Western Cape Government

Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning

BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT, 1998 (ACT NO. 107 OF 1998) AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS.

September 2026

BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT, 1998 (ACT NO. 107 OF 1998) AND THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS.

April 2024

(For official use only)	
Pre-application Reference Number (if applicable):	
EIA Application Reference Number:	
NEAS Reference Number:	
Exemption Reference Number (if applicable):	
Date BAR received by Department:	
Date BAR received by Directorate:	
Date BAR received by Case Officer:	

GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

(This must Include an overview of the project including the Farm name/Portion/Erf number)

PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A TRAFFIC CIRCLE ON BADEN POWELL DRIVE, PORTION OF ERF 547, MACASSAR, CITY OF CAPE TOWN, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE

The City of Cape Town (CCT, "the Proponent') proposes to upgrade the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Macassar and Japhta K Masemola Roads, located at the eastern edge of Khayelitsha (hereafter referred to "the proposed project" (Appendix A1, Locality Map). These roads provide direct access to key regional transport routes. The project is being undertaken on behalf of the City of Cape Town in support of the Macassar Housing Development. The site is located along Baden Powell Drive (R310) and Macassar Road within the jurisdiction of the City of Cape Town in the Western Cape at the following coordinates: 34.048461°S, 18.718494°E.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND APPLICABLE LISTED ACTIVITIES

Due to the listed activities triggered by the proposed development, an Environmental Basic Assessment Report (BAR) process is required in application for Environmental Authorisation to undertake the proposed project. The Environmental Partnership (TEP) was appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by The City of Cape Town to undertake this BAR.

This document constitutes the Final BAR and was undertaken in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) and associated EIA Regulations. Listed Activities triggered by the proposed development are:

- ***Activity 19,*** *Listing Notice 1. (GN R983 of 2014, as amended by GN R327): "The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse…"*
- ***Activity 12****. Listing Notice 3 (GN R985 of 2014 as amended by R324): "The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan.* ***i. Western Cape:*** *Within any critically endangered or endangered ecosystem listed in terms of section 52 of the NEMBA or prior to the publication of such a list, within an area that has been identified as critically endangered in the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004; Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans..."*

As part of the BAR, three alternatives were assessed:

1. **Alternative 1: Preferred Alternative**: **Landscaped Traffic Circle**, including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
2. **Alternative 2: Paved Traffic Circle**, including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
3. **Alternative 3: No-Go Alternative**, which implies that the project will not be realised.

The proposed project requires an application for a water use license in terms of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998). A General Authorisation is required as the road widening would encroach on existing wetlands and the working areas would place the wetlands at risk of being impacted, and trigger Section 21 c and i water uses.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The proposed upgrade entails a conversion of the existing stop-controlled intersection to a traffic circle (roundabout). The upgrade will include additional lanes entering and exiting the traffic circle. Baden Powel Drive has priority flow and the traffic circle is intended reduce the delay experienced

by current and future development traffic approaching from Japhta K Masemola and Macassar Roads and allow for safer right turn and crossing manoeuvres at this intersection. See Appendix B1 for Project Plan. With the proposed upgrade, improved traffic flow for the wider area will be achieved. The roundabout is proposed to have two circulatory lanes with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach. The inscribed circle diameter is in the order of 44m to 45 m, with a truck apron to accommodate articulated vehicles and Non-Motorised Transport (NMT) crossings on the four approaches. Works are largely confined to the road reserve, with minor widening into adjoining land. The upgrade will include additional lanes entering and exiting the traffic circle. The exits along Baden Powel Drive will also be upgraded to two lanes per exit before tapering back to the current single lane per direction road cross-section. The exits along Japhta K Masemola and Macassar Road will remain as single lanes. Lane widths are generally between approximately 3.7 m and 4.0 m.

The proposed project will provide formalised public transport stops and block pedestrian crossings on all four legs of the intersection. The latter will improve crossing opportunities of especially Baden Powel Drive.

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

The site sits inside the Cape Town urban edge. Surrounding land uses are informal residential settlement in Khayelitsha to the south-west, undeveloped Cape Flats Dune Strandveld veld on RE/547 and RE/3/547 to the north-east and north-west, and the Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works to the south-east.

The natural vegetation to the north-east is classified as (1) Degraded to Highly degraded Strandveld and (2) Highly degraded to Transformed Strandveld. The existence of fragmented remnants of a depression wetland was confirmed within the project footprint, located to the west of Baden Powell Drive in the Khayelitsha informal settlement which extends up to the current edge of Baden Powell Drive. These have triggered the need for this Basic Environmental Assessment.

PROPERTY DESCRIPTIONS

Five erven are affected:

1. Remainder of Erf 18332, Khayelitsha (RE/18332)
2. Remainder of Farm Vergenoegd 547 (RE/547)
3. Portion 2 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (2/547)
4. Portion 3 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (3/547)
5. Remainder of Farm 544 Driftsands.

Two minor exemption subdivisions are associated with the road widening, to be deemed TR2 zoning in terms of Section 16(3) of the City of Cape Town Development Management Scheme.

These are Portion 1 of the Remainder of Cape Farm 547 Portion 3 (about 161 m²) on the north-west side, and Portion 1 of Farm 544 (about 2 765 m², of which roughly 1 650 m² is deemed TR2) on the southern side of Macassar Road (Appendix B3).

The combined cadastral extent of the host properties is greater than 78ha. The direct construction footprint for the roundabout and widening is in the order of 20,900 m².

IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO BE READ PRIOR TO COMPLETING THIS BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

1. **The purpose** of this template is to provide a format for the Basic Assessment report as set out in Appendix 1 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA"), Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") Regulations, 2014 (as amended) in order to ultimately obtain Environmental Authorisation.

2. The Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") Regulations is defined in terms of Chapter 5 of the National Environmental Management Act, 19998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA") hereinafter referred to as the "NEMA EIA Regulations".

3. *Submission of documentation, reports and other correspondence:*

The Department has adopted a digital format for corresponding with proponents/applicants or the general public. If there is a conflict between this approach and any provision in the legislation, then the provisions in the legislation prevail. If there is any uncertainty about the requirements or arrangements, the relevant Competent Authority must be consulted.

The Directorate: Development Management has created generic e-mail addresses for the respective Regions, to centralise their administration. Please make use of the relevant general administration e-mail address below when submitting documents:

DEADPEIAAdmin@westerncape.gov.za
Directorate: Development Management (Region 1):
City of Cape Town; West Coast District Municipal area;
Cape Winelands District Municipal area and Overberg District Municipal area.

DEADPEIAAdmin.George@westerncape.gov.za
Directorate: Development Management (Region 3):
Garden Route District Municipal area and Central Karoo District Municipal area

General queries must be submitted via the general administration e-mail for EIA related queries. Where a case-officer of DEA&DP has been assigned, correspondence may be directed to such official and copied to the relevant general administration e-mail for record purposes.

All correspondence, comments, requests and decisions in terms of applications, will be issued to either the applicant/requester in a digital format via email, with digital signatures, and copied to the Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") (where applicable).

4. The required information must be typed within the spaces provided in this Basic Assessment Report ("BAR"). The sizes of the spaces provided are not necessarily indicative of the amount of information to be provided.

5. All applicable sections of this BAR must be completed.

6. Unless protected by law, all information contained in, and attached to this BAR, will become public information on receipt by the Competent Authority. If information is not submitted with this BAR due to such information being protected by law, the applicant and/or Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") must declare such non-disclosure and provide the reasons for believing that the information is protected.

7. This BAR is current as of **April 2024**. It is the responsibility of the Applicant/ EAP to ascertain whether subsequent versions of the BAR have been released by the Department. Visit this Department's website at http://www.westerncape.gov.za to check for the latest version of this BAR.

8. This BAR is the standard format, which must be used in all instances when preparing a BAR for Basic Assessment applications for an environmental authorisation in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations when the Western Cape Government Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning ("DEA&DP") is the Competent Authority.

9. Unless otherwise indicated by the Department, one hard copy and one electronic copy of this BAR must be submitted to the Department at the postal address given below or by delivery thereof to the Registry Office of the Department. Reasonable access to copies of this Report must be provided to the relevant Organs of State for consultation purposes, which may, if so indicated by the Department, include providing a printed copy to a specific Organ of State.

10. This BAR must be duly dated and originally signed by the Applicant, EAP (if applicable) and Specialist(s) and must be submitted to the Department at the details provided below.

11. The Department's latest Circulars pertaining to the "One Environmental Management System" and the EIA Regulations, any subsequent Circulars, and guidelines must be taken into account when completing this BAR.

12. Should a water use licence application be required in terms of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) ("NWA"), the "One Environmental System" is applicable, specifically in terms of the synchronisation of the consideration of the application in terms of the NEMA and the NWA. Refer to this Department's Circular EADP 0028/2014: One Environmental Management System.

13. Where Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) ("NHRA") is triggered, a copy of Heritage Western Cape's final comment must be attached to the BAR.

14. The Screening Tool developed by the National Department of Environmental Affairs must be used to generate a screening report. Please use the Screening Tool link https://screening.environment.gov.za/screeningtool to generate the Report. The screening tool report must be attached to this BAR.

15. Where this Department is also identified as the Licencing Authority to decide on applications under the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (Act No. 29 of 2004) ('NEM:AQA"), the submission of the Report must also be made as follows, for-
    Waste Management Licence Applications, this report must also (i.e., another hard copy and electronic copy) be submitted for the attention of the Department's Waste Management Directorate (Tel: 021-483-2728/2705 and Fax: 021-483-4425) at the same postal address as the Cape Town Office.

    Atmospheric Emissions Licence Applications, this report must also be (i.e., another hard copy and electronic copy) submitted for the attention of the Licensing Authority or this Department's Air Quality Management Directorate (Tel: 021 483 2888 and Fax: 021 483 4368) at the same postal address as the Cape Town Office.

DEPARTMENTAL DETAILS	
CAPE TOWN OFFICE: **DIRECTORATE: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (REGION 1)** (City of Cape Town, West Coast District, Cape Winelands District & Overberg District)	**GEORGE REGIONAL OFFICE:** **DIRECTORATE: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT (REGION 3)** (Central Karoo District & Garden Route District)
The completed Form must be sent via electronic mail to: DEADPEIAAdmin@westerncape.gov.za Queries should be directed to the Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) at: E-mail: DEADPEIAAdmin@westerncape.gov.za Tel: (021) 483-5829 Western Cape Government Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Attention: Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) Private Bag X 9086 Cape Town, 8000	The completed Form must be sent via electronic mail to: DEADPEIAAdmin.George@westerncape.gov.za Queries should be directed to the Directorate: Development Management (Region 3) at: E-mail: DEADPEIAAdmin.George@westerncape.gov.za Tel: (044) 814-2006 Western Cape Government Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Attention: Directorate: Development Management (Region 3) Private Bag X 6509 George, 6530

ACRONYMS

DAFF:	Department of Forestry and Fisheries
DEA:	Department of Environmental Affairs
DEA& DP:	Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning
DHS:	Department of Human Settlement
DoA:	Department of Agriculture
DoH:	Department of Health
DWS:	Department of Water and Sanitation
EMPr:	Environmental Management Programme
HWC:	Heritage Western Cape
NFEPA:	National Freshwater Ecosystem Protection Assessment
NSBA:	National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment
TOR:	Terms of Reference
WCBSP:	Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan
WCG:	Western Cape Government

ATTACHMENTS

Note: The Appendices must be attached to the BAR as per the list below. Please use a ✓ **(**tick) or a **x** (cross) to indicate whether the Appendix is attached to the BAR.

The following checklist of attachments must be completed.

APPENDIX			✓ **(Tick) or x (cross)**
Appendix A:	**Maps**		
	Appendix A1:	**Locality Map**	✓
	Appendix A2:	**Coastal Risk Zones as delineated in terms of ICMA for the Western Cape by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning**	**N/A**
	Appendix A3:	**Map with the GPS co-ordinates for linear activities**	✓
Appendix B:	**Appendix B1:**	**Site development plan(s)**	✓
	Appendix B2	**A map of appropriate scale, which superimposes the proposed development and its associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the preferred site, indicating any areas that should be avoided, including buffer areas;**	✓
Appendix C:	**Photographs**		✓
Appendix D:	**Biodiversity overlay map**		✓
Appendix E: **NOTE: Comments from all relevant organs of state and all those indicated with ✓ here were collated as part of the consultation with the release of the Draft Basic Assessment Report. All comments and copies of**	**Permit(s) / license(s) / exemption notice, agreements, comments from State Department/Organs of state and service letters from the municipality.**		
	Appendix E1:	**Final comment/ROD from HWC**	**N/A**
	Appendix E2:	**Copy of comment from Cape Nature**	
	Appendix E3:	**Final Comment from the DWS**	✓
	Appendix E4:	**Comment from the DEA: Oceans and Coast**	**N/A**

consultations are therefore included in this Final Basic Assessment Report.	**Appendix E5:**	**Comment from the DAFF**	**N/A**
	Appendix E6:	**Comment from WCG: Transport and Public Works**	**N/A**
	Appendix E7:	**Comment from WCG: DoA**	**N/A**
	Appendix E8:	**Comment from WCG: DHS**	**N/A**
	Appendix E9:	**Comment from WCG: DoH**	**N/A**
	Appendix E10:	**Comment from DEA&DP: Pollution Management**	**N/A**
	Appendix E11:	**Comment from DEA&DP: Waste Management**	**N/A**
	Appendix E12:	**Comment from DEA&DP: Biodiversity**	**N/A**
	Appendix E13:	**Comment from DEA&DP: Air Quality**	**N/A**
	Appendix E14:	**Comment from DEA&DP: Coastal Management**	**N/A**
	Appendix E15:	**Comment from the local authority**	**N/A**
	Appendix E16:	**Confirmation of all services (water, electricity, sewage, solid waste management)**	**N/A**
	Appendix E17:	**Comment from the District Municipality**	✓
	Appendix E18:	**Copy of an exemption notice**	**N/A**
	Appendix E19	**Pre-approval for the reclamation of land**	**N/A**
	Appendix E20:	**Proof of agreement/TOR of the specialist studies conducted.**	✓
	Appendix E21:	**Proof of land use rights**	**N/A**
	Appendix E22:	**Proof of public participation agreement for linear activities**	**N/A**

Appendix F:	**Public participation information: including a copy of the register of I&APs, the comments and responses Report, proof of notices, advertisements and any other public participation information as is required.**	✓
Appendix G:	**Specialist Report(s)**	✓
Appendix H:	**EMPr**	✓
Appendix I:	**Screening tool report**	✓
Appendix J:	**The impact and risk assessment for each alternative**	✓
Appendix K:	**Need and desirability for the proposed activity or development in terms of this Department's guideline on Need and Desirability (March 2013)/DEA Integrated Environmental Management Guideline**	✓
Appendix…..	**Any other attachments must be included as subsequent appendices**	✓

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The City of Cape Town (CCT) proposes to upgrade the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Macassar and Japhta K Masemola Roads, located at the eastern edge of Khayelitsha (the proposed project). See Appendix A1 for Locality Map. The proposed project entails a conversion of the existing stop-controlled intersection to a roundabout. Baden Powel Drive has priority flow, and the traffic circle is intended reduce the delay experienced by current and future development traffic approaching from Japhta K Masemola and Macassar Roads and allow for safer right turn and crossing manoeuvres at this intersection. The project is being undertaken in support of the Macassar Housing Development. A Transport Impact Assessment (ITS Engineers, 2012) was undertaken as part of the Macassar Housing Project, which identified that the Baden Powell / Macassar Road intersection is expected to operate over capacity during the afternoon peak hour. A traffic circle was proposed to alleviate the expected congestion and improve traffic flow at the intersection.

Five erven are affected:

1. Remainder of Erf 18332, Khayelitsha (RE/18332)
2. Remainder of Farm Vergenoegd 547 (RE/547)
3. Portion 2 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (2/547)
4. Portion 3 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (3/547)
5. Remainder of Farm 544 Driftsands.

PROJECT PROPOSAL

The City of Cape Town (CCT) proposes to upgrade the existing priority-controlled intersection of Baden Powell Drive (R310), Macassar Road (M9) and Japhta K Masemola Road, located on the eastern edge of Khayelitsha, to a single-point roundabout (the “proposed project”) (Figure 1). The upgrade replaces the current T-junction configuration with a 44 m – 45 m traffic circle with two circulatory lanes, a truck apron, formalised public-transport stops, and Non-Motorised Transport (NMT) crossings with concrete/asphalt sidewalks on all four approaches.

The two-lane circulatory roundabout will include two-lane approaches on all four legs, tapering back to the current single-lane cross-section beyond the intersection on Baden Powell Drive. Lane widths are generally between approximately 3.7 m and 4.0 m, and the total footprint of the project (including exiting roads) is approximately 20,900 m2. The exits along Macassar Road and Japhta K Masemola Road remain single-lane.



Figure 1: Locality Plan

Two minor exemption subdivisions are associated with the road widening, to be deemed TR2 zoning in terms of Section 16(3) of the City of Cape Town Development Management Scheme. These are Portion 1 of the Remainder of Cape Farm 547 Portion 3 (about 161 m²) on the north-west side, and Portion 1 of Farm 544 (about 2 765 m², of which roughly 1 650 m² is deemed TR2) on the southern side of Macassar Road.

DESCRIPTION OF RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

The site sits inside the Cape Town urban edge. Surrounding land uses are informal residential settlement in Khayelitsha to the south-west, undeveloped Cape Flats Dune Strandveld veld on RE/547 and RE/3/547 to the north-east and north-west, and the Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works to the south-east.

The natural vegetation to the north-east is classified as (1) Degraded to Highly degraded Strandveld and (2) Highly degraded to Transformed Strandveld. The existence of fragmented remnants of a depression wetland was confirmed within the project footprint, located to the west of Baden Powell Drive in the Khayelitsha informal settlement which extends up to the current edge of Baden Powell Drive. These have triggered the need for this Basic Environmental Assessment.

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND APPLICABLE LISTED ACTIVITIES

Due to the listed activities triggered by the proposed development, an Environmental Basic Assessment Report (BAR) process is required in application for Environmental Authorisation to undertake the proposed project. The Environmental Partnership (TEP) was appointed as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by The City of Cape Town to undertake this BAR. This document constitutes the Final BAR and was undertaken in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) and associated EIA Regulations.

Listed Activities triggered by the proposed development are:

- ***Activity 19,*** *Listing Notice 1. (GN R983 of 2014, as amended by GN R327): "The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse…"*
- ***Activity 12****. Listing Notice 3 (GN R985 of 2014 as amended by R324): "The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan.* ***i. Western Cape:*** *Within any critically endangered or endangered ecosystem listed in terms of section 52 of the NEMBA or prior to the publication of such a list, within an area that has been identified as critically endangered in the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004; Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans..."*

As part of the BAR, three alternatives were assessed:

4. **Alternative 1: Preferred Alternative**: **Landscaped Traffic Circle**, including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
5. **Alternative 2: Paved Traffic Circle**, including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
6. **Alternative 3: No-Go Alternative**, which implies that the project will not be realised.

The proposed project requires an application for a water use license in terms of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998). A General Authorisation is required as the road widening would encroach on existing wetlands and the working areas would place the wetlands at risk of being impacted, and trigger Section 21 c and i water uses. Proof of submission to DWS has been attached as Appendix N.

SPECIALIST STUDIES UNDERTAKEN

Two Specialist Studies informed this BAR:

1. **Botanical Statement, Capensis (2026).** *Greg Nicolson, Pr. Sci. Nat. (Botanical Science),* This Study is supported by Full Botanical Assessment undertaken on the adjacent Farm RE/547 (Nicolson, 2022), which included fieldwork in 2014, 2017 and 2021 (Capensis, 2022).
2. **Detailed Freshwater Ecological Assessment, EnviroSwift / Steytler (2026).** *Nick Steytler, SACNASP Pr. Sci. Nat. (Ecological Sciences),*

KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Biophysical Environment

The botanical assessment confirmed that the vegetation within the study area is Cape Flats Dune Strandveld, which is nationally listed as Endangered. However, vegetation within the proposed development footprint is largely degraded to highly degraded, with the western portion classified as degraded to highly degraded and the eastern portion as highly degraded to transformed. Approximately 500 m² of indigenous vegetation will be cleared as part of the proposed road upgrade. The development footprint falls outside the City of Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (2024) and does not occur within a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA). Although the adjacent Farm RE/547 is mapped as CBA 1a (irreplaceable), the proposed development footprint does not encroach into this area.

One species of conservation concern, *Erepsia dunensis* (Endangered), has historically been recorded on a neighbouring property; however, the known buffer area for this species does not intersect the proposed development footprint. A pre-construction botanical walk-down is therefore recommended to confirm the presence of any species of conservation concern within the footprint. Should any such species be identified, they must be translocated to suitable conserved habitat prior to vegetation clearance. Given the degraded condition of the vegetation and the limited extent of clearing, a biodiversity offset is not considered necessary.

The freshwater ecological assessment identified two watercourses within the broader area of influence: the Kuils Riverfloodplain wetland, located approximately 450 m downstream, which will not be directly affected, and a small depression wetland remnant located within the informal settlement west of Baden Powell Drive, which will be partially lost due to road widening. Approximately 2 000 m² of this depression wetland falls within the development footprint. The wetland is classified as having a Present Ecological State (PES) of Category F (Critically Modified), with a WET-Health Level 2 composite score of 8.2, indicating a severely degraded system. The wetland's Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) was assessed as low to marginal, and the WET-EcoServices assessment indicated uniformly low ecosystem service provision.

Given the wetland's critically modified condition, low ecological importance, and highly transformed surrounding context, the specialist concluded that rehabilitation to a higher

ecological category is not feasible, and that a wetland offset is not required in accordance with the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 23 June 2023).
The primary potential impacts associated with the development include loss of degraded vegetation, limited wetland habitat loss, and temporary construction-related disturbance. These impacts are assessed as low to moderate before mitigation and low after mitigation, provided that the recommended mitigation measures and the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) are implemented.

Overall, the specialists concluded that the development is acceptable from a biophysical perspective. Key mitigation measures include a pre-construction botanical walk-down, translocation of any species of conservation concern identified, and implementation of construction-phase environmental controls through the EMPr.

Socio-Economic Environment

The project area is located within a densely populated peri-urban environment between Khayelitsha and Macassar, characterised by a mix of formal and informal residential areas, relatively high unemployment levels, and strong reliance on public transport and major road corridors for access to employment and essential services. Baden Powell Drive functions as an important regional transport route supporting commuter mobility and economic activity.

Temporary negative socio-economic impacts are expected during the construction phase, including traffic disruptions, noise, dust generation, and temporary access constraints affecting nearby residents, commuters, and informal traders operating near the intersection. In addition, informal dwellers currently occupying the road reserve may need to be relocated during the construction preparation phase. This relocation impact is rated as medium significance before mitigation. With the implementation of a fair and transparent relocation process, provision of suitable alternative accommodation, and stakeholder engagement, the residual impact is expected to reduce to low to medium significance.

Overall, construction-phase socio-economic impacts are assessed as moderate before mitigation but low after mitigation, provided that a traffic management plan, dust suppression measures, appropriate construction scheduling, and stakeholder communication mechanisms are implemented.

The project is also expected to generate positive socio-economic impacts, particularly during the operational phase. These include short-term employment and local procurement opportunities during construction, as well as long-term improvements in traffic flow, road safety, pedestrian accessibility, and public transport efficiency. Improved intersection performance is expected to reduce congestion and travel delays along Baden Powell Drive, enhancing connectivity between surrounding communities and key economic nodes. These

benefits are assessed as having moderate to high positive significance, resulting in an overall net positive socio-economic outcome.

Heritage Environment

A Site Sensitivity Verification Report confirmed that the proposed development footprint has low heritage sensitivity, and no known archaeological, palaeontological, or historical heritage resources have been identified within the project area. The project involves upgrading an existing road intersection within an already transformed urban environment, which further reduces the likelihood of significant heritage resources occurring on site.

The only potential impact relates to the chance discovery of previously unknown archaeological or palaeontological material during construction. This impact is considered low probability and low significance, provided that a chance-find protocol is implemented. Should any heritage material be uncovered during construction, work must cease in the immediate area and the relevant heritage authority must be notified, allowing a qualified heritage specialist to assess the find and recommend appropriate management measures.

Impact Summary Table

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Alternatives 1 and 2: Traffic Circle and Approach Roads		Alternative 3 — No-Go	
	Without mitigation	With mitigation	Without mitigation	With mitigation
CONSTRUCTION PHASE				
BIOPHYSICAL IMPACTS				
Potential Displacement and mortality of fauna during site clearance	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Loss and disturbance of Degraded-to-Highly-Degraded Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (indigenous vegetation)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Spread of invasive alien plants from disturbed ground into adjacent CBA 1a	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
Potential Direct wetland habitat loss (approx. 2 000 m²)	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
Potential Wetland habitat disturbance during construction	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Erosion and sedimentation into remnant wetland / downstream Kuils River	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Water-quality impairment (cement, fuels, litter, turbid runoff)	Moderate (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Loss of aquatic biota	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS				

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Alternatives 1 and 2: Traffic Circle and Approach Roads		Alternative 3 — No-Go	
	Without mitigation	With mitigation	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Potential Traffic congestion and NMT safety risk during construction	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Nuisance to adjacent residents and businesses (dust, noise, vibration, access)	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Short-term employment and SMME procurement opportunities (positive)	Low (+)	Medium (+)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Chance-find disturbance to heritage or palaeontological resources	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Relocation of Informal Dwellers from the Proposed Road Reserve	Medium (-)	Low – Medium (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
OPERATIONAL PHASE				
BIOPHYSICAL IMPACTS				
Potential fragmentation of ecological connectivity across the CBA	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Nuisance lighting effects on nocturnal biodiversity	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Alteration of wetland flow regime from raised road prism and stormwater discharge	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Ongoing wetland habitat disturbance (operational maintenance, windblown litter)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
Potential Improved road safety for all users (positive)	Medium (+)	High (+)	Medium (-)	Medium (-)
Potential Improved traffic flow, travel time and public-transport reliability (positive)	Medium (+)	Medium (+)	Medium (-)	Medium (-)
Potential Stimulation of broader economic activity along the R310 corridor (positive)	Low (+)	Medium (+)	Not applicable	Not applicable
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE				
A traffic circle is permanent road infrastructure. Decommissioning is not foreseen within any assessable timeframe and is therefore not separately assessed. Should decommissioning ever occur, impacts would be similar in nature and significance to those assessed for the construction phase.				

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public participation is a key component of the environmental assessment process as it introduces the proposed activity to the public and provides an opportunity for comments and concerns to be raised. Public participation was undertaken in terms of Section 41 of the 2014 NEMA: EIA Regulations, as amended.

The draft Basic Assessment Report was made available to the broader public, identified Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) and Organs of State for their perusal and comment from **22 April to 25 May 2026** by the following means:

- The draft BAR was distributed to the relevant Organs of State for comment via email (with a link for larger files, if necessary).
- The Information Sheet (summary of the BAR) was distributed to via email or hand-delivered to the following identified I&APs: occupiers of the site, directly adjacent landowners/occupiers and key I&APs such as the Ward Councilor and any Community Organizations in the area such as a Ratepayers Association.
- An electronic copy of the draft BAR and Information Sheet was placed on The Environmental Partnership's website (www.enviropart.co.za).
- A media notice was published in the *City Vision: Khayelitsha Edition* local newspaper.
- Site notices were placed in conspicuous locations around the site.
- A hard copy of the draft Basic Assessment Report was placed at **Macassar Public Library** for the duration of the commenting period.
- Where written comments cannot be provided, provision was made for telephonic communication.

Second public participation iteration

The following was undertaken for the second public participation iteration:

- Distribution of an Information Sheet (summary of the revised BAR) to registered I&APs.
- Distribution of copies of the revised BAR to relevant state departments for comment.
- Placement of a copy of the revised BAR on The Environmental partnership's website, www.enviropart.co.za.
- Compilation of a Comments and Responses Table to document all comments received.
- The 30-day commenting period ran from 19 August 2026 until 21 September 2026

At the end of the commenting period, all comments were captured and addressed and included in this Final Basic Assessment Report (BAR). Proof of the Public Participation Process is appended to this Final BAR as Appendix F.

WAY FORWARD

All comments and concerns raised by I&APs during the public participation process were addressed by the EAP and the project team. Upon completion of the 30-day period, PPP Report was compiled and appended to this Final BAR (Appendix F). This Final BAR is submitted to the Competent Authority (DEA&DP) for decision-making

The commenting period ended on 21 September 2026. Comments were submitted to:

The Environmental Partnership
5 Summit Way, Nova Constantia, Cape Town, 7806
Tel: 021 422 0999
Email: comments@enviropart.co.za

EAP IMPACT STATEMENT

The EAP is of the reasoned opinion that the proposed upgrade of the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Macassar Road and Japhta K Masemola Road at the eastern edge of Khayelitsha, to a traffic circle (Alternative 1 – Preferred), should be authorised, subject to the implementation of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and the mitigation measures contained in the specialist reports.

This opinion is based on the findings of the Basic Assessment process and supporting specialist studies, which indicate that the proposed development will occur largely within an existing road reserve in an already transformed urban environment. Although the broader vegetation type is Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (Endangered), vegetation within the development footprint is degraded to highly degraded. The footprint also falls outside the City of Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network and does not encroach into the adjacent Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA 1a) located on Farm RE/547.

Specialist studies further confirmed that a small remnant depression wetland adjacent to the road will be partially lost; however, the wetland is already critically modified (PES Category F) and has low ecological importance and sensitivity. Based on these characteristics, and in accordance with the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 2023), neither a biodiversity offset nor a wetland offset is considered necessary.

Potential negative impacts associated with the proposed development include the loss of degraded vegetation, limited loss of wetland habitat, temporary construction-related disturbances such as noise, dust and traffic disruptions, and the relocation of informal dwellers currently occupying portions of the road reserve. These impacts are assessed as low to moderate prior to mitigation and low after mitigation. The relocation impact is expected to occur during the pre-construction phase and can be effectively managed through a fair and transparent relocation process, appropriate stakeholder engagement, and the provision of suitable alternative accommodation.

The project will result in several positive socio-economic benefits during both the construction and operational phases. These include short-term employment opportunities and local procurement during construction, as well as long-term improvements in traffic flow, road safety, pedestrian accessibility and public transport efficiency. The upgrade will improve the operational performance of the intersection and reduce congestion along Baden Powell Drive, thereby improving connectivity between surrounding communities and economic opportunities.

No significant heritage resources were identified within the study area, and the site has been confirmed to have low heritage sensitivity. The only potential heritage impact relates to the unlikely discovery of previously unknown archaeological or palaeontological material during construction. This risk can be adequately managed through the implementation of a chance-find protocol.

The EAP therefore concludes that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable and that the preferred alternative should be authorised, subject to the implementation of the EMPr and the recommended mitigation measures, including a pre-construction botanical walk-down, translocation of any species of conservation concern if identified, clear demarcation of no-go areas, alien invasive species control, appropriate construction management, and independent environmental monitoring.

SECTION A: ADMINISTRATIVE DETAILS

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Highlight the Departmental Region in which the intended application will fall</td><td colspan="2">CAPE TOWN OFFICE: REGION 1</td><td>GEORGE OFFICE: REGION 3</td></tr>
<tr><td>(City of Cape Town, West Coast District</td><td>(Cape Winelands District & Overberg District)</td><td>(Central Karoo District & Garden Route District)</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="8">Duplicate this section where there is more than one Proponent
Name of Applicant/Proponent:
Name of contact person for Applicant/Proponent (if other):
Company/ Trading name/State Department/Organ of State:
Company Registration Number:
Postal address:

Telephone:
E-mail:</td><td colspan="3">City of Cape Town</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">San-Marie van Jaarsveld</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Regional Programme Manager Eastern District Office, Housing Implementation
Human Settlement Directorate</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Not Applicable</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Cnr Victoria & Andries Pretorius Road, Somerset West Municipal Offices, Somerset West</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Cape Town</td><td>Postal code: 7129</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">(021) 483 3107</td><td>Cell:</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Sanmarie.Vanjaarsveld@capetown.gov.za</td><td>Fax: ( )</td></tr>
<tr><td>Company of EAP:</td><td colspan="3">The Environmental Partnership</td></tr>
</table>

EAP name:	Carmen du Toit	
Postal address:	5 Summit Way, Nova Constantia	
	Cape Town	Postal code: 7806
Telephone:	021) 422 0999	Cell: 083 460 3784
E-mail:	Info@enviropart.co.za/ carmen@enviropart.co.za	Fax: ( )
Qualifications:	• MPhil Env Mngt (Stell) • BA Hons EGS (UCT) Registered Professional Natural Scientist with SACNASP (400057/99)	
EAP registration no:	2020/ 3063	

Duplicate this section where there is more than one Municipal Jurisdiction Municipality in whose area of jurisdiction the proposed activity will fall:	City of Cape Town	
Contact person:	Dimitri Georgeades	
Postal address:	City of Cape Town Environmental & Heritage Management Floor 8, 44 Wale Street, Cape Town	
		Postal code:
Telephone	(021) 400 6518 - (021) 425 4448	Cell:
E-mail:	Dimitri.Georgeades@capetown.gov.za	Fax: (021) 425 4448

SECTION B: CONFIRMATION OF SPECIFIC PROJECT DETAILS AS INLCUDED IN THE APPLICATION FORM

1.	Is the proposed development (please tick):	New		**Expansion**	
2.	Is the proposed site(s) a brownfield of greenfield site? Please explain.				
The site comprises a combination of brownfield and greenfield areas (Appendix A1). Certain portions remain undeveloped (greenfield), while other sections consist of existing infrastructure, including Baden Powell Drive (R310), which functions as a key connecting route. The primary roads within the site are classified as brownfield areas due to their existing development and infrastructure. The proposed project will largely work within the existing road reserve which includes some minor encroachment onto adjacent indigenous vegetation and wetlands on site (Appendix B2). The inscribed circle diameter is in the order					

of 44m to 45 m, with a truck apron to accommodate articulated vehicles and Non-Motorised Transport (NMT) crossings on the four approaches. Works are largely confined to the road reserve, with minor widening into adjoining land.

3.	**For Linear activities or developments**
3.1.	Provide the Farm(s)/Farm Portion(s)/Erf number(s) for all routes:

Five property cadastres are affected (Appendix B3) :

1. Remainder of Erf 18332, Khayelitsha (RE/18332) (south-west quadrant);
2. Remainder of Farm Vergenoegd 547 (RE/547) (north-east quadrant);
3. Portion 2 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (2/547) small parcel at the intersection);
4. Portion 3 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (3/547) (north-west quadrant);
5. Farm 544 Driftsands being the Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works owned by the City of Cape Town (south-east corner).

Erf RE/18332 located west of Baden Powell Drive and south of Japhta K Masemola Road, farm number 2/547 and farm number 3/547 located east of Baden Powell Drive and north of Japhta K Masemola Road, adjacent to the Baden Powell/ Macassar circle, round-about, are inhabited by informal housing settlements.

Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works is located on the area south of Macassar Road and east of Baden Powell Drive. The land east of Baden Powel drive and north of Macassar Road has a small storage building directly adjacent to the Baden Powell that also belongs to Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works. The rest of farm number RE/547 is covered with Cape Flats Dune Strandveld.

3.2.	Development footprint of the proposed development for all alternatives.	20, 900 m²

The proposed project constitutes the upgrade of the existing interchange, and therefore includes minimal disturbance of additional land needed primarily for the widening of the existing roads associated with the approach to the traffic circle.

The development footprint refers to the total area required for the upgrade and construction of the proposed roundabout and associated infrastructure at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. This includes the circulatory roadway, central island, additional approach lanes, pedestrian facilities, and the necessary road widening and tie-ins to the existing road network.

This would include the following:

- The traffic circle plus circulatory carriageway, will have a Circle Diameter 45 m (≈ 1,590 m²);
- New / widened approach lanes, splitter islands and pedestrian walkways on the four arms (≈ 5,800 m² in total, made up of ≈ 3,000 m² on the two Baden Powell Drive arms, ≈ 1,400 m² on Macassar Road and ≈ 1,400 m² on Japhta K Masemola Road);

- The existing carriageway to be resurfaced and tied into the new geometry (≈ 5,200 m² and the 5 m construction working-area envelope around the circle and along both sides of each approach (≈ 8,350 m² net of overlaps).

No site alternatives are proposed. Only the preferred layout shown on Appendix B1 being assessed. Alternative 1: Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2: Paved Traffic Circle are design alternatives with identical impact footprints.

3.3.	Provide a description of the proposed development (e.g. for roads the length, width and width of the road reserve in the case of pipelines indicate the length and diameter) for all alternatives.

See 3.2 above.

3.4.	Indicate how access to the proposed routes will be obtained for all alternatives.

Access to the proposed development site will be obtained via the existing road network, namely Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. Construction access will be provided directly from these existing roads to the site. As no alternative routes are proposed, the same access arrangements will apply to the proposed development.

3.5.	SG Digit codes of the Farms/Farm Portions/Erf numbers for all alternatives	Remainder of Erf 18332,| Khayelitsha (RE/18332)	C	0	1	6	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	1	8	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0
		Remainder of Farm Vergenoegd 547 (RE/547)	C	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	0
		Portion 2 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (2/547)	C	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	2
		Portion 3 of Farm 547 Vergenoegd (3/547)	C	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	0	3
		Remainder of Farm 544 Drift Sands	C	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	0

3.6.	**Starting point co-ordinates for all alternatives**			
	Latitude (S)	34º	02’	54.5“S
	Longitude (E)	18º	43‘	06.6“E
	Middle point co-ordinates for all alternatives			
	Latitude (S)	34º	02‘	54.5“S
	Longitude (E)	18º	43‘	06.6“E
	End point co-ordinates for all alternatives			
	Latitude (S)	34º	02‘	54.5“S
	Longitude (E)	18º	43‘	06.6“E

Note: For Linear activities or developments longer than 500m, a map indicating the co-ordinates for every 100m along the route must be attached to this BAR as Appendix A3.

4.	**Other developments**	
4.1.	Property size(s) of all proposed site(s):	788,400m^2
4.2.	Developed footprint of the existing facility and associated infrastructure (if applicable):	5,200 m2

4.3.	Development footprint of the proposed development and associated infrastructure size(s) for all alternatives:	20,900 m2

4.4.	Provide a detailed description of the proposed development and its associated infrastructure (This must include details of e.g. buildings, structures, infrastructure, storage facilities, sewage/effluent treatment and holding facilities).

The development footprint refers to the total area required for the upgrade and construction of the proposed roundabout and associated infrastructure at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. This includes the circulatory roadway, central island, additional approach lanes, pedestrian facilities, and the necessary road widening and tie-ins to the existing road network (Appendix B1, Site Development Plan).

This would include the following:

- The traffic circle plus circulatory carriageway, will have a Circle Diameter 45 m (≈ 1,590 m²);
- New / widened approach lanes, splitter islands and pedestrian walkways on the four arms (≈ 5,800 m² in total, made up of ≈ 3,000 m² on the two Baden Powell Drive arms, ≈ 1,400 m² on Macassar Road and ≈ 1,400 m² on Japhta K Masemola Road);
- The existing carriageway to be resurfaced and tied into the new geometry (≈ 5,200 m² and the 5 m construction working-area envelope around the circle and along both sides of each approach (≈ 8,350 m² net of overlaps).
- The proposed location and extent (±495 m^2) of construction camp site is shown in Appendix B3.

No buildings or sewage treatment facilities are proposed.

4.5.	Indicate how access to the proposed site(s) will be obtained for all alternatives.

Access to the proposed development site will be obtained via the existing road network, namely Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. Construction access will be provided directly from these existing roads to the site. As no alternative routes are proposed, the same access arrangements will apply to the proposed development.

4.6.	SG Digit code(s) of the proposed site(s) for all alternatives:	**No alternative sites considered. See SG codes for all affected properties in 3.5.**

4.7.	Coordinates of the proposed site(s) for all alternatives:			
	Latitude (S)	34°	02‘	54.5“S
	Longitude (E)	18°	43‘	06.6“E

SECTION C: LEGISLATION/POLICIES AND/OR GUIDELINES/PROTOCOLS

1. Exemption applied for in terms of the NEMA and the NEMA EIA Regulations

Has exemption been applied for in terms of the NEMA and the NEMA EIA Regulations. If yes, include a copy of the exemption notice in Appendix E18.	YES	**NO**

2. Is the following legislation applicable to the proposed activity or development.

The National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008) ("ICMA"). If yes, attach a copy of the comment from the relevant competent authority as Appendix E4 and the pre-approval for the reclamation of land as Appendix E19.	YES	**NO**
The National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act No. 25 of 1999) ("NHRA"). If yes, attach a copy of the comment from Heritage Western Cape as Appendix E1.	YES	**NO**
The National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) ("NWA"). If yes, attach a copy of the comment from the DWS as Appendix E3.	**YES**	NO
The National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004) ("NEM:AQA"). If yes, attach a copy of the comment from the relevant authorities as Appendix E13.	YES	**NO**
The National Environmental Management Waste Act (Act No. 59 of 2008) ("NEM:WA")	YES	**NO**
The National Environmental Management Biodiversity Act, 2004 (Act No. 10 of 2004 ("NEMBA").	**YES**	NO
The National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act, 2003 (Act No. 57 of 2003) ("NEMPAA").	YES	**NO**
The Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, 1983 (Act No. 43 of 1983). If yes, attach comment from the relevant competent authority as Appendix E5.	YES	**NO**

3. Other legislation

List any other legislation that is applicable to the proposed activity or development.

The following legislation and guidelines have informed the scope and content of this BAR:

- National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) 107 of 1998. The National Environmental Management Act (NEMA [107 of 1998]) is the overarching framework for environmental law and is intended to give effect to Section 24 of the Constitution, which states that every person has the right to an environment not harmful to their health and well-being, as well as to have the environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations.
- EIA Regulations, published under Chapter 5 of NEMA (GNR R982 in Government
- Gazette No 40772 of December 2014, as amended) Guidelines published in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, in particular: Public Participation in the EIA Process
- Integrated Environmental Management Information Series (published by DFFE)
- National Water Act (Act no. 36 of 1998) – Application for General Authorisation. Notice No. 4167 of Government Gazette No. 49833 (December 2023) promulgated in terms of the NWA makes allowance for a regulated area around all watercourses within which the risk of an

activity in terms of water uses (c) and (i) under section 21 of the Act must be assessed. The stipulated regulated areas include everything within 500m of the boundary of wetland, and everything within 100m or the 1:100 year flood-line (whichever is the greater distance) of a river, stream or drainage line. The Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) has developed a Risk Assessment Matrix (RAM) for the purpose of determining the level of risk posed by Section 21 (c) and (i) activities. If the risk to the watercourse(s) is determined to be LOW then the proposed development would qualify for a **General Authorisation (GA).**

- **NEM:BA** applies through section 52 (site within the Critically Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld), the WCBSP as a section 40 bioregional plan, and the Alien Invasive Species Regulations under sections 71–73 (Category 1b invasives on site need an IAS control plan in the EMP). No NEM:BA permit is currently triggered, but a section 57 Threatened or Protected Species permit may be needed if the pre-construction walk-down finds any listed species.

4. Policies

Explain which policies were considered and how the proposed activity or development complies and responds to these policies.
The proposed project as described is considered in relation to the following policies: - National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) – governing environmental authorisation processes. - National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998) – particularly in relation to impacts on wetlands and watercourses. - Municipal Systems Act – guiding municipal planning through the Integrated Development Plan (IDP). - The City of Cape Town Integrated Development Plan (2022–2027). - The applicable Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the area (Western Cape EMF or municipal EMF, depending on zoning and designation).

5. Guidelines

List the guidelines which have been considered relevant to the proposed activity or development and explain how they have influenced the development proposal.

DEA&DP Guidelines on Public Participation, 2011	The guidelines on public participation, insofar as they remain applicable under the 2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Section F.
DEA&DP Guidelines on Alternatives, 2013	The guidelines on alternatives, insofar as they remain applicable under the

	2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Section H.
DEA&DP Guidelines on Need and Desirability, 2017	The guidelines on need and desirability, insofar as they remain applicable under the 2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Appendix K.
DEA&DP Guidelines on the Review of Specialist Input in the EIA process, 2005	The guidelines on the review of specialist input in the EIA process, insofar as they remain applicable under the 2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Section G.
DEA&DP Guidelines for Involving Heritage Specialists in the EIA Process, 2005	The guidelines on heritage specialist involvement, insofar as they remain applicable under the 2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Section G.
DEA&DP Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans, 2005	The guidelines on Environmental Management Plans, insofar as they remain applicable under the 2017 EIA Regulations, have been adhered to. Please see Appendix H.

6. Protocols

Explain how the proposed activity or development complies with the requirements of the protocols referred to in the NOI and/or application form
On 20 March 2020, Procedures for the Assessment and Minimum Criteria for Reporting on Identified Environmental Themes in terms of Section 24 (5) (a) and (h) and 44 of the National Environmental Management Act (107 of 1998) were published. These procedures prescribe the requirements for undertaking Site Sensitivity Verification Reports as well as describe the requirements for specialist input per environmental 'theme' in the Screening Tool. In line with the requirements of the Protocol, a web-generated Screening Tool Report was produced for the proposed project. Please see Appendix I(i): Screening Tool Report. Based on this, the Site Sensitivity Verification Report (SSVR) (Appendix I(ii)) was compiled to motivate the various environmental themes identified and to indicate whether specialist studies have been/will be undertaken. The Table below provides a summary of the SSVR. Two specialist studies were commissioned for the project: a Freshwater and Wetland Specialist Study, and a Botanical Assessment:

1. **Freshwater and Wetland Specialist Study (Aquatic Ecological Study, 2026)**

EnviroSwift, 2026. *Detailed Freshwater Ecological Assessment: Proposed development of a Roundabout at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road, Khayelitsha, City of Cape Town, Western Cape.* Prepared by Steytler, N. of EnviroSwift for The Environmental Partnership (Pty) Ltd. 31 March 2026. SACNASP Reg. No. 400029/02.

2. Botanical Compliance Statement (2026)

Capensis, 2026. *Botanical Statement for a Proposed Traffic Circle at the Intersection of Baden Powell Drive (R310) and Macassar Road (M9) within the City of Cape Town Municipality.* Prepared by Nicolson, G. of Capensis Ecological Consulting for The Environmental Partnership (Pty) Ltd. This Study is supported by Full Botanical Assessment undertaken on the adjacent Farm RE/547 (Nicolson, 2022), which included fieldwork in 2014, 2017 and 2021 (Capensis, 2022).

Theme	Site Environmental Sensitivities	Is a Specialist Study or other report required for this this theme, to inform this Final BAR?
Agriculture	High	**No.** The site sits within the existing road reserve at the Baden Powell / Macassar Road / Japhta K Masemola intersection. There are no cultivated lands on the footprint, and the project will not take any land out of agricultural production.
Animal Species	High	**Terrestrial Biodiversity Compliance Statement needed.** No standalone animal study. Faunal habitat on the footprint is addressed through the Botanical Compliance Statement and the Freshwater Specialist Study. The species flagged by the Screening Tool (Circus ranivorus, Circus maurus, Afrotis afra, Frankenbergerius opacus, Pachysoma aesculapius) depend on wetland habitat or intact Strandveld, both of which fall under the two specialist studies already commissioned.
Aquatic Biodiversity	Very High	**Yes.** A **Freshwater and Wetland Specialist Study was commissioned.** The Screening Tool picked up Wetland Depressions within the site and the Zandvliet WWTW attenuation system is adjacent to the south-east corner. The findings feed into the BAR, the Section 21(c) and (i) Water Use process (General Authorisation), and the EMP.
Archaeological and Cultural Heritage	Very High	**No.** Earthworks are shallow and remain within the existing road formation. A Chance Finds Protocol is included in the EMP.

Civil Aviation	High	**No.** The roundabout is ground-level infrastructure with no structure taller than 45 m, and the site is more than 15 km from any major aerodrome.
Defence	Very High	**No.** The nearest military facility is about 10 -15 km from the site. The roundabout has no tall structures and will not affect line-of-sight or military operations.
Palaeontology	Medium	**No.** Earthworks are confined to the shallow Quaternary sands of the existing road formation. A Chance Finds Protocol in the EMP addresses any unexpected finds, in line with the NHRA.
Plant Species	High	**Yes. Terrestrial Biodiversity Compliance Statement commissioned.** The site falls within Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (Endangered under NEM:BA).
Terrestrial Biodiversity	Very High	**Yes. Terrestrial Biodiversity Compliance Statement commissioned.** The site overlaps WCBSP CBA 1a and sits within the NPAES focus area.

SECTION D: APPLICABLE LISTED ACTIVITIES

List the applicable activities in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations

Activity No(s): 19	Provide the relevant **Basic Assessment Activity(ies)** as set out in **Listing Notice 1**	Describe the portion of the proposed development to which the applicable listed activity relates.
19	***Activity 19,*** *Listing Notice 1. (GN R983 of 2014, as amended by GN R327)* *The infilling or depositing of any material of more than 10 cubic metres into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock of more than 10 cubic metres from a watercourse; but excluding where such infilling, depositing, dredging, excavation, removal or moving-* *(a) will occur behind a development setback;* *(b) is for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan;*	The proposed activity will result in the infilling of material in excess of 10 cubic metres into portions of some of the wetlands located along the road. More than 10 cubic metres of wetlands will be impacted by the construction of the traffic circle, approach lanes and associated infrastructure.

	(c) falls within the ambit of activity 21 in this Notice, in which case that activity applies; *(d) occurs within existing ports or harbours that will not increase the development footprint of the port or harbour; or* *(e) where such development is related to the development of a port or harbour, in which case activity 26 in Listing Notice 2 of 2014 applies.*	
Activity No(s): 12	Provide the relevant **Basic Assessment Activity(ies)** as set out in **Listing Notice 3**	Describe the portion of the proposed development to which the applicable listed activity relates.
12	***Activity 12,*** *Listing Notice 3 (GN R985 of 2014 as amended by R324):* *The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of indigenous vegetation except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan.* ***i. Western Cape*** *i. Within any critically endangered or endangered ecosystem listed in terms of section 52 of the NEMBA or prior to the publication of such a list, within an area that has been identified as critically endangered in the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment 2004;* *ii. Within critical biodiversity areas identified in bioregional plans;* *iii. Within the littoral active zone or 100 metres inland from high water mark of the sea or an estuarine functional zone, whichever distance is the greater, excluding where such removal will occur behind the development setback line on erven in urban areas;*	More than 300 m^2 of indigenous vegetation will be cleared as part of the proposed project. The original ecosystem is Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld.

	On land, where, at the time of the coming into effect of this Notice or thereafter such land was zoned open space, conservation or had an equivalent zoning; or On land designated for protection or conservation purposes in an Environmental Management Framework adopted in the prescribed manner, or a Spatial Development Framework adopted by the MEC or Minister.	

Note:

- The listed activities specified above must reconcile with activities applied for in the application form. The onus is on the Applicant to ensure that all applicable listed activities are included in the application. If a specific listed activity is not included in an Environmental Authorisation, a new application for Environmental Authorisation will have to be submitted.
- Where additional listed activities have been identified, that have not been included in the application form, and amended application form must be submitted to the competent authority.

List the applicable waste management listed activities in terms of the NEM:WA

Activity No(s):	Provide the relevant **Basic Assessment Activity(ies)** as set out in **Category A**	Describe the portion of the proposed development to which the applicable listed activity relates.
No waste management activities will be triggered by the proposed project.		

List the applicable listed activities in terms of the NEM:AQA

Activity No(s):	Provide the relevant **Listed Activity(ies)**	Describe the portion of the proposed development to which the applicable listed activity relates.
Not applicable as no activities listed in terms of the Air Quality are triggered by the proposed development.		

SECTION E: PLANNING CONTEXT AND NEED AND DESIRABILITY

1.	Provide a description of the preferred alternative.

The **Preferred Alternative 1: Landscaped Traffic Circle** will provide a more aesthetically pleasing option to be enjoyed by both vehicle and NMT road users. Alternative 1 will be landscaped with indigenous, water-wise plants and will improve sense of place and be in keeping with the positive impact of stimulation of economic activity and investment along the corridor.

2.	Explain how the proposed development is in line with the existing land use rights of the property as you have indicated in the NOI and application form? Include the proof of the existing land use rights granted in Appendix E21.

No potential conflicts are anticipated with respect to land use rights as the project constitutes an upgrade of an existing interchange and associated approach roads. However, to accommodate the road widening needed for the approach to the new traffic circle, two minor exemption subdivisions are being instituted for these sections be deemed Transport Zoning 2 (TR2) (as opposed to the existing Agriculture zoning) in terms of Section 16(3) of the City of Cape Town Development Management Scheme. These are Portion 1 of the Remainder of Cape Farm 547 Portion 3 (about 161 m²) on the north-west side, and Portion 1 of Farm 544 (about 2 765 m², of which roughly 1 650 m² is deemed TR2) on the southern side of Macassar Road (Appendix B3).

An Exemption Application is being made, given that the subdivision is deemed TR2 zone per Section 16(3) of DMS (see emphasis): " Any public road and public street and any portion of land proclaimed or reserved under any law as public road or public street or the widening or improvement of any such existing public road or street or specified on a General Plan of a registered township, diagram or map as public road or public street, shall be deemed to be zoned as Transport Zoning 2: Public Street and Public Parking."

3.	Explain how potential conflict with respect to existing approvals for the proposed site (as indicated in the NOI/and or application form) and the proposed development have been resolved.

No potential conflicts are anticipated with this proposed site with respect to existing approvals as there are no existing approvals linked to the Baden Powell, Macassar Roundabout.

4.	Explain how the proposed development will be in line with the following?
4.1	The Provincial Spatial Development Framework.

The Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework (PSDF), which is informed by the Western Cape Provincial Land Transport Framework (PLTF), includes "a well-maintained road network" as one of the strategies for transport in the Western Cape (PSDF).

The proposed roundabout at Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road is in line with the City of Cape Town's transport planning objectives, as it will reduce traffic congestion, improve the efficiency of the road network, and enhance connectivity for residents traveling to work, schools, and local economic hubs. This development will support economic activity, improve road safety, and provide a more accessible and organised transport infrastructure for the surrounding communities.

4.2	The Integrated Development Plan of the local municipality.

The City of Cape Town's Integrated Development Plan (IDP) 2022–2027 sets out the City's overarching strategic framework for enhancing quality of life and economic opportunity, anchored in the vision of *"A City of Hope for All"* (City of Cape Town, 2022). The plan recognises that improving transport connectivity and reducing congestion are central to these objectives, as congestion negatively impacts travel times, economic productivity and public transport efficiency.

To improve transport connectivity and manage congestion, the current IDP commits to the following initiatives:

- Targeted road capacity enhancements and infrastructure investments to address major pressure points on the road network and reduce travel times.
- Investment in modern traffic management systems and technologies, such as upgraded signal controllers and intelligent transport systems, to optimise movement and reduce congestion.
- Continued maintenance and rehabilitation of the road network to ensure safety, reliability and improved infrastructure condition.
- Support for sustainable transport options, including public transport improvements and non-motorised transport infrastructure, to reduce reliance on private vehicles and improve equitable mobility access (City of Cape Town, 2022).

The proposed project is in line with the City of Cape Town IDP as it supports the initiative of reducing congestion and upgrading the road network.

4.3.	The Spatial Development Framework of the local municipality.

The City of Cape Town Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) states that traffic congestion "*comes at a great cost to the sustainability and efficiency of the city*" as Cape Town is the most congested city in South Africa (MSDF, 33). It thus follows that the proposed Baden Powell Macassar Traffic Circle Upgrade will alleviate traffic congestion. Policy 20 of the MSDF specifies the importance of promoting and prioritizing public transport (MSDF, 122).

Policies 23-27 of the MSDF states that urban development impacts on natural resources and critical biodiversity networks are to be appropriately managed (MSDF, 59). In obtaining specialist opinions

and aiming, where possible, to reduce and minimize the impact of the proposed activity primarily on plants and wetlands in the area, the proposed activity is in line with the MSDF.

4.4.	The Environmental Management Framework applicable to the area.

The proposed project falls within the jurisdiction of the City of Cape Town and is subject to the Western Cape Environmental Management Framework (EMF), developed by the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). The EMF provides spatial guidance on environmental sensitivities, including wetlands, biodiversity areas and development suitability zones.

Given the presence of informal settlements, wetland features and remnant indigenous vegetation in the surrounding area, the EMF serves as a decision-support tool to identify environmental constraints, determine risk levels, and guide mitigation measures to ensure that the proposed infrastructure development is undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner.

The EMF notes that any land use or activity that will have an impact on the vegetation cover or hydrological functioning of a wetland area and its associated buffer area, including infilling, is a development/land use/activity that would be undesirable (EMF, 65).

5.	Explain how comments from the relevant authorities and/or specialist(s) with respect to biodiversity have influenced the proposed development.

The Botanical Compliance Statement as prepared based on a Botanical Impact Assessment that was undertaken on the site in 2022. The findings from the botanical specialist indicate that much of the site is Transformed but still contains a significant area of Special habitats such as the exposed calcrete and SCC such as the Endangered dune spoonfig (*Erepsia dunensis*) and marsh brass buttons (*Cotula filifolia*) (NT) occurs here (Appendix B2.1).

It was confirmed that the area likely to be cleared for the new traffic circle and associated approach road widening, is excluded from the 2024 Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (TBN) (City of Cape Town, 2024) and that the vegetation within the road reserve is not considered a conservation priority. The adjacent area on Farm RE/547 is classified as CBA 1a and is considered an important area and according to the TBN, CBA1a sites are considered to be 100% irreplaceable (Appendix B2.2).

Nevertheless, the project is supported from a botanical perspective as it is unlikely that any SCC exists within the road reserve, however, to mitigate the potential presence of the Endangered *Erepsia dunensis*, a pre-development walk-down is required to ensure that this species is not present.

6.	Explain how the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (including the guidelines in the handbook) has influenced the proposed development.

The Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan 2023 and its Handbook classify the land next to the existing Baden Powell Drive / Macassar Road intersection as CBA 1a (irreplaceable) False Bay Cape Flats Dune Strandveld, while excluding the hardened road reserve itself. Because CBA 1a is the highest biodiversity category outside a protected area, the Handbook's desired state — "no further loss of natural habitat" — became a key consideration for the project. Although the footprint of the proposed project will not directly impact this CBA1a area, this area has been avoided in determine the camp site location, and will be strictly avoided and protected via no-go designation during the construction phase.

7.	Explain how the proposed development is in line with the intention/purpose of the relevant zones as defined in the ICMA.

The Integrated Coastal Management Act (ICMA), is not applicable to the proposed project as it is not situated in a coastal zone.

8.	Explain whether the screening report has changed from the one submitted together with the application form. The screening report must be attached as Appendix I.

The DFFE Screening Report attached as Appendix I(i) is the same as that submitted with the Notice of Intent.

9.	Explain how the proposed development will optimise vacant land available within an urban area.

The proposed roundabout optimises vacant urban land by converting underutilised space into functional transport infrastructure. It improves connectivity, reduces congestion, and enhances land-use efficiency while supporting surrounding residential and commercial areas without impacting sensitive or built-up zones.

10.	Explain how the proposed development will optimise the use of existing resources and infrastructure.

As stated above, the proposed activity will entail the upgrading of an existing roadway as well as the improvement of traffic flow for existing road infrastructure, therefore optimising the use of existing transport resources and infrastructure.

11.	Explain whether the necessary services are available and whether the local authority has confirmed sufficient, spare, unallocated service capacity. (Confirmation of all services must be included in Appendix E16).
No services are required for the proposed activity as the activity is a road activity.	
12.	In addition to the above, explain the need and desirability of the proposed activity or development in terms of this Department's guideline on Need and Desirability (March 2013) or the DEA's Integrated Environmental Management Guideline on Need and Desirability. This may be attached to this BAR as Appendix K.
The existing intersection experiences persistent congestion, right-turn and crossing-conflict crashes, extended delays for public-transport and emergency vehicles, and degraded NMT safety. The proposed upgrade advances the strategic objectives of the National Development Plan 2030, the Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework, the CCT Integrated Development Plan 2022–2027, the CCT Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan, and the IRT-enabling road programme. Furthermore, it aligns with the Integrated Spatial Development Framework for Khayelitsha Mitchells Plain and Blue Downs (2023), towards achieving spatial transformation by containing new urban development within the urban edge; facilitating higher densities for transport corridors. And supporting a viable sustainable public transport system to manage traffic flows, reduce travelling times and improve access to opportunities. See Appendix K.	

SECTION F: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Public Participation Process ("PPP") must fulfil the requirements as outlined in the NEMA EIA Regulations and must be attached as Appendix F. Please note that If the NEM: WA and/or the NEM: AQA is applicable to the proposed development, an advertisement must be placed in at least two newspapers. Exclusively for linear activities: Indicate what PPP was agreed to by the competent authority. Include proof of this agreement in Appendix E22.

The following was undertaken during the first Public Participation Process (see Appendix F for the Public Participation Plan and approval thereof):

a. A media notice was published in The City Vision newspaper, Khayelitsha.
b. Site notices were placed in conspicuous locations around the site.
c. An electronic copy of the draft BAR was placed on The Environmental Partnership's website (www.enviropart.co.za) – in addition to the draft BAR, the information was also made available on the website as a second, more concise download option.
d. A copy of the draft BAR was placed at Macassar Public Library for the duration of the public commenting period.

e. The Information Sheet (summary of the BAR) was distributed to identified Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) via email, physical drop-offs or letters sent via registered mail where necessary.
f. The Information Sheet was also delivered to the following entities:
    - Occupiers/owners of the site
    - Directly adjacent landowners.
g. The draft BAR was distributed to the following relevant Organs of State via email (with a link for larger files, if necessary), as listed in the Notice of Intent submitted to the Department on 22 APRIL 2026 and added to by the Competent Authority's approval letter:
    - DEA&DP Directorate: Development Management (the Competent Authority)
    - City of Cape Town: Environmental and Heritage Management (the Municipality)
    - Department of Water and Sanitation

Upon completion of the commenting period, a Comments and Responses Table was compiled to document all comments, and to provide responses thereto.

2. Confirm that the PPP as indicated in the application form has been complied with. All the PPP must be included in Appendix F.

See in attached Appendix F.

3. Confirm which of the State Departments and Organs of State indicated in the Notice of Intent/application form were consulted with.

Directorate: Development Management (Region 1)
Rondine Isaacs
021 483 4098
Rondine.Isaacs@westerncape.gov.za

Department of Water and Sanitation
Nelisa Ndobeni
021 941 6140
NdobeniN2@dws.gov.za

South African National Biodiversity Institute
Theressa Frantz
T.Frantz@sanbi.org.za

Western Cape Department of Transport & Public Works
Maxine Bezuidenhout
service@westerncape.gov.za.

4. If any of the State Departments and Organs of State were not consulted, indicate which and why.

The Public Participation Process Report (PPP Report), including the Comments and Responses Table, is appended to this Final BAR as Appendix F.

5. if any of the State Departments and Organs of State did not respond, indicate which.

All relevant Organs of State as indicated in the Notice of Intent received the draft BAR for their comment in accordance with the 2014 NEMA Regulations, as amended.

6. Provide a summary of the issues raised by I&APs and an indication of the manner in which the issues were incorporated into the development proposal.

The issues raised by I&APs during the public participation process, and the manner in which they were addressed, are documented in the Comments and Responses Table included in the PPP Report (Appendix F).

Note:

A register of all the I&AP's notified, including the Organs of State, and all the registered I&APs must be included in Appendix F. The register must be maintained and made available to any person requesting access to the register in writing.

The EAP must notify I&AP's that all information submitted by I&AP's becomes public information.

Your attention is drawn to Regulation 40 (3) of the NEMA EIA Regulations which states that *"Potential or registered interested and affected parties, including the competent authority, may be provided with an opportunity to comment on reports and plans contemplated in subregulation (1) prior to submission of an application but **must** be provided with an opportunity to comment on such reports once an application has been submitted to the competent authority."*

All the comments received from I&APs on the pre -application BAR (if applicable and the draft BAR must be recorded, responded to and included in the Comments and Responses Report and must be included in Appendix F.

All information obtained during the PPP (the minutes of any meetings held by the EAP with I&APs and other role players wherein the views of the participants are recorded) and must be included in Appendix F.

Please note that proof of the PPP conducted must be included in Appendix F. In terms of the required "proof" the following is required:

- a site map showing where the site notice was displayed, dated photographs showing the notice displayed on site and a copy of the text displayed on the notice;
- in terms of the written notices given, a copy of the written notice sent, as well as:
  - if registered mail was sent, a list of the registered mail sent (showing the registered mail number, the name of the person the mail was sent to, the address of the person and the date the registered mail was sent);
  - if normal mail was sent, a list of the mail sent (showing the name of the person the mail was sent to, the address of the person, the date the mail was sent, and the signature of the post office worker or the post office stamp indicating that the letter was sent);
  - if a facsimile was sent, a copy of the facsimile Report;
  - if an electronic mail was sent, a copy of the electronic mail sent; and
  - if a "mail drop" was done, a signed register of "mail drops" received (showing the name of the person the notice was handed to, the address of the person, the date, and the signature of the person); and
- a copy of the newspaper advertisement ("newspaper clipping") that was placed, indicating the name of the newspaper and date of publication (of such quality that the wording in the advertisement is legible).

SECTION G: DESCRIPTION OF THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT

All specialist studies must be attached as Appendix G.

SPECIALIST STUDIES UNDERTAKEN

The two Specialist Studies that were undertaken as part of this BAR, namely, Freshwater Ecological Assessment and a Biodiversity Scan, are detailed below.

1. **Botanical Statement, Capensis (2026).** *Greg Nicolson, Pr. Sci. Nat. (Botanical Science), Capensis Ecological Consulting.* (Appendix G1)

1.1 Scope

TEP, as EAP, commissioned Capensis Ecological Consulting to provide a botanical statement on the proposed traffic circle at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive (R310) and Macassar Road (M9). The specialist had previously acted as the botanist for a proposed development on the adjacent Farm RE/547 (north-east quadrant of the intersection) in 2014, 2017 and 2021, and the present statement draws directly on that historical fieldwork. No new site-specific

fieldwork was undertaken for the traffic circle footprint itself — the study is therefore a desktop assessment informed by multiple past site visits to the immediately adjoining property.
The scope was limited to (i) characterising the vegetation likely to be affected within the road reserve, (ii) testing whether the clearance will trigger the "indigenous vegetation in an Endangered ecosystem" threshold of the EIA Regulations, (iii) checking for species of conservation concern (SCC), and (iv) recommending mitigation where appropriate.

1.2 Methodology

Methods combined (a) review of the latest Cape Flats Dune Strandveld vegetation mapping, (b) interrogation of aerial imagery (City of Cape Town aerials and Google Earth) for the road-reserve footprint, (c) re-use of ecological polygons and species lists from the 2022 Farm RE/547 botanical report, and (d) overlay of the proposed traffic-circle footprint (spatial files supplied by TEP) onto the Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (TBN, 2024) to test Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) status. Habitat condition was mapped against a five-class scheme: Intact, Semi-intact, Degraded, Highly Degraded and Transformed. The first three being "indigenous vegetation" under the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) definition and the last two being excluded.

Three explicit assumptions were made and recorded in the statement: (i) the road-reserve vegetation is taxonomically and structurally the same habitat mapped on the adjoining Farm RE/547, (ii) condition is likely to be the same or poorer than in 2021, given ongoing disturbance pressures, and (iii) the footprint spatial data supplied by TEP is accurate. The precautionary principle was applied throughout.

1.3 Key findings

- The vegetation type at the site is Cape Flats Dune Strandveld, listed nationally as Endangered.
- Ecological Condition in the road reserve is Degraded to Highly Degraded Strandveld on the west of Baden Powell, and Highly Degraded to Transformed Strandveld on the east. The adjacent Farm RE/547 carries the same habitat in better condition.
- Applying the precautionary principle, the road-reserve vegetation that would be impacted by the proposed development must be treated as "indigenous" under the DEA&DP definition (GG 33306, 2010), even though it is heavily disturbed.
- The sensitivity classes for the adjacent habitats are (1) Medium and (2) Very Low. The project footprint itself is excluded from the 2024 City of Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (TBN) and is not in a CBA.
- The adjacent Farm RE/547 is mapped as CBA 1a (100% irreplaceable under the TBN), but the construction footprint does not encroach into that polygon.
- One species of conservation concern (SCC), *Erepsia dunensis* (Endangered), has been recorded historically on the adjacent Farm RE/547. Its buffer does not intersect the proposed works.

- Given the >300 m² clearance of indigenous vegetation in an Endangered ecosystem, Environmental Authorisation under Listing Notice 3 Activity 12 is required.

1.4 Impact statement and recommendation

The specialist concludes that the proposed traffic circle will not have a significant impact on the ecological functioning of the area. The road-reserve remnant is already under strong degradation pressure (dumping, bush clearing, invasive plants, informal infilling) and the specialist considers its trajectory downward regardless of the project. It is highly unlikely that important species occur within the footprint.

One mitigation measure is required: a pre-construction botanical walk-down of the footprint to confirm the absence of *Erepsia dunensis* (and any other SCC that may have colonised the strip). If SCC are found, they must be translocated into the conserved habitat on Farm RE/547 or another suitable receiving site before vegetation clearance commences. No biodiversity offset is required.

2. Detailed Freshwater Ecological Assessment, EnviroSwift / Steytler (2026). *Nick Steytler, SACNASP Pr. Sci. Nat. (Ecological Sciences), Reg. No. 400029/02, EnviroSwift Consulting.* (Appendix G2)

2.1 Scope

EnviroSwift Consulting was appointed by TEP to undertake a Detailed Freshwater Ecological Assessment in terms of the Protocol for the Specialist Assessment and Minimum Report Content Requirements for Environmental Impacts on Aquatic Biodiversity (GN 320 of 2020). The trigger was a “Very High” aquatic-biodiversity sensitivity rating returned by the DFFE National Web-based Environmental Screening Tool. The study assesses the freshwater receiving environment within and around the 500 m regulated area of the proposed traffic circle, classifies and delineates wetland and riverine watercourses, determines their Present Ecological State (PES), Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS), Recommended Ecological Category (REC), and assesses the impacts of the construction, operational and decommissioning phases (including the No-Go scenario) on each watercourse. The report also informs listed-activity triggers under the NEMA EIA Regulations and the water-use triggers under sections 21(c) and 21(i) of the National Water Act (NWA, 36 of 1998).

2.2 Methodology

The methodology was a layered desktop and field investigation. The desktop phase integrated the National Wetland Map 5 (NWM5), the 1:50 000 NGI river network, CoCT aquatic biodiversity layers and the DFFE Screening Tool outputs. Wetland classification was carried out per Ollis et al. (2013) down to Level 6 (HGM unit and natural/artificial status). Delineation

was by soil augering along transects, supported by indicator vegetation, topographic context and aerial imagery in accordance with DWS (2005, 2008) guidelines. Watercourse condition was assessed using the WET-Health Level 2 tool (Macfarlane et al., 2007), with separate scores for Hydrology, Geomorphology and Vegetation to produce a composite PES in the A–F range. Ecosystem services were assessed using the WET-EcoServices tool (15 services, 0–4 scoring). Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) was scored per Rountree et al. (2013). Project-phase impacts were assessed using the standard TEP impact methodology (nature, extent, duration, intensity, probability, significance before and after mitigation) and supplemented with a DWS Risk Assessment Matrix for the s21(c) and s21(i) water uses.

2.3 The receiving environment

Two watercourses are at direct risk of being impacted by the proposed upgrade. The first is the Kuils River floodplain wetland, which extends for approximately 15 km from its Macassar estuary back to the M12 road at Blue Downs, covering a mapped footprint of about 187 ha. The proposed widening intersects the very downstream end of this system. The second is a series of fragmented depression-wetland remnants located within the Khayelitsha informal-settlement matrix immediately west of Baden Powell Drive. These remnants are hydrologically linked to the broader Kuils River wetland complex and include a residual wet depression immediately adjacent to (and abutting) the eastern kerb of Baden Powell Drive. It is this depression that will be impacted by the proposed road widening, with approximately 2 000 m² of depression wetland area to be impacted.

The Kuils River is situated 450 from the development site. It's a perennial river, with a well-defined channel, riffle sequences over cobble, and pools over sand; a Scopus umbretta (Hamerkop — Least Concern) was observed foraging along the channel. The wetland vegetation type is Western Strandveld (Endangered). Classification of the affected depression per Ollis et al. (2013): Level 1 – Inland Wetland; Level 3 – Plain; Level 4 – Depression; Level 5 – Non-perennial (now shifted to effectively perennial through urban-runoff augmentation); Level 6 – Natural.

2.4 PES, EIS and REC

Attribute	Finding	Basis
Present Ecological State (PES)	**Category F — critically modified**	WET-Health Level 2 composite score 8.2 (Hydrology 8.0; Geomorphology 8.0; Vegetation 8.6). Trajectory of change: continuing downward.
Ecological Importance & Sensitivity (EIS)	**Low / marginal**	Median score 1 per Rountree et al. (2013): biodiversity support 0; protection status 1/3;

Attribute	Finding	Basis
		no sensitivity to flood regime changes. The depression is not a regional refuge.
Recommended Ecological Category (REC)	**Not recommended (specialist discretion)**	Given the wetland is embedded in an informal settlement and the rehabilitation pathway from PES F back to PES D is neither socially nor practically implementable, the specialist elected not to recommend an REC.
Ecosystem services (WET-EcoServices)	**Uniformly low**	All 15 services return low scores; the depression provides no material flood attenuation, water-quality amelioration, provisioning or cultural benefit above the baseline matrix.

2.5 Key findings

- Approximately 2 000 m² of depression wetland falls within the proposed widening envelope and will be lost.
- The wetland is critically modified (PES F) and of Low/marginal ecological importance. It is not a conservation-priority system.
- The residual wetland is on a downward trajectory and is predicted to be lost in its entirety to incremental informal infilling in the short-to-medium term, with or without the project (i.e. the No-Go scenario also realises the loss).
- A wetland offset is not required. The specialist cites three reasons, all aligned with the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 23 June 2023): (i) PES is Category F, (ii) EIS is Low/marginal, and (iii) the regional rate of wetland loss in Khayelitsha will realise the same outcome regardless of the proposed project.
- NEMA listed-activity triggers: Listing Notice 1 Activity 19 (infilling/excavation of >10 m³ from a watercourse).
- National Water Act, (Act No 36 of 1998) (NWA), s21(c) and s21(i) water uses are triggered; and a Water Use License is required for the proposed project. A General Authorisation (GA) (rather than a full Water Use Licence) is considered sufficient in view of the PES/EIS findings.
- All of the activities potentially generating negative freshwater ecological impacts were found to be associated with a LOW risk class. This aligns with the impact assessment which rated all potential impacts generated by the proposed development to be either of a **Very Low**
  (-ve) or **Low (-ve)** significance rating (Table below).

Phase	Activity	Impact	Significance (max = 100)	Risk Rating	Confidence level
CONSTRUCTION	Site preparation including vegetation removal	Loss of wetland habitat & function	26	L	Medium
		Disturbance of wetland habitat	12,8	L	Medium
		Erosion and sedimentation	12,8	L	Medium
		Biota loss	16	L	Medium
	Operation of construction machinery and storage of construction materials	Disturbance of wetland habitat	16	L	Medium
		Water quality impairment	9,6	L	Medium
		Biota loss	9,6	L	Medium
OPERATIONAL	Presence of hard surfaces	Alteration of flow regime	16	L	Medium
	Residential land use	Disturbance of wetland habitat	14,4	L	Medium
	Residential land use	Water quality impairment	14,4	L	Medium
		Biota loss	14,4	L	Medium

Freshwater Risk Assessment Matrix

Freshwater Specialist Study Conclusion: *"the proposed development is supported from a freshwater ecological perspective", subject to implementation of the construction-phase mitigation listed above and implementation of the EMPr.*

All relevant potential impacts associated with the proposed Baden Powell Drive – Macassar Road Traffic Circle, as identified by Biodiversity and Freshwater Ecology Specialist Studies, and through this Basic Assessment Process (DFFE Screening Tool, Site Sensitivity Verification Report, Public Consultation) have been assessed and sittable mitigation measures have been proposed.

1. Groundwater

1.1.	Was a specialist study conducted?	**YES**	NO
1.2.	Provide the name and or company who conducted the specialist study.		
Nick Steytler (Pr.Sci.Nat.) EnviroSwift.			
1.3.	Indicate above which aquifer your proposed development will be located and explain how this has influenced your proposed development.		
Aquifers were not delineated in this study, given that "*the NWA defines a water resource as a watercourse, surface water, estuary or aquifer, of which the latter two are not applicable to this assessment due to an estuary being associated with the sea (i.e. not freshwater) and, in line with best practice guidelines, wetland and riparian assessments only include the*			

assessment of the first 50 cm from the soil surface, therefore aquifers are excluded" (Enviroswift, 2026).

1.4.	Indicate the depth of groundwater and explain how the depth of groundwater and type of aquifer (if present) has influenced your proposed development.

The intersection (proposed development site) consists of tarred road surfaces bordered by areas of compacted soil and rubble (Appendix C). This level of disturbance indicates that any wetland habitat that may previously have occurred in the immediate vicinity of the intersection has likely been lost (Enviroswift, 2026).

Another notable feature of both Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road is the absence of formal stormwater infrastructure and pedestrian sidewalks. Consequently, rainfall falling on the road surface drains uncontrolled into the surrounding areas, which include adjacent wetland habitat.

2. Surface water

2.1.	Was a specialist study conducted?	**YES**	NO
2.2.	Provide the name and/or company who conducted the specialist study.		
Nick Steytler (Pr.Sci.Nat.) EnviroSwift			
2.3.	Explain how the presence of watercourse(s) and/or wetlands on the property(ies) has influenced your proposed development.		

The road-reserve footprint lies immediately adjacent to a depression wetland that extends up to the eastern kerb of Baden Powell Drive (Appendix B2.3, Wetland Delineation Map). The depression wetland forms part of the broader Kuils River floodplain/wetland system (EnviroSwift, 2026, Appendix G2). Per the EnviroSwift Detailed Freshwater Ecological Assessment (2026) the Present Ecological State (PES) of the depression wetland is Category F (critically modified — WET-Health Level 2, score 8.2) and the Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) is Low/marginal.

The Recommended Ecological Category (REC) is a D. Approximately 2 000 m² of wetland area falls within the proposed widening envelope and will be lost. Ordinarily a wetland loss of this extent would trigger an offset under the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 23 June 2023). However EnviroSwift (2026) explicitly concludes that a wetland offset is not required, as the residual impact is rated Low (-ve) for three reasons: (i) PES Category F (very little remaining natural habitat); (ii) EIS Low/marginal (not significant at the local scale); and (iii) the high rate of incremental wetland loss in the surrounding informal settlement means the wetland is likely to be lost in its entirety in the short to medium term regardless of the project.

3. Coastal Environment

3.1.	Was a specialist study conducted?	YES	**NO**
3.2.	Provide the name and/or company who conducted the specialist study.		
Not applicable as the proposed development is not located on or near the coast.			
3.3.	Explain how the relevant considerations of Section 63 of the ICMA were taken into account and explain how this influenced your proposed development.		
Not applicable as the proposed development is not located on or near the coast.			
3.4.	Explain how estuary management plans (if applicable) has influenced the proposed development.		
	Not applicable as the proposed development is not located on or near the coast.		
3.5.	Explain how the modelled coastal risk zones, the coastal protection zone, littoral active zone and estuarine functional zones, have influenced the proposed development.		
	Not applicable as the proposed development is not located on or near the coast.		

4. Biodiversity

4.1.	Were specialist studies conducted?	**YES**	NO
4.2.	Provide the name and/or company who conducted the specialist studies.		
Gregory Nicolson MSc (Botany) Pr. Sci. Nat. CAPENSIS			
4.3.	Explain which systematic conservation planning and other biodiversity informants such as vegetation maps, NFEPA, NSBA etc. have been used and how has this influenced your proposed development.		
Systematic conservation planning tools and biodiversity informants used include aerial imagery (City of Cape Town and Google Earth), vegetation mapping from the Farm RE/547 botanical assessment, and the City of Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (TBN) (2024). The site falls within the Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld ecosystem. The road-reserve vegetation is classified as Degraded to Highly Degraded Strandveld (Nicolson, 2026, Appendix G1) (Appendix B2). Under the DEA&DP definition of indigenous vegetation (>300 m²) the affected vegetation remains indigenous vegetation of the nationally-listed Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld ecosystem, and this is the activity trigger for Environmental uthorisation. The road-reserve footprint itself is excluded from the 2024 CoCT Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (TBN). The adjacent CBA 1a on Farm RE/547 will not be directly affected by the works. These findings support the siting of the proposed traffic circle within the road reserve (Nicolson, 2026).			

4.4.	Explain how the objectives and management guidelines of the Biodiversity Spatial Plan have been used and how has this influenced your proposed development.
4.5	Explain what impact the proposed development will have on the site specific fea and/or function of the Biodiversity Spatial Plan category and how has this influer proposed development.

The objectives of the Biodiversity Spatial Plan include protecting Critical Biodiversity Areas and avoiding impacts on irreplaceable habitats. The proposed development is aligned with these objectives as it avoids the adjacent CBA 1a area and is confined to a degraded road reserve that is not included in the biodiversity network. Nicolson (2026) records one plant Species of Conservation Concern (SCC): *Erepsia dunensis* (Endangered), which was identified in a prior survey of the adjacent Farm RE/547 (Appendix B2). The buffer around that record does not intersect the proposed works.

The proposed development will not impact the function or integrity of any Biodiversity Spatial Plan category, as it is located outside the mapped biodiversity network. The adjacent CBA 1a area will remain unaffected. Due to the degraded to highly degraded condition of the vegetation within the road reserve, the development will not affect ecological processes or conservation targets, and therefore has minimal influence on biodiversity spatial planning priorities. (Capensis, 2026)

4.6.	If your proposed development is located in a protected area, explain how the proposed development is in line with the protected area management plan.

The proposed development is not located within a protected area, and therefore no protected area management plan is applicable.

4.7.	Explain how the presence of fauna on and adjacent to the proposed development has influenced your proposed development.

The degraded to highly degraded condition of the site, together with ongoing dumping, bush clearing and invasive species, means that faunal presence is likely to be low and no significant faunal habitat is expected within the road reserve (Capensis, 2026). No faunal species of conservation concern are expected. A pre-construction botanical walk-down remains the only ecological mitigation recommended by the Biodiversity Specialist.

5. Geographical Aspects

Explain whether any geographical aspects will be affected and how has this influenced the proposed activity or development.
The footprint lies on the flat Cape Flats coastal plain (0–3 % slope) and contains no ridgelines, koppies or other distinctive geomorphological features. No geographical aspects will be directly affected by the proposed development.

6. Heritage Resources

6.1.	Was a specialist study conducted?	YES	**NO**
6.2.	Provide the name and/or company who conducted the specialist study.		
Based on the outcomes of the Site Sensitivity Verification Report, and given that the proposed project constitutes an upgrade of an existing road, heritage study was not required.			
6.3.	Explain how areas that contain sensitive heritage resources have influenced the proposed development.		
	Not applicable as a Heritage Study was not needed.		

7. Historical and Cultural Aspects

Explain whether there are any culturally or historically significant elements as defined in Section 2 of the NHRA that will be affected and how has this influenced the proposed development.
Not applicable as a Heritage Study was not needed.

8. Socio/Economic Aspects

8.1.	Describe the existing social and economic characteristics of the community in the vicinity of the proposed site.
	The proposed roundabout at Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road is in a densely populated peri-urban area on the eastern outskirts of Cape Town, within Khayelitsha and parts of Macassar. The community is characterised by extensive informal settlements, low-income households, and high reliance on major transport routes for employment and services. Unemployment is relatively high, with many households dependent on informal trading, temporary work, and social grants. A significant portion of residents commute

	to other areas for employment. Housing is mainly informal, with some subsidised RDP housing, and parts of the area occur in environmentally sensitive zones such as depression wetlands. Community facilities like schools, clinics, and religious institutions support social networks and resilience. Baden Powell Drive is a major arterial route with high pedestrian and vehicular traffic, including public transport. The land use reflects a transitional interface between informal settlements, municipal infrastructure, and remnant vegetation. The proposed roundabout is expected to improve traffic flow, safety, and accessibility, with potential short-term construction disruptions. **Social Characteristics** • High population density. • Significant informal settlement presence. • Predominantly low-income households. • High proportion of youth and economically active individuals. • Strong reliance on public transport. • Presence of schools, clinics, religious institutions, and community facilities. **Economic Characteristics** • High unemployment relative to metro averages. • Dependence on informal trading and small-scale businesses. • Many residents commute to other areas for employment. • Household income often supplemented by social grants. **Infrastructure & Accessibility** • Baden Powell Drive is a major arterial transport route. • High pedestrian and vehicular movement. • Significant public transport usage. • Intersection plays a strategic role in mobility and access. **Development Context** • Transitional peri-urban environment. • Interface between informal settlements, municipal infrastructure, and natural vegetation. • Proposed road upgrade likely to improve safety and traffic efficiency.
8.2.	Explain the socio-economic value/contribution of the proposed development.
The proposed roundabout at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road will have significant socio-economic value by improving traffic flow, reducing congestion, and enhancing public transport infrastructure in the area.	

Baden Powell Drive serves as a major arterial route connecting Khayelitsha, Macassar, and surrounding communities. The proposed roundabout will support the safe and efficient movement of vehicles, pedestrians, and public transport, including minibus taxis and buses, which are critical for residents' access to employment, education, and essential services.

Furthermore, the roundabout contributes to the City of Cape Town's broader transport objectives by integrating key transport routes, improving connectivity, and supporting the development of a more efficient, accessible, and inclusive transport network for low-income, transport-dependent communities.

8.3.	Explain what social initiatives will be implemented by applicant to address the needs of the community and to uplift the area.

Initiatives to be implemented would include prioritising local labour during the construction phase to create short-term employment opportunities, sourcing goods and services from local small and medium enterprises where feasible, and implementing skills transfer programmes for workers. The applicant may also establish a stakeholder engagement process to ensure ongoing communication with affected residents and community representatives.

In addition, road safety awareness measures and temporary traffic management plans will be implemented to protect pedestrians and road users during construction. Where possible, rehabilitation of disturbed areas with indigenous vegetation will contribute to environmental enhancement and community well-being.

Interpretive signage should be installed to highlight the ecological value of the adjacent wetlands and CBA 1a indigenous vegetation, promote community stewardship and discourage further degradation.

8.4.	Explain whether the proposed development will impact on people's health and well-being (e.g. in terms of noise, odours, visual character and sense of place etc) and how has this influenced the proposed development.

The proposed roundabout at Baden Powell Drive and Macassar Road is unlikely to have significant long-term adverse impacts on the health and well-being of the surrounding community. During construction, temporary impacts may occur, including noise, dust, and increased traffic congestion, which could cause minor disruptions to residents, pedestrians, and informal traders. Measures such as dust suppression, controlled construction hours, and traffic management will be implemented to minimise these impacts.

Odours are not expected to be an issue, as the development does not involve waste or chemical processing. The visual character and sense of place are likely to improve, as the

roundabout will provide a safer and more organised transport environment, replacing potentially chaotic intersection conditions.

The design and planning of the roundabout have taken these considerations into account, ensuring the layout promotes safe traffic flow, pedestrian crossings, and clear sightlines, while temporary construction impacts are mitigated to protect local residents' health and well-being.

SECTION H: ALTERNATIVES, METHODOLOGY AND ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

1. Details of the alternatives identified and considered

1.1.	Property and site alternatives to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

Provide a description of the preferred property and site alternative.

Alternatives considered

Regulatory framework for the assessment of alternatives

The assessment of alternatives for the proposed project has been undertaken in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NEMA Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (Government Notice R.982 in Government Gazette No. 38282, 4 December 2014, as amended by GN R.326 in GG 40772 of 7 April 2017), read with Regulation 1 which defines "alternatives" in relation to a proposed activity as different means of meeting the general purpose and requirements of the activity. The six categories of alternatives contemplated by the Regulations are the property or location on which the activity is undertaken, the type of activity to be undertaken, the design or layout of the activity, the technology to be used, the operational aspects of the activity, and the option of not implementing the activity (the no-go alternative).

The DEA&DP *Guideline on Need and Desirability* (March 2013) and the companion DEA&DP *Guideline on Alternatives* (March 2013) have been applied in working through each of these six categories, and the feasibility of each has been tested against the project purpose, the engineering constraints of the site, the environmental sensitivities of the surrounding land, and the applicable policy context.

The conclusion of that assessment, set out below, is that only one feasible and reasonable engineering alternative exists for the upgrade of the Baden Powell Drive / Macassar Road intersection, and that the Preferred Alternative has therefore been carried forward into the impact assessment alongside the No-Go Alternative in line with regulatory requirements.
Only two alternatives are assessed in this BAR and associated specialist studies, namely:

1. Alternative 1: Preferred Alternative: Traffic Circle with landscaping, including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
2. Alternative 2: The proposed traffic circle with additional lanes as per alternative 1, but with the center island concrete and impermeable
3. Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative.

Location and site alternatives

The need being addressed by the project is intersection-specific: the safety, congestion, public-transport-reliability and emergency-services-routing deficiencies occur at this specific intersection of Baden Powell Drive (R310) with Macassar Road and Japhta K Masemola Road. Relocating the intersection to a different position along the R310 corridor would not address the identified need, would require extensive additional land acquisition, and would introduce new environmental impacts on land that is currently undisturbed. The intersection is also bounded on all four quadrants by committed land uses — the Zandvliet Wastewater Treatment Works to the south-east, informal residential settlement in Khayelitsha to the south-west, and undeveloped Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (classified as CBA 1a under the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan, CapeNature, 2023) to the north-east and north-west, which eliminates any realistic option of providing a second, parallel intersection nearby. Location alternatives are therefore not feasible for this project.

Provide a description of any other property and site alternatives investigated.
Not applicable as no property and site alternatives are feasible.
Provide a motivation for the preferred property and site alternative including the outcome of the site selectin matrix.
Motivation provided above.
Provide a full description of the process followed to reach the preferred alternative within the site.
Full description is provided above.
Provide a detailed motivation if no property and site alternatives were considered.
Provided above.
List the positive and negative impacts that the property and site alternatives will have on the environment.
Not applicable as there are no alternatives.

1.2.	Activity alternatives to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

Provide a description of the preferred activity alternative.

The purpose of the project is to upgrade the geometric configuration of an existing intersection in order to improve safety, capacity and public-transport and NMT functionality. Alternative activities that the proposed project is responding to the present needs of the development site for alleviation of congestion, improved traffic flow and improved safety for existing road users.

Provide a description of any other activity alternatives investigated.

No other activity alternatives were investigated as explained above.

Provide a motivation for the preferred activity alternative.

Not applicable as there no alternatives.

Provide a detailed motivation if no activity alternatives exist.

As stated above, options were considered in the finalisation of the project proposal. No alternative activities could be investigated as they would not result in the implementation of the proposal.

List the positive and negative impacts that the activity alternatives will have on the environment.

Not applicable as there are no activity alternatives.

1.3.	Design or layout alternatives to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts

Provide a description of the preferred design or layout alternative.

Design and layout alternatives

In addition the above, the layout that met the engineering design standards while keeping the works largely confined to the existing road reserve: a two-lane at-grade roundabout with an inscribed-circle diameter of 44 to 45 m, a truck apron to accommodate articulated vehicles, and formalised block-crossings on all four approaches, was the only option that satisfied the joint safety, capacity, environmental and cost requirements of the project.

The preferred layout alternative for the Baden Powell Roundabout is **Alternatives 1 and Alternatives 2**, which is in the form of a single point interchange (Appendix B1).

The other layout options were not considered reasonable and feasible given the context of the adjacent existing land uses.

Provide a description of any other design or layout alternatives investigated.

No other design or layout alternatives were identified.

Provide a motivation for the preferred design or layout alternative.

The preferred design is proposed as it will improve traffic flow and enhance road safety at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. The roundabout layout allows for more efficient movement of vehicles from all directions while reducing congestion and the likelihood of accidents. It also provides improved accessibility and accommodates future traffic demand associated with surrounding developments.

Provide a detailed motivation if no design or layout alternatives exist.

No design or layout alternatives were considered as the proposed roundabout is the most suitable solution to improve traffic flow and safety at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road. The design accommodates existing and future traffic volumes while reducing congestion and improving road safety.

List the positive and negative impacts that the design alternatives will have on the environment.

As stated above, Alternative 1 was developed to improve traffic flow, road safety, and accessibility at the intersection. However, the development may result in temporary negative impacts during construction, including noise, dust, traffic disruptions, and the clearing of vegetation within the development footprint.

1.4.	Technology alternatives (e.g., to reduce resource demand and increase resource use efficiency) to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

Provide a description of the preferred technology alternative:

While no specific technology alternatives were identified as part of the assessment, the EMPr encourages the use of alternative lighting to mitigate impacts on nocturnal species, e.g. use of downward-shielded, full-cut-off luminaires to minimise light spill outside the road reserve.

Provide a description of any other technology alternatives investigated.
Not applicable as no technology alternatives are currently proposed.
Provide a motivation for the preferred technology alternative.
Not applicable as no technology alternatives are currently proposed.
Provide a detailed motivation if no alternatives exist.
As stated above, the alternatives are focussed on the layout of the alignment of the interchange and no technology alternatives are proposed.
List the positive and negative impacts that the technology alternatives will have on the environment.
Not applicable as there are no technology alternatives.

1.5.	Operational alternatives to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts.

Provide a description of the preferred operational alternative.
Operational alternatives for a public-road project are limited in nature, since a road, once constructed, operates continuously and is managed by the relevant roads authority under established road-traffic law. No Operational Alternatives are therefore assessed.
Provide a description of any other operational alternatives investigated.
Not applicable as no operational phase alternatives were investigated.
Provide a motivation for the preferred operational alternative.
Not applicable as no operational phase alternatives were investigated.
Provide a detailed motivation if no alternatives exist.
As stated above, no operational alternatives have been investigated for the proposed development. The preferred operation alternative is the use of the construction of Baden Powell, Macassar Roundabout once the construction is complete. As the development is a road and associated infrastructure, its primary and only use during the operational phase will be for road users to drive on. The primary difference between the existing road infrastructure and the proposed road infrastructure is that it will be improved in terms of the accommodation and operation of private vehicles, public transport facilities and non-motorised traffic, safer, and

more efficient, providing commuters with access to improved public transport and reducing their travelling time.

List the positive and negative impacts that the operational alternatives will have on the environment.

Not applicable as there are no operational alternatives.

1.6.	The option of not implementing the activity (the 'No-Go' Option).

Provide an explanation as to why the 'No-Go' Option is not preferred.

The **No-Go Alternative** represents the baseline scenario in which the proposed upgrade is not implemented and the existing priority-controlled intersection remains in operation in its current configuration. The existing safety, congestion, public-transport and emergency-services deficiencies at the intersection would persist and would worsen over time as traffic volumes on the R310 corridor grow. The strategic objectives of the *National Development Plan 2030*, the *Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework*, the City of Cape Town *Integrated Development Plan 2022–2027* and the City's *Comprehensive Integrated Transport Plan* would not be advanced at this location. The No-Go Alternative is therefore carried through to the impact assessment and is described in the Section H impact tables alongside the Preferred Alternative.

1.7.	Provide and explanation as to whether any other alternatives to avoid negative impacts, mitigate unavoidable negative impacts and maximise positive impacts, or detailed motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist.

The assessment identified reasonable mitigation measures to avoid or limit impacts associated with the proposed project.

1.8.	Provide a concluding statement indicating the preferred alternatives, including the preferred location of the activity.

On the basis of the systematic consideration of all six categories of alternatives defined in Regulation 1 of the 2014 EIA Regulations, only one feasible engineering alternative exists for the upgrade of the Baden Powell Drive / Macassar Road intersection. The three alternatives assessed in this BAR and associated specialist studies, are:

1. **Alternative 1: Preferred Alternative**: **Landscaped Traffic Circle** including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
2. **Alternative 2: Paved Traffic Circle** including two circulatory lanes, with all four approaches to the roundabout upgraded to two lanes per approach.
3. **Alternative 3: No-Go Alternative**.

These three alternatives are assessed in Section H of this BAR. **Given that Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are identical in terms of footprint, they have been assessed together. However, in the instances where the impact differs, specification is made in the impact table.**

2. "No-Go" areas

Explain what "no-go" area(s) have been identified during identification of the alternatives and provide the co-ordinates of the "no-go" area(s).

Although some infilling of the wetlands adjacent to Baden Powell Macassar drive will occur, disturbance of these areas will not be permitted beyond the construction limits of the proposed road extension. This also applies to the CBA1a areas of botanical sensitivity north-east of the traffic circle.

As per the freshwater specialist's recommendations, construction disturbance for the road reserve clearing through wetlands should be limited to a maximum of 10m beyond the closest hard edge of the (new) road footprint. Any area outside this is to be treated as a no-go area.

3. Methodology to determine the significance ratings of the potential environmental impacts and risks associated with the alternatives.

Describe the methodology to be used in determining and ranking the nature, significance, consequences, extent, duration of the potential environmental impacts and risks associated with the proposed activity or development and alternatives, the degree to which the impact or risk can be reversed and the degree to which the impact and risk may cause irreplaceable loss of resources.

All identified positive and negative impacts are based on the general approach to impact significance assessment applied in South Africa (Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism 2002 and the requirements for impact assessment in the 2017 Amendments of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (DEA GNR 326, 2017). Impacts are ranked and scored in terms of the following assessment criteria (Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP): (1) Extent: spatial scale of the impact; (2) Significance: rank of the impact; (3) Duration: time scale of the impact; 4) Reversibility: degree to which the outcome can be reversed; and (5) Probability: of the impact occurrence; (6) Loss of Resources: degree of loss; (7) Cumulative impacts: combination of impacts over time and space (Table 2).

Table 1: Impact Assessment Rating Methodology

Extent (Scale):

Site Specific	The impact is limited to the development site (development footprint) or part thereof.
Local	The impacted area includes the whole or a measurable portion of the site, but could affect the area surrounding the development, including the neighbouring properties and wider

	municipal area.
Regional	The impact would affect the broader region (e.g. neighbouring towns) beyond the boundaries of the adjacent properties.
National	The impact would affect the whole country (if applicable).

Duration:

Temporary	The impact will be limited to part of the construction phase or less than one month.
Short term	The impact will continue for the duration of the construction phase, or less than one year.
Medium term	The impact will continue for part the operational phase
Long term	The impact will continue for the entire operational lifetime of the development but will be mitigated by direct human action or by natural processes thereafter.
Permanent	This is the only class of impact that will be non-transitory. Such impacts are regarded to be irreversible, irrespective of what mitigation is applied.

Probability:

Improbable	The possibility of the impact occurring is very low, due either to the circumstances, design or experience.
Probable	There is a possibility that the impact will occur to the extent that provisions must therefore be made.
Highly probable	It is most likely that the impacts will occur at some stage of the development. Plans must be drawn up to mitigate the activity before the activity commences.
Definite	The impact will take place regardless of any prevention plans.

Significance (without mitigation):

No significance	The impact is not substantial and does not require any mitigation action.
Low	The impact is of little importance, but may require limited mitigation.
Medium	The impact is of sufficient importance and is therefore considered to have a negative impact. Mitigation is required to reduce the negative impacts to acceptable levels.
Medium-High	The impact is of high importance and is therefore considered to have a negative impact. Mitigation is required to manage the negative impacts to acceptable levels.
High	The impact is of great importance. Failure to mitigate, with the objective of reducing the impact to acceptable levels, could render the entire development option or entire project proposal unacceptable. Mitigation is therefore essential.
Very High	The impact is critical. Mitigation measures cannot reduce the impact to acceptable levels. As such the impact renders the proposal unacceptable.

Determination of Significance (with mitigation):

No significance	The impact will be mitigated to the point where it is regarded to be insubstantial.
Low	The impact will be mitigated to the point where it is of limited importance.
Medium	Notwithstanding the successful implementation of the mitigation measures, the impact will remain of significance. However, taken within the overall context of the project, such a persistent impact does not constitute a fatal flaw.
High	Mitigation of the impact is not possible on a cost-effective basis. The impact continues to be of great importance, and, taken within the overall context of the project, is considered to be a fatal flaw in the project proposal.

Reversibility:

Completely Reversible	The impact is reversible with implementation of minor mitigation measures
Partly Reversible	The impact is partly reversible but more intense mitigation measures
Barely Reversible	The impact is unlikely to be reversed even with intense mitigation measures
Irreversible	The impact is irreversible, and no mitigation measures exist

Degree to which an Impact can be Mitigated:

High	The impact can be completely mitigated
Moderate	The impact can be partly mitigated
Low	It is possible to mitigate the impact only slightly
Very low	It is not possible to mitigate the impacts

Loss of Resources:

No loss of resource	The impact will not result in the loss of any resources
Marginal loss of resource	The impact will result in marginal loss of resources
Significant loss of resources	The impact will result in significant loss of resources
Complete loss of resources	The impact will result in a complete loss of all resources

Determination of Cumulative Impact:

Negligible	The impact would result in negligible to no cumulative effects
Low	The impact would result in insignificant cumulative effects
Medium	The impact would result in minor cumulative effects
High	The impact would result in significant cumulative effects

PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Activities associated with the proposed project that may result in potential biophysical, socio-economic or heritage impacts are listed below.

Construction phase

1. Site establishment, including the site camp, no-go fencing, relocation or protection of affected service infrastructure.
2. Potential relocation of informal dwellings from the project footprint.
3. Clearing of indigenous vegetation and stripping of topsoil within the approved construction footprint.
4. Bulk earthworks, including cut-to-fill operations and the import of fill material.
5. Demolition of the existing intersection infrastructure (kerbs, channels, signage, markings, traffic signals).
6. Stormwater and wetland-interface works, including installation of pipes, catchpits and culverts and any infilling or reshaping of the wetland edge.

7. Roadworks, including layerworks, asphalt paving, kerbing and construction of the central island, truck apron and pedestrian facilities.
8. Installation of road furniture (signage, street lighting, traffic signals and NMT infrastructure).
9. Operation of construction plant and haulage of materials, together with traffic accommodation (lane closures, detours and pedestrian diversions).
10. Storage, handling and disposal of fuels, chemicals, concrete and construction-and-demolition waste.

Operational phase

11. Routine use of the upgraded intersection and maintenance of the pavement, stormwater system, lighting, signage and verges.

Decommissioning phase

12. Removal of the road infrastructure and rehabilitation of the disturbed footprint (not anticipated within the design life; however, addressed in the EMPr).

POTENTIAL IMPACTS ASSESSED

The following potential impacts have been identified for **Alternative 1 (Preferred): Landscaped Traffic Circle; Alternative 2: Paved traffic Circle and Alternative 3: No-Go Alternative**, all of which may result in potential impacts on the natural biophysical environment, socio-economic and heritage environment, in the three project phases: (1) Demolition and construction phase, (2) operational phase and (3) demolition phase.

Given that Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are identical in terms of footprint, they have been assessed together. However, in the instances where the impact differs, specification is made in the impact table.

The following impacts have been identified and assessed for the proposed roundabout development at the intersection of Baden Powell Drive, Japhta K. Masemola Road and Macassar Road.

CONSTRUCTION PHASE IMPACTS (13 IMPACTS IDENTIFIED)

Potential Biophysical Impacts - Terrestrial Biodiversity

1. Potential displacement and mortality of fauna
2. Potential loss of degraded / highly-degraded indigenous Strandveld vegetation (construction)
3. Potential spread of invasive alien plants into the CBA

Potential Biophysical Impacts Freshwater Ecology

4. Potential wetland habitat loss (direct infilling and footprint encroachment)

5. Potential wetland habitat disturbance (edge effects)
6. Potential erosion, sedimentation and altered surface-water flow to the wetland
7. Potential water-quality impairment (sediment, cement, hydrocarbons, wastewater)
8. Potential loss of wetland biota

Potential Socio-economic Impacts

9. Potential traffic congestion and non-motorised-transport (NMT) safety risks during construction
10. Potential nuisance to adjacent residents and businesses (dust, noise, vibration, access)
11. Potential short-term employment and SMME procurement opportunities (positive)
12. Potential relocation of informal dwellers from the proposed road reserve

Potential Heritage and palaeontological resources impacts

13. Potential chance-find disturbance to heritage or palaeontological resources

OPERATIONAL PHASE IMPACTS (7 IMPACTS IDENTIFIED)

Potential Biophysical Impacts - Terrestrial Biodiversity

14. Potential fragmentation of ecological connectivity across the CBA
15. Potential nuisance lighting effects on nocturnal biodiversity

Potential Biophysical Impacts Freshwater Ecology

16. Potential alteration of the wetland flow regime from increased impervious surface
17. Potential wetland habitat disturbance

Potential Socio-economic impacts

18. Potential improved road safety for all users (positive)
19. Potential improved traffic flow, travel time and public-transport reliability (positive)
20. Potential stimulation of broader economic activity and investment along the R310 corridor (positive)

DECOMMISSIONING PHASE IMPACTS

Decommissioning of the road facility is not foreseen within its design life; impacts are treated as a single grouped item for completeness and addressed through the rehabilitation provisions of the EMPr.

21. Potential disturbance, waste generation and rehabilitation opportunities associated with eventual decommissioning and site rehabilitation

4. Assessment of each impact and risk identified for each alternative

Note: The following table serves as a guide for summarising each alternative. The table should be repeated for each alternative to ensure a comparative assessment. The EAP may decide to include this section as Appendix J to this BAR.

ASSESSMENT OF CONSTRUCTION PHASE IMPACTS

1. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential displacement and mortality of fauna		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and/ risk	Vegetation clearance and earthworks may displace or kill low-mobility fauna (reptiles, small mammals, invertebrates, ground-nesting birds) within the footprint.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Fauna assemblage is limited by existing ecological degradation, traffic and urban pressures.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Marginal loss of resource.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Partly Reversible. Mobile fauna are expected to re-establish post-construction; killed fauna cannot be recovered.	Not applicable

1. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential displacement and mortality of fauna		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Undertake pre-clearance walk-through by an ECO or suitably qualified ecologist to relocate any fauna found. - Clear vegetation progressively in one direction to allow mobile fauna to move away rather than be trapped. - No night-time construction where feasible, to avoid impacts on nocturnal species. - Implement speed restrictions for construction vehicles when site clearing indigenous vegetation (10-20km/h). - Implement worker training, briefing on prohibiting harming, collecting or feeding of any fauna encountered on site.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	No significance with mitigation in place.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

2. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Loss of degraded / highly-degraded indigenous Strandveld vegetation (construction)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Clearance of road-reserve vegetation classified as Degraded to Highly Degraded Strandveld (>300 m² of nationally Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld). Project footprint is outside of the CoCT Terrestrial Biodiversity Network; adjacent CBA 1a on Farm RE/547.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Vegetation in the footprint is already Degraded to Highly Degraded and likely to have worsened since 2014–2021 surveys.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Definite	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Marginal loss of resource. Footprint excluded from CBA; specialist opinion is that no significant impact on ecological functioning is expected.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Barely Reversible	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Pre-construction botanical walk-down by a qualified specialist to confirm no *Erepsia dunensis* or other SCC occur within the final	Not applicable

2. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Loss of degraded / highly-degraded indigenous Strandveld vegetation (construction)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	footprint (only recorded SCC on Farm RE/547 has a buffer that does not intersect the works). - Restrict clearance strictly to the demarcated footprint; no clearance in the adjacent CBA 1a on Farm RE/547. - Implement search-and-rescue / relocation of any SCC identified during the walk-down.	
Residual impacts	No significance. Residual loss is limited to a small area of already-degraded vegetation.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

3. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential spread of invasive alien plants into the adjacent CBA**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Soil disturbance, imported fill and vehicle movement could introduce or spread declared invasive alien plants (NEMBA Category 1a/1b/2) from the footprint into the adjacent CBA 1a on Farm RE/547 and the remnant wetland edge.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low to medium consequence, dependent on fill sources, housekeeping and follow-up maintenance.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable

3. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential spread of invasive alien plants into the adjacent CBA		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Marginal loss of resource. Adjacent CBA is at risk of incremental degradation rather than outright loss	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Partly Reversible. Invasives can be cleared, but re-infestation is likely without follow-up	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Source imported soil, fill and aggregate from reputable suppliers and inspect loads for visible weed propagules before use. - Clean construction vehicles, plant and boots before entering and leaving site to limit seed transport. - Contractor's Method Statement to include an Invasive Alien Plant management protocol aligned with NEMBA regulations.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	No significance with mitigation in place.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very Low (-)**	Not applicable

4. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Wetland direct habitat loss (~2 000 m²)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Loss of approximately 2 000 m² of fragmented depression-wetland habitat along the widened northern approach on Baden Powell Drive. PES Category F (critically modified); EIS Low/marginal (EnviroSwift).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Wetland is critically modified with almost complete loss of natural habitat and aquatic biota; residual rated Low (-) by EnviroSwift and no biodiversity offset is required.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Definite	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Marginal loss of resource. The critically modified wetland is unlikely to be associated with irreplaceable biodiversity (EnviroSwift, 2026).	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Irreversible	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Medium (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Low	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Limit clearance strictly to the engineering footprint. - No encroachment beyond demarcated construction limits. - No encroachment beyond construction camp site.	Not applicable

4. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Wetland direct habitat loss (~2 000 m²)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Residual impacts	Low. Loss of ~2 000 m² of critically modified wetland habitat.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

5. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Wetland habitat disturbance**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Vehicle movement, machinery operation and placement of materials within the immediate catchment cause compaction, vegetation damage and sedimentation risk in the adjacent wetland (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence — wetland is already critically modified with limited natural habitat or aquatic biota remaining.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource — no irreplaceable biodiversity associated with the disturbed wetland.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Reversible	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High (-)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Medium (-)**	**Not applicable**

5. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Wetland habitat disturbance**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate — disturbance-causing activities can be located away from sensitive habitat.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate — activities causing disturbance can be contained.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate — disturbed areas can be partially restored through rehabilitation.	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Declare the wetland area west of Baden Powell Drive a No-Go area for construction personnel, vehicles, machinery and materials. - Access only by written ECO authorisation on the basis of an approved Method Statement. - Daily ECO inspection of the No-Go area — immediate removal of any rubble, spoil or litter that enters it. - Contain upslope run-off and stockpiles so water infiltrates rather than discharging into the wetland.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	No significance — with mitigation implemented, disturbance is insignificant.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Moderate (-)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

6. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Erosion and sedimentation		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two-lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Exposed soils from clearing, excavation and infilling erode during rainfall and deposit sediment into the inwardly draining receiving wetland (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Small scale of works; wetland is inwardly draining so no off-site sedimentation.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable. During winter rains when cleared areas and stockpiles are most vulnerable.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource. No irreplaceable biodiversity at risk.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Completely Reversible — sediment can be removed and eroded areas stabilised.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate — undertaking works in the dry summer season would largely avoid the impact.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Schedule earthworks for the dry summer season where practicable. - No stockpiles west of Baden Powell Drive; only use the ECO-approved stockpile sites, protected	Not applicable

6. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Erosion and sedimentation		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two-lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	with tarps / erosion blankets in the wet season. - Install straw bales, silt fences or sediment traps to divert and settle run-off before discharge off-site. - Implement weekly ECO inspection through the wet season plus post-storm inspections after heavy rainfall.	
Residual impacts	No significance. With mitigation implemented, erosion and sedimentation is insignificant.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very low (-)**	**Not applicable**

7. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Water-quality impairment (cement, fuels, litter, turbid runoff)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Possible release of cement, bitumen, paints, solvents, fuels or wash-water into run-off that reports to the adjacent wetland. The intersection sits above and close to the wetland (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Small scale of works; with mitigation, intensity reduces further.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource. Critically modified wetland unlikely to be associated with irreplaceable biodiversity.	Not applicable

7. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Water-quality impairment (cement, fuels, litter, turbid runoff)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Irreversible. Contaminants entering the wetland cannot be recovered.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Moderate (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Cement mixing only within bunded, impermeable areas; daily removal of all wet/dry cement residues. - Store fuel, chemicals and hazardous substances in bunded, weather-proof containers located at least 50 m from any wetland. - Daily inspection of storage facilities and vehicles for leaks. - Immediate clean-up of spillages, with contaminated soil removed to a licensed waste facility — no stockpiling of contaminated soil on site. - Portable toilets located at least 10 m from the wetland and regularly serviced. - No discharge of any wash-water, cement slurry or construction effluent into the wetland.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	No significance — with mitigation implemented, water-quality impairment is insignificant.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

8. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Loss of Biota**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Mortality or displacement of aquatic and semi-aquatic biota could occur from infilling, crushing by vehicles, inappropriate placement of machinery/materials, or contaminated run-off (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Wetland already critically modified; limited surviving biota expected to be present.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource. No irreplaceable biodiversity associated with the wetland.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Irreversible — killed individuals cannot be recovered; mobile biota are expected to return post-construction.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Demarcate the wetland west of Baden Powell Drive as a No-Go area prior to site establishment; maintain it for the duration of construction. - Avoid all activity inside the wetland No-Go area. - No parking of construction vehicles, storage of machinery or siting of stockpiles west of Baden Powell Drive.	Not applicable

8. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Loss of Biota**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Residual impacts	No significance. With mitigation implemented, biota loss is insignificant.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very low (-)**	**Not applicable**

9. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential traffic congestion and NMT safety risks during construction		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Lane closures, detours and construction vehicle movements on a busy arterial (Baden Powell Drive / R310) is expected to cause congestion and potentially pose crash or pedestrian-safety risks during the works. The site carries significant pedestrian volumes from Khayelitsha.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Medium consequence. Arterial carries high commuter and school-going pedestrian volumes.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Highly probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Completely Reversible. Restored on project completion.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Medium (-)	Not applicable

8. **CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Loss of Biota**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	High	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Prepare a Construction Traffic Management Plan (TMP) for approval by the CoCT Transport Directorate prior to site establishment. - Phase works to keep at least one lane open per direction on Baden Powell Drive during peak periods. - Provide clearly marked, illuminated temporary pedestrian bypass routes with traffic marshals at peak times. - Advance public notification (at least 14 days) of lane closures, detours and expected delays through the City and local media. - Liaise with minibus-taxi operators and bus services to ensure temporary stop locations remain usable. - Reduce construction speed limits on site and for haul routes; and implement flagmen at critical points.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Low — some residual disruption during works.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable

10. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential nuisance to adjacent residents and businesses (dust, noise, vibration, access)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Dust, noise, vibration, lights and access disruption from contruction are likey to affect residents of Khayelitsha and Macassar, informal traders along the verges, and businesses dependent on the corridor.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Nuisance is localised (typically within 100–200 m) and time-bound.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Completely Reversible. Ends with construction.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Medium (-)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	High	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	High	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Restrict noisy activities to weekdays 07h00–17h00 (SANS 10103 guidance); no night works unless authorised by the City for safety-critical reasons. - Implement dust-suppression measures (wetting, covered loads, wheel-wash) particularly in the dry summer months.	Not applicable

10. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential nuisance to adjacent residents and businesses (dust, noise, vibration, access)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	- Implement vibration monitoring for any piling or heavy compaction within 50 m of residential structures. - Maintain safe pedestrian and vehicular access to all adjacent properties and informal trading locations at all times. - Grievance mechanism: signposted hotline for complaints, with a 48-hour response commitment; log all complaints in the ECO register. - Ensure daily site housekeeping and remove construction debris, litter and spoil from public areas promptly.	
Residual impacts	No significance.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	Not applicable

11. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential short-term employment and SMME procurement opportunities (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Construction phase generates semi-skilled and unskilled employment and subcontracting opportunities for local SMMEs, particularly from Khayelitsha and Macassar.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Positive (+)	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low to medium consequence. Meaningful at the individual / household scale, modest at the metro scale.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Definite.	Not applicable

11. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential short-term employment and SMME procurement opportunities (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource (positive impact).	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Not applicable (positive impact).	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation/enhancement	**Low (+)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Not applicable (positive impact — to be enhanced).	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	High (via procurement conditions and community liaison).	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Apply the CoCT Preferential Procurement Policy and CIDB subcontracting targets, with preferencing for local labour and SMMEs registered in Khayelitsha / Macassar wards. - Partner with local ward councillors / community liaison officers to publicise recruitment opportunities transparently. - Provide short-course skills training (e.g. plant operation, health and safety) to uplift workers beyond the life of the contract.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Medium — enhanced via procurement and local-labour conditions.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Medium (+)**	**Not applicable**

12. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential chance-find disturbance to heritage or palaeontological resources		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Excavation in previously disturbed road-reserve soils could encounter unrecorded archaeological, burial or palaeontological material. The site has been repeatedly disturbed; likelihood is low.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Site Specific and permanent (for any disturbed material)	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Improbable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Marginal loss of resource	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Irreversible	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	High (through chance-finds protocol and immediate stop-work)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	High	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	High	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Include a formal Chance-Finds Protocol in the EMPr: stop work immediately; secure the find; notify the ECO and Heritage Western Cape (HWC) within 24 hours. - Implement induction briefing to all site personnel on recognising archaeological, burial, cultural and fossil finds. - On confirmation of a find, suspend work in the affected area until a permit	Not applicable

12. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential chance-find disturbance to heritage or palaeontological resources		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	or letter of exemption is issued by HWC / SAHRA, and a specialist has assessed the material. - Document and retain all correspondence and permits in the project environmental record.	
Residual impacts	No significance	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very Low (-)**	Not applicable

1. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Relocation of Informal Dwellers from the Proposed Road Reserve		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Social disruption associated with relocation of informal dwellers currently occupying the proposed road reserve. This may include temporary loss of shelter, disruption of livelihoods, and psychological stress during the transition period.	No relocation required as the road is not developed and the existing informal settlement remains in place.
Nature of impact:	Negative	No change
Extent and duration of impact:	Medium-term during relocation and settlement process until households are established in alternative accommodation.	No change
Consequence of impact or risk:	Medium – potential disruption to community stability, access to services, and livelihoods if relocation is not adequately planned and supported.	Status quo retained.
Probability of occurrence	Definite	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Partly reversible through proper resettlement planning, compensation,	Not applicable

1. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Relocation of Informal Dwellers from the Proposed Road Reserve		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	and/or provision of alternative housing or serviced sites.	
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation/enhancement	Medium	Medium
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Medium (-)	Low (-)
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced	Low	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Implement a fair and transparent relocation plan in consultation with affected households. - Provide adequate alternative accommodation or serviced sites before relocation occurs. - Ensure access to basic services (water, sanitation, electricity) at relocation sites. - Provide livelihood support or transport access where relocation may affect employment opportunities. - Engage in ongoing stakeholder communication with affected residents and community representatives.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Medium. Realised alongside other corridor investments.	No significance
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Medium

1. CONSTRUCTION PHASE: Potential Relocation of Informal Dwellers from the Proposed Road Reserve		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	Low - Medium (-)	Low (-)

ASSESSMENT OF OPERATIONAL PHASE IMPACTS

2. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential fragmentation of ecological connectivity across the CBA		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Widening of the Baden Powell Drive / Macassar Road road reserve at the existing intersection will incrementally increase the footprint of the existing linear barrier that lies alongside CBA 1a on Farm RE/547.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Fragmentation already exists via the existing roads.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Moderate	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low	Not applicable

2. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential fragmentation of ecological connectivity across the CBA**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Low	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Restrict the construction footprint to the existing road reserve on the eastern side. Demarcate the eastern road-reserve boundary with star-pickets and safety webbing before any construction commences; treat as a no-go area. - Prohibit storage of materials, laydown, refuelling, or ablutions within 10 m of the eastern road-reserve boundary (i.e. adjacent to CBA 1a). - Use only indigenous, locally appropriate (non-invasive) species in any post-construction roadside landscaping, in line with the adjacent Cape Flats Dune Strandveld habitat. - Install "Protected Area / CBA / no encroachment" signage at intervals along the eastern roadside to discourage further informal encroachment from the verge into Farm RE/547. - Confirm, via a pre-construction walk-down, the absence of *Erepsia dunensis* and other SCC in the narrow strip closest to the CBA boundary (as per Nicolson, 2026). If present, translocate to the CBA polygon on Farm RE/547. - Environmental Control Officer (ECO) to include the eastern construction edge in every twice-monthly site inspection; non-conformances to be raised immediately.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low (adds marginally to an existing severance caused by the existing Baden Powell Drive)	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very Low (-)**	Not applicable

3. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential nuisance lighting effects on nocturnal species**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Intersection and street lighting may disorient and displace nocturnal fauna (bats, owls, moths, amphibians) and affect pollinator behaviour at the wetland and CBA edge.	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Area already lit to an extent by existing road lighting and adjacent settlement.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Barely Reversible.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Low (-)	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Where possible, utilise downward-shielded, full-cut-off luminaires to minimise light spill outside the road reserve. - Use warm-white or amber LEDs (≤ 3000 K) lighting which is less disruptive to nocturnal biodiversity than cool-white LEDs.	Not applicable

3. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential nuisance lighting effects on nocturnal species**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
	- Design to SANS 10098 / relevant CCT lighting standards without exceeding recommended lux levels. - Minimise luminaires directed towards the adjacent wetland and CBA edge; use back-shields or re-aiming where unavoidable.	
Residual impacts	No significance to Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Very Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

4. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential Alteration of wetland flow regime**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Additional hard surfacing from the widened intersection is expected to increase run-off volume and discharges into the adjacent depression wetland (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Small additional impervious area; inwardly-draining wetland.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource. Critically modified wetland unlikely to be associated with irreplaceable biodiversity.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Partly Reversible. Flows can be re-engineered in principle, but not practicable in this context.	Not applicable

4. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential Alteration of wetland flow regime**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Medium	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low. Increased run-off from hard surfacing is largely unavoidable.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate. Run-off can, in principle, be contained and attenuated.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Very low. No practicable on-site mitigation (EnviroSwift, 2026): attenuation ponds cannot reasonably be accommodated given space constraints and rapid on-going wetland loss.	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Ensure that waste disposal bin are available at pedestrian crossing and public transport stops to prevent contamination of nearby wetlands.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Low	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

5. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential Wetland habitat disturbance**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Ongoing hydrocarbon spills, litter, illegal dumping, traffic noise and wildlife poaching associated with operation of the intersection and pedestrian use along Baden Powell Drive (EnviroSwift, 2026).	No construction would take place. Status quo retained.
Nature of impact:	Negative	Not applicable
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long term	Not applicable

5. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential Wetland habitat disturbance**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Consequence of impact or risk:	Low consequence. Wetland already critically modified.	Not applicable
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	No loss of resource.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Barely Reversible. Once disturbance has occurred it cannot readily be reversed.	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low. Habitat disturbance from infrastructure operation is largely unavoidable.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated	Moderate	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Implement signage and pedestrian-management measures to direct pedestrian movement onto the formalised crossings rather than through wetland remnants. - Install interpretive signage to highlight the ecological value of the adjacent wetlands and CBA 1a indigenous vegetation, promote community stewardship and discourage further degradation.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact post mitigation	High	Not applicable
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Low (-)**	**Not applicable**

6. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential improved road safety for all users (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Two-lane roundabout with formalised block pedestrian crossings on all four legs, improved stops and public transport (PT) upgrades reduce potential crash severity (particularly right-angle and right-turn crashes) and improve pedestrian crossing safety compared with the existing priority-controlled intersection.	Status quo retained. Existing priority-controlled intersection continues, with associated crash and pedestrian-safety risk profile.
Nature of impact:	Positive	Negative
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and long term	Regional and long term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Medium to high consequence. Roundabouts consistently reduce fatal and serious-injury crashes relative to priority-controlled intersections.	Ongoing crash and pedestrian-safety risk at a high-volume arterial intersection.
Probability of occurrence	Definite	Definite
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Not applicable (positive impact).	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Not applicable (positive impact).	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation/enhancement	Medium	Medium
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation/enhancement	Medium (+)	Medium (-)
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Not applicable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	High. Via design standards and on-going maintenance.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhances	Moderate	Not applicable

6. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential improved road safety for all users (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Proposed mitigation	- Implement adequate signage, road markings and illumination to support driver recognition and safe negotiation of the roundabout. - Ensure regular maintenance of lane markings, signage and lighting over the design life. - Ensure that pedestrian-crossing lighting meet CCT standards for pedestrian-scale visibility.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	High	Medium. Existing crash/pedestrian-safety risks persist.
Cumulative impact post mitigation	High	Medium
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	High (+)	Medium (-)

7. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential improved traffic flow, travel time and Public Transport (PT) reliability (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Continuous-flow operation of the roundabout is expected to reduce delays on Japhta K Masemola and Macassar Road approaches, enable safer right turns, and support more reliable minibus-taxi and bus operations via formalised stops.	Existing delays retained; right-turn and crossing movements remain constrained; PT reliability unchanged.
Nature of impact:	Positive	Negative
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and long term	Regional and long term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Medium consequence. Noticeable reduction in peak-period delay at the intersection.	Continued peak-period delay and constrained movements.

7. **OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential improved traffic flow, travel time and Public Transport (PT) reliability (POSITIVE)**		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Probability of occurrence	Definite	Definite
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Not applicable.	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation	Medium	Low
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Medium (+)	Medium (-)
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced	Low	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	- Implement public transport stop design, pedestrian access and signage fit for purpose and maintain it over the design life.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Medium. Reliable improvement retained with adequate maintenance.	Medui. Persistent operational inefficiency at the intersection.
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Medium
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	**Medium (+)**	**Medium (-)**

8. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential stimulation of economic activity and investment along the R310 corridor (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Potential impact and risk	Improved accessibility, safety and travel-time reliability would be realised due to the proposed project, along the R310 corridor. This would support business retention, investment decisions and ease of labour commuting between Khayelitsha, Macassar and surrounding industrial / commercial nodes. This impact will be further enhances with **Alternative 1: Landscaped Traffic Circle**, which includes aesthetically pleasing and attractive landscaping, uplifting the sense of place and economic value of the area.	Corridor continues to operate under current delay and safety conditions.
Nature of impact:	Positive (indirect)	No change
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and long term	Regional and long term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Medium	Status quo retained.
Probability of occurrence	Probable	Definite
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources	Not applicable	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed	Low	Not applicable
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation/enhancement	Medium	Medium
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation	Low (+)	Medium (-)
Degree to which the impact can be avoided	Low	Not applicable
Degree to which the impact can be managed	Moderate	Not applicable

8. OPERATIONAL PHASE: Potential stimulation of economic activity and investment along the R310 corridor (POSITIVE)		
	Alternative 1 Landscaped Traffic Circle and Alternative 2 Paved Traffic Circle (both 45 m diameter) with two lane inner circle and two lane approach roads	Alternative 2: No-Go Alternative
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced	Low	Not applicable
Proposed mitigation	Coordinate with City economic-development initiatives targeting the R310 / Macassar corridor to ensure the upgrade is leveraged in subsequent planning.	Not applicable
Residual impacts	Medium. Realised alongside other corridor investments.	No significance
Cumulative impact post mitigation	Medium	Medium
Significance rating of impact after mitigation	Medium (+)	Medum (-)

ASSESSMENT OF DECOMMISSIONING PHASE IMPACTS

The proposed traffic circle and associated infrastructure are considered as permanent. Decommissioning is not foreseen within any assessable timeframe and is therefore not separately assessed. Should decommissioning ever occur, impacts would be similar in nature and significance to those assessed for the construction phase.

1.	Provide a summary of the findings and impact management measures identified by all Specialist and an indication of how these findings and recommendations have influenced the proposed development.

The EMPr will include the following specifications extracted from the Biodiverrsity Compliance Statement (Capensis, 2026) and the Freshwater assessment (EnviroSwift, 2026):

Measures to protect vegetation:

- Ensure that a suitably qualified botanist conducts a pre-construction site walk-through prior to vegetation clearance to identify and assess any SCC within the footprint, and implement species-specific mitigation measures as required.

Measures to mitigate construction phase wetland habitat disturbance:

- Declare the wetland area to the west of Baden Powell Road in the vicinity of the intersection as a No-Go area to construction personnel, vehicles machinery and materials;
- Access to the No-Go area may only be authorised by the Environmental Control Officer (ECO) following the approval by the ECO of a Method Statement detailing the activity that will be undertaken in the No-Go area including how the area will be accessed;
- Contractor to regularly (i.e. daily) inspect the No-Go area and clear and remove with immediate effect any rubble or litter that may have been accidentally been deposited into the No-Go area as a result of construction activities and dispose of at an appropriate registered waste management facility;
- The ECO must advise on measures to ensure that run-off from construction areas and any stockpiles located upslope of the wetland is contained and encouraged to infiltrate rather than discharge directly into the receiving wetland.

Measures to mitigate construction phase erosion and sedimentation:

- Avoid the impact as far as is practically possible by undertaking the construction phase during the dry summer season, where feasible.
- For all construction activities that take place during the winter rainy season, the ECO must advise on measures to ensure that run-off from cleared areas and stockpiles located upslope of the wetland is contained and encouraged to infiltrate rather than discharge directly into the receiving wetland.
- Formulate and implement a Development/Construction phase EMP which includes the following specifications:
    - No stockpiles may be located to the west of Baden Powell Drive;
    - The ECO shall approve the site for stockpiling;
    - Protect soil stockpiles during the winter rainy season from erosion using a tarp or erosion blankets;
- Implement erosion control measures in order to prevent erosion and sedimentation of the

- receiving wetland as required by the ECO. For example. strategically place straw bales or sediment fences/traps, to divert stormwater away from areas susceptible to erosion etc.);
- All sediment contaminated runoff should be contained and allowed to settle before being
- discharged off-site. The settled-out sediment collected in this manner should be cleared
- manually as needed and removed from site;
- The ECO shall, for the duration of the winter rainy season, check erosion control measures
- weekly to ensure these are still intact (and cleared of sediment in accordance with the
- recommendations above) as needed;
- The ECO shall check the site for erosion damage and sedimentation after heavy rainfall
- events. Should erosion or sedimentation be noted, immediate corrective measures must be undertaken.

Measures to mitigate construction phase water quality impairment

- Where cement is mixed in a cement mixer ensure that the cement mixer operates at all times within a bunded area with an impermeable base;
- Where cement is mixed by hand, ensure that the cement is mixed at all times in impermeable containers or in a bunded area with an impermeable base;
- All wet and dry cement deposits outside the contained areas are to be removed at the end of each day and disposed of off-site as rubble;
- Store fuel, chemicals and other hazardous substances in suitable secure weather-proof containers with impermeable and bunded floors to limit pilferage, spillage into the environment, flooding or storm damage and to be located at least 50m from any wetland;
- Inspect all storage facilities and vehicles daily for the early detection of deterioration leaks;
- Clean up any spillages (e.g. concrete, oil, fuel), immediately. Remove contaminated and dispose of it appropriately;
- Dispose of used oils, wash water from cement and other pollutants at an appropriate licensed landfill site. Disposal of any of these waste materials into any wetland is strictly prohibited;
- Dispose of concrete and cement-related mortars in an environmental sensitive manner (as this can be toxic to aquatic life). Washout may not be discharged into the wetland;
- Provide an adequate number of portable toilets where work is being undertaken. These toilets must be located at least 10m from the wetland and must be serviced regularly in order to prevent leakage/spillage
- All contaminated soil removed from the site by excavator or hand is to be immediately placed in a skip (i.e. no stockpiling of contaminated soil on-site);
- All skips containing waste shall be immediately transported to landfill for disposal when the skip becomes full;
- Any skips containing solid waste at the end of the day shall be covered to prevent wind from blowing the waste away; and
- Receipts for the safe disposal of solid waste shall be kept on record by the Contractor.

Measures to mitigate construction phase wetland biota loss

- Clearly demarcate the area to the west of Baden Powell Drive as a No-Go area prior to commencement of the construction phase and maintain the area as a No-Go area for the duration of the construction phase;
- Any activities within the wetland No-Go areas must be authorised by the ECO (e.g. during infilling);
- The parking of construction vehicles and storage/placement of construction machinery and the siting of stockpiles may not be located to the west of Baden Powell Drive.

2.	List the impact management measures that were identified by all Specialist that will be included in the EMPr

All identified mitigation measures listed above will be taken forward.

3.	List the specialist investigations and the impact management measures that will not be implemented and provide an explanation as to why these measures will not be implemented.

All specialist impact management measures will be implemented.

4.	Explain how the proposed development will impact the surrounding communities.

The proposed project will provide much needed relief from traffic congestion, improve traffic safety and enhance the area to attract economic investment.

5.	Explain how the risk of climate change may influence the proposed activity or development and how has the potential impacts of climate change been considered and addressed.

Cape town experiences a Mediterranean climate with mild, wet winters and warm, dry summers. The Cape Town climate is influenced by the presence of the cold Benguela current in the Atlantic Ocean and Table Mountain. The highest temperature ranges between 24-26℃ and occurs during December, January, and February. Average low temperatures range between 16-17℃, occurring during June, July, and August, when precipitation is at its peak.

The proposed roundabout may be affected by climate change through increased flooding, heavy rainfall, and higher temperatures, which could impact roads and nearby wetlands. To address this, the design includes stormwater management, erosion control, and resilient materials, while sensitive areas like the depression wetland are protected, ensuring the development is climate-adaptive and long-lasting. The risk of climate change is not expected to influence the development to a large degree.

6.	Explain whether there are any conflicting recommendations between the specialists. If so, explain how these have been addressed and resolved.
There are no conflicting recommendations between the specialists appointed for the project.	
7.	Explain how the findings and recommendations of the different specialist studies have been integrated to inform the most appropriate measures that should be implemented to manage the potential impacts of the proposed activity or development.
All mitigation measures proposed by the specialists will be adhered to.	
8.	Explain how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied to arrive at the best practicable environmental option.

The mitigation hierarchy is a tool which EAPs and specialists can use to assist them in balancing development needs with natural conservation needs. The hierarchy begins from the most beneficial method of mitigation and goes on to the least beneficial method of mitigation in the following order: Avoid, Minimize, Rectify, Reduce and Offset. This hierarchy has been applied in the impact assessment for the proposed project.

In addition, the next method of mitigation – minimisation – has been applied as demonstrated by the fact that mitigation measures have been recommended by the freshwater and botanical specialists to minimise impacts on aquatic features. The subsequent methods of mitigation – rectifying and reducing – have been applied largely with regard to the construction phase impacts such as dust generation, which, when unavoidable, can be reduced for example by the use of tarpaulins over-loads of sand transported to and from site. In addition to the first four methods of mitigation being successfully applied, the last method of mitigation – offsetting – is recommended for the proposed development by both the freshwater and botanical specialists.

SECTION I: FINDINGS, IMPACT MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Table 2: Impact Assessment Summary Table

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Alternatives 1 and 2: Traffic Circle and Approach Roads		Alternative 3 — No-Go	
	Without mitigation	With mitigation	Without mitigation	With mitigation
CONSTRUCTION PHASE				
BIOPHYSICAL IMPACTS				
Potential Displacement and mortality of fauna during site clearance	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Loss and disturbance of Degraded-to-Highly-Degraded Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (indigenous vegetation)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Alternatives 1 and 2: Traffic Circle and Approach Roads		Alternative 3 — No-Go	
	Without mitigation	With mitigation	Without mitigation	With mitigation
Potential Spread of invasive alien plants from disturbed ground into adjacent CBA 1a	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
Potential Direct wetland habitat loss (approx. 2 000 m²)	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
Potential Wetland habitat disturbance during construction	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Erosion and sedimentation into remnant wetland / downstream Kuils River	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Water-quality impairment (cement, fuels, litter, turbid runoff)	Moderate (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Loss of aquatic biota	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
Potential Traffic congestion and NMT safety risk during construction	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Nuisance to adjacent residents and businesses (dust, noise, vibration, access)	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Short-term employment and SMME procurement opportunities (positive)	Low (+)	Medium (+)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Chance-find disturbance to heritage or palaeontological resources	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Relocation of Informal Dwellers from the Proposed Road Reserve	Medium (-)	Low – Medium (-)	Low (-)	Low (-)
OPERATIONAL PHASE				
BIOPHYSICAL IMPACTS				
Potential fragmentation of ecological connectivity across the CBA	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Nuisance lighting effects on nocturnal biodiversity	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Alteration of wetland flow regime from raised road prism and stormwater discharge	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential Ongoing wetland habitat disturbance (operational maintenance, windblown litter)	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACTS				
Potential Improved road safety for all users (positive)	Medium (+)	High (+)	Medium (-)	Medium (-)
Potential Improved traffic flow, travel time and public-transport reliability (positive)	Medium (+)	Medium (+)	Medium (-)	Medium (-)
Potential Stimulation of broader economic activity along the R310 corridor (positive)	Low (+)	Medium (+)	Not applicable	Not applicable

POTENTIAL IMPACTS	Alternatives 1 and 2: Traffic Circle and Approach Roads		Alternative 3 — No-Go	
	Without mitigation	With mitigation	Without mitigation	With mitigation
DECOMMISSIONING PHASE				
A traffic circle is permanent road infrastructure. Decommissioning is not foreseen within any assessable timeframe and is therefore not separately assessed. Should decommissioning ever occur, impacts would be similar in nature and significance to those assessed for the construction phase.				

SECTION J: GENERAL

1. Environmental Impact Statement

EAP DECLARATION

The Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) is of the reasoned opinion that the proposed upgrade of the Baden Powell Drive / Macassar Road intersection to a traffic circle, namely **Alternative 1: Landscaped Traffic Circle** (Preferred) **should be authorised**, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures and conditions contained in the EMPr (Appendix H) and the relevant specialist reports (Appendix G).

The assessment indicates that, with mitigation, identified impacts are reduced to low or low–moderate significance, while several aspects particularly traffic flow and road safety will result in positive outcomes.

The EAP is of the opinion that the project should proceed, subject to identified mitigation management measures being implemented as part of the EMPr.

1.1.	Provide a summary of the key findings of the EIA.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The intersection is currently unsafe and congested at peak times, and the roundabout will slow traffic down, give pedestrians and minibus-taxi users safer crossings, and allow the road network to keep up with growth in the area for foreseeable future. The environmental assessment looked at potential impacts associated with the biophysical, socio-economic and heritage aspects of the proposed project.

The most important findings are:

- The roundabout footprint will remain inside the existing road reserve, except for tiny slivers witin the road reserve needed for construction purposes.
- A small strip of natural vegetation will be cleared. The vegetation type — Cape Flats Dune Strandveld — is nationally listed as Endangered, but in the road reserve itself the plants are already in poor condition because of dumping, informal use and invasive weeds.
- Parts of the depressed wetlands that are interspersed between the informal settlements will be affected (about 2 000 m^2) on the western kerb of Baden Powell Drive. The wetland is already very heavily damaged and the specialist rates it as "critically modified" without any meaningful flood or water-quality benefit, and it is not home to any rare or threatened species.
- No biodiversity offset is needed. Neither the botanical specialist nor the freshwater specialist ask for an "offset site" to make up for the damage, because the areas being lost are already of low ecological importance and are on a downward trajectory regardless.
- All construction-phase environmental impacts can be kept to LOW or lower if the the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) I adhered to. The main operational-phase impact, a small change to how stormwater flows across the site, is also LOW and is managed by standard road-drainage design.
- The project will deliver clear POSITIVE social and transport benefits: safer intersection, shorter travel times, better pedestrian facilities, better bus and minibus-taxi access.
- Some informal settlements will need to be relocated to clear the road reserve needed for the proposed project. This will lead to temporary displacement and disruption of lives or businesses of those directly affected.

1.2.	Provide a map that that superimposes the preferred activity and its associated structures and infrastructure on the environmental sensitivities of the preferred site indicating any areas that should be avoided, including buffers. (Attach map to this BAR as Appendix B2)
	Please see Appendix B2.
1.3.	Provide a summary of the positive and negative impacts and risks that the proposed activity or development and alternatives will have on the environment and community.

Biophysical Environment

The botanical assessment confirmed that the vegetation type within the study area is Cape Flats Dune Strandveld, which is nationally listed as Endangered. However, vegetation within the proposed development footprint is largely degraded to highly degraded, with the western portion of the site classified as degraded to highly degraded and the eastern portion classified as highly degraded to transformed. Approximately 500 m² of indigenous vegetation will be cleared as part of the proposed road upgrade. The development footprint falls outside the City of Cape Town Terrestrial Biodiversity Network (2024) and does not occur within a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA). Although the adjacent Farm RE/547 is mapped as CBA 1a (100% irreplaceable), the proposed footprint does not encroach into this area.

One species of conservation concern, *Erepsia dunensis* (Endangered), has historically been recorded on the neighbouring property; however, the known buffer area for this species does not intersect with the proposed development footprint. The botanical specialist therefore recommended a pre-construction botanical walk-down to confirm the presence of any species of conservation concern within the footprint. Should any such species be identified, they must be translocated to suitable conserved habitat prior to vegetation clearance. Given the degraded condition of the vegetation and the limited extent of clearing, a biodiversity offset is not considered necessary.

The freshwater ecological assessment identified two watercourses within the broader area of influence, namely the Kuils River floodplain wetland located approximately 450 m downstream, which will not be directly impacted, and a small depression wetland remnant adjacent situated within the informal settlement to west of Baden Powell Drive, which will be directly affected by the proposed road widening. Approximately 10 m³ of this depression wetland will be lost within the development footprint. The wetland is currently classified as having a Present Ecological State (PES) of Category F (Critically Modified) with a WET-Health Level 2 composite score of 8.2, indicating a severely degraded system. The wetland's Ecological Importance and Sensitivity (EIS) was assessed as low to marginal, and the WET-EcoServices assessment similarly indicated uniformly low ecosystem service provision.

Given the wetland's critically modified condition, low ecological importance and sensitivity, and the surrounding urban context, the specialist determined that rehabilitation to a higher ecological category is not feasible and that a wetland offset is not required in accordance with the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 23 June 2023). The primary potential impacts associated with the proposed development include loss of degraded vegetation, limited wetland habitat loss, and temporary construction-related disturbance.

These biophysical impacts are assessed as low to moderate prior to mitigation and low after mitigation, provided that the recommended mitigation measures and the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) are implemented. See Impact Summary Table Below. Overall, the specialists concluded that the proposed development is acceptable from a biophysical perspective. Key mitigation includes a pre-construction botanical walk-down, translocation of any species of conservation concern, and implementation of construction-phase environmental controls through the EMPr.

Socio-Economic Environment

The project area is located within a densely populated peri-urban environment between Khayelitsha and Macassar, characterised by a mix of formal and informal residential areas, relatively high unemployment levels, and a strong reliance on public transport and major road corridors for access to employment opportunities and essential services. Baden Powell Drive functions as an important regional transport route connecting surrounding communities and supporting commuter mobility and economic activity.

The proposed project is expected to result in temporary negative potential impacts during the construction phase, including increased traffic disruptions, noise generation, dust emissions, and temporary access constraints affecting local residents, commuters and informal traders operating in the vicinity of the intersection. These impacts are assessed as moderate prior to mitigation, but can be reduced to low significance after mitigation through the implementation of a traffic management plan, dust suppression measures, appropriate construction scheduling, and stakeholder communication.

The project is also expected to generate positive socio-economic impacts, particularly during the operational phase. These include short-term employment opportunities and local procurement during construction, as well as long-term improvements in traffic flow, road safety, pedestrian accessibility, and public transport efficiency. Improved intersection performance is expected to reduce congestion and travel delays along Baden Powell Drive, thereby enhancing connectivity between surrounding communities and key economic nodes.

The socio-economic benefits are therefore assessed as having moderate to high positive significance, resulting in a net positive socio-economic outcome.

Heritage Environment

A Site Sensitivity Verification Report confirmed that the proposed development footprint has low heritage sensitivity, and no known archaeological, palaeontological, or historical heritage resources have been identified within the project area. The development involves the upgrade of an existing road intersection within an already transformed urban environment, which further reduces the likelihood of significant heritage resources being

present. The only potential impact identified relates to the chance discovery of previously unknown archaeological or palaeontological material during construction activities.

This heritage impact is considered low probability and low significance, provided that an appropriate chance-find protocol is implemented. In the event that any heritage material is uncovered during construction, work must cease in the immediate area and the relevant heritage authority must be notified so that a qualified heritage specialist can assess the find and determine appropriate management measures.

Based on the available information and the implementation of standard mitigation measures, heritage impacts associated with the proposed development are considered negligible and manageable. Overall, the specialists concluded that biophysical impacts are limited and acceptable with mitigation.

2. Recommendation of the Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP")

2.1.	Provide Impact management outcomes (based on the assessment and where applicable, specialist assessments) for the proposed activity or development for inclusion in the EMPr

Impact Management Outcomes to be included in EMPr

Displacement / Relocation of Informal Dwellers

- Ensure that no relocation occurs without compliance with applicable legislation and municipal policies.
- Implement a transparent and inclusive stakeholder engagement process. Provide adequate notice to all affected persons. Maintain clear communication throughout the process. Document all engagements and agreements.
- Ensure that alternative accommodation or relocation sites are identified and made available prior to displacement.
- Facilitate access to basic services (water, sanitation, electricity) at relocation sites.

Vegetation and Biodiversity

- Ensure that a suitably qualified botanist conducts a pre-construction site walk-through prior to vegetation clearance to identify and assess any SCC within the footprint, and implement species-specific mitigation measures as required.
- Ensure that vegetation clearance is strictly limited to the approved development footprint (~530 m²).
- Demarcate all no-go areas prior to construction and prevent any encroachment beyond these boundaries.

- Implement search-and-rescue procedures for species of conservation concern where feasible.
- Rehabilitate all disturbed areas using locally indigenous species immediately after construction.
- Control and remove invasive alien plant species throughout the construction phase.

Wetland Habitat Protection

- Restrict all construction activities to ECO approved work areas.
- Prevent dumping of rubble, waste, or spoil in low-lying areas.
- Prevent unnecessary disturbance to surrounding areas outside the development footprint.
- Maintain the ecological condition of adjacent areas by avoiding additional fragmentation or degradation.

Soil and Erosion Management

- Implement erosion control measures (e.g. stabilisation, compaction, vegetation cover) during and after construction.
- Ensure that all exposed soils are stabilised immediately to prevent erosion.
- Stockpile and manage excavated materials in designated areas to avoid soil loss and degradation.

Stormwater Management

- Design and install appropriate stormwater infrastructure to manage runoff effectively.
- Prevent uncontrolled runoff, ponding, and flooding during and after construction.
- Ensure that no contaminated runoff leaves the site.
- Maintain all stormwater systems to ensure long-term functionality.

Traffic and Transport

- Implement traffic management measures during construction to minimise disruption.
- Ensure continuous and safe access for public transport and road users.
- **Improve** traffic flow and intersection efficiency in line with the approved design.

Road Safety

- Install appropriate road signage, markings, and traffic control measures.
- Ensure that the upgraded intersection reduces conflict points and enhances pedestrian safety.
- Maintain safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians throughout construction.

Air Quality (Dust Control)

- Implement dust suppression measures (e.g. wetting of surfaces, covering of stockpiles).
- Ensure that construction activities do not result in excessive dust generation.
- Maintain all vehicles and machinery to minimise emissions.

Noise Management

- Restrict construction activities to approved working hours.
- Ensure that noise levels are kept to a minimum through proper equipment use and maintenance.
- Avoid unnecessary noise disturbances to surrounding receptors.

Socio-Economic – Relocation of Informal Dwellers

- Ensure that relocation is conducted in accordance with applicable legislation and municipal requirements.
- Implement a fair, transparent, and consultative relocation process.
- Provide appropriate alternative accommodation or arrangements prior to displacement.
- Minimise disruption to livelihoods and social structures.

Socio-Economic Benefits

- Promote local employment opportunities during construction where feasible.
- Ensure that the development enhances accessibility, mobility, and safety for the surrounding community.

Waste Management

- Implement proper waste management practices, including separation, storage, and disposal.
- Dispose of all waste at licensed facilities only.
- Prevent littering and illegal dumping on or near the site.
- Promote waste minimisation, reuse, and recycling where possible.

Heritage Resources

- Implement a chance-find procedure during all excavation activities.
- Cease work immediately if heritage resources are discovered and **notify** the relevant authority.

Compliance and Monitoring

- Appoint an Environmental Control Officer (ECO) to oversee EMPr implementation.
- Monitor all activities to ensure compliance with mitigation measures.
- Conduct regular environmental audits and maintain records.
- Ensure compliance with all conditions of the Environmental Authorisation.

The EMPr contains further generalized construction management measures that need to be adhered to. Ensure that all mitigation measures are fully implemented.

2.2.	Provide a description of any aspects that were conditional to the findings of the assessment either by the EAP or specialist that must be included as conditions of the authorisation.

The following conditions should be met:

- Implementation of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) throughout the construction phase.
- Appointment of an independent Environmental Control Officer (ECO) to monitor compliance with environmental management measures.
- A pre-construction botanical walk-down must be undertaken by a suitably qualified botanist to confirm the presence of any species of conservation concern within the development footprint.
- Should any species of conservation concern be identified, these must be translocated to a suitable conserved habitat prior to vegetation clearance in accordance with an approved translocation protocol.
- All construction activities must be confined to the demarcated development footprint and designated no-go areas must be clearly marked prior to construction.
- Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures must be implemented to prevent sedimentation of the adjacent wetland during construction.
- All fuels, oils, cement and hazardous substances must be stored and handled in accordance with the EMPr to prevent contamination of soil or water resources.
- A chance-find protocol must be implemented for the protection of heritage or palaeontological resources discovered during construction.
- Measures must be implemented to manage dust, noise, traffic disruption and construction-related nuisance impacts on surrounding communities.
- Any relocation of informal dwellers from the road reserve must be undertaken in accordance with applicable municipal processes and with appropriate stakeholder engagement.

Subject to these conditions, the proposed development is considered acceptable from a biophysical, socio-economic and heritage perspective.

2.3.	Provide a reasoned opinion as to whether the proposed activity or development should or should not be authorised, and if the opinion is that it should be authorised, any conditions that should be included in the authorisation.

Based on the findings of this Basic Assessment, the EAP is of the reasoned opinion that the proposed upgrade of the intersection at Baden Powell Drive, Macassar Road and Japhta K Masemola Road to a traffic circle **should be authorised**, subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr).

This opinion is based on the following key considerations:

- The proposed development will occur largely within an existing road reserve in an already transformed urban environment. The footprint also does not encroach into the adjacent Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA 1a) located on Farm RE/547.
- Specialist studies further confirmed that a small remnant depression wetland will be partially lost as a result of the road upgrade; however, the wetland is already classified as having a Present Ecological State (PES) of Category F (Critically Modified) with low ecological importance and sensitivity. In accordance with the National Biodiversity Offset Guideline (GN 48841 of 2023), both the botanical and freshwater specialists concluded that a biodiversity offset or wetland offset is not required.
- Potential negative impacts associated with the development are primarily limited to the construction phase and include the clearing of degraded vegetation, limited wetland habitat loss, temporary disturbance to fauna, construction-related nuisance impacts (noise, dust and traffic disruption), and the relocation of informal dwellers currently occupying portions of the road reserve. These impacts are assessed as low to moderate prior to mitigation and low after mitigation.

The project is also expected to generate positive socio-economic benefits, including short-term employment opportunities during construction and long-term improvements in road safety, traffic flow, pedestrian accessibility and public transport efficiency. The upgrade will support improved intersection performance along Baden Powell Drive and accommodate future traffic demand associated with the Macassar Housing Development.

No significant heritage resources were identified within the project area and the site has been confirmed to have low heritage sensitivity. The only potential heritage impact relates to the chance discovery of previously unknown archaeological or palaeontological material during construction, which can be adequately managed through the implementation of a chance-find procedure.

The No-Go alternative would avoid the limited construction-related environmental impacts associated with the proposed development; however, it would also result in the continued deterioration of traffic conditions, ongoing safety risks, and the inability of the intersection to accommodate future traffic demand associated with planned development in the surrounding area. The No-Go alternative is therefore not considered desirable.

The EAP therefore concludes that the proposed development is environmentally acceptable and should be authorised, provided that the following conditions are included in the Environmental Authorisation:

- Implementation of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) throughout the construction phase.

- Appointment of an independent Environmental Control Officer (ECO) to monitor compliance with environmental management measures.
- A pre-construction botanical walk-down must be undertaken by a suitably qualified botanist to confirm the presence of any species of conservation concern within the development footprint.
- Should any species of conservation concern be identified, these must be translocated to a suitable conserved habitat prior to vegetation clearance in accordance with an approved translocation protocol.
- All construction activities must be confined to the demarcated development footprint and designated no-go areas must be clearly marked prior to construction.
- Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures must be implemented to prevent sedimentation of the adjacent wetland during construction.
- All fuels, oils, cement and hazardous substances must be stored and handled in accordance with the EMPr to prevent contamination of soil or water resources.
- A chance-find protocol must be implemented for the protection of heritage or palaeontological resources discovered during construction.
- Measures must be implemented to manage dust, noise, traffic disruption and construction-related nuisance impacts on surrounding communities.
- Any relocation of informal dwellers from the road reserve must be undertaken in accordance with applicable municipal processes and with appropriate stakeholder engagement.

Subject to these conditions, the proposed development is considered acceptable from a biophysical, socio-economic and heritage perspective.

2.4.	Provide a description of any assumptions, uncertainties and gaps in knowledge that relate to the assessment and mitigation measures proposed.
	The environmental assessment and recommended mitigation measures are based on the following key assumptions: - The accompanying EMPr will be implemented by the developer The development footprint will remain as assessed, and no expansion beyond the approved layout will occur. - Specialist findings (botanical, freshwater, socio-economic, and traffic) are accurate and representative of site conditions at the time of assessment. - The site is largely transformed, with vegetation and ecological functioning already degraded, and any remaining wetland function is minimal or absent. - All mitigation measures outlined in the EMPr will be fully implemented and enforced throughout the project lifecycle. - The relocation of informal dwellers will be undertaken in accordance with applicable legislation, municipal processes, and best practice for stakeholder engagement.

	- Stormwater infrastructure will be properly designed, installed, and maintained to improve current drainage conditions. Despite the level of assessment undertaken the following uncertainties remain: - Seasonal and temporal variability: Site assessments were conducted at specific points in time and may not fully capture seasonal variations in vegetation or hydrological conditions., - Socio-economic dynamics: The outcomes of informal dweller relocation may vary depending on implementation, stakeholder engagement, and external socio-economic factors.
2.5.	The period for which the EA is required, the date the activity will be concluded and when the post construction monitoring requirements should be finalised.
Given that the proposed Baden Powell / Macassar Road Traffic Circle and associated infrastructure are permanent transportation service infrastructure, the EA will need to be in place indefinitely.	

3. Water

Since the Western Cape is a water scarce area explain what measures will be implemented to avoid the use of potable water during the development and operational phase and what measures will be implemented to reduce your water demand, save water and measures to reuse or recycle water.
The proposed development will not require potable water or water provision by the local municipality outside of the construction phase. Water may be utilised for dust suppression during construction in which case only grey water will be utilised to promote the recycling of water.

4. Waste

Explain what measures have been taken to reduce, reuse or recycle waste.
For the construction phase of the development, the EMPr (Appendix H) details in length with the management of waste, indicating that the waste hierarchy must be implemented as far as possible. Furthermore, the following measures are inter alia outlined: • Where feasible, selection of construction systems that do not depend on temporary support, shoring, construction aids, or other materials that will be disposed of as debris during the construction phase of the activity. • Where possible, selection of construction materials that do not depend on the use of adhesives which require containers, and which produce residue and packaging waste.

Adhesives are not advised as they hinder salvaging and recycling at the end of the infrastructure's use.

- Where feasible, avoidance of construction materials sensitive to damage, contamination, environmental exposure or spoilage on site. These factors increase the potential for waste accumulation on the jobsite.

The above impact management measures will assist in reducing the waste produced on the site and will enable the reusing and/or recycling what waste is produced.

5. Energy Efficiency

8.1.	Explain what design measures have been taken to ensure that the development proposa will be energy efficient.
The operational phase of the proposed road activity will not require any power source. During the construction phase, power will be sourced from generators or batteries.	

SECTION K: DECLARATIONS

DECLARATION OF THE APPLICANT

Note: Duplicate this section where there is more than one Applicant.

I……., ID number ……in my personal capacity or duly authorised thereto hereby declare/affirm that all the information submitted or to be submitted as part of this application form is true and correct, and that:

- I am fully aware of my responsibilities in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA"), the Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") Regulations, and any relevant Specific Environmental Management Act and that failure to comply with these requirements may constitute an offence in terms of relevant environmental legislation;
- I am aware of my general duty of care in terms of Section 28 of the NEMA;

- I am aware that it is an offence in terms of Section 24F of the NEMA should I commence with a listed activity prior to obtaining an Environmental Authorisation;

- I appointed the Environmental Assessment Practitioner ("EAP") (if not exempted from this requirement) which:
  - meets all the requirements in terms of Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations; or
  - meets all the requirements other than the requirement to be independent in terms of Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, but a review EAP has been appointed who does meet all the requirements of Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations;

- I will provide the EAP and any specialist, where applicable, and the Competent Authority with access to all information at my disposal that is relevant to the application;

- I will be responsible for the costs incurred in complying with the NEMA EIA Regulations and other environmental legislation including but not limited to –
  - costs incurred for the appointment of the EAP or any legitimate person contracted by the EAP;
  - costs in respect of any fee prescribed by the Minister or MEC in respect of the NEMA EIA Regulations;
  - Legitimate costs in respect of specialist(s) reviews; and
  - the provision of security to ensure compliance with applicable management and mitigation measures;

- I am responsible for complying with conditions that may be attached to any decision(s) issued by the Competent Authority, hereby indemnify, the government of the Republic, the Competent Authority and all its officers, agents and employees, from any liability arising out of the content of any report, any procedure or any action for which I or the EAP is responsible in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations and any Specific Environmental Management Act.

Note: If acting in a representative capacity, a certified copy of the resolution or power of attorney must be attached.

Signature of the Applicant: Date:

Name of company (if applicable):

DECLARATION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PRACTITIONER ("EAP")

I CARMEN DU TOIT-SHARIFF, EAP Registration number 2020/3036 as the appointed EAP hereby declare/affirm the correctness of the:

- Information provided in this BAR and any other documents/reports submitted in support of this BAR;

- The inclusion of comments and inputs from stakeholders and I&APs;

- The inclusion of inputs and recommendations from the specialist reports where relevant; and

- Any information provided by the EAP to interested and affected parties and any responses by the EAP to comments or inputs made by interested and affected parties, and that:

- In terms of the general requirement to be independent:
  - Other than fair remuneration for work performed in terms of this application, have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the activity or application and that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity; or
  - am not independent, but another EAP that meets the general requirements set out in Regulation 13 of NEMA EIA Regulations has been appointed to review my work (Note: a declaration by the review EAP must be submitted);

- In terms of the remainder of the general requirements for an EAP, am fully aware of and meet all of the requirements and that failure to comply with any the requirements may result in disqualification;

- I have disclosed, to the Applicant, the specialist (if any), the Competent Authority and registered interested and affected parties, all material information that have or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Competent Authority or the objectivity of any report, plan or document prepared or to be prepared as part of this application;

- I have ensured that information containing all relevant facts in respect of the application was distributed or was made available to registered interested and affected parties and that participation will be facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties were provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments;

- I have ensured that the comments of all interested and affected parties were considered, recorded, responded to and submitted to the Competent Authority in respect of this application;

- I have ensured the inclusion of inputs and recommendations from the specialist reports in respect of the application, where relevant;

- I have kept a register of all interested and affected parties that participated in the public participation process; and

- I am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the NEMA EIA Regulations;



Signature of the EAP: Date:03/11/2026

THE ENVIRONMENTAL PARTNERSHIP

Name of company (if applicable):

DECLARATION OF THE REVIEW EAP

I Carmen Du Toit-Shariff, EAP Registration number 2020/3036 as the appointed Review EAP hereby declare/affirm that:

- I have reviewed all the work produced by the EAP;
- I have reviewed the correctness of the information provided as part of this Report;
- I meet all of the general requirements of EAPs as set out in Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations;
- I have disclosed to the applicant, the EAP, the specialist (if any), the review specialist (if any), the Department and I&APs, all material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Department or the objectivity of any Report, plan or document prepared as part of the application; and
- I am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the NEMA EIA Regulations.



Signature of the EAP: Date: 03/11/2026

The Environmental Partnership

Name of company (if applicable):

DECLARATION OF THE SPECIALIST

Note: Duplicate this section where there is more than one specialist.

I ……, as the appointed Specialist hereby declare/affirm the correctness of the information provided or to be provided as part of the application, and that:

- In terms of the general requirement to be independent:
  - other than fair remuneration for work performed in terms of this application, have no business, financial, personal or other interest in the development proposal or application and that there are no circumstances that may compromise my objectivity; or

  - am not independent, but another specialist (the "Review Specialist") that meets the general requirements set out in Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations has been appointed to review my work (Note: a declaration by the review specialist must be submitted);

- In terms of the remainder of the general requirements for a specialist, have throughout this EIA process met all of the requirements;

- I have disclosed to the applicant, the EAP, the Review EAP (if applicable), the Department and I&APs all material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Department or the objectivity of any Report, plan or document prepared or to be prepared as part of the application; and

- I am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the EIA Regulations.

Signature of the EAP: Date:

Name of company (if applicable):

DECLARATION OF The REVIEW SPECIALIST

I ……., as the appointed Review Specialist hereby declare/affirm that:

- I have reviewed all the work produced by the Specialist(s):
- I have reviewed the correctness of the specialist information provided as part of this Report;
- I meet all of the general requirements of specialists as set out in Regulation 13 of the NEMA EIA Regulations;
- I have disclosed to the applicant, the EAP, the review EAP (if applicable), the Specialist(s), the Department and I&APs, all material information that has or may have the potential to influence the decision of the Department or the objectivity of any Report, plan or document prepared as part of the application; and
- I am aware that a false declaration is an offence in terms of Regulation 48 of the NEMA EIA Regulations.

Signature of the EAP: Date:

Name of company (if applicable):