

| Organizations | Comment Received | Response |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Wildlife and Environmental Society of South Africa</p> <p>Carolyn Schwegman EIA Co-ordinator, WESSA KZN Region</p> | <p>The issue of interest are, inter alia –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Restoration of the riparian zones and future protection of the streams 2. Storm water management 3. Sanitation - site infrastructure plus treatment 4. During the planning stages we would like consideration given to measures which will reduce potable water use and, 5. Alternative energy sources warrant investigation. 6. Ecological improvement of the site overall from indigenous landscaping will be supported. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A landscaping plan is recommended to form part of the environmental authorisation. 2. Stormwater management will be commissioned. 3. The Engineering Services Report will provide details with this regard. Once the information is available it will be incorporated in the Basic Assessment Report 4. Comment noted. 5. Comment noted. 6. Comment noted. |
| <p>Umgeni Water</p> <p>Steve Terry</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What sort of industry is anticipated? 2. What is the likely increase in water use / demand, and indication of potential sewage and trade effluent generation? What steps are to be taken to prevent any wastes from entering the streamlines (or canals/conduits if you end up doing them that way)? 3. What is the sewer network layout across that site at the moment, what state is it in (at a glance, there are apparently issues!), will the developer be re-doing any lines? 4. Floodline on the Copesville stream (the one coming past the quarry of course, it does have a name, even if not | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The site is zoned “General Industrial” which permits the development of heavy industry. However the developer wishes to rezone the property to “General” which would restrict industrial activities to light industrial uses. 2. The water use / demand are largely dependent upon the occupying industry. The development of the site shall be subject to a service agreement between the developer and the Municipality. 3. The sewage referred to in the Background information document is <i>ex situ</i> sewage that is leaking from a municipal manhole. It is therefore the Msunduzi Municipalities responsibility to ensure that this is repaired. A copy of the BID was forwarded to the municipalities Water and Sanitation Unit notifying them of the pollution. 4. As part of the planning process which has occurred |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>formal) – will that impact the site / development at all? I don't think you will get away with canalizing that if it is not actually on the property?</p> <p>5. Intentions re. stormwater retention and pervious pavements etc. on the site itself to avoid increased peak runoff, and what is the max likely flow coming onto the site from above, from that small subcatchment in panorama gardens? Do you have the contours of the catchment (not just the site – the catchment above and area etc. there are important).</p> <p>6. Yes, DEFINITELY there will be a need to look further – perhaps not just the wetland ecology, but what function the current channels may perform in delaying/absorbing flows etc.</p> <p>7. If you leave some “natural” channel, what will the implications be for reduction in viable site area, for various set-backs? May be worth considering up front as a parkland area.</p> | <p>subsequent to the circulation of the BID, the floodline of the Copesville Stream has been delineated. The area within the floodline has been excluded from the development footprint.</p> <p>5. Please see the attached Specialist Studies labelled D3 and D8. These studies detail how storm water attenuation is to be managed.</p> <p>6. Please refer to the response No. 5.</p> <p>7. As discussed, the project excludes the area within the 1:100 year floodline.</p> |
| <p>Msunduzi Municipality: Environment Department</p> <p>Jessica Brislin</p> | <p>1. We recommend that a wetland delineation is undertaken, with adequate buffers determined from the outer edge of the temporary zone. We require this information to be provided in shapefile format for record purposes. While the EMF recommends that a wetland functionality assessment and biodiversity assessment be done, we feel it is not necessary as the site has recently been illegally cleared. We do however require a rehabilitation plan to be completed and carried out such that the entire wetland footprint (or hectare-equivalent, if calculable) is restored to a functional state as the site exists in a highly stressed catchment, particularly in terms of water quality.</p> <p>2. Similarly, the riparian corridor identified on site needs to be retained, buffered and rehabilitated (and is to please be included in the wetland rehabilitation plan). Because streams and wetlands are highly valued natural systems,</p> | <p>1. A 1: 10 year floodline has been determined and, in the opinion of the Specialist Ecologist, extends beyond what would be the temporary wetland boundary. It is the opinion of the Specialist Ecologist that the proposed formalized system, as detailed in the Preferred and Alternative Layout, will lead to a drastic improvement in the functionality of the wetland system. The Preferred Layout incorporates the Municipality's concern for the catchments water quality by limiting the accessibility of the watercourse to pollution.</p> <p>2. A Landscaping Plan for the proposed development is a recommendation of this assessment. The developer has also sort to negotiate with the municipality to incorporate the landscaping and management of the</p> |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>their rehabilitation could potentially be seen as an offset to the development commencing. This is also in line with our Unit's 'no net-loss' policy in terms of the above systems.</p> <p>3. In terms of the ESP plan, the site has been identified strategically as a key area for conservation and preservation of its associated riparian corridors and we therefore ask that you take this into consideration when compiling the BAR.</p> <p>4. We require a stormwater management plan that will not only identify floodlines and address issues around flooding but potentially enhance the wetland and riparian areas and promote flood-neutrality.</p> | <p>adjacent municipal open space. This adjacent land has become inundated with a variety of alien vegetation species (Both category 2 and 3 species in terms of the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, Act 43 of 1983) and the incorporation into the management of the development would be in line with the Units 'no net-loss' policy.</p> <p>3. This has been taken into consideration.</p> <p>4. Please see Appendix D for the Stormwater Management Plan and Appendix C for the Facility Illustrations which detail the interpretation and catering for the recommendations of this plan.</p> |
| <p>Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife</p> <p>Jeffrey Maivha</p> | <p>Ezemvelo requests that:</p> <p>1. A Wetland Delineation assessment is undertaken. Wetland on the proposed site must be delineated by a suitably qualified wetland ecologist and be afforded an appropriate ecological buffer. Buffers must be delineated from the edge of the temporary wet hydromorphic zone, to ensure that the ecological processes of the wetland systems on the property and downstream hydrological connectivity are not negatively impacted upon.</p> <p>2. A Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) is produced for this development to ensure that post development stormwater runoff approximates pre-development conditions in terms of water quality, intensity of release and spatial distribution of release points. Stormwater from hardened surfaces (e.g. roads, paved areas, etc.) must be treated prior to entering the natural environment, so as to prevent oils, cleaning agents, etc. from entering and contaminating surface or</p> | <p>1. A 1: 10 year floodline has been determined and, in the opinion of the Specialist Ecologist, extends beyond what would be the temporary wetland boundary.</p> <p>2. Please see Appendix D for the Stormwater Management Plan and Appendix C for the Facility Illustrations which detail the interpretation and catering for the recommendations of this plan.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | ground water. Should wetlands or watercourses be affected by the proposal, the SMP should be reviewed by the wetland/watercourse specialist. | |
| Duzi Umgeni Conservation Trust Andrew Booth | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal seems as if it's only for the infrastructure at the moment. Do you know what the long term plan for the area is? 2. As you have commented its essential to get a wetland ecologist in. 3. I would not be in support of draining the area extensively as the catchment has lost most of its wetlands already. Peak flows are dangerously high on the Baynespruit already and I would have serious concerns storm water management increased these flows. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The developer wishes to rezone the property to "General" which would restrict industrial activities to light industrial uses. 2. Please see Appendix D for the Wetland Delineation Report. 3. Please see the Stormwater Management Plan which negates any unnatural peak flows as a result of the proposed development. |