



MINUTES OF MEETING



CLIENT	:	Johannesburg Roads Agency
PROJECT	:	Environmental Impact Assessment for the Route Determination of the Proposed Metro Boulevard
PROJECT No	:	J 26213
PURPOSE	:	Information Sharing Meeting on the Findings of the EIA Phase
PLACE	:	St Michaels and All Angels Anglican Church, 1123 Cornelius Street
DATE & TIME	:	26 November 2008, 18h30
MINUTE TAKER	:	Kasantha Moodley

NAME	REPRESENTING	E-MAIL ADDRESS	DISTRIBUTION
PRESENT			
Ashlea Strong (AS)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	astrong@gibb.co.za	Y
Kasantha Moodley (KM)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	kmoodley@gibb.co.za	Y
Various Interested and Affected Parties – See attendance register	Homeowners		Y
APOLOGIES			
Steve Kruger	JRA	skruger@jra.org.za	Y
Mr Murray Macgregor	Homeowner	Murray.macgregor@absamail.co.za	Y
ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION			
Rose	Northside Chronicle Newspaper	roses@caxton.co.za	Y
All Registered Interested and Affected Parties	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. Arcus GIBB were thus unable to complete presenting the findings of the DEIR. 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.

It must be noted that the italic text indicates responses from the JRA received subsequent to the meeting in response to the queries minuted.

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
1.	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION		
1.1.	Ashlea Strong (AS) greeted and welcomed all to the information sharing meeting. All attendees were then introduced to the Arcus GIBB project team present. Apologies were made for Mr Murray Macgregor and Mr Steve Kruger. All attendees were then asked if they had any apologies to convey for anyone. No additional apologies were minuted. It was stated that the aim would be to close the meeting by 20h30.		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
1.2.	<p>CONDUCT AND PURPOSE OF THE MEETING</p> <p>AS requested all attendees to adhere to meeting etiquette. Some requests included the switching off of all cell phones, all attendees to wait for the discussion session to ask questions and to introduce themselves prior to asking questions.</p> <p>AS presented the purpose of the meeting which was to relay the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the EIA Phase amongst other purposes.</p>		
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>Three (3) attendees at the meeting were excused at this point as it had become apparent that this was not the project that they had an interest in.</p> <p>AS went on to describe the proposed route alignment and present the dimensions of the proposed road. Mrs Natasha Venter (NV) queried the width of the proposed road and stated that there have been a number of contradictions (i.e. 75 m wide/40 m wide). NV also mentioned that clarity should be provided on the number of lanes proposed for the road (i.e. 6 or 4 lanes). AS responded by saying this issue would be followed up on and clarified for all.</p> <p><i>The JRA have responded and stated that the width will vary depending on the cuts and fills but the minimum is 40 meters.</i></p>	JRA	
2.2.	<p>AS went on to briefly discuss the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated storm water infrastructure; • Other projects related to the proposed Metro Boulevard; • Need and desirability of the proposed Metro Boulevard; • Financial feasibility; • Project alternatives including the upgrading of surrounding roads, design alternatives, road alignment alternatives, dams location alternatives, alternative transportation methods and the no-go alternative; • Legal requirements; and • Public participation process. 		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
2.3.	<p>AS briefly went through all the technical studies undertaken for the project and then handed the floor over to Kasantha Moodley (KM) to present the findings of the technical studies.</p> <p>KM began discussing the Terrestrial Ecology Study, during which an attendee enquired about the location of the Egoli Granite Grassland site identified in the study, it was suggested by another attendee that it be shown after the presentation. The following studies were then discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetland ecology; • Agricultural potential; • Geology and soils; • Air quality; • Noise; and • Property evaluation. <p>Whilst presenting the findings of the Property Evaluation Study, numerous attendees disagreed with the findings and enquired about the data used in the evaluation process. KM indicated that data up to 2007 was used.</p> <p>At this point during the presentation all attendees wished to have the discussion session, the floor was handed back to AS to facilitate the questions and comments made.</p>		
3.	<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>The main points of all issues raised are recorded below, unfortunately some names of the attendees who raised specific issues were not provided.</p>		
3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Johannesburg Roads Agency failed to respond to comments made by affected residents; furthermore all residents have individual queries with the JRA which needs to be answered. • <i>The JRA have responded stating that the consultant (Arcus GIBB) must filter the queries so that they (JRA) remain focussed to the task in hand, which is road planning.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The notification process for the meeting was queried; it was asked why posters were not put along the proposed route to notify the public and affected residents of the meeting. It was also requested that notices of any developments should be put in the municipal accounts; AS thanked the meeting for their ideas and stated that these ideas would be considered for future consultation. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The noise and air quality limits were queried, AS responded by saying that these will be looked up in the relevant studies and provided to all attendees (Please refer to Appendix 3). 		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was then proposed that the meeting be closed immediately as the attendees didn't wish to continue or have a meeting without the JRA being there to respond to all their queries. AS responded by saying that this issue would be conveyed to the JRA for their consideration. <i>The JRA have since responded and have indicated that it is not policy for the JRA to attend any public meetings. Furthermore experience has it that meetings with the Client (JRA) have deteriorated into an emotional complaint session. The JRA is prepared to attend a second public meeting and respond to written enquiries submitted before the meeting. This must be confirmed or the JRA will vacate the meeting.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was then asked what would happen to the road reserve, should authorisation not be granted, would it be released for development, public open space or another land use. <i>The JRA will continue to make it a condition on any development application.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why is the proposed N1-20 Metro Boulevard Interchange being built if the proposed Metro Boulevard is not being constructed yet? It was then stated that the proposed Metro Boulevard would be a road in the middle of nowhere, if the interchange weren't constructed; AS stated that the meeting attendees need to note that the Metro Boulevard and the N1-20 Interchange are 2 different projects and that the N1-20 interchange EIA is currently on hold. <i>The JRA have responded by saying that the N1-20 Interchange is being completely funded from the private sector. Metro Boulevard would follow the same course if funding was forthcoming.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A representative from Riding for the Disabled raised the issue that their property would be reduced in size due to the alignment of the Metro Boulevard, she mentioned that the property is already too small to accommodate the students and the horses at the school, furthermore it was stated that they could not afford a loss of land. 		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All landowners then queried the need for the proposed road and mentioned that problems on existing roads should be solved first before planning any new roads. Mr Bill Grobler (BG), an affected resident feels that there is a need for the proposed Metro Boulevard and further stated that Hendrik Potgieter and Beyers Naude cannot take current traffic congestion. NV disagreed with Mr Grobler and stated that existing roads first need to be fixed to see if they can alleviate any congestion. Furthermore there is the issue of living between the proposed Metro Boulevard and Hendrik Potgieter. <i>The JRA stated that Hendrick Potgieter is being upgraded as Provincial funds allow. Metro Boulevard is a planning initiative and will be built on grants from the private sector as it demands it.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paul Venter (PV) enquired why a social study was not conducted as the proposed road does affect the residents in a number of ways. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms Ann Roberts (AR) claimed that legal proceedings had occurred for the property that the Villas Complex currently exists on. This land was rezoned for residential use. AR went on to mention that she was sued for selling property close to the proposed Metro Boulevard due to the fact that she was unaware that the servitude existed and had therefore failed to disclose this information to the buyer. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It was then stated that Beyers Naude is not in a good condition, look at issues that can be fixed like Beyers Naude. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peter Road is already a very busy road, why distribute the traffic congestion to other roads, should re-look at upgrading all internal roads. <i>The JRA have responded by saying that a similar planning exercise has been done on Peter Road.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic lights on some roads are also an issue, thus it has been suggested that the maintenance and upgrading of roads and the re-consideration of un-used roads be re-looked at. <i>The improvement of traffic signals is an on going task, according to the JRA.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AR mentioned that properties along the route are already devalued; she went on to say that property cannot be sold along the proposed route as all realtors have a legal obligation to inform potential buyers of all proposed developments in any specific area. 		

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION	DEADLINE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NV requested that the proposed route be re-zoned so all affected parties can move on, she also enquired about who is responsible for re-zoning. <i>Metro Boulevard would be zoned as a road reserve.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BG suggested that the PWV 5 be constructed, which runs north to south. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PV mentioned that two interchanges within 2km of each other is not best practice as it does not alleviate any congestion. He then asked if the 14th Intersection is going to be closed. AS responded by saying that the proposed N1-20 Metro Boulevard Interchange is not a full interchange but is just one off-ramp and on-ramp. <i>According to the JRA, this is a SANRAL decision made in conjunction with the private sector.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No roads can currently cope with the existing traffic congestion; attention should be paid to Hendrik Potgieter and Beyers Naude. <i>According to the JRA, this is being done via Traffic Systems Management – Signals etc.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Town Planning was allowed to move the urban edge to Peter Road; the whole area is going to expand even more. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The size of the servitude was queried (i.e. 70 m/40m). <i>The JRA have responded and stated that the width will vary depending on the cuts and fills but the minimum is 40 meters.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the standard distance between a substation and a road? AS responded stating that she was not aware of the exact distances but that it could be between 20-40 meters from the road. She stated that it had been noted and will be confirmed. <i>According to the JRA there is no standard.</i> 	JRA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> More problems are being created by building the proposed road, such as Peter Road and JG Strijdom having the inability to cope with the potential traffic that the Metro Boulevard could attract. 		
4.	<p>MEETING CLOSURE AS thanked all for attending and asked everyone to help themselves to tea or coffee. The meeting was officially closed.</p>		

APPENDIX 1
Meeting Presentation

APPENDIX 2
Attendance Registers

APPENDIX 3

Applicable Air and Noise Standards

Table 1- Acceptable rating levels for noise in districts SANS 10103-2004

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Type of district	Equivalent continuous rating level ($L_{Req,T}$) for noise					
	dBA					
	Outdoors			Indoors, with open windows		
	Day-night $L_{R,dn}^{1)}$	Day-time $L_{Req,d}^{2)}$	Night-time $L_{Req,n}^{2)}$	Day-night $L_{R,dn}^{1)}$	Day-time $L_{Req,d}^{2)}$	Night-time $L_{Req,n}^{2)}$
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						
a) Rural districts	45	45	35	35	35	25
b) Suburban districts with little road traffic	50	50	40	40	40	30
c) Urban districts	55	55	45	45	45	35
NON RESIDENTIAL DISTRICTS						
d) Urban districts with some workshops, with business premises, and with main roads	60	60	50	50	50	40
e) Central business districts	65	65	55	55	55	45
f) Industrial districts	70	70	60	60	60	50

Day-time : 06:00 to 22:00, Night-time : 22:00 to 06:00

1) The values given in columns 2 and 5 are equivalent continuous rating levels and include corrections for tonal character, impulsiveness of the noise and the time of day.

2) The values given in columns 3, 4, 6 and 7 are equivalent continuous rating levels and include corrections for tonal character and impulsiveness of the noise.

NOTE 1 If the measurement or calculation time interval is considerably shorter than the reference time intervals, significant deviations from the values given in the table may result.

NOTE 2 If the spectrum of the sound contains significant low frequency components, or when an unbalanced spectrum towards the low frequencies is suspected, special precautions should be taken, and specialist attention is required. In this case the indoor sound levels may significantly differ from the values given in columns 5 to 7. See also annex B.

NOTE 3 Residential buildings, e.g. dormitories, hotel accommodation, residences etc. may only be allowed in non- residential districts on condition that the calculated or anticipated indoor $L_{Req,T}$ values given in column 3 of table 1 are not exceeded.

Table 2- Proposed South African Ambient Air Quality Standards for Criteria Pollutants (SANS)

Pollutant	Averaging Period	Limit Value ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	Limit Value (ppb)
Sulphur Dioxide SO_2	1- hr	500	134
	24-hr	125	48
	Annual average	50	19
Nitrogen dioxide NO_2	1-hr	200	106
	Annual average	40	21
Carbon monoxide CO	1-hr	30 000	26 000
	8-hourly running average	10 000	8 700
Ozone O_3	1-hr	200	102
Particulate Matter PM_{10}	24-hr	75	-
	Annual average	40	-
Lead Pb	Annual average	0.5	-
Benzene C_6H_6	Annual average	5	1.6