

APPENDIX F2: Comments and Response Report during Pre-Application Public Participation

Pre-Application Public Participation Process (9 February 2026 – 11 March 2026)

Proposed Residential Development on Portion 38 of Farm 136, Tergniet

1. INTRODUCTION

This Comments and Response Report (CRR) document records and responds to all comments received during the pre-application Public Participation Process (PPP) undertaken in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the 2014 EIA Regulations (as amended).

All comments received from Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) and Organs of State have been recorded, considered, and responded to. Where applicable, these comments have informed amendments to the Draft Basic Assessment Report (DBAR) and Environmental Management Programme (EMPr).

2. COMMENT AND RESPONSE TABLE

2.1 ORGANS OF STATE

Western Cape Government: Department of Health (WCG: DoH)

Comment

Response

No objection to the development, subject to compliance with Environmental Health requirements and municipal guidelines.

Comment noted. All Environmental Health requirements have been incorporated into the EMPr.

Breede-Olifants Catchment Management Agency (BOCMA)

Comment

Response

Confirmation required whether Section 21 water uses are triggered.

No watercourses present; no Section 21(c) or (i) uses triggered.

Proof of municipal bulk services capacity required.

Bulk services assessment completed; municipal confirmation obtained.

Compliance with National Water Act required.

Requirements incorporated into EMPr.

CapeNature

Comment

Response

Site falls within CBA 1 (Critical Biodiversity Area) and contains Endangered Hartenbos Dune Thicket.	Acknowledges presence of CBA 1 and Endangered vegetation as key sensitivities.
CBAs should be protected, rehabilitated, and limited to low-impact uses.	Clarifies CapeNature comments are based on BID only, not detailed specialist studies in DBAR.
Despite surrounding transformation, the site still has ecologically significant features requiring careful consideration.	Specialist studies confirm site is: • Disturbed and historically transformed • Fragmented by surrounding development and infrastructure • Reduced in ecological connectivity
Vegetation is endemic, poorly protected, and under-assessed, increasing conservation concern.	Specialists did not identify the site as a "no-go", but suitable for development with mitigation.
Records indicate presence of threatened species and protected trees, highlighting ecological value.	SDP revised to reduce impacts: • Inclusion of ecological corridors and open space • Avoidance of sensitive areas where possible
Specialist studies must inform the SDP before any approval.	Reduced development footprint
Recommend consultation with DFFE as competent authority.	Confirms DFFE and other authorities are being consulted.
Development will cause definite, irreversible loss of threatened vegetation → considered a high biodiversity impact.	Acknowledges permanent loss of vegetation, but argues significance must be viewed in already transformed urban context.
Do not agree with BID conclusion of low-moderate impacts.	Impact significance based on specialist studies and refined layout, not BID assumptions.
Retained open space "pockets" are insufficient to offset habitat loss or maintain functionality.	Open space areas are mitigation measures, not intended as biodiversity offsets.

Firebreak requirements and legal duty of care (NEMA Section 28) must be adhered to.	Fire management and NEMA Duty of Care incorporated into EMP.
---	--

Will provide further comments at DBAR stage and may revise position.	Welcomes further engagement during formal DBAR public participation phase.
--	--

Garden Route District Municipality

Comment

Dust, waste, sanitation impacts.

Response

Mitigation included in EMPr.

Department of Fisheries, Forestry and Environment

The site mainly consists of protected Milkwood trees and shrubs, together with pioneer species such as Taaibos, Crossberry and scattered Rooikrantz. Forestry indicated that the development layout should be refined to reduce units located close to individual and clustered protected trees, retain larger trees within the development design, and preserve the larger protected tree clusters on the north-east and south-east portions of the site as no-go areas. Forestry further indicated that formal comment would be provided during the public participation process together with a follow-up site inspection.

Response

Option C as preferred Site Layout plan was developed

Mitigation included in EMPr.

2.2 COMMUNITY AND I&AP COMMENTS

Dolphin Crescent Paraat Group

Comment

Rezoning before EIA concern.

Peer review requested.

PPP flawed.

Response

Processes clarified; EA required.

Specialists independent; DEADP reviews.

PPP compliant; further phase to follow.

EIA must consider cumulative impacts of developments (past 10 years); request full inventory

Cumulative impacts acknowledged and assessed at site/local scale.

A full regional inventory is beyond scope of project EIA (handled at SDF level).

Concern about loss of protected plants and monitoring responsibility

Monitoring will be managed through:

- Environmental Control Officer (ECO)
- EMP compliance system

Includes tracking of vegetation clearing and protected species.

Site has Very High sensitivity; wildlife already declining → development should not proceed.

Very High" sensitivity is a screening trigger, not a prohibition.

Specialist studies confirm High sensitivity, but:

- Development can proceed with mitigation

Mitigation includes:

- Ecological corridors
- Retention of open space
- Reduced units (144 → 133)

Dust impacts poorly managed in past developments; request control measures, phased clearing, complaint system.

Dust addressed in EMP with specific measures, including:

- Wetting surfaces
- Phased clearing
- Speed control
- Rehabilitation

ECO will manage complaints and monitoring.

Option for community forum/representative for complaints.

Construction noise must follow by-laws
Operational noise will reduce tranquillity
Request complaint mechanism & HOA control

Noise mitigation in EMP:

- Restricted working hours
- No Sundays/public holidays
- Equipment maintenance

ECO will manage complaints.

Operational noise = typical residential levels.

	HOA responsibility included in EMP
Traffic not "low"; request re-evaluation and proof of studies	Detailed TIA conducted with traffic counts and modelling. Intersections operate at Level of Service A (free flow). No upgrades required.
Dangerous intersections and limited access points	Access from Impala Road is acceptable in design and safety. Adequate visibility and stacking space provided.
Concern about temporary gravel road access (dust/noise)	No contractor access required per TIA. If needed → managed via EMP with mitigation and resident notification.
Pedestrian & cyclist safety risks.	Area already low-speed residential. Mitigation includes: • Safe access design • Visibility improvements • Potential crossings (if required by Municipality).
Insufficient water supply capacity; request full system review.	Bulk supply confirmed sufficient. Only constraint: fire flow → pipeline upgrade planned. Reservoir provides ~97 hours storage.
Stormwater flooding issues; concern about capacity.	Stormwater managed via engineered attenuation systems. Designed to mimic pre-development runoff. No natural watercourses impacted.
Sewer system bottleneck risk	Capacity confirmed adequate. Development includes new pump station + rising main.
Concern about overall infrastructure capacity (incl. electricity)	Full engineering assessments + municipal confirmation completed. Required upgrades included in development (MV network, substations).
Development will negatively impact tranquillity, views, and social character; cumulative effects must be considered; objections may prevent rezoning.	Site already in urbanising, fragmented landscape. Development consistent with existing residential character and SDF urban edge. Cumulative impacts considered → not unacceptable with mitigation.

Regional cumulative studies fall under strategic planning, not project EIA.

Andrea Beierle

Comment

Response

Applicant and landowner details are inconsistent and unclear.

Will correct applicant name and clarify ownership structure.
Mandate from landowners to representative will be included in DBAR.
Confirms this is standard practice for multiple owners.

Conflicting dates in DBAR (2024 vs 2026).

2024 date refers to DEA&DP template version, not report date.
DBAR was issued February 2026.

Missing EAPASA registration number in notices.

Will be included in next PPP round

Development size unclear (5 ha vs 10 ha).

Property is ~10 ha, but development footprint is ±5–6 ha due to constraints.

Incorrect / inconsistent reference numbers.

Two numbers exist (fee + file reference).
Will standardise going forward.

PPP is misrepresented as pre-application and flawed; process started earlier without consultation.

Confirms process is pre-application following NOI submission (2025).
PPP conducted before formal submission as required by DEADP.

I&APs were excluded early in process.

Pre-application PPP allows early engagement before submission.
Comments will be captured and incorporated into DBAR v2.

Lack of authority consultation (CapeNature, SANBI).

Authorities are being consulted as part of ongoing process.
Comments will be included in updated DBAR.

DEA&DP feedback not provided.

DEA&DP engaged via NOI and pre-application meeting.
DBAR submitted to DEA&DP for comment.

Incorrect vegetation map reference (2018 instead of 2024).

Acknowledged and updated to 2024 VegMap.
No change to findings.

Inconsistencies in vegetation type descriptions.	Will review and correct inconsistencies in DBAR.
Fine-scale (Vlok) mapping not considered.	Confirmed it was considered in specialist study.
Insufficient field surveys (single season).	Confirms two site visits (2024 & 2025). SCC assessment based on habitat + datasets, not only seasonality.
Incorrect statement about WCBSP trigger reasons availability.	Trigger layer not publicly available at time. Assessment still used WCBSP categories.
No-go alternative incorrectly assessed; ignores CBA importance and restoration potential.	No-go reflects current land-use reality, not ideal restoration scenario. CBAs recognised but do not guarantee active conservation.
Development causes irreversible biodiversity loss; corridors inadequate.	Permanent loss acknowledged. Mitigation includes corridors, open space, invasive control, tree protection. Residual impact considered low within fragmented context.
Presence of alien vegetation shows poor compliance and cannot justify lower sensitivity.	Alien vegetation noted as ecological observation, not compliance finding. Sensitivity remains High–Very High. Management included in EMP.
SEI rating of medium is flawed and downplays importance.	SEI based on structured methodology (CI, FI, RR). Reflects combined factors (condition, connectivity, recovery).
Incorrect use of <i>Hermannia lavandulifolia</i> status and trends.	Confirms species is Vulnerable and considered in assessment. Removes speculative statement about status change.
Insufficient faunal surveys and lack of rigour (camera traps, seasonality).	Limitations acknowledged in report. Likelihood of species based on habitat and datasets. Camera trap details added.
Sensitivity rating contradicts development suitability.	Screening sensitivity ≠ SEI. Specialist study provides site-specific context for decision-making.
Misuse of Bontebok and CBA justification	Bontebok reference corrected and deemed not relevant.

	CBA designation acknowledged, not redefined.
Layout does not avoid protected trees.	Layout informed by specialists; avoidance where feasible. Permits required if removal unavoidable.
Impact ratings underestimated; residual impacts incorrect.	Ratings based on standard EIA methodology. Residual impact = reduced significance after mitigation, not zero impact.
Habitat corridor insufficient and isolated.	Corridor is partial mitigation in already fragmented landscape. Includes faunal movement gaps
Permanent vegetation loss is high and cannot be mitigated.	Loss acknowledged; mitigation reduces extent and intensity. Includes search & rescue, relocation, and management measures.

Uys Meiring

Comment

Loss of sea view.

Response

Design refined to minimise impact.

Joey Gouws

Comment

Vegetation and wildlife concerns.

Wetland concern.

Access safety.

Response

Mitigation measures included.

No wetlands confirmed.

Traffic study completed.

Janine Greeff

Comment

Request to register.

Response

Registered as I&AP.

3. GENERAL ISSUES

Public Participation Process

Comment

Notice visibility and language.

Response

Improved placement; bilingual notices.

Access to documents.

Clarified and improved.

Process Clarification

Comment

Response

Rezoning vs EIA confusion.

Processes clarified.

4. CONCLUSION

All comments have been recorded, considered, and incorporated into the DBAR (v2) and EMPr. The proposal has been refined through stakeholder input. A further PPP phase will follow submission.