

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr David Potter

Date 2021/07/01 Method Email

Comment

Hi there Thank you. I did post to the Bordeaux North Residents Association group and asked them to share on. Will share the advert when you send it next week. Mr Potter also provided contact details of other interested and affected party he was aware of.

Response

Clr Potters correspondence was noted and the potential I&APs were added to the projects database.

Ms Ria Barkhuizen

Date 2024/01/23 Method Email

Comment

Please supply SANRAL with an A4 locality map as well as GPS co-ordinates pertaining to your application. Maps and GPS co-ordinates together with the whole application can be emailed to nrstat@nra.co.za

Response

I&AP was provided with requested information, that is, site plan. See proof of correspondence.

Date 2024/01/30 Method Email

Comment

Please supply motivation memorandum as well

Response

Good morning Ria, Thaks for the message. We do not specifically have a 'Motivational Memorandum'. This application is for an Environmental Authorisation. The project background is provided in the Basic Assessment Report available on our website. Please advise if you have any other specific queries or concerns?

Date 2024/02/01 Method Email

Comment

Good day This email is an acknowledgement of receipt for your enquiry. Please note that in line with requirements of Section 29 of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act (Act No 16 of 2013) read with Section 3 of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (Act No 3 of 2000) SANRAL have 30 days to acknowledge receipt of your application and 90 days to evaluate and provide response. Should you not receive any response within 120 days, kindly follow up on the enquiry by responding to Jan Oliver who will be dealing with it and will convert back to you. He can be contacted on (012) 426-6242 / Cell 081 010 6403.

Response

No response required - Acknowledgement of receipt

Date 2024/02/05 Method Email

Comment

Response

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Ms Ria Barkhuizen

Please find attached SANRAL's comments. Please note for any new applications and request for comments, use NRStat@nra.co.za email address.

The South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited (SANRAL) has no objection to the above-mentioned application as no roads or interchanges under jurisdiction of SANRAL are affected. Comment was noted and I&AP details changed as per the email.

Mr Russel James Cloake

Date 2024/01/29 Method Email

Comment

Received a notification from BSRA RE about a potential sewer pipeline upgrade down our road in Bordeaux South, Randburg. Will they destroy our outside gardens and damage infrastructure coming into our homes (water, electricity, Fibre, etc) with this proposed project? What is the methodology to avoid this?

Response

Many thanks for the message below. The Basic Assessment and associated Environmental Authorisation application relates only to the sections of the pipeline that traverse the park area and specifically the Brramfonteinspruit. However, your concern is a valid one and we have passed this on to the relevant engineers who will be designing the remainder of the pipeline and requested feedback. In the meantime, are you able to provide me with your specific address so that we can check whether the alignment would affect your property. We will get back to you shortly regarding your query.

Date 2024/02/12 Method Email

Comment

I&AP responded to previous questions: I am on Valley Road on the side you plan to run the pipeline.

Response

Just some feedback- I am expecting some feedback from the project engineers regarding your query by the end of this week. I will forward this to you as soon as possible.

Dr Deonita Damons

Date 2021/07/13 Method Email

Comment

Greetings, With reference to the EMIS 1433, I am unable to locate same on the www.eims.co.za/public-participation site.

Response

Good day Dr Deonita, Thank you for your correspondence. May you please explain your below email further, kindly indicate whether you are trying to register as an interested and affected party for the Selkirk Avenue Pipeline Project so that I may advise accordingly.

Date 2021/07/14 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sinalo, Hope you are well. I am wanting to register as an interested party accordingly.

Response

Dear Dr Deonita, Thank you for your correspondence, Kindly note that you have been registered as an interested and affected party (I&AP) on the project database. Kindly note that as an interested and affected party you will be notified of opportunities to participate in the

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Dr Deonita Damons

Environmental Authorisation Process as they become available. May you kindly confirm if your email address will be sufficient for future notifications. Alternatively, you could provide me with additional contact details such as, fax, postal address or cell phone number. Should you have further queries, please feel free to let EIMS know.

Date 2021/07/22 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sinalo, Thank you so much for the confirmation. I am happy with email, but should you need immediate response, please do not hesitate to use my mobile number. Have a pleasant day further.

Response

Dear Dr Deonita, Thank you, your correspondence was noted. Should you have further queries, please feel free to contact EIMS.

Ms Nozipho Maduse

Date 2021/07/02 Method Email

Comment

Good afternoon, Please send the notice and any future communication that has to do with EIAs to the Sub-units central e-mail account eisdapplications@joburg.org.za and cc giftmab@joburg.org.za. Note that I was unable to access the link to the notice which is on the e-mail below.

Response

Dear Nozipho, Thank you for your correspondence. Kindly note that future correspondence with regards to the above-mentioned project will be sent to the emails provided. In addition to this please indicate whether you would like to be removed to the projects Interested and Affected Party database?

Date 2021/07/28 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sinalo, You can remove me.

Response

Ms. Maduse was removed from the projects database as requested.

Teboho Leku

Date 2024/05/02 Method Other

Comment

COMMENTS ON DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED JAN SMUT AVENUE TO BORDEAUX RIVERSIDE PARK SEWER PIPELINE, CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY. Regarding the above-mentioned draft basic assessment report received by this Department on 05 March 2024, please herewith find comments from the Department. 1. Description of the site/property/route and development The proposal entails installation of a new sewer pipeline with an internal diameter of between 200 to 360mm which has an

Response

EIMS submitted an application for EA on the 08 November 2023. A draft BAR was prepared and distributed to all stakeholders for the required 30 day comment period between the 17 January 2024 To the 15 February 2024. The BAR was thereafter updated and submitted to the GDARDE on the 28 February 2024. On the 10 April GDARDE issued comments on the BAR for the EAPs consideration. This letter serves to acknowledge these comments and where applicable respond to these as listed below: We refer to your letter dated 10 April 2024 regarding the above project.

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Teboho Leku

approximately length of 2km. The following issues are associated with the proposed site and the development:

- 1.1 The Pipeline will be made of uPVC Class 34 and it will be installed adjacent to the existing system with the existing system being kept operational.
- 1.2 The sewer infrastructure will be installed within the existing road servitude from Jan Smut Avenue to Bordeaux Riverside Park, tracking through Valley Road and Garden Road.
- 1.3 Before the proposed sewer infrastructure connects to an existing sewer infrastructure manhole which is located on the other side of Bordeaux Riverside Park, the pipeline will cross the Braamfontein Spruit stream, alongside the existing pipe.
- 1.4 The farm portions that form the Bordeaux Riverside Park that will be crossed by the pipeline include portion 44 of the Farm Klipfontein 203 IR, Portion 59 of Farm Driefontein 41, 26 of the Farm Driefontein 41 and Portion 8 of Farm Zandfontein 42.
- 1.5 The proposed sewer pipeline is planned to supplement the existing sewer pipeline for Selkirk Avenue Housing Development.

2. Description of the receiving environment

The part of the site where the proposed pipelines will be constructed falls within Critical Biodiversity Area and Ecological Support Area characterised by Primary Vegetation, with the presence of Endangered Threatened Ecosystem, a river/ stream and the wetland according to the Gauteng Conservation Plan and it lies within an Environmental Management Zone 1 (Urban development Zone) and Zone 2 (High Control Zone inside Urban Boundary) of the Gauteng Provincial Environment Management Framework (GPEMF, 2021).

3. Listed activities applied for

The following listed activities have been applied for- Listing Notice 1 (GNR 327) Activity 19: The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse; but excluding where such infilling, depositing, dredging, excavation, removal or moving — (a) will occur behind a development setback; (b) is for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan; (c) falls within the ambit of activity 21 in this Notice, in which case that activity applies; (d) occurs within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour; or (e) where such development is related to the development of a port or harbour, in which case activity 26 in Listing Notice 2 of 2014 applies. The proposed sewer pipeline will traverse a watercourse

Listing Notice 3 (GNR 324) Activity 12: The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan

Part of the proposed sewer pipeline route falls within Critical Biodiversity Area.

4. Specialist studies

The ecological and wetland baseline and impact assessment report attached with the Draft report is noted and should form part of the final report.

5. Need and desirability of the development

The need and desirability of the proposed activity is provided and must form part of the final report.

6. Maps, layout plans and routes positioning

The general Layout Plan should form part of the final report. All the route position of the old and new pipelines should be indicated and form part of the final Basic Assessment report. It must be legible with legend clearly corresponding to the activities' components on the layout plan.

7.

Please refer to the table below providing responses to comments of note which were raised.

9. Other aspects to be considered

- a) The Department of Water and Sanitation have been engaged and a Water Use License application is pending
- b) i) Relevant landowners of associated properties have been engaged and consent has been obtained. Consent form has been attached as part of the BAR. ii) JCPZ have been consulted and comments have been included in the BAR.
- c) The section of the pipeline associated with the application does not affect the road reserve, therefore, comment from JRA is not required.

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Teboho Leku

Alternatives The assessment of alternatives included in the draft report is noted and the reason for not having an alternative pipeline route is also provided and noted. 8. Public Participation Process The Public Participation Process must be done in accordance to the requirements of EIA Regulations 2014 (as amended). Stakeholders must be consulted through the delivery of draft Basic Assessment Report. Note that all comment from registered interested and affected parties must be incorporated into the comments and response report to be attached on the final report. The comments from the registered interested and affected parties must be adequately addressed. Please note that the application may be prejudiced by not addressing issues raised by the registered interested and affected parties and all aspects raised in the letter. Proof of correspondence (site notice, newspaper advertisement, email, fax, delivery etc.) with stakeholders must be included in the final basic assessment report. Should the applicant unable to submit comments, proof of attempts that were made to obtain such comments must be submitted to the Department. Any other information that needs to be added that will benefit the decision-making process must be included in the final basic assessment report. 9. Other aspects to be considered a) Department of Water and Sanitation should be consulted regarding a Water Use License Application in respect of those activities that will take place within the watercourse. b) In instances where the pipeline construction will negatively affect the community properties, an agreement must be reached with the community members before the final Basic Assessment report is submitted to the Department. c) Proposed pipelines will affect traffic as it will be taking place within the road reserve, therefore comments from Johannesburg Roads Agency (JRA) should also be considered. d) The pipeline crossing Method in areas where it will transverse the watercourse must be included in the final report. 10. Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) The Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) must be included in the final report and must comply with the content requirements as stipulated in Appendix 4 of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014. The EMPr needs to address impacts that may arise because of the proposed activities. The EMPr needs to address impacts that may arise as a result of the proposed activity and must be practical, site specific and easily enforceable. It is a binding document and all the conditions in it should be enforceable, it is therefore important that words that do not emphasise enforcement be avoided. If you have any queries regarding the contents of this letter, please contact the official of the Department using any of the above indicated contact details.

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

Date 2021/07/02 Method Email

Comment

City Parks was alerted about this notification and we are not certain of what it entails, can you

Response

Kindly note that the notification sent on the 30th June 2021 is a call to register on the Interested

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

please forward additional information.

and Affected Party Database for the Proposed Selkirk Avenue Sewer Pipeline Project. Please note that Environmental Impact Management Services (EIMS) Pty Ltd was appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner to assist with the application for an Environmental Authorisation for the pipeline. The proposed sewer pipeline passes a stream (Braamfontein Spruit) at Bordeaux Riverside Park; hence a Basic Assessment process is being followed for the application. Kindly note that Johannesburg City Parks was pre identified as a potentially interested and affected party for this application, particularly because the Bordeaux Riverside Park will be affected by the proposed development. Please indicate if you would like to remain registered so that you may receive opportunities to comment in the Basic Assessment report when it is made available for Public Review. Further to the above please see the attached initial call to register notification and site notices that were sent out to I&APs.

Date 2021/07/16 Method Email

Comment

We are unable to located Erf 1433 Serkirk Avenue, please indicate of where it is located.

Response

Kindly note that as indicated in the notification letter the part of the pipeline that requires an EA and WUL is located along an existing sewer pipeline on portion 44 of the Farm Klipfontein 203 IR, portion 26 of Farm 41 IR and portion 8 of Farm 42 IR (Bordeaux Riverside Park). The start, middle and end points for the pipeline through the Bordeaux Riverside Park is as follows: Start: 26° 5'57.20"S, 28° 1'4.91"E; Middle: 26° 5'5.56"S, 28° 1'12.89"E; and End: 26° 5'59.75"S, 28° 1'18.48"E. May you kindly refer to the attached locality map for the location of the pipeline. Please note that the number 1433 is the reference number that EIMS uses for this project and is not the location. Apologies for any misunderstandings this might have caused. Should you have further queries, kindly feel free to contact EIMS.

Date 2021/07/21 Method Email

Comment

Based on our telephonic discussions earlier where a number of discrepancies and inconsistencies were outlined, attached is the objection from City Parks. It was also highlighted that the project number raised a red flag regarding this project since it is a bit 'misleading' as it creates an impression that it's a stand number or reference number from authorities. Also information about this EIA came to City Parks by chance since City Parks as the custodian of the site was not notified.

Response

This e-mail was responded to including a response to the submitted letter. See subsequent correspondence.

Date 2021/07/21 Method Other

Comment

Response

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

RE: NOTIFICATION REGARDING OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION APPLICATION PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED SEWER PIPELINE UPGRADE FOR THE SELKIRK AVENUE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, IN THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG, GAUTENG PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA. Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo (JCPZ) is a municipal entity within the City of Johannesburg which is responsible for the development and maintenance of Public Open Spaces, Parks, Road verges and cemeteries within the jurisdiction of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality. In reference to the above-stated subject, the following is applicable:

- 1) The reference number used in the correspondence is noted to be 'misleading' since it is not related to the project, and infers to the stand number or reference number from authorities. a. 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA
- 2) The EIA is undertaken on council land without the relevant permission.
- 3) Information solicited from a telephonic call with the consultant's states there is an existing line and the project entails installing a new line. However the outlined diagrams submitted does not correlate with the information that was provided to City Parks but the legend only states 'red-line: authorisation required, blue-line: authorisation not required'.
- 4) Another contradiction and inconsistency noted is that the consultant does not know or do not have information about the origin source of the information to install this pipeline. Yet in the submitted documentation the following is stated: a. 'part of the development approval process, Johannesburg Water (JW) requires that JOSHCO upgrades portions of the existing sewer infrastructure to comply with their masterplan requirements'
- 5) The site is a developed park developed and there is no proof of consultation that was undertaken. These open spaces are not reserved for sewer infrastructure requirements. The above highlighted non-compliances render the process followed by the appointed EAP to be null and void, and provide adequate grounds for submission of this objection from City Parks. Correspondence for clarity purposes can be forwarded for the attention of Mr Cebolenkosi Mhlongo at the following email address: cmhlongo@jhbcityparks.com.

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the proposed Selkirk Avenue Pipeline Project. I tried calling you with regards to the EIA process for the above-mentioned project however, I was unable to get through on your cell number. Prior to addressing the points in the objection received, I would just like to provide some background to the project. EIMS was appointed by CSM Consulting Services (Pty) Ltd on behalf of the Johannesburg Social Housing Development Company (JOSHCO) (hereafter referred to as the applicant) as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) to assist with undertaking the required authorisation processes (including the statutory public participation). As a part of the EIMS EA process, we conduct a call to register phase and invited pre-identified I&APs to register on the project database and provide initial comments on the project that are considered when putting together the environmental impact assessment reports. The project is currently in the initial call to register phase of the project. Please note that the project team of the EIA process consists of the project manager, the EAP and the public consultation consultant. This response was drafted by the EAP on the project. Should you have any queries or wish to speak over the phone please do not hesitate to contact me. EAP: Cheyenne Muthukarapan (0*****). In response to your comments raised in the objection letter, please see below. I have numbered the responses to align with the numbering of the comments received for ease of reference.

1. The project reference "1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA" refers to the EIMS referencing system that allows for I&APs and the project team to ensure that comments are being submitted for the correct project. As I'm sure you are aware I&APs are requested to participate in a number of EIA processes and the project specific reference number "1433" and project name is what EIMS requests to be quoted in correspondence. EIMS would like to apologise for the confusion and inconvenience caused in this regard. It was unintended for the EIMS project reference number to be confused with the affected project properties. In order to prevent confusion in future we will specify that the project number 1433 is the EIMS reference number to be used in correspondence. Furthermore, please note that an application has not yet been submitted to the authorities however, once it has been EIMS will provide the GDARD reference number to I&APs to use in their correspondence as well.
2. Since the application process is still at its infancy, the JOSHCO has been advised to seek such permission and/or any wayleaves required as these are also required for the EIA application process.
3. I apologise for the confusion in this regard. The intention of the locality map in the notification documents was to only show the new pipeline as the scale of the map would not have been adequate to show both pipelines due to their proximity. Detailed design drawing which will be made available to City Parks and Interested and Affected parties show both the new and the existing pipelines. As a result of the Selkirk Avenue Development, Johannesburg Water requires that new infrastructure be installed adjacent to the existing infrastructure to compensate for the new development. In terms of the EIA regulations the pipeline section highlighted in blue on the locality map does not require environmental authorization as it falls within an urban area. The pipeline section highlighted in red requires environmental authorization due to its proximity to the watercourse and the potentially sensitive

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

park. More details regarding the pipeline will be provided in the Basic Assessment report and associated appendices that will be made available for a 30-day public review and comment period once the necessary studies have been conducted. 4. The information presented in the documents is correct according to our understanding. As noted in the documents provided the instruction or mandate to upgrade the existing pipeline was given to JOSHCO by Johannesburg Water as there is no capacity in the existing pipeline to cater for this new proposed housing development. Again, EIMS apologizes for the confusion created during the telephonic discussion. 5. As mentioned at the start of this correspondence, the EIA process has only just commenced with the call to register period. Public consultation is a vital component of the EIA process and will be ongoing throughout the basic assessment and WULA processes. EIMS encourages all interested and affected parties to provide comments on the proposed project. We would also like to add that the City Parks has from inception been identified as in Interested and Affected party and correspondence with regards to the project was sent to the City Parks. We note that this correspondence did not get to your office, and we have taken note of your details as the primary contact person with regards to this proposed project. In this regard we would like to consult with you further and at an appropriate time schedule a virtual meeting to discuss the application.

Date 2021/08/03 Method Email

Comment

1. This information is a bit incorrect: a. Since the application process is still at its infancy, the JOSHCO has been advised to seek such permission and/or any wayleaves required as these are also required for the EIA application process. 2. Please indicate the name of the Jwater official that issued this instruction and information pertaining to the sewer. a. The information presented in the documents is correct according to our understanding. As noted in the documents provided the instruction or mandate to upgrade the existing pipeline was given to JOSHCO by Johannesburg Water as there is no capacity in the existing pipeline to cater for this new proposed housing development. 3. Credentials a. Your credentials are not stated in your signature if you are an Administrator or a registered EAP or professional scientist etc

Response

Correspondence with I&AP was continued via telephonic communication and face-to-face meetings (see correspondence of February 2024). Further communication with Jwater was undertaken together with CSM to gather information as suggested by the I&AP. See attached correspondence.

Date 2024/01/23 Method Email

Comment

City Parks would like to meet with you to discuss this matter. The proposed date is Friday, 26 Jan at 9am on site please confirm.

Response

Meeting scheduled with I&AP on provided date. See additional comments related.

Date 2024/01/24 Method Email

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

Comment

The co-ordinate are; 26° 5'51.21"S and 28° 1'27.64"E. The physical address is along Iona Drive in Bordeaux where it crosses the Braamfonteinspruit. If possible please also confirm if you have any specific queries regarding the project that you would like to address? Please feel free to contact me if you have any queries or concerns.

Response

Follow-up meeting schedule - See attached proof. EAP Response: Good morning Cebo, I hope you are well? Your request for a meeting on site to discuss the Selkirk Sewer Project refers. I have sent a confirmation reply to your request. I suggest we meet at the attached point at 09h00 then we can drive to the site. Please can you send me your mobile details so that we can be in contact in case of any last-minute issues? If possible please also confirm if you have any specific queries regarding the project that you would like to address?

Date 2024/01/24 Method Email

Comment

The co-ordinate are; 26° 5'51.21"S and 28° 1'27.64"E. The physical address is along Iona Drive in Bordeaux where it crosses the Braamfonteinspruit. If possible please also confirm if you have any specific queries regarding the project that you would like to address? Please feel free to contact me if you have any queries or concerns.

Response

Response following scheduled site visit: As per the discussion held on site this morning, please receive attached a copy of the landowner consent that was submitted with the application- the properties are listed in the form. The application to GDRAD was submitted on the 8th November 2023- see attached the acknowledgement of receipt. We look forward to receiving your formal objection/ comment on this application so that we can consider and respond.

Date 2024/01/26 Method Email

Comment

Can you please confirm if there is permission that was issued by City Parks? Also you mentioned that two Jhb Water officials identified this specific site location and area where the new pipeline must be installed sometime in 2018, and the new official who did the review also confirmed it in 2021. Hence we would like to obtain the contact details both mobile number and email addresses for Jhb Water officials that were or are involved in this proposed new pipeline, kindly send it through.

Response

I have received some feedback from the Joshco Engineering team. It is understood that as part of the wayleave application JCP was contacted in August 2023 and advised of the intention to cross the stream. The JCP contact, MR Hamilton Masiela noted that they were hesitant to support the development in the absence of an EA and approval to work within the sensitive areas. The engineers advised that a Basic Assessment was underway and requested whether there was any further comment or requirements from JCP. The opportunity for the engineers to meet with the JCP representatives was also offered, but was not taken. It is understood that you were included in this communication. As far as we are aware no consent or permission has been issued by JCP specifically. As per my previous email to you, consent has however been provided by the Johannesburg Property Company. Please feel free to contact me if you have any further queries or concerns regarding the Basic Assessment or EA application processes.

Date 2024/02/05 Method Email

Comment

Kindly forward the Site Development Plan for this project. Also to forward all the previous rlemail correspondence that was held with JPC pertaining to the consent.

Response

I will revert back to you ASAP with the SDP. In the interim please receive attached the correspondence between the engineers and JCP as requested.

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

Kindly forward the requested information urgently. -Site Development Plan for this project. - All the previous email correspondence that was held with JPC pertaining to the consent.

Response

Please see attached the plans as requested. My previous email included communication between the project engineers and JCP regarding the wayleaves. I have requested that the project team provide any further correspondence that they have had with JCP. I will forward on to you if and when I receive such.

Date 2024/02/08 Method Email

Comment

There seems to be some confusion: JPC refers to Johannesburg Property Company. JPCZ refers to Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo.

Response

I&AP referred to the use of the acronym JCP in the previous email correspondence. This point was noted. Consultant provided the I&AP with a memo of communication for clarity.

Date 2024/02/14 Method Other

Comment

Kindly note the attached objection from City Parks. Content of Letter: It is hereby confirmed that Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo through the City of Johannesburg has an existing system for the management of Environmental Authorisations processes and wayleaves amongst others. These processes are managed in accordance with environmental legislative prescripts where projects that are proposed in environmental sensitive areas, parks and open spaces must have in place the relevant permissions and authorizations. It is in this context that Risk and Compliance: Environmental Protection Unit received a notification about the EIA process in the parks under its custodian. JCPZ hereby register the objection to the proposed sewerage installation within an eco-wetland ecosystem given the environmental sensitivity of much of the land and the desired intentions to conserve some of this land as a formally declared rivertrail. The wetland and river system was incorrectly identified for a new sewerage pipeline which is characterized by critical grassland and forms a continuous eco system both functionally and visually along the river trail. This area needs to be looked at differently in terms of its protection and sensitivities that exists since it is critical ecosystem both from an environmentally and socio-economic context. The classification basis for the specialist reports is questionable given the specialist reports which confirmed the sensitivity of much of the site. Upon, the perusing the submitted reports, the following is applicable: 1) To demonstrate that Johsco/EIMS initiated an unauthorised process in the identified open spaces, the following evidence is submitted to the department: a) On the 26 July 2021, the Consultant provided the following acknowledgement to residents: "Dear Donovan, kindly note that the Public Participation Process for this project started with an initial notification and call to register phase. During this

Response

Please see attached the response to the comments received. This response as well as your comments will be included in the Basic Assessment Report and associated documentation that will be submitted to the GDARD for their consideration in the decision-making process. As a registered I&AP we will advise on the outcome of the decision making process as soon as such is available. Content of letter: The first section of this letter is noted. EIMS acknowledges Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo as an important I&AP, hence why and how the I&AP has been and continues to be engaged. EIMS thanks JCPZ for their objection being submitted through Mr Cebo Mhlongo. We would also like to thank Mr Mhlongo for his continued input as part of the public participation endeavours of this project. With reference to the BAR, the receiving environment was investigated and associated impacts assessed by a qualified and experienced specialist. The specific assessment determined that the impacts were likely to be of medium significance but can be reduced to low significance with mitigation. 1) EIMS has undertaken an application for an Environmental Authorisation as required by and accordance with the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). It is EIMS understanding that the applicant and their appointed representatives have engaged the necessary role-players in terms of applying for additional consents (e.g. wayleave, servitudes, etc.). It is unclear from the remainder of this comment as to what specific unauthorised processes are being referred to. a) EIMS acknowledges the message sent to Mr Donovan (a respondent who engaged with EIMS after the initial call to register of the project- See Table of Correspondence (Appendix E6). This was sent to the I&AP who wanted clarity on the process. Mr Donovan responded to the initial notification process as is required by the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). b)

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

phase, initial notices were sent out to the pre-identified Interested and Affected Parties where contact details were available, site notices and advert placement were also undertaken as part of informing I&APs of the proposed project and inviting them to register on the projects database. I have attached the notification for your convenience. Further to the above, specialist studies and basic assessment report (BAR) and associated is currently in the process of being drafted. Once the reports have been completed and the application will be submitted, and the reports will be made available for public review and comment for a period of 30-days.” b) On the 14 April 2023 Ms Puleng Mothebe Johsco acknowledged in writing to Jhb Property Company when soliciting consent for the pipeline in the said open spaces: that an EIA ‘was underway’ within the park’s properties. c) On the 13 August 2023 Acknowledgement by Mr Rothe Madzhadzi that “‘we are busy with the EAI and will revery as soon as it its completed’. Request to meet through a physical meeting was made “‘if more information of the project is required’”. d) Information on the dolomitic conditions that exists including the risks levels and exposure to subsidence and impact on the downstream environment. Development of dolomitic areas should be undertaken with reference to the CoJ Dolomite Risk Management Policy and draft Dolomite Risk Management By Laws and should adhere to the SANS 1936 standards for development of dolomite land in relation to the various hazard classes. 2) A sewer pipeline crossing a wetland and river does not have mitigation measures to contain future sewerage spillages. This will result in environmental deterioration and direct pollution of the receiving environment. There is no regard for the class of dwellings that exists within the vicinity of the site and the impact thereof pollution in the river system. A social survey in addition to the public participation to was not undertaken to determine the needs, measure the public perceptions and acceptance of the proposed sewer line within the river since this site is a declared river trail and is used extensively by park users for recreational activities such as dog walking, running, jogging amongst others. 3) Portion of the site is a breeding ground for the butterflies which was not considered in the report since the report did not consider the seasonality. At the time of the inspection the 26 January and bufferflies migration which emanates from the site was observed. 4) On page 13, the report refers to an upgrade of the sewerage pipeline despite that this is an installation of a new sewer pipeline which does not constitute an upgrade, but it will be two separate lines that runs parallel to each other. 5) Issues raised by Interested and affected stakeholders creates concerns in terms of how the provided consent was provided by JPC despite the objection submitted by City Parks, and for a possible referral to Legal at the City for further investigation to be initiated. 6) Information on the employment opportunities that will be created is not outlined nor where the project will be utilised local labour and there is no information on the estimated number of jobs that will be created for the community. The criteria used to determine that 10 job opportunities will be created is unknown and how the number in question was determined. 7) The length of the activity of 0.5km could not be confirmed and this contracts information provided during the site meeting where the route was estimated to be about 4.5km and the portion in the wetland

Noted. c) Noted. d) With reference to Section 5.5 of the BAR, groundwater, soil and geological stability of the site is considered, specifically in relation to dolomite, sinkholes, or doline areas. It is our understanding that the engineering team will undertake the required geotechnical investigation and will comply with the relevant dolomitic risk management policies, bylaws and standards as appropriate for development. For clarification purposes, the following condition will be added into the EMPr – “Prior to construction, a qualified geotechnical specialist will ensure that construction considers the integrity of the landscape in terms of dolomite and associated risks and relevant project controls implemented.” 2) This point has several aspects to it. The intention of the project is to increase sewage capacity to reduce future spills. This pipeline and associated infrastructure are designed with due consideration of capacity requirements, and under normal conditions is not anticipated to leak. In relation to sewage spillages, this has been dealt with in section 8 (Impact Assessment) of the BAR itself. Please see Table 10, under Operational Phase, page 69. Potential leaks or discharges were rated as low post-mitigation. However, mitigation measures should an incident occur is captured and therefore considered. Section 5.6 presents an overview of the socio-economic profile of the receiving environment. A public notification and consultation process has been conducted as per the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). 3) No dedicated lepidoptery study was undertaken. The screening tool indicated a medium sensitivity for the potential occurrence of *Aloeides dentatis dentatis* However, to address this concern, the specialist was engaged and the necessary information on lepidoptera now included on page 39 of the Ecology and Wetlands report. The following has been included after engaging the specialist: “The screening tool indicated the potential occurrence of the *Aloeides dentatis dentatis* for the area. The assigned sensitivity for this taxa was medium. According to the South African National Biodiversity Institute (<http://speciesstatus.sanbi.org/taxa/detail/200/>) this species habitat preference is fairly flat, rocky highveld grassland above 1,500 m, along or below ridges. Due to the disturbance to the grassland and the absence of ridges for the area, the likelihood of occurrence of this species is expected to be low.” 4) With reference to page 13 of the BAR, it is specifically noted that this is a new development. The BAR clearly describes the nature of the pipeline in terms of the proximity to the existing pipeline. 5) The application process has been followed in accordance to the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). With reference to the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014), Chapter 6 Section 39 (2a) states that consent is not required to make an Environmental Authorisation application for a project of this nature. (1) If the proponent is not the owner or person in control of the land on which the activity is to be undertaken, the proponent must, before applying for an environmental authorisation in respect of such activity, obtain the written consent of the landowner or person in control of the land to undertake such activity on that land. (2) Sub-regulation (1) does not apply in respect of- linear activities; It is however noted that despite this, consent was obtained from Johannesburg Property Company (refer to Addendum 1 of the EA Application form). In addition, relevant stakeholders (including JPCZ) were invited to participate In the EA application

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

estimated to be about 2km. 8) On Page 33 under Section 6.2. consultation with other stakeholders, the Consultant does not disclose to the Competent Authority that City Parks objected to the EIA when the organisation first became aware of the proposed sewer installation in a public space. 9) There is no evidence to show that JCPZ was consulted nor engaged with either by Johsco or by IEMS prior to initiating the process requirements for the EIA including the circulation of the call to register. 10) The consent was issued to Johsco by Jhb Property Company despite being aware of the objection submitted by City Parks as the land custodian. The chronological events outlined in the provided table demonstrates that the submitted consent which is used as the basis for submission of the EIA to authorities was not supported by the organisation. 11) The required permissions from both City of Johannesburg and JCPZ was undertaken after and when the EIA processes had been initiated as a formality to comply with the EIA Regulations. This is a formalisation of a pre-determined decision by Johsco to install a new sewerage line in an open space which includes a wetland. These sites are confirmed to be Critical Biodiversity Areas. 12) There is no information of engagements undertaken with the City of Johannesburg Environmental Management Department which has an oversight for environmental compliance for city owned. 13) The absence of a storm water masterplan and the associated level of intended model development meant that the accumulation of storm water from the highly urbanised catchment associated with the site could not be accurately modelled. There is no correlation between the existing trees, climate change, flooding and future impacts in the context of the previous flooding that occurred which resulted in the infrastructure damage. 14) There is no evidence for JCPZ having been identified as an Interested and Affected Stakeholder despite the information which is public knowledge and is available on the organisation's website. 15) There is no assessment of the route that was undertaken since information is not available in the provided reports. 16) The space requirements for the pipeline in question is not available. Information is limited to the pipeline diameter. 17) On Page 11 of the BAR, the consultant indicated that a copy of the Draft BAR was submitted to entities or state departments, and this is noted to be incorrect since the provided report is not a draft report but the actual copy of the report. 18) The planning processes that were followed could not be established since information is not available to acquire the additional portions of land for the installation of the new sewerage pipeline. 19) There is no information indicated in the report of when the water use licence was applied for and whether it was acknowledged by the department of water and sanitation. 20) The property descriptions are not adequately explained and there are discrepancies in terms the route location. 21) There is no information provided pertaining to cost implications of current maintenance and the future maintenance of the new sewerage pipeline. The identified properties are currently maintained by JCPZ in accordance with the relevant maintenance schedules. 22) For peak flows and volumes analysis, it of concern that: that no allowances for climate change was included in this study. A risk analysis using the expected life of a structure or process will indicate the relevance of considering climate change (i.e. as the expected life increases the

process. 6) It is noted that the BAR does not provide substantial information on the employment opportunities to be created by the project. With reference to page 13 of the application form (Socio-economic Values – Construction Phase), the applicant has advised EIMS that it is anticipated that the follow no. of jobs will be created: “Total number of new employment opportunities to be created in the construction phase of this activity – 19” Reference to filling station in the BAR is an error and will be amended to state the following to be submitted to the Competent Authority: “Employment creation will be negatively impacted if the No Go alternative is considered. The pipeline project will contribute to 19 employment opportunities during construction”. 7) With reference to Section 4.4 and Appendix A (Site Plan) of the BAR, it is estimated that the length of the pipeline within the open space is approximately 0.5 kms. It is possible that your reference to a longer pipeline may relate to the length of the entire pipeline from start (Selkirk Social Housing Development) to finish and not the pipeline in the open space only. This application relates to the section of pipeline within the open space only. 8) EIMS acknowledges this comment and associated concern. We would like to refer JCPZ to the Public Participation appendix (Appendix E) of this report which provides more detail in terms of specific comments. What is reflected in the BAR is but a high-level summary of main comments. In Section 6 in the Public Participation Report, objection from JCPZ was specifically noted. The detail of this objection was erroneously not included in the BAR which was put out for public review. This letter including associated correspondence will be included it is the final BAR for submission to the Competent Authority. 9) As noted in the response provided in (8) above, JCPZ was identified as a key I&AP and included in the initial call to register and subsequent review of the BAR. 10) Please refer to (5) above 11) In terms of permissions, refer to comment (5) above. Appendix G presents the project in relation to CBAs. 12) The City of Johannesburg was identified as a key I&AP and included in the initial call to register and associated notifications. This includes representation from the COJ Environment and Infrastructural Services Department as well as via the email address eisdapplication@joburg.org.za. Formal comments from the COJ Impact Management and Compliance Monitoring Department . The COJ identified certain additional requirements and recommendations and noted that the Department does not have an objection to the project. 13) The project's intention is not to repair the impacts of flooding in the spruit. The impact of the project will be minimised so that the spruit's flow is not impeded beyond the extent of the current infrastructure. The sewer line's crossing of the Braamfontein Spruit was determined with the purpose of minimise the impact during construction and after construction. 14) Refer to (8) and (9). EIMS acknowledges this comment and supports that this correspondence and past correspondence is proof that JCPZ has been engaged. In terms of the project's I&AP database, JCPZ has been on the project's database since 30 June 2021, when the project's Public Participation process commenced. 15) Section 4.3 of the BAR and Appendix A (Site Plan) and Appendix C (Facility Illustrations) clearly illustrate the proposed pipeline route and Section 8 highlights the associated impacts. 16) Section 4.4 of the BAR provides information on the length of the proposed pipeline (0.5 kms) as well as the width of the servitude (~1m) 17) The report has

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

influence of climate change increases). Climate change is expected to exacerbate due to an increase in rainfall intensities, scale and impact. 23) An online source consulted does not state Tsakane Clay Grassland exists in the study area or on the northern areas of the City. However, Page 34 of the Ecological Report refers to the existence of "The grassland biome comprises many different vegetation types. The project area is situated within both the Carletonville Dolomite and Tsakane Clay grasslands vegetation types according to Mucina & Rutherford (2006)". 24) Information is not available in the Biodiversity Technical report pertaining to the diversion methodology, the volumes and quantities, the impact of, and associated rehabilitation. • The location of the crossing will be isolated by diverting current flow patterns of the water in the stream around the specified location. This will be achieved with sandbags utilizing material from the site. The isolated areas will then be dewatered from a temporarily excavated sump. Enough working space should be allowed around the proposed crossing location. Topsoil will be removed to a depth of 500mm below the stream bed level and to the approved plan dimensions as shown on the approved construction drawings. Spoil material will be stockpiled at the designated area or at an approved site to be identified by the contractor. Excavation will be done by means of handheld drills and/or an excavator equipped with a hydraulic hammer, dependant on the state of the bedrock encountered. The concrete will then be cast for the encasement of the sewer pipe. Once the concrete has set, the in-situ material can be backfilled and compacted as specified. 25) The identified limitations are not addressed such as that: • Only a single season survey was conducted, this would constitute a dry season survey. • The exact design and specifications were not made available, as such assumptions were made by referring to standard features. • The wetlands within the project area were the focus for the assessment, these systems were ground-truthed and further assessed. Wetland areas beyond the project area but within the 500 m regulated area not considered to be at any appreciable level of risk were only considered at a desktop level. 26) The impact on the green canopy which include the existing trees is unknown and it was not determined. It is noted in the Ecological Report, the assessment is limited within the 500m radius where it states the following: • A total of 28 tree, shrub and herbaceous plant species were recorded in the project area during the field assessment. The low diversity can be attributed to the dry season survey conditions when most plants are dormant resulting in less above ground plant parts to assist with identification, like flowers. The project area was also found to be recently burnt. Plants listed as Category 1 alien or invasive species under the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEMBA) appear in green text. Plants listed in Category 2 or as 'not indigenous' or 'naturalised' according to NEMBA, appear in blue text. 27) The Biodiversity Report refers to the replacement of alien species, but it does not take into account the impact thereof, the associated risk of localised flooding when alien plants are removed, there are replacement plans proposed to mitigate the potential impacts. • Invasive Alien Plants (IAPs) tend to dominate or replace indigenous flora, thereby transforming the structure, composition and functioning of ecosystems. Therefore, it is important that these plants are controlled by means

been provided for public and stakeholder review and comment as required by the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). 18) The EIA process has been undertaken in accordance with the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). In terms of landowner consent and notification, please refer to (5) above. 19) A Water Use License Application is underway. As this is a separate process from the EIA, finer details of such were not included in the BAR. However, page 37 to 38 provides details of the relevant water uses. With regards to the WULA process, Phase 3 has been submitted. 20) It is unclear which discrepancies are being referred to. It is assumed that this comment is referring to the Property Description on Page 25 of the BAR. The details highlighted here refer to the Farm names and Portion numbers of affected land parcels. 21) Joshco and the professional team is only involved with the construction of the sewer line, not maintenance costs have been developed. Maintenance of the sewer line will be done by Johannesburg Water as it is being at present. 22) The flood line was noted by the Environmental Specialist. The sewer line is designed at 67% of the total capacity of the sewer line. The new sewer line will be installed in such a manner that the impact on the flow will be minimised. Both the current as well as the new manholes that will fall within the 1:100 flood line will be sealed so that the ingress as well as leaching of sewer water is minimised. 23) Many thanks for bringing this typo error to our attention. This correction has been made. 24) Appendix G and I includes the Specialist Reports and Method Statement respectively. The potential impacts of the proposed project have been considered and assessed by the specialists and relevant mitigation measures have been included in the BAR. 25) The method statement and designs were provided to inform the study. The final designs and methods were provided in Oct 2023, which were included in the report. The limitations do not render the assessment inadequate, and further to the findings, management measures have been prescribed to further address these listed limitations. 26) The impact on trees is negligible, the alignment avoids all large trees. 27) This comment is not clear. The biodiversity report makes no claim to the replacement of alien species. Nevertheless, EIMS acknowledges this argument in relation to the study performed in terms of flora and fauna in the area. It was ascertained that the project may increase the amount of alien plants in the area. This has been accounted for and has been addressed through proposed mitigation measures. The potential impact of AIPs has been identified and relevant mitigation measures proposed 28) Noted 29) Noted 30) The pictures were taken during the field survey which was conducted in July 2021, and it was stated this was a dry season survey. No seasonal variance was deemed necessary due to the assigned sensitivities. The transformed habitat comprising roads, houses etc was assigned a least concern sensitivity as per the classification provided. 31) The assessment concluded that the area does not represent the CBA; Important it is classified as due to the extent of modification due to the impacts. Management measures were also prescribed to mitigate any associated impacts to an acceptable level, including rehabilitation of the disturbed areas. 32) The disturbed grassland was assigned a low sensitivity. This habitat has been infested with AIP, especially Kikuyu which dominated a large portion of the herbaceous layer. 33) The method use is the prescribed method of the DWS, referring to the 'scientific buffer'

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

of an eradication and monitoring programme. Some invader plants may also degrade ecosystems through superior competitive capabilities to exclude native plant species. 28) Extract from the Ecological Report refers to: • No mammal species were recorded in the project area during the surveys based on either direct observation or the presence of visual tracks & signs. This can be attribute to the winter survey fauna are generally more inactive. The area was also in a disturbed state and had a lack of suitable quality habitat and the species has most likely been persecuted due to the urban area and its associated disturbances. 29) The Biodiversity report refers to: • No reptile or amphibian species were recorded in the project area during the surveys. This can be attribute to the winter survey when herpetofauna are inactive die to them being ectothermic (cold-blooded). 30) The pictorial evidence included in the specialist's report does not have a date of when the imagery was taken. Some of the pictures shows the assessment was conducted after the vegetation had been burnt through controlled fires. There is no seasonal variation incorporated in the submitted studies. Hence the findings which classifies the habitats to have a low sensitivity. • This habitat unit represents all areas of urban area and recently cleared areas and the associated tar and secondary roads. This habitat is regarded as transformed due to the nature of the modification of the area to an extent where it would not be able to return to its previous state. Due to the transformed nature of this habitat, it is regarded as having a low concern sensitivity. 31) The study area is confirmed to be a: • Critically endangered in terms of the ecosystem threats. Ecosystem types are categorised as Critically Endangered (CR), Endangered (EN), Vulnerable (VU) or Least Threatened (LT), based on the proportion of each ecosystem type that remains in good ecological condition (Skowno et al., 2019). The project area was superimposed on the terrestrial ecosystem threat status (Figure 7-2). As seen in this figure, the pipeline is situated within an ecosystem that are listed as CR. Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs) are terrestrial and aquatic areas of the landscape that need to be maintained in a natural or near-natural state to ensure the continued existence and functioning of species and ecosystems and the delivery of ecosystem services. Thus, if these areas are not maintained in a natural or near natural state then biodiversity targets cannot be met. The project area falls across both CBA: Important and ESA classified area (Figure 7-1). Sections of the project area is still unclassified. 32) The assertion is based on the assessment at the time of the study within a site which had recently been impacted by a fire. • The project area has been altered both currently and historically. The proximity and prevalence of the urban area has had an impact on both the fauna and the flora in the area, which is evident in the disturbed and transformed habitats. However, the wetland habitats can be regarded as important, not only within the local landscape, but also regionally; as they are used for habitat, foraging and movement corridors for fauna within a fragmented landscape to more natural areas where they may reproduce. The degraded Grassland was rated with a moderate sensitivity because it: 33) In addition to the water license issues, there is no basis nor substantial information provided on the proposed buffer zones since it is based on outdated literature: • The "Preliminary Guideline for the Determination of Buffer Zones for

tool. 34) EIMS thanks JCPZ for identifying this in the report. The statement cited refers to the need for a Water Use License in terms of Section 21 (c) and (i). Therefore, the assertion in the report is that a GA would not apply to this project. A WULA is being completed for the project in terms of associated water uses. Please see comment above in terms of what phase the WULA is in. 35) EIMS acknowledges the comment. The clearing of vegetation will be related to the footprint of the pipeline where applicable. The proposed pipeline route and proposed servitude width are indicated in the BAR. The Specialist report does include information on biodiversity sensitivity which correspond to the high biodiversity sensitivity of the site (refer to figure 9-2 and page 79). The disturbance will be to grassland of low sensitivity, as stated above. 36) Point 1 – This is incorrect. The co-ordinates provided specifically related to the meeting point and not the actual site. Point 2 – Noted. Point 3 – Noted. Point 4 – It is unclear what record is being referred to or requested. The existing manholes did have an odour during site visit. Point 5 – Please refer to Appendix G (Specialist Reports) for the findings of the biodiversity field assessment. Point 6 – EIMS notes this comment. Point 7 – The BAR and associated appendices do provide information on the route and facility illustrations being applied for. 37) It is important to note that the BAR does provide several outlines in terms of alternatives. Please refer to Section 4.3 for the identified alternatives. It is unclear what additional alternatives are being suggested. 38) EIMS notes this comment. In terms of the content of this comment. Refer to (19) and (34) above – Water Use License Application is underway. 39) The EMPr includes recommendations in terms of compliance with regulations, guidelines, and standards such as Gauteng Noise Control Regulations, and the National Dust Control Regulations. The proposed project's limited extent and short duration do not merit a detailed baseline survey. 40) It is the EAP's understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. Capacity of the pipe is not something that is determined on site by seeing the level. The capacity of a sewer line it is based on calculation. This involves various safety considerations, any sewer line operates at 2/3 of the line capacity to adhere to safety considerations. 41) EIMS notes this comment. It is argued here that a list of all other properties would not add value to the EIA process which essentially only applies to the segment of the pipeline which triggers the listed activities, namely the portions that traverse the open space system and cross the watercourse. 42) It is the EAP's understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. 43) The seasonality is acknowledged, mitigation measures include "A qualified environmental control officer must be on site when construction begins to identify faunal species that will be directly disturbed and to relocate fauna/flora that are found during the activities" 44) The question referred to in the BAR does not request a list of wetlands. Instead, this comment is taken out of context as the question referred to relates to a prior inquiry on the presence of sensitive habitats or natural features. The follow-up question referred to, requests specification of the type of sensitive habitats or natural features, and not a

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

Rivers, Wetlands and Estuaries” (Macfarlane et al., 2014) was used to determine the appropriate buffer zone for the proposed activity. A pre-mitigation buffer zone of 30 m is recommended for the identified wetland, which can be decreased to 15 m with the addition of all prescribed mitigation measures. 34) The report states that: The following water uses are applicable to the proposed activity, which would require a GA registration or WULA from the DHSWS. • However, there is no record of compliance with the NWA requirements since the affected properties under City Parks custodian are located with the 500m radius where the project is proposed. • This further contradicts the finding of the Ecological Assessment which states that: In accordance with the GA in terms of section 39 of the NWA, for water uses as defined in section 21 (c) or section 21 (i) a GA does not apply “to any water use in terms of section 21 (c) or (i) of the Act associated with the construction, installation or maintenance of any sewer pipelines, pipelines carrying hazardous materials and to raw water and waste water treatment works”. Since this project will include the installation of sewerage services to accommodate the proposed development, a water use license will be required. 35) The scale and extent of the proposed or required vegetation clearance that is required is not outlined or is unknown or if its exceed or below the EIA Regulations thresholds, and the impact within the CBA and ESA pockets. • GNR.324, Activity 12: The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan. (c) In Gauteng: i. Within any critically endangered or endangered ecosystem listed in terms of section 52 of the NEMBA or prior to the publication of such a list, within an area that has been identified as critically endangered in the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004; ii. Within Critical Biodiversity Areas or Ecological Support Areas identified in the Gauteng Conservation Plan or bioregional plans; or iii. On land, where, at the time of the coming into effect of this Notice or thereafter such land was zoned open space, conservation or had an equivalent zoning. 36) Of concern is that the during the site meeting where in attendance was officials from EISD, IEMS, ArcusGibb Africa and JCPZ, the following discussions transpired: • The EIMS Consultant forwarded incorrect coordinates to the site. The meeting point was at corner Iona Drive and St Andrews Road where it crosses the Braamfontein Spruit, where it is a wrong location. • Consultant did not have information about the site ownerships and relevant zonings. • The consultant did not have knowledge about flooding impacts within the study area and the erosion that occurred downstream and upstream where infrastructure was eroded and demolished. • There was no record about the odour and stench that is prevalent on site on the existing sewerage manholes. • No information is available about the trees along the route. • Relevant consents were made available after the site meeting where a consent letter was produced to City Parks. • Copies of the Site Development Plan were not available, and it could not be determined if the plans were supported by Planning department since information was provided that the initial plans were amended. The changes that were effected in the plans could not confirmed. 37) A comprehensive risk assessment of alternatives

list of wetlands. However, the detail on the type of wetlands traversed is attached in the Biodiversity and Wetlands Specialist report (Appendix G). 45) EIMS notes this comment. It is important to understand that at the time of commencement with this study, the 2022 census data had not yet been collected. Further, it is important that JCPZ elaborate on which data are incorrectly representing the population especially in terms of the related project. It is important to note that although Stats SA provides data following the 2022 census, in terms of location, that is Randburg, 2011’s dataset is much more robust, providing finer details related to the specific population. Should the response to this comment be inadequate, EIMS urges JCPZ to provide a reference to data which is more relevant and up to date. However, to add clarity, the latest information for the City of Johannesburg will be included in the submission to GDARD. 46) Please refer to Appendix G for the Heritage Exemption letter. No features of heritage significance were identified. Appendix E of the BAR also specifies efforts made to inform the public through site notices placed on site in a local language. No comments were raised with regards to religious events. On the basis of this comment, the EAP has included an additional impact, as follows: Description of impact – Impact on pre-existing land uses within the park, e.g. mountain biking and walking trails, religious and other gatherings. 47) Apologies for this error. Please refer to (6) above. This will be rectified in the report for submission to Competent Authority. 48) It is the EAP’s understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. 49) An existing sewer line currently runs through the park and crosses the stream, if this sewer line has a servitude could not be confirmed. The new sewer line will be laid as close as practically possible to the existing line, a servitude will have to be registered. 50) It is the EAP’s understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. 51) It is the EAP’s understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. JCPZ does not provide details on specific alternatives to be assessed. a. The BAR includes: > A description of the proposed activity > A description of the receiving environment > A description of reasonable alternatives > The identification and assessment of anticipated impacts, and > Recommended management and mitigation measures. It is EIMS’ understanding that the BAR complies with the relevant prescripts of the NEMA: Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (2014). b. Refer to (5) above. c. It is the EAP’s understanding after engagement with engineers that the need for the pipeline was identified and required by Johannesburg Water in order to ensure adequate capacity for the proposed Selkirk Social Housing Development. The upgrade is part of the Masterplan of the City of Johannesburg. d. The specific information and context that was “generated” is unclear. e. See (32) above. f. EIMS notes this comment. It is important that EIMS points out that these observations have been captured in the BAR. Further, it is the overall rationale of the project that the area which has already been disturbed, that is the

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

by the Consultant was not conducted to determine the feasibility including the disadvantages and disadvantages of all the identified alternatives to minimise the impact on the CBA sites where the pipeline is proposed. • The following is based on speculation and is not adequately substantiated: No site or activity alternatives have been identified for the proposed project as there is an existing pipeline servitude. Please note that from an environmental point of view the proposal is considered the best option for the proposed installation as all identified impacts under the proposal can be reduced to medium and low significance provided that all recommended mitigation measures are implemented correctly. 38) Information on Page 13 contradicts information on page on 15. The consultant indicates they have applied for an authorisation yet on page 15 the following is stated: • The proposed sewer pipeline will traverse certain watercourses (rivers/ streams and wetland). The DHSWS is the competent authority to this regard. A WUL application will be made to the DHSWS in terms of Section 40 of the NWA, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) for water uses as defined in Section 21(c) and Section 21(i). A GA registration or WULA will have to be undertaken for the proposed project. 39) The report refers to air quality during construction as follows: The proposed project may cause the generation of dust, noise disturbances and unwanted odours during the construction phase and the operational phase therefore the Air quality act will be applicable as it sets out measures with regards to dust, noise and unwanted odours. • However, there is no information provided of air quality prior and post implementation of the project. 40) The need for the new pipeline is premised on speculation since there is no adequate evidence provided to substantiate the following assumptions: • The old sewer pipeline has reached its full capacity and regularly overflows at the manholes, leaking from certain parts along its route, polluting the environment. 41) The report states the following: Numerous properties are involved along the pipeline route, where the proposed pipeline will mostly be following a road servitude within urban areas and open fields. • A detailed map indicating the list of properties is not included to corroborate the assertion, the properties provided are only for the section which triggers compliance with the EIA. 42) It is noted that the pipeline will not increase the existing sewerage system since it is an additional sewerage line to assist the proposed development with sewer connection to an existing system which is contrary to the following. • The sewer pipeline is the only feasible and reasonable alternative given that there is an already existing pipeline, and the proposed pipeline is required to increase the capacity of the existing system. 43) The BAR refers to the following: No rare or endangered flora or fauna species were recorded on site. This was primarily due to the site being recently burnt. • This indicates the timing of the specialist report did not consider the seasonality where vegetation has fully recovered for the studies to be undertaken. 44) Page 29 refers to the following: Yes. The Site consists of several wetlands as well as the Braamfontein spruit that the proposed pipeline transverses. • The list of wetlands in question is not included except for the Braamfontein Spruit. 45) Under social context, the report refers to an outdated population statistic of 2011. • According to StatsSA (2011), Randburg has a total population of 337 053 people, with 73.3 % of the population between the

current pipeline route, be seen as the best alternative to the construction of a pipeline upgrade. EIMS has endeavoured to engage in different assessments, involving different specialists to best approach an assessment of the proposed project. This information has been made available for public review. EIMS acknowledges JCPZ's objection and will include this letter as part of correspondence with the I&AP to be submitted to the GDARD together with the BAR and overall application.

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

working age (15 -64 years). Randburg has a high population density of 2007 people per square kilometre. In terms of education, 42.6% of persons older than 20 years have obtained higher education and 31% of persons have obtained matric. 46) The report states that: • A Heritage Specialist was appointed to conduct a walkthrough of the proposed application area and an heritage exemption letter was produced. No fatal flaws in terms of heritage was identified and no further assessments were required. • The site in question is utilised by various religious groups for rituals and baptism. This aspect was not considered in terms of the impact of the informal groups that utilises the site for religious practices and how the impacts will be managed. These groups are mostly semi-illiterate and do not reside in the area and were not identified as the interested and affected stakeholders. This activity is not reflected in any of the submitted reports. 47) Page 69 of the BAR refers to the following. • Employment creation-Employment creation will be negatively impacted if the No Go alternative is considered. The filling station will contribute to 10 employment opportunities during construction and 8 employment opportunities during operation to previously disadvantaged persons if the project goes ahead. • This demonstrates the project to have been a "copy-and-paste" exercise of information hence the reference to a filling station. 48) The rationale statement provided is premised on speculation since when the time was initiated there are no known existing pressures along the pipeline route. The statement is not corroborated by the quantities and volumes. • Should the sewer pipeline not be installed, the new development will place additional pressure on the existing infrastructure and could result in spillages. This could significantly impact on the socio-economic status of the area. 49) The servitude in question is not outlined in the submitted diagrams since the servitude parameters are unknown including the distance, parameters and the conditions associated with the servitude in question. • The proposed project will increase the capacity for sewage management in the area and allow for further economic growth and urban development. The proposed pipeline will be installed in an existing servitude. 50) The following statement is based on speculation and is unsubstantiated: The proposed project aims to increase the capacity of the sewage infrastructure in Randburg, City of Johannesburg. The current sewage infrastructure is inadequate and is therefore, unable to support any further development in the area. The installation of the pipeline will allow for the housing developments in the area to commence. The proposed pipeline will be installed in an existing servitude. 51) The wetland disturbance can be avoided through a proper investigation and assessment of available alternatives; hence the following statement is speculative. • Several impacts have been identified for the proposed project, with many having medium significance pre-mitigation. These Moderate impacts are anticipated as the proposed project will be for the installation of the pipeline infrastructure and the temporary and short-term physical disturbance of the wetland area cannot be avoided during construction. JPCZ is of the view that the EIA process followed in this instance is flawed based on the following: a. The sub-standard quality of information provided in the BA report, and with an additional detection of a 'copy-and-paste' exercise. b. Processes associated with the EIA were initiated

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

without the land custodian's permission. c. The above listed information is not available which denotes that it is being 'made-up' based on responses from City Parks to further provide the rationale for this project. d. Some of the information was generated after the processes had been initiated as a formalisation process of a pre-determined outcome to cause an environmental damage and associated disturbance on the open spaces, river and wetland through the installation of a sewer pipe. e. The Ecological Assessment was under when the study had already been disturbed through a fire and it does not provide an actual account of prevalent site conditions. This resulted in reliance in the desktop assessment supported through literature and 'inaccurate' findings on the sensitivities found on site. f. Of concern is that the identified site is confirmed to be a Critical Biodiversity Area 1 in terms of the City's biodiversity layer and is effectively part of an important ecological wetland system. These are areas that are required to be protected and conserved to secure and protect a range of ecological processes associated with the area and in support of the open space system to which it is linked. The management objective for such areas is to maintain natural areas and to rehabilitate any degraded areas to a natural or near natural state, and managed so that there is no further degradation. JPCZ hereby requests the Department not to grant the requested authorisation to Johsco/EIMS based on the above objection.

Date 2024/02/14 Method Email

Comment

Kindly note the attached objection from City Parks. Regards,

Response

Many thanks for your submission. This will be recorded in the process and included in the submissions to the Competent Authority. ** A letter responding to concerns was subsequently submitted to I&AP. See attached correspondence.**

Date 2024/02/28 Method Email

Comment

Some of the provided information in the response is vague and not clearly explained. Can you please include specific dates, names of officials and relevant evidence to corroborate this: 9) As noted in the response provided in (8) above, JCPZ was identified as a key I&AP and included in the initial call to register and subsequent review of the BAR. 14) Refer to (8) and (9). EIMS acknowledges this comment and supports that this correspondence and past correspondence is proof that JCPZ has been engaged. In terms of the project's I&AP database, JCPZ has been on the project's database since 30 June 2021, when the project's Public Participation process commenced. Also expand on what is meant by the following: 26) The impact on trees is negligible, the alignment avoids all large trees. 34) EIMS thanks JCPZ for identifying this in the report. The statement cited refers to the need for a Water Use License in terms of Section 21 (c)

Response

Please see the below response to your most recent follow-up comments: 9) please refer to comments captured in the attached comments and response table. Correspondence of note included the following: a) Email dated 02 July 2021 b) Email dated 16 July 2021, c) Email and Objection Letter dated 21 July 2021, d) Email dated 03 August 2021, e) Email dated 23 January 2024, f) Email dated 24 February 2024, g) Email dated 26 January 2024, h) Email dated 05 February 2024, i) Email dated 08 February 2024, j) Email and Objection Letter dated 14 February 2024, k) Email dated 28 February 2024 (below) These have now been included in the BAR to be submitted to GDARDE. 26) Large trees will be avoided during construction. 34) A Water Use License is required for this project and is currently underway. 41) The properties which are subject to the Environmental Authorisation Application have been listed in the BAR. 49) Refer to

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Mr Cebo Mhlongo

and (i). Therefore, the assertion in the report is that a GA would not apply to this project. 41) EIMS notes this comment. It is argued here that a list of all other properties would not add value to the EIA process which essentially only applies to the segment of the pipeline which triggers the listed activities, namely the portions that traverse the open space system and cross the watercourse. 49) An existing sewer line currently runs through the park and crosses the stream, if this sewer line has a servitude could not be confirmed. The new sewer line will be laid as close as practically possible to the existing line, a servitude will have to be registered.

Appendix C – Facility Illustrations. Sewer servitude is indicated in these drawings.

Jessie

Date 2021/07/27 Method Email

Comment

To whom it may concern, Please will you keep us notified of development with respect to: NOTIFICATION REGARDING OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION APPLICATION PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED SEWER PIPELINE UPGRADE FOR THE SELKIRK AVENUE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, IN THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG, GAUTENG PROVINCE, SOUTH AFRICA.

Response

Dear Sir/Madam Thank you for your correspondence and interest in the proposed project. Kindly note that you will be registers as an interested and affected party (I&AP) on the project's database. As a registered I&AP you will be provided with the opportunities to participate in the Environmental Authorisation as they become available. Please may you provide me with your contact details such as fax, cell phone number and postal address. Alternatively, may you kindly advise if the email address you used will be sufficient for sending notices to you in the future. Should you have further queries or comments, please feel free to let EIMS know.

Donovan Smith

Date 2021/07/25 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sirs Please register me as an I&AP and include me in all invitations regarding public participation and information relating to the authorisation process. You have my email address. My name is set out below. I live in Valley Road, Bordeaux. I could not find any information on the EIMS site regarding the project or authorisation process. In the circumstances I am currently unable to participate in any public participation process or indicate whether I am in favour of or opposed to the activity for which authorisation is sought.

Response

Dear Donovan, Thank you for your correspondence. Please note that you have been registered as an interested and affected party (I&AP) to the project database. As a registered I&AP kindly note that you will be provided with an opportunity to participate in the proposed projects Environmental Authorisation process and opportunity to comment on the Basic Assessment Report once it has been made available. Kindly note that currently the Basic Assessment process is at the starting phase and therefore no reports have been uploaded to the website regarding the project, you will be notified of the report availability once it has been made available for public review and comment. Should you have further comments or queries, please feel free to contact EIMS.

Date 2021/07/26 Method Email

Comment

Response

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Donovan Smith

Thank you. 1. Surely there must be at least some information available about the application? 2. I thought the Basic Assessment Report had to include a section on public participation? In other words the Basic Assessment process ought to include public participation. So the initial public participation must surely take place before the preparation of the draft Basic Assessment Report? Am I wrong?

Dear Donovan, Thank you for your correspondence and interest in the project. Kindly note that the Environmental Authorisation process will follow a Basic Assessment Process. The process will include the Application Phase followed by the Basic Assessment Phase and lastly the appeal phase. Public consultation is required as per the regulations to be conducted throughout the process. Please note that EIMS conducts an additional public participation period as part of our application process. At the inception of any project, EIMS conducts what is referred to as a call to register and initial notification period. The aim of this is to provide I&APs with an opportunity to register on the project database and to provide initial comments on the project, if they have any, so that we may address them in the next phase of the environmental authorisation process. This project is currently in the initial notification and call to register phase. Kindly note that the Public Participation Process for this project started with an initial notification and call to register phase. During this phase, initial notices were sent out to the pre-identified Interested and Affected Parties where contact details were available, site notices and advert placement were also undertaken as part of informing I&APs of the proposed project and inviting them to register on the projects database. I have attached the notification for your convenience. Further to the above, specialist studies and basic assessment report (BAR) and associated is currently in the process of being drafted. Once the reports have been completed and the application will be submitted, and the reports will be made available for public review and comment for a period of 30-days. A hard copy of the report will be placed at a local public venue for public access. A soft copy of the report will also be made available on the EIMS website once available. Registered I&APs will be notified of the opportunity to participate and comment on the BAR and associated appendices when they become available. In addition to the above please find attached the initial notification letter that was sent at the start of the public consultation. Please do not hesitate to contact EIMS should you require any further clarification regarding the above or should you have any additional comments.

Date 2021/07/27 **Method** Email

Comment

Thank you. Is the applicant considering any alternatives? It is not apparent from the initial notification letter.

Response

Dear Donovan, Thank you for your correspondence. The initial notification merely provides an introduction to the project. Please note that alternatives will be assessed in the Basic Assessment Report which will be made available for public review and comment. At this stage, we are still awaiting various specialist reports in order to inform our Basic Assessment Report. Should you have any further comments or queries please feel free to contact EIMS.

Nhlanhla Makhathini

Date 2024/01/22 **Method** Email

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Nhlanhla Makhathini

Comment

The EAP is aware that this serves as a notification and adherence to the specified submission requirements on the first page of the BAR template is crucial for the streamlined processing and review of your Draft Basic Assessment Report for the issuance of comments.

Response

This comment was in response to Ntshepiseng Moloi's correspondence. However, comment included in report as project email address was copied in. No response from EAP required.

Ms Katlego Kale

Date 2021/07/16 Method Email

Comment

Good Day Sinalo, Kindly register the Department of Environment and Infrastructure Services as an I & AP for the proposed project. Kindly send us a copy of the report, together with the relevant specialist studies for review.

Response

Dear Katlego, Thank you for your correspondence. Kindly note that your department has been registered as an I&AP to the projects database and will be provided with an opportunity to comment in the Basic Assessment Report when it becomes available. Please may you confirm the email we can use for sending notifications relating to the mentioned project in future.

Date 2021/07/16 Method Email

Comment

Hi Sinalo, Please forward the reports to the email copied here.

Response

Dear Katlego, Thank you for your correspondence. Kindly note that all further notifications with regards to the above-mentioned project will be sent to the copied email addresses as requested.

Date 2024/01/24 Method Email

Comment

Could you kindly send a hard copy of the report to 118 Jorissen Street. Traduna House 6th floor.

Response

Many thanks for your mail and apologies for the delay in responding to you. We are in the process of printing a hard copy as requested and will deliver via couriers as soon as possible. Please let me know if there are any specific instructions for the couriers?

Date 2024/02/15 Method Email

Comment

Kindly note attached the Department's comments on the abovementioned application. Should you have any queries, do not hesitate to contact me.

Response

Many thanks for your submission. We will consider and incorporate into the Final BAR to be submitted for decision making.

Date 2024/02/15 Method Other

Comment

Response

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Ms Katlego Kale

Kindly note attached the Department's comments on the abovementioned application. Should you have any queries, do not hesitate to contact me. Content of Letter: Description of the project: The proposed development involves the installation of new sewer infrastructure within the existing road servitude from Jan Smut Avenue to Bordeaux Riverside Park, Valley Road and Garden Road. The proposed sewer pipeline infrastructure will involve the installation of a new uPVC Class 34 pipeline with an internal diameter of between 200mm to 360mm. The proposed project will cross the Braamfontein Spruit stream located over the above-mentioned farm portions. The start, middle and end points for the pipeline through the Bordeaux Riverside Park are: Start: 26° 5'57.20"S, 28° 1'4.91"E; Middle: 26° 5'5.56"S, 28° 1'12.89"E; and End: 26° 5'59.75"S, 28° 1'18.48". Guidelines, by-laws and policies: The Report considers relevant policies, by laws and strategies. The site falls within Region B, Sub Area 17 whose objective is to enhance the residential character and ambience of the area. The proposed development is also aligned with the SDF 2040 that supports infrastructure upgrades and the promotion of the quality and integrity of the environment. The application for the pipeline upgrade envisages the maintenance and provision of infrastructure as ensuring sufficient capacity for the future. Description of alternatives: The sewer pipeline is planned to supplement the existing sewer pipeline for a new proposed developments in the area. No alternatives were considered. The proposed route crossed the stream at Garden Road and again at Bordeaux Riverside Park. Although the Department takes into cognizance that the proposed sewer line will be installed within an existing road servitude, an alternative of avoiding the crossing at Garden Road must be explored. Description and assessment of the identified environmental issues: The CoJ Wetland Audit layers show that the site is affected by a Channeled Valley Bottom wetland system and the 1:100-year floodline. Furthermore, the City's Bioregional Plan shows that part of the proposed development site is mapped as a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) and Ecological Support Area (ESA). CBAs are areas required to meet biodiversity patterns and/ or ecological processes targets. No alternative sites are available to meet these targets. Therefore, the desired management of these areas is to maintain them in a natural state with limited or no biodiversity loss. Ecological Support Areas are split based on land cover- ESA 1 being in a largely natural state and ESA 2 areas important for maintaining landscape connectivity. In addition, ecological support areas play an important role in supporting the ecological functioning of Critical Biodiversity Area in delivering associated ecosystem services. Consequently, development in these areas should be planned in a manner that allows for faunal movement. The following report is included in the Draft BAR Ecological and Wetland Baseline and Impact Assessment Two wetland types, a channeled valley bottom and hillslope seep were identified and delineated for the 500 m regulated area. These systems are adjacent to the Braamfontein spruit which is classified as a riverine system. The ecological status of the wetlands was determined to be seriously modified and largely modified. The overall Ecological Importance and Sensitivity for the systems was determined to be Moderate A buffer zone of 15 m has been calculated for all wetlands based on the extent and impacts of the

Comments were provided in the order captured in the attached letter. Content of response letter attached below: Comment is noted Comment is noted The upgrade of the sewer line follows the path of the existing sewer line, as it will augment the current line, and for that to be done the tow lines will be interconnected at strategic points. Thus the new sewer line, like the existing line will cross Garden Road as well as the Bordeaux Park, but as mentioned previously the lines will be placed as close to each other as possible. Comment relates to the content of the report. This comment is noted and also relates to the content of the subsequent comment. This comment is noted, and the necessary conditions included in the EMPr. Please see page 31, under section 15.9. Comment noted as it pertains to the content of the BAR and EMPr Comment noted on public participation process. The department's stance is noted. The recommendations here have been incorporated into the EMPr to clearly highlight the need to conduct rehabilitation according to the compiled Rehabilitation Plan. This comment is noted, and the necessary information confirmed in the EMPr. Addressed in comment above. The suggestion around the spanning of the wetlands has been included as an additional alternative in the BAR. Reasons for not engaging with this alternative further is also provided. It is anticipated that this alternative will involve additional impacts and risks, such as affecting pre-existing land uses, having visual impacts, and presenting new risks associated with the nature of suspending the infrastructure. This comment has been noted and recommendation confirmed to be included in the EMPr. This comment has been noted and recommendation confirmed to be included in the EMPr. This comment has been noted and recommendation confirmed to be included in the EMPr. The recommendations of this comment have been incorporated in the EMPr. This comment has informed the adjustment of a condition in the EMPr which addresses this concern. While the proposed activity will have a limited impact on the free flow of water within the wetland/watercourse, conditions in the EMPr address the rehabilitation of the area as well as ensuring that construction activities have a minimal impact on the wetland during the phase. This comment is addressed through the conditions of the EMPr. In this regard, access to the area during construction will be restricted. This comment has been noted and recommendation confirmed to be included in the EMPr. This comment is addressed in the EMPr as a recommendation informing the nature of construction. This comment has been noted and recommendation confirmed to be included in the EMPr.

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Ms Katlego Kale

construction and operation of the pipeline. The City's Catchment Management Policy does not allow development of infrastructure within 1:100-year floodline or 30 metres buffer zone of any watercourse or whichever is greatest. The policy only accepts the exceptional rule to work within the buffer zone, when the proponent implements rehabilitation measures that would improve the Present Ecological Status. Thus, a rehabilitation plan must be developed for the wetland. The report states that the Bordeaux Riverside Park will be used for a camp site and the temporary stockpiling of excavated material. Permission will have to be sought from Johannesburg City Parks and Zoo (JCPZ) for this. Furthermore, the rehabilitation measures specific for the park must ensure that no faunal species in the habitat are harmed. This must be included in the EMPr. Evaluation and presentation of mitigation measures: Mitigation measures are proposed for each identified environmental impact and are outlined in Section E of the DBAR. The proposed mitigation measures are also included in the Draft EMPr, which is included as Appendix H. Most of the impacts are expected to have "Moderate" significance ratings prior to mitigation. These ratings are expected to be decreased by applying the prescribed mitigation measures and adhering to recommendations, with the significance of the aspects being reduced to a "Low" level of risk. Public Participation: The Public Participation (PP) was undertaken is in line with the requirements as specified in the EIA Regulations, 2014(as amended). Recommendations: Having noted the above, the Department has no objection to the proposed activity in principle however requires the following be included in the FBAR: Rehabilitation/maintenance plan intended to achieve the mitigations & rehabilitation objectives for the wetland must be compiled. These must be included in the EMPr. The park must also be rehabilitated therefore a rehabilitation plan pertaining this must be compiled and submitted for review. The applicant must explore the alternative that avoids crossing the river twice at Garden Road and the Bordeaux Office Park. The Department recommends that where the pipe route will be crossing the wetland, it should span the entire wetland, where possible and its entire 30 m buffer (to avoid flow disturbances and to provide opportunities for displaced urban wildlife to flee safely along the wetland to other parts of the open space system. It is further recommended to maintain the riparian vegetation and incorporate a plan to remove the invasive species over time and permit indigenous species to grow, to improve the habitat and ecosystem services already provided by the riparian vegetation. • Furthermore, the following must be noted and adhered to: o All construction activities should be restricted to the pipeline reserve as proposed. The following mitigation measures implemented to minimize impact on the wetland during construction: o No heavy machinery should be moved within the wetland or area away from the pipeline reserve, and its buffer zone. o No excavations and soil stockpiling activities should take place within the wetland. o Storage facilities should not be placed within the wetland and its buffer. o Vehicles should use existing crossways/bridges and roads during project implementation. o The proposed activity should not impede the free flow of water within the wetland/watercourse. o The area where construction work will take place needs to be cordoned off. The watercourse/ wetland and its buffer on site must be treated sensitive. o

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Ms Katlego Kale

Ongoing monitoring plan for invasive species during and after construction should be developed and implemented. o The work should be carried out during dry seasons to prevent run-off being transported through the construction area of the pipelines. o Any post development revegetation and landscaping must use local indigenous species to the preferred area. As far as possible, indigenous plants naturally growing along the route but would otherwise be destroyed during construction must be used.

Bernie Marais

Date 2021/07/12 Method Email

Comment

Hello Sinalo I would like to informed and to participate in Project 1433, the new sewer line through Bordeaux South. I live on Valley Road that I understand will be impacted.

Response

Dear Bernie, Thank you for your correspondence. Kindly note that you have been registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) for the Proposed Selkirk Avenue Sewer Pipeline Project. Please note that as a registered I&AP you will be informed of the opportunities to participate in the Environmental Authorisation application and Basic Assessment process as they become available. Should you have further comments or queries, please feel free to contact EIMS.

Cllr Timothy Truluck

Date 2021/07/02 Method Email

Comment

In which suburb is Selkirk Ave

Response

Good day Cllr Tim, Thank you for your correspondence. Please note that Selkirk Avenue is located Randburg, close to the Randburg CBD taxi rank. Should you require any further information, please feel free to let EIMS know.

Date 2021/07/05 Method Email

Comment

Hi Its not my ward.

Response

Good day Cllr Tim, Thank you for your correspondence. It has been noted. Please indicate if you would like to be removed from the above-mentioned projects I&AP database?

Date 2021/07/14 Method Email

Comment

Hi. Yes. Please remove me.

Response

Good day Cllr Tim, Thank you for your correspondence. Please note that you have been removed from the project database as requested.

Comments and Responses 1433 Selkirk Avenue Development Pipeline BA

Ntshepiseng Moloji

Date 2024/01/22 Method Email

Comment

Good afternoon Mr Makhathini, Please find the attached and email for your attention.

Response

Project email address copied in internal correspondence. Refer to response from Nhlanhla Makhathini.

Date 2024/02/21 Method Email

Comment

I&AP requested de-registration. See previous comment for proof thereof.

Response

I&AP was removed from database

Stuart Green

Date 2021/07/13 Method Email

Comment

Dear Sinalo I would like to register as an interested & affected party for Bordeaux South - Project Number 1433. Please confirm and advise next steps.

Response

Dear Stuart, Thank you for your correspondence. Kindly note that you will be registered as an Interested and Affected Party for the Selkirk Avenue Pipeline Project. Please may you provide me with the relevant contact details where we can send you notifications, such as an email, cell phone number and/or fax. Should you have further queries please feel free to let EIMS know.

Date 2021/07/14 Method Email

Comment

Hi Sinalo Thank you for the confirmation. You can contact me on this email address.

Response

Dear Stuart, Kindly note that your below correspondence was received and noted. Should you have further queries or comments, please feel free to contact EIMS.