



GA Environment

**COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED
SCOPING AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED MINING OF QUARRY 6A
ASSOCIATED WITH THE UPGRADE OF NATIONAL ROAD R573
(MOLOTO ROAD), GAUTENG PROVINCE**

July 2021

PREPARED BY:
GA Environment (Pty) Ltd

SUBMITTED TO:
Department of Mineral Resources and Energy

Address: P O Box 6723
Halfway House
Midrand
1685
+27 11 312 2537
Telephone: environment@gaenvironment.com
e-mail

Address: Mineralia Building, Cnr De Korte
and De Beer Street,
Braamfontein
Telephone: 011 357 9700
e-mail: Nkosinathi.Mahlaba@dmr.gov.za

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 3

2. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES 5

3. SUMMARY COMMENTS AND CONCLUSION 82

1. INTRODUCTION

This Comments and Responses Report (CRR) captures the comments and issues raised by Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) during the initial notification phase, Draft Scoping report and Draft EIR phase of the Scoping and EIA Process for the clearance of indigenous vegetation and the undertaking of construction activities within close proximity of a watercourse associated with the proposed mining of borrow material on Quarries 6A for the upgrade of National road R573 (Moloto road), Gauteng province. For the purposes of the Public Participation Process, the Public Participation process for both Quarry **6A & 6B** was combined due to the close proximity of the sites as these sites are located adjacent to each other. Comments received from stakeholders (for both Quarry 6A & 6B) are similar and have been combined except in cases where specific comments were submitted to reflect issues particular to a specified quarry.

The necessity for the CRR is based on Regulation 44 of the National Environmental Management Act's (NEMA) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations of 2014 (as amended). A summary of the Public Participation Process undertaken for the project to date is as follows:

- Notification letters were compiled and distributed to all adjacent landowners on the 27th of July 2018 (Quarry 6A) and yet again on the 6th of July 2020 for Quarries 6A & 6B. Knock and Drop Registers were completed for all I&APs that received a notification letter on the aforementioned dates. Electronic version of the notification letters have also been sent to I&APs and is currently ongoing;
- A newspaper advertisement notifying I&APs of the proposed development was placed on page 2 of the Pretoria News on the 9th of July 2020 and on Page 4 of the Pretoria North Rekord on the 10th of July 2020;
- Site notices presenting the project were erected on site and at visible and accessible locations close to the site on the 20th of July 2020;
- A focus group meeting was held with the Ward Councillor of Ward 87 and Ward 96 of the City of Tshwane (CoT) on the 2nd of July 2020;
- A meeting was also held with the City of Tshwane: Environmental Planning and Open Space department on 14 December 2020;
- The Draft Scoping Report for Quarry 6A was made available for a 30 legislated review period from the 20th of November until the 18th of January 2021. All comments received during the availability of the Draft Scoping report has been included in this Comments & Response Report.

- The Draft EIR for Quarry 6A was made available for a 30 day legislated review period from the 28th of May 2021 until the 28th of June 2021.

Table 1 indicates the name of the I&AP, their organisation, the date of the receipt of the comments, their communication methods as well the response of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to the comment. This report contains all comments that have been received to date. All comments received have been acknowledged and responded to by GA Environment. All correspondence between GA Environment and the I&APs have been included in **Appendix D7**.

2. COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Table 1: Comments and Responses (Draft EIR Phase)

	NAME AND SURNAME OF PARTY/PARTIES	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/CONCERNS	EAP's RESPONSE
2.1 Commentary Authority			
2.1.1	Kemmone Mofela City of Tshwane Environmental Planning & Open Space Management Section	<p>Date Received: 22nd June 2021</p> <p>1. Introduction The Environment and Agriculture Management Department (the Department) has considered the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report in respect of the above-mentioned application. The Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report is submitted to the Environment and Agriculture Management Department of the City of Tshwane, hereafter referred to as the City', as a commenting authority as required in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the EIA Regulations of December 2014.</p> <p>2. Project Location and Description GA Environment (Pty) Ltd has been appointed by South African National Roads Agency SOC Ltd as an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake environmental assessment for the proposed establishment of quarry —to be known as Quarry 6A - on part of the Remainder of the farm Doornpoort 295-JR. The site is bordered by national road N1 in the west, Transnet railway line in the north, residential dwelling units in the east and open velds on the south. The site is accessed from the existing railway service road north of the proposed development site and via Maroele road through privately owned land. The total extent of the proposed development measures approximately 603Ha. The proposed</p>	<p>The background information provided on the project has been acknowledged by GA Environment. The extent of the site for acquisition purposes is 603 hectares. Approximately 201 hectares of indigenous vegetation will be cleared. The listed activities applied for are as follows:</p> <p>Listing Notice 1: Activity 30 Listing Notice 2: Activity 15 Listing Notice 3: Activity 12</p>

		<p>development site is located within the area of jurisdiction of the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality.</p> <p>The duration of the proposed development is approximately 6 (six) years from the start of mining activities. The proposed development entails the sourcing of 66 000m³ overburden as well as 114 000m³ crushed G6 material, and 584 000m³G1 material from Norite.</p> <p>The proposed development site will consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 1 (Q6ABP1) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 18.74ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 1 (Q6AS1), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area — 19.52ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 2 (Q6ABP2) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 19.81ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 2 (Q6AS2), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area — 17.98ha; • Quarry 6A Quarry 1 (Q6AQ1), includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 19.46ha; • Quarry 6A Quarry Stockpile 1 (Q6AQS1) comprising a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area — 16.83ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 3 (Q6ABP3) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 18.48ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 3 (Q6AS3), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area — 15.71ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 4 (Q6ABP4) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 19.02ha; and • Quarry 6A Stockpile 4 (Q6AS4), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area — 8.33Ha 	
--	--	---	--

		<p>According to the report, SANRAL is exempted from applying for a mining right to develop a quarry to extract road construction material. However, application for the clearance of vegetation on a 44 hectare site should be applied for and hence the application. The proposed development entails undertaking the following listed activity in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation, 2014, under: Listing Notice 1, GNR 984: Activity 15 and Listing Notice 3, GNR 985: Activity 12.</p> <p>3. Key Factors Informing the Comments</p> <p>In making its comments in respect of the proposed activity the Department has taken, inter alia, the following into consideration:</p> <p>a) The information contained in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report dated 26 May 2021 and received by the Department on the 08 June 2021.</p> <p>b) Information obtained from the Departments' s information base including <i>inter alia</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic Information System (GIS data). • Gauteng Open Space Plan (GOSP). <p>c) Compliance with applicable Municipal, provincial and national policies and guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Bioregional Plan for the City of Tshwane; • The Gauteng Agricultural Potential Atlas (GAPA) • The Gauteng Conservation Plan version 3.3 (C PLAN); • The Gauteng Provincial Environmental Management Framework (GPEMF) ; • The National Environmental Management Act 1998 (Act 107 of 1998) (NEMA): its decision-making principles and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Tshwane Open Space Framework (TOSF). <p>d) Site inspection conducted on 15 June 2021</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>4. Discussion In reviewing the application, the Department made the following findings:</p> <p>a) The Wetland Assessment report identified the wetland located north but outside the proposed development site and thus will not be directly impacted by the proposed development. Similarly, the drainage line has been identified in the northern section of the site but has been previously bisected by the establishment of the existing gravel access road and the existing railway line. As a result, the specialist recommends the approval of layout alternative 2 to avoid direct impact on the watercourse areas. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with development of Quarry 6A on the watercourses are negligible.</p> <p>b) In response to the presence of Katdoring-loop, GA Environment indicated that the wetland specialist could not locate the watercourse and thus requested the Tshwane GIS map in order to verify. The Department is of the opinion that the watercourse may have been impacted by various anthropogenic factors onsite and thus no longer exist. During site inspection conducted on the 15 June 2021, borrow pit (BP4) and other developments were observed to have been planned north of the dilapidated historic quarry which is located further northwards away from the potential location of</p>	<p>The comment provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The comment provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>the Katdoring-loop. Therefore, the proposed development will not directly impact on the watercourse area.</p> <p>c) According to the Heritage Impact Assessment report, no sites or features of cultural or historic significance were identified on the proposed development site. Therefore, the proposed development does not have heritage impacts associated with it.</p> <p>d) In response to the concern regarding rehabilitation measures post development, KBK Engineers indicated the site will be rehabilitated such that no damming of water occurs. In addition, GA Environment indicated that site specific rehabilitation plan will be compiled and included in the Mine Closure application after the material have been sourced from the site. The Department will provide formal comments on the rehabilitation of the quarried sites during the decommissioning phase.</p> <p>e) The layout plan depicts several positions earmarked for the storage of generator and fuel storage. However, details about the quantity of fuel to be store is not indicated in the report. In addition, the reason for storing the fuel onsite when the proposed development site is abutting a fuel station is not provided in the report.</p>	<p>The comment provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The comment provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>As per the information made available by the KBK Engineers a diesel storage area has been accommodated in the site layout. Even though the layout has accommodated for the diesel storage, the storage can only be confirmed once the Contractor has been appointed. However, should diesel be stored on site, the cumulative capacity will be less than 80m³.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Therefore, the Department cannot evaluate the desirability of fuel storage onsite.</p> <p>f) During site inspection on the 15 June 2021, few aircrafts were observed flying over the proposed development site. However, the requested comments from the Wonderboom Airport Management as well as the South African Civil Aviation Authority (SACAA) are still outstanding. Therefore, the Department cannot evaluate the potential aviation impacts associated with the proposed development.</p> <p>g) Three freight locomotives were observed travelling along the existing railway line and Transnet personnel working within the vicinity of the railway line. However, comments regarding the usage of the railway access roads are not provided in the report. Therefore, the Department cannot evaluate the potential impacts associated with usage of the Transnet access roads for haulage of material from the proposed development site.</p> <p>h) The layout plan depicts access roads planned westwards away from the residential dwelling. During site inspection conducted on the 15 June 2015, the access roads used lies along the eastern and northern boundary of the site causing significant dust impact. The Department request that the proposed dust suppression</p>	<p>The SACAA and the Wonderboom Airport were notified of the availability of the Draft EIR, however comments were not received from either entity. Proof of correspondence is attached to Appendix D7.</p> <p>Transnet has been informed of the proposed project through the public participation undertaken for this EIR. Transnet has acknowledged on the 3rd of December 2020, that they are being notified of the proposed project and it is not a request for approvals. SANRAL will however engage with Transnet as part of the land acquisition discussion. Correspondence with Transnet has been included in Appendix D7.</p> <p>The potential impacts associated with Dust has been assessed as part of the EIR. Mitigation measures has been included in the EMPr. In terms of visual intrusion, the proposed mining area will be demarcated, and screen fencing will be used to reduce the impact of visual intrusion. Earth bunds will also be used where topographically feasible.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>measures in the EMPr should be implemented. In addition, a shade net should be fitted along the eastern section facing the abutting residential dwelling to alleviate the dust impact.</p> <p>i) The Management Plan is still outstanding. Therefore, the potential impacts associated with potential blasting cannot be evaluated.</p>	<p>The condition for the compilation and implementation of a Blast Management Plan has been included in the EIR. A Blast Management Plan can only be compiled once the final layout has been approved and the relevant authorisations/approvals have been obtained eg Environmental authorisation, and finalisation of the land acquisition process.</p>
		<p>5. Recommendations</p> <p>The Department recommends that the following issues be taken into consideration:</p> <p>a) Comments regarding the need and desirability of fuel depot on the proposed development site should be provided in the Final Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report.</p> <p>b) Details about the combined quantity of fuel to be stored on the proposed development site should be indicated in the Final EIA report.</p> <p>c) Clarity regarding the storage of fuel on the proposed development site when the proposed development site is abutting a fuel station should be provided in the Final EIA report.</p>	<p>Refer to the response provided in Section 4e.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided in Section 4e.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided in Section 4e.</p>

		<p>d) Layout Alternative 2 which excludes watercourse from the proposed development should be implemented.</p> <p>e) Implementation of a shade net along the eastern section facing the abutting residential dwelling to alleviate the dust impact should be investigated and comments included in the Final EIA report.</p> <p>f) Comments regarding potential aviation-related issues induced by the proposed development should be sourced from the Wonderboom Airport Management as well as the South African Civil Aviation Authority (SACAA).</p> <p>g) The Blast Management Plan should be compiled and included in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>h) A Rehabilitation Plan regarding the borrow pits will be provided during the decommissioning phase.</p>	<p>The comment provided by the department has been acknowledged.</p> <p>The proposed mining area will be demarcated, and screen fencing will be used to reduce the impact of visual intrusion. Earth bunds will also be used where topographically feasible.</p> <p>Refer to the comment provided in Section 4f.</p> <p>Refer to the comment provided in Section 4i.</p> <p>The comment has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
		<p>6. Conclusion</p>	<p>The Final EIR will be made available to the department.</p>

		The Department will provide final comments upon the receipt of the Final EIA report addressing the above-mentioned recommendations	
2.1.2	Mrs Sekonko Department of Forestry Fisheries and Environment (DFFE)-Biodiversity	<p>Comments received on the 29th of June 2021</p> <p>The Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation reviewed and evaluated the aforementioned draft report. Based on the information provided in the draft report, the proposed mining activities will lead to a total loss of terrestrial floral communities and associated faunal habitat within the extent of the proposed development footprint. The main concern is the Rocky Bushveld and Outcrop habitat. Sections of the Rocky Bushveld and outcrops which is 167 hectares are characterized by a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), earmarked as the highest biodiversity importance in terms of the Mining and Biodiversity Guidelines (2021) as well as a high Control Zone (Zone 2) in terms of the Gauteng Environmental Management Framework (GEMF). This zone is sensitive to development activities. According to the GEMF, only conservation should be allowed in this zone. Notwithstanding the above, the following recommendations must be considered in the final report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Clarity to the Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation as to within which CBA does the development site falls, since developments are fatal flawed and not allowed on CBA 1 that is not transformed or disturbed. Therefore, CBA areas must remain conserved and be excluded from development. • Layout Alternative 2 must be recommended as the preferred layout alternative, as it will mitigate negative impacts on several areas of sensitive vegetation. 	<p>The background information provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment was undertaken by Field and Form Landscape Science. The specialist has been consulted in terms of the comments provided by the Department. The specialist has confirmed that the site falls within a CBA that has been categorised as CBA: Important Area (CBA2) and such has been included in the report. The Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment Report is attached to Appendix F.</p> <p>The comment provided by the department has been acknowledged. The recommendation has been included in the EIR for consideration by the Competent Authority.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A pre-construction walk-through of the final development footprint must be undertaken in order to locate and identify species of conservation concern that can be translocated. • If several plant Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) which are protected are identified in the study area, a Search and Rescue Plan to exercise the removal and relocation of them must be developed and included as part of the final report. • A detailed site Rehabilitation Plan must be developed and all disturbed and cleared areas be rehabilitated with indigenous perennial shrubs and grasses from the local area. • An Alien Invasive Species Eradication Plan must be developed in order to reduce the establishment and spread of alien plant species within the development footprint. • Permits from relevant authorities must be obtained for the removal or disturbance of any TOPs, Red Data listed or provincially protected species; and 	<p>The comment provided by the Department has been acknowledged and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>The comment provided by the Department has been acknowledged and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>A comprehensive Rehabilitation and Closure Plan will be development prior to the decommissioning and closure of the proposed quarry operation. Such condition has been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>An Alien Invasive Species plan has been compiled and included under Appendix G of the EIR.</p> <p>According to the Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment, No TOPs, Red data listed, or provincially protected species were recorded in the study area. However, a specialist walk down will be undertaken prior to any pre-construction activities on site. Should the walkdown identify any of the aforementioned species, then the required permit shall be obtained from the relevant authorities. Such condition has been included in the EMPr.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sensitive habitats in close proximity to the development footprint must be avoided or demarcated as No-Go Areas i.e. drainage lines, wetlands, CBA's. <p>In conclusion please note that all Public Participation Process documents related to Biodiversity EIA review and any other Biodiversity EIA queries must be submitted to the Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation at Email: BCAdmin@environment.gov.za for attention of Mr Seoka Lekota.</p>	<p>As provided in the EIR, the design (preferred layout) shows that the stockpiles size has been reduced in order to ensure that the 16m buffer has been accommodated to prevent siltation and disturbance to the drainage line. In terms of the CBA, the proposed layout does however encroach on the CBA within the central portion of the site. The potential impacts have been assessed in the EIR. Mitigation measures as provided by the specialist have been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>The comment provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
<p>2.1.3</p>	<p>Mulalo Sundani Department of Forestry Fisheries and Environment : Forestry</p>	<p>Comment provided on the second of July</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mandate of the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE): Forestry Branch as an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) commenting authority, is mainly to ensure control over development affecting natural forests, protected woodlands and listed protected trees under the National Forests Act, 1998 (Act No. 84 of 1998). 2. Environmental Impact Assessment, Environmental Management Programme reports, Terrestrial biodiversity assessment reports and findings from the site visit conducted on the 29 June 2021, the woodland vegetation types to be affected are Marikana Thornveld and Norite Koppies Bushveld and are dominated by Vachellia karoo, Vachellia tortilis, and Ziziphus mucronuta. No tree species protected by 	<p>The comment has been noted by GA Environment.</p> <p>The comment has been noted by GA Environment.</p>

		<p>National Forests Act of 1998 identified on site, Quarry A (proposed Quarry).</p> <p>3. The Department therefore' advise that if any trees species protected by the NFA is encountered in the proposed area, such trees should be clearly marked and may not be destroyed without a licence in terms of the Act.</p>	The comment has been noted and included in the EMPr.
2.1.4	Mr Andrew Solomon South African Heritage Resources Agency	<p>Comment provided on the 2nd of June 2021</p> <p>It is the intention of the South African National Roads Agency Soc Ltd to establish various Quarries to provide the necessary construction materials for the proposed upgrading of national road R573-1 (K139) from Stormvoël Road in Tshwane (km 0,00) to the Gauteng / Mpumalanga Provincial Border (± 48.00 km). The proposed Quarry 6A is located approximately 2.5km to the northwest of the R573 (Moloto Road) roadway, immediately to the northeast of the N1/N4 highway intersection and bordering the N1 highway to the east. The site centre geographic coordinates are 25°37'35.67" S, 28°17'08.25" E.</p> <p>Van Schalkwyk, J. January 2021. Phase 1 Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment: The Proposed Establishment Of Quarry 6A For Sourcing Material To Be Used For The Upgrade Of Section 1 Of National Road R573 (Moloto Road), Gauteng Province</p> <p>The proposed development entails part of a SANRAL project for the upgrading of National Road R573 (K139) Section 1 from Stormvoël Road in Tshwane (km 0,00) to the Gauteng/Mpumalanga Provincial Border (+ 48.00 km). In order to achieve this, a number of quarries and borrow pits have been identified from where the required raw material will be sourced from.</p>	The background information provided by SAHRA has been acknowledged by GA Environment.

		<p>During the survey no sites, features or objects of cultural significance were identified. The SA Palaeontological Sensitivity Map indicates that the study area has Insignificant fossil sensitivity.</p> <p>Final Comment</p> <p>SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit has no objections to this proposed development. provided that the recommendations in the specialist reports and this comment are adhered to, and in addition. on the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No palaeontological assessment is required, however a protocol for finds is required. • If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g., remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments and charcoal/ash concentrations) or palaeontological remains are found during the proposed activities, SAHRA must be alerted immediately, and a professional archaeologist or palaeontologist, based on the nature of the finds, must be contacted as soon as possible to inspect the findings. If the newly discovered heritage resources prove to be of significance a Phase 2 rescue operation might be necessary. <p>If any unmarked human burials are uncovered and the archaeologist called in to inspect the finds and/or the police find them to be heritage graves, mitigation may be necessary and the SAHRA Burial Grounds and Graves (BGG) Unit must be contacted for processes to follow.</p>	<p>The final comment provided by SAHRA has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The conditions have been included in the EIR.</p> <p>The conditions have been included in the EIR.</p>
--	--	--	---

		Should the project be granted Environmental Authorisation, SAHRA must be notified and all relevant documents submitted to the case on SAHRIS.	Once a decision has been made by the DMRE, such will loaded on SAHRIS.
2.2 General Comments Related to the Project			
2.2.1	Mr Peter Murray Murray Attorneys INC	<p>Comment provided on the 28th of June 2021</p> <p>1. We refer to the draft environmental impact report ("the EIR") that you prepared for South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited dated May 2021 relative to the quarry which you designate as Quarry 6A.</p> <p>2. We represent First Land Development Limited, the owner of the Remainder of the Farm Doornpoort No. 295 JR, of which farm the study area forms part.</p> <p>3. Our client has instructed us that, having perused the EIR, our client has various submissions and comments relative to same, which will be set out in the rest of this letter under separate headings.</p>	<p>Your comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>Your comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>Your comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment</p>
		<p>4. The extent of the area of Quarry 6A should be reduced</p> <p>4.1. Our client's town planners, EVS Planning (attention: Maxi Alberts) have prepared a report on behalf of our client, a copy of which is annexed hereto.</p> <p>4.2. As appears from the annexed report, the southern part of the study area is and will be affected by a proposed link road between the Moloto Road and Lavender Road through this particular part of the farm portion, and by the extension of the PWV2/N4.</p>	<p>Your comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>Your comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment</p> <p>The entire portion of the property RE Doornpoort 295 east of the N1 is being acquired permanently by SANRAL considering the number of viable material sources in this area, to simplify the land acquisition process and to ensure no redundant severed land parcels remain between the material sources to which access should then be provided.</p>

		<p>4.3. The proposed link road and the extension are required by the City of Tshwane and also by SANRAL itself. The roads are included in the City’s Road Master Planning for the farm. The planned route is important for the future development of that part of the farm which is to the west of the N1. If the link road is not protected it will have a direct impact on that part of the farm which is to the west of the N1.</p> <p>4.4. It is also important to note that none of the quarry areas, stockpile areas or borrow pit areas designated for the construction phase and operational phase of the project impinge upon the proposed link road or any part of the farm which is to the south of the proposed link road.</p>	<p>The proposal is still to acquire the entire area, but as indicated on the layouts not to develop the full area as borrow areas. This will allow scope to retain a corridor on the alignment proposed in the CoT Master Plan that will not be developed as Borrow Area. The development of the Borrow Pit will therefore not inhibit future development of the area, as area within the larger Borrow Area will remain where a future road alignment can be established.</p> <p>The extension of the N4 (PWV2 Link) between the N1 and Moloto road has been proclaimed in the government gazette of June 2020 as a national road reserve. The planning of the PW2 link has also been formalized in previous Provincial (GPDRT) Basic Planning Reports as far back as 1998. In the planning undertaken by SANRAL this will be the only link road constructed between the N1 and Moloto Road in the vicinity and as part of this project.</p> <p>Both the Quarry 6A and the N4 extension have been part of the design development since 2017 and discussed in progress meetings which was attended by the CoT Roads Planning division. No objections have been raised by the CoT to either development.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided in 4.2.</p> <p>The proposal is still to acquire the entire area. Any link road can be developed but only with prior authorization from SANRAL as the link road will directly impact on the N1. It should be noted that the PWV2 link is in any event located to the South of the proposed link road. The exact alignment of the link road has also not been formalized by further planning and can be adjusted to suite conditions.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>4.5. No explanation has been given as to why the study area should have been designated as going to the southern part of the farm (near the interchange) under circumstances where such southern portion will not be utilised.</p> <p>4.6. The exclusion of that part of the farm which is south of the proposed link road from the study area will not impact upon the project at all.</p> <p>4.7. Accordingly, the study area should be amended as set out above.</p>	<p>As stated in response 4.2, the entire portion of the property RE Doornpoort 295 east of the N1 is being acquired permanently by SANRAL considering the number of viable material sources in this area, to simplify the land acquisition process and to ensure no redundant severed land parcels remain between the material sources to which access should then be provided.</p> <p>The acquisition of the southern corner of the property is still considered to be more feasible than providing the extended roads infrastructure to provide access to this portion from the existing secondary road network. No access will be allowed directly from the N1 or extended N4.</p> <p>The proposal is still to acquire the entire area and register the link road servitude only.</p>
		<p>5. Air Emission Licence</p> <p>5.1. The EAP records that our client raised in its comments on the draft scoping report that an Air Emission Licence will be required.</p> <p>5.2. In the draft scoping report and in the draft EIR the EAP maintains that dust that will be released will be managed through the National Dust Control Regulations (2013).</p> <p>5.3. However, it is unclear as to whether other activities such as the burning of diesel will necessitate the requirement for an AEL. Our client maintains that an AEL will be required.</p>	<p>The comment is noted, as all correspondence received from I&APs are captured in the Comments and Response Report which is attached to Appendix D5.</p> <p>GA Environment acknowledges the comment provided.</p> <p>As per the information made available by KBK Engineers, a generator will be on site and it is anticipated that the generator will be used for the crushing of material on site. Even though the layout has accommodated for the generator, the use of a generator can only be confirmed once the Contractor has been appointed. At this stage it is anticipated that the generator will have a design capacity of less than 10MW heat input per unit. In addition, the storage of diesel on site will be less than 80m³. According to the Minimum Emission Standards, identified in terms of Section 21 of the National Environmental Management Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No 39 of 2004) an AEL will not be required as the threshold will</p>

			not be exceeded. In addition, not all proposed sites within Quarry 6A will be mined at the same time, the sites will be mined as per the material required for the road works.
		6. Major hazard installation 6.1. It is not clear whether a major hazard installation licence will be required.	As per the information made available by the KBK Engineers a diesel storage area has been accommodated in the site layout. Even though the layout has accommodated for the diesel storage, the storage can only be confirmed once the Contractor has been appointed. However, should diesel be stored on site, the capacity will be less than 80m3. Once the quantity of diesel has been confirmed, the SANRAL appointed Health and Safety specialist will undertake a risk assessment to determine the need of registration with the CoT in terms of the bylaws.
		7. Social and urban impact 7.1. In its previous round of comments our client identified the need for a social urban impact report.	<p>The comment provided on the 19th of January 2021 refers: “On page 49 of the DSR you identify potential impacts that have been identified in the Scoping Phase. Please add to this list the social urban impact which encompasses the fact that land which would have been used for residential and mixed used township development will no longer be available for same”.</p> <p>Based on the above request, social urban impacts were required to be assessed. The potential social impacts that will emanate from the proposed development include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust • Noise • Visual • Traffic • Land capability • Cultural Heritage; and • Socio economic. <p>The above-mentioned potential impacts have been assessed as part of the EIR. The potential impacts identified did not justify the need to undertake Social Impact Assessment as measures to mitigate potential negative impacts were provided in the EIR.</p>
		7.2. The social impact of the proposed project is not clear.	Kindly Refer to the response provided in Section 7.1.

		<p>7.3. A social impact report is required.</p> <p>8. Agreements between the project proponent and the land owner</p> <p>8.1. The question of the agreements that must be concluded between the project proponent and the land owner has not yet been answered.</p> <p>8.2. In our client’s comments dated 18 January 2021 we stated as follows: “We refer to the diagrammatic presentation of the environmental process set out on pages 60 and 61 of the DSR. What is missing from this process flowchart is the timing and nature of the agreements to be concluded between the landowner (our client) and SANRAL. SANRAL should, as soon as possible, consult with our client regarding negotiations aimed at acquiring the land on which the quarry activities will take place. The land sale agreement to be concluded between our client as seller and SANRAL as purchaser (if same can ultimately be concluded) will contain clauses dealing with the agreement between the seller and purchaser regarding various important legal aspects that have not been dealt with in the DSR.”</p> <p>8.3. It is not clear whether SANRAL intends to conclude a lease agreement or a purchase agreement with our client. In either event, none of the commercial terms have been discussed with our client.</p>	<p>Kindly Refer to the response provided in Section 7.1.</p> <p>The comments provided has been acknowledged and a response has been provided in Sections 8.2 to 8.5 below.</p> <p>The comment provided under Section 8.2 has been responded to in response dated 23rd February 2021. The comments provided has also been captured in the Comments and Response Report which is attached D5.</p> <p>As provided on the response dated 23rd February 2021, a land acquisition process can only be finalised once the Environmental approvals have been obtained. The land acquisition process is undertaken by SANRAL’s property service provider. Although the land acquisition process would ideally have been in the advanced stages while finalising the Environmental approvals, SANRAL requires confirmation that the proposed material source is viable from an environmental perspective before they conclude the land acquisition. It follows that in most cases SANRAL will first conclude the Environmental process before they conclude the Land Acquisition process, as the Environmental process will determine if the land to be acquired is viable. A meeting was however held between KBK Engineers and First Land Development in order to form the basis of the land acquisition process.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>8.4. It is an important component of any environmental investigation that the proposed project must be sustainable. One of the important headings under the topic of sustainability is the financial sustainability of any project.</p> <p>8.5. Our client has previously directed correspondence to SANRAL requesting that the commercial terms of the proposed agreement be set out. This has not yet occurred. Our client submits that the commercial terms (even if only in a heads of agreement) must be known and understood before the environmental process can be completed.</p> <p>9. Period of the proposed environmental authorisation</p> <p>9.1. In proposed condition (q) on page 108 of the EIR it is stated that the period of the EA will be 10 years.</p> <p>9.2. It must also, however, be a condition that the 10-year period will apply only if the project is commenced within one year after the grant of environmental authorisation.</p>	<p>Since then SANRAL was in the process of process of transitioning between Property Service Providers. SANRAL has now appointed Property Portfolio Service Provider (PPSP) named PropSol JV, and the land valuation and the negotiation processes towards acquiring the required land parcel will proceed in due course towards the permanent acquisition of the applicable areas.</p> <p>The proposed Quarry has been identified to provide road material for the R573 Moloto Road. The upgrade of the Moloto Road is a Strategic Infrastructure Project (SIP). SIP's are coordinated by the Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission (PICC). Considering that SANRAL is a state-owned company, all projects that require capital expenditure are scrutinised at every stage of design to ensure that the project will be feasible in its national context.</p> <p>Refer to a response provided in Section 8.3. For this reason, the land acquisition and environmental processes run concurrently, considering that SANRAL will not complete a land acquisition if the purpose for use of the land will not be environmentally feasible. Similarly, the environmental process assumes certain ownership conditions for the property once it is in use as a quarry and thus require the land acquisition process to advance.</p> <p>The comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The timeframe of 10 years is a recommendation provided by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner. The onus is on the Competent Authority, in this application, which is the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy, to decide on the validity of the Environmental Authorisation. The period stipulated on the Authorisation will be effective from the date that the Authorisation has been issued.</p>
--	--	---	--

		9.3. In the absence of such a condition it is conceivable that the EA could be valid for a period of 15 years under circumstances where the project does not go ahead.	Refer to the comment provided in section 9.2.
2.2.2	Erasmus Chauke Total South Africa (Pty) Ltd	<p>Comments received on the 29th of June 2021</p> <p>We refer to your call for public comments on the environmental impact report for application for the proposed mining of quarry 6A situated on the remainder of farm Doornpoort 295JR. This feedback relates specifically to proposed activity quarry 6A located adjacent and south of the Total Petroport Panorama service stations, which will potentially be directly impacted by the proposed mining activity. Total South Africa has not received information related to location of the other quarries (Quarry 4, Quarry 5 and Quarry 6B), therefore it is believed that their locations have no potential direct or indirect impact to Total Petroport Panorama service stations or any of the other service stations within our network, hence no comments are made regarding these quarries (4, 5 and 6B) in this response. Feel free to contact the undersigned should you have questions or require any clarification.</p> <p>Issues of concern:</p> <p>1. Critical Biodiversity area</p> <p>It is noted from the EIR that some parts of the proposed mining area comprise of critical biodiversity area, it is not clear how this area will be protected from the impact related to mining activities.</p>	<p>Thank you for the background information provide. GA Environment acknowledges and takes not of the comments provided. In terms of the proposed Quarries, on the 18th of June 2021, Mr Casper Badenhorst was informed of the 30-day legislated review period of the DEIR. A link to access an electron copy of the report was made available to Mr Badenhorst.</p> <p>As provided in the Draft EIR, the central portion of Quarry 6A is indicated to be associated with a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA). A Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment has been commissioned as part of the Scoping and EIA process. The potential impacts of the proposed development on the biodiversity has been included in the EIR. The proposed mitigation measures have also been included in the EIR and in the EMPr which is attached to Appendix G of the EIR. An independent Environmental Control Officer will be appointed during the construction phase of the project to ensure that all potential impacts on the CBA are minimised.</p>

		<p>2. Underground Rock Blasting Based on the proposed mining, it is likely that quarry activities may require to break large rocks insitu/underground using blasting technique. Blasting induced vibration is known to have potential negative impacts on buildings, underground storage tanks and associated infrastructures. Underground fuel storage tanks, pipelines with sensitive underground sensors are present at the Total service station. These installations are sensitive to major vibrations, therefore, will most likely be impacted by vibrations resulting from blasting activities at the proposed quarry. There is no record of assessment conducted to evaluate potential impacts on Total Petroport Panorama which may be caused by vibrations induced by rock blasting at the quarry. Apart from the induced crack survey (recommended), other risks such as impact on underground fuel equipment and sensors were not considered in the report. Recommendations are made in the EIR that adjacent landowners and businesses must be notified well in advance about blasting activities and appropriate precautionary measures must be taken.</p> <p>Concern: It is not clear in the report what mitigation measures will require to be taken, by whom, at what cost and who will be responsible for such cost/ re-imburement of potential revenue losses which may be suffered by impacted businesses due to such measures/actions.</p>	<p>It should be noted that Quarry 6A includes, four borrow pits and one quarry. Blasting will only be undertaken at the area designated a Quarry (Q6AQ1) shown in Figure 4 of the Draft EIR. As Quarry 6A specifically Q6AQ1, which is a hard rock quarry, explosive blasting is required to be undertaken. Blasting is the only means used to break parent rock formations in quarries. The proposed blasting area is approximately 360m from the site boundaries and approximately 530m from the Total Petroport Panorama. Measurements were taken from the edge of the proposed Quarry. Once the final design of the study area has been carried out, and the Contrcator has been appointment. A blasting specialist will be appointed, and a blast design undertaken as per the final design of the study area. Blasting will be undertaken in line with the legislation and guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explosives Act (Act 15 of 2003) • Mine Health and Safety Act 29 of 1996 and Regulations • Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (Act No 28 of 2002) • Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act 85 of 1993) • Explosive Regulations GoN R109, G. 24272, in terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act 85 of 1993). <p>Once the blast design has been confirmed, an asset condition survey will be undertaken on adjacent properties as a basis for comparing complaints or allegations of structural damage to property. This survey will also include the identification of sensitive receptors and the approximate radius will be determined by the blast design. The Contractor shall keep a record of the condition (e.g. cracks, existing damage) of the structures within the affected radius. A grievance procedure will be implemented in such a way that the Contractor’s Community Liaison Officer is able to manage and address any complaints received. The appointed Contrcator shall be responsible to reimbursed residents for damages resulting from blasting activities through the grievance procedure. Material that falls into private land or in sensitive land shall be removed by the Contrcator. Although the concern is noted regarding the underground storage tanks, the distance to the intended blasting areas is significant and the over blast would have to be extreme in order to reach the tanks. An emergency</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Objection: Total Petroport Panorama hereby object the use of blasting as a mechanism to break rocks from the ground. Alternative methods should be employed.</p>	<p>response plan has been included in the EMPr to address such extreme cases.</p> <p>The objection has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment. Kindly refer to the response provided in under Section 2 above.</p>
		<p>3. Dust Management Blasting, crushing, transportation (vehicles) as well as soil and rock stockpile activities are likely to generate dust which could disperse over and beyond boundaries of the quarry site. Presence of dust reaching the Total Petroport Panorama will have significant impact on quality of infrastructure and services rendered to customers at the Total site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could impact on attractiveness or appeal of the site services to customers, which will have detrimental impact on customer population visiting the site. This will have direct impact on revenues generated by the site. • Dust will also impact the infrastructure and paint at the site, which will reduce the paint life. • In addition, the presence of dust reaching the Total site will lead to direct long-term exposure (to dust) by Total employees, of which if not equipped with preventative personal equipment for dust, this could result in long term human health risk. • Moreover, the presence of dust storms reaching the Total site will lead to reduced visibility for vehicle drivers accessing or driving through the site. This could lead to potential accidents/ collisions on site. <p>Recommendations: The cost associated with impact of dust must be internalized throughout the lifecycle of the quarry project. Measures must be implemented to prevent generation of dust and ensure that</p>	<p>The comments provided and the recommendations have been acknowledged. Dust suppression will be considered as part of the design and location of borrow pits, quarries and aggregate crushing plants, and measures will be implemented to restrict dust-related impacts. These</p>

		<p>residual dust does not disperse over and beyond borders of the quarry operations site(s).</p>	<p>include regular watering techniques of the haul roads and mining area to minimise dust generation. Dust that will be released will be managed through the National Dust Control Regulations (2013). Air quality to be monitored (baseline and during construction) for dust fallout and particulate matter. Sampling locations to consider major sources of dust and sensitive receptors. The Contractor will document any air quality / dust complaints raised by communities and record them on a grievance register sheet. Any dust related grievances raised will be investigated by the Contractor.</p>
		<p>4. Underground Water Total Petroport Panorama service stations uses groundwater to support all activities on sites, including consumption. Mining activities are known to have significant impact on accessibility and quality of the groundwater aquifer. These impacts could be due to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pumping of the pit and encroachment of the highwall toward the wells could dewater the water table aquifer, leading to dry water supply boreholes. It is noted from your EIR that during excavation no water will need to be pumped out, but free draining. It is not clear how this free draining is going to be achieved on the quarry (if deep) without dewatering (pumping). • Long term impacts on water quality due to the mining (the breakup of the rocks). The mechanisms of these changes (via pyrite oxidation) are well known. They increase the dissolved solids component especially sulfate, iron, manganese, aluminum, and sometimes sodium. Occasionally, other minor metals show up. This could result to long term human health exposure through groundwater ingestion at the Total service stations 	<p>The quarry is located on a portion of the property that has a naturally raised elevation, a feature that makes the site geologically feasible. This slightly raised elevation relative to the surrounding landscape, along with the limited depth of excavation, allows the excavations to be free draining, meaning that the angle of the excavation is such that, for example, rainwater, runs freely off the soil into the veldt. Although some water may collect in depressions, during excavation no water will be required to be pumped out. Other than evaporation, the water that collects in the excavations will be collected by the excavator with the material and transferred to the crusher, which will also aid in dust suppression.</p> <p>The quarry and borrow pit areas are positioned in elevated locations to the extent that the water table should not be reached. The only percussion drilling holes undertaken as part of the drilling investigations that struck water was located to the far south and significantly deeper than the proposed quarry depths. Further water level readings in the core locations where standpipes were established will be taken prior to the commencement of constructions activities. However, KBK Engineers has requested a copy of the Water Use License, as this will allow the design</p>

		<p>Recommendations: Potential impact of mining activities on groundwater quality at the area should be investigated and well understood. As a result, Total Panorama hereby object to location of deep excavations within distance which mining activities could impact on groundwater accessibility and quality from existing boreholes and any future boreholes which could be drilled within our site boundaries.</p> <p>Figure 23 of the EIR report: Stockpile SQ1 is located on top of an area classified as of high biodiversity importance. Alternative location should be considered.</p>	<p>team to determine the depth and quality of the available water to use as basis for further impact determinations and monitoring.</p> <p>Regarding the comment made on pyrite, according to the geotechnical assessment undertaken, no pyrite was identified in any of the XRD tests that were undertaken. Furthermore, no mining industry standard processes or treatment of the ore will be undertaken. No modification of the excavated material is anticipated. The material is used as it is excavated and crushed without any chemical or metallurgical processing.</p> <p>Refer to the response provided in Section4, bullet 2.</p> <p>The comment provided has been noted. Reference is made to SQ1 which is situated in an area of high biodiversity importance in terms of the Mining and Biodiversity guidelines. However, ground truthing undertaken by the specialist in terms of the Biodiversity Assessment undertaken, revealed that the area can be categorized as Medium and Medium Low biodiversity significance (refer to Figure 22 of the DEIR). In addition, the required listed activities in terms of Listing Notice 3 of the EIA Regulations has been applied for and included in the EIR.</p>
		<p>5. Visual and Aesthetic Impacts</p> <p>The mining activities and stockpiles will have negative visual impact encroachment to the Total Petroport Panorama service station. Measures must be implemented to screen visibility to mining activities from the site.</p>	<p>The proposed mining area will be demarcated, and screen fencing will be used to reduce the impact of visual intrusion. Earth bunds will also be used where topographically feasible. In addition, the existing vegetation on site will also serve as a screen for the mining activities.</p>
2.2.3	Jacques Du Rand	<p>Comment provided on the 4th of June 2021</p> <p>Can you send me a more detailed plan of the upgrade and how far the upgrade will be on the road?</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. GA Environment's scope of Work includes the following road projects that are related to the R573 Moloto upgrade:</p>

		<p>I know you only doing the quarry, but if you can assist thanks.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 1: R573 Section 1 from Baviaanspoort Road (M15) to Stormvoël Road (M5) and Moepel Road Overpass • Proposed Construction of the PWV2 between N1/N4 and the R573 Moloto Road <p>The layouts for the above have been attached to this email.</p> <p>However, on the broader scope, It is the intention of the South African National Road Agency Soc Ltd to upgrade national road R573-1 (K139) from Stormvoël Road in Tshwane (km 0,00) to the Gauteng / Mpumalanga Provincial Border (± 48.00 km). The aforementioned project will be implemented in four phases. The phases are as follows:</p> <p><u>Phase 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of the R573-1 between Stormvoël Road (km 0.00) and Baviaanspoort Road (km 2.32) as an urban 4-lane undivided dual carriageway; • Extension of Baviaanspoort Road to link with the urban streets to the east of the R573-1; and • Construction of the Moepel Road Overpass. <p><u>Phase 2a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of the R573-1 just North of Sefako Makgatho Drive (km 4.10) to km 8.94; and • The construction of the PWV2 link from the R573-1 (km 0.00) to the N1/N4 Interchange (km3.20) <p><u>Phase 2b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of the R573-1 from De Wagendrift North (km 37.80) to the Gauteng/Mpumalanga Border (km 48.30). <p><u>Phase 3a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction of the R573-1 from Baviaanspoort Road (km 2.32) to Sefako Makgatho Drive (km 4.10); • Construction of the R573-1 / Sefako Makgatho Interchange; and • Construction of the R513-1 (Sefako Makgatho Drive) upgrades from km 0.20 to km 1.6. <p><u>Phase 3b</u></p>
--	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from Kameelfontein Street (km 20.90) to km 31.30. <p><u>Phase 4a</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from km 31.30 to De Wagedrift North (km 37.80). <p><u>Phase 4b</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from km 8.94 to Kameelfontein Street (km 20.90).
2.2.4	Hennie Albert	<p>Comment provided on the 21st of June 2021</p> <p>Could you send me the R573 upgrade plans proposed start date and how the quarry affect the R573 please</p>	<p>Thank you for your email. GA Environment's scope of Work includes the following road projects that are related to the R573 Moloto upgrade:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 1: R573 Section 1 from Baviaanspoort Road (M15) to Stormvoël Road (M5) and Moepel Road Overpass Proposed Construction of the PWV2 between N1/N4 and the R573 Moloto Road <p>The layouts for the above have been attached to this email. Construction for the above-mentioned phase 1 will commence within the first quarter on 2022.</p> <p>However, on the broader scope, It is the intention of the South African National Road Agency Soc Ltd to upgrade national road R573-1 (K139) from Stormvoël Road in Tshwane (km 0,00) to the Gauteng / Mpumalanga Provincial Border (± 48.00 km). The aforementioned project will be implemented in four phases. The phases are as follows:</p> <p><u>Phase 1</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 between Stormvoël Road (km 0.00) and Baviaanspoort Road (km 2.32) as an urban 4-lane undivided dual carriageway; Extension of Baviaanspoort Road to link with the urban streets to the east of the R573-1; and Construction of the Moepel Road Overpass.

			<p>Phase 2a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of the R573-1 just North of Sefako Makgatho Drive (km 4.10) to km 8.94; and The construction of the PWV2 link from the R573-1 (km 0.00) to the N1/N4 Interchange (km3.20) <p>Phase 2b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The construction of the R573-1 from De Wagendrift North (km 37.80) to the Gauteng/Mpumalanga Border (km 48.30). <p>Phase 3a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from Baviaanspoort Road (km 2.32) to Sefako Makgatho Drive (km 4.10); Construction of the R573-1 / Sefako Makgatho Interchange; and Construction of the R513-1 (Sefako Makgatho Drive) upgrades from km 0.20 to km 1.6. <p>Phase 3b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from Kameelfontein Street (km 20.90) to km 31.30. <p>Phase 4a</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from km 31.30 to De Wagedrift North (km 37.80). <p>Phase 4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of the R573-1 from km 8.94 to Kameelfontein Street (km 20.90).
2.2.5	Steven Geldenhuys	<p>Comment provided on the 18th of June 2021</p> <p>Could you please pass on my comments below regarding the proposed quarry that is to be excavated about 100 meters from my property to upgrade the Moloto road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We contacted the bank who insures our property, and someone came out to speak to me regarding where we stand should the blasting for the quarry destroy the houses foundations in the area. There was a grey area as to what they will and won't cover, so my question to your environmental impact team is: "Who will pay out the home owners in the 	<p>It should be noted that Quarry 6A includes, four borrow pits and one quarry. Blasting will only be undertaken at the area designated a Quarry (Q6AQ1) shown in Figure 4 of the Draft EIR. As Quarry 6A specifically Q6AQ1, which is a hard rock quarry, explosive blasting is required to be undertaken. Once the final design of the study area has been carried out, and the Contrcator has been appointment. A blasting specialist will be</p>

		<p>area if their homes foundations are cracked and the house is deemed not safe to live in?”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It goes without saying that should the quarry commence, there will be years of construction/excavation noise as well as dust pollution from the site. This will have a direct negative impact on the communities surrounding the quarry. My question is: “As one cannot avoid this dust and noise pollution, do we as taxpayers have a right to object to this pollution? Surely sites for a quarry can be obtained elsewhere where people do not stay nearby?” 	<p>appointed, and a blast design undertaken as per the final design of the study area. Blasting will be undertaken in line with the legislation and guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explosives Act (Act 15 of 2003) • Mine Health and Safety Act 29 of 1996 and Regulations • Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (Act No 28 of 2002) • Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act 85 of 1993) • Explosive Regulations GoN R109, G. 24272, in terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act (Act 85 of 1993). <p>Once the blast design has been confirmed, an asset condition survey will be undertaken on adjacent properties as a basis for comparing complaints or allegations of structural damage to property. This survey will also include the identification of sensitive receptors. The approximate radius will be determined by the blast design. The Contractor shall keep a record of the condition (e.g. cracks, existing damage) of the structures within the affected radius. A grievance procedure will be implemented in such a way that the Contractor’s Community Liaison Officer is able to manage and address any complaints received. The appointed Contractor shall be responsible to reimburse residents for damages resulting from blasting activities through the grievance procedure. Material that falls into private land or in sensitive land shall be removed by the Contractor</p> <p>The potential noise and dust impacts have been assessed as part of this EIR. Mitigation measures have also been included in the EMP. As indicated in the EIR, air quality will be monitored (baseline and during construction) for dust fallout and particulate matter as well as noise monitoring. There will be community structures in place during the operation of the Quarry, as a Community Liaison Officer will be appointed by the Contractor and an Environmental Monitoring Committee will be established. Such committee will include the adjacent landowners.</p> <p>As provided in the EIR various site alternatives were considered. Six (6) potential Quarry sites and eight (8) Borrow Pits sites were identified following a geotechnical desktop study. As majority of the R573 Moloto</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have lived in the area of Rynoue for almost twenty years, and drive on the Moloto road a few times a day. The traffic, especially on a Monday morning, was busy. But since the advent of Covid many people work from home, and will continue to do so as businesses see the benefits thereof, thus the traffic is minimal on the Moloto road. So my question is: “Does the government deem it viable to spend millions, if not billions to upgrade a road whose traffic is a fraction of what it was?” By all means incorporate traffic circles, and maybe widen the road for about two kilometers or so before the intersection of Sefako Makgatho road to accommodate the build-up of traffic there, but even there, the traffic on the road is minimal. (I drive on the Moloto road between Roodeplaar Spar and the China Mall at least four times a day.) And lastly, those involved in civil engineering say that the Moloto road will be upgraded – this is a done deal. I am sure they are not lying when they say so, so my question is: “Why go through the process of listening to the public’s comments, 	<p>Road is bordered by residences or small holdings (extensively inhabited areas in general), areas for safe reliable quarrying were severely limited. Many of the sites were eliminated due to the difficulty in procuring the land and based on the results of the geotechnical drilling.</p> <p>As presented in the EIR, the R573 Moloto Road is one of South Africa’s busiest and most important economic routes connecting Gauteng, Mpumalanga, and Limpopo provinces with an extremely high number of buses and light motor vehicles. The road links small towns and rural settlements with Pretoria and carries inter-district traffic between these locations, hence the road is an important regional mobility function but has an equally significant accessibility function. The Moloto Road Upgrade project is a Strategic Infrastructure Project (SIP). SIP’s are coordinated by the Presidential Infrastructure Coordinating Commission (PICC). The PICC has identified 18 SIPs to regenerate the South African economy. The upgrading of the Moloto Road projects falls under SIP 1: Unlocking the northern mineral belt with Waterberg as the catalyst, which includes the development of a logistics corridor to connect Gauteng with Mpumalanga.</p> <p>The road has been dubbed the “road of death” due to the high number of accidents that has happened on it over the years. In order to address safety, mobility functions and ensure that reasonable access is provided to adjacent properties and areas to enable the future land use development, SANRAL is proposing the upgrade of the R573 Moloto Road.</p> <p>In addition, considering that SANRAL is a state-owned company, all projects that require capital expenditure are scrutinized at every stage of design to ensure that the project will be feasible in its national context.</p> <p>An Environmental Impact Assessment process is undertaken in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998) in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 as amended. Public Participation is undertaken in terms of Section 41 of the NEMA EIA</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>where we feel we have a right to object to what is going on around us, when the government does what it wants?" (I am not being critical or judgmental; I am merely saying what is.)</p> <p>Comment provided on the 28th of June 2021</p> <p>Just resending my comments regarding the construction of the quarry 6B for the upgrade of the Moloto road. My main question is who will compensate the homeowners for the value of their properties should the blasting from the quarry crack the houses foundations and walls of the surrounding communities? That the blasting can deem the surrounding buildings inhabitable is a reality. Years ago, my in-laws stayed in the Delmas region, and the blasting in their area damaged the houses irreparably.</p>	<p>Regulations 2014 ,as amended, and in line with the Directions issues by the Minister associated with undertaking Public Participation during the COVID 19 Pandemic. All comments received from Interested and Affected parties are captured in the Comments and Response Report (Appendix D5) for consideration by the Competent Authority when making a decision on the project.</p> <p>The comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment. A response regarding blasting has been provided under Response 1.</p>
2.2.6	Cecile Swart	<p>I am unfortunately not for the proposed development that you have planned for our area. There is just to much that I cannot stand that will come with your development. The increase in dust will further deteriorate the health of my loved ones that already suffers with damaged lungs. The increase of people into our area which will automatically lead to a higher crime rate. With the amount of traffic that will come with your development it will no longer be save for the any of our children to move around safely. The noise levels will go up and that is definitely not why we live here. This does not even include employment seekers that will swarm our properties yet again leaving us open to crime. This will also severely impact the values of both of my properties that is directly impacted by your proposed development. The impact of your proposed development is just to high for us to accept it any way. There are other options for your road that is just as suitable</p>	<p>GA Environment acknowledges the comments provided and the objection made. The EIR has assessed the potential impacts in terms of dust, noise, traffic and socio-economic that will emanate from the mining activities. Mitigation measures has been provided in the EMPr which is attached to Appendix G of the EIR. The comments provided will be captured in the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Competent Authority to consider in their decision making.</p>

		as your proposed road leading to the quarry that has minimal impact on the surrounding properties. Me and my family therefore are not in favour for you planned development.	
--	--	--	--

Table 2: Comments and responses (Initial notification and Scoping Phase)

	NAME AND SURNAME OF PARTY/PARTIES	COMMENTS/QUESTIONS/CONCERNS	EAP's RESPONSE
3.1 Competent Authority			
3.1.1	Nkosinathi Mahlaba Department of Mineral Resources and Energy	<p>The Scoping Report (SR) and Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment received by this Department on 22 January 2021, refer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Department is satisfied that the abovementioned SR and Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment complies with the minimum requirements of Appendix 2(2) of the EIA Regulations, 2017. The SR is hereby accepted by the Department in terms of regulation 22(a) of the EIA Regulations, 2017. You may proceed with the environmental impact assessment process in accordance with the EIA Regulations, 2017. Kindly ensure that comments from all relevant stakeholders are submitted to the Department with the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR). This includes but is not limited to the Land Claims Commission, Provincial Heritage Resources Authority, Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD), Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF), Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) and the Local Municipality. The listed activities must be described as per the new amendments of the EIA Regulations promulgated on 7 April 2017. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The acknowledgement by the DMRE has been noted by GA Environment. The acceptance of the scoping report has been acknowledged by GA Environment. GA Environment acknowledges the comment provided by the department, and the Environmental Impact Phase of the project will proceed. The comments provided by all stakeholders to date have been captured and responded to in this report. All comments received during the EIR phase of the project will be captured in this report and responded to. The comments have been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment. The stipulated timeframes in terms of the EIA regulations (2014) as amended is acknowledged.

		<p>6. The applicant is hereby reminded to comply with the requirements of regulation 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2017 with regards to the stipulated timeframes for complying with the requirements of the Regulations.</p> <p>7. Furthermore, it must be reiterated that, should an application for Environmental Authorisation be subjected to any permits or authorisations in terms of the provisions of any Specific Environmental Management Acts (SEMA's), proof of such application will be required.</p> <p>8. You are requested to submit three (3) hard copies of the EIAR inclusive of any specialist reports and EMPr and at least one electronic copy, through SAMRAD, of the complete EIAR and EMPr to this Regional Office within 106 days of the date of this letter. The EIAR and EMPr must have been subjected to the public participation process of at least 30 days. Kindly refer to section 24N(2) of the NEMA and Appendix 2, 4 and 6 of the EIA Regulations, 2017 for the minimum requirements set for the aforementioned reports. The public participation process should be conducted as stipulated in chapter 6 of the EIA Regulations, 2017 and taking into considerations any guidelines applicable to public participation.</p> <p>9. Kindly note that acceptance of your scoping report does not grant you a right to commence with the listed activities applied for. Acceptance simply confirms that your application will be processed further in the EIA phase and a recommendation on granting or refusal of an environmental authorisation will be forwarded to the Minister or his delegate for consideration, and the decision will be communicated as stipulated in regulation 4(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2017</p>	<p>7. The comment has been noted and such has been addressed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. As per the assessment undertaken by the EAP, no other authorisations will be required in terms of SeMA's.</p> <p>8. As SANRAL is exempted from the undertaking of a mining right application. During a meeting held with the DMRE on the 15th of October 2020, the DMRE confirmed that hard copies shall be submitted to the department. Three hard copies of the EIR will be submitted to the department. The draft EIR will be issued for public review before final submission to DMRE in accordance with the NEMA EIA Regulations 2014 as amended.</p> <p>9. The comment has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>10. The comment has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>10. Further note that in terms of regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2017, failure to submit the documents or meet any timeframes prescribed in terms of the EIA Regulations, 2017 will result in your application deemed as having lapsed.</p> <p>11. Your attention is brought to Section 24F of the NEMA which stipulates "that no activity may commence prior to an environmental authorisation being granted by the competent authority". Commencement with a listed activity without an environmental authorisation contravenes the provisions of section 24F(1) of NEMA and constitutes an offence in terms of section 49A (1) (a) of NEMA.</p>	<p>11. The comment has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
3.2 Commentary Authority			
<p>3.2.1</p>	<p>Kemmone Mofela City of Tshwane Environmental Planning & Open Space Management Section</p>	<p>1. INTRODUCTION The Environment and Agriculture Management Department (the Department) has considered the Draft Scoping Report in respect of the above-mentioned application. The Draft Scoping Report is submitted to the Environment and Agriculture Management Department of the City of Tshwane, hereafter referred to as 'the City', as a commenting authority as required in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the EIA Regulations of December 2014.</p> <p>2. PROJECT LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION GA Environment (Pty) Ltd has been appointed by South African National Roads Agency SOC Ltd as an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to undertake environmental assessment for the proposed establishment of quarry —to be known as Quarry 6A - on part of the Remainder of the farm Doornpoort 295-JR. The site is bordered by national road N1 in the west, Transnet railway line in the</p>	<p>The background information provided on the proposed Quarry 6A has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>

		<p>north, residential dwelling units in the east and open velds on the south.</p> <p>The site is accessed from the existing railway service road north of the proposed development site and via Maroele road through privately owned land. The total extent of the proposed development measures approximately 603Ha. The proposed development site is located within the area of jurisdiction of the City of Tshwane Metropolitan Municipality.</p> <p>The duration of the proposed development is approximately 6 (six) years from the start of mining activities. The proposed development entails the sourcing of 66 000m³ overburden as well as 114 000m³ crushed G6 material, and 584 000m³G1 material from Norite. The proposed development site will consist of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 1 (Q6ABP1) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 18.74ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 1 (Q6AS1), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area – 19.52ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 2 (Q6ABP2) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 19.81ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 2 (Q6AS2), comprises of a topsoil/overburden stockpile area – 17.98ha; • Quarry 6A Quarry 1 (Q6AQ1), includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 19.46ha; 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarry 6A Quarry Stockpile 1 (Q6AQS1) comprising a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area — 16.83ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 3 (Q6ABP3) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 18.48ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 3 (Q6AS3), comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area — 15.71ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 4 (Q6ABP4) includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets — 19.02ha; and • Quarry 6A Stockpile 4 (Q6AS4), comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area — 8.33Ha <p>According to the report, SANRAL is exempted from applying for a mining right to develop a quarry to extract road construction material. However, application for the clearance of vegetation on a 44hectare site should be applied for and hence the application.</p> <p>The proposed development entails undertaking the following listed activity in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation, 2014, under: Listing Notice 1, GNR 984: Activity 15 and Listing Notice 3, GNR 985: Activity 12.</p>	
		<p>3. KEY FACTORS INFORMING THE COMMENTS</p> <p>In making its comments in respect of the proposed activity the Department has taken, inter alia, the following into consideration:</p>	<p>The key factors considered in informing the comments provided by the City of Tshwane are noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>

		<p>a. The information contained in the Draft Scoping Report dated 18 November 2020 and received by the Department on the 23 November 2020.</p> <p>b. Information obtained from the Departments' s information base including inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic Information System (GIS data). • Gauteng Open Space Plan (GOSP). <p>c. Compliance with applicable Municipal, provincial and national policies and guidelines including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Draft Bioregional Plan for the City of Tshwane; • The Gauteng Agricultural Potential Atlas (GAPA) • The Gauteng Conservation Plan version 3.3 (C PLAN); • The Gauteng Provincial Environmental Management Framework (GPEMF); • The National Environmental Management Act 1998 (Act 107 of 1998) (NEMA): its decision-making principles and Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2017; and • The Tshwane Open Space Framework (TOSF). <p>d. Consultation meeting held on 14 December 2020</p> <p>e. Meeting notes CoT-6A6B — 14.12.2020</p> <p>f. Consent letter (dated 09 July 2020) from landowner, First Land Developments Limited</p>	
		<p>4. DISCUSSION</p> <p>In reviewing the application, the Department made the following findings:</p> <p>a. First Land Developments Limited owns the proposed development site as informed by the Tshwane GIS. A signed</p>	<p>a. The comment has been noted.</p>

		<p>consent letter granting SANRAL permission to only conduct geotechnical investigation on the proposed development site has been shared with the Department. The Department is satisfied with the submission.</p> <p>b. According to Google Earth Imagery (dated 02/08/2002), a quarry was developed on the southern section of the proposed development site wherefrom material were sourced to upgrade the N1 and N4 roads. In response to the enquiry about the difference the choice of site for the proposed development, KBK Engineers indicated that the ridge onsite is good source of G1 material to be utilised as a top layer in the road construction and thus the quarry will be expanded further towards the sourcing of the additional G1 material. Other sections of the sites identified on the layout plan will be quarried for the G5 and G6 material which will be utilised as the founding layers. The Department is stratified with the submission.</p> <p>c. The proposed development is planned on a rock outcrop which will have to be blasted to source the required construction. As a result, the proposed development has high potential noise and visual impacts to the neighbouring N1 road users and neighbouring residential communities. However, KBK Engineers and GA Environment alluded during the consultation meeting that the noise will be kept at acceptable acoustic levels which matches developments of similar nature in the area. The Department request that details about such mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential noise and air pollution should be clearly articulated in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>d. Concerns regarding the impacts of blasting have been raised and addressed as indicated in the report. The report indicates that affected landowners will be consulted prior to blasting commencement. However, potential impacts to the</p>	<p>b. The comment has been noted.</p> <p>c. Potential impacts in terms of dust and noise have been assessed in the Draft EIR report which has been made available to the CoT for review and comment.</p> <p>d. Blasting will be undertaken approximately 480m from the N1. A blast management plan will be compiled prior to blasting on site. The management plan will identify the sensitive receptors and mitigation. Should the blast management plan identify any potential impact on the N1 then SANRAL being the proponent and the custodian of the N1 will follow the required procedures/mitigations.</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>traffic along national road N1 are not satisfactorily addressed by the response. The Department request that details about the traffic impact in relation to the potential blasting should be provided in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>e. During consultation meeting conducted on the 14 December 2020, KBK Engineers indicated that the impending blasting will not result in the splashing of rocks and debris into the air during blasting. GA Environment indicated associated details about blasting will be outlined in the Blast Management Plan which will be incorporated into the EMPR. The Department request that the Blast Management Plan should be included in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>f. According to the Tshwane GIS, a watercourse named Katdoring-loop traverse the southern section of proposed development site. However, the watercourse is not depicted on the hydrological map represented as Figure 12 of the report. Instead, two wetlands located outside the southern section of the site have been delineated. The Department cannot evaluate the potential impacts to the Katdoring-loop subject to the review of the Wetland Delineation and Assessment report.</p> <p>g. The report indicates that no new access roads will be constructed for the haulage of material to their respective destinations. During consultation meeting held on the 14 December 2020, KBK Engineers indicated that the haulage routes will be to the north towards the existing railway line. However, clarity on the positioning of the access road could not be ascertained in light of the proposed borrow pits and stockpile which are planned along the existing access roads. In light of the above, the Department is of the view that on the contrary new access roads outside the proposed borrow pits and stockpiles</p>	<p>e. The condition for the compilation and implementation of a Blast Management Plan has been included in the EIR. A Blast Management Plan can only be compiled once the final layout has been approved and the relevant authorisations/approvals have been obtained eg Environmental authorisation, and finalisation of the land acquisition proves.</p> <p>f. A wetland Assessment has been undertaken by Limosella for the proposed Quarry. According to Limosella, as per the site visit and analysis of aerial imagery a watercourse is not evident on the southern section of the site. However, the specialists have advised that it is possible that a drainage line occurs but that no specialised habitat is associated with the drainage line. It will be appreciated if CoT can provide a location or further details of the Katdoring-loop.</p> <p>g. It is anticipated that no new access roads will be constructed for the haulage of material. It is the intention of SANRAL to use the railway maintenance track towards the north of the site as the main haulage route. The impacts on the haulage of material has been considered in this EIR. In terms of the drainage line situated towards the north of the site, the existing railway line and rail access road traverses the drainage line. No new access roads will be constructed that will traverse the drainage line.</p> <p>However, informal access roads within the project footprint will be constructed (by means of the removal of vegetation) for the</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>areas will have to be planned which negate the assertion that no new access roads will be constructed. The Department request clarity whether or not the proposed access roads will traverse the watercourse on the northern section of the site. Should the road traverse the watercourse, the associated listed activity should be applied for and reflected in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>h. During consultation meeting conducted on the 14 December 2020, GA Environment indicated that a wetland was identified on the northern part of the site. However, the wetland is not delineated in any of the attached maps. The Department cannot evaluate the potential impacts to the watercourse subject to the review of the Wetland Delineation and Assessment report.</p> <p>i. According to the Draft Bioregional Plan for the City of Tshwane, the northern and southern sections of the proposed development is classified as Other Natural Areas. As a result, the site is not earmarked for any biodiversity management and conservation as informed by the Gauteng Conservation Plan (CPLAN). Therefore, the proposed development therein does not conflict with objectives of CPLAN and Bioregional Plan.</p> <p>j. The Gauteng Conservation Plan (CPLAN) and the Draft Bioregional Plan for the City of Tshwane depicts the middle section of the proposed development site classified as an Important Area / Critical Biodiversity Area with a patch of Ecological Support Area. The high ecological sensitivity is attributed to the potential presence of the red data bird habitat and primary vegetation. As a result, this section of the site is earmarked for biodiversity conservation and management.</p>	<p>movement of haul vehicles. Potential environmental impacts associated with the access tracks have been considered in the EIR.</p> <p>h. A Wetland assessment has been commissioned for the proposed Quarry. Kindly refer to the Draft EIR for the delineated watercourses within the study area.</p> <p>i. The comment provided by the CoT has been acknowledged by the GA Environment.</p> <p>j. The comment has been acknowledged. A terrestrial biodiversity assessment has been commissioned for the Quarry. The site sensitivities have been confirmed by the specialist. All mitigations as provided by the specialists has been included in the Draft EIR and EMPr. The EIA has also included the relevant activities in terms of Listing Notice 3 of the EIA regulations (2014) as amended.</p> <p>k. The GPEMF in relation to the site has been included in the Draft EIR, including the need and desirability of the proposed project. The onus is on the DMRE to provide their decision and conditions on the proposed application.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Therefore, the proposed development therein is not aligned with the conservation objectives of CPLAN and Bioregional Plan.</p> <p>k. According to the Gauteng Provincial Environmental Management Framework (GPEMF), the proposed development site is classified as Zone 1: urban development zone with a patch of Zone 2: high control zone within an urban development area. The proposed development is undesirable in these zones. Therefore, the proposed development conflicts with GPEMF's objectives.</p> <p>l. The proposed development site is located within close proximity to the Wonderboom airport as depicted in the Tshwane GIS. As a result, aircrafts are often observed flying at low altitude within close proximity to the proposed development site. However, comments regarding potential aviation-related issues are not sourced from the Wonderboom airport management or the South African Civil Aviation Authority (SACAA). The Department request that the aforementioned parties should be consulted, and their inputs included in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>m. The report indicates that the Transnet Freight Rail was consulted and awaits the receipt of formal wayleave application concerning the proximity of blasting points to the TRF railway line. In addition, the Department request clarity regarding use of railway infrastructure for the haulage of the material emanating from the proposed development site.</p> <p>n. The report indicates that the following specialist studies will be conducted and included in the Draft EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Terrestrial Ecological Assessment 	<p>l. The Wonderboom airport as well as the South African Civil Aviation Authority will be consulted during the EIR phase of the project.</p> <p>m. Transnet has been informed of the proposed project through the public participation undertaken for this EIR. Transnet has acknowledged on the 3rd of December 2020, that they are being notified of the proposed project and it is not a request for approvals. SANRAL will however engage with Transnet as part of the land acquisition discussion.</p> <p>n. The Specialist studies have been conducted as indicated in the Plan of Study.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Wetland and Aquatic Assessment • Heritage Impact Assessment report 	
		<p>5. RECOMMENDATIONS The Department recommends that the following issues be taken into consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Confirmation regarding the absence or presence of Katdoring-loop traversing the southern section of the proposed development should be provided in the Draft EIA report. b. A layout plan should be revised to indicate the location of the watercourses in relation to the proposed development should be designed and included in the Draft EIA report. c. Clarity regarding whether or not the proposed access roads will traverse the watercourse on the proposed development site should be provided in the Draft EIA report. d. Should the planned access road(s) traverse the watercourses on the proposed development site, the associated listed activity should be applied for and reflected in the Draft EIA report. e. Details about such mitigation measures aimed at reducing the potential noise and air pollution should be clearly articulated in the Draft EIA report f. All identified specialist reports should be conducted and included in the Draft EIA report. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Refer to the comment provided in Section 4f. b. The Draft EIR includes the updated layout plan with the delineated watercourses. c. Refer to the comment provided in 4g. d. The comment has been acknowledged and the relevant listened activities for working within close proximity of the watercourse has been included and assessed in the EIR. e. Mitigation measures for potential noise and air pollution has been included in the EIR. f. Specialist reports have in included as Appendix F of the Draft EIR. g. Refer to the comment provided under Section 4C

		<p>g. Clarity regarding use of railway infrastructure for the haulage of the material emanating from the proposed development site should be provided in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>h. Proof of the lodgment of wayleave application with Transnet Freight Rail regarding proximity of blasting points to the TRF railway line should be included in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>i. Comments regarding potential aviation-related issues induced by the proposed development should be sourced from the Wonderboom Airport Management as well as the South African Civil Aviation Authority (SACAA).</p> <p>j. layout plan showing the proposed blasting points in relation to the railway infrastructure should be designed and included in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>k. Clarity regarding the potential impacts and associated mitigation measures regarding the blasting operations in close proximity to the national road N1 should be provided in the Draft EIA report.</p> <p>l. The Blast Management Plan should be compiled and included in the Draft EIA report.</p>	<p>h. Refer to the comment provided in Section 4m.</p> <p>i. Refer to the comment provided in 4l.</p> <p>j. A layout plan for the proposed Quarry is provided in the EIR. As already indicated in the EIR Quarry 6A will include four borrow pits and one Quarry. Blasting will only be undertaken at the Quarry which is approximately 1km away from the Transnet railway line.</p> <p>k. Refer to the comment in 4d.</p> <p>l. Refer to the comment provided in 4e.</p>
		<p>CONCLUSION The Department will provide final comments upon the receipt of the Draft EIA report addressing the above-mentioned recommendations.</p>	<p>The Draft EIR has been circulated to the CoT for comment.</p>

3.2.2	Department of Water and Sanitation Ms Lumka Kuse	<p>1. Background</p> <p>The applicant, South African National Roads Agency SOC Ltd (SANRAL), intends to establish various quarries to provide necessary construction materials for the proposed upgrading of national road R571 — 1 from Stormvoël Road in Tshwane to the Gauteng / Mpumalanga Provincial Border. Quarry 6 A is one of those quarries and is located approximately 2.5 km to the northwest of the R573 Road roadway and immediately northeast of the N1/N4 highway intersection and bordering N1 highway to the east. The proposed quarry and associated borrow pits and stockpile areas are located within the regulated area of a wetland.</p>	<p>The background information provided on the project is noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
		<p>1.1 Watercourses affected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A drainage line and a wetland will be affected by the proposed activities. 	<p>1.1 According to the Wetland Assessment undertaken by Limosella, a drainage line is situated towards the northern boundary of the site. The site layout has been amended, whereby the stockpiles are situated out of the calculated buffer.</p>
		<p>1.2 Documents submitted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description document. • Wetland delineation and assessment report which consists of risk matrix amongst others. • Master layout plan showing proposed location of the proposed activities in relation to delineated watercourses. 	
		<p>2. Summary or Analysis</p> <p>2.1 Stockpile area will be located within a portion of the drainage line.</p> <p>2.2 A generic buffer zone of 30 m based on GDARD requirement has been recommended but not applied as the stockpile area will be placed within the drainage line.</p>	<p>The summary of analysis has been noted and acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>

		<p>2.3 According to the risk matrix, the risk rating is low for all aspects of the proposed activity.</p> <p>2.4 The proposed site where the quarry is located is considered as a potential source of rock material that is required for the proposed road.</p>	
		<p>3. Recommendations</p> <p>3.1 The need and desirability for placing stockpiles within the watercourse is not known as there is sufficient space on site to accommodate the stockpiles without compromising the watercourse. Therefore, instream Water Use (IWU) recommends the following:</p> <p>3.1.1 Stockpiles must be moved outside of the watercourse and its scientifically determined buffer zone.</p> <p>3.1.2 No infrastructure must be placed within the watercourse and its scientifically determined buffer zone.</p> <p>3.1.3 The buffer zone must be scientifically determined to ensure protection of the watercourse. Should the wetland specialist be of the opinion that 30 m buffer is sufficient to protect the watercourse, a motivation must be submitted to support such opinion.</p> <p>3.2 The documentation submitted does not indicate any intention of rehabilitating the site. It must be indicated whether the site will be rehabilitated or not. If yes, a clear rehabilitation</p>	<p>3.1.1 The comment has been noted and acknowledged and the layout has been amended to accommodate the drainage line. The scientifically determined buffer zone has been undertaken by wetland specialist, Limosella Consulting.</p> <p>3.1.2 The layout has been amended to reflect the removal of stockpiles away from the watercourse and the buffer zone has been scientifically determined by the Wetland Specialist.</p> <p>3.1.3 The buffer zone has been scientifically determined by the Wetland Specialist and now included in the wetland assessment report.</p> <p>3.2 A rehabilitation plan has been compiled for the watercourses identified on site. The rehabilitation plan has been included in the Draft</p>

		<p>plan must be submitted. If no, the proposed activities will be considered as fatally flawed.</p> <p>3.3 The risk matrix must be updated as per above points.</p> <p>3.4 Master layout plan must be updated to show the above changes, all infrastructures (inclusive of stormwater management infrastructure) in relation to delineated watercourses, 1:100 year flood lines and scientifically determined buffer zones.</p> <p>3.5 It must be brought to the attention of the applicant that the regulated area of a wetland refers to a 500 m radius from the boundary of any wetland or pan not 500 m from the boundary of the proposed activities / project site. Refer to GN 509 of 2016 for further information about definitions of the regulated areas.</p>	<p>EIR and will be submitted with the DWS submission for the Water Use Authorisation.</p> <p>3.3 The risk matrix has been updated and included in the Wetland Assessment Report.</p> <p>3.4 A master plan has been included in the wetland assessment report.</p> <p>3.5 The comment has been acknowledged by GA Environment. The wetland specialist has amended the project maps showing the 500m radius from the boundary of the wetland.</p>
<p>3.2.3</p>	<p>Provincial Heritage Resource Authority-Gauteng Tebogo Molokomme</p>	<p>Comments received on the 14th of May 2021</p> <p>1. This serves to confirm that the above-mentioned application was discussed by the PHRA-G Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) Committee on Tuesday, 04 May 2021.</p> <p>2. <u>The following recommendations have been made:</u></p> <p>a) A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report should be conducted and should amongst other things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clearly identify and map the heritage resources on the earmarked property/area • give the historical background of the area 	<p>The comments have been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>A Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken by Dr Johnny van Schalkwyk. A copy of the report has been included in the DEIR, which has been made available to PHRAG.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • show how the proposed work might have an impact on heritage resources • outline recommendations and mitigation measures • give a report on the conducted Public Participation process <p>b) The applicant is kindly requested to <u>submit only the requested information</u> and no other reports that need the other authorities' approvals. A hard copy HIA report is therefore requested.</p> <p>3. The requested information will assist the Committee in making an informed decision</p>	<p>The comments have been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p> <p>The comments have been acknowledged by GA Environment.</p>
3.3 General Comments Related to the Project			
3.3.1	<p>Belinda Boshoff Community Member</p>	<p>Email dated 27th July 2018</p> <p>If the road like it is now is going to be used to the quarry, its directly through my property. I am a game and vegetable farmer and the dust from the extra/heavy traffic will severely affect me.</p> <p>My house is also next to the road, so the dust is also going to affect my family.</p>	<p>Haulage of Material</p> <p>Various haulage route options will be considered for the proposed Quarry. Haulage routes will include, the railway maintenance track towards the north of the site, Tamboti Road, Maroela Road, along the proposed PWV2 alignment (adjacent to the Kameeldrift police station) as well as additional internal road links. Public roads that will be used for the haulage of material will be maintained as needed during material production. Upon vacating the quarry sites, public roads that were used for haulage will be maintained one final time and left in an acceptable condition for public use. Haulage of material will be undertaken during the working daylight hours which excludes Sundays. Future Maroela Road upgrades (extent is yet to be determined) and realignment is planned in order to align the road and urban interchange with future road networks will likely commence in 2023.</p> <p>Dust</p> <p>In terms of dust, non-toxic and environmentally friendly dust suppression measures will be undertaken on site and on haulage roads to prevent vegetative dust. Regular dust monitoring will be undertaken on site during the construction and operational phases. Ongoing community forum meetings will be held by the Contractor and the adjacent communities to</p>

		<p>Blasting will also be a problem with the animals on my property.</p> <p>Email dated 26th August 2020 With the proposed mining of these quarries your trucks will have to enter my property and will pass my house that is directly adjacent to the gravel road. This will cause a lot of dust and will cause health issue for all of us. Also, Moroela road is not suitable for heavy traffic daily as it is long overdue for a fill. If the road</p>	<p>present the findings of the monitoring. Considering the long-term viability of the Quarry, the surfacing of the haulage routes will be undertaken as a control measure for dust.</p> <p>Blasting Blasting will be undertaken to loosen bedrock materials prior to being excavated and crushed/processed. This will be undertaken on site, as per the blasting management plan which will be compiled by the Contractor. This will include notification of the nearby affected communities. No blasting will occur on weekends or on Public Holidays or at night. Blast designs and procedures will be developed to keep noise and blasting to a minimum without compromising blast requirements and will consider appropriate drilling grid, charge size, charging plan, blasting ratio, charge stemming and delay interval.</p> <p>Adjacent landowners and businesses will be notified well in advance about blasting activities and appropriate precautionary measures shall be taken. Blasting will be undertaken as per industry standard methods to control the impact of blasting and limit the risk of damage to buildings and structures by reducing blast vibrations induced in the rock mass, eliminating fly rock and limiting air-blast and noise to acceptable levels. The size of explosive charges used for blasting will be optimised so as to balance breaking capacity against minimising any vibration impact and fly-rock. There will be ground vibration likely within at least 500 to 1000m of the blasting zone. Considering the location of the proposed quarry pit areas and their proximity to residential areas, it will be critical that no over-blasting occurs.</p> <p>A response on the haulage of material and dust has been provided above.</p>
--	--	---	---

		situation can be fixed (maintain Maroela and make a plan with the dust at my house) I will not have a problem with this.	
3.3.2	Gonda van Ekeren Community Member	<p>Email dated 31 July 2018 Thank you for the notification we received in our gate last week.</p> <p>We have 2 questions at the moment. When are you intending to start this process of upgrading the Moloto Rd and the R573?</p> <p>As the upgrading and mining will have direct effect on us, can you please let us know if the Maroela Rd and the Lalapalm Rd will be tarred? as there is already a lot of traffic on these gravel roads and a lot of dust in winter times and in summer times a lot of mud.</p>	<p>The proposed upgrading of the Moloto Road will be undertaken in phases. Phase 1 is expected to go out to tender within the fourth quarter of 2021 with the start of construction anticipated in mid-2022.</p> <p>Please refer to response on Section 3.3.1 on issues relating to the haulage of material during the upgrading of the roads</p>
3.3.3	Adri de Kock Community Member	<p>Email dated:31 July 2018 Access to Quarry 6 Concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Condition of Moroela Road and Lalapalm street. We have already a lot of traffic on these roads. As it is it is terrible. Additional trucks will leave us with impossible roads 2. School children: there are several bus stops on the road with children walking next to the road. Lalapalm is dangerous and it will be dangerous for the children. 3. Use of explosives for mining? 4. Dust? <p>I am not against the use of the Quarry but steps must be taken to keep the road in good condition and avoid accidents.</p>	Refer to response on Section 3.3.1 regarding haulage of material, dust and blasting issues.
3.3.4	Rainer Kreft Community Member	<p>Email dated 31 July 2018 I Rainer Kreft object in writing that there will not be making use of the road running through my plot as access to this Quarry the list of reasons why to be set out in points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purely as a safety risk for me and the surrounding owners; 	Refer to response on Section 3.3.1 regarding haulage of material and dust issues.

		<p>2. Road will not be able to hold the traffic (and no future upgrades are in the pipeline or brought to the table before this notice was served);</p> <p>3. Also a health risk it will hold in for my daughter that has asthma as well as allergies for dust;</p> <p>4. Based on the fact that the council stipulated on their website that the road running through his portion is only for residential use and not primary metropolitan distributor.</p> <p>All of the above points will be put in a full report after proper investigation has been done and points will be added if any. These points will also be delivered and given to the necessary departments for further investigations.</p> <p>Email date 9th July 2020</p> <p>The above comments were re-submitted</p>	
3.3.5	Rhona Brooks Community Member	<p>Email dated: 01 August 2018</p> <p>Requested to be registered as an I&AP.</p> <p>Email dated: 12th January 2021</p> <p>If they do the quarry the roads are not appropriate for all the traffic.</p> <p>The roads are very narrow, and in a very bad state, it should be widened and all be tarred</p> <p>There also should be better road signs and also a robot to connect Maroela with the Moloto road,</p> <p>Traffic especially during night times not allowed as it is too dangerous.</p>	<p>Ms Rhonda Brooks has been included on the I&AP database and will be informed of all project developments.</p> <p>Refer to 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of Material</p>

		<p>Numerous school children walking down the road to and from school.</p> <p>No dinamite as this is agriculture and a lot of farm animals.</p> <p>Trust that above will suite your order.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 3.3.1 regarding blasting issues.</p>
3.3.6	<p>Jaap Rademeyer Community Member</p>	<p>Email dated 14 August 2018 Would like to be registered on the Project database? YES</p> <p>Here are a few concerns regarding the opening of the quarry six at Kameeldrift.</p> <p>1.Which roads will be used to access the quarry?</p> <p>2.Please confirm how many Squares the quarry will consist off, L x W x D (Length x Width x Depth);</p>	<p>Mr Jaap Rademeyer has been registered on the I&AP database.</p> <p>1. Refer to response on section 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material;</p> <p>2. The proposed Quarry 6A will include various mining areas that are referred to as Borrow Pits 1, 2, 3, & 4 and Quarry 1. Such referencing has been provided by the Design Engineer for ease of identification of the available material on site. The proposed development of Quarry 6A includes the following proposed mining areas as provided below and in the Scoping report.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 1-includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 18.74ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 1 -comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area – 19.52ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 2- includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 19.81ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 2 -comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area – 17.98ha; • Quarry 6A Quarry 1-includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 19.46ha;

		<p>3.What will be the operational time be for this quarry, will it be months or years?</p> <p>4.From what time will the quarry be opened and closed, or will it be a 24-hour cycle?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quarry 6A Quarry Stockpile 1 -comprising a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area – 16.83ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 3 - includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 18.48ha; • Quarry 6A Stockpile 3- comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area – 15.71ha; • Quarry 6A Borrow Pit 4 - includes a crushing area, a spoil area, a generator and fuel storage area and temporary toilets – 19.02ha; and • Quarry 6A Stockpile 4 - comprises of a topsoil/ overburden stockpile area – 8.33ha. <p>Based on the geotechnical investigation undertaken, the intended depth of the Quarry and Borrow Pits will be approximately 30m. A stepped benched approach will be considered for the mining.</p> <p>3. Approximately 6 years from the start of the mining activities for the required roadworks materials related to the R573-1. The use of the quarry for further road construction projects will be determined at the end of the R573-1 construction. Activities can only commence once all required approvals have been obtained. This includes environmental approvals as well as land acquisition or lease agreements being in place.</p> <p>4. The quarry will be operational from sunrise to sunset Monday to Saturday. Special permission shall be obtained, and prior notification will be undertaken should work be undertaken on Sundays and public holidays.</p> <p>5. The material obtained from the Quarry will be used for the upgrading of the entire Moloto road up to the Mpumalanga boarder which is</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>5. Will this quarry be used for the upgrade for the rest of the Moloto Road?</p> <p>6. How many trucks and the size of the trucks will be used to transport the borrow material?</p> <p>7. Will explosives be used at the quarry?</p> <p>8. Will people staying/living at the quarry for the duration of the work?</p> <p>9. If Maroela Road is used as accessed road, what will be put in place for safeguarding the school pupils that made use of the road as well as what is the plan for action for the trucks to cross or turn right and left into the Moloto Road at the Engen garage?</p> <p>10. The trucks will have a huge impact on Maroela Road and even more on the gravel part of Maroela Road, how will this road be maintained during the duration off the quarry?</p>	<p>approximately 48 kilometres. It is important to note that three other Quarries (Quarries 4 & 5 and 6B) are also proposed by SANRAL for the Moloto Road upgrade.</p> <p>6. The optimum number of trucks allowed on the road per day will be informed by the traffic impact assessment undertaken for the entire Moloto Road upgrade project. The size of the trucks cannot be confirmed at this stage as it will be dependent on the appointed Contractor.</p> <p>7. Explosives will be used for the mining of the Quarry. Refer to response 3.3.1 under blasting.</p> <p>8. A Contractors camp will be set up for the purposes of office facilities. Employees will not be staying on site as the nearest town is within reasonable distance for personnel to travel to site on a daily basis.</p> <p>9. Refer to response on Section 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material. In terms of traffic management on the R573, such will be addressed during the EIA phase of the project. The Contractor will also be required to operate according to the approved Traffic Management Plan.</p> <p>10. Refer to response 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material</p>
--	--	---	---

3.3.7	Christa Droste Community Member	Email dated: 3 August 2018 We have serious problems with the proposed quarry in terms of the roads and the extreme dust and noise levels that will go with the mining.	Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding dust and haulage of material.
3.3.8	Mr Sipiwe Kusana Community Member	Telephonic: 7 August 2018 Mr Kusana requested information on the project as he recently purchased a property in the area. Email dated: 8th January 2021 How is the quarry be ferried from 6B? Are you going to use Maroela Street? If yes, then I request that you minimise the impact your vehicles will have on Maroela Road and the environment around it.	GA Environment provided Mr Kusana with a Background Information Document and his details are now included in the Project database. Refer to response provided under Section 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material.
3.3.9	Jurie Wessels/Marie Wessels Community Member	Email dated: 16 August 2018 I would like to attach my comments regarding the upgrading of Baviaanspoortweg and Stormvoël street. By using Maroela and Lalapalm roads to and from the quarry will create a list of problems for us staying close by, We already have constant problems with Maroela road because the municipality do not keep it in order. It is impossible to keep your vehicle in order during winter or summer that is a disaster. With all the transport expecting going in during your upgrading we foresee big problems for us and the community. Is there a way that they can upgrade Maroela road as well? Email dated: 11th January 2021 Goeie more Ons woon al sedert Oktober 2001 hier in Kameeldrif Oos. Ons woon op plot 858 Kameeldrift Oos en gebruik Maroelaweg daagliks. Daai pad is onbegaanbaar en in erge toe stand ek kan	Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material. Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding the haulage of material.

		<p>net dink hoe dit nog verder gaan versleg sodra. Julle met quarry gaan begin en al daai vragmotors daar op en af moet ry. Die stof is reeds Baie erg in omgewing weens verkeer op Maroelaweg. Hier is skoolbusse en busstoppe vir kinders wat ook groot gevaar inhou sodra verkeer hier gaan toeneem en stof Nog Meer gevaar inhou vir verkeerd en mense wat hier woon.</p> <p>Ek sou dink Dat ons pad naamlik Maroelaweg eers opgegradeer behoort te word voordat tale vragmorors. Met werk by quarry begin.</p> <p>Translation We have been living in Kameeldrif East since October 2001. We stay at Plot No 858 Kameeldrif East and use Maroela Way daily. The road is unusable and in a very bad state and I can only think how it is going to deteriorate when you start with the quarry and all the heavy vehicles will drive up and down on it. The dust in the area is already very bad due to the use of Maroela Way There are school buses and bus stops for children which poses a great threat when the traffic will increase, as well as dust will pose more of a threat for the traffic and people who life here.</p> <p>I would think that our road Maroela Way, should first have been upgraded before numerous heavy vehicles Start with work at the quarry.</p>	
3.3.10	Dawid Fourie Community Member	<p>Email dated: 22 August 2018 Mr Fourie requested to be registered on the I&AP database.</p>	Mr Fourie has been included on the I&AP database and will be informed of any developments regarding the projects
3.3.11	Gideon Fourie Community Member	<p>Email dated: 21 August 2018 Mr Fourie requested to be registered on the I&AP database.</p>	Mr Fourie has been included on the I&AP database and will be informed of any developments regarding the projects.
3.3.12	Raymond Plisic	Email dated 27th July 2020	

	Community Member	Could you please register The Sphinx Farmers Association on the Proposed Mining Quarries 6A and 6B with the upgrade of National Road R 573 (Moloto Road) GAUTENG PROVINCE	Sphinx Farmers Association has been included on the I&AP database and will be informed of any developments regarding the projects.
3.3.13	Mr Theo Strauss Community Member	Email dated 2nd August 2020 Could you send more info please?	A notification letter was made available to Mr Strauss on the 18 th of August 2020. Mr Strauss has been informed of the availability of this Draft scoping report for his comment.
3.3.14	Steven Geldenhuys Community Member	Email dated 10 August 2020 I would like to object to the quarrying of Farm Doornpoort. Could you please send particulars as to how I may officially object?	<p>Your objection has been noted. The Scoping and EIA Process undertaken to seek Environmental Authorisation for the proposed quarries makes provision for public participation, which includes the opportunity for Interested & Affected Parties (I&APs) to raise their concerns. Should Authorisation be granted by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE) for the quarries, all registered I&APs will be granted an opportunity to appeal the decision.</p> <p>Chapter 2 of the National Appeal Regulations 2014 makes provision for any affected person to appeal against the decision. Within 20 days of being notified of the decision by DMRE, the appellant must submit the appeal to the appeal administrator. An appeal panel may be appointed at the discretion of the delegated organ of state to handle the case. The appeal panel will then submit its recommendations to that organ of state for a final decision on the appeal to be reached. GA Environment will communicate the decision of the DMRE and the manner in which appeals should be submitted to the Minister and to all I&APs as soon as reasonably possible after the final decision has been received.</p> <p>The Scoping phase of a project identifies potentially significant environmental issues/aspects for further consideration and prioritization during the EIA stage. Hence the Scoping phase is the first opportunity for the members of the public to provide their comments of the proposed project. All comments provided by the stakeholders, including your objection. is captured in the Scoping report that will be submitted to the</p>

		<p>Will there be blasting; use of explosives to facilitate the quarrying process?</p> <p>What entrance and exit routes will the trucks travel to and from the quarry site?</p> <p>What measures will be taken to prevent the spread of dust during the quarrying process, as well as during the transport of the materials via trucks?</p> <p>Would it not be more viable to decrease the toll fees on the N1 north from the Doornpoort plaza onwards so that more vehicles can make use of this national road, rather than spending billions on revamping the R573? The increased stream of cars on the N1 will make up for this deficit in toll fees, and then one could spend a fraction of the proposed budget to expand the on/off routes to Moloto and extended towns.</p> <p>Email dated 18th August 2020 Thanks for the info.</p> <p>I sent you a mail because I object to the excavation of a quarry on the property across the railway line from me, as this activity will have a direct impact on my life. My question to you is this: "As a citizen of South Africa, do I have a right to object as to what</p>	<p>Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE). The onus is on the DMRE to reject or approve the application.</p> <p>Please refer to response provided on Section 3.3.1 under dust and blasting.</p> <p>Please refer to response provided on Section 3.3.1 under the haulage of material.</p> <p>Please refer to response provided on Section 3.3.1 under dust.</p> <p>Issues pertaining to the control of toll fees within the Doornpoort Plaza are regarded to be outside the scope of the EIA. Fundamental project assessments were undertaken by the Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport and SANRAL to assess provincial and national traffic as well as safety needs prior to commissioning of this project.</p> <p>Mr Geldenhuys was referred to the appeal process detailed above.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>happens around me? And if so, what more can I do to stop the formation of a quarry 200m from my property?"</p> <p>Email dated 25th August 2020</p> <p>Our house is about 200 metres from the proposed quarry site. The use of explosives on the site will no doubt crack the foundations and walls of the dwellings around the quarry site. One cannot really compensate for this calamity as the financial and physical damage to the dwelling makes it obsolete – it becomes worthless. In terms of environmental assessment, how does your department solve such a problem, where years of working to pay off a bond become worthless, as the property is damaged beyond repair by the explosives used as part of the quarrying process?</p> <p>Email dated: 8th January 2021</p> <p>Submitted an appeal to the Department of Environment, Forestry and Fisheries (DEFF) @ AppealsDirectorate@environment.gov.za</p>	<p>Please refer to response provided on Section 3.3.1 on blasting.</p> <p>The comments provided have been received by GA Environment. The email address used: AppealsDirectorate@environment.gov.za is not a GA Environment email address and this email address can only be used for lodging appeals following the issuing of a decision by the Competent Authority. GA Environment are independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners that have been appointed by KBK Engineers on behalf of SANRAL to undertake the Environmental Authorisation application process. The email address that was used is for the National Department of Environment Forestry and Fisheries that provides leadership in environmental management, conservation and protection towards sustainability for the benefit of South Africans and the global community</p> <p>The decision-making authority (Competent Authority) for the proposed Quarries is the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE). The Scoping and EIA Process undertaken to seek Environmental Authorisation for the proposed quarries makes provision for public participation, which</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>The quarry is proposed for material to upgrade the R573 (Moloto road) to accommodate the high volume of vehicle traffic thereon. Since the outbreak of Covid-19, the traffic on the Moloto road is minimal (I travel the road a few times a day). The predictions from the World Health Organisation to manage COVID will be till around 2025, thus there will be no major increase in traffic on the road for the next few years.</p> <p>The nation is suffering from the effects of COVID, as is the economy of South Africa and the world. The billions spent on the upgrade of the Moloto road could and should be better spent on more telling problems at the moment, such as putting food on the table of those who have lost their jobs, and continue to lose their jobs “thanks” to the COVID crisis.</p>	<p>includes the opportunity for Interested & Affected Parties (I&APs) to raise their concerns. Should Authorisation be granted by the DMRE for the quarries, all registered I&APs will then be granted an opportunity to appeal the decision. Currently the project is in the scoping phase and a decision has not yet been reached by the Competent Authority (DMRE). However, your comments provided will be captured and responded to in the Final Scoping Report for the DMRE to provide their decision.</p> <p>Thank you for your valuable input. Fundamental project assessments were undertaken by the Gauteng Department of Roads and Transport and SANRAL to assess provincial and national traffic as well as safety needs prior to commissioning of this project. The upgrade of the Moloto Road is aimed at addressing the safety, mobility functions and to ensure that reasonable access is provided to adjacent properties and areas to enable the future land use development.</p>
3.3.15	Mr Zak Labuschagne Community Member	<p>Email dated 14th August 2020</p> <p>I hereby want to register as an interested and affected party and request that you send me more information regarding the proposed operations and logistics of these potential quarries. I saw your notice by chance today, as it is almost hidden on a portion of road very rarely used by the majority of residents in this area. Please send the information urgently.</p> <p>Email dated 18th August 2020</p> <p>Thank you for the letter.</p>	<p>Mr Zak Labuschagne has been registered as an Interested and Affected Party and his details have been included on the project database. A copy of the notification letter was made available to Mr Labuschagne on the 18th of August 2020 which included a background to the project.</p>

		<p>Please send more information regarding the expected impact on the rural roads in the Kameeldrift and Rynoue agricultural holdings.</p> <p>Which roads will be used to transport the mined aggregate to the construction areas?</p> <p>How many people will be employed by the quarries? Are new residential areas being created for the quarry employees?</p> <p>Please also forward me the list of Interested and Affected Parties currently registered.</p> <p>19th August 2020</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Will there be blasting? 2. What is the life time of the Quarry? 3. Will the rural road network in the Rynoue Agricultural holdings be used for construction and mining vehicles? 	<p>Please refer to the response provided on Section 3.3.1 under haulage of material.</p> <p>Please refer to the response provided on Section 3.3.1 under haulage of material.</p> <p>The number of employees that will be employed at the Quarry is unknown at this stage. However, a Contractor will be appointed by SANRAL to undertake material production and stockpiling. Such contractors generally have skilled or semi-skilled labourers and employ unskilled local labourers for the duration of the crushing contract. The employees will not be staying on site as the nearest town is within reasonable distance for personnel to travel to site on a daily basis.</p> <p>A copy of the Interested and Affected Party database was made available to Mr Labuschagne. However, contact details of all registered I&APs were withheld due to privacy reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blasting will be undertaken for the mining of the Quarries. Please refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 under blasting 2. Approximately 6 years from the start of the mining activities in terms of provision of material for the R573-1 roadworks. The use of the quarry for further road construction projects will be determined at the end of the R573-1 construction. Activities can only commence once all required approvals have been obtained. This includes environmental approvals as well as landowner consent. 3. Please refer to response provided on Section 3.3.1 under haulage of material.
--	--	---	--

		<p>4. Will employees be living on the mining premises?</p> <p>5. What will the operating hours be of the Quarry?</p> <p>6. What will be the intended use of the Quarry once rehabilitation is complete?</p>	<p>4. A Contractors camp will be set up for the purposes of office facilities. The employees will not be staying on site as the nearest town is within reasonable distance for personnel to travel to site on a daily basis.</p> <p>5. The quarry will be operational from sunrise to sunset Monday to Friday. Special permission shall be obtained, and prior notification will be done should work be undertaken on weekends and public holidays.</p> <p>6. The land will be acquired by SANRAL prior to any mining activities. The use of the quarry for further road construction projects will be determined at the end of the R573-1 construction.</p>
3.3.16	Ms Sonja Scheepers Community Member	<p>Email dated 17th August 2020</p> <p><u>Opening Statement</u> With regards to the notice of an environmental impact assessment and water use authorisation process for the proposed mining of quarries 6A & 6B associated with the upgrade of the National Road R573 (Moloto Road) Gauteng Province, <u>I strongly decline</u> and unfortunately <u>do not give my permission</u> or consent for the impact assessment to be conducted.</p> <p><u>The simple reason</u> is, that once this impact assessment has been approved, activities will commence irrespective of the outcome and or proof that the environment will be destroyed. Whilst construction and destruction of the environment continues and claims occur from unsatisfied parties arises, authorities and or affected parties as revealed in the past will always refer to the Environmental impact assessment which will either give permission that such occurrence is irrelevant and or in a previous statement whereby I handed my concern to the proposed Mining will CONCLUDE that no damages to our properties will be done and our property values will NOT decrease, and no dust molecules that would cause health issues will actually do harm.</p>	<p>GA Environment takes note of all comments including those related to matters outside the scope of this assessment. It is important to note that the current Scoping and EIA process is for the proposed mining of Quarries for the upgrade of the existing R573 Moloto Road. The Scoping phase of a project identifies potentially significant environmental issues/aspects for further consideration and prioritization during the EIA stage.</p>

		<p>“Everything will be reasonably controlled and according to such statements has a LOW RISK”. I cannot help but wonder if those individuals who make such statements would like to make an offer to purchase my property whereby a National Road will run in front of my gate? How can they conclude that a road on your doorstep will not decrease your property value? Who in their right mind would exchange beautiful sunset scenery for a project of mining activities with dust, smoke and an unbearable smell facing and make part of your front yard?</p> <p>I challenge any of those individuals who make such statements to make me an offer to purchase my property. Better yet. If this was your property and I decide to continue with these projects, would you feel that your properties value will increase? In the morning I hear nature greets me, and now you expect me to approve your impact assessment and to approve for your activities to commence by allowing a greeting of cars, and a noisy road in the morning? I purchased this property to be close to nature and enjoy the quietness thereof, not to allow affected parties to change my quality of life on my behalf. <u>Where and what happened to our human rights as individuals, to protect our property and quality of life?</u></p>	
		<p>Whilst our general citizens think we understand and or want to be made to believe that the purpose and aim of the Environmental impact assessment is there to identify and assess the potential environmental impacts that may arise as a result of the proposed mining of materials for the proposed upgrading of the road, this assessment has a far larger and complicated impact and power than what we as citizens are made to believe, by your authorities and or affected parties.</p> <p>How can the GA Environment and or the affected parties even consider and or publicly announce this notice of an assessment, if both quarries are situated on privately owned land and the consultation with the potentially affected landowners has not yet been finalized? In fact it is still “underway”?</p>	<p>Your comment regarding “both quarries are situated on privately owned” land bears reference. The applicant, SANRAL, requires confirmation that the proposed Quarry site is environmentally feasible before they can start to engage with the landowners regarding the land acquisition. The public participation process and ultimately the environmental approval by the DMRE (if granted) is by no means the final approval for SANRAL to start to mine on the property. It only allows SANRAL to proceed with coming to an agreement with the landowner. The landowners for Quarry 6A & 6B have been notified of the proposed project and meetings are currently underway.</p>

		<p>This action to continue with the notice whilst an official agreement has not yet been concluded proves, that irrespective of the consequences and the damage these proposed mining of Quarries 6A & 6B will have, that the environmental impact assessments (individually or not) will continue. This environmental impact assessment is just another official legal binding formality that has to take place in order for the main purpose of the proposed mining and the upgrade of the Moloto Road to continue.</p>	
		<p>It is clear from previous environmental assessments in the past, that the GA environment is not for the protection of our environment but are forced and obliged to be manipulated by Parliament/Government to give way to their continuous destruction of our country and environment.</p>	<p>GA Environment has been appointed by KBK Engineers on behalf of SANRAL as independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners in terms of National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998), Regulation 13 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (EIA) 2014 as amended. A declaration of interest as required in terms on NEMA has been completed by the Environmental Assessment Practitioner and included in the Scoping report.</p>
		<p>In your letter of notice you mentioning “Rehabilitation of affected areas will be undertaken following the completion of the mining activities”. Once again...you continue with your “PROPOSED MINING ACTIVITIES” as if it is a done and finalized matter between the landowners who’s privately owned land you want to use to destroy our environment, which has not yet been <u>finalized</u>. Furthermore you state that, “In <u>some cases</u>, there <u>may</u>, be a requirement for a final environmental audit covering the extend of the project”. Very “profound” words to confuse and mislead our ordinary citizens who does not have a degree in LAW and or understand the consequences of words such as “Some cases and or “May”. Unless this statement changes to “a Final environmental audit will be submitted to cover the extend of the project”, your statement above has no interest to prepare such audit, which is just another “short cut” to get this project to commence.</p>	<p>Your comment regarding the “Rehabilitation of affected areas will be undertaken following the completion of the mining activities” bears reference. Your comment is noted and GA Environment acknowledges that the statement regarding rehabilitation and final environmental audit should have read “<i>if the proposed project be authorisation rehabilitation will be undertaken</i>”. It is important to note that the main objective of EIA process is to obtain the required Environmental Authorisation from the Competent Authority (i.e. Department of Mineral Resources and Energy), before activities commence. The process aims to identify and assess potential environmental impacts associated with the activities of the development; as well as any alternatives to the development / activity and to compile appropriate mitigation measures. The statement regarding rehabilitation and final environmental audit was to merely notify Interested and Affected Parties that should the proposed project be authorisation rehabilitation will be undertaken.</p>

		<p><u>Please find further reasons for not agreeing that the impact assessment continues, and or the proposed project.</u></p> <p><u>No Consultation</u> I received no consultation, notices, letters, maps, alternative amendments and or documents from the deeds offices or any affected parties explaining the affect the servitude or the impact it would have when I purchase my property, 5 years ago. If I received consultation and it was explained to me that this property would be in front of a National Road and that my front door would face a mining site, I would most definitely not have bought this property. In fact, no one would have bought it.</p>	<p>GA Environment is unable to comment on the procedures of the Deeds office.</p>
		<p><u>Traffic Pollution causes health issues</u> Living near a road with heavy traffic is risky compared with being in other places in a community. Growing evidence shows that many different pollutants along busy roads is higher than in the community as a whole, increasing the risk of harm to people who live near busy roads. America been a first world Country and the leaders of all nations conducted a study in January 2010, whereby the Health Effects Institute published a major review of the evidence put together by a panel of expert scientists. The panel looked at over 700 studies from around the world, examining the health effects of traffic pollution. They concluded that traffic pollution causes asthma attacks and a wide range of other effects including the onset of childhood asthma, impaired lung function, premature death and death from cardiovascular diseases and cardiovascular morbidity. <u>The area most affected, they concluded, was roughly the band within 0.2 to 0.3 miles (300 to 500 meters) of the highway.</u></p>	<p>Based on the proposed mining of Quarries 6A & 6B, the proposed project will include the haulage of material to and from site. A Traffic Management Plan will be compiled by the appointed contractor whereby the total number of haulage vehicles will be controlled per day. An Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) will be compiled during the EIA phase of the project. The EMPr will set out actions, responsibilities and schedules for the implementation of mitigation measures including traffic pollution.</p>

		<p>A Danish study found that long-term exposure to traffic air pollution increase the risk of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD). They found that those most at risk were people who already have asthma or diabetes. Studies have found increased risk of premature death from living near a major highway or an urban road.</p> <p>Research, found that adults living within 300 - 500 meters risk dementia and having poor cognition.</p>	
		<p><u>Climate and environmental damages / changes</u> Increase in vehicles will result in increased pollution and increased carbon emissions and detrimental to climate change. Therefore I plea to the respective interested and affected parties to Stop destroying our environment, especially relatively to bird species (threatened or otherwise), other animal species: amphibians, reptiles, mammals & invertebrates.</p>	<p>The current Scoping and EIA process is for the clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with the proposed mining of borrow material on Quarry 6A & 6B associated with the upgrade of National road R573 (Moloto road). The Scoping phase of a project identifies potentially significant environmental issues/aspects including air quality impacts for further consideration and prioritization during the EIA stage. During the EIA phase independent specialists assessment will be commissioned to further assess all the potential impacts of the proposed activities. The findings of the specialist assessment will be detailed in the EIA report which will be made available to the public for review and comment and to the DMRE for decision making.</p> <p>The administration and management of the identified mitigation measures (by specialists and as identified as part of the EIA) will be facilitated by means of the Draft EMPr to be submitted to the competent environmental authority (DMRE). The approved EMPr will become a legally binding document should the proposed project be authorised.</p>
		<p><u>Mist levels</u> At high altitudes, the mist levels become thick and almost impenetrable; this poses a major safety threat on roads high wind levels pose threats in terms of expropriation of land.</p>	<p>The project is not located on high altitudes that will commonly experience misty events. Although occasionally misty events will occur, it is not expected to occur frequently. Mist is a natural phenomenon, it is not anticipated that the proposed mining activities will alter the mist levels within the proposed study area.</p>

		<p>Noise Traffic noise is a concern for landowners/farmers residing within close proximity of the proposed road and the perceived impact on livestock feeding patterns. Roads have an indirect impact through the noise and movement that they introduce into an area. This can be significant in areas where species that are sensitive to such disturbances are present within wetlands (or any other habitat in close proximity to the road).</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the haulage of vehicles will result in noise related to traffic. A Traffic Management Plan will be compiled by the appointed contractor whereby the total number of haulage vehicles will be controlled per day. An Environmental Management Programme will be compiled during the EIA phase of the project. The EMPr would set out actions, responsibilities and schedules for the implementation of mitigation measures including noise pollution.</p>
		<p>Closing A qualified unbiased archaeologist and heritage specialist must be appointed to identify and assess potential archaeological sites and material, and other resources such as graves. <i>I request the right to conduct my own investigation and credibility of such individuals appointed.</i> Decisions taken up to 15 years ago cannot be up to date anymore because our Country has changed and it is clear that increasing carbon emissions is very detrimental to our climate and the wellbeing of all living creatures on this planet. The decision taken up to 15 years ago to build a road in front and through my property should be investigated, reviewed and removed by the registrar Deed’s offices from my property. This property was registered for agricultural purposes <u>NOT a NATIONAL Road?</u> South Africa has signed several agreements on international level and agreed to take great effort to reduce such emissions (NOT INCREASE IT). The upgrade of the National Road R573 (Moloto Road) is diametrical to this, and therefore contradict South Africa’s responsibility to fulfill this international agreement. I therefore require the right for actual evidence and proof of statistics to be made public to all interested parties that this road will in fact reduce such emissions and not increase it.</p>	<p>The plan of study for the Environmental Impact Assessment is prepared to meet the requirements for a plan of study as prescribed in Regulation 22 (a) and Appendix 2 (2)(i) of Government Notice R982 promulgated in terms of chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No 107 of 1998). The specialist assessment identified thus far includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Impact Assessment; • Wetland and Aquatic Assessment; • Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment. <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken by an independent specialist Dr Johnny van Schalkwyk. The Curriculum Vitae of the specialists are available upon request.</p> <p>It is a fundamental principle that sustainable development requires consideration of the social, economic and environmental impacts of an activity. The promulgation of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) enshrines the principles of Sustainable development. In terms of the current EIA process impacts emanating from the planning, design, construction, and operation will be undertaken with a sustainable concept in mind. These will be fulfilled as Specialists assessments taking cognisance of the potential impacts within the ambits of the pillars of sustainability will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA process.</p>

		<p>Without prejudice</p> <p>I as the owner shall not be liable for any damage, including consequential loss or damage whether direct or indirect, which might be caused to the applicant’s service during the environmental impact assessment or the <u>proposed</u> mining of Quarries 6A & 6B, associated with the upgrade of National Road R573 (Moloto Road).</p> <p>The APPLICANT, affected, interested and or third parties shall and hereby does indemnify me as the owner against any damage to my property, whether movable or immovable, including any consequential damage directly flowing from physical damage to my property, as well as any legal costs of any of the foregoing; whenever such damage, injury or death is due to or arises out of the construction, or existence of the WORKS or any portion thereof, or the use thereof by the APPLICANT.</p> <p>I shall notify the APPLICANT forthwith of the occurrence of any damage, and or claim(s) against which the APPLICANT is liable to indemnify me, in respect of such claim or demand abide by the directions of the APPLICANT as to whether and on what terms it shall be settled, compromised or contested, it being understood and agreed that whatever action may be taken by myself pursuant to such directions of the APPLICANT shall be at the APPLICANT’s risk and expense.</p> <p>This will included but not be limited from health issues, property damage, increase on my bond insurance and or environmental changes directly or indirectly. This condition includes the construction of the applicant’s service across my properties servitude/s and I do not grant you the right to do any excavations in future for repair or maintenance purposes. Should such future excavations within the servitude area/s of my property be necessary, permission will have to be requested timorously and in writing to myself.</p> <p>Email dated: 16th January 2021</p>	<p>The proposed road upgrade will improve the condition of the existing Moloto road and road safety. Mitigation measures on the negative impacts from the use of this road will be assessed and included in the draft EIR that will be compiled. This road will also benefit all road users and to the local community in particular. Before construction, a baseline study will be undertaken to look at the existing structures and infrastructures within the project footprint. A forum between the local Residents Association and the main contractor will be established. A Community Liaison Officer will also be appointed by the Contactor, to manage communication between the community and the Contractor.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Unfortunately, I am not for the proposed development, and cannot give my consent. There are too many negative elements such as (dust, health, noise, traffic) which will affect the value of my property and the health of myself and my farm animals. I am also not willing to take any responsibility for the damage which will be caused by this project to my property, irrespective of the precautions that might be considered to adhere to.</p> <p>The "no comment" as to why no authority consulted me when I purchased my property about the servitude is not acceptable, as no person would have wanted to purchase a property where a national road would be build.</p> <p>Regretfully my answer is not in favour of this project. This is my final comment.</p>	<p>GA Environment acknowledges your comments made regarding the proposed Quarries. Your comments provided have been captured in this report for the consideration of DMRE as the Competent Authority. The environmental elements, as well as damage to your property has been addressed in your submission dated 17th August 2020. You have an opportunity to appeal the Decision from the DMRE in line with the National Appeal Regulations 2014 (as amended) as soon as the Decision is Issued by DMRE.</p> <p>As provided in your previous submission, GA Environment is unable to comment on the internal process of the deed's office. Such comment falls out of the Scope of Work for the proposed Quarries.</p> <p>GA Environment acknowledges your comment provided. You have an opportunity to appeal the Decision from the DMRE in line with the National Appeal Regulations 2014 (as amended) as soon as the Decision is Issued by DMRE.</p>
3.3.17	Mr Skosana, Sipiwe Community Member	<p>Email dated 19th August 2020</p> <p>Hi Kirthi and thanks for sending us this update. Which road names from Maroela Road is 6A going to be accessed</p>	<p>Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding haulage of material.</p>
3.3.18	Mr Tom Muller Community Member	<p>Email dated 26th August 2020</p> <p>Please provide me more detail on the Proposed Quarry</p> <p>As we live on Maroela road that will possibly be used to access the quarry 6A. The road is already in a Very Bad state. What would be done regarding the additional heavy duty traffic on the road and the safety of the intersection with R573, very accident prone.</p>	<p>A notification letter was made available to Mr Muller on the 5th of October 2020.</p> <p>Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding haulage of material.</p>

		<p>What would the impact be on Ground water as this will effect our Agriculture in the Area.</p> <p>Your response regarding the above will be appreciated.</p> <p>We stay at 47 Maroela ave, Kameeldrift East.</p>	<p>According to KBK Engineers and as far as could be determined, there are no active boreholes in the immediate vicinity of the proposed quarry pit areas. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, a baseline study will be undertaken to look at the existing structures and infrastructures within the project footprint. Blasting activities will then be designed accordingly. The size of explosive charges used for blasting (if required) shall be optimised so as to balance breaking capacity against minimising any vibration impact.</p>
3.3.19	<p>Councillor Freddie Pienaar (Ward 87 CoT) Ward Councillor</p>	<p>Focus group meeting held on the 2nd of July 2020</p> <p>Blasting could be a concern as the adjacent plots are currently using groundwater. What is be the radius of the potential impact.</p> <p>Dust will be a problem for the haulage of vehicles.</p> <p>Community upliftment in the area, e.g., re-gravelling of the Road, look at providing the CoT with G5 for upgrading of the CoT roads. Community upliftment and Job creation is important.</p>	<p>Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding blasting issues.</p> <p>Refer to response provided in Section 3.3.1 regarding the dust issues.</p> <p>In terms of community development, SANRAL has procedures in place in accordance with National Treasury regulations and requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community Development Projects (CDPs) will be identified and included within the larger project, which will include works for smaller contractors only (with lower CIDB grades); and 2. Contract Participation Goal (CPG) targets will be applicable to each construction project, which will require the Contractor to utilize local labour, sub-contractors and suppliers relative to the total Contract value.
3.3.20	<p>Johannes PJ Labuschagne Ward Councillor</p>	<p>Email dated: 15th September 2020</p>	

		I oppose the planned Quarry as it will have a negative impact on the environment and the community of Rynoue.	A response regarding the appeal process and the objectives of the scoping process is provided in response in Section 3.3.14.
3.3.21	Councillor Hannes Coetzee (Ward 96) Ward Councillor	<p>Focus group meeting held on the 2nd of July 2020</p> <p>A township application has been submitted to CoT for the proposed site earmarked for mining activities. Required clarity regarding the intended use of the site. The township establishment will create jobs in the area.</p> <p>What type of backfilling will be used once the mining activities has been concluded? As the site has been earmarked for township development</p> <p>The site is environmentally sensitive, and blasting will be a concern.</p>	<p>Permission was granted to undertake materials investigations on both sites without any indication that township applications were lodged prior to granting consent. Proof of an application for residential township establishment must be provided as part of the land acquisition negotiations that is ongoing. No quarry operations will be established prior to the completion of the land acquisition process.</p> <p>Final layout and cover material as part of the rehabilitation of the quarry will only be determined towards the decommissioning stage of the quarry life cycle at the end of the project construction. All rehabilitation works will need to be approved by the DMRE.</p> <p>As per the Plan of Study provided in the Draft Scoping report, a Wetland assessment as well as a Terrestrial Biodiversity Assessment will be undertaken as part of the EIR phase.</p>
3.3.22	Modipadi Maboko Transnet	<p>Email dated 19th August 2020</p> <p>Modipadi provided a response from Transnet Freight Rail regarding the project.</p> <p>'The attached notification from SANRAL and TFR requirements dated 01 July 2016 now attached, refers.</p> <p>From Transnet site, they must submit their official application with clear indications on what will the nearest distances be between the blasting points on site to our TFR railway line, together with all drawings, aerial photos, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed 6A borders the Transnet railway line. The site layout plan has been presented in Appendix C of the Scoping report. The project engineers (KBK Engineers) and SANRAL will undertake consultation with Transnet regarding the proposed Quarry and the requirements for blasting.</p>

		<p>Once received, the application can be evaluated and TFR will submit our comments, requirements and specifications on the proposed blasting.</p> <p>Email dated: 3rd December 2020 Your notification as here under, refers and has been discussed with my Depot Engineer. As this is only an notification and not any Application to do any work near the TFR railway line, we will not respond at this stage.</p> <p>Will wait for your official Application with full detail to do any work near the TFR railway line on when we will then provide our full official comments, requirements and specifications.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please, for your further attention for now, find the following TFR Guidelines and Specifications; • Specification E7/2. • Safety Specification E4e, and • TFR Blasting guidelines for blasting closer than 500m from TFR railway lines. 	<p>GA Environment acknowledges the comments provided by Transnet. The project is in the scoping phase and the layout plans is yet to be approved by the DMRE. Once the relevant approvals have been obtained for the project, the applicant SANRAL will submit a formal application for work to be undertaken within close proximity of the railway line. Thank you, we have however take note of the requirements and specifications provided.</p>
3.3.23	<p>Ben Molleman City of Tshwane: Roads and Transport Department</p>	<p>Email Dated: 11th January 2021 I perused the documents received from your office.</p> <p>This Section hereby confirms that it has no comments on the application and support the proposed development.</p>	<p>The comments provided has been acknowledged by GA Environment. The Comments provided have been captured in this report for the DMRE's consideration.</p>
3.3.24	<p>Solomon Maruma Department of Land Reform and Rural Development</p>	<p>We confirm that there are land claims against the properties as per attached list. It should be noted that the claims were received during two lodgment periods and as a result different requirement will be applicable. The first lodgment period</p>	<p>GA Environment acknowledges the comments provided by the Department of Land Reform and Rural Development. The Department will be kept informed on the progress of the project. The comments will also be captured in the EMPr which will form part of the EIA phase. Should the required approvals be obtained by SANRAL, SANRAL will notify the</p>

		<p>closed on the 31st of December 1998 and the 2nd lodgement period was from the 1st of July 2014 to the 27th of July 2016.</p> <p>Claims lodged during the first lodgement period were lodged in terms of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 (Act No. 22 of 1994) and claims lodged during the 2nd lodgement period were lodged in terms of the Restitution of Land Rights Amendment Act, 2014 (Act No. 15 of 2014) ("the Amendment Act") which, amongst others, reopened the lodgement of claims for a period of five years.</p> <p>The claim/s lodged during the first lodgement period were lodged by Mahlanqu MJ before 31 December 1998 and the claim/s lodged during the second lodgement period were lodged by Fakude Sibusiso Micheal and others as per attached list from the 1st July 2014 to 27th July 2016.</p> <p>With regard to the claims lodged before the 31st of December 1998 by Mahlanqu MJ, we confirm that the claims have been accepted by the Regional Land Claims Commissioner as compliant with the requirements of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994. As a result, you need to comply with section 11 (7) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 by informing (giving one month's notice) to the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights before you sell, exchange, donate, lease, subdivide, rezone or develop the property.</p> <p>With regard to the claim lodged during the 2nd lodgement period by Fakude Sibusiso Micheal and others, the validity of the Amendment Act was challenged in the Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court found the Amendment Act to be invalid because of the failure of Parliament to facilitate public involvement as required by the Constitution. The Amendment Act ceased to be law on 28 July 2016.</p>	<p>department 30 days prior to the commencement of construction activities and this requirement will be included as a condition of approval in the Environmental Impact Report that will be submitted to the Competent Authority..</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>The Constitutional Court ordered that the claims that were lodged between 1 July 2014 and 27 July 2016 are validly lodged, but it interdicted the Commission from processing those claims until the Commission has finalised the claims lodged by 31 December 1998 or until Parliament passes a new law providing for the re-opening of lodgement of land claims. Parliament was given until 27 July 2018 to pass such a law.</p> <p>Parliament has so far not been able to pass new legislation and has instead approached the Constitutional Court for an extension until 29 March 2019 and the application was rejected. As a result the Commission will, unless directed otherwise until by the Constitutional Court, not be processing claims lodged between 1 July 2014 until 27 July 2016 2016 until all the claims lodged on or before 31st December 1998 are finalised and or a new Act is passed by Parliament and signed into law by the President. In the meantime, the Commission through the Chief Land Claims Commissioner has been ordered to report the progress of all the outstanding land claims on six months basis for monitoring by the court. The Commission will communicate widely once we have been granted permission to begin dealing with these claims lodged during the 2nd lodgement period. It is important to note that the provisions of section 11 (7) of the Restitution of Land Rights Act, 1994 do not apply to claims lodged during the 2nd lodgment period until after the Commission has accepted the claim for investigation and published its details in the Government Gazette. That will only be done on the happening of the event in the previous paragraph.</p> <p>For further enquiries please contact Solomon Maruma at solomon.marumandr@dlr.gov.za , telephone 012 310 6588 Edith Mokgoko at Edith.mokgokoR@dlr.gov.za , telephone 012 310 6573.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Email Dated 2nd September 2020</p> <p>Please note that you are only required to give 30 day notice to the Commission before starting with the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For Remainder of the Farm Doornpoort 295 JR, please address your notice to Mr Ramere Serumula on Ramere.Serumula@drdlr.gov.za For Portion 2 Jakkalsdans 243 JR, please address your notice to Mr Lucas Monokoane at Lucas.Monokoane@drdlr.gov.za 	
3.3.25	<p>P B Murray</p> <p>Murray INC Attorneys on behalf of the landowner, First Land Development</p>	<p>1. We refer to the draft scoping report ("<i>the DSR</i>") that you prepared for South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited dated 18 November 2020 relative to the quarry which you designate as Quarry 6A.</p>	<p>1. GA Environment acknowledges reference made to the Draft Scoping report that was issued out for stakeholder review and comment.</p>
<p>2. We represent First Land Development Limited, the owner of the study area, being the Remainder of the Farm Doornpoort No. 295 JR.</p>		<p>2. GA acknowledges that First Land Development will be represented by Murray INC Attorneys.</p>	
<p>3. Our client has instructed us that, having perused the DSR, our client has the following comments and submissions relative to same:</p> <p>3.1. The comment in made on page 22 of the DSR that an Air Emission Licence is not required as it is anticipated that dust that will be released will be managed through the National Dust Control Regulations (2013). Given that the burning of diesel will be an important component of the crushing of unprocessed bedrock, does this statement hold true?</p>		<p>3.1 Based on the information provided, An Air Emission Licence is not required as the anticipated dust that will be released will be managed through the National Dust Control Regulations (2013). The principles provided in Section 32 and 34 of the Act will be included into the EMPr during the EIA phase, in order to manage and minimise dust and noise related activities generated during the construction and operational phase of the project.</p> <p>It is further acknowledged that depending on the volumes of diesel that may be required during the construction phase of the project, diesel tanks may require an Air Emission Licence be obtained before installations. According to the Air Quality Act "All permanent immobile tanks liquid storage facilities at a single site with a combined storage capacity of greater than 1000m³" require an Air Emission Licence. It is unlikely that</p>	

			<p>the development will install tanks above the listed activity thresholds 1000m³ thus no Basic Assessment or Scoping/EIA will be triggered. Should this be required an AEL will be lodged with the relevant Competent Authority.</p>
		<p>3.2. On page 23 of the DSR you refer to the Gauteng Conservation C-Plan and you make the following comments in respect of the C-Plan: "According to the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (G.DARD) Conservation Plan data, the central portion of the study area is associated with a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), and a portion of the study area along the northern boundary is indicated to fall within an ESA. A Terrestrial Ecological Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase of the project. The findings of the study as well as the specialist recommendations will be provided to the EIA in the report." Please provide us, on behalf of our client, with a copy of the draft Terrestrial Ecological Assessment as soon as same is available as our client might have comments on the draft report which should be incorporated before same is made available for general circulation</p>	<p>The Terrestrial Ecological Assessment will be made available for comment during the EIA phase of the project. The EIA phase is undertaken subsequent to the Scoping Phase and once acceptance of the Final Scoping Report has been received from the DMRE. The Terms of Reference for the proposed study has been included in the DSR.</p>
		<p>3.3 Will a major hazard installation licence be required for the storage of on-site diesel?</p>	<p>In terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act (85 of 1993), Major Hazard Installation Regulations (GNR 692, 30 July 2001), any use or ancillary activity that involves the storage or keeping of hazardous substances that may result in an installation being declared a major hazardous installation in terms of occupational health and safety law is not permitted, unless a risk management and prevention plan has been submitted by the owner, and the City has given approval thereto. It cannot be confirmed within the Environmental scope work if diesel storage will be undertaken on site and if such constitutes a Major Hazardous Installation.</p> <p>However, such will be further assessed in the EIR phase of the project and conditions regarding the appointment of a Health and Safety Specialists and adherence to the conditions of the City of Tshwane Fire Brigade Service bylaws will be addressed in the EMPr during the EIA phase.</p>

		<p>3.4. On page 44 of the DSR the statement is made that a Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase of the project. Please provide us, on behalf of our client, with a copy of the draft Heritage Impact Assessment Report as our client might have comments in respect of same prior to the general circulation of the report.</p>	<p>The Heritage Impact Assessment will be made available for comment during the EIA phase of the project. The EIA phase is undertaken subsequent to the Scoping Phase and once acceptance of the Final Scoping Report has been received by the DMRE. The Terms of Reference for the proposed study has been included in the DSR.</p>
		<p>3.5. Will any of the applicants' specialist consultants require access to the site during the EIA phase? If so, arrangements need to be made with our client.</p>	<p>The comment is acknowledged by GA Environment. Prior arrangements will be made through the landowner.</p>
		<p>3.6. On page 49 of the DSR you identify potential impacts that have been identified in the Scoping Phase. Please add to this list the social urban impact which encompasses the fact that land which would have been used for residential and mixed used township development will no longer be available for same.</p>	<p>The potential loss of urban development areas has been included under Table 10 and 11 and will be assessed during the EIA phase.</p>
		<p>3.7. In your list of the legislation, which is applicable to the proposed project, you do not mention the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act No. 70 of 1970. As the proposed activity will take place on part of an existing farm portion, there will either have to be a subdivision or the granting of a long lease over the study area. Please can you advise whether SANRAL is exempt from obtaining Act 70 of 70 approval or is this a further approval which will have to be obtained by SANRAL?</p>	<p>GA Environment acknowledges the comment provided. Your comment has been forwarded to SANRAL to confirm the applicability and exemptions in terms of the Agricultural Land Act No. 70 of 1970. A formal response will be provided once feedback from SANRAL has been received.</p>
		<p>3.8. We refer to the diagrammatic presentation of the environmental process set out on pages 60 and 61 of the DSR. What is missing from this process flowchart is the timing and nature of the agreements to be concluded between the landowner (our client) and SANRAL. SANRAL should, as soon as possible, consult with our client regarding negotiations aimed at acquiring the land on which the quarry activities will take place. The land sale agreement to be concluded between our client as seller and SANRAL as purchaser (if same can ultimately be concluded) will contain clauses dealing with the agreement between the seller and purchaser regarding various important legal aspects that have not been dealt with in the DSR</p>	<p>It is important to note that a land acquisition process can only commence once the Environmental approvals have been obtained. The land acquisition process is undertaken by SANRAL's property service provider. The comment has been forwarded to SANRAL for a further response. A formal response will be provided once feedback from SANRAL has been received.</p>

		4.	Please acknowledge receipt hereof.	The comments provided was acknowledged on the 20 th of January 2021. Proof of such is included in Appendix D7.
--	--	----	------------------------------------	---

3 SUMMARY COMMENTS AND CONCLUSION

The comments captured in this report were obtained during the Notification Phase , review of the Draft Scoping report and Draft EIR. The comments received highlights community issues ranging from the routes that will be used for the haulage of material, impacts from blasting activities on site, groundwater, as well as dust and noise pollution. All comments received have been captured and responded to in this report. Some of the I&APs have objected to the proposed developments based on the issues highlighted above.