

**N21 (R300) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PHASE:  
I&AP COMMENTS**

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
7/10/02	Barker	Mr and Mrs G J		1	<p>After reading through the details that you sent me, the first issue that I would like to comment on, is that the "knock and drop" to homes affected by this project has not been adequately met. We have been doing research with people in these areas, and most of them in the Lakeside, Steenberg, Lavender Hill area are completely uninformed and clueless, as we were. I feel this is taking advantage of the fact that people are busy trying to make ends meet, and unless they are told directly by the "knock and drop" system, they are left in the dark, and so according to the survey, seem to not have a problem with this scheme, whereas their lives will be affected, their property values will drop due to noise and increased crime, and it will then be too late to protest.</p> <p>We are directly affected, as we are 100m from the proposed circle/ring road and have never had any letter delivered to any of our 3 houses. Our 3 houses were purchased only 5 months ago, and we have been renting them for the previous 3 years, and although we know that a road has been proposed for the last 50 years or so, the fact that the process has gone so far has escaped us as our lives are busy and we have had no one deliver any information even though we are so directly affected.</p> <p>The buildings we own are of historical importance and are 100 years old and we will not sit back and allow these to be demolished.</p> <p>I will be contacting a lawyer to find out if we have</p>	<b>7/10BARG-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>grounds to stand on, if in the future we are told that we did not protest in time, or anything of that nature, as we were so obviously affected by the toll road and never directly informed.</p> <p>Besides all the obvious issues regarding environmental issues, we and our community oppose this road strongly and do not feel it is necessary, and that the cons far outweigh the pros.</p>	
10/10/02	McFarlane	James			<p>This unnecessary construction is going to ruin several valuable nature areas, thereby destroying badly needed and shrinking wildlife habitat, thereby placing what may prove to be the final straw for many species of birds, animals and plants which are already subjected to undue pressure by the amount of new building that has been going on in the past 20 years in the southern Peninsula.</p> <p>It is also going to affect adversely the very great (and growing) ecotourism potential of this area.</p>	<b>10/10MCFJ-S</b>
10/10/02	Asaro	Susan	Whipstall Investments (Pty) Ltd	3	<p>I object to the proposed toll road being constructed against the boarder of our property portion 17 of farm 152 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased noise pollution</li> <li>2. Increased air pollution</li> <li>3. Values of property would decrease substantially – values based on rural, quiet environment</li> <li>4. Difficulty in selling properties in such close proximity to a highway.</li> </ol> <p>I propose that the highway would serve a better purpose being constructed on the border of the 'enviroserve' leased ground in Frankdale allowing a clay mining buffer zone to remain. This would</p>	<b>10/10ASAS-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					reduce noise to Morningstar residents, property would not be adversely affected and distances between the coastline and the N7 would be reduced.	
10/10/02	Asaro	Gino	Whipstall Investments (Pty) Ltd	3	<p>I object to the proposed toll road being constructed against the border of our property, portion 18 of farm 152 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noise levels – we live here for tranquility</li> <li>2. Devaluation of property – who will buy next to a freeway</li> <li>3. Increased pollution – we already have dumps/incinerators, but hopefully these will close eventually. It would benefit Morningstar residents if the road was constructed against the Wastetech/Enviroserve waste disposal site, preventing further waste disposal extensions and reducing noise and air pollution possibilities and preventing property values to be affected negatively. The existing buffer zone would be reduced by the extent of the road but would remain intact as a clay mining site.</li> </ol>	<b>10/10ASAG-S</b>
10/10/02	Horler	Vivien			<p>I oppose the development of this road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it will bisect and dissect a series of wetlands</li> <li>• it will increase noise and fumes in a "stepping stone" open space which links the mountain to further open areas</li> <li>• it will further endanger the already endangered leopard toad</li> <li>• it will deposit a lot of traffic on to an intersection with the Main Road in Lakeside that is already congested</li> <li>• it incorporates a road built with public funds (the R300) and yet will be a toll</li> </ul>	<b>10/10HORV-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>road. This is immoral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is likely to go over the railway line rather than under it, which will constitute visual pollution in a beautiful area, and should any vehicles go off the bridge and into the vlei the oil pollution could be incalculable.</li> <li>• run-off from the bridge into the vlei would be polluted</li> <li>• the sound of traffic from a raised bridge would carry far across the water, ruining the present peace of the area.</li> <li>• it will negatively affect my property value from a visual and sound pollution point of view.</li> <li>• it will negatively affect my wellbeing.</li> </ul> <p>I could go on, but that will do for the moment.</p>	
10/10/02	Horler	Thora			I think it is vital that we preserve our open spaces and natural habitat for the benefit of our children and future generations. Please keep me informed of developments.	<b>10/10HORT-S</b>
10/10/02	Greathead	Graham	Hermanus Ratepayers' Association		<p>A ring road around Cape Town incorporating the existing R300 freeway is proposed. This ring road will consist basically of three sections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a southern section (in two parts) from the vicinity of Muizenberg to Vanguard Drive at the south-western end of the N21/R300 Freeway;</li> <li>• a central section comprising the existing N21/R300 freeway, and</li> <li>• a northern loop on new alignment from the Stellenberg Interchange between the N21/R300 &amp; the N2 to where the proposed ring road meets the coastal road north of Bloubergstrand.</li> </ul> <p>Where available public funds are insufficient for</p>	<b>10/10GREG-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>the construction of transportation facilities that although costly are economically justifiable, a toll road may fill the need. However, tolling a road introduces extra costs, not only in construction of toll plazas, etc but also from the operational expenses of the facility. By excluding certain (non-affording) traffic from it, the benefits (in public utility) from constructing a road as a toll facility are also reduced. Highways built previously utilising public money should therefore not be incorporated into the toll road system, nor should taxes or other public monies be used for their construction.</p> <p>Given a shortage of public funding for roads, there is nothing morally wrong or unacceptable about building a new toll facility from the Stellenberg Interchange up to the coastal road north of Bloubergstrand. Should construction of this section as a toll road prove economically feasible, this is an excellent opportunity for a user-pays facility. (If construction of this portion as a toll road is not economically feasible, the road should probably not be built anyhow). A toll facility (or facilities) built westwards from Vanguard Drive at the western end of the N21/R300 will be acceptable, provided existing parallel surface streets remain open to serve traffic not desiring to use the toll road.</p> <p>What is morally wrong is the proposal to incorporate the existing R300 freeway between Vanguard Drive and the N1 into the proposed N21 toll road. This freeway was constructed with public funding (by the Cape Province). National Roads only became (partially) involved when they</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>re-declared sections of the N1 &amp; N2 just to the east of Stellenberg &amp; Swartklip interchanges as national routes, in order to contribute towards the cost of these two interchanges. Previous users of the R300, many of whom may not be able to afford to pay the tolls, will suffer hardship if this road now becomes a toll road. This transgresses their constitutional rights.</p> <p>Proponents of the R300/N21 toll road may be aware of the basic principles, about which toll roads in SA were predicated and accepted (by institutions like SAICE and ASSOCOM) but are ignoring these, in frustration over the lack of funds made available by Treasury for national roads; This appears to be the main reason behind them trying to force non-viable toll proposals into becoming viable by unjustifiably incorporating sections of existing roads into their "schemes". In the process, engineering judgement and morals have been thrown overboard.</p> <p>Back in the days when tolling was first mooted, the Chambers of Commerce was apoplectically opposed to the concept. In the end the Cape Town Chamber, persuaded to face financial reality, decided to send someone to talk at a hostile Assocom national congress in Durban. When Assocom did eventually give a guarded blessing to the idea, it was with the strict provisos that existing roads should not be tolled, and that there should always be an alternative "free" route parallel to a tolled road.</p> <p>I personally wrote a draft toll road policy for the Cape Town traffic engineering subcommittee (of SAICE) containing the same two basic principles.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>These principles are accepted throughout the civilised world as basic to toll road planning, yet are not normally legislated into toll road acts. In SA the parallel road principle was actually included in the initial Toll Road Act. The relevant clause was subsequently removed (it shouldn't have been necessary to have it there anyhow). This is now apparently taken, as 'licence' to do anything the planner wants, with no thought of ethics or morals. In the circumstances I question the constitutionality of the act itself, as amended. The economic feasibility/justifiability of the proposed new section of the N21 from the western end of the existing R300, westwards and the ring road northwards from the Stellenberg Interchange has apparently not been examined separately. This should be done.</p> <p>It is my understanding that even the proponents of the R300/N21 toll road believe:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. that tolling is only a <u>second-best alternative</u>;</li> <li>2. that the R300/N21 would better serve the people if it were built as a "free" facility, and</li> <li>3. that revenue for road construction &amp; maintenance would be better raised in any other way than by tolling.</li> </ol> <p>Unfortunately, I have not seen this advice stated in a way that it would be likely to influence Sanra. Engineers &amp; planners involved in this "scheme" should examine their consciences and provide, clearly stated, good professional and ethical advice for consideration by Sanra, bearing in mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the need for parallel "free" routes when a toll road is constructed;</li> <li>• that economic analyses should consider</li> </ul>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>individual sections of the proposed toll road separately;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• that there are ethical &amp; moral grounds against tolling an existing highway built with public funds;</li> <li>• that better ways of raising revenue for road construction and maintenance should be thoroughly investigated, before resorting to this "second-best alternative, and</li> <li>• that principles of good planning and design should be applied to toll roads planning, irrespective of strictly legal requirements.</li> </ul> <p>In 1987, when the national roads fund ceased to benefit from a dedicated fuel levy, the financial situation within SA was critical and there were good reasons to divert the fuel levies into the general revenue fund. Building up funds of unspent taxes is also not good public financial policy. Despite the current weak position of the Rand, the position in SA has improved, the national debt is under control and the tax collected exceeds the budgeted amount. SA's coffers are full.</p> <p>It was reported recently that R30 billion is to be made available over the next five years, for upgrading and maintaining the country's road network. With R30 billion made available by the government to upgrade the country's roads one question is the need to make the existing R300/N21 into a toll road, in order to generate a further (second-rate) source of revenue for national road construction and maintenance.</p> <p>Apart from anything else, a danger exists that should Sanra benefit from toll road financing, that</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>their annual central government 'hand-out' from the treasury would be cut, by this amount.</p> <p>There are precedents for this. When motor vehicle licence fees were one of two provincial sources of revenue, each year treasury would work out what the cape Province's allocation should be, and then reduce it by the amount that vehicle licences had been increased that year. If no increase had as yet been made to the MVL structure, it was not above treasury to assume an increase and deduct that amount, in anticipation of a later increase in MVL's.</p> <p>There is absolutely no reason why treasury should not do the same to Sanra – in fact maybe treasury is already doing this and that is the reason why Sanra's allocation is only R900 million this year. Perhaps next year, if the revenue from toll roads increases by R50 million, Sanra's allocation will be only R850 million.</p> <p>Seriously (with R30 billion available for road systems upgrading over 5 years), a reduction must be unlikely. However, surely now is the time to make <u>realistic</u> requests for additional funding, and for this to be from a better source than the economically inefficient way of raising taxes through tolling existing freeways and highways. This is not user-pay principle but just a morally indefensible way of raising "dedicated" (to national roads) tax revenue.</p> <p>In conclusion, the tolling of the existing R300/N21 is not supported (as it is morally and ethically wrong). The tolling of the other sections of the ring road should be evaluated separately, and implemented if justified, and if funds for their</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					construction as "free" facilities will not be available instead.	
14/10/02	Silva	Mr A			The increase in noise that the road will bring, will take away the peaceful and quiet atmosphere that the area currently holds. The passing traffic will also have a negative effect on related air/ground pollution. The immediate area and surrounds will lose its 'rural' attraction and noise and pollution will prevail. Property values will also be negatively affected which is of great concern because my property is relatively near to the proposed extension. I sincerely hope all concerns are taken into account and developments conveyed to all concerned.	<b>14/10SILA-S</b>
14/10/02	Levatte	E		1	I do not want any development especially a noisy and polluting toll road.	<b>14/10LEVE-S</b>
14/10/02	Owen	D		3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No waste dump between Morningstar and the R300.</li> <li>2. No low cost housing between Morningstar and the R300.</li> <li>3. We want Ultra City/garage at intersection.</li> </ol>	<b>10/10OWED-S</b>
15/10/02	Burger	Jan	Princess Vlei Civic Association		<p>Inputs regarding fauna and flora have already been made by this Association and will therefore not be mentioned again. However, at a very well-attended public meeting a discussion and proposal from the floor was that Cape Town does not need toll roads. A unanimous no was given, reasons being as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be cost-effective</li> <li>• Toll roads through poorer areas</li> <li>• More pollution in areas already badly polluted</li> <li>• Day and night noise pollution in areas, which will be part of extension of</li> </ul>	<b>15/10BURJ-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>programme.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Environmental issues</li> </ul> <p>The general feeling is that because petrol, diesel and paraffin is so heavily taxed, there is enough money to attend to the needs of roads. Residents are convinced that even though Government denies the tax on fuel, there is a portion thereof that is in fact not being used.</p>	
15/10/02	Davies	Bryn		3	<p>In 1999 I purchased 2 ha of land (portions 28 and 16 of farm 152) in Morningstar, which is immediately adjacent to the planned R300. This I did after having met with the then Cape Metropolitan Council to understand the development plans for the area, within the then MSDP. The plans, as described to me, did not include any major roads such as this right next to my fence! In August this year I began to build my house, and to date my costs on developing the property, as well as costs to complete the buildings, are extensive. On 21st September this year, I received a notification (from Kayad) of the proposed R300 extension. Whilst I understand the reasons for the road, and the negative effects on the overall economics within the area and the greater Western Cape should it not be built, I, together with other residents of Morningstar, especially those immediately adjacent to the proposed road, <i>vigorously object to this alignment</i>. Issues affecting us are, amongst others, noise, increased crime, accelerated development close to what is now a peaceful rural area, devaluation of our properties and increased pollution. During the meeting at Morningstar on 8th October, we were told by Kayad engineers that an alignment</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					approximately 800m further to the south, within the buffer zone, would not cost more than the currently proposed alignment. We therefore propose that the road be moved south, away from our properties, such that the above negative effects are minimised. A road, even at this distance from our properties, is undesirable, but we believe that a compromise must be reached and therefore are prepared to accept such new alignment. A formal response to this email and the proposed change, is anticipated.	
18/10/02	Tyler	Paul			<p>My wife and I wish to bring to your attention the major and intrusive impact that the above toll road will have on a most sensitive and important natural area on the southwestern Cape Flats. We are residents of Muizenberg, members of Cape Bird Club, keen hikers and enthusiastic, indigenous gardeners. We therefore greatly appreciate the beautiful natural environment that surrounds us and spend many hours enjoying the numerous bird and plant species that currently abound in the habitats that exist in this area.</p> <p>We are also passionate supporters of economic empowerment and social upliftment for the previously disadvantaged communities and have both committed our working lives to these objectives. However, we fail to see any benefit to the poorer local communities from the proposed toll road as the road will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not provide better access to any of the major employment nodes;</li> <li>• Present a physical and environmental threat to the communities that have been built up close to the proposed</li> </ul>	<b>18/10TYLP-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>route; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be a further reason for increases in the cost of essential commodities because of the increase in transport costs that the tolls will cause.</li> </ul> <p>We urge you to ensure that comprehensive environmental studies are carried out over a period of annual seasons in the road reserve and adjacent areas so that important evidence can be gathered on what impact the proposed toll road will have on such sensitive and diverse aquatic and terrestrial habitats as the Cape Flats Waste Water Treatment Works. We believe that adequate time needs to be given for the studies and that they need to consider the effect on the sustainability and biodiversity of all living creatures up to 1 kilometer on either side of the proposed road. We further ask you to ensure that the specialist reports are not conducted in isolation of the whole environment through which the proposed toll road passes. In addition, we ask for investigations to be carried out on the impact of the additional traffic as it reaches the existing road system around Lakeside, Retreat and Muizenberg where there is already a great deal of congestion at times.</p> <p>We firmly believe that there is a more sustainable and equitable approach that could be taken which would be very much in line with the Integrated Metropolitan Environmental Policy for the City of Cape Town 2020. This would be to upgrade the public transport system (both train and bus services), which could be done without causing irreversible damage to Cape Town's unique</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>biodiversity. This would benefit all parts of our community, not just the few who will be able to afford both a means of private transportation and the tolls and thus "enjoy" the possible benefits of shorter journey times.</p> <p>Please help us to preserve, for future generations, the proclaimed nature reserves at Rondevlei and Zandvlei and the fifth most important (in terms of numbers) waterbird site in South Africa – the Strandfontein Treatment Works. We would love the opportunity to show you the beauty and importance of these areas if you are not familiar with them and if you have some time in your busy schedule; please do not hesitate to contact us.</p>	
18/10/02	Wood	Julia	South Peninsula Municipality	1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All the alternatives (including no-development option) need be assessed and form part of the EIA. Mitigation measures such as burying the road or putting road on silts needs to be addressed. The impact assessment needs to address a wide area (band) and not just the proposed alignment in each place.</li> <li>2. The need for the road needs to be explained.</li> <li>3. Adequate corridors over rivers (Zeekoevlei outlet; Sand River; Keyser River) and the over migration routes (between Capricorn &amp; Rondevlei and between Pelican Park &amp; Zeekoevlei) must be determined by specialists in consultation with the City.</li> <li>4. The proposed EIA process must be adequately explained in the next round of public meetings /open days.</li> </ol>	<b>18/10WOOJ-S</b>
21/10/02	Kruyer	David	Global Family Trust	3	I have invested R3.5 million on my property and	<b>21/10KRUD-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					do not want the R300 placed opposite my back fence. The noise pollution and air pollution will have a detrimental effect on our quality of life we moved to the country for.	
21/10/02	Vachaudez	R E	Residents' Monitoring Group: Vissershok	3	The N21 Ring Road must be completed as soon as possible for the following reasons: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Residential, industrial and commercial expansion north of Tableview.</li> <li>2. Emergency facility to exit Koeberg area in case of nuclear disaster.</li> <li>3. Completion of M12 and various arterial roads to service the area</li> <li>4. Justify railway facility to Cape Town ring areas.</li> <li>5. Deviation of having to drive through Dunoon, which has become a hazard on Potsdam Road and on the N7.</li> </ol>	<b>21/10VACR-S</b>
21/10/02	Wiley	Jeremy	Chairman – Peninsula Tourism	1	We were not able to send a representative to your Open House on the R300 in Tokai on the 5 <sup>th</sup> September, but I understand from people present that there was no mention made in the assessment on the negative effect on tourism the proposed route from Prince George Drive, cutting through Rondevlei and the sewerage ponds, Strandfontein Road and ending at Vanguard Drive, would have. Peninsula Tourism represents over 300 members in the area, some of whom were previously disadvantaged. These members gain their livelihood from visitors who come because of the natural beauty of the area in question and to see the bird life and wetland vegetation. Cape Town and the Western Cape are trying to attract high sending foreign tourists seeking this experience It	<b>21/10WILJ-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					is a market specifically targeted in the Western Cape's Draft Tourism Marketing Strategy. We object strongly to any road cutting through the area. The noise and sight of speeding cars would fatally damage the experience of peace and tranquillity, which is an integral part of the whole visitor experience. We do not object to the concept of the toll road per se, but believe the northerly route is the only acceptable option tabled.	
21/10/02	Lee-Wright	Ludine		1	I have spent time taking photographs at the water treatment pans and am aware of the hyper-sensitivity of the coastal wild birds – just the slightest sudden movement can cause a whole flock to take off. I am amazed and horrified that anyone can think the effect of this road on them will be anything short of complete devastation. I wish to protest in the strongest terms. What can I do?	<b>21/10LEEL-S</b>
24/10/02	Ward	Sarah	Energy and Development/Sustainable Energy Africa	1	I am restricting my comments to the necessity of building a link road between the M3 and the M5: At the moment there is no proper connection between the M5 and the M3 (Blue Route) in the South Peninsula area and yet there is a huge amount of traffic needing to make this cross over: all trucks and cars needing to pass between the two highways currently use residential areas as through routes: Muizenberg, which is a residential area and a very important recreational destination area, is groaning under the weight of trucks thundering through the area and cars trying to move through at high speed. These vehicles use Atlantic Road (which is acceptable as this is a public use and commercial road, however it has a	<b>24/10WARS-A</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>low bridge on it), but they also use an entirely residential road (Albertyn) which is narrow, totally unsuited to such heavy traffic use and is also in the heart of the Muizenberg Village; and a residential and recreational road along the Zandvlei (Henley) - this latter road is a suitably small Muizenberg-scale road connecting the Village to the Vlei, supporting braai areas, informal and formal soccer areas, play grounds and other vlei activities (the vlei supports a large amount of wildlife and a wetland area). These recreational areas are extremely well used on weekends by people from all over the Peninsula and offer a wide range of facilities such as beach, pool, vlei, soccer, boating, super tubes etc etc. Traffic travels at high speed along this road and for some unfathomable reason the traffic department have refused to apply any traffic calming measures along this road although they agree that few cars obey the speed limit and that there is a great danger of children being hurt or killed. The link between the M3 and the M5 urgently needs to be built to complete these original road building projects. In addition, the bridge over Atlantic Road needs to be raised so that trucks can be accommodated on this road; through traffic must be very actively discouraged (barred?) from using Albertyn and Henley Roads and attractive traffic calming measures installed which will make this area even more attractive and certainly safer for all its users. In addition, the train system should be improved, particularly on weekends in summer, to improve access to the Muizenberg recreational facilities and reduce traffic congestion. It is absurd</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					to have built these two major highways without providing a connection between them, and expect residential and recreational areas to cope with the problem. It seems that, as this portion of the road completes unfinished road building projects, it should not be tolled - it will not be a choice for vehicles to use this portion - it will be a necessity.	
4/11/02	Lee	Helen			Please can you let me have any information regarding the ongoing reports whether this road will be going ahead. What rights do I have regarding the road being built directly behind my house, which will devalue my property and force me to eventually sell as the noise and height of the road will directly affect me.	<b>4/11LEE-H-S</b>
4/11/02	Van der Wielen/Muller	M/D			<p>We would like to add our voice to the growing body of dissenters to the proposed R300 (N21) Toll Road (Lakeside via the R300 around Durbanville to Bloubergstrand). Firstly, there is compelling evidence that this road will threaten fauna and flora that is unique in this part of the country, and indeed the world. People the world over are drawn to this part of the Cape for its biodiversity and unique Fynbos, which, ironically, seems to be constantly under threat by so-called Developers - perhaps the term Desecrators should be coined instead!</p> <p>Secondly, we question the need for such a road. It seems to us that there are several routes to the False Bay coastline from the northern suburbs, viz. the M5, the Blue Route, and Main Road, so the problem is not one of accessibility: however, there is already a problem of congestion at the south end of these routes as they verge onto Main Road and Boyes Drive at Lakeside or Muizenberg</p>	<b>4/11VANM-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>or at Ou Kaapse Weg. Yet another route will further compound the traffic bottleneck, especially if the route is upgraded to 6 lanes as proposed! We have heard talk of the widening of the Main Road along the coastline by doing away with the railwayline. To do this would not only be doing away with a unique rail route that must class as one of the most scenic in the world, it would remove the very essence of all that makes this part of the Cape charming, original and attractive to tourists and locals alike.</p> <p>If the Government is serious about sustainability, it should be looking at a way to assist the greatest number of people in a way that is sensitive to the environment and indeed enhances it. It should stick to its policy of improving Public Transportation (IMEP - 2020) so that all may benefit not only those with private vehicles in order to reduce noise and air pollution. The investment in more roads would be far better spent on upgrading and extending, if necessary, the already existing rail infra-structure, making it cheaper and safer and thus attractive to commuters to use, especially for the purpose of leisure during weekends and peak holiday seasons.</p> <p>We understand that the proposed toll road is in the interests of a private consortium, which aims to make a profit. No significant monies will be reinvested back into the Local Communities or W. Cape infrastructure. If there are alternative routes, it is unlikely that many people would opt to use a toll route, in which case it is in danger of becoming a white elephant!</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					Please - let's bring people to enjoy this beautiful part of the Cape, but let's do it in a way that is harmonious with the existing resources, and not at the expense of nature and the quality of life for many people living in the areas concerned.	
4/11/02	Dowling	Patrick	WESSA: WC		<p>The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa: Western Cape Region objects strongly to the proposal for the R300 ring road. Below follow some of the reasons for this position.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Cumulative and secondary impacts</b> - Apart from the extensive footprint required by the road and its undeniably significant social and biophysical impacts immediately it would also lead to further impacts. Roads attract development and there would be pressure by other landowners to capitalise on the infrastructure provided. This in turn is likely to exacerbate pressure on resources, pollution outputs and habitat destruction. Other roads have already had significant negative impacts and future ones like the N1/N2 toll Rd proposals (not alluded to in the context of the R300) will add more. This road cannot be assessed in isolation.</li> <li>2. <b>Public Participation</b> – Relatively few people attended most of the Open House Meetings to discuss the road proposal. The National Environmental Management Act states that Environmental Management must place people and their needs at the forefront of its concern. And later that all people must have the opportunity to develop the understanding, skills and</li> </ol>	<b>4/11DOWP-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>capacity necessary for achieving equitable and effective participation, and further on that participation by vulnerable and disadvantaged persons must be assured. A road of this length will affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of people directly and indirectly – many in an adverse way. Current attendance records cannot be used to justify the notion of opportunity to participate effectively.</p> <p>3. <b>Public Transport</b> – We believe that increasing road infrastructure encourages the use of private rather than public transport. The latter meets many more of the requirements for sustainable development than the former and is likely to consume less energy and produce fewer pollutants. Upgrading existing road infrastructure and ensuring the rights and safety of cyclists and pedestrians should be getting priority attention in a city, which boasts an Integrated Development Plan (IDP) approach and has sworn to combat ills like bad air quality. Any new transport infrastructure investment should be directed at an improvement of public transport, which is far more likely to serve the equity principle of sustainable development than one which encourages private vehicle ownership.</p> <p>4. <b>Desirability</b> – As an unsolicited bid, this road has no legitimacy as something wanted by the greater public of Cape Town. Notions put forward by its few and</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>interested proponents that the road would lead to economic benefits, growth etc must be countered by an insistence that the carrying capacity of the region for additional development has already been exceeded. More activity of the sort promoted by another road will greatly increase the amount of environmental and social stress.</p> <p>5. <b>Biophysical impacts</b> – Any additional threat to bird, mammal, insect, fish or plant species cannot be tolerated. Such serious inroads have been made into the biodiversity of the Cape Flats over a few centuries of development that large amounts of international funding are now being channelled at preserving the last patches of natural heritage in the region via the C.A.P.E project. Civic bodies and organizations have been fighting hard to preserve or restore local environments like the Parkwood wetland, Zandvlei and the False Bay Coastal Park. It would be highly irresponsible of any commercial group or provincial/local authority to sideline these efforts in pursuit of something that the majority of the public is either ignorant of or fiercely opposed to. WESSA wishes particularly to endorse the comments made by the Zandvlei Trust and by Charles Oertel regarding their objections to the proposed R300 Toll Rd.</p>	
4/11/02	Bosma	Sharon	Friends of Simon's Town Coastline		<p>1. <b>Objection in principle:</b> In principle, we do not support the promotion</p>	4/11BOSS-S

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>and facilitation of increasingly greater volumes of vehicular traffic in and around Cape Town. The alternative of more efficient, reliable, safe and environmentally responsible public transport should be part of a national transport strategy. We intend to pursue this with the Minister of Transport as an alternative to the proposed Ring Road.</p> <p>2. <b>Objection to alignment:</b></p> <p>2.1 Apart from objecting to the Ring Road as a whole, we object specifically to the routing of Sector 1, the Southern Greenfields Section. This passes through the sensitive Cape Flats natural areas, the proposed False Bay Ecology Park, the Strandfontein Waste Water ponds, and the Lakeside Wetlands. We are completely opposed to this sector because of the considerable negative conservation impacts on both flora and fauna.</p> <p>2.2 In terms of traffic management, this section of the road will channel more weekend and holiday traffic into the Main Road running south to beaches towards Fish Hoek and Simon's Town. At present the traffic delays into and out of Fish Hoek and Simon's Town during the summer season are untenable. No mention is made of managing this traffic flow. Designers appear to be focussing on daily peak hour traffic moving <i>out</i> of the area to the North, and have not considered additional holiday traffic moving in.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p><b>3. Objections to process:</b></p> <p>3.1 Consideration of "No go" option: No mention is made of the "no go" option. Specialists have been asked to recommend mitigation measures, and to determine the significance of impact before and after mitigation (BID #2, page 3). We will lobby together with other environmental groups for the 'no go' option.</p> <p>3.2 Incomplete specialist reports: while we have received brief summaries of the specialists' reports, these are incomplete. We find it unreasonable to be expected to provide informed comment when we do not have access to the full and to all the specialist reports. We would also like to have the opportunity to comment on the specialist reports before they are accepted.</p> <p>3.3 We have not seen the Scoping Report, and have been unaware of the public participation meetings or various presentations, bar one on the 25 September 2002. However we are now listed as an I&amp;AP and hope to receive all the background information and documents relevant to the project.</p> <p><b>4. General comments:</b></p> <p>One of the reasons given for building the Ring Road is the increasing number of vehicles being acquired by previously low income groups living in the Cape Flats area. The Ring Road is promoted as serving the transport interests of people living</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>in this relatively inaccessible area. However, the financial viability analysis indicates that the toll road will be financially viable only at the middle to high tariff structure. It will not be financially viable at low tariff. This effectively will bar lower income groups for whom the road is being touted, from using the road.</p> <p><b>5. Summary:</b>  We are commenting in a vacuum despite trying to establish where we are in the process, in order to meet the end of October deadline for comments on alignment. We should appreciate the opportunity to comment fully on detailed aspects of conservation-related concerns, once these documents are made available.</p>	
4/11/02	Lawson	Gavin	Cape Bird Club		<p>There is a concern that alternatives have not been adequately investigated. These alternatives include the no-go option, and alternative alignments. The Southern Greenfields – sector 1 alignment is in an extremely important environmental habitat of the Cape Flats. The proximity of the proposed Road to the important Nature Reserves with broader business plans, wetlands and potential eco-tourist destinations will seriously jeopardize and impact on these core businesses.</p> <p><b>Public participation and Social Issues</b>  The attendance figures of all previous public meetings suggest that the system and methods of advertising are not reaching the ‘ordinary persons’ of Cape Town. It is evident when speaking to the ‘ordinary person’ in the Cape Metropolitan area that they are unaware of this proposal.  On a political level – if the electorate have not</p>	<b>4/11LAWG-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>been consulted or participated in this process and are opposed to the Toll Road, it could be embarrassing for the Regional and National Governments. The new dispensation requires that all decision-making be inclusive and participative. Have the broader poorer communities had a fair chance to consider the importance of this proposal and voice their comments? They have to pay the same price for food and any other goods purchased, which are transported into the Cape Metropolitan area.</p> <p><b>Loss of potential opportunities in False Bay Ecology Park (FBEP)</b></p> <p>From a socio-economic perspective, the presence of a major road through the middle, of the FBEP– (Rondevlei, Zeekoevlei, Cape Flats Waste Water Works, Muizenberg Landfill site and the adjoining CAFDA property) will significantly negatively impact on the ‘wilderness’ experience the area affords and thereby impacts on its recreational, educational, physiological and psychological amenity value. The need for quiet, peaceful natural environments within an urban context, is great and all the more so in areas where access to quality open spaces is limited. The value of natural areas from a physical and psychological perspective must not be underrated.</p> <p>The FBEP provides this opportunity for the many people in close proximity to have access to such an environment. The road will impact on this experience and reduce the opportunities it affords to the communities for economic and social upliftment. The road will be in close proximity to the eco-village and camping area, the viability</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>thereof being affected, which in turn will impact significantly on the viability of the FBEP as a whole in its objective to become as financially self-sustaining as possible.</p> <p>The Cape Waste Water Works is regarded as the 5th most important birding site in South Africa. It presently attracts many foreign tourists, as groups and individuals. The tourist potential is untapped and is being presently marketed by a number of companies. Eco-tourism activities and facilities will provide for much needed job opportunities, particularly for local communities. The proposed road is likely to severely compromise the integrity of the FBEP. It will effectively bisect the Park, thereby severely impacting on biodiversity, the activities and infrastructure proposed in terms of the FBEP Development and Action Plan (December 2001). Light pollution and noise pollution can be anticipated to be major impacts – both to humans and fauna, especially avifauna. Birds are particularly sensitive to environmental influences and changes, and being mobile, may elect to relocate from areas of disturbance. Many species are migratory. What impact would the road have on these birds, which arrive annually from the northern hemisphere? This proposal would affect some of the world migratory populations of birds. The quantitative impact of the proposed road on all the bird populations is of great concern, and it is urged that the precautionary principle be applied when dealing with this impact. Many studies worldwide have pointed to the significant adverse impacts of new roads on bird and fauna populations.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p><b>Zandvlei Nature Reserve</b>  The height profile (road surface above ground level) of the proposed road on the northern boundary of the Zandvlei Nature Reserve where it would have to cross the Keysers River and the railway line would be visible in Muizenberg, Lakeside and the Marina da Gama to the south, Retreat and Kirstenhof in the north and west. The visual, road light, noise and air pollution disturbance would have an enormous impact. The immediate residents in Norfolk Park, Coniston Park, Zerilda Park, Lavender Hill, Seawinds, Vrygrond and Marina da Gama would have diminished quality of lifestyle and property values. The noise would be accentuated being so close to the very large water bodies in the vicinity. The strong prevailing winds would also carry the sound and air pollution great distances. This would probably spell the end of the terrestrial part of the Nature Reserve, established in 1977. The Environmental Education Centre would not be viable to the local schools (about 2000 children per annum and increasing) as they would have access problems and the noise and visual disturbance with the added pollution would detract from the present quiet undisturbed Nature experience. Many of these children need this experience to cope with the social situation they find themselves in. Also they are in walking distance to the Reserve. The Environmental Centre is less than 70 meters from the road alignment. The northern water pans in the Reserve are less than 80 meters from the proposed road alignment. The road would also isolate the very successful</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>Langevlei Wetlands Development from the Nature Reserve and this Education facility would be lost. The present road reserve has nearly 20 plant types that don't occur in the Nature Reserve and this additional habitat would help to make the Nature Reserve more viable long term for the sustainable Education and recreation programmes presently undertaken. The Greater Zandvlei Estuary Reserve proposal is in an advanced stage, this to manage the viable identified land and water components in and around the Zandvlei Estuary.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The Cape Bird Club remains opposed to the Southern Greenfields – sector 1. This due to the extreme environmental damage anticipated during the construction and operation of the proposed road, the environmental damage caused by the loss of unique habitat and the loss of future opportunities for the area. Also, as stated in all previous correspondence on this matter. As this proposal is an unsolicited bid, a further suggestion that the developers and SANRAL revise their agreement and go back to the National Minister of Transport and re-think the revenue collection process and system. The tax from the fuel levy already covers the construction and maintenance of all National Roads (or should do so). This form of taxation is also recognised as a most efficient form of tax collection. This potential double form of taxation (fuel and toll tax) will only escalate the inflation rate in the Western Cape as all business and transportation costs will be added to the already unaffordable cost of living for the majority of our Cape Metropolitan population.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
6/11/02	Otty	J		1	<p>I am enclosing an original comment sheet duly completed together with 3 sheets of petition signatures against the project in its current format. I and those who have signed have the following reasons for objecting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The potential destruction of on of South Africa's most important birding areas. The area is designated an Important Bird Area and is listed in the African Directory of Important Bird Areas.</li> <li>2. The project is an unsolicited proposal by Penway</li> <li>3. The public in the Lakeside area have not been given adequate details/information of the project and the impact it will have on their immediate area.</li> <li>4. The negative effect it will have on a number of endangered species of flora, fauna and bird life. We believe that the protection of these species is of paramount importance to future generations of South Africans.</li> </ol> <p>I, together with the signatories believe that the most sensible and effective answer to traffic congestion/flow in the Cape Peninsula is the upgrade of the existing and the development of new public transport infrastructure which will be able to move thousands of commuters quickly, efficiently, safely on a daily basis. This is our recommended alternative to the proposal.</p>	<b>6/11OTTJ-S</b>
11/11/02	Hoffman	D M		3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No to 'proposed' toll road.</li> <li>2. Why new road – rather upgrade present run down systems.</li> <li>3. Your proposed route, as you gathered does</li> </ol>	<b>11/11HOFD-A</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>not go down with the Morningstar residents.</p> <p>4. If your system is a must, route your road through Vissershok.</p> <p>5. At present, road tests are underway on the N7 near Morningstar. The N7 has been single laned during the duration of the tests. It would be interesting for you to do decibel reading while this test is being carried out. Heavy vehicles approaching the single lane are using their jake brakes and or exhaust brakes to help them gear down to pass the test rig. Decibel testings at late night and early morning would give you the right affect that one would get from traffic gearing to enter or exit your proposed interchange on the N7 – please do the test.</p>	
14/11/02	Higgs	G			<p>I am opposed to the toll road that links the southern end of the M3 with the R27 via the R300 and wish to lodge my objection in the strongest terms. It seems crazy that you are even a part of this proposition and it can only be limited in relation to the ecology, which has to surpass you and yours and be passed on to generations to come. It is illogical too, your so-called 'environmental assessment', and this only to appease those who stand to benefit by gain financially. And so are your thoughts illogical and contribution towards the same. I wonder if any of you live in this environment? And if not, I wonder how you would feel if you were personally affected with a similar situation. Quite frankly, it's pathetic, your way of thinking. What the hell do you want</p>	14/11HIGG-S

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					to cut up the ecology for? The Cape Town area is already shrinking because of you and yours. The ecology is already damaged, threatened, and if you knew more about biology and the ecology and how important these 'basic' forms of life are to you and me, you would think twice before going were you are going.	
18/11/02	Madden	M		1	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals for the Peninsula Expressway for two reasons:</p> <p>(1) because they conflict with the following portions of the National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998</p> <p>(2) because the fundamental issue of public transport has been ignored.</p> <p>(1) <u>Conflict with National Environmental Management Act of 1998</u></p> <p>Below I have quoted portions of the Act, and have followed each quote from the Act with an explanation (<i>in italics</i>) of how the proposals for the Peninsula Expressway conflict with that portion of the Act.</p> <p>The Act says:</p> <p>(4) (a) Sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors including the following:</p> <p>(i) That the disturbance of ecosystems and loss of biological diversity are avoided, or, where they cannot be altogether avoided, are minimised and remedied;</p> <p><i>The proposed Toll Road will cause an appreciable disturbance of the ecosystems in the Cape Flats water treatment works, Zeekoevlei, Rondevlei, the Zandvlei Estuary and the Westlake Wetlands.</i></p>	<b>18/11MADM-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p><i>These disturbances can easily be avoided altogether by eliminating the part of the road which runs through these areas. The developers of the Toll Road claim that the Road has to be built as an all-or-nothing project, but this commercial argument cannot take precedence over an Act of Parliament.</i></p> <p>The Act says</p> <p>(4) (a) Sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors including the following:</p> <p>(vii) that a risk-averse and cautious approach is applied, which takes into account the limits of current knowledge about the consequences of decisions and actions; and</p> <p><i>The proposed Toll Road will expose the ecosystems mentioned above to risks which are likely to be long-lasting and large but cannot be estimated accurately. Therefore a risk-averse approach is not applied by the proposals, and the limits of current knowledge about the consequences of decisions and actions are being ignored.</i></p> <p>The Act says:</p> <p>(4) (a) Sustainable development requires the consideration of all relevant factors including the following:</p> <p>(viii) that negative impacts on the environment and on people's environmental rights be anticipated and prevented, and where they cannot be altogether prevented, are minimised and remedied.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>The proposed Toll Road will cause appreciable negative impacts on the environment. These impacts can easily be remedied, by eliminating the part of the Road which runs through the areas of Rondevlei, Zeekoevlei, the Cape Flats water treatment works, the Zandvlei Estuary and the Westlake Wetlands. The proposed project ignores this simple remedy.</p> <p>The Act says:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Sensitive, vulnerable, highly dynamic or stressed ecosystems, such as coastal shores, estuaries, wetlands, and similar systems require specific attention in management and planning procedures, especially where they are subject to significant human resource usage and development pressure.</p> <p><i>The areas of Rondevlei, Zeekoevlei, the Cape Flats water treatment works, the Zandvlei Estuary and the Westlake Wetlands are all examples of "sensitive, vulnerable, highly dynamic or stressed ecosystems, such as coastal shores, estuaries, wetlands" as listed in the Act. The proposed Toll Road should therefore not be allowed to traverse these areas.</i></p> <p><u>(2)Public transport has specifically been ignored.</u></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">New multi-lane roads elsewhere in the world have generally failed to improve traffic flows after a short time, and have become congested because they attract traffic. The M23 orbital motorway around London is perhaps the most obvious example of a failed new multi-lane road. In contrast, improving public transport makes ecological sense, benefits poor</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					communities and is much cheaper. However, improving public transport has been ignored by the Penway consortium because it is considered to be "a problem that the government must address and the specialists have not been asked to address it" (S Chand, Focus group meeting no 2, Thursday, 11 April 2002, Tokai Library). This statement by Chand, whose fees are paid by the Penway consortium, strongly suggests that the commercial aims of the consortium conflict with the interests of the people of the Western Cape.	
19/11/02	Chalton	D and M		1	We should like to register as an Interested and Affected Party, to oppose this section of the proposed ring road most strongly. We are part of the monthly bird count at Strandfontein and the variety and numbers of birds there (over 10,000 birds in summer) make it unique. It is also a valuable stopping-off area for palaeartic migrants, one of the few areas left (with Rondevlei and Langebaan Lagoon), as man occupies more and more natural places. This also applies to the few wild animals we have left in the Cape, such as the Cape Grysbok, the Steenbok, the Lynx, the Porcupine, Cape Fox, the mongooses and a host of plant and insect species, some of which are found nowhere else. The S. Greenfield's Section of the proposed private toll road will result in the destruction of 25% of Strandfontein's oxidation pans and create a physical barrier between Strandfontein, Rondevlei and Zeekoevlei -- all part of the very important wetland system. It will also	<b>19/11CHAD-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>damage about six hectares of strandveld vegetation in the northern section of the Zandvlei Nature Reserve, an area that is considered to have the best vegetation in the entire Zandvlei region. The road will intrude right through these lovely areas, with all the resulting noise, pollution (just look at the plastic bags, tins and other rubbish all along our roads) and intrusion of people not at all interested in preserving the few wild places left around Cape Town. What will it appear like to the increasing numbers of visitors we are getting, especially birders from all over the world, coming often from areas that have already destroyed most of their own wild and natural areas? Surely the authorities, who have proclaimed that they are committed to "the conservation of fauna and flora and the City of Cape Town's unique biodiversity", could find an alternative route for this ring road, one that does not harm one of our few remaining wetlands.</p>	
22/11/02	Clark	M C		1	<p>I am against this new toll road extension on the R300/M3 going through the southern Peninsula and destroying Zandvlei Nature Reserve and bird sanctuary at the water treatment plant. It is not necessary – it is only enriching greedy developers. Better traffic control can help solve the problems without ruining our available land – we do not want to look like Joburg!</p>	<b>22/11CLAM-S</b>
22/11/02	Neden	G			<p>I wish to add my objection to the development of this new road to the many others you must have received. The Metropolitan Spatial Plan of 1996 showed a more northerly route to connect the M5 with the R300 and did not show any road through the Strandfontein area. This area is world famous</p>	<b>22/11NEDG-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					for its ornithological interest and a new road through the area would destroy this. The need for such a road here is in any case not proven. The proposed road is, I understand, an unsolicited private initiative and one can only wonder as to the promoter's interests. I hope that sense will prevail and the proposal be abandoned.	
26/11/02	Robson	Selwyn			Having examined the detailed proposal for the R300 Toll Road, I am utterly opposed to this development, since it will result in a severe degradation of the ecotourism potential of the Cape Flats. I hereby register my disgust that this road be even under consideration.	<b>26/11ROBS-S</b>
26/11/02	White	Sam	Western Province Freshwater Angling Association	1	I represent Western Province Freshwater Angling Association in the capacity of Nature Conservation Representative. In this capacity I attend the meetings of ZEMT, FBEP and ZCM. Herewith the data with regard to the usage of Zeekoevlei by anglers on a formal and informal basis. (Refer to letter dated 26/11/02). In addition, three social (non-registered) clubs, use Zeekoevlei on average two to three times per year. Their average attendance is 18. The above trend will continue during 2003 with the addition of the Presidents League Ladies National championship which is scheduled to take place at Zeekoevlei during the second week of April 2003. This championship will be attended by 90 anglers, 9 officials and 3 National representatives. During the second week of November 2003 the National Masters championship is scheduled to take place at Zeekoevlei. The total number of anglers, officials and national representative will be approximately 175. These championships take place over three	<b>26/11WHIS-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>days from a Wednesday to a Friday with the majority of participants from all over the country practising in the waters from the previous Saturday. Similar events have been scheduled for the year 2004. These tournaments are organised on behalf of the controlling South African Freshwater Bank Angling Association. The proposed R300 if proceeded with adjacent to Zeekoevlei has the potential of despoiling the tranquility we currently enjoy at Zeekovlei. The toll roads, if proceeded with, will have a major impact on the freshwater angling sport in this Province. The majority of 'local' anglers using Zeekoevlei regularly, whether they are registered with clubs or not, live further than 30km from the vlei. We as registered anglers also use Brandvleidam near Worcester and Theewaterskloof near Villiersdorp regularly, which means whichever way you look at the R300 and proposed toll roads, the additional cost to the anler to whom freashwater agnling is a sport and not just a hobby may cause the poorer anglers to resign from the sport and therefore impact both the clubs and the Province. We are certainly opposed to both the R300 and toll roads.</p>	
27/11/02	Robertson	E		1	<p>I think having a toll road is completely unnecessary and something that will add a lot to the cost of living for the average motorist. Why should we have to pay more when we have to travel to Cape Town every day? Who is going to benefit from the toll road? Why do the developers feel the need to make the Southern Peninsula more accessible to the rest of the Western Cape? Where are all the extra cars going to park over the</p>	<b>27/11ROBE-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>weekends and holidays? What are the developers planning to do about the bottleneck between Muizenberg and Simonstown? Have they seen the traffic along this route during the Summer, when people are trying to get to the beach? A new road will only worsen the problem and not improve anything at all - except the bank account of the developer!!! They have obviously looked into it and have seen that it will be worthwhile for them. What about us? Who takes any notice of what we, the average person in South Africa, wants? We have protest marches, gatherings and prayer meetings, just to try and get our voices heard, and air our point of view, (not only about this issue) but no one listens. Does government only listen to the voice of a few businessmen who wave the carrot of extra money before them? They seem to turn a blind eye to what will happen if this road system gets the go ahead? What will happen when all the natural areas and reserves and wetlands have been destroyed? Who will stand up and take the blame? Nobody, least of all the people in authority. The developers will shrug their shoulders and say " It's not our fault, the people in authority felt it was OK" Come on people of the South Peninsula, do you really want the beauty of the whole Peninsula destroyed by unnecessary 6 lane highways? Come on councillors in the Unicity of Cape Town and all other people in authority, you were supposedly elected to SERVE us the people who live in this area. We really are not seeing much service only high-handed authoritarian actions. Show us, the people you actually work for, that you do care about us, our</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>concerns, and the area we live in, not just about how important you are in your recently redecorated offices and driving around in the large cars that we are paying for. You are all quick enough to arrange and accept nice salary increases, so now do something for us, your employers! Upgrade the trains and other public transport. Why is it not safe to travel on the train anymore? Who is responsible for the state the train service is in? Why is nothing done about security on the trains? Travelling on the train used to be a normal daily event for people to get to work or to go "up the line" or for a days outing, at any time of the day. Not any more. Get the "developers" to put their minds to improving the train service, then we will applaud them instead of booing them. They will then be doing a service to people of the South Peninsula and if they can come out with a good bank balance, we will be pleased for them. Give us back our train service we lost and keep your toll roads, we don't want them. I hope there is someone in authority, with half a brain, who can see how unnecessary this whole project is.</p>	
27/11/02	Gottschalk	M and J			<p>We read in the Constantia Bulletin about a proposed road that will link the southern end of the M3 with the R27 at Bloubergstrand, via the R300 on the Cape Flats. While it would be useful to have this road, we object most strongly to its construction as it will cut through ecologically sensitive areas. As grandparents, we would like there to be a worthwhile ecological legacy for our grandchildren and great-grandchildren to enjoy. We</p>	27/11GOTM-S

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					also feel that Cape Town is promoted for its eco-tourism, which would be laughable if we have a road which cuts through and destroys ecologically sensitive areas. We ask that you reconsider the wisdom of building this road.	
27/11/02	Gottschalk	K			It is with alarm that I have read about the proposed expressway that will link the M3 with the R27, cutting through ecologically sensitive areas. I wish to voice my objection to this proposed road in the strongest possible terms. The road would negatively affect wetlands, which are world renowned birding areas. The Cape Flats Waste Water Treatment Works is the fifth most important birding site in South Africa. The area that the road cuts through is home to endangered species. I feel that as you will be paying the environmental consultants who will be studying the ecological impact of the proposed road, they will not be able to give a truly objective and unbiased opinion about its impact. Please do not go ahead with this project!	<b>27/11GOTK-S</b>
27/11/02	Jackson	J	False Bay Ecology Park Provisional Steering Committee	1	Refer to letter dated 27/11/2002.	<b>27/11JACJ-S</b>
28/11/02	Viljoen	Y			Thank you for the opportunity to object most strongly to the proposed R300 extension Toll Road. I object because Cape Town already has a sufficient number of roads, which could be made more efficient by improved linking. Cape Town is an important centre for local and international tourism and visitors to the city, who come to experience its natural assets. The proposed toll	<b>28/11VILY-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>road would impact negatively on an internationally valuable wetland. It is well-known that wetlands the world over are threatened environments and each and everyone should be out of bounds to development of any kind. The Cape Flats wetlands are of Ramsar quality and birds from the far northern hemisphere use it annually. It would be criminal to jeopardize their existence. The toll road concept is a business enterprise: sites are sought out for the purpose of making money. In this case, one of the interested parties is a government department, which should be paying attention to using ratepayers money on improved transport systems such as public transport. Instead, it is teaming up with a [so-called] private company [Penway] in an attempt to make money out of the tax-paying public. Shame! Cape Town is fortunate to have the basis of a commuter rail system - a rare facility in our country. If this system were improved in efficiency, comfort, style, security and imaginative fare structuring, it would be even more used than it is by residents and visitors. The National Transport Agency should rather use its influence to get Intersite and Metro Rail to improve the commuter rail service - not only for passengers but also for goods. The department of transport could also pressure the relevant local authority to improve its bus services. Cape Town must say 'no' to this proposal.</p>	
28/11/02	Campbell	B and L			<p>We the undersigned are opposed to the construction of the R300 Toll Road across the False Bay Coastal Park. Such a road is not in the least necessary under present economic conditions in the area, since people most affected by it would</p>	28/11CAMB-S

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					not be able to afford to use it. Any type of construction which threatens the ecology of this region is to be deplored. The only beneficiary would be the private consortium. The real problem in the South Peninsula is the congestion of roads to Deep South via Muizenberg and Ou Kappse Weg and this proposed toll road would not help to solve that at all. There are enough through roads already in existence and all efforts should be directed to solving the congestion points along Main Road to Simon's Town.	
3/12/02	Ives	John		1	<p>I am opposed to this road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With recent upgrading of Prince George Drive and the M5 there is adequate reasonably fast road connection between the southern Peninsula at Muizenberg and the R27 near Milnerton – though perhaps improved linkages at the northern end are necessary.</li> <li>2. As has been extensively pointed out, the proposed extension would cross environmentally sensitive areas around Rondevlei, Zeekoevlei and Sandvlei. This wetland area is quite small, relatively speaking and a road right across it would obviously be a negative development.</li> <li>3. There is absolutely no need for a rapid road link. Either it would get little use, on account of the toll fee, or if large numbers did use it – e.g. at weekends and during the holiday seasons, the result would be much added congestion to the already over-used Main Road between Tokai and</li> </ol>	<b>3/12IVEJ-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					Fish Hoek, and of the Ou Kaapse Weg. Summarising, as it is most definitely not a 'win-win' situation, the idea should be scrapped.	
4/12/02	Smith	Penny		1	May I express my deepest concerns about the proposed toll road that will link the M3 with the R27 via the R300. Having lived at Zandvlei for the past 19 years, I am very aware of the birdlife situation. To anyone who has had the privilege of viewing the truly amazing birdlife at the Cape Flats Waste Water Treatment Works, the thought of any further manmade intervention in this fragile ecosystem, is sickening, and I strongly oppose this project. I find it most distressing to realise that there are intelligent people prepared to endanger and quite possibly destroy a precious and almost unique part of nature. The fact that birders come from around the world to view this spectacle, is surely a tourist attraction in itself. Having studied the map of this area, and seeing what a small portion this special area covers, one would conclude that developers and consultants, with their expertise, could surely formulate an alternative route.	<b>4/12SMIP-S</b>
4/12/02	Diamond <i>et al</i>	J	Zandvlei Residents	1	We, the undersigned, are opposed to the construction of the R300 Toll Road across the proposed False Bay Coastal Park. Such a road is not in the least necessary under present economic conditions in the area since the most people affected by it would not be able to afford to use it. Any type of construction which threatens the ecology of this region is to be deplored. The only beneficiary would be the private consortium. The real problem in the South Peninsula is the congestion of roads to Deep South via Muizenberg	<b>4/12DIAJ-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					and Ou Kaapse Weg and this proposed toll road would not help to solve that at all. There are enough through roads already in existence and all efforts should be directed to solving the congestion points along Main Road to Simonstown. Refer to letter dated 4/12/2002	
5/12/02	Bright	T and M		1	We are totally opposed to the building of the proposed toll road, which will destroy The Zandvlei Nature Reserve and impact on the Westlake Wetlands, and so many other ecological sites. We are living in Lakeside and this matter directly affects us.	<b>5/12BRIT-S</b>
6/12/02	Archer	Tony		1	I would like to register as an Interested and Affected Party regarding the building of the new ring road at Strandfontein. Firstly I feel it is vital that all people involved should rather develop and encourage the use of public transport. The roads are just getting fuller and fuller and we are destroying our wonderful country with roads that cost millions in upkeep. Let us rather make proper use of the existing facilities. Then there are the birds: I have travelled extensively around the world doing birdwatching. It is a growing passion amongst many tourists and most include binoculars and bird guide books with their baggage when travelling. From as far as Round Rock in Texas to Gdansk in Poland I have spoken to people who know about the special birds to be found around Cape Town and environs. When these friends contact us for recommendations regarding places to visit, Strandfontein is amongst the top three places in the Western Cape we recommend. The proposed road will cut off a	<b>6/12ARCT-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					portion of the pans and only a proper survey made over at least two years will let us know what sort of effect this will have on bird populations in the area. Also the Flora. Some of the plants that require definite conservation effort grow right where the road will pass. Do we have the right to destroy this without an absolute in depth survey? I think not.	
18/12/03	Hill	Candace		1	I oppose the Strandfontein Sewagw Works Ring Road development. The Penway timescales allocated to the Environmental Impact Assessment are hopelessly inadequate. A comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment needs to be taken of the area taking the effect of the development on the fauna and flora over a period of annual seasons. No significant investment into local communities or the infrastructure of the Western Cape is planned from this development either. Wouldn't the millions intended for the ring road development be better spent on upgrading the public transport system? The number of vehicles on metropolitan roads will be reduced and the 'need' for extra roads to speed up travelling times negated.	<b>18/12HILC-S</b>
18/12/02	Draper	Vikki		1	Rondevlei is a bit of a paradise in an unlikely spot. The playing fields of a Grassy Park school are across the way. I hear the wing-beats of hundreds of birds that have found a refuge in their trouble – the trouble of dwindling habitats. The fynbos is diverse and exquisite – as rich as on Table Mountain. It is a restful place, and a refuge for me too. I pray that every person involved in the road project will go there for a morning and experience the miracle of this place.	<b>18/12DRAV-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
6/01/03	Horden	Peter			My comment as far as expressways go, I think we as motorists are being ripped off with these toll roads! I have no problem if the company builds a new road from scratch, I mean not an old road when you have a choice to use it. But I mean look at the Mooi River plaza that was an old road and now we are paying to use it and this Christmas I thought that for the money we pay, the road was in bad condition. From Johannesburg to north of Pretoria, they have put up toll gates on an existing road. I think the local public needs to wake up and see we are paying enough as motorists pay high insurance road tax! I can go on and on.	<b>6/01HORP-S</b>
17/01/03	Cartwright	Jonathan	DEF		The proposal to develop the R300(N21) does not appear to have any support from civil society. No comment was received in favour of the road (either as a tolled or untolled route). No individual or organisations have suggested that the construction of this road along the proposed route is necessary (except the unsolicited bidder). The majority of respondents who addressed transport issues suggested that although maintenance of the existing section of road was necessary and/or overdue, to privatise this essential component of the existing integrated road system of the Western Cape, was not desirable. The fact that a consortium is driving the road proposal, by means of an unsolicited bid, does not indicate that this road will enhance or improve the transport situation in the Western Cape. To the contrary, the construction of this road (in either a tolled or untolled form), is likely to increase the pressure on urban sprawl/creep, which in turn reduces the potential for urban renewal.	<b>17/01CARJ-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>The alignment for this road may have its roots in history, but the Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) and Integrated Development Plan (IDP), which are two of the major documents presently in use in the Western Cape to evaluate urban planning, do not support construction of the R300 to the north. The recently released Rural Management Framework (RMF) which indicates presently developed land and land proposed for future development, does not support, justify or warrant the proposed northern alignment.</p> <p>The link (the R300/N21) between the N1 and N2 is an integral part of both the metropolitan road system and the National Roads network. The N1 and N2, although National Roads, are roads of metropolitan significance from east of the R300, throughout the entire Unicity. If it is necessary to upgrade the section of road between the N1 and N2 (to 3 lanes in both directions, with or without a New Jersey barrier between the north and south bound traffic), the upgrade will destroy the fynbos on the road median. The ecological value of the road reserve is still unknown to us. Social, aesthetic, stormwater and other functions of this section of road reserve are also hard to value. We do know that engineers have managed to reduce the road reserve corridor to 60m in parts of Durbanville which is less than the 80m required for a road with an 'N' status and that the alignment of the R300 under the N1 is liable to cause a few technical problems due to constraints and difficulties caused by previous engineering glitches.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>The southern alignment will affect the viability of the National Coastal Park and poses a serious threat to the bio-diversity of the entire region. As a country we have ratified various international environmental treaties and acknowledge Agenda 21. As Western Cape residents we have a responsibility to 'act local and think global' in order to preserve the bio-diversity within our unique floral kingdom. The need for responsible urban planning with efficient transport planning is essential if we are to maintain the bio-diversity of, and thus conserve, the southern section in a sustainable manner. Urban planning should meet the needs of residents and improve the potential for a sustainable tourism industry. If fynbos being lost on an ad hoc basis, and roads rather than the provision of an integrated transport is being addressed, we must question if the local government of the Western Cape is working toward sustainable development.</p> <p>If roads are required in the Western Cape, the funding of them should be done in a equitable manner. The income derived from fuel levies and the licensing of vehicles is not being effectively used to maintain road infrastructure and the bitumen industry has, for many years, been pointing out that maintenance contracts to keep the roads up to standard are not keeping pace with wear and tear. The excessive wear and tear on vehicles caused by inadequately maintained roads is a major concern. The excessive wear and tear on roads caused by overloaded vehicles has exacerbated the situation. The levies raised by the proposed tolls do not assist in the maintenance or</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>construction of any other section of road required to keep our road infrastructure functioning. At the end of the thirty year concession period the roads are "to be returned to the people in much the same state as they are now" (ie, with a few years of life in them). The tolling of roads may raise money but not in an equitable or cost efficient manner. Toll gates have little aesthetic appeal and do little to create jobs. Tolling of roads constructed with public money cannot satisfy civil societies needs.</p> <p>Road infrastructure is an important component of an integrated transport plan. Road maintenance is essential to keep the system working. Road planning should however never be used as a tool to dictate urban development, especially if the proposal is contrary to best practice and all other planning.</p> <p>Unscrupulous and irresponsible urban development in the Northern Tygerberg can be shown to be increasing the need for increased road infrastructure in the region. This is predominantly caused by the lack of adequate transport planning or any planning for its provision in urban design. This 'oversight' in urban planning does not justify the need for a road of the magnitude proposed and, if the existing road reserve is ever used for road construction, the road using the alignment should promote a transport system, as described in the Government White Paper on Transport.</p> <p>The present development proposal for Parklands lacks adequate transport planning or the potential for its provision in the future. The need for some</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>sort of east/west road linkage through the, as yet undeveloped, northern section of Parklands is not in doubt. Questions do however need to be raised when the present road alignment proposals do not indicate that a transport system is part of the Parklands development deal. In order to maintain biodiversity it is important to evaluate the ecological issues and the issues pertaining to sustainable development simultaneously.</p> <p>The proposed section of road to the north of Tableview and west of the N7, is a road of metropolitan significance. To satisfy SANRAL the 'ring-road' must run from somewhere up the west coast to the south end of the M3. Of the entire road proposal, only the section between the N7 and the N1 is possibly addressing the issue of unconstructed National Roads, with the section between the N1 and N2 addressing previously constructed National Road.</p> <p>A document produced in 1991 suggests that the great advantage of the development of this road to the north of the N1 is to promote urban development northwards. If the Western Cape is to remain a sustainable place into the future we need to retain our present footprint, densify and work towards an integrated transport system. As this does not appear to be the goal of the SANRAL proposal, we do not believe that the SANRAL proposal is in the interest of Western Cape residents.</p> <p>The tolling of roads, without retaining viable untolled options or, in urban areas, the provision of a public transport system, is little more than a cost inefficient manner of milking an unwilling but</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>captive market and is liable to result in an increase in the cost of living without offering any additional benefits. The present methods of tolling are inefficient. If electronic methods of tolling are used, the job creation potential of the project is reduced. The question that needs to be addressed is the manner in which the Western Cape is going to provide transport into the future. We have infrastructure (under-maintained though it is). What appears to be lacking in the Western Cape appears to be the political will to initiate a functional integrated transport system designed in a manner which optimises the present footprint taken up by urban development which would prevent urban creep and sprawl. Western Cape residents need transport, not roads. Western Cape roads need to be maintained (and in some situations upgraded), not constructed according to historically set alignments. The few thousand or so short term jobs created by this road proposal are not worth the loss of social or environmental sustainability or integrity in the short, medium or long term.</p>	
17/01/03	Abass	F	Hanover Park Civic Association		<p>The consultancy firm Chand Ecosense JV said that more than two thousand parties registered with them to object against this proposed extension. On Friday, 6<sup>th</sup> September 2002 at 5pm, Radio 786 had an hour long discussion about this proposed toll road. All the people who phoned in were against it. When Emily, the secretary of Chand Ecosense JV, was interviewed, she said she cannot imagine all the damaging effects this toll road will have on the environment. The Minister of Transport has to give their final approval Oct/Nov</p>	<b>17/01ABAF-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					2002. In view of above facts, we appeal to your department to support our opposition to this proposed toll road by making your disapproval known in a letter to the Minister of Transport. Clearly, the above-mentioned toll road is not in the interest of the environment. It will be appreciated if you notify us of any action you have taken or not.	
19/02/03	Feather	Dr C E			I fully support the construction of this ring road. Flora and fauna sensitive areas will recover after construction. It is recommended that indigenous flora should be planted in the centre and along the roadside to allow strandveld/renosterveld to recover with the assistance from man. This road is urgently needed.	<b>19/02FEAC-S</b>
22/05/03	Oertel	C			The terms of reference for the economic study were: <i>Use existing data and original data collected, on the economic make-up of each area, as well as the comments received through the scoping and public participation processes, to interpret the potential economic impacts of the proposed road.</i> Given that the original data was shown to be incomplete, out of context, insufficient, and the comments were made by I&APs that were not necessarily experts in that field (nor were being paid to conduct in-depth data gathering and analysis) - the outcome of this study cannot be any better than the inadequate summary of findings released last year. <i>Specifically:</i> <i>Determine whether the proposed tolling negatively impacts or unfairly discriminates against any vulnerable or disadvantaged persons/communities.</i>	<b>22/05OERC-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>We know it does. It's obvious. Poor communities do not have private vehicles - they rely on public transport. Those with cars, and most likely taxi-drivers also, will find alternative roads even though transport experts argue that the long-term cost of using the toll-road is cheaper.</p> <p><i>Assess the impacts of the green-fields part of the proposed project on property values of farms and on the continuing financial viability of farms.</i></p> <p>This is a limited and deceptive measure. Property value of a farm totally ignores the overall value of a farm. Farm land is incredibly cheap, around R1000 per hectare (say) - while the property value of suburban land is around R1m per hectare (conservatively).</p> <p>A toll-road through the farm may ruin the farm, but even if it doesn't, the property value of the farm goes up a thousand-fold. The farmer would sell to a developer who would market this "country lifestyle" secure complex 10 minutes from town (by virtue of the toll-road). The farmer would retire on the huge profits of the sale.</p> <p>However, the labourers would be without a job. The countryside would be spoilt. The city would spread. Air-pollution would increase. Traffic congestion entering the city would increase. The cost of food in the city would go up (because it now needs to be trucked in from further away). The overall cost to the city and its inhabitants is high, while the farmer and the developer walk away smiling.</p> <p>What about the "greenfields" development through Norfolk Park and past the Marina Da Gama? These are quiet suburbs that will now</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>have a noisy highway where before there was open fynbos fields with birds and flowers. Since their property values are high due to the openness, quiet and aesthetic beauty of the natural environment, the road can only decrease their property values. On what basis do you favour the farmers over the suburbanites?</p> <p><i>Comment on the financial sustainability of the project by means of reference to documents issued by the project proponents financial advisors.</i></p> <p>Why have we not seen these? They are relevant to the I&amp;APs because some comments made by the developers implied that the project would not be viable if the road were built on pylons through the wetlands. This seems to indicate that the project is not very profitable, or that the developers are aiming for very high returns at our expense.</p> <p><i>Based on the impacts identified, document practical mitigation measures that could enhance positive economic impacts and reduce negative impacts.</i></p> <p>The risk with this requirement is that it "greenwashes" the development. For example, the developers can make a production of how they have provided taxi drivers with cheap monthly toll-fees, and provided jobs for a few residents of the Cape Flats. However, what goes unnoticed is that the jobs provided might be at minimum wages because of the cost of subsidising the taxi tolls. The wording of this is a disguised way of saying: maximise the economic benefits of the road. This goal is only noble if the total economic impact is</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>considered - and as the point relating to property value of farms indicates, the viewpoint is myopic and restricted to small and measurable areas while ignoring enormous intangible knock-on effects. Comment on the environmental economics of the proposed road going through the proposed False Bay Ecology Park, wetlands and sensitive floral sites.</p> <p>What is the cost of a lost species?</p> <p>Using the evaluation method prescribed, determine the significance of the identified impacts both before and after mitigation.</p> <p>How about determining the impacts before and after the construction of the road? It is all well and good saying that a given mitigation will improve the environment by R5m per annum, when the presence of the road itself has destroyed the environment in the first place.</p> <p><i>Make recommendations that would be relevant to the design, construction and operational phases of the proposed road.</i></p> <p>Let's hope these are more useful than the ones we have seen in earlier drafts.</p> <p><i>Describe the current economic profile of areas along the routes. Identify and describe sensitive areas, including the nature of sensitivity.</i></p> <p>I thought this was done.</p> <p><i>Identify and assess the likely benefits of the scheme to the regional and national economy.</i></p> <p>This point is wholly misleading. By virtue of the "multiplier effect" of spending large amounts of money, there will be enormous benefits by this measure. In the billions of Rand per annum. Enough to offset any local economic loss.</p>	

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>The economic benefit measured in this way is wrongly being attributed to the construction of this particular road when in fact the benefit can be achieved by building any road at all, another shopping mall, a harbour, a power station (nuclear or otherwise), a wind-farm, or by rigging the lotto to pay out to all ticket buyers in the Western Cape next Saturday.</p> <p>What would be more useful would be a comparison of the relative benefits of building this toll-road as compared to an improved rail system, the high-speed bus system, an underground rail system, upgrading of public transport interchanges and all the other possible developments that might alleviate the problems this road is purported to solve.</p> <p><i>Identify and assess the benefits of the proposed toll road as compared to the toll costs, to the various user groups, giving consideration to likely improved efficiency and safety.</i></p> <p>Scientifically, it may well be cheaper to pay the toll and use the road. But science has nothing to do with an ordinary person's decision to use the road or not. Most people would avoid the road to save a few rand in their pocket, even though it might be more expensive in the long run.</p> <p>There may be economic benefits to the users of the road. Does this give them the right to destroy our environment? What price the last pieces of Cape Flats fynbos?</p>	
07/07/03	Latsky	A	Estate Agent	1	We need this ring road in a hurry. Please cant you speed things up. I stay in Marina da Gama and we are in the real estate business down here. Our biggest problem to sell property in this area is the	<b>7/07LATA-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					approach roads to Marina. Property prices will escalate in a big way if we get this Ring road you have been planning for a long time. At the moment our family and friends have to drive down Military road to get to the Marina which is totally unsafe.	
21/07/2003	Mansfield	Glen	Western Cape Microlight Club	3	The Western Cape Microlight Club have occupied the premises, which we know, as "Morning Star Flight Park" since 1993. In that time we have cleared the bush, erected hangars, built a runway, constructed an access road and spent further funds on maintaining the site, constantly keeping the Port Jackson trees at bay. This is now where the proposed R300 freeway interchange is being planned. Kindly make note of our formal concerns and register us as an affected party.	<b>21/7MANG-S</b>
10/12/03	Venter	J C	Director: Agricultural Engineering, Department of Agriculture	All		<b>10/12VENJ-S</b>
12/12/03	Cox	P	Director: Cape and Transvaal Land & Finance Co. (Pty) Ltd	1	From the orthophoto layout plan, the erven which look likely to be affected by the development and which are owned by ourselves include erven 640, 641, 648, 650, 651, 652, 658, 659, 660 and 661 Schaapkraal. We will expect market-related compensation for all expenses we might incur in potentially having to take out new certificates of Consolidated or Registered Title, given that we may otherwise be left with useless portions of the above affected erven. Such expense would include legal and survey fees. Sand-mineral deposits exist currently on some of the affected erven. This sand is of value as an important mineral resource and we would expect reasonable, market-related compensation for any	<b>12/12COXP-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					loss we might incur due to the construction of the road across these dunes.	
06/01/04	Thovhakele	M	Act. Director: Mineral Development, Western Cape, Department of Minerals and Energy	All	You are advised that the Department has no objection against the proposed project.	<b>6/01THOM-S</b>
08/01/04	Ingle	Dr R		1	<p>I also wish to raise my objections to the section of the road which will pass through the Strandfontein sewage works. Construction of this section would lead to the destruction of 25% of the pans at this site, which is one of the most important sites for birds in South Africa, and holds globally important populations of a number of species including Great Flamingo. Furthermore the proposed road would isolate this area from important breeding grounds at the nearby Rondevlei and Zandvlei reserves. How is the impact of this road on avian populations to be assessed?</p> <p>Cape Town is marketing itself as a premier tourist destination, and the local economy is increasing reliant on both domestic and international tourism. Yet construction of this tollway would wreck any chances of further developing ecotourism in the False Bay Park, and therefore the potential to channel money from tourism to the communities in which these valuable reserves are found. Lastly the Cape Flats area is already heavily developed and the construction of new roads is at best only a temporary measure to reduce congestion as has been evidenced by the failure of successive programs of road building in the UK in reducing congestion. Resources should instead be diverted towards creating a viable and efficient public transport system in Cape Town as</p>	<b>8/01INGR-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					a longer term solution, rather than in constructing a road which will damage the last remaining wildlife rich areas on the Cape Flats.	
24/03/04	Jappie	Yusuf		1	<p>Please be advised that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The date mentioned in the above letter is wrong in that the meeting referred therein was held on the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004 and not the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2003.</li> <li>2. The minutes of the above meeting is incorrect in that I did not say that compensation for the loss of my property would satisfy me.</li> <li>3. The meeting of the 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004 was the very first formal notification I had of the intended ring road that would result in the expropriation of my property, which would have dire consequences for myself and my family.</li> <li>4. It has come to my attention that an initial ring road was planned as far back as 1996. Please supply me with a copy of that original plan so that I can make comparisons.</li> <li>5. It has come to my attention that an initial ring road was not accepted by the farmers in Sector 3 whose properties were affected. I also believe that their objections were conceded to and that the original ring road was then altered to what is now called the 'final proposed alignment'. Please supply me a copy of the 'final proposed alignment' as well as copies of the minutes of all the meetings held with</li> </ol>	<b>24/3JAPY-S</b>

DATE RECEIVED	SURNAME	NAME/ INITIAL	ORGANISATION	SECTOR	COMMENT	REFERENCE NUMBER
					<p>the farmers of Sector 3.</p> <p>6. As an affected property owner, I was not consulted with regard to any aspect of the proposed N21 (R300) Cape Town Ring Road prior to 25<sup>th</sup> February 2004.</p> <p>7. I request that I be granted the same opportunity to influence the course and direction of the said ring road such that it would also satisfy me and my family, before the road is approved, should that be the outcome.</p> <p>8. I feel that all the affected property owners should be treated equally and fairly, and I would do everything in my power to see that this comes about.</p> <p>9. I hold that the 'final proposed alignment' of the said ring road cannot be regarded as final.</p>	