply of approximately 40 000 Amps 3 phase. The bulk supply will equate to approximately 20 to 25 MW of power from the municipality.	The information is provided in the bulk services report.
N Birch	Comments related to the IDP and SDP	The SPD and IDP are currently being revised to include the northern areas. The new SDF will only be available in draft format for comment from March 2008. No diagrams are yet available, even in draft format.
Legislative		
Author	Comment	Response
N Birch	The engineering service report for this development states that there will be the need for the provision of a reservoir for the development therefore within listed activities as per R386, activity no 1 (n) would therefore be relevant.	The application has been amended
N Birch	May need to include the Electricity Act (Act 41 of 1987) which regulates and controls energy supply in South Africa	Will be included
T Anderson - Wessa	Evaluation of environmental factors not adequate	The scoping report has assessed the broader site alternatives. The impact assessment phase as mentioned in the PoS will undertake a detailed assessment.
B Childress IUCN	Will you specifying the provisions of the various international agreements that affect this development? (It may be that some of them do not have any effect, while others are very important.)	This will be undertaken in the EIA phase legislation scan.
N Smith Birdlife South Africa	This development is proposed next to a Global Important Bird area because of its importance to the Flamingos (IBA SA032). Apart from its conservation significance we would like to bring to your attention that the project will attract	The legislative scan will cover all international agreements, and the environmental impacts will be unbiasedly documented..

	negative international attention as did the proposed development at lake Natron in Tanzania. (Since abandoned due to international objections)	
General		
Author	Comment	Response
T Anderson -Wessa	There needs to be a statement that should ownership of the development be transferred before it is completed, the new owners must comply with the EIA and RoD and continue the development as approved by DTEC and the municipality. This should also be stipulated in the RoD. If the new owners wish to change plans, a new EIA process must be followed.	These requirements are covered by NEMA and the EIA regulations.
T Anderson - Wessa	The Eco Centre (d) would serve tourism and educational purposes, not offset residual biodiversity impacts. The DSR states that ownership of the Eco Centre will be transferred to the Flamingo Environmental Trust and they will manage the Eco Centre. Have they agreed to this and do they have the capacity to do so to ensure it is a sustainable venture?	Revenue generated from the eco-centre would serve conservation in the Kamfersdam area which would in effect be the same contribution as 1.4 (f) of DSR. Ownership would be based on a written agreement entered in between the FET and Group 1. At this stage the FET has indicated whether it wishes to own the centre or not.
T Anderson - Wessa	Sect. 4.2.1 Contractor management – the PIPP should also include a copy of the EMP and RoD and the contractor must understand their contents and be properly managed to ensure he complies with all their requirements, so that there are no accidents.	All contractors will have a copy of the EMP and RoD
T Anderson - Wessa	Sect. 3.3 explains the impact rating system used, but does not refer to the Hacking method included as Appendix D. Why is this method appended?	It was used in the very draft scoping report and as that was integrated into the final DSR, it was decided to leave it in. It will be removed for the final SR.
N Birch	The project description given does not provide a true sense of the scale of the development. A detailed description of each component of each phase is required giving the size of the component, number of units, related infrastructure development required, and description, for example. <i>Suburban business (description eg supermarket) – 7.9ha – 1 unit – upgrade of substation, development of water pipeline etc</i>	The project description provides hectares and number of units? The detailed description would form part of the engineering report. As this is a scoping document of environmental, and socio-economic aspects.
N Birch	Detailed project description aspects	Refer to above comments
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Why was a separate company formed for the development (Northern Cape Investment Holdings) and not Group1?	The structure and strategic intent of the business does not form part of an EIA
Flamingo Environmental Trust	Note that to our knowledge the wetland's name is spelt as "Kamfers Dam" and not "Kamfersdam".	The two versions are widely used, and if you prefer the former, it will be so used in future.

Flamingo Environmental Trust	The then Northern Cape Nature Conservation Services, developed a proposal for the development and expansion of Kamfers Dam, including expansion to link to the Vaal River. This would also protect the large African White-backed Vulture colony at Rivermead. A map of this proposed larger conservation area can be obtained from the FET. How would the proposed development impact on this proposal (see p.58)?	The consultant is not sure this forms part of the assessment as no indication is given to whether this "proposal" is actually going to happen. The impact of such a proposal should be assessed by the authors desired Strategic Environmental Assessment as part of the SDP
------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------