

NAME	COMMENT	RESPONSE	DATE	METHOD OF COMMUNICATION
Comments regarding Public Participation				
Daleside Community	It was indicated that not all members of the community are present and therefore, more meetings should be held to make sure that most members are consulted and informed about the proposed project	The Environmental Assessment Practitioner explained that an extension for the project timeframes to be extended has already been requested on 23rd June 2021 with the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) and they are still awaiting their feedback. The ward councilor also added that prior to the lapsing time, we can try to have few meetings should the Department not grant the extension. However, this will be dependent on the presidential address that was expected over the coming weekend regarding the 3rd wave of the Covid 19 pandemic that had badly affected the Gauteng province.	24 June 2021	Community Meeting
	The community indicated that the notification and commenting period is short and requested that it be extended.	The Environmental Assessment Practitioner explained that the commenting period, which is 30 days, has been provided for as per the requirements for the NEMA EIA Regulations 2014 as amended. However, as it has been requested, more meetings will be held with community should the presidential address on Covid 19 not restrict gatherings. She concluded by saying that an extension on timeframe has also been requested from the Department on 23rd June 2021 and they are awaiting the Department's response	25 June 2021	email
Peter Funke Highbury Resident	Procedure was not followed on the notice on newspapers. The ones used do not get to the	The public participation process was carried out as per the NEMA regulations section 41 (2) (c). It must be noted that	25 June 2021	email

	<p>people. That's why other forms of notice have to be used and the extensions on the comments needs to be extended.</p>	<p>the Environmental Assessment Practitioner confirmed with the Local Municipality and the newspaper itself that Sedibeng Ster and the Henley Herald is the right paper for the community.</p> <p>The request for extension of timeframes has already been submitted on 23rd June 2021 and we are still waiting for the Department's response. For future notifications, as agreed with the ward councilor, we will liaise with him to assist us in announcing the project on the community WhatsApp group and other forms of communication that the community use.</p>		
	<p>The Daleside community is marginalized; feeding schemes are the order of the day. This community cannot afford in the least, to engage the applicant on a legal plane; we can only express our disgust in the way information has been fed piece-meal during the public presentation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. As per the Daleside community meeting held on 24th June 2021, future notifications, as agreed with the ward councilor, we will liaise with him to assist us in announcing the project on the community WhatsApp group and other forms of communication that the community use. The full presentation was emailed on the 2nd July 2021 to all community members who have filled in the attendance register and provided their email addresses as per their request. The applicant has agreed to have follow-up meetings as not all the community members could attend the meeting, if Covid regulations allows.</p>		
	<p>The procedures and processes that need to be followed may be easily motivated by the applicant; however: if there was even a hint of transparency in this process,</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner liaised with the newspapers and they confirmed by email that they cover Daleside and Henley on Klip areas. Site notices were placed at 8</p>		

	<p>the applicant would have attended when told there is no newspaper distribution on this suburb, so that an advertisement in any newspaper is of absolutely no value whatsoever. Furthermore, displaying a so-called 'public notice' down the bottom of the rusted mine fence at knee-level, is a far cry from transparency</p>	<p>various conspicuous areas including the site itself along Bokmakiere Road, Henley Library located 45 Regatta Rd, Henley on Klip; Randvaal Library Houtkapper Rd, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Belrose Supermarket, 87 Kroonarend Rd, Witkopdorp, Karee Road shopping complex, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Henley on Klip Post Office, 1895 Ewelme Rd, Henley on Klip, Little Austria Nursery, corner The Avenue and Wargrave ave, Henley on Klip and Henley Shopping Centre, Cnr Ewelme, Iffley Rd, Henley on Klip.</p> <p>After receiving this concern from numerous community members, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner has requested for an extension for timeframes with the Department on 23rd June 2021 to allow for further consultation to take place.</p>		
<p>Peter Meyer DMS RAPID</p>	<p>Please register me Peter Meyer, as an affected party with reference to the proposed brick plant</p>	<p>Comment noted and member registered</p>	<p>28 June 2021</p>	<p>E-mail</p>
<p>Wynand Engelbrecht For the Daleside Volunteers</p>	<p>There are two important points to note: 1. Glen Douglas Mine and SA Block did not call a public meeting in Daleside for so-called 'public participation'. The city ward Councilor and the Daleside public had to call their own meeting so the mine and SA Block could present the semi-informed proposed plan. 2. The matter of the so-called brick making plant is viewed with absolute distrust by the Daleside</p>	<p>Daleside community meeting was held on 24th June 2021 as arranged in collaboration with the ward councillor Mr Peter Teixeira. As it has been requested, more meetings will be held with community should the presidential address on Covid 19 not restrict gatherings.</p> <p>Comment noted. All comments received from Daleside community members and concerns raised have been noted in this document and will be responded to.</p>	<p>25 June 2021</p>	<p>E-mail</p>

	community, as it is this community who will be worst affected by this plan.			
Jon cronin 329 sontnell road, Highbury	<p>I would like to register as an interested and affected party against proposed brick plant on mine Glen Douglas in Henley/Daleside . My concerns and disagreements are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of public notice and participation. not aimed at correct market. Most residents don't have access to 2 media adverts posted 	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner liaised with the newspapers and they confirmed by email that they cover Daleside and Henley on Klip areas. Site notices were placed at 8 various conspicuous areas including the site itself along Bokmakiere Road, Henley Library located 45 Regatta Rd, Henley on Klip; Randvaal Library Houtkapper Rd, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Belrose Supermarket, 87 Kroonarend Rd, Witkopdorp, Karee Road shopping complex, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Henley on Klip Post Office, 1895 Ewelme Rd, Henley on Klip, Little Austria Nursery, corner The Avenue and Wargrave ave, Henley on Klip and Henley Shopping Centre,Cnr Ewelmee, Iffley Rd, Henley on Klip.</p> <p>After receiving this concern from numerous community members, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner requested for an extension for timeframe with the Department on 23rd June 2021 to allow for further consultation to take place.</p>	30 June 2021	E-mail
Peter Teixeira Daleside Ward Councillor	I am also requesting for an extension on the public participation notice period for additional community engagements regarding this proposed development.	Comment noted. Request for an extension on the project timeframes to be extended has already been requested on 23rd June 2021 with the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (GDARD) and they are still awaiting their feedback. The applicant has also agreed to more	30 June 2021	E-mail

		consultation meetings with the community		
Stan Wallace Geln Douglas Mine Residents Forum	<p>I am the chairman of the Glen Douglas Mine resident's forum which has been in existence for roughly 30 years.</p> <p>It represents residents affected and potentially by mining activity within a 3km radius from the mines fence line. While theoretically this is not a mining operation, it will still take place on mining ground, which still has to be rezoned.</p> <p>On the 25 May 21021 at 16h20 I received a call in my capacity as the chairman of The Glen Douglas Mine Residents forum which is a required organisation in the Glen Douglas mines EMP.</p> <p>It was from Ntsanko Ndlovu who informed me of the application regards a proposed brick works to be erected on the mine.</p> <p>No mention of a bitumen tar plant nor a ready-mix cement type of development. I asked for more information and was told I must wait till this is published. I enquired would there be public participation and was told yes. Again, enquired what is the plant and was told to wait, I ended the call as it was clear it was purely an academic call of no real value.</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner has contacted Mr. Wallace as a courtesy call based on his position held on the Glen Douglas Mine Residence Forum to inform him about the proposed project. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner explained that the public participation process has not commenced yet and that all I&APs including members of the Mine Forum will be provided with detailed written information about the proposed project.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner has sent out emails with Background Information Documents (BIDs) to all I&APs including Mr. Wallace on 27th May 2021 to announce the project and explained on the email that the Draft Basic Assessment Report (DBAR) will be shared with all stakeholders from the 1st June 2021.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner sent out a link with the Draft Basic Assessment Report on 1st June 2021 (see attached proof of I&APs correspondence).</p> <p>The Mine Forum requested a focus group meeting and it was held with the Environmental Assessment Practitioner and the representatives of the applicant on Monday 21st June 2021 at 6pm (see attached attendance register and minutes).</p>	30 June 2021	E-mail
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	On receiving the documents on the 1st of June, we noted there is a 30 day period to comment.	The NEMA EIA regulations 2014 as amended stipulates that I&APs must be provided with a 30-day commenting	30 June 2021	E-mail

	<p>From the outset we pointed out that many of the affected people are living under impoverished circumstances where a meal is a luxury and as the process at it stood then was purely electronic removing them from a process that may affect their lives either positively or negatively. I and many others were told this route is legally acceptable and no public meetings will be allowed due to covid regulations, which at that stage was a blatant distortion of reality.</p>	<p>period of Draft the Basic Assessment Report and all stakeholders for this project were asked to comment on the Draft Basic Assessment Report from Tuesday 1st June to Thursday 1st July 2021.</p> <p>On an email sent to Mr Wallace on 15th June 2021, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner explained the following: "Before Covid 19, we used to place draft reports in libraries or common areas that the communities may suggest for the general public/communities to review. However, Directions issued by the Minister of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment in terms of Regulation 10(8) of the Regulations issued in terms of section 27(2) of the Disaster Management Act, 2002 (act no. 57 of 2002): Measures to Address, Prevent and Combat the spread of covid-19, have discouraged the sharing of hard copies with any interested and affected parties as well as having meetings with large number of people to combat the spread of the Covid 19 virus. These Directions have therefore recommended the sharing of all EIA related projects in a cloud format; hence the link has been indicated on the newspaper advert, site notice and written notices sent out by email.</p> <p>As per the Glen Douglas Mine Forum request, a Focus Group meeting was held on 21st June 2021 it followed Covid 19 in terms of social distancing and keeping the number under 50. In</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

		collaboration with the ward councillor and per Glen Douglas Mine Forum's recommendations, a consultation meeting with some members of the Daleside community was held on Thursday 24th June 2021 and it was on the meeting that follow-up meetings will be held with the community.		
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	<p>We as a mine forum insisted on a meeting which was eventually agreed to but only on the 22nd of June as the mine manager was not available.</p> <p>In correspondence it was noted by Ntsanke Ndlovu that the area councilor Peter Texiera did not answer calls or reply earlier during the process. I in a matter of minutes ascertained he and family were involved in a car accident and informed her of this.</p> <p>On the 20th I contacted him to discover it appeared no further attempts were made to contact him.</p> <p>It had taken me all of 30 seconds to make contact with him.</p> <p>On the 22nd May a presentation was done by Ntsake which said a lot about nothing.</p>	The Environmental Assessment Practitioner indeed tried to contact the ward councilor from the 1st day she contacted Mr. Wallace on 24th May 2021 but could not get hold of him until she requested one of the community members (Mr. John Maphalala) to inform him that she's urgently looking for him. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner was informed by Mr. Maphalala that the ward councilor was involved in a car accident and he still recovering, however, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner's contact details were provided to ward councilor who had indicated that he'll contact the Environmental Assessment Practitioner when he is feeling better.	30 June 2021	E-mail

<p>Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum</p>	<p>On the 22nd May a presentation was done by Ntsake which said a lot about nothing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It was pointed out, as it had been previously in the mine furnace attempt that the newspaper they used Ster, is not available in the area, the second one The Henley Herald is more of an advertorial in Henley and is neither distributed in any of the areas directly affected by this application. We were told that's tough luck as it complies legally. • We explained that the notices they put up had no value as it referred them to documents on the internet that they have no access to, this is contradictory to our countries constitution as they were being discriminated purely because they were poor. Which is why a public meeting is required. • We indicated that the residents especially in Daleside directly next to the mine have limited access to the internet even if it's at the library, we were initially told its legally compliant and as such not a concern in the application. • It was enquired as to what studies were done, we were 	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner liaised with the newspapers and they confirmed by email that they cover Daleside and Henley on Klip areas. Site notices were placed at 8 various conspicuous areas including the site itself along Bokmakiere Road, Henley Library located 45 Regatta Rd, Henley on Klip; Randvaal Library Houtkapper Rd, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Belrose Supermarket, 87 Kroonarend Rd, Witkopdorp, Karee Road shopping complex, Witkopdorp (Daleside), Henley on Klip Post Office, 1895 Ewelme Rd, Henley on Klip, Little Austria Nursery, corner The Avenue and Wargrave ave, Henley on Klip and Henley Shopping Centre, Cnr Ewelme, Iffley Rd, Henley on Klip.</p> <p>After receiving this concern from numerous community members, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner has requested for an extension for timeframes with the Department on 23rd June 2021 to allow for further consultation to take place.</p> <p>Meeting was held on Monday 21st June 2021 not May 22nd (see attached attendance register) The EIA NEMA Regulations 2014 as amended, specifies that a project must be advertised on a local newspaper.</p>		
--	---	---	--	--

	<p>told only the one to determine if there were graves or endangered animals, which there are none.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • But this is common knowledge as prior to this they had applied for other activities on the same ground so these reports are freely available and add zero real value. It also states this in the mines EMP. • The reports which actually would add value to the process are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Noise o Dust o Vibration o Traffic • Yet these were deemed not important enough and as such were not done. We were told if we see them as important, we can ask for them to be done, but they would only be done after closing of comments. • Two days later we discovered in a non-transparent way the mine doing noise report tests behind the mine forums back. These were done with a consultant who is aware that it was agreed to those two forum members would be invited to attend as observers. The excuse was they never knew the mine forum should 	<p>The Local Municipality and the newspaper itself confirmed that the Sedibeng Ster and Henley Herald covers the Daleside and Henley on Klip area.</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner presented studies done as requested by the National Department of Environmental, Forestry and Fisheries.</p> <p>Other potential impacts related to dust, noise, traffic and other impacts have also been identified and assessed as per the prescribed impact assessment methodology and the impact significance was found to be low due to the construction and layout of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>have a representative there as agreed to by both parties. What is upsetting is they were reminded of this at the previous forum meeting about three weeks prior to this, plus why did they not mention they doing tests during the Afrimat and forum meeting regards the brick works 48 hours earlier. This raises more questions than answers one being that the community is of no importance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• At the beginning of the forum meeting, it was asked that the process should be delayed to allow fair public participation, this was refused. After a long debate it was agreed to by afrimat that an extension would be requested to allow a more balanced public participation period.• It was stated throughout the mine forum / Afrimat meeting its impossible to arrange a public meeting due to covid. Yet Mr Texiera the areas councillor in two days arranged a public meeting fully compliant with regulations attended by nearly 50 people, all questioning why there was an attempt to side-line them and others not attending due to the short notice of the meeting.	<p>This comment has no relevance to the proposed project and should be raised with the management of the Glen Douglas Dolomite Mine.</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The irony is Afimat tried at the meeting arranged by Mr Texiera in Daleside to give the impression the meeting was called and arranged by them, when the reality was, they had refused to call one since the start of this process. 	<p>In collaboration with the ward councilor and per Glen Douglas Mine Forum's recommendations, a consultation meeting with some members of the Daleside community was held on Thursday 24th June 2021 and it was on the meeting that follow-up meetings will be held with the community.</p>		
<p>Dougherty Alan Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Hereunder please find my comments and misgivings re your Basic assessment report and application to build a brick/block plant on portion of Glen Douglas Dolomite's property on corner of Bokmakierie and Adelaar Street. The timing of the application during Covid lockdown conditions and at a time when the Town Councilor for the area was</p>	<p>After receiving this concern from numerous community members, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner has requested for an extension for timeframes with the Department on 23rd June 2021 to allow for further consultation to take place. As per the Daleside community meeting held on 24th June 2021, future notifications, as agreed with the ward councilor, we will liaise with him to assist us in</p>	<p>1 June 2021</p>	<p>E-mail</p>

	<p>recovering from a motor accident seem to the applicant's advantage and not the affected parties. Even though the minimum legal requirements of the application seem to be met, the most important considerations and studies have been ignored and omitted where they should have been undertaken and accurate not contradictory, vague or completely irrelevant as per the application. Public information and participation have been very low profile and inadequate considering the area.</p>	<p>announcing the project on the community WhatsApp group and other forms of communication that the community use.</p>		
Mr. Stan Wallace	<p>Mr. Wallace requested information on how interested and affected parties are given the necessary information if they do not have email.</p>	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White responded that hard copies can be collected from Mr. Leon. Kirchner at the Firehouse Gym on Tuesday 30 November 2021</p>	<p>29 November 2021</p>	<p>Public Consultation Meeting</p>
Mr. Allen Dougherty	<p>Mr. Dougherty wanted to know when the report will be issued.</p>	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White replied and said the report will be issued during this week. Ms. White explained that she was waiting for this public meeting to complete the minutes as well as the comments and response report. The report will be sent to the applicant by no later than Wednesday (1 December 2021) for review and approval and then be submitted to the department and distributed to all interested and affected parties on Thursday (2 December 2021).</p>	<p>29 November 2021</p>	<p>Public Consultation Meeting</p>

Mr. Allen Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty expressed his concern about the lack of time for commenting on the reports.	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White explained that she communicated with the department official and explained the situation, because of the delay with the specialist studies. Ms. White received a response from the official stating she will be out of the office until 30 November 2021. Ms. White will communicate with the department and request that a period of 30 days be granted for public comments to be sent to her or directly to the department.</p> <p>Ms. White stated that she cannot confirm at this time and that she is waiting for a response from the department official.</p>	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting
Comments relating to traffic				
Daleside community	<p>Traffic must be diverted away from the Daleside area as the roads are currently in a bad condition.</p> <p>Trucks must use the Henley Drive off-ramp and the entrance to the proposed site must be changed not to be closer to the community to ensure that trucks do not use the streets of Daleside</p>	<p>A possible solution might be to have the road permanently closed at Bokmakierie and Adelaar Streets.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to investigate the traffic impact further.</p> <p>Note on the matter, the community needs to consider the negative economic impact on small businesses in Daleside main streets as a result of diverted traffic.</p>	24 June 2021	Meeting with community
Wynand Engelbrecht For Daleside Volunteers	<p>The Daleside Volunteers (a thoroughly constituted NPO representing the Daleside community-at-large at the Glen Douglas Mine Forum) herewith submits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are sorely concerned that the initial impact studies on 	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner presented studies done as requested by the National Department of Environmental, Forestry and Fisheries. Other potential impacts related to dust, noise, traffic and other impacts have also been identified and assessed as per the prescribed impact</p>	25 June 2021	E-mail

	<p>traffic, noise and dust were not included in the presentation, yet there is concern for the impact on the flora and fauna. There is a school some 300 meters away from the proposed site, and residential properties less than 100 meters away.</p>	<p>assessment methodology and the impact significance was found to be low due to the construction and layout of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments</p>		
<p>Wynand Engelbrecht For Daleside Volunteers</p>	<p>A separate entrance for truck traffic is indicated near corner of Bokmakierie Road and Adelaar Street. It is 100 meters away from the existing gate in Bokmakierie Road. There is no clarity even as to which institution is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of Bokmakierie Road; what therefore, will be the outcome of spending on bulk contribution to upgrade the 'new intersection' as proposed, to make provision for heavy trucks using the gate; normal tar surfaces do not last under these severe conditions.</p>	<p>This matter should be discussed at municipal and provincial level to find a workable solution to address this concern that has been raised in the past in this specific area.</p> <p>A possible new intersection and bulk contribution to possible upgrade will be dealt with on local municipal level should the project be authroised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project</p>	<p>25 June 2021</p>	<p>E-mail</p>
<p>Wynand Engelbrecht For the Daleside Volunteers</p>	<p>A traffic impact study, considering the effect of added truck traffic through Daleside, needs to be conducted. Kroonarend Street</p>	<p>The applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project.</p>	<p>25 June 2021</p>	<p>E-mail</p>

	and Karee Road will come under renewed stress.			
Grant Miles Neve Sontnell road, 323	<p>Currently the mine cannot control the large trucks that come into the village despite there being a weight restriction, on many occasions they come down Sontnell Road to the wrong entrance only to turn round again and cause severe destruction of our road, this has many potholes due to this.</p> <p>The mine staff use Sontell as a raceway, my child rides his horse on the road and on several occasions, the speed has nearly caused a severe accident</p>	Although the comment has no direct relevance to the proposed project, the applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimised as far as possible.	28 June 2021	e-mail
Jon Cronin 329 Sontnell road, Highbury	Road traffic increase, already henley and bokmekkerie str are heavy traffic areas and road is in ill state of repair and dirty from trucks leaving mine without lawfully being covered. mine failing already to address stipulated law.	The applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Jon Cronin 329 Sontnell road, Highbury	Sontnell road is literally a 1 lane road but trucks constantly misuse road to go to main gate instead of bokmekkerie str entrance. There is a school on sontnell road and these trucks are a major risk and also pass 2 5 tonne signs to reach sontnell street which again is unlawful	Although the comment has no direct relevance to the proposed project, the applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimised as far as possible.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents	Naturally such a plant will increase traffic, to what extent is unknown as no facts were	This matter should be discussed at municipal and provincial level to find a workable solution to address this	30 June 2021	email

	<p>presented, but the impact will be reduced if no clinker ash is trucked in.</p> <p>The road already can't cope and is in poor condition as Midvaal Council believes it's a provincial road and the provincial authorities can't verify or deny this, Wynand Engelbreght indicated he may submit information on this.</p>	<p>concern that has been raised in the past in this specific area.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project</p>		
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Irrespective of whether legally required or not the following studies should have been undertaken to show willingness to transparency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road Access safety and maintenance responsibilities 	<p>The applicant agreed to further investigate the traffic impact of this proposed project.</p>	01 July 2021	e-mail
<p>Stan Wallace Chairperson: Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum</p>	<p>Mr Wallace requested confirmation whether the outbound lane is within the parameter of the project footprint</p>	<p>Ms. White confirmed that it was lanes on Bokmakierie road to ensure access from Bokmakierie road to the site</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Community Forum meeting
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Mr Dougherty requested confirmation whether new lanes are going to be built on Bokmakierie road.</p>	<p>Ms. White confirmed that new lanes are going to be built as per the mitigation measures in order to ease traffic</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Community Forum meeting
	<p>Mr Dougherty requested information on who the material will be transported from the mine to the brick plant.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Trucks will be used to transport the materials from the mine to the brick plant and there will be approximately 4 trucks per week delivering cement</p> <p><u>Response from Mr. Da Serra:</u></p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Community Forum meeting

		In the future conveyer belts will be used to transport materials used from the mine to the brick plant.		
Danie Grobbelaar	Mr. Grobbelaar expressed his concern about the traffic assessment that has been done. According to Mr. Grobbelaar, Bokmakierie road is in a bad condition and adding traffic to that road will only worsen the state of the road. He would like to note that the road is beyond repair.	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White explained that the Traffic assessment was done by looking at how many vehicles will be travelling to and from the facility and according to these numbers (8 and 11 respectively), a conclusion was made that the additional traffic will not be significant.</p> <p>The specialist stated that there will be an additional 8 to 11 trips on that road which is not significant.</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Community Forum meeting
Comments relating to noise and vibration				
Daleside Community	The community requested that the brick plant should not operate at night because of vibrations that will be coming from the facility which will disturb their rest and sleep at night. This point is supported because they are currently experiencing vibrations from 3-5km away from another brick plant, meaning this one will be worse since it will be a few meters away from their houses	The applicant has committed to operate the proposed facility within the current working hours of the mine.	24 June 2021	Community Meeting
Peter Funke Highbury Resident	<p>The following issues must be addressed by the EMP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise • Dust • Vibration and • Social impact 	The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural	28 June 2021	E-mail

		Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments		
Grant Miles Neve Sontnell Road 323	The noise currently from the mine is annoying to say the least, we can never sleep with windows open in the summer	Although the comment has no direct relevance to the proposed project, the applicant has agreed to further investigate the possible noise impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimized as far as possible	28 June 2021	E-mail
Peter Teixeira Daleside Ward Councillor	<p>Good Evening Trust this email finds you well. I would like to hereby forward the communities concerns regarding the proposed brick making plant. The important points of concern raised by the community are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution that may emanate from the development/ Nearest residential property is 100 meters from the proposed development site. • Volumes of heavy-duty vehicles that will go through the residential area/ No traffic impact study done. 	The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments	30 June 2021	e-mail
Jon cronin 329 sontnell road, Highbury	Noise levels are a concern to residential surrounding areas	The applicant has agreed to further investigate the possible noise impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimised as far as possible. In	30 June 2021	e-mail

		addition, the applicant has committed not work outside the current Glen Douglas Mine working times.		
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	The issues that need clarity are: The mine has a long history of noise issues going back decades. This has never been resolved, but more like a compromise was accepted as there is no solution to a mine operating next door to residential stands till late at night in hours that are intrusive to the community. And the proposed brick plant has had zero noise impact studies done, naturally it will impact on the surrounding areas, but until they do what should have been done, that impact is based on guessing.	The applicant has agreed to further investigate the possible noise impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimised as far as possible. In addition, the applicant has committed not work outside the current Glen Douglas Mine working times.	30 June 2021	e-mail
	VIBRATION It was explained that the brick manufacturing process uses vibration to compact the bricks. Numerous people have pointed out their homes are affected by a similar brick plant that is further away that this proposed one. SA Block stated theirs is different but could not actually say why nor show samples of what the plant will look like as they admitted the one attached to the documents is actually just a picture and not the actual plant. No one from SA Block have been able to state what will happen if vibration is an issue, its already an issue with many complaining	The applicant has agreed to further investigate the possible vibration impact of this proposed project to ensure that it complies with relevant regulation/s and legislation which should result in minimal impact on the surrounding residences. The differences in specifications between the machines as referred by Mr. Wallace will be requested from the supplier and will be shared once received.	30 June 2021	email

	about the mines ground vibration, what will SA Block do if they add to it, or are people simply expected to live with it?			
	Mr Wallace requested clarification whether a noise barrier could or would be placed along the northern and along part of the eastern site boundaries.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> If it is found that the impact is so severe a noise barrier can be placed, however, Mr. Swanepoel confirmed that a noise barrier will be placed to reduce the noise impact.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
	Mr. Wallace expressed his concern about the reverse alarm noises that will be generated and requested clarification on how this will be mitigated.	<u>Response from Mr. Da Serra:</u> Mr. Da Serra reassured Mr. Wallace that the brick manufacturing facility will have to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety regulations and not the regulations issued by the Department of Minerals and Energy and therefore the rules and regulations are not as stringent as required or the mining operation. The alarm noises will therefore be effectively mitigated, but still be audible to be heard for safety purposes.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
	Mr. Wallace requested clarification whether the Noise Study done by the Mine was separate from this project	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel confirmed that it was a separate study.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
	Mr. Wallace requested information about a Vibration Impact Assessment	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> The Vibration Assessment was included within the scope of work for the noise impact assessment conducted. The specialist report will be reviewed to include this aspect.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
	Mr. Wallace wanted to know to which regulations the operation of	<u>Response from Mr. Ackerman:</u>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting

	<p>the conveyor belt will have to comply with when materials are transported.</p> <p>Mr. Wallace's concern with the conveyer belt is the sirens which make a lot of noise.</p>	<p>The operation of the conveyor belt will have to conform with the mine's regulations.</p>		
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Irrespective of whether legally required or not the following studies should have been undertaken to show willingness to transparency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise generation & mitigation, considering the proximity to residential areas. • Dust generation & mitigation also. considering the proximity to a residential area and primary school. • Multiple noise creation on adjacent plants would not be possible to monitor and separate responsibility. • No similar block plants exist locally allowing for site assessment of the noise & pollution. 	<p>The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days in order for them to provide their comments</p>	<p>01 June 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>
	<p>Mr. Dougherty objected to the daytime and night-time noise levels. He expressed that the noise levels are too low. Mr Dougherty used the mine plant to explain that households that are located 3 kilometres from the mine can still hear the reverse alarms during night-time.</p>	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White reminded Mr Dougherty that the assessment was undertaken by a noise specialist and that the comment will be noted.</p>	<p>23 November 2021</p>	<p>Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting</p>

	<p>Mr. Dougherty requested clarification about the operating hours for the proposed development as daytime could mean anytime from when the sun rises until the sun sets.</p> <p>He also expressed that the mine's operating hours are from 6am to 10pm and he requested information whether the plant will also be operated during these hours.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr. Swanepoel confirmed that the noise specialist indicated according to international standards, day-time operating hours are indicated as 6:00 – 22:00. Confirmation will however be given upon review of the previous minutes.</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
Danie Grobbelaar	<p>Mr. Grobbelaar also requested clarification about the operating hour and expressed that it was said that the operating hours will be from 6am to 6pm during the previous meeting held.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr. Swanepoel confirmed that the noise specialist indicated according to international standards, day-time operating hours are indicated as 6:00 – 22:00. Confirmation will however be given upon review of the previous minutes.</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
	<p>Mr. Grobbelaar disagrees with the base line noise levels and argues that it is over exaggerated.</p>	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> No comment can be made as Ms. White is not the Noise Specialist. The comment is therefore noted.</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
Mr. R. Geberthuel	<p>Mr. Gaberthuel requested clarification whether the bricks are going to remain in the shed or are the bricks going to be moved out to the yard at some point. Mr Gaberthuel also wanted to know if the access gate on the west end</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel explained that on the southwestern side, there will be an exit gate where the forklift will exit with a parcel, and it will be placed in the yard where the trucks will load the parcel. Mr</p>	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting

	side of the proposed operation will be open or closed during the night.	Swanepoel stated that the southwestern access gate will be open at all times.		
Mr R. Geberthuel	Mr. Geberthuel requested clarification on how the company would assure the residents living within a close proximity of the proposed plant a peaceful night's sleep when working overtime or night shift. Mr. Geberthuel also stated that no one has spoken about wind blowing from the west to the east which will increase noise levels. He added that the existing brick plant is causing him to have endless headaches and lack of sleep due to noise vibration. Mr. Geberthuel wanted to know what the company is going to do to mitigate these impacts to ensure the residents a peaceful night's sleep.	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel reassured Mr Geberthuel that the operating hours for the plant will be from 6am to 10pm and that they will not work overtime.</p> <p><u>Ms. White</u> added that the company should comply to all regulations and standards and if they do not comply, it will have to be addressed by the Competent Authority.</p>	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr Dougherty made a statement by saying that there is already one plant generating noise and dust. The moment the second plant is put up on the same property they will be blaming one another for the noise and dust impact, and no one will be held accountable.	Noted	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace objects to referring to the previous meeting held with the Henley Liaison Forum as a public participation meeting. According to Mr Wallace the meeting held with the Henley Liaison Forum was to discuss noise, dust, and vibration	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White reiterated that the specialist only concluded their assessments after their due date and therefore a summary of the findings was presented within the meetings. All I&AP's will however</p>	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting

	and that he has not received the information that he required in that meeting. Mr Wallace expressed his concern that he was not given a hard copy of each specialist report during that meeting.	receive a copy of the reports as well as revised Basic Assessment Report to provide insurance that all comments received have been included within the report submitted to the GDARD.		
Comments related to Ecology				
Stan Wallace	Mr Wallace wanted to know what species was found to be of conservation concern.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> The species name will be included within the Final Basic Assessment, as it was omitted from the presentation	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
Comments related to dust				
Grant Miles Neve Sontnell road, 323	The constant dust, yes despite the mines finding, come and see our pool filter sand on a regular basis.	Comment noted. The possible impact of dust emission will be further investigated and findings will be shared with all interested and affected parties.	28 June 2021	e-mail
Daleside community	Work area must be paved to reduce dust impact	Agreed	24 June 2021	Meeting with Daleside community
Peter Teixeira Daleside Ward Councillor	The important points of concern raised by the community are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dust that may emanate from this development. 	The possible impact of dust emission will be further investigated and findings will be shared with all interested and affected parties	30 June 2021	e-mail
Jon Cronin 329 Sontnell road, Highbury	Dust levels as initially said was going to be a Klinger ash plant but since been changed. If we are to believe anything. Non transparency	The reference to clinker ash in the original application was based on the current SA Block operational model. The proposed operation is to utilize the Glen Douglas Mine material as aggregate in the mix designs.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	The mine area has a huge dust issue simply because dust and mining go hand in hand. SA Block state they will mitigate this by having most of the production inside a building.	The possible impact of dust emission will be further investigated and findings will be shared with all interested and affected parties. The reference to clinker ash in the original application was based on the	30 June 2021	email

	<p>They also state that the use of clinker ash which would be used in the production process, being trucked in was incorrect and that they will not use it.</p> <p>That needs to be corrected in writing with an undertaking that clinker ash won't be used now or in the future as the aggregates are 100% from the mine and won't be trucked in adding to an already badly stressed traffic impact.</p>	<p>current SA Block operational model. The proposed operation is to utilize the Glen Douglas Mine material as aggregate in the mix designs.</p>		
<p>Dorette Funke 3-303 Dinsdale Road, Highbury</p>	<p>Also, the dust that will be generated will be significant and I fear for the air quality that will be diminished.</p>	<p>The possible impact of dust emission will be further investigated and findings will be shared with all interested and affected parties. Once operational, SA Block will ensure that the dust emissions will comply with minimum requirements as per the National Air Quality Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Act.</p>	30 June 2021	e-mail
<p>Danie Grobbelaar</p>	<p>Mr Grobbelaar requested information on how a dust impact assessment was done without the plant being operational currently</p>	<p><u>Response from Ms. White:</u> All specialist reports will be sent to all interested and affected parties. The PowerPoint presentation only contains the summary of all the specialist studies and does not go into detail about what methodology was used for the assessment.</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Mr. Dougherty stated that the impact of dust cannot be assessed if no design for the brick manufacturing plant exists.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> The designs will be undertaken upon a decision from the Environmental Authority. Undertaking the designs for the development is an enormous cost if</p>	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting

		it is not yet known whether the development will be approved. Your comment is however noted.		
Comments relating to the operation of Glen Douglas Mine				
Grant Miles Neve Sontnell road, 323	The mine has made many promises to the community over the 18 years I have lived in the village, to me, they disrupt the peace and tranquillity of the village and I see the brick works as only adding to our misery both in noise, traffic and dust, this cannot be allowed to go ahead	The possible impact of traffic, dust, noise emissions will be further investigated and findings will be shared with all interested and affected parties. Once operational, SA Block will ensure that the dust emissions will comply with minimum requirements as per the National Air Quality Act and the Occupational Health and Safety Act.	28 June 2021	e-mail
	also hear from the mine forum that the mine has sneaked through rezoning	The re-zoning will be addressed with the local municipality should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development		
	The mine dump along sontnell road is placed illegally	The comment has no direct relevance to the proposed project		
Comments relating to the operating hours of the proposed brick plant				
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	The representatives from SA Block stated that the operation will end at 18h00 at night, this is minuted but still needs to be put in writing that this will be the hours and that they will not be increased without consultation.	The applicant agrees to not run the plant outside the Glen Douglas primary section working hours which is 06h00 to 22h00.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Peter Funke Highbury Resident	No working should be permitted after 18h00 at night should the plant be built.	The applicant agrees to not run the plant outside the Glen Douglas primary section working hours which is 06h00 to 22h00.	25 June 2021	e-mail
Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1	Operating times cannot be piggy-backed on the Mine operating times (which were obtained under dubious circumstances).	The applicant agrees to not run the plant outside the Glen Douglas primary section working hours which is 06h00 to 22h00.	01 July 2021	e-mail

<p>Dorette Funke 3-303 Dinsdale Road, Highbury</p>	<p>Dear Ntsanko,</p> <p>With this email I'm registering as a interested and affected party with regards to the proposed brick plant at Glen Douglas mine.</p> <p>I live in Highbury/Henley on Klip very close to the mine. At night we can hear the the Conframat brick plant all the way in our home and that plant is next to the R59 and significantly further away than the location of the proposed plant. One of the main reasons we moved to Henley/Highbury is due to it being a quiet small village. The proposed plant will change all of that.</p>	<p>The applicant has agreed to further investigate the possible noise impact of this proposed project to ensure that the occurrence of similar incidents is minimised as far as possible. In addition, the applicant has committed not work outside the current Glen Douglas Mine working times.</p>	<p>30 June 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>
Comments relating to employment opportunities				
<p>Daleside community</p>	<p>The community proposes that the brick plant must employ 80% of community members</p>	<p>The applicant agrees to employ at least 80% from the local communities for this operation as long as the minimum job specific required skills and qualifications are met by community members. If the minimum qualifications and skills cannot be met by local direct communities, the applicant will have to employ from further away.</p>	<p>24 June 2021</p>	<p>Community meeting</p>
<p>Daleside Community</p>	<p>The proposed brick plant must use local businesses as suppliers</p>	<p>The applicant agrees to use and support local businesses and suppliers as far as possible as long it does not compromise on service level, quality and costs.</p>	<p>24 June 2021</p>	<p>Community meeting</p>

<p>Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum</p>	<p>Concerns were raised at the Texiera public participation meeting about employment never being offered to the direct community first. SA Block indicated they would look at where possible employing locals, this needs to be put in writing.</p>	<p>The applicant agrees to employ at least 80% from the local communities for this operation as long as the minimum job specific required skills and qualifications are met by community members. If the minimum qualifications and skills cannot be met by local direct communities, the applicant will have to employ from further away.</p>	<p>30 June 2021</p>	<p>email</p>
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Irrespective of whether legally required or not the following studies should have been undertaken to show willingness to transparency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment opportunities for local residents (minimal in automated plants) • The project is not as stated in the background to be of primary benefit to Midvaal and the residents but to utilise a surplus product generated by Glen Douglas Dolomite and cross subsidise other operations. 	<p>The applicant agrees to employ at least 80% from the local communities for this operation as long as the minimum job specific required skills and qualifications are met by community members. If the minimum qualifications and skills cannot be met by local direct communities, the applicant will have to employ from further away.</p> <p>The applicant agrees to use and support local businesses and suppliers as far as possible as long it does not compromise on service level and quality.</p>	<p>01 July 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>
<p>Ms. Magogo</p>	<p>Ms. Magogo stated that she is representing the community members that has not been working for a long time and that the community members are looking forward to when the proposed project is operational. Ms. Magogo requested information on what the date will be when the project will be operational in order for those people that have not been working</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel responded that there are job specifications and if a person complies to these specifications, priority would be given to the Daleside community.</p> <p><u>Ms. White</u> added that it is noted within the Environmental Management Plan and that becomes the conditions of the Environmental Authorisation. It is also</p>	<p>29 November 2021</p>	<p>Public Consultation Meeting</p>

	for many years, can hold hope in their hearts to have a possible job.	stated within the Environmental Management Plan that locals should be employed for the project.		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace addressed a question to Ms Magogo and asked if she is aware that the proposed project is not as labour intensive and that there won't be hundreds of jobs available.	Ms. Magogo responded and said if it is only 10 jobs that there will be 10 households that can sleep at night.	29 November 2021	Public Consultation Meeting
Comments relating to land rezoning				
Wynand Engelbrecht For the Daleside Volunteers	<p>The Daleside Volunteers (a thoroughly constituted NPO representing the Daleside community-at-large at the Glen Douglas Mine Forum) herewith submits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The zoning for the two erven is agricultural. The proposed operation is industrial. The Midvaal City Council ought to express comments on the fact that other brick works were forced to develop in the industrial corridor between Springbok Road and the R59, yet this applicant brazenly submits this proposal 	The comment is correct with regards to the zoning of the property, however, the zoning does not form part of the environmental impact assessment process. The re-zoning will be addressed with the local municipality should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.	25 June 2021	e-mail
Wynand Engelbrecht For the Daleside Volunteers	The fact that transporting raw material to another site does not, in our opinion, justify this application. a. Furthermore: The home owner just across the road from the proposed site (less than 100 meters away) may not, under the town planning limitations, erect a building applicant	The construction plans on dolomite approvals will be addressed with the local municipality and engineers should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.	25 June 2021	e-mail

	proposes to construct two massively high silos on site. Where is the impact study proving the dolomite conditions will not affect an application for re-zoning? higher than two storeys, due to dolomite conditions; yet the			
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	It is unclear what the zoning is, but fundamentally its already used for mining type activity. As a result, they should give more information regards it.	The zoning does not form part of the environmental impact assessment process. The re-zoning will be addressed with the local municipality should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Jon cronin 329 sontnell road, Highbury	Is the plant a mine application or industrial application? as currently the mine is under DME. to best of our knowledge no industrial application to use mine lands has been lodged or approved	The zoning does not form part of the environmental impact assessment process. The re-zoning will be addressed with the local municipality should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.	30 June 2021	e-mail
Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1	Irrespective of whether legally required or not the following studies should have been undertaken to show willingness to transparency. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-division and rezoning of the property • The size of the property also suggests future development is planned. • The proposed plant layout does not lend itself to 	The zoning does not form part of the environmental impact assessment process. The re-zoning will be addressed with the local municipality should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.	01 July 2021	e-mail
Comments relating to activities being applied				
Daleside community	Community is concerned about their health as tar fumes and	The applicant commits to conduct further investigation on this matter and will provide feedback to the community	24 June 2021	Community meeting

	smell will result in them inhaling contaminated air	before going ahead with the asphalt plant		
Peter Teixeira Daleside Ward Councillor	The important points of concern raised by the community are as follows: Confusion whether this development will be for a brick manufacturing plant only or a bitumen and a ready-mix cement plant.	As clarified on the meeting held with the Daleside on 24th June 2021, the application for the brick plants, the asphalt and ready-mix concrete plants. Although the applicant is only starting with brick plants for now while going through the process, they have decided to include the possible future developments like asphalt plant and ready-mix plants.	25 June 2021	e-mail
Wynand Engelbrecht	The Daleside Volunteers (a thoroughly constituted NPO representing the Daleside community-at-large at the Glen Douglas Mine Forum) herewith submits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed brick making plant cum bitumen plant cum ready-mix cement plant ought to have ensured a proper route of presenting the scheme to this community. Either a poor cut-and-paste job was presented, or there is a sinister agenda. 	The proper procedure is being followed throughout this process	25 June 2021	e-mail
Jon Cronin 329 Sontnell road, Highbury Interested and affected party	There seems to be a bitumen and additional plant that has no clarity and seems to be piggy backing s a block application	As clarified on the meeting held with the Glen Douglas Mine Forum on 21st June 2021, the application for the brick plants, the asphalt and ready-mix concrete plants. Although the applicant is only starting with brick plants for now while going through the process, they have decided to include the possible future developments like asphalt plant and ready-mix plants.		

<p>Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum</p>	<p>There is mention of the application being for three activities. Brick works Bitumen tar products Ready mix cement concrete. Despite this no one from Afrimat could provide any information besides the limited information provided on the brick works. But they confirmed this application is for three activities despite that only one is addressed now, but want from what we understand permission for all three based on only the brick plants limited information. Which cannot be acceptable as the bitumen tar plant has the potential to be the most negative of the three.</p>	<p>As clarified on the meeting held with the Glen Douglas Mine Forum on 21st June 2021, the application for the brick plants, the asphalt and ready-mix concrete plants. Although the applicant is only starting with brick plants for now while going through the process, they have decided to include the possible future developments like asphalt plant and ready-mix plants.</p>	<p>30 June 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322, Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>Irrespective of whether legally required or not the following studies should have been undertaken to show willingness to transparency.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Materials handling time & motion inside the plant. • The plant will be cross subsidizing other less profitable SA Block manufacturing plants resulting in capital outflows for the area 	<p>Comment noted, the main aim for the proposed project is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve future sustainability of SA Block 2. Increase/stabilise sales volumes for Glen Douglas which will improve the its sustainability and future viability 3. This will also increase job security as well as local business benefiting from these operations 	<p>01 July 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322, Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>The RMC Plant and Asphalt Plant should be excluded from the possible activities due to a complete lack of information</p>	<p>As clarified on the meeting held with the Glen Douglas Mine Forum on 21st June 2021, the application for the brick plants, the asphalt and ready-mix</p>	<p>01 July 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>

	supplied, and an RMC plant is not able to be housed within a building	concrete plants. Although the applicant is only starting with brick plants for now while going through the process, they have decided to include the possible future developments like asphalt plant and ready-mix plants. Because the RMC plant does not generate significant noise, dust and vibrations like a brick manufacturing plant there is no need to house and enclose within a building.		
Mr. L. Kirchner	Mr. Kirchner requested information about the number of lines that will be made.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> We will be making one line. We are hoping to produce 120 000 bricks per day.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum meeting
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty required a better understanding of how the concrete will be cured within 2 days, as the concreted used at other operations take 28 days to cure.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Concrete is not going to be used. The mixture used for the brick manufacturing will be a dry mix which use less water.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum meeting
General Comments				
Daleside Community	The community would like the mine/SA Block to assist with regards to providing rehabilitation measure for substance abuse as most of the community member do not get employment in the mine because they fail the substance test	The applicant will liaise with the Glen Douglas Mine management regarding this matter and investigate any possibilities of assisting in this regard.	24 June 2021	Community Meeting
	The proposed land is seating under dolomite, a dolomite study must be conducted to ensure that the proposed brick making structure will be safe	The construction plans on dolomite approvals will be addressed with the local municipality and engineers should the proposed project be authorised by the Gauteng Department of Agriculture and Rural Development.		

	Should the project be authorised, SA Block must ensure that there is a complaint structure that should include community members to ensure that the community is able to raise their complaints and that the complaints are being attended to.	Comment noted, a complaints register will be on site where the public can formally register their complaints which will be investigated and addressed accordingly.		
	The community requests that SA Block ensures that there are security measures in place to protect neighboring houses from crime activities	Comment noted. The applicant will have 24-hour security patrolling on site. SA Block is not a law enforcement agency but they will endeavor to liaise with local municipalities and authorities to improve security in the surrounding areas as far as possible		
Grant Miles Neve Sontnell road, 323	So, in a nutshell, NO, we do not want the brick plant thank you.	Comment noted.	28 June 2021	email
Stan Wallace Glen Douglas Mine Residents Forum	<p>The end result is as a forum representing affected residents we are forced to reject and oppose this application purely because the applicant has not been transparent on providing factual information to the point of saying they would use clinker ash which was then denied it would be used, they have hidden behind the covid regulations at the time to avoid meaningful and constructive interaction regarding this project as a whole, when it was demonstrated by Mr Texiera they were simply taking the easier route.</p> <p>The end result leaves us not being able to decide is it a positive or a negative for the area, as such we urge you to instruct them to go</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner presented studies done as requested by the National Department of Environmental, Forestry and Fisheries. Other potential impacts related to dust, noise, traffic and other impacts have also been identified and assessed as per the prescribed impact assessment methodology and the impact significance was found to be low due to the construction and layout of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are</p>	30 June 2021	email

	<p>back and do what they should have done to answer the above as to afford us the opportunity to make a constructive decision as we see both sides of the coin being development but also life quality of an already heavily impacted by mining actions community.</p> <p>As such we hope the applicant will be instructed to relook and fill in all the blank spots.</p>	<p>incorporated into the Draft Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments</p>		
<p>Alan Dougherty Affected Property owner, 322 Dinsdale Rd Highbury Ext 1</p>	<p>The whole application is flawed and the onus placed on the affected parties to do the applicant's investigations and monitoring if the project should ever be given the green light.</p>	<p>The Environmental Assessment Practitioner presented studies done as requested by the National Department of Environmental, Forestry and Fisheries. Other potential impacts related to dust, noise, traffic and other impacts have also been identified and assessed as per the prescribed impact assessment methodology and the impact significance was found to be low due to the construction and layout of the proposed operation.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to conduct further investigations with regards to noise, dust, vibration and traffic impact. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner will liaise with the Department of Gauteng of Agriculture and Rural Development to request an extension on the project timeframes to ensure that the findings of these investigations are incorporated into the Draft Basic Assessment Report that will have to be send out to all registered stakeholders for 30 days them to provide their comments.</p>	<p>01 July 2021</p>	<p>e-mail</p>

Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace expressed his concern about why they have not received all specialist studies prior to the public participation meeting.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White explained that extension of the project was granted by the department on the 22 nd of October. The specialists should have completed all additional assessments by the 15 th of November, however, these assessments were only concluded two days prior to the consultation. Ms. White apologised and indicated that the specialist assessments will be shared after the meeting has been concluded.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr Grobbelaar expressed his concern that all formal questions and concerns raised by the public were not being addressed and that there is no assurance that the comment would be included within the Final Basic Assessment Report.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White reassured all attendees that all comments will be addressed, and everybody will receive a copy of the minutes of the stakeholder engagement as well as a copy of the comments and response report.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace expressed his concern about the lack of time for commenting on the specialist reports	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White explained that the Final Report needs to be submitted to the Competent Authority (GDARD) by the 6 th of December to prevent the project from lapsing and that all interested and affected parties may still send all comments and concerns even though the Final has been submitted. Any comments received will be forwarded to the competent authority for consideration. It is also noted that all I&AP's still have another opportunity to appeal the project once a decision has been made by the GDARD.	23 November 2021	Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting

<p>Mr. A. Dougherty</p>	<p>Mr Dougherty referred to the power point presentation and asked to go back to the pre-mix plant as he requires information on the proposed mitigation measures for noise, dust and transportation in and out of the plant.</p> <p>Mr Dougherty insisted on seeing drawing for the proposed plant.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel explained that there will be trucks transporting materials on site to the building of the pre bins. A front-end loader will gather the materials from the bins and put it into a small bin from where it will be transported via conveyer into the building. Mr Swanepoel stated that he has started many similar plants and that he is very excited as this plant will be using new technology. The baseline used in the noise study was generated from the reputational health and safety surveys that are done every year.</p> <p><u>Ms. White</u> added that the specialist reports were received on 20 November 2021 and the public meeting was held to share the findings of the specialist reports. She added that everyone will receive a copy of the specialist reports and should there be any additional questions or comments, it can be sent to her or directly to the department. Ms. White added that the Final Basic Assessment Report needs to be submitted by 6 December 2021. Therefore, all comments received to date will be included within the Final BA Report and should there be any additional comments, these can be sent</p>	<p>29 November 2021</p>	<p>Public consultation Meeting</p>
--------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------	------------------------------------

		to the Department directly via the Environmental Assessment Practitioner.		
Stan Wallace Chairman, Glen Douglas Community Forum	<p>Firstly, in my personal capacity I put it on record that I believe when compared to the past the mine is better run than before, yes there are issues which can / could easily be resolved. Sadly, as fast as we try convince people of this, the below destroys any convincing we have made.</p> <p>Secondly, I think the brick plant is a project worth looking at objectively as it makes business sense and if and only if certain issues are addressed (noise, dust, vibration, traffic) as it's a far lesser invasive project than others which could be done there, the once proposed furnace being one of them. But then I don't live next to it. But we represent people who will live next to it, not the shareholders of these companies, so we are morally required to see it from affected residents' eyes and this will affect them. So, I now reply regards the Glen Douglas mine liaison committee meeting held last night 2021.11.23.</p> <p>At the first meeting held in June the committee raised concerns, as basically the meeting was held with minimal facts available. But a meeting based on assumptions</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>As per the request during the meetings held in June, additional specialist assessments were undertaken which includes, Noise and Vibration Assessment, Dust Assessment and</p>	24 November 2021	email

	<p>and “we think” were presented as the substance for the meeting without real tangible facts. Eventually, it was agreed this was early days and that a new more comprehensive meeting would be held and agreed that the June meeting would not be ticked off as public participation. Furthermore, the representative from Afrimat came with a long-drawn-out explanation as to why she could not hold a proper public participation meeting. Yet within two days after that meeting, the ward councillor, Peter Teixeira arranged a well turned out meeting where Afrimat were the guests, opposed to the organisers.</p> <p>In last night’s meeting the two above meeting were included in the presentation as if they were arranged by the people representing the brick manufacturers as their public participation, despite that at both meetings they agreed not to do so.</p> <p>Then on 2021.11.23 meeting we expected, as agreed to in the first meeting, that the issues regarding noise, dust and vibration that were raised at the first non-productive meeting, would be discussed as agreed to, noting that basically in a weeks’ time there is a public</p>	<p>Traffic Assessment. These assessments were concluded on the 20th of November after the GDARD approved the request for extension of the application.</p> <p>As the additional specialist assessment were only concluded on the 20th of November, it was decided to provide all attendees of the meeting with a summary of the findings of each report. This summary was presented during both meetings (Glen Douglas Mine Forum Meeting as well as the public participation meeting) and it was confirmed during these meetings that the report which includes the specialist assessments, and comments and response report, will be distributed to all registered interested and affected parties and should there be any additional comment to what was raised previously or during the latest consultations, such comments can be submitted to the GDARD directly or</p>		
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>participation meeting that only allows residents a few days to respond before closure.</p> <p>The issue is that area comprises of many poor as well as previously disadvantaged resident to who internet and email etc. is still a distant dream.</p> <p>The applicants simply have ignored this and brushed it off as insignificant, despite it being a human rights issue.</p> <p>So, most of these people rely on the mine forum network to be able to inform them opposed to the mine forum being a rubber stamping tick box exercise, which it's become clear how the applicants are treating it.</p> <p>This begs the question as how we as a resident's mine forum can state this.</p> <p>Well, its simple, again last night a meeting was held in the good spirit of engaging with the representatives of the community to get clarity on:</p> <p>Noise. Dust. Vibration. Traffic, as in how new traffic will be mitigated on a road that's basically falling to pieces as no</p>	<p>through the Environmental Assessment Practitioner. A hard copy of the report will also be made available to I&AP's at the Firehouse Gym in Daleside.</p> <p>The additional specialist assessments were undertaken to address the concerns raised with regards to noise and vibration, dust and additional traffic generated. The mitigation measures proposed, minimizes or manages the impacts identified and has been included within the Environmental</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>one takes responsibility for it between municipal and provincial government structures.</p> <p>We were told that specialists have investigated the above issues and reports have been drawn up.</p> <p>Yet at the meeting we given an excuse they were only received last week Friday and so have not been distributed, which at best should have been a simple email to all concerned to allow transparent discussion to take place at the meeting.</p> <p>At worst it could have been included in last night's presentation and discussed there regardless of how long it took.</p> <p>But neither of the two were done, apparently, we will get it later in the week via email which again begs the question of why was it not done before the meeting. If you going to distribute it via email then why not do it in time for the meeting. So why hold the meeting?</p> <p>This is like asking a student to write their matric exam on Monday but only provide the learning materials days after, if at all, then can't grasp why they failed. This is totally absurd</p>	<p>Management Plan for implementation, should the project be approved.</p> <p>As noted in the response above.</p>		
--	--	---	--	--

	<p>concept unless it's done intentionally.</p> <p>So last night we sat and watched the presentation we saw last time with about as much factual content, which was nothing, wasting all who attended time plus further unnecessarily, adding more strain to the mine / residents at times tense relationship. We as a mine forum have again put it on record that we will not see the meeting 2021.11.23 as public participation due to it being void of any facts or answers to questions raised from the first meeting.</p> <p>The only tangible positive was the withdrawal of the bitumen plant, but questions regard the ready-mix concrete remain unanswered, which raised questions as to why, no one opposed the idea, but opposed the non-transparency around this project as a whole.</p> <p>In short, we are expected to answer residents' questions regard the development, but have not been provided with any information to do so.</p> <p>The result is, I as chairman won't be treated like a mushroom, being kept in the dark and fed compost who is like anyone on the Residents mine forum being unable to answer honestly</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>questions being asked by residents.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this made me decide to resign as chairman at the end of the year, as I see the forum is being used as a rubber-stamping exercise and seen as an irritation ignoring the fact it could be a valuable tool in paving a fruitful relationship between both parties on opposite sides of the fence.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--