

**WANSLEY SIYAKHULA (PTY) LTD**

**APPLICATION TO EXPAND THE EXISTING MINING RIGHT  
FOOTPRINT OF WANSLEY QUARRY**

# **PROOF OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

***DEPARTMENTAL REFERENCE NUMBER:***

***EC 30/5/1/2/2/228 MR***

**JANUARY 2021**



## NOTIFICATION OF SECTION 102 AMENDMENT APPLICATION TO STAKEHOLDERS AND I&APS DURING INITIAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PHASE

*COMMENTING PERIOD: 11 SEPTEMBER – 13 OCTOBER 2020*

During the initial public participation process the stakeholders and I&AP's were informed of the project by means of background information documents that were sent directly to the contact persons. A 30 days commenting period was allowed that expired 13 October 2020. The following table provides a list of the I&AP's and stakeholders that were informed of the project:

<b>STAKEHOLDERS</b>			
<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Ms Nontyantyambo	Amathole District Municipality	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr Andile Sihlahla Ms Kholeka Sishuba	Buffalo City Metro Municipality	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Cllr Makhaya Bopi	Buffalo City Metro Municipality – Ward 15	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr Cira Ngetu Mr Briant Noncembu	Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr Yawa	Department of Labour	11 September 2020	No Response Received

**STAKEHOLDERS**

<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Mr MD Qwase	Department of Public Works	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mrs ZB Makina	Department of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr Babini Mbewu	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr J Mhlomi	Department of Transport	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Me Molepo Khuthadzo	Department of Human Settlements, Water and Sanitation	11 September 2020	14 September 2020
Me Molepo Khuthadzo registered the DWS as an commenting stakeholder on the 14 <sup>th</sup> of September 2020.			
Greenmined acknowledged receipt of the registration on 14 September 2020 and will provide the DWS with a copy of the DSR for their perusal.			
Mr Aphelele Tomsana	Eskom	11 September 2020	No Response Received

**STAKEHOLDERS**

<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Me Chumisa Njingana	SANRAL	11 September 2020	No Response Received
SAHRIS on-line system	SAHRA	11 September 2020	No Response Received

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Warren Farms CC Mr P Warren	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 1 of Farm No 653	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mette Pi la Cour Nielsen	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 15 of Farm No 652	11 September 2020	08 October 2020

Comments received during the initial public participation phase:

*“As a neighbour to the existing quarry my husband and I are worried about the proposed extension. I have gathered some thoughts and questions regarding the proposed extension and would like more information as the background information seemed vague on many important points. Please know that even with more information we both object to this extension. We bought our farm to live on a small farm surrounded by nature and the proposed size of the quarry will make it impossible. The quarry has been*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>working at odd hours of the day and in weekends. One of my main worries as a neighbour is how and who is going to monitor the operation, since it's already not following its regulations.</i></p>			
<p><i>Please note the following concerns and questions:</i></p>			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. The Listed Activities triggered by the proposed extension note the construction of a road, kindly indicate on a plan where the expected roads will be placed/constructed?</i></li> <li><i>2. The Listed Activities triggered by the proposed extension note the construction of dams/ weirs, kindly indicate on a plan where the expected dam/ weirs will be placed/construct?</i></li> <li><i>3. It appears from aerial imagery that the extension area has been recently burnt. Please confirm if this was routine burning or uncontrolled fire? Please describe the circumstances surrounding the fire.</i></li> <li><i>4. Please elaborate, if one can at this stage, proposed operational times should the mining right be approved? Further to this, please clarify times that trucks will utilise haul roads, blasting times, crushing and screening times etc?</i></li> <li><i>5. Please clarify management measures that are and will be in place to mitigate dust emanating from haul roads and crushing and screening operations?</i></li> <li><i>6. Will there be an independent organisation that will routinely monitor compliance with the various approvals? And also, has there been audits done to date on the current mining operations and the associated compliance of such with the current approvals? It must be noted that the BID clearly shows the current mining approved mining area (in red) having been exceeded by the mining operations. It is concerning that the current approved area has been exceeded of which the likelihood of the extended mining area being exceeded is a potential risk that should be addressed with routine compliance audits.</i></li> <li><i>7. The BID notes that the extent of the proposed extension area is ±37.8575 ha. This is significantly larger than the current footprint. Has the proponent investigated any alternatives (site and layout)? We would like to propose that the proponent presents alternatives for the extension.</i></li> <li><i>8. The activities are taking place on Portion 1 of Farm 652. The extent of the property is approximately 133 ha. The area to be mined will comprise almost 30% of the property. Is there a requirement for the area where the property is to be mined to be rezoned and or/ subdivided for a specific land use? Or a departure from the land use be required for the duration of the mining licence? It is assumed the property has an agricultural zoning and the mining operations on the specific portion of the property don't comprise agricultural zoning activities.</i></li> <li><i>9. Whilst we note the 2012 vegetation map used identifies the area as falling within Albany Coastal Belt vegetation type, we are aware that there is a more updated vegetation map available (2018 version). This is the third and latest update to the original 2006 Vegetation Map of South Africa, Lesotho and Swaziland. Changes made in the 2009 and 2012 versions were retained and additional portions of the 2006 map have been mapped at a finer scale, with 47 new vegetation types mapped</i></li> </ol>			

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

since 2012. Based on this, the new vegetation type name that the site falls in is the “South Eastern Coastal Thornveld” vegetation type. Please update your information. This vegetation unit has a range of endemic (to South Africa) species that are often found in this vegetation type and the area that was burnt (intentionally or not) may have included such species. It is also noted that the extension area encroaches on “intact” vegetated area and clarification regarding the management/mitigation of encroaching onto potentially protected (forest or non-forest) plant species is required.

10. While it is noted that the various water use approvals/ registration processes are underway, adding more dams and water uses when there is no current valid water use licence in place seems risky when the current water uses have yet been approved. Please advise the stage of water use application phase that the current water use applications are at?

11. Given that the BID does not provide a location for the proposed dams, we are assuming the location of the dams are on the same drainage line that two existing dams are located on. Placing additional in stream structures to store water is expected to reduce water further from accessing the catchment downstream and the associated water uses. Clarification regarding the exact size of the dam as well as the locality of the dam is requested.

12. The following fauna species are often seen in this area:

- ◆ Bushbuck
- ◆ Common Duiker
- ◆ Blue Duiker
- ◆ Blesbok

All these species are protected under the Provincial Nature Conservation Ordinance and further investigation regarding the impact of the mining operations on the habitat, breeding and movement of the above species is requested to be investigated, especially since the boundary of the extension area is encroaching on areas where vegetation is relatively thick in some sections. It must be further noted that the first three species are shy and sensitive species. Thank you for taking our worries, questions and objection in to consideration when continuing the report.”

Greenmined’s response to the above listed comments:

“Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your detailed correspondence received 08 October 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you both as Interested and Affected Parties on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal.

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team for consideration and assessment. Our response to your concerns will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, that will also be available to you for commenting. All your comments will be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all be available for your perusal and commenting. Further to this, please feel free to send us your suggestions regarding operational hours.”</i></p>			
<p>Boniface Trust Mr &amp; Mrs Boniface</p>	<p>Neighbour: ◆ Portion 14 of Farm No 652</p>	<p>11 September 2020</p>	<p>28 September 2020</p>
<p>Francois and Trevor Boniface objected to the project and am concerned about noise, dust and the speed/number of trucks.</p>			
<p>Response from Greenmined on 30 September 2020:</p> <p><i>“Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of your objection received 28 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal. We acknowledge your concerns regarding the noise, dust and mining related traffic and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact has been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. All your comments, and the findings of the project team will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, on which you will be able to comment.”</i></p>			
<p>On 05 October 2020 the following additional comments were received:</p> <p><i>“Our property was purchased by us for the purpose of not only living out of town for the peace and quiet, but also for our exotic bird business, therefore we cannot accept the plans of extending the size of the quarry. When we first settled down, we had no concerns as the road was well maintained for our vehicles, but now the amount of trucks that are utilizing the W road are not only causing the road to worsen over time, but they are also driving irresponsibly as well as driving up and down late at night to sometimes early morning (this includes Saturdays and Sundays) which breaks our pattern of sleep and we have to work the next day. The noise, dust and no respect from</i></p>			

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>the truck drivers are not acceptable.</i></p> <p><i>The constant up and down of the trucks are not only making our farm living noisy, but it is also depreciating the value of all of our lands and homes as it is no longer peaceful and well maintained. Apart from my family and I coming in to close contact and almost having accidents with these trucks, we cannot afford any farm animal to be on the road as it is too dangerous. As to Francois birds, they are very sensitive to loud noise as it is, we cannot have any birds stressed out as this will affect his business, we have invested up to R3 million for his birds as well as all the aviaries, we cannot allow any more noise and disruptions as this is a source of income for us. Farm living is supposed to provide us with the peace and tranquility that cannot be found in town, this extension will take the last bit of quiet that we have away from us, we should be looking forward to coming home and relaxing without constant noise and our animals cannot afford to be affected by any more blasting, noise and traffic by the trucks.”</i></p>			
Mr JF Page	Neighbour ◆ Portion 42 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr PF Jonker	Neighbour ◆ Portion 44 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mrs PA Stapleton	Neighbour ◆ Portion 45 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	16 September 2020

Comments received during the initial public participation phase:

- “1. As I am the direct neighbour to the right of this quarry how are all these changes i.e. blasting, crushing and general noise etc going to impact on me and to the value of my property? I already hear work going on all hours and weekends.*
- 2. The B Road, always in a shocking state with constant usage of huge trucks, this is a narrow road with many resident's living along it having to put up with a lot of dust, noise, arrogant drivers who have had and caused many accidents in the past and still do, and our vehicles that take huge strain. I want this road closed to these trucks as they have a perfectly good other option, the W road which is much wider and they seem to be able to keep it in a better condition i.e. grading it, and it is shorter and goes directly out on to the N6.*



**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

3. *Safety and security, has also become a problem because this area has been opened up to many undesirables which also think using these once unknown roads attractive.*

Greenmined's response to the comments:

*"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your correspondence received 02 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. Please note that your comments will be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all also be available for your perusal and commenting."*

Mr BG McMillan Lombardy Private Nature Reserve	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 15 of Farm No 652	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr & Mrs Lennard	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 41 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	04 October 2020

Response received during the initial participation process:

*"I absolutely object to the plans of extending the size of the quarry. Living on the W road has been nothing short of hell. The amount of crush and sabunga going out from the quarry is going to increase substantially. The amount of trucks using the road is going to increase as well. The trucks do not have any respect for the resident drivers, there have been quite a few near accidents. The speed the trucks drive is dangerous. As the trucks do not belong to the Quarry they do not really care what happens after a truck leaves their property. Even after being assured that matters would be attended to nothing does happen. Even us residents phoning the truck owners has had no effect on the speed limit driven by these trucks. These trucks also operate till late night hours sometimes only ending at 10 or 11pm. They are definitely removing sabunga. Coming in empty and going out full again. Trying to sleep is impossible. The noise and dust is appalling. This area is a lifestyle smallholding area, we live*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

*here for peace and quiet, which is just impossible as the quarry has become so busy. We bought our properties for the lifestyle of living on farmland with our horses, ducks, goats, pigs and other farm animals. The first few years of living here were quite pleasant even though there were some rogue drivers we could at least ride our horses around the area. This cannot be done now unless you have a death wish. Our quality of life has gone down the drain. It's not pleasant living here anymore. Regarding the road used by the trucks and I can only comment on the W road as this is where I live. The dust created by these trucks is something terrible. Normal traffic does not travel at that speed so in that instance the dust is not a problem. The Quarry owners have only just recently made an effort to fix the road properly. Before that it resembled a cattle track. We once out of our own pockets paid to have someone grade and camber the road. That cost us R10,000 which I know is nothing but at least the road was good for a while. Once the quarry increases in size I cannot imagine how many trucks are going to be using the road to the N6. I don't need to spell it out to you what a disaster our lives will be. The amount of smallholding owners around the area of the Quarry are going to be badly affected. By the blasting, by the noise, by the traffic caused by the trucks."*

Greenmined's response to the objection received:

*"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your detailed correspondence received 06 October 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal and commenting. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team for their consideration and assessment. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. The rest of your comments will also be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all be available for your perusal and commenting."*

BJ Cilliers Boorkontrakteurs (Pty) Ltd Mr D Cilliers	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 37 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	13 October 2020
---	--	-------------------	-----------------

Comments received during the initial public participation process:

*"Me and my father live on Farm 73/821 on B Road which is roughly 500m from Wansley Quarry. I have read through the Background Information Document and I would just like to raise some concerns as summarised in my completed I&AP form:*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

1. *The state of the B Road is of great concern. It is safe to assume that the high volumes of tipper/haulage trucks moving to and from Wansley quarries with their heavy loads, has a great part in the deterioration of the B Road. The road is becoming undriveable and the tipper/haulage trucks moving on it also makes driving difficult and dangerous. The B Road is narrow and has deep erosions next to and on it. Wansley does supply material to fill some of these erosions, but the rain washes it away each time and it is only a short term solution. The only suggestion is for the trucks to drive only on the W Road, which is in a better state and also wider. This suggestion unfortunately, is also dependent if the residents on W Road will accept the trucks driving only on that road.*
2. *We do not border the quarry directly, so a direct concern with blasting would only be the sound/shockwave.*
3. *The noise levels can possibly become a major concerning factor because the quarry operating hours might alter and run throughout the night? Are there any set regulations for the operating hours and types of operation to minimize the noise?*
4. *As for the dust, East London does have notoriously strong and sporadic wind patterns. There is no mention on mitigations for dust and can become problematic if not addressed properly.*
5. *Also a concern to note is that with the possible blasting, dust, noise and unbearable road conditions, the property value might decline. All of these factors can make the property less attractive to any potential buyer in the future.*
6. *Can I also ask for clarification on the actual footprint of the mining size that is allocated? I noticed on Fig 1 of WC 30/5/1/2/2/8/7 that the size of excavations seems to be larger than the allocated size on the red polygon?"*

Response from Greenmined to the above listed comments:

*"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your detailed correspondence received 13 October 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal and commenting. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. The rest of your comments will also be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all be available for your perusal and commenting."*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Mr & Mrs Joubert	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 74 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	15 September 2020

Comments received during the initial public participation process:

*“Why haven’t all the residents living on the B Road not been notified of this study and how it will impact on them living here. This specific road is a “private Servitude” road for the residents living along the road. Surely they also have a say in this matter? Please revert back to me if you are needing e-mail addresses.”*

Greenmined’s response to the above sent on 16 September 2020:

*“Thus far the publishing of the proposed activity (initial public participation process) included the following:*

- ◆ *an advertisement in The Rep,*
- ◆ *three A2 notices that were placed at:*
  - *the turnoff from the N6 onto the MN10118 St,*
  - *the turnoff from the R102 onto the B road,*
  - *the T-junction where the MN10118 St and B road meets.*
- ◆ *Background Information Documents (BID’s) that were send directly to the neighbouring landowners as well as a few additional residents in the area that we were requested to include;*
- ◆ *BID’s that were send to all the relevant State Departments.*

*The reasoning behind the initial public participation process is to inform the public of the proposed project and allow a registration and commenting period. Each person that registers his/her interest in the project are listed on a register, and they will be kept informed throughout the entire EIA process that will follow. For ease of reference I have attached a copy of the BID and Project Map to this email. As mentioned on page 12 of the BID, we gladly invite you to provide us with the contact details of persons you feel should be contacted. Therefore, in answer to your question, we would highly appreciate it if you can provide us with the email addresses of the people you feel should be contacted.*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

*Regarding the B road – the use of the road has been highlighted by a few I&AP's (interested and affected parties). The matter has therefore been directed as a priority to the project team that will assess the various possibilities and propose the best possible option. The findings of the project team will be discussed and assessed in the Draft Basic Assessment Report (DBAR) that will be published for public review and commenting over a further 30-days period. The comments received on the DBAR will then be incorporated into the Final Basic Assessment Report that will be submitted to the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy for decision making."*

Additional response:

*"This project will not have a DBAR and Final Basic Assessment as mentioned earlier. We will incorporate the initial comments into the **Draft Scoping Report** that will be published for a 30 days commenting period, upon which the additional comments will be added to the Final Scoping Report (FSR). The FSR will then be submitted to the DMRE for decision making. Should DMRE approve the FSR, we will continue with the draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) that will contain amongst others the findings of the specialists. The DEIAR will again be published for a 30 days commenting period and the comments received on the DEIAR will be incorporated into the Final EIAR that will be submitted to the DMRE for decision making. The matter of the access roads will be added to the DSR and FSR and will be assessed in detail in the DEIAR and FEIAR."*

Further comments received from Mrs Joubert on 29 September 2020:

*"This is our issues regarding the Up grading of the Wansley Quarry*

- 1. Blasting, crushing and general noise is going to make a huge impact on our property value? They have already started increasing production as work is going on all hours and weekends which never was the case before...i.e. trucks up and down the B road all the time*
- 2. The B Road is in a shocking state with constant usage of huge trucks, The B road was originally a tarred road but due to the constant trucks up and down carrying huge loads the tar has disintegrated and now it is just a huge disaster called a road!!!!!! It is also has become very dangerous because of these trucks speeding up and down and has caused many accidents ... to name but a few....writing off a residents vehicle as they were turning out of the driveway, damaging numerous fences due to brake failures, killing pets in the road, almost writing me off a few times just coming out of my driveway.....I can go on and on>*
- 3. Safety and security, has also become a problem because this area has been opened up to many undesirables which also think using these once unknown roads attractive."*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

Greenmined responded as listed below on 30 September 2020:

*“We will include your comments into the Scoping Report (next report), forward it to the project team (including specialists), and discuss and assess it in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow once the DMR accepts the Scoping Report and allows the Environmental Impact Assessment Process to continue (this is not an approval of the mining application yet). Both the Scoping Report and the Environmental Impact Assessment Report will be available for your perusal and commenting. I can also confirm that we have contracted the expertise of a road engineer that will be looking at both the B- and W roads and make recommendations regarding the traffic management of the access roads. The findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment will also be incorporated into the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.”*

Mr AW Wild	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 46 of Farm No 821	11 September 2020	30 September 2020
------------	--	-------------------	-------------------


Comments received during the initial public participation process:

*“2. The information supplied in the form of headings such as “QNR 324 Activity 4” are extremely vague and do not detail exactly what the intentions of the applicant are. I am concerned about any activity which will affect the water run off quantity and quality. This includes construction of dams / weirs, washing of mined product, movement of material from or into FEPA pronounced waterways. I would like more specific information to be made available.*

*3. It is noted that the existing mining licence gives authority for 5.2149 ha to be mined, but in fact mining is taking place over an area of some 11 plus ha, which surely places Wansley Quarries in serious breach of their mining licence. Your satellite view photo (fig 1) clearly shows the extent of mining in breach of the existing licence. It also shows excavation that has been carried out through one of the two FEPA on the property, which I believe is also a breach of regulations. The photograph below shows the extent of “overmining” if you can call it that, outside the white outlined licenced area.*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------



4. *The neighbouring farms (W-6 / B-23 and B-17), and servitude are in the immediate area of the current mining, and proposed extended mining area, and have animals and people moving on them at any time. Blasting at the quarry would therefore pose a physical danger to both people and animals unless restrictions are applied. My understanding is that regulations state no blasting may take place within 500 feet of persons, and so I recommend that a restriction of “no blasting within 500 feet of the Wansley farm boundary may be undertaken”, if a blasting licence is granted.*
5. *The degradation of the “B road” due to the heavy truck traffic to and from Wansley Quarry is of great concern to all residents in the area. Although Wansley do supply Subunga and grade sections of the road occasionally, the danger posed by speeding and inconsiderate truck drivers are a constant danger to pedestrians, motorists, and animals in the area, which is zoned as agricultural. The local municipality and Provincial authority refuse to carry out any maintenance on this road. I believe that all heavy trucks should be routed via the “W road”, which is wider, and does not travel through the centre of any owner’s farm.*
6. *Property values in the immediate vicinity of the increase proposed mining will be adversely affected, due to noise, dust, potential blasting dangers.*
7. *Please register me as I&AP.”*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p>Greenmined's response to the above listed comments:</p> <p><i>“Greenmined herewith thank you for your participation and acknowledge receipt of your correspondence received 30 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as well as Me Stapleton as Interested and Affected Parties on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal and commenting. We acknowledge and take note of your concerns regarding the possible impact on water quality, extent of the mining footprint, potential blasting impact, access road and property values and have forwarded your comments to the various specialists that form part of the project team. Further to the above, please note that all your comments will be included in the draft scoping report, and will be discussed and assessed (once feedback from the various specialists were received) in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow once the Scoping Report was approved by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy. You will be notified as soon as the above mentioned reports are available for your perusal and commenting.”</i></p>			
Mr M van Niekerk	Interested and Affected Party	11 September 2020	No Response Received
Mr & Mrs Boniface (Trevor & Tammy)	Interested and Affected Party	-	12 October 2020

Response received during the initial public participation process:

*“Kindly receive this as an official objection to the expansion of the Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd quarry. We are direct fence sharing neighbours with Wansley and will be greatly affected should the quarry expand by any degree. We have chosen to live in Holm Hill for the lifestyle benefits of the lower noise levels and quiet surroundings. The wild animal life which we enjoy is already diminishing and will decrease even further if the quarry is given a greater area to mine. Currently the traffic flow on the W road is very high due to the cartage trucks, many of which speed and disregard other vehicles. These heavily loaded trucks are causing damage to the road and create constant dust for the adjacent properties. The noise from these cartage vehicles is also an issue as they often run before and after normal business hours. It is important to note that the W road, as we refer to it, is a private road. It is merely a servitude for Wansley Farm as noted in our title deeds (our boundary is on the other side of the road). Permission has not been granted to Wansley Quarries for their business use and they do have an alternative route available. It is also of concern that as per the aerial*



**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

*image (Figure 1) on your report it seems that the quarry has already exceeded their current approved mining area. Rehabilitation of the land does also not appear to have been done.”*

Greenmined’s response to the above listed comments:

*“Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your detailed correspondence received 12 October 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal and commenting. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. The rest of your comments will also be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all be available for your perusal and commenting.”*

Me Liz & Mteto & Judith Dakiso	Interested and Affected Party	-	16 September 2020
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	---	-------------------

Comments received during the initial public participation process:

*“Regarding the study being done and the extension of quarry and Usage of W road to connect to N6, I would like to object to this project as I am the resident and we were never all consultant and given an opportunity to voice out the impact of this to us. The Portion on W road is on my property which I still need to sort out as surveyors recommendation last year. I would like to put it on record we will not approve any extension unless a different route is use not W or C road.”*

Greenmined’s response send on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September 2020:

*“Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of your correspondence received 16 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal and commenting. Further to the*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>above, I have also attached a copy of the Background Information Document and Project Map should you like to share it with additional interested parties. Alternatively, please feel free to provide me with the contact detail of the person/s you wish to be included and we will gladly supply them with the documents. We acknowledge your concern regarding the access road and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment.”</i></p>			
Mr R Masters	Interested and Affected Party ♦ Farm B12A	-	05 October 2020
<p>Comments received during the initial public participation process:</p> <p><i>“I would like to raise an objection due to the following reasons:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>1. the increased noise &amp; traffic volumes;</i></li> <li><i>2. the poor maintenance &amp; upkeep of the potholed B Road;</i></li> <li><i>3. excessive speed limits of the heavy trucks and dust;</i></li> <li><i>4. for the personal safety/security of our wives and children;</i></li> <li><i>5. current maintenance and upkeep of the roads is not satisfactory.”</i> </li></ol>			
<p>Greenmined’s response send on the 13<sup>th</sup> of October 2020:</p> <p><i>“Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your correspondence received 05 October 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. Your objection will also be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will also all be available for your perusal and commenting.”</i></p>			

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Me D Reynhardt	Interested and Affected Party	-	11 October 2020

Comments received from Me Reynhardt on 13 October 2020:

*"I require an extension of the period for comment, as I haven't received the DSR yet. Just briefly though, my objections and concerns are related to loss of sense of place, in holm hill; additional noisy road traffic, (as the truck load bodies and tail gates rattle terribly as they go down the b road) and it makes it unpleasant and unsafe to cycle, run or ride horses on our farm roads. Speeding of the trucks has also been an issue in the past. Additionally, the proposed footprint is in a STEP vegetation corridor and Insufficient detail has been given regarding a number of pertinent issues, regarding water, wildlife, blasting magnitudes, frequency, times etc. and other impacts; alternatives, monitoring, compliance, etc. I would like to submit more detailed comment. Could you advise if there will be opportunity to do this? And will there be a public meeting regarding this?"*

Response from Greenmined on the above listed comments:

*"We are still in the process of drafting the Scoping Report, and therefore it has not yet been published for comments. As soon as the document is ready we will inform all the registered interested and affected parties (I&AP's) (of which you form part) and stakeholders and allow for another 30-days commenting period. We do take note of the concerns you listed below, and will include them in the Scoping Report. Your concerns will also be forwarded to the project specialists (for instance ecologist, road engineer etc.) that will consider and assess them. The outcome of the specialist studies will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) that will follow should the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy accept the Scoping Report. The DEIAR will once again be distributed to all the registered I&AP's and stakeholders for another 30-days commenting period. You will therefore still have at least two more opportunities to provide us with your comments. Due to the uncertainties/difficulties regarding COVID, we do not at the moment plan to hold a community meeting. However, should you wish to meet we are happy to arrange a virtual meeting with you to discuss the project."*

Mr EW Scheun	Interested and Affected Party	-	14 September 2020
--------------	-------------------------------	---	-------------------

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

**TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME**

**AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS**

**CONTACTED DATE**

**RESPONSE RECEIVED**

Comments received during the initial public participation process:

*"We have been handed the documentation by a neighbour. We are concerned that we are not receiving the documentation from your office directly, and we are further concerned that we may have missed documentation. Kindly and as a matter of urgency register us as interested parties. Please note further that unless we receive an firm undertaking that the road between the quarry and the N6 will not be used in this operation, we will without any doubt oppose the application, and we insist on being granted the opportunity to do so."*

Response from Greenmined:

*"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of your correspondence received 14 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal. Please note that you have not missed previous correspondence, and that the attached Background Information Document and Project Map were the first documents that were circulated regarding the proposed project. We acknowledge your concern regarding the access road and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact has been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment."*

Additional comments submitted by Mr Scheun on 16 September 2020:

*"The access road is a real concern. Currently, Wansley farm hold a servitude to utilise a road over my land. We will not extend the use of the road to a business being conducted on Wansley farm. Please, we must make this point very clear."*

Additional comments submitted by Mr Scheun on 30 September 2020:

*"We have requested to be included in the list of interested and affected parties. We are the owners of the remainder of portion 2 of farm 652. I note that you refer to " the expertise of a road engineer that will be looking at both the B- and W roads and make recommendations regarding the traffic management of the access". We again confirm that the W road is on private land. It is not a public road. The road engineer would have no business looking at the W road. In terms of our title deed. The quarry*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<i>does not hold a servitude to use the road. Unless we receive as a matter of urgency confirmation that the quarry will immediately desist from using the road, we will be physically closing the road for all cartage vehicles."</i>			
Mr A Scheun	Interested and Affected Party	-	01 October 2020

Comments received from Mr Scheun with the response of Greenmined (02 October 2020) thereon:

*"I have 3 questions that I am putting to you to better understand this Wansley issue:*

1. *Are you situated in East London?  
I am situated in Ballito, and the rest of the project team are from various areas including East London, Johannesburg, Bloemfontein, Somerset-West, and Cape Town.*
2. *Did you visit Wansley Farm before compiling the document you sent to Boniface Trust?  
I have visited the farm before.*
3. *Did you consider having a meeting with the residents of Holm Hill, specifically all those on the B and W roads, before compiling the above document?  
The Background Information Document that was send out forms part of the initial public participation phase associated with a Section 102 amendment application (such as this one). The reasoning behind an initial public participation process is to identify and notify the interested and affected parties (I&AP's) and stakeholders and provide the public with a period to register on the EIA process (still to follow). As the initial public participation phase takes place at the onset of the EIA (environmental impact assessment), the technical information regarding the project still needs to be obtained as well as the input of the specialists. Once this information was obtained it is presented in a report (environmental impact assessment report) that is then circulated to the registered I&AP's and stakeholders for their perusal and commenting. In light of this it is (in our opinion) more effective to meet with interested parties once the technical information is available and the recommendations of the specialists were received. However, should you wish so we will gladly set up a virtual meeting with you to discuss the project."*

Additional comments received from Mr Scheun on 02 October 2020:

*"public participation phase? The document that was put up at the entrance to W-road, and most probably at the other entrances to Holm Hill too, was put up on a S-turn in the road at an uphill opposite an informal settlement. There is no way that I would stop to read the notice that, as you know, was small print on a small temporary board. If it were not for the community of Holm Hill spreading the document amongst ourselves, very few members of the public would actually have known about this project and*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>able to participate - that includes immediate neighbours and private road owners. No further response required.”</i></p>			
<p><i>“No idea what all the references to roads in your document means. I assume they refer to roads on the premises – Wansley Farm. When do you expect the proposed MR will expire?</i></p>			
<p><i>1. I have come to the conclusion that your MR holder has not been acting in good faith over the years and that they are not following good business practice.</i></p> <p><i>1.1 According to your document and maps it is obvious that the current mining footprint is already far greater than the “approved mining area”, which is in violation of the mining rights issued</i></p> <p><i>1.2 According to your document the distance from city centre to Wansley farm is ± 30 kilometres.</i></p> <p><i>1.2.1 East London Tourism (Argyle street) to Wansley Quarries via North East Expressway and Lavender Blue is 15,5kms</i></p> <p><i>1.2.2 East London Tourism to Wansley Quarries via North East Expressway and the N2 and B-road is 16.5kms</i></p> <p><i>1.2.3 East London Tourism to Wansley Quarries via Vincent, N2, Meiseshalt, and B-road is 18,1kms</i></p> <p><i>1.2.4 East London Tourism to Wansley Quarries via North East Expressway, the N6, and W-road is 15,4kms.</i></p> <p><i>1.2.5 Outer edge of Beacon Bay to Wansley Quarries is 6,2 kms and possibly only 5 kms as the crow flies.</i></p> <p><i>1.3 Blasting has been taking place from time to time which is in violation of the mining rights issued.</i></p> <p><i>1.4 Promised road maintenance to the private roads being used is not being done properly.</i></p> <p><i>1.5 Watering the W-road on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays to curb dust as was agreed by the owner of Wansley Farm in 2007 is not being done.</i></p> <p><i>1.6 Oil spills due to accidents where cartage vehicles overturned on the private road were not attended to in an environmentally friendly way. On one instance the oil spill was covered with soil in a ditch that is a waterway to one of our dams.</i></p> <p><i>1.7 The MR holder has no concern for the rights and expectations of its neighbours and the local community at large. Complaints, even on WhatsApp groups of which the MR holder and staff are participants, fall on deaf ears. Here they have dropped the ball and the opportunity to involve the community in addressing issues affecting the community.</i></p>			
<p><i>2. <u>Noise Pollution</u></i></p> <p><i>2.1 As of late up to 35 cartage trucks have been counted over an hour and a half period using the W-road passing our homesteads that are right next to the road. I have requested records from the MR holder to see how many cartage trucks actually use our private road on average per day, but that has not been forthcoming.</i></p>			

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p>2.2 <i>The excavators and crushes and blasting can be heard from our property depending on the wind or lack thereof.</i></p> <p>2.3 <i>The operation is not limited to office hours as vehicles could be on the road from sun rise to after 20h00, and even over weekends. It is all dependent on customer demands.</i></p> <p>3. <u><i>Dust Pollution</i></u></p> <p>3.1 <i>The cartage trucks cause dust pollution on/in:</i></p> <p>3.1.1 <i>Grazing to the effect that certain areas next to the road cannot be grazed due to the build-up of dust and dying vegetation.</i></p> <p>3.1.2 <i>Building roofs from where water runs into our water tanks for household use.</i></p> <p>3.1.3 <i>Our homes and other buildings and laundry, as our buildings are right next to the W-road.</i></p> <p>4. <u><i>Traffic</i></u></p> <p>4.1 <i>Excessive speeds by the cartage drivers on our private road</i></p> <p>4.2 <i>Reckless driving by the cartage drivers on our private W-road sometimes literally forcing vehicles off the road</i></p> <p>4.3 <i>High volumes of cartage trucks</i></p> <p>4.4 <i>Long hours of cartage trucks on the road</i></p> <p>4.5 <i>Loads are not secured and lost partial loads are not attended to.</i></p> <p>5. <u><i>Other</i></u></p> <p>5.1 <i>When the MR holder does work on the road, they continuously block the under-road drainage pipes to our dam and block the road run-offs to our property.</i></p> <p>5.2 <i>When the MR holder has idle cartage trucks, they will dump loads of sabunga on the road surface for later use which is a risk to all road users as these dumped loads could lie there for weeks on end.</i></p> <p>5.3 <i>The deteriorating condition of our roads due to the heavy traffic has a very negative effect on our own vehicles.</i></p> <p>5.4 <i>Horse riding on our roads has come to an end due to the cartage truck traffic.”</i></p>			
Mr D Webber	Interested and Affected Party ♦ Farm B1	-	18 September 2020

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

Comments received during the initial public participation period:

*“My family have been living on Farm B1 since the sixties (One of the first families to settle in this area.) Regarding the quarry....*

**TRUCKS**

*It is blatantly obvious that the quarry trucks that move the earth from the quarry have the following effect on us... Destruction of the B Road (my parents along with Ray Rogers and one or two other residents pooled their hard earned cash together and had a large portion of the B Road tarred. The tar did not last long due to the quarry trucks. It would seem that a fair way to deal with the transport of earth from the quarry by the trucks to the main roads should be controlled by the quarry - / speeding - / what routes the trucks should take etc (Lip service does not do it for me..I am talking about a system in place that is controlled and monitored by the quarry and a third party that has an interest in the community of Holmhill. It is suggested that the trucks delivering to Gonubie use the B road only. Trucks delivering anywhere else, should use the W Road. Why can this not be implemented and monitored by the quarry (+3<sup>rd</sup> party) since the only people who benefit from the transport of this earth is the quarry. Discipline and control of the drivers from the quarry to the main roads should be monitored and controlled by the quarry (+3<sup>rd</sup> party). The quarry brushes off any incident or problem caused by the truck drivers and pass the responsibility onto the truck drivers. Once again, the only people benefiting from the trucks is the quarry, so it seems fair that they should be responsible for monitoring and discipline of the truck drivers and also give feedback as to the actions taken regarding any incidence regarding the trucks.*

**ROAD (If you can call it that)**

*Since the quarry is directly responsible for the majority of destruction of B Road, it is only fair that the quarry does regular maintenance to the B Road. The quarry should not call on the residence to contribute to any repairs.*

**DUST**

*We already live in a permanent dust cloud caused mainly by the quarry trucks. Should the quarry expand, the dust will increase due to more traffic. Clearly, I am opposed to the quarry expansion.*

**NOISE**

*Same points as above.*



**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><b>BLASTING</b>  <i>Absolutely opposed to this. It will be like a mini earthquake. Noise pollution in a rural setting with a lot of animals and residents living here. Absolutely opposed to this.</i></p> <p><b>SPEEDING TRUCKS</b>  <i>Same story...</i></p> <p><i>Bottom line is that, I have the impression from all that has happened on Holmhill, that the quarry is only focused on activities of the quarry and anything that happens outside of the quarry property is brushed off by putting the blame on the contracted truck drivers and have no interest in anything that outside of that. This has to change. I am not against progress, but when it is done for profit and no consequences for the people dealing with the negative side of that progress, I am highly opposed to any support for that progress and am willing to personally get involved to adjust those dynamics by any means necessary."</i></p>			
<p>Response from Greenmined on the above listed comments:</p> <p><i>"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of, and thank you for your detailed correspondence received 18 September 2020 on the proposed Section 102 amendment application of Wansley Siyakhula (Pty) Ltd in the East London area. We registered you as an Interested and Affected Party on the project, and will henceforth keep you posted on the progress of the Environmental Impact Assessment process as well as supply you with a copy of the draft scoping report (DSR) for your perusal. We acknowledge your concerns and have forwarded it to the project team. The access road and traffic impact have been identified as a matter of importance and the project team is in the process of investigating the best possible options. Their findings will be discussed in the EIA documents that will follow in due course, and on which you will be able to comment. The rest of your comments will also be included in the Draft Scoping Report and discussed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will all be available for your perusal and commenting."</i></p>			
Mr A Moss	Interested and Affected Party ♦ Portion 13 (Portion of Portion 2) of Farm No 652	-	06 October 2020

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

**TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME**

**AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS**

**CONTACTED DATE**

**RESPONSE RECEIVED**

Comments received during the initial public participation phase:

*“With reference to the Background Information Document dated 11<sup>th</sup> September 2020, I, Andrew Moss, hereby submit my objections to the project proposal as the property owner of Portion 13 (A Portion of Portion 2) Farm 652 – Farm W8.*

*W Road*

*With reference to the attached Title Deed for the property, there is a servitude at the top of the property which allows access to Portion 1 Farm 652. This servitude is termed “W Road” and is linked to the servitudes of the two adjacent properties and is in essence a private road. The servitude is intended for access to Portion 1 Farm 652 and not for haulage vehicles belonging to Wansley Siyakhula (WS), which are in breach of the conditions of the Title Deed. The haulage vehicles cause excessive damage to the rural road which is not designed for over usage by heavy vehicles. WS does not adequately maintain the road which is used by the surrounding property owners for access to and from their properties.*

*Safety of other road users*

*The haulage vehicles and a threat to the safety of other road users. Every road user has a “near miss” storey to tell when avoiding a collision with a haulage vehicle driving at excessive speeds. Mothers transporting young children to and from school activities during the day are the most vulnerable. It is a matter of time before a serious incident does happen, which unfortunately will be too late.*

*Groundwater*

*Most properties in the area rely on boreholes for their water supply, which are at risk of being damaged due to the proposed blasting activities.*

*Conclusion*

*W Road and the surrounding properties are already under stress due to the current operations of Wansley Siyakhula, an extension to the project area and the introduction of blasting will have a severe effect on the area and the inhabitants. Wansley Siyakhula have not adhered to any agreements with regards to the safe usage and maintenance of W Road to date and are unlikely to do so in the future. The existing quarry area has already exceeded the approved demarcated boundary, which is a clear indication of Wansley Siyakhula’s attitude towards the environment.”*

### SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Unknown	Interested and Affected Party	-	13 October 2020

Comments received from unknown sender:

*“It is with great concern that I write to you regarding the expansion of Wansley Quarries. We have long had a strained view of the quarry which has a habit of working after reasonable hours, on weekends, on public holidays and with heavy industrial equipment making an extremely loud noise. This noise pollution, dust, constant heavy vehicles traffic as well as the unsightly industrial view only negatively affects our future plans and our property value. We would never have bought our property had we known that this quarry, which is in the middle of a smallholder, residential farming community, would be allowed to expand as such. It is inconceivable that this expansion is even being considered without sufficient review of the environmental and community impacts. We live across the valley and probably have more noise pollution and disruption from quarry as an eyesore than the neighbouring farms and yet we were never consulted. It is through the farming community that we have been alerted of such expansions. The negative impact on the surrounding area and community needs to be thoroughly assessed. Our very own business plan, job creation plan through eco-tourism in the surrounding area will be seriously negatively affected and the very viability of these plans will be in question because of the expansion of such an unsightly, invasive industry on our doorstep.”*

### SUMMARY OF INITIAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The I&AP's and stakeholders were informed of the proposed project through:

- ◆ telephonic discussions;
- ◆ direct communication with background information documents;
- ◆ placement of on-site notices (11 September 2020); and
- ◆ the placement of an advertisement in the Go & Express newspaper on 10 September 2020.

## SUMMARY OF INITIAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

The following I&AP's and stakeholders registered on the project:

- ◆ Boniface, Francois & Trevor;
- ◆ Boniface, Trevor & Tammy;
- ◆ Cilliers, Jaco;
- ◆ Dakiso, Judith, Liz and Mteto;
- ◆ Department of Water and Sanitation;
- ◆ Joubert, Cathy;
- ◆ Lennard, Michele Adriana;
- ◆ Masters, Robert;
- ◆ Mette Pi la Cour Nielsen & Vaughn Bruce;
- ◆ Moss, Andrew;
- ◆ Reynhardt, Debbie;
- ◆ Scheun, EW;
- ◆ Scheun, Andre;
- ◆ Stapleton, Penny;
- ◆ Webber, Dean;
- ◆ Wild, Alfred.

The Draft Scoping Report was subsequently compiled and all the I&AP's and stakeholders listed above were contacted and provided with a chance to comment on the Draft Scoping Report.

## DRAFT SCOPING REPORT'S AVAILABILITY TO STAKEHOLDERS AND I&APS

*COMMENTING PERIOD: 19 NOVEMBER 2020 – 08 JANUARY 2021 (EXTENDED UNTIL 14 JANUARY 2021)*

In accordance with the timeframes stipulated in the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended by GNR 326 effective 7 April 2017) the Draft Scoping Report (DSR) was compiled to allow perusal of the report by the I&AP's and stakeholders listed above. A 30-day commenting period, ending 08 January 2021 (that was extended until 14 January 2021), was allowed for perusal of the documentation and submission of comments. The following table provides a list of the I&AP's and stakeholders that were informed of the availability of the DSR:

STAKEHOLDERS			
TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Ms Nontyantyambo	Amathole District Municipality	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr Andile Sihlahla Ms Kholeka Sithuba	Buffalo City Metro Municipality	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Cllr Makhaya Bopi	Buffalo City Metro Municipality – Ward 15	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr Cira Ngetu Mr Briant Noncembu	Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr Yawa	Department of Labour	19 November 2020	No Response Received

**STAKEHOLDERS**

<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Mr MD Qwase	Department of Public Works	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mrs ZB Makina	Department of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr Babini Mbewu	Department of Rural Development and Land Reform	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr J Mhlomi	Department of Transport	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Me Molepo Khuthadzo	Department of Human Settlements, Water and Sanitation	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr Aphelele Tomsana	Eskom	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Me Chumisa Njingana	SANRAL	19 November 2020	No Response Received
SAHRIS on-line system	SAHRA	19 November 2020	No Response Received

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Warren Farms CC Mr P Warren	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 1 of Farm No 653	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mette Pi la Cour Nielsen	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 15 of Farm No 652	19 November 2020	07 January 2021

Comments received on the DSR on 07 January 2021:

*“...Regarding the compliance - I understand that they will have to follow the regulations. But it raises a concern when we already know that they have been operating outside the permitted area, had trucks working at odd hours and I believe blasting without permission. How often will an audit be required from them?”*

*Regarding operational hours - normal working hours (8-17). No late nights and no weekends. It's hard to imagine the noise pollution from the operational process, so please if that could be taken in to consideration when the hours are discussed. We live and work on our farm, so are here all day.*

*Regarding blasting - I have been told that blasting has a big effect on structures around it, if this is the case has it been considered? The proposed area for mining is close to our boundary fence/property therefore I would like to know more it.*

*That leads me to the road that will be needed on the north side of the proposed area. Again it is close to our boundary fence. Is there any regulations on how many meters a road like that is allowed to be from a boundary fence? And has it been considered?*

*Will the vegetation that used to be on the site of the veld fire be taken in to consideration? It must be hard to do a full site report when it has all been burned.”*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p>Greenmined's response to the DSR comments, sent on 12 January 2021:</p> <p><i>“Greenmined herewith acknowledge and thank you for the comments you submitted on 07 January 2021 regarding the draft Scoping Report for the Wansley Quarry Section 102 Amendment Application.</i></p> <p><i>Please see the following in response to your comments/questions:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Audit frequency: The audit frequency will be determined by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy. However, at this stage we expect that an annual Environmental Audit Report will have to be submitted.</i></li> <li>• <i>Work hours: Thank you for your input, we will take it into consideration.</i></li> <li>• <i>Blasting: The draft Environmental Impact Assessment (DEIAR) will include more specific information on the blasting and the potential impact it may have on the surrounding environment and nearby structures as we have contacted a qualified blaster in this regard. The proximity of your property to the proposed extension area will also be taken into account, and discussed in the DEIAR that will be available to you for commenting.</i></li> <li>• <i>Access Road: Your enquiry regarding the proximity of the road to a boundary fence will be directed to the road engineer that is responsible for the traffic impact assessment. His response will be incorporated into the DEIAR for your perusal.</i></li> <li>• <i>Vegetation: We taken note of your comment and directed it to the ecologist. However, we can confirm that the ecologist has visited the farm on numerous occasions and therefore his findings will not only be based on a single inspection of the property.”</i></li> </ul>			
Boniface Trust Mr & Mrs Boniface	Neighbour: ♦ Portion 14 of Farm No 652	19 November 2020	19 November 2020



**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Mr Boniface requested an electronic copy of the DSR on 19 November 2020 that was sent to him on the same day. To date no additional comments were received from Mr Boniface.			
Mr JF Page	Neighbour ◆ Portion 42 of Farm No 821	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr PF Jonker	Neighbour ◆ Portion 44 of Farm No 821	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mrs PA Stapleton	Neighbour ◆ Portion 45 of Farm No 821	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr BG McMillan Lombardy Private Nature Reserve	Neighbour: ◆ Portion 15 of Farm No 652	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr & Mrs Lennard	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 41 of Farm No 821	19 November 2020	14 January 2021

Additional comments received from Mrs Lennard on 14 January 2021:

*"I would like to bring to your attention what we are having to cope with on a daily basis. These trucks have no control by their owners and the quarry could not care less. I have just been to the accident scene and no-one from the quarry is there. This particular owner has 4 trucks. One of them nearly had a head on collision with me the other day. I had to drive straight into the bush scratching my car badly on the side. This situation cannot continue. My camera at the gate shows an expanded view of the road*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>and the speed the trucks are doing is absolutely insane. You will have to deal with it somehow, either re-route the road away from residential properties or have some control in place. It's not the first accident of this nature and it will not be the last. We have had to just deal with it in the past but now it ends."</i></p>			
<p>Greenmined's response sent on 18 January 2021:</p> <p><i>"Greenmined acknowledge receipt of your email sent 14 January 2021. We do take note of your concern and am in the process of assessing the traffic impact on the B-Road in collaboration with the road engineer and applicant. As mentioned previously, the findings in this regard will be discussed in the draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow should the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy approve the Scoping Report."</i></p>			
<p>Additional comments received from Mrs Lennard on 18 January 2021:</p> <p><i>"Just to clarify matters, I am on the W road – W4 to be exact. This is a relatively straight road with a few hills so the trucks use the downhills to gain speed which becomes really dangerous. The road being of such a nature that its not a 2-way size road the oncoming cars are in danger of being collided with as the trucks do not deviate or slow down at all."</i></p>			
<p>BJ Cilliers Boorkontrakteurs (Pty) Ltd Mr D Cilliers</p>	<p>Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 37 of Farm No 821</p>	<p>19 November 2020</p>	<p>08 January 2021</p>
<p>Mr Cilliers acknowledged receipt and perusal of the DSR on 08 January 2021, and confirmed that there are no additional objections or concerns other than the ones already noted. Mr. Cilliers awaits further correspondence.</p>			
<p>Mr &amp; Mrs Joubert</p>	<p>Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 74 of Farm No 821</p>	<p>19 November 2020</p>	<p>No Response Received</p>

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Mr AW Wild	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 46 of Farm No 821	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr M van Niekerk	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	23 November 2020
<p>Comments received on the DSR on 23 November 2020:</p> <p><i>“...I do not have a problem with the mining as such, as long as the required rehabilitation is done. My biggest concern are the many trucks on the roads, safety first, as some of them are driving like maniacs and a danger to all road users. Secondly the condition and maintenance of the road, as the trucks are doing some serious damaging to the roads and lastly the clearing of the overgrowth and bushes on the side of the road, which makes it difficult for vehicles to pass one another safely, especially the truck, which are much bigger and wider than the normal traffic.”</i></p>			
<p>Greenmined’s response to the DSR comments sent on 23 November 2020:</p> <p><i>“...We do acknowledge your concern regarding the traffic impact of the mine on the roads and -users. Please note that the matter has been handed to the road specialist and will be discussed in more detail upon receipt of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA). The findings of the TIA will be incorporated into draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIAR) that will follow upon approval of the final Scoping Report by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy. The DEIAR will be available for your commenting in due course.”</i></p>			
Mr & Mrs Boniface (Trevor & Tammy)	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	19 November 2020

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p>Mrs Boniface enquired, on 19 November 2020, whether their objection still stands.</p> <p>Greenmined confirmed on 20 November 2020 that the objection was still valid, and noted that it has been incorporated into the Draft Scoping Report (DSR). The matters highlighted by Mrs Boniface will be discussed/assessed in the draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow should the Final Scoping Report be approved by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy.</p>			
<p>Mrs Boniface then enquired on the work hours of the quarry, to which Greenmined responded (25 November 2020) as follows:</p> <p><i>“The work hours, specified in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), of Wansley Quarry are:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Monday – Friday from 6:00 to 18:00; and</i></li> <li>• <i>Saturdays from 6:00 to 13:00.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Please note that the EMP does not restrict loading/transporting of material to specific hours. In light of the comments thus far received as part of the public participation process for the Section 102 extension application, the work hours (including mining, crushing, blasting and transporting of material) of the quarry will be reassessed. The new/amended (if applicable) work hours will be specified in the draft Environmental Impact Assessment that will follow should the DMRE approve the Scoping Report. The DEIAR will be available for public commenting over another 30-days period. Please feel free to provide us with your suggestions should you have any.”</i></p>			
Me Liz & Mteto & Judith Dakiso	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	19 November 2020
<p>Me Dakiso enquired, on 19 November 2020, whether their objection still stands.</p> <p>Greenmined confirmed on 20 November 2020 that the objection was still valid, and noted that it has been incorporated into the Draft Scoping Report (DSR). The matters highlighted by Me Dakiso will be discussed/assessed in the draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow should the Final Scoping Report be approved by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy.</p>			

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
Mr R Masters	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Farm B12A	19 November 2020	24 November 2020

Comments received on the DSR on 24 November 2020:

*“Thank you for this information received, I have had a brief study of the content and don’t see where all the various objections have been dealt with? Could you please be so kind to direct me to the place where we can study the detailed responses to all the various objections that were raised? It would appear this report lists the “actual comments” raised by the various interest/affected parties, which I imagined would have been dealt with in “complete confidentiality”? Anyway, it would be great now if we could ALL see the actual response to ALL these objections raised, before any further progress is made regarding this development?”*

Greenmined’s response to the DSR comments sent 13 January 2021:

*“...According to Appendix 2 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended 2017) “the objective of the scoping process (of which the Scoping Report is the associated document) is to, through a consultative process—*

- (a) identify the relevant policies and legislation relevant to the activity;*
- (b) motivate the need and desirability of the proposed activity, including the need and desirability of the activity in the context of the preferred location;*
- (c) identify and confirm the preferred activity and technology alternative through an impact and risk assessment and ranking process;*
- (d) identify and confirm the preferred site, through a detailed site selection process, which includes an impact and risk assessment process inclusive of cumulative impacts and a ranking process of all the identified alternatives focusing on the geographical, physical, biological, social, economic, and cultural aspects of the environment;*
- (e) identify the key issues to be addressed in the assessment phase;*
- (f) agree on the level of assessment to be undertaken, including the methodology to be applied, the expertise required as well as the extent of further consultation to be undertaken to determine the impacts and risks the activity will impose on the preferred site through the life of the activity, including the nature, significance, consequence, extent, duration and probability of the impacts to inform the location of the development footprint within the preferred site; and*
- (g) identify suitable measures to avoid, manage or mitigate identified impacts and to determine the extent of the residual risks that need to be managed and monitored”*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
-------------------------	------------------------------------	----------------	-------------------

*Appendix 3 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended 2017) notes that “The objective of the environmental impact assessment process (of which the Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) is the associated document) is to, through a consultative process—*

- (a) determine the policy and legislative context within which the activity is located and document how the proposed activity complies with and responds to the policy and legislative context;*
- (b) describe the need and desirability of the proposed activity, including the need and desirability of the activity in the context of the preferred location;*
- (c) identify the location of the development footprint within the preferred site based on an impact and risk assessment process inclusive of cumulative impacts and a ranking process of all the identified development footprint alternatives focusing on the geographical, physical, biological, social, economic, heritage and cultural aspects of the environment;*
- (d) determine the—*
  - (i) nature, significance, consequence, extent, duration and probability of the impacts occurring to inform identified preferred alternatives; and*
  - (ii) degree to which these impacts—*
    - (aa) can be reversed;*
    - (bb) may cause irreplaceable loss of resources, and*
    - (cc) can be avoided, managed or mitigated;*
- (e) identify the most ideal location for the activity within the preferred site based on the lowest level of environmental sensitivity identified during the assessment;*
- (f) identify, assess, and rank the impacts the activity will impose on the preferred location through the life of the activity;*
- (g) identify suitable measures to manage, avoid or mitigate identified impacts; and*
- (h) identify residual risks that need to be managed and monitored.”*

*In light of the above, the comments/objections received during the initial public participation process as well as on the draft Scoping Report (DSR) were all listed in the DSR as it were formally received during the various commenting periods. The comments/objections contribute to the identification of the aspects in need of further assessment during the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process. Should the DMRE (Department of Minerals and Energy) approve the Scoping Report, the project team will commence with the subsequent EIA phase, where the identified aspects (of the Scoping Report) are assessed and discussed in the draft EIAR. Accordingly, the comments/objections received to date are also dealt with and responded to in the EIAR as many of the comments require specialist input that isn't available during the scoping phase. Further to this, please take note that all comments/objections submitted during the public participation process of an EIA have to be treated as public knowledge unless otherwise instructed by the writer or the DMRE. In summary, we therefore confirm that the comments/objections received to date were all listed in the Scoping Report, and will be dealt with/responded to in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report that will follow should the DMRE approve the Scoping Report and*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<i>thereby permit the subsequent EIA phase."</i>			
Me D Reynhard	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr EW Scheun	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Mr A Scheun	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	19 November 2020

Mr Scheun informed Greenmined, on 19 November 2020, that according to Appendix 5 of the DSR the correspondence of Peter Warren was sent to Warren Page.

Comments received on the DSR on 20 November 2020:

*"....1. I acknowledge that our complaints/reservations have been logged and that most of them will only be responded to once the xperts produce their responses. Just make sure that Peter Warren, not just Warren Page, has received the correspondence and had the opportunity to respond as I saw that correspondence directed to Peter Warren had been sent to Warren Page at some stage as per the DSR.*

*2. Regarding our complaints that have been logged regarding the current mining footprint that is already outside the mining right, which is proof that the applicant is not acting in good faith, Christine has responded by saying that the footprint outside the MR will be incorporated into the amended footprint of the mine - so as if to say that it is okey to mine illegally and to trust the applicant that he will not transgress in future - how will this be policed?*

*3. The DSR states incorrectly that the average precipitation per year is 593mm (Wansley farm = 782mm) with March being the highest with about 79mm. The minimum rainfall is 16mm average for June or July. I am 1300m from the Wansley farm entrance and my recordings for the past 12 years is as follows: Average annual precipitation*

**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME	AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS	CONTACTED DATE	RESPONSE RECEIVED
<p><i>is 817mm (close to Wansley farm's average) with the highest 12 year average is October with 109.1mm, followed by February with 98.5mm The lowest 12 year average is June/July with about 31mm. See attachment.</i></p> <p><i>4. Temperatures are listed way lower than that measured on our farm during the last 12 years. Unfortunately I no longer have those readings which I had to keep on a daily basis as I was producing tomatoes under cover and the up-to-date records were required for irrigation planning and GLOBALGAP certification.</i></p> <p><i>5. The wind speeds are way below those stated in the DSR, ask me, I have lost enough plastic from the tunnels due to excessive wind speeds of up to and over 50kms/h over the years.</i></p> <p><i>6. The potential impact on the access road Mn10118 St (W-Road) has a significance of only "9" meaning it is Low-Medium, meaning "impact would be of a low order and with little effect. In the case of negative impact, mitigation and / or remedial activity would be either easily achieved or little would be required, or both". To us as residents it is actually one, if not THE major concern."</i></p>			
<p>Greenmined's response to the DSR comments sent on 23 November 2020:</p> <p><i>"Greenmined herewith acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated 19 &amp; 20 November 2020 respectively. We thank you for highlighting the matter regarding our correspondence with Messrs Peter Warren and Warren Page. Attached hereto please find proof that Mr Peter Warren was indeed contacted during the previous commenting period. The delivery note will be corrected in the Final Scoping Report (FSR).</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your comments as contained in clauses 2, 3, 4 &amp; 5 of your correspondence under reply. Your comments will be taken into consideration and we will update the FSR accordingly, for evaluation and determination by the DMRE.</i></p> <p><i>We do acknowledge your concern regarding the impact of the mine on the W-road. Please note that the matter has been handed to the road specialist and will be discussed in more detail upon receipt of the Traffic Impact Assessment."</i></p>			
Mr D Webber	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Farm B1	19 November 2020	No Response Received



**SURROUNDING LANDOWNERS / INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES**

<b>TITLE, NAME AND SURNAME</b>	<b>AFFILIATION/KEY STAKEHOLDER STATUS</b>	<b>CONTACTED DATE</b>	<b>RESPONSE RECEIVED</b>
Mr A Moss	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 13 (Portion of Portion 2) of Farm No 652	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Wylde Attorneys Inc.	Interested and Affected Party ◆ Portion 1 of Farm No 652	19 November 2020	No Response Received
Unknown	Interested and Affected Party	19 November 2020	No Response Received

## SUMMARY OF INITIAL PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

As mentioned earlier, the Draft Scoping Report was compiled and all the I&AP's and stakeholders listed above were contacted and provided with a chance to comment on the Draft Scoping Report. A 30-day commenting period, ending 08 January 2021, was allowed for perusal of the documentation and submission of comments. This commenting period was extended with 7 days to 15 January 2021. Comments were received from the following I&AP's:

- ◆ Boniface, Francois;
- ◆ Boniface, Tammy;
- ◆ Cilliers, Jaco
- ◆ Dakiso, Liz
- ◆ Lennard, Michele
- ◆ Mette Pi La Cour Nielsen
- ◆ Scheun, Andre
- ◆ Van Niekerk, Mader

See attached Appendix 5 for proof of the correspondence with the I&AP's and stakeholders during the public participation process.

**-END OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT-**