

AGENDA: PUBLIC MEETING	Date: 29 November 2021
Project: Midvaal Brick Manufacturing SA Block (Pty) Ltd	Venue: Firehouse Gym, Daleside, Gauteng Province

1. Welcome and introduction

Ms. White welcomed everybody to the meeting and introduced herself.

2. Absent

Mr A. Da Serra from SA Block (Pty) Ltd could not attend the public meeting.

3. Background Information

Ms White introduced herself to the group. She went through the agenda of the meeting. Ms White referred to the previous meeting held where the community requested additional specialist studies to be done, which took some time. A request for the extension of the application had to be handed in by the department to prevent the project from lapsing. The department approved the extension on 22 October 2021 and noted that the final report be submitted by 6 December 2021.

Ms White explained that SA Block (Pty) Ltd is proposing to erect a brick manufacturing facility adjacent to Glen Douglas mine, on the corner of Adelaar Drive and Bokmakierie Street. The brick manufacturing plant will be under a roof of 1500m² and it will also have a storage yard of approximately 5000m². There will also be temporary buildings and offices. There is a possibility for the expansion of the project in the future, which will include a ready-mix plant. There was a discussion about also having an asphalt plant added to this facility, but it must be noted that this is no longer considered.

Ms White explained that an EIA process is a legislative tool needs to be done in order for the department to authorise the project. She explained that it is called an environmental Impact Assessment process and during this process it is required to do public participation, therefore a meeting was arranged to gather everybody's inputs and see where everyone can be accommodated, what the impacts are and how the impacts are going to be mitigated and for this reason the additional three specialist studies were undertaken. According to the National Environmental Management Act (Act 36 of 1998), it has three listing notices. Listing notice 1, 2, and 3 (GNR 983 GNR 984 and GNR 985) as amended in 2017. The two listed activities applicable to this proposed project falls within listing notice 1, which states that a Basic Assessment process needs to be conducted:

GNR 983, 2014 (as amended), Activity 26:

Residential, retail, recreational, tourism, commercial or institutional developments of 1000 square meters or more, on land previously used for mining or heavy industrial purposes

GNR 983, 2014 (as amended), Activity 27:

The clearance of an area of 1 hectares or more, but less than 20 hectares of indigenous vegetation, except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for – (i) the undertaking of a linear activity.

Ms. White then explained that a Heritage Impact Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment was requested by the department and the findings were as follow:

Heritage Impact Assessment

A site investigation was conducted and nothing that was found to be of heritage significance by Mr. Francois Coetzee.

Ecological Impact Assessment

The Ecological Impact Assessment was undertaken by scientific terrestrial services. The site is located within the Vulnerable Soweto Highveld Grassland. It was found that the study area have been exposed to historic disturbances, therefore the impact on fauna and flora is low, however there was one species found to be of conservation concern. A permit will have to be obtained in order for that species to be removed.

Ms. White stated that upon request from the previous public meeting a Dust Impact Assessment, a Noise Impact Assessment and a Traffic Assessment was conducted and that the findings were as follow:

Noise Impact Assessment

Acusolv was appointed to investigate the noise impact of the proposed operation on the surrounding environment. It was found that there is a lot of noise surrounding the proposed operation. The noise is generated from the R59 main road and local roads, noise from the railway line to the west, and noise from Glen Douglas Dolomite Mine to the South. In Daleside, surveys indicate that the daytime and night-time levels were in the order of 50dBA and 45 dBA, respectively. The Noise study found that the noise impact of the proposed operation on the nearest houses, will be negligible (the nearest house is outside the 3dBA impact footprint).

This negligible impact is due to the following reasons:

- Restriction of operation to daytime hours;
- Placement of brick manufacturing machines inside brick plant buildings;
- Reverse alarm noises could however be audible but can effectively be mitigated by construction of a noise barrier along the northern and along part of the eastern site boundaries.

Dust Impact Assessment

OH & AP Consulting was appointed to conduct the dust assessment for the proposed operation. It was concluded that the main sources of dust will be from the movement of haul trucks over the terrain for the delivery of process material, off-loading of process material, Open storage of process material, dust generated through material entering silos and dust emitted through material handling inside the plant.

The processing plant will be housed inside an enclosed structure. Any dust emissions inside the plant will be controlled as required by the relevant Occupational Health Legislation. The impact rating of

the proposed project is projected to be **low** provided the mitigating measures are implemented against backdrop of the prevailing dust fall conditions at the boundaries of the existing site.

The proposed mitigation measures are as follow:

- The paving of access roads and material storage areas
- Building of product storage bunkers to limit windblown dust
- The implementation of dust suppression at storage bunkers
- The use of dust suppression at material transfer points
- The implementation of dust extraction with a filtering system on top of silos
- Dust extraction and filtering of emissions from sources inside building

Traffic Assessment

Mariteng Consulting Engineers were appointed to conduct the Traffic Impact Assessment. Based on the results the proposed development will generate approximately 8 and 11 trips, during the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours respectively. The following minimum access arrangements are proposed for the site:

- Access from Bokmakierie Road, on the most southern boundary of the site;
- Two inbound lanes (1 x 3.7m & 1 x 4.5m);
- One outbound lane, minimum width 4.5m;

From a traffic engineering point of view, it is confirmed that the impact of the new brick manufacturing facility will be negligible on the traffic flow along Bokmakierie Road. To compensate for the turning vehicles an exclusive right-turn lane (storage length = 25) should be provided on the southern leg of Bokmakierie Road. To improve road safety, taxi stops to be provided on Bokmakierie Road, downstream of the new access and to improve road safety, a 1.5m paved walkway to be provided around the taxi stops.

Ms White indicated that no fatal flaws in terms of environmental and socio-economic impacts were identified as all of the impacts can be mitigated and managed to be of low significance and where possible it can also be prevented.

Ms. White indicated that the finding of the additional specialist studies are included within the Final Basic Assessment Report and an Environmental Management Programme, which includes mitigation measures proposed by the project specialists, have also been included for approval by the department.

Ms. White briefly explained the public participation process to date. The summary of the PPP was as follows:

- Project announcement
- On-site notices (8) – 27 May 2021
- Newspaper (English) adverts – Sedibeng Ster, 26 May 2021 and the Henley- Herald Newspaper, 10 June 20021
- Distribution of notification letters by email to I&AP's - 27 May 2021
- Distribution of Draft Scoping Report – 01 June 2021

Previous public consultations undertaken:

- Henley Liaison Forum – 21 June 2021;
- Daleside community – 24 June 2021 (which was organized by Mr. Peter Teixeira)

I&APs comments were received and included within the Comments and Response Report submitted to GDARD which was followed by a request for extension to undertake the additional specialist assessments.

Mr Swanepoel then explained the process flow that will be implemented for the brick making. The way SA Block is proposing to manufacture bricks are different than baking clay bricks in an oven. A mixture of cement, water and aggregate (which is a -10 stone dust) is used as a dry mix to manufacture the bricks. SA Block is proposing to use Glen Douglas mine's -10 materials. The mixture used for the brick manufacturing consist of a chemical that expedites a reaction with the cement, currently this method is not being used, but most brick manufacturers are using this method. The wet concrete mixture is thrown into a mould and under pressure and vibration it is compacted into stone bricks. The mould lifts and the stone bricks are released onto a conveyer belt where it is cured for 24-48 hours. Once it is cured it is at 70% strength where it is placed in the yard for at least one week, thereafter the stone bricks can be collected by client. A forklift will be used to transport the stone bricks. A loader will also be used to get the dry mixture into the large mixer.

3. Questions and Comments:

Interested and Affected Party	Comment	Response
Mr R. Geberthuel	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 side of the proposed operation will be open or closed during the night.	<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 Swanepoel stated that the southwestern access gate will be open at all times.
Mr. A. Dougherty	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. Mr Dougherty insisted on seeing drawing for the proposed plant.	<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

		<p>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 to the Department directly via the Environmental Assessment Practitioner.</p>
<p>Mr R. Geberthuel</p>	<p>Mr Gaberthuel 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 Gaberthuel 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. Gaberthuel wanted to know what the company is going to do to mitigate these impacts to ensure the residents a peaceful night's sleep.</p>	<p><u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel reassured Mr Gaberthuel 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>
<p>Mr. A. Dougherty</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>Noted</p>

	will be blaming one another for the noise and dust impact, and no one will be held accountable.	
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 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.	<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 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.
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace requested information on how interested and affected parties are given the necessary information if they do not have email.	<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
Ms. Magogo	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 for many years, can hold hope in their hearts to have a possible job.	<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. <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 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.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr Dougherty wanted to know when the report will be issued.	<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

		<p>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>Mr. A. Dougherty</p>	<p>Mr Dougherty expressed his concern about the lack of time for commenting on the reports.</p>	<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>

4. Conclusions

Ms. White indicated that the meeting was noted, and communication will be forwarded to all attendees. Ms. White requested that any additional questions be submitted via email in order for the comments and questions to be included within the Final Basic Assessment Report.

Ms White encouraged all the attendees to write down all concerns and questions and send it to her via email.

Ms. White thanked everybody for attending the meeting and the meeting was adjourned.