



# MINUTES OF MEETING



<b>CLIENT</b>	:	<b>Johannesburg Roads Agency</b>
<b>PROJECT</b>	:	<b>Environmental Impact Assessment for the Route Determination of the Proposed Metro Boulevard</b>
<b>PROJECT No</b>	:	<b>J 26213</b>
<b>PURPOSE</b>	:	<b>Information Sharing Meeting on the Findings of the EIA Phase</b>
<b>PLACE</b>	:	<b>Panorama Primary School, Albert Street</b>
<b>DATE &amp; TIME</b>	:	<b>19 February 2009, 18h30</b>
<b>PRESENTER</b>	:	<b>Ashlea Strong</b>
<b>MINUTE TAKER</b>	:	<b>Kasantha Moodley</b>

<b>NAME</b>	<b>REPRESENTING</b>	<b>E-MAIL ADDRESS</b>	<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>
<b>PRESENT</b>			
Ashlea Strong (AS)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	<a href="mailto:astrong@gibb.co.za">astrong@gibb.co.za</a>	Y
Kasantha Moodley (KM)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	<a href="mailto:kmoodley@gibb.co.za">kmoodley@gibb.co.za</a>	Y
Steve Kruger (SK)	Johannesburg Roads Agency	<a href="mailto:skruger@jra.org.za">skruger@jra.org.za</a>	Y
Peter Peska (PP)	Johannesburg Roads Agency	<a href="mailto:ppeska@jra.org.za">ppeska@jra.org.za</a>	Y
Peet Booyens (PB)	Johannesburg Roads Agency	<a href="mailto:pbooyens@jra.org.za">pbooyens@jra.org.za</a>	Y
Hendre Du Preez (HDP)	PH Bagale	<a href="mailto:hdupreez@phbagale.co.za">hdupreez@phbagale.co.za</a>	Y
Various Interested and Affected Parties – See attached attendance register	Various – homeowners, organisations and associations	Various	Y
<b>APOLOGIES</b>			
None			
<b>ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION</b>			
All Registered Interested and Affected Parties	Various	Various	Y

Attendees at the meeting are required to take their own notes and act on these rather than await the arrival of the minutes. The minutes serve as a record of events at the meeting. Due to the nature of the proposed development, a significant number of objections were raised during the presentation. The minutes recorded below have captured the main points of all issues that were raised. I&APs are thus encouraged to add any issues and/or comments to these minutes that have not been captured accurately.

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION		
1.1.	<p>Ashlea Strong (AS) greeted and welcomed all to the information sharing meeting. AS introduced herself and Kasantha Moodley (KM) as the Environmental Consultants from Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd. She also indicated that representatives of the Johannesburg Roads Agency (JRA) were present and introduced Steve Kruger (SK) from the JRA and Hendre Du Preez representing PH Bagale (Consulting Engineer to JRA). AS pointed out that the meeting held tonight is the second meeting for the EIA Phase of the proposed project. Thus, AS requested all those attendees who did not attend the previous meeting to raise their hand. <i>This show of hands indicated that a significant number of attendees were absent at the last meeting.</i></p>		
	<p>AS then indicated that she would briefly go through the presentation as this was not completed at the previous meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to relay the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the EIA Phase amongst other purposes. AS briefly described the agenda for the evening and indicated that only written submissions of queries and concerns would be responded to during the discussion session. She went on to say that the meeting will have to be strict in this regard if it is to end by 21h00. AS indicated that this meeting was merely a clarification meeting to have the main queries and concerns addressed by the JRA. AS mentioned that all written submissions received during the commenting period (27 January 2009 – 16 February 2009) were brought to the meeting to ensure that only these queries were appropriately addressed. AS said that copies of the Issues and Response Report (IRR) were printed for the attendees, and that this report includes all queries/ comments and issues received to date for the EIA Phase of the project. AS indicated that if there are specific queries that still need to be addressed after JRA addresses the main queries, provision will be made in the form of a half an hour discussion session as AS once again reiterated that meeting should close by 21h00.</p>		
	<p>Mrs Natasha Venter (NV) had a query regarding how new issues and concerns will be addressed if it cannot be addressed at the meeting. <i>AS responded and indicated that comment sheets were also brought to the meeting, I&amp;APs were told that they can complete the comment sheet and submit it to Kasantha Moodley. AS went on to say that all comments received shall be incorporated into the Issues and Response Report (IRR) for consideration by the relevant authorities, the Gauteng Department of Agriculture Conservation and Environment (GDACE).</i></p>		
	<p>AS moved on to point out the toilets at the back of the hall. AS then requested all attendees to adhere to meeting etiquette. Some requests included the switching off of all cell phones or to take calls outside. She went on to request that all attendees wait for the discussion session to ask questions and to introduce themselves prior to asking questions. AS indicated that minutes of the meeting will be taken and sent to everyone present as well as those that have been registered as an I&amp;AP on the Arcus GIBB project database. AS thanked everyone for their attendance.</p>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
2.	PROJECT PRESENTATION		
2.1.	<p>AS began with a brief overview of the project by clearly stating the meaning of “<i>route determination</i>” and mentioning the requirement for another separate EIA Process for the construction of the proposed Metro Boulevard, should the proposed servitude be registered.</p> <p>NV queried if the EIA process would start from the beginning for the construction of the proposed route. <i>AS confirmed that it would.</i></p> <p>AS went on to describe the proposed route alignment and present the dimensions of the proposed road saying that it will be 12 kilometres long and 40 meters wide. She went on to say that the road reserve may be wider in some areas for associated infrastructure like stormwater dams.</p> <p>A locality map of the proposed route was shown indicating the location of the proposed Metro Boulevard in relation to existing roads.</p> <p>AS then briefly described other infrastructure associated with the proposed road such as stormwater attenuation dams. She mentioned that the JRA tried to identify suitable parcels of land for the dams such as existing wetland areas or parks.</p> <p>AS moved on to mention other related projects in the same vicinity as the proposed Metro Boulevard. They were described and indicated on a locality map in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EIA for the construction of the proposed N1-20 Metro Boulevard interchange;</li> <li>• Environmental authorisation granted for the upgrading of 14th Avenue from Golden Gate Road to Weltevreden Road; and</li> <li>• Basic Assessment for the construction of a mixed-use development on Fairland Ext 26.</li> </ul> <p>AS mentioned that Arcus GIBB has been appointed to undertake the EIA for the N1-20 Metro Boulevard interchange and the Basic Assessment for the mixed-use development. She went on to say that the above two projects are currently on hold as there are no funds available. Furthermore AS stated that no environmental reports have been released for public review or for environmental authorisation. The project regarding the upgrading of 14<sup>th</sup> Avenue was conducted by Strategic Environmental Focus (SEF) according to SK.</p>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>The need and desirability of the proposed road was discussed by AS. She mentioned that all desirables and needs such as alleviation of congestion would only occur once construction is complete.</p> <p>The financial feasibility of the proposed Metro Boulevard was then discussed by AS. It was mentioned that the cost of construction is estimated to be R 2.5 billion. AS stated that all the JRA can do currently is register the servitude and not construct as there are no funds available to build the proposed Metro Boulevard.</p> <p>AS then briefly looked at the project alternatives including the upgrading of surrounding roads, design alternatives, road alignment alternatives, dams location alternatives, alternative transportation methods and the no-go alternative. AS mentioned that the road alignment alternatives are considered to reduce the impact on ecosystems and other sensitive environments. These alignment shifts are identified and recommended in the various specialist studies undertaken for the project stated AS. AS mentioned that the different transportation alternative and the no-go alternative which must be considered as part of the EIA Process are not considered feasible options and thus the proclamation and gazetting of the proposed Metro Boulevard between JG Strijdom and Peter Road with the recommended shifts in the alignment is the preferred alternative.</p> <p>AS then briefly described why there was a need for the EIA in terms of the legal requirements. AS mentioned that due to the fact that the servitude was previously known as the PWV 10 and is 40 meters wide and that there are more than one lane in each direction, all these factors necessitate the need for the EIA in terms of NEMA and the listed activity in the New EIA Regulations.</p> <p>AS looked at the history of the EIA Process to date. AS stated that there was a significant delay between the acceptance of the Scoping Report and the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for public review. She went on to say that the delay was due to the fact that additional specialist studies had to be undertaken. AS also discussed how much longer the EIA will take to complete and said that the report will be finalised with comments and submitted to the relevant authorities by March 2009, thereafter the authorities have 115 days in which to review the report and issue a Record of Decision (RoD).</p> <p>AS then discussed what a Public Participation Process (PPP) is and is not. She briefly stated that it is a tool to inform I&amp;APs of the project and to incorporate their comments into the relevant phases of the project. The PPP is not a public relations exercise and not a tool through which I&amp;APs can settle personal grievances with the client, stated AS. AS then showed a flow chart of the PPP and indicated where this project is currently at. She mentioned that there has been delay in this process as well due to the need for a second public meeting. She went on to say that all I&amp;APs will be hearing from Arcus GIBB next to inform them of the release of the Final EIR and the Record of Decision once received.</p>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>AS briefly went through all the technical studies and main findings of each study undertaken for the project. AS mentioned that all studies looked at the construction of the road as JRA requested this. Furthermore the relevant specialists would not have found any impacts on the environment for registering the servitude, stated AS. AS mentioned that the Property Evaluation Study was the most important of the social impacts that's why this study was conducted and not a full comprehensive Social Impact Study as this shall be undertaken during the EIA for the construction of the proposed road. Furthermore GDACE, the relevant authority did accept the need for a property evaluation study only, stated AS.</p> <p>AS briefly described the method of analysing the significance of identified impacts. She mentioned that each specialist relies on their background, past knowledge, expertise to determine the significance of the potential impacts. Furthermore there are also specific criteria used in determining the significance such as probability, duration, extent and intensity, mentioned AS. AS stated that this analysis is undertaken before and after mitigation of the potential impacts. She went on to mention that the mitigation measures look at the long term impact of construction as the relevant specialists cannot determine the impact of determining a route or registering the servitude as status quo will remain if an authorisation is granted or not. AS briefly listed the potential impacts and significance thereof before and after mitigation identified in each technical study.</p> <p>AS moved on to the conclusions and recommendations of the EIA Phase stating that there are no fatal flaws identified in registering the servitude and that there shall be no EMP as the road is not being constructed, instead the RoD will act as the legal binding document with all the conditions in it should the registration of the servitude be allowed. The registration of the servitude from JG Strijdom to Peter Road with the recommended shift in alignment is recommended by Arcus GIBB, stated AS. AS concluded the presentation with the way forward in terms of the EIA Process and said that all I&amp;APs will be notified of the release of the Final EIR and the Record of Decision once received.</p> <p>AS then said that all questions which were put into broad categories will be answered by the JRA.</p>		
3.	<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p><i>Each question posed to the JRA and their response thereto has been recorded below. Furthermore, the main points of all issues raised are recorded below, unfortunately some names of the attendees who raised specific issues were not provided.</i></p>		
3.1	<p>The first issue addressed by the JRA was related to the impacts on property, namely expropriation and compensation.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mr Steve Kruger (SK) first introduced himself as the Operations Manager of Planning at the JRA. He then introduced his colleagues, Mr Pieter Peska (PP) as the Manager of Development Applications and Mr Peet Booyens (PB) a Senior Manager at the JRA.</li> </ul>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>Lastly, Hendre du Preez from PH Bagale was introduced as the consulting engineer who is responsible for the design of the proposed route.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>From what source will JRA compensate affected property owners?</b> SK responded and said that monies for compensation will be drawn from the Capital Expenditure (CAPEX) budget.</li> <li>• <b>What compensation will be made to property owners?</b> SK replied and said that property owners will be compensated at market value at the time of acquisition. He went on to say that the purchase of properties and the decision to negotiate or expropriate will be conducted professionally. AS mentioned that the preferred situation in such cases is a willing buyer/willing seller and that expropriation is often a last option and is currently very rare.</li> </ul> <p>NV asked how those affected residents who are neighboured by the proposed road going to be compensated, where only a part or section of the property is required. SK replied and requested that these landowners put in a claim which shall be considered fairly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Will re-zoning rights be made available?</b> AS explained that this question asks if the proposed route will be zoned as a servitude/open space.</li> </ul> <p>NV stated that the proposed road will trap herself and others on land between the proposed Metro Boulevard and Hendrik Potgieter. NV wanted to know what the proposed route will be re-zoned to and when re-zoning will take place. She stated that it is not clear if the JRA is moving ahead or not and what timeframes can be expected. Furthermore, she mentioned that landowners do not want the values of their properties to drop while this process continues into the future.</p> <p>Peter Peska (PP) responded by saying that this is addressed by town planning and the Regional Spatial Development Framework (RSDF) of the area. He went on to say that properties along major roads are identified as business nodes and are usually re-zoned to business 4.</p> <p>Paul Venter (PV) stated that should the road go ahead, property prices will be reduced.</p> <p>AS stated that re-zoning is not JRAs forte.</p>		
3.2	The second issue addressed was related to the impacts on existing infrastructure.		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Access to properties (i.e. closing of Kiewiet Street)</b> Hendre Du Preez (HDP) stated that the street of major concern is Kiewiet Street located on the eastern side of Christiaan de Wet and Jim Fouche. He went on to say that Kiewiet Street was constructed to give access to Allens Nek; however there was no road reserve for Kiewiet Street when constructed.</li> </ul> <p>NV mentioned that it is very difficult to get out of Kiewiet Street, that access was needed due to growth of the area. PP stated that should construction proceed, the closing of Kiewiet Street shall be considered during that phase. PV asked what landowners do in the meantime. It was suggested that Kiewiet Street be brought into the design of the proposed road, however at this stage the design is preliminary and considers the route alignment only.</p>		
3.3	Technical aspects were also addressed at the meeting.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Number of lanes in either direction?</b> It was stated that there are two (2) lanes in either direction (dual lane). SK furthermore stated that previously roads required a 70 meter servitude. AS then said that road servitudes now vary between 40 and 70 meters because of associated infrastructure like stormwater dams.</li> </ul> <p>An attendee then stated that he lives on Peter Road and that he is concerned as he does not know the size/area of his property that is required for the proposed road. He went on to say that no buyers are willing to purchase the property for this reason. SK responded to this query and said that there is a diagram of each property that will be affected; hence the JRA knows exactly how much property along the route is required for the servitude. AS then requested that all landowners who wish to know how much of their property will be affected by the proposed road, to email the description and erf number of the property to Kasantha Moodley. The request will then be forwarded to the consulting engineer.</p>		
3.4	Social impacts were a major concern at the previous meeting and thus had to be addressed at this meeting.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why was a social study not undertaken, when will this be done?</b> AS stated that the most significant social impact identified during this stage of the project was the impact on property values. Thus a property evaluation study was conducted. She went on to say that property evaluation studies are not usually undertaken during the EIA Process. Other social impacts are usually a result of the construction phase of a project. A social impact study shall be conducted in the construction phase of the project should the proposed servitude be registered. Furthermore, the relevant authority was satisfied with just a property evaluation study been undertaken at this phase of the project and did not request a full social impact study, stated AS.</li> </ul>		
3.5	Queries regarding the alternatives for the project were addressed.		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Why not improve roads such as Peter Rd, Nic Diedrichs Boulevard, Witkoppen and Northumberland to alleviate pressure?</b> SK responded by saying that all roads require upgrading and that these upgrades are separate, additional projects that are to be undertaken. AS then reiterated SK's response and said that these roads will be upgraded. PP stated that according to the traffic model created by Arup for the study area, if the whole area (between Hendrik Potgieter, Christiaan de Wet, Peter Road and Nic Diedrichs Boulevard) were developed to its full potential, a total of eight (8) lanes are required to get everyone out of these suburbs. He went on to say that Wilge road is a planned carriageway as well as Johan Road which will serve as a North-South link.  An attendee asked if these other projects will be undertaken before the Metro Boulevard. PP replied by saying that some of these projects are on the CAPEX budget.</li> <li>• <b>Why not develop just a single carriageway instead of 4/6 lane carriageway?</b> SK responded to this query and stated that more than one lane is required as there is a road hierarchy involved.</li> <li>• <b>Possible use of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) System?</b> SK replied and stated that the BRT System is not being addressed in the study area at all. He went on to mention that the proposed road may be converted to BRT during the detailed design phase hence the exercise of reserving the proposed road as a future investment.</li> </ul>		
3.6	Safety and security were also addressed.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What will be done about the increase of crime due to the proposed road?</b> An attendee wanted to know if the JRA will assist the affected communities in addressing crime. SK responded by saying that an approval from GDACE is required first before the JRA can do anything. SK mentioned that the JRA will have the power to call in the JMPD and SAPS to assist with crime once the servitude is registered.  PV also mentioned that the open area is a problem. SK said that during this planning process nothing can be done about this issue.  Another attendee at the meeting enquired if it were possible for the JRA to assist with erecting palisade fencing to prevent vagrants. SK replied that it is the duty of the Health Department and Housing Department to remove people from these areas if settled for more than three (3) days and to find alternative housing/areas for these people.</li> </ul>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>Another attendee stated that they have a property behind the Trade Centre and they had asked for palisade fencing to security and they got a wall instead. She went on to say that should the proposed Metro Boulevard be constructed, current access to the property will be cut off. Further to this she mentioned that there is a crematorium on the property and this will make it difficult to privatise access to the property. SK responded and said that the JRA similarly has a problem with culverts under roads; it is difficult to control movement of these people. He went on to say that everything is taken on its merits and he advised the attendee to seek help from the Health and Environmental Departments. The attendee said that there are very few people left on the property. AS responded by telling the attendee to send through her comments in writing.</p> <p>SK then urged all I&amp;APs to download or print the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to ensure that these issues are not forgotten and are raised during the next phase of the project.</p> <p>Another attendee mentioned that she just found out that she has two proposed attenuation dams on her property. SK replied and said that when searching for suitable properties for the placement of such infrastructure, parks and generally wetland areas are considered. The attendee responded and said that her property is always flooded by the Wilgespruit, thus the attenuation dams on her property are fully supported by her.</p>		
3.7	Financial and Economic Impacts were briefly readdressed.		
	<p>AS stated that the queries regarding sales of properties and the cost of the project have already been addressed.</p> <p>An attendee at the meeting queried about the funding of the proposed road, the townhouses cut through by the road and the endpoint of the road (quarry). AS requested the JRA to respond to the first query regarding funding. SK replied and stated that in the past funding was provided by the local authorities. He went on to say that now the proposed road is a candidate for a Public Private Partnership (PPP). Examples of such successful partnerships include the K60 road and a road in Sunninghill which was a partnership between the residents and the JRA, said SK. SK stated that if there are willing developers it can be considered an investment for future infrastructure. PP mentioned that developers do get into services agreement to make their developments work. He went on to say that the proposed road will be constructed in stages, for example if a developer needs 300 meters of the proposed road for his development to work he may build it, this shall continue until the proposed road is built to its full extent. SK added on that if more people become optimistic, more opportunities for growth and development will come along.</p>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<p>AS then queried if a phased approach will be taken during construction if different developers are involved. SK responded and said that it rarely happens that a road gets constructed to its full extent instantly. He went on to say that it takes a lot of time and usually the road is constructed two lanes at a time.</p> <p>With regards to the quarry issue, AS mentioned that the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality (CJMM) boundary ends at this point and the Mogale City Municipality boundary starts there as well. SK added on that the proposed road was taken to the urban fringe; it was the decision of the JRA and is a provisional termination of the road. He went on to say that if more development pressures arise the proposed road would be extended.</p> <p>Mr Andrew Barker (AB) stated that there is no thought beyond Peter Road. SK responded and said that the road will not just stop. He added on that it is not known what the quarry will develop into. He mentioned that there is still a lot of planning to consider like how the proposed Metro Boulevard will connect to the Krugersdorp Highway.</p> <p>An attendee stated that if developers construct sections of the proposed Metro Boulevard at a time, this does not meet the desirability of the project. SK replied and said that there is no money to build the road fully.</p> <p>Another attendee asked why does the proposed road start nowhere and ends nowhere. They went on to say that Peter Road needs an upgrade as it is a disaster. AS responded and said that Peter Road is to become a dual road.</p>		
3.8	Lastly general queries were addressed.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>How long will the project take to complete?</b> AS responded and said that there is no timeframe for the project as this does depend on too many factors at this phase of the project. She went on to say that if a positive Record of Decision (RoD) is received and there are no appeals and if the authorisation is upheld, the servitude will be registered in a year or two.</li> <li>• <b>Who will maintain the servitude?</b> SK replied and said that it is the duty of the City of Joburg's Environmental Health Department to prevent dumping and squatting. He suggested that residents report incidents to the JMPD, who have peace offers with the JRA to attend to such matters.</li> </ul>		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>What will happen to the road reserve should authorisation not be granted?</b>            SK responded and said that the JRA will continue taking land for development. He went on to say that the Regional Council did not have a tidy plan or clear geometrics. He added on that they will follow development applications.             NV and PV both stated that the JRA does not currently maintain the servitude. SK reiterated that that the current phase of the project is a planning exercise thus the need for an EIA. He went on to say that once authorisation is granted the JRA will have more clout in controlling the servitude.             AS then discussed the authorisation and the conditions that come with it. SK added on that an I&amp;AP can appeal or add on to those conditions in the RoD. He went on to say that the council is bound by those conditions.             An attendee representing a residents association stated that she has no one to go to regarding squatters and crimes. SK replied and said that there are lots of channels through which these issues can be addressed such as the local councillor who will be accountable for such issues.             AB then stated that the JRA shouldn't wait for GDACEs decision; all comments must be noted in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) as conditions. AS responded by saying that the RoD will act as an EMP for this process as there is no EMP due to the process being for the route determination.         </li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Why not maintain existing roads instead of building a new road?</b>            SK responded and stated that there are a lot of issues with regards to maintenance, however with existing infrastructure where the opportunity arises with developers they do try to maintain roads as best as they can.         </li> </ul>		
	<p>SK added on that the JRA is trying to protect the road reserve as a future investment.</p> <p>An attendee stated that the studies conducted look at just the project and they do not address wider considerations. SK responded and said that all specialists are experts in their relevant fields. AS added on that Arup who undertook the traffic study did take the broader situation into account and the wetland and air quality studies for example may have looked specifically at the project but all studies did consider cumulative impacts of the proposed road.</p> <p>Mr Norman queried if the road reserve is registered what the timeframe would look like for the project. AS responded and stated that there is no timeframe due to the lack of funds. AS added on that registration may happen in one or two years time. If the JRA does not register the road reserve within the timeframe of the RoD, the time for authorisation will lapse and the project will have to start again, said AS.</p>		

	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>ACTION</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
	<p>Mr McElnea stated his concern over the groundwater in Wilgeheuwel. AS replied and said that this should be considered during construction and it is recommended that groundwater studies are undertaken during the construction EIA.</p> <p>Mr Leslie Lesch (LL) stated that all landowners cannot put their lives on hold, they cannot sell their properties. SK responded and said that not everyone will be happy and satisfied with the project; however some people are supporting the project.</p> <p>An attendee asked why landowners cannot get compensated now. SK responded and said that they have to wait for an RoD to put the development application forward. AS said that an appeal process is open after the RoD is issued. AS went on to say that in two weeks time the report shall be finalised and submitted before end March.</p> <p>The South African Riding for the Disabled Association (SARDA) were present and one of its representatives asked if the servitude is registered would that be the final route of the road. They went on to say that their working area will be reduced significantly and they cannot be compensated as they do not own the property. AS replied and said that there are two avenues through which they can appeal and object to the project.</p> <p>Another attendee had an issue with the Public Participation Process (PPP), they don't think that Arcus GIBB have done enough to inform all residents and suggests more contact with the Body Corporates. AS responded and stated that BIDs were distributed, advertisements were placed. She added on that PPP is a dual role, residents should communicate with one another and share information and try to encourage others to participate in the process. AS also briefly stated that it is not feasible to inform landowners of project developments via the rates account as this is an automated system and would prove to be difficult to pull out a few accounts for this purpose.</p>		
	<p>An attendee said that he had last three comments to make. Firstly he would like to request that the comment period be extended before finalizing the DEIR. Secondly, he stated that the Arcus GIBB should reconsider the compensation and legal reposition. Thirdly he mentioned that the JRA process of planning is not fair to anyone.</p>		
4.	<p><b>MEETING CLOSURE</b> AS thanked all for attending. The meeting was officially closed at 21h00.</p>		

**APPENDIX 1**  
***Meeting Presentation***

**APPENDIX 2**  
***Attendance Registers***