

**N21 (R300) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASE:
OPEN HOUSE 4: DURBANVILLE TOWN HALL
I&AP COMMENTS**

DATE RECEIVED	SECTOR	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	COMMENT
18/09/02	4	Wynne-Dyke	Ken		<p>I am particularly concerned about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. effect on birdlife at Strandfontein Sewerage Works 2. noise levels when passing through residential areas when houses are in close proximity to R300. 3. that toll fees may be too high for locals making short trips.
		MacLeod	S		<p>The proposed noise control is as realistic as saying water flows uphill. To monitor noise levels after the construction of the proposed road means absolute nothing for residence and property owners. There are so many roads to study this phenomenon it would be an insult to the reader to say more. My opinion is that we residents should be given some options to debate and choose the solutions we prefer and not vague gobeldy-gook recommendations. It is pointless stating that there will be complaints of noise and related problems in the future with out suggesting realistic alternatives to avoid this predicament. By admitting and recognizing that there will be a problem why has no one proposed a remedy? This noise `impact study` has in my mind acknowledged its own defeat before being implemented. The so-called plan to alleviate noise is very flimsy and untested to say the least. The road surface compounds may alleviate the noise of a decibel or two but does not do near enough. The suggestion of the speed control for any purpose is nothing but a bad joke. The law enforcement on our roads let alone for speed is a tribute to what we can expect on the N21 (R300). I will be blunt without being rude, which is a little more than I can say about this noise reduction control proposal. I am not a rocket scientist but I do believe I may have a brain. To be asked to believe this so called impact study is an insult to my intelligence. Building sound barriers will be part of the solution but will accomplish little on its own. I believe that the planned road should be dug in to the ground to hinder the escape of sound by a natural barrier. The embankments either side of the road will cause the sound of traffic to go upwards reducing noise pollution in the surrounding suburbs. Any adjoining property being</p>

					adversely affected by noise pollution will be forced to take precautions such as double glass-glazed windows. The suggestion that new buildings be considered for noise insulation does nothing for the existing structures and does not mention which party will be paying for these renovations.
		Le Roux	B		I am negative. I think the project will cause people to pay unnecessary money. The value of my house will drop. Noise being caused by the road.
		Wicht			Under no circumstances should this road be permitted to be a toll road, nor should any existing routes (eg. N1 sections) become tolled. Alternative, fairer financing arrangements are possible.
		Doherty	A		The birds in the wetlands, which include Spurwing Geese and Blue Cranes, will be chased away and the noise and pollution on my back fence hasten my removal from Cape Town.
		van Vuuren	F		The information regarding the crossing of the new Langeberg Road and the proposed R300 is insufficient. The proposal map shows this road to end in a non-existing road. Details of the new Langeberg Road and who the responsible person for this road plan is will be welcomed.
		Opperman	M		Long overdue!
		Van der Tang	Derryn	Stellenberg Gardens Body Corporate	<p>We would like to be involved in the Environmental Impact studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution: we will be surrounded by roads, Eversdal and the R300 • Emissions pollution: we would like to see tree planting and landscaping to filter emissions. • Safety and security: squatters/access through our property to the Eversdal Road. <p>Our suggestions include planting of trees/thorn trees along the outside boundary on the Stellenberg Interchange off ramp adjacent to our property – we would like to see a safe parkland, small animal reserve developed along the river.</p>
		Jennings	H M	Stellenberg Gardens Body Corporate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worried about noise and fume pollution. • Safety of complex – easy to get off road into our property. • Devaluation of property. • Squatters moving in during building and taking over - difficult to get rid off after completion of road.

		Stodel	Rob	Stodel's Nursery (Pty) Ltd	Congratulations. Please. Sooner. We have been waiting too long already. We need to take traffic congestion off the N1 and Eversdal Road.
		Heyns	C C		Die huidige R300 na Paarl en N1 word net gebruik tot by om Paarl Pad. Die M5 van Muizenberg tot Milnerton is 'n nuwe dubbelpad. Waarom kan die Malmesbury nasionale pad na Goodwood nie daarby aansluit nie?
		Swart	Trevor		All I care about is that the negative impact on the natural environment is minimized, and prevented if possible. If an ecological zone is to be bisected by road, the road should be designed and built with the needs of the ecosystem as the top priority. Spare no expense at building the road with this in mind and charge an appropriate toll. Remember that natural zones are being destroyed left and right by urban sprawl, and this help maintain biodiversity, which is tragic. Don't be shy to 'no go' any section if mitigation to preserve biodiversity is not an option, or isn't possible. Don't fragment habitats – raise the road above them. I oppose Section 1 on account of the major impact – see Section 1 sheet 7. Perhaps this (and other) sections can be raised to a suitable height, which represents a give and take for man and environment. Similar for section between N7 and R27.
		Du Toit	R	R Brochetto (Pty) Ltd	Our property falls in Sector 1, 14 and 15 plot 585. We are an affected party and no-one has contacted us in regard of this development! We operate as a sand quarry and the proposed road cuts through a silica sand deposit, that has not been mined to date. We do not have a valid mining license in place for plot 585. Contact us as soon as possible to resolve this dilemma.
		Francis	Gary	Reutech Radar Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toll concept, access only at Wellington and De Villiers Road. • Good idea new Langeberg Road and fact that there is no bridge (raised over R300). • Property devaluating in Goedemoed.
		Liebenberg	M		Proposed toll road will not provide sustainable solution to transport problems and congestion, while resulting in significant impacts (despite attempted mitigation) already strained natural resource base, eg. impacts on wetlands and renosterveld. Its operation as a toll road will result in increased traffic on alternative routes and impact on low-income communities. Also various impacts on adjacent residential ares,

					especially noise that is difficult to mitigate.
		Hobbs	Jo	Cape Bird Club	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am concerned that, according to newspaper reports, Unicity Portfolio Committees and councilors are opposed to toll roads and feel that, instead, more of the fuel levy funds should be spent on improving existing transport systems, and that toll roads built by private initiative for profit are not in the public interest. Presumably the local council is more <i>au fait</i> with the local situation and local needs and requirements than a consortium considering a project for its own financial benefit. One hopes that the reservations and recommendations of local experts will receive due weight and consideration before any final decision is taken. 2. Sector 1 (Southern Greenfields): This section seems very remote from the bottlenecks mentioned in explanatory posters at your recent Open House (Hospital Hill and N1/Foreshore) and there seems to be no logical reason to go so far south that it becomes necessary to slice through an area of existing nature reserves and wetlands, especially when strenuous efforts have been made, and are still being made, to consolidate these and promote a viable ecotourism focus in the area. As you own EIA states, this road could compromise the integrity of the entire wetland system. Surely some professional advice, for instance from the UCT's FitzPatrick Institute and other appropriate faculties, should have been sought? What studies have been done to establish that the road is necessary now, or will be necessary in the future? The answer that I was given at the recent Open House, 'But it's a ring road', is hardly convincing. Would it not be an option to at least postpone the construction of this section and re-evaluate the demand for it? 3. Incidentally, the littered state of the approach to the sewerage works is a comparatively recent problem blamed by the Council on shortage of funds, and should not be used as part of an argument that the area is 'not pristine' anyway. Nor should the fact that the primary function of the sewerage works is to be a sewerage works and not a bird sanctuary (which goes without

					<p>saying). But the two are not incompatible, as a visit to the Paarl Sewerage Works/Bird Sanctuary will demonstrate. If the road does go ahead on this section, it is greatly to be hoped that all the recommended mitigation measures will be strictly adhered to.</p>
		Lombaard	Dupre		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I refer to my previous submission during the scoping phase, in which I specifically requested that alternative routes to the north of Durbanville also be investigated. In your background information document circulated at Durbanville on 18 September 2002, you do not even mention the alternative having been investigated, neither is there any specialist study assigned thereto. 2. As proposed previously and as roughly indicated on the copy of the plan circulated together with the background information document, the alternative of re-routing the road to the east of Rondeboschjes Berg from where it passes through the last residential development north-east of Durbanville up to the N7 should be seriously investigated. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1 The proposed route is longer by approximately 15km and therefore the building cost could increase approximately 70%. However, the additional cost of construction would be made by the saving in land acquisition as it is obvious that the wine lands and vineyards through which the road is now proposed cost up to 10 times as much as the mainly wheat fields through which the alternative would be routed. 2.2 The proposed route crosses through young vineyards, which have not even reached their peak production, i.e vineyards less than 8 years old. In acquiring land on which these vineyards are located the farmers cannot be feasibly compensated for their loss of income over the lifespan of the vineyards. This land is worth no less than R300 000, 00 per ha, whereas the wheatfields to the east of Rondeboschjes Heuwel is worth at most R10 000, 00 per ha. The total income generated from the vineyards is also much higher than on the wheatfields. Therefore, the losses in productive land to the farmers should not only be

					<p>equated to the additional cost in construction and maintenance of the road on the longer eastern alignment. The long-term costs to the farmers should be analysed by an agricultural economist as a specialist study attached to your EIA.</p> <p>2.3 It should be noted that for every ha of land used for intensive fruit farming and vineyards in the Durbanville area, two permanent jobs per year are created. Therefore every ha of land that is taken from producing wine farms and vineyards the loss of two permanent jobs per year should also be included in the cost of calculations. Opposed thereto, where wheat farming and grazing is involved, as along the proposed eastern alignment the loss in land would equate one job for approximately every 12 to 20 ha of land.</p> <p>2.4 Further to costs relating to splitting of the farms for the construction of the road along its current alignment there should be consideration of the long-term cost of rationalizing the farms, such as the installation of additional irrigation systems, the re-routing of farm equipment and vehicles, the loss of security on farms by the introduction of a public access road through the middle thereof and the loss of aesthetic quality of the Winelands.</p> <p>3. Unless these issues are taken seriously and not discarded as 'not feasible' as was the previous response to this same input, every possible action to frustrate the construction of this road will be taken. It is totally unacceptable that there are specialist studies for every aspect but none for the socio-economic and agricultural economic aspects. I hope that this request for specialist studies and detailed analyses and consideration of an alternative alignment to the northeast of Durbanville will be satisfied.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

