

Meeting Agenda

Project number	1001083	Meeting date	2021-02-12
Project name	Strategic Environmental Assessment for mixed use development options in Cato Ridge	Drafted by	J Wiese
Meeting/subject	Authority Initiation Meeting	Total pages	4

Item	Topic
1	Welcome and attendance
2	Round of introductions
3	Background to the project
4	Purpose of the SEA
5	Approach to the SEA
6	Authority consultation & engagement
7	Desired outcomes
8	Discussion and Questions

Attendees

Full Name	Initial	Organisation	User Action	Timestamp
Ashley Mcleod	AM	Assmang CRDC	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:30:33 AM
Carlos Magalhaes	CM	Assmang CRDC	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
George Karsten	GK	Assmang CRDC	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Dr Dee Fischer	DF	DEFF	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:53:38 AM
Michelle Lotz	ML	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:58 AM
Cameron McLean	CMI	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:30:15 AM
Khomotjo Rakubu	KR	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:31:14 AM
Velile Ndaba	VN	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:32:01 AM
Greg Mullins	GM	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:32:58 AM
Rayven Moodley	RM	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:40:07 AM
Thembekile Mbatha	TM	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:56:54 AM
Mpume Gumede	MG	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Emmanuel Letebele	EL	eThekwini Municipality	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Dominic Wieners	DW	Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Felicity Elliott	FE	Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Mdu Zondo	MZ	KZN EDTEA	Joined	2/12/2021, 10:21:57 AM
Nasreen Asmal	NA	KZN EDTEA	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Asia Khan	AK	KZN EDTEA	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Jeanne-Louise Wiese	JW	Zutari	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Reuben Heydenrych	RH	Zutari	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:30:45 AM
Mel Pillay	MP	Zutari	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:29:44 AM
Rowan Albertyn	RA	Zutari	Joined	2/12/2021, 9:31:25 AM

Meeting Minutes

Item	Topic Discussion
1	Welcome and Attendance Mel Pillay (MP) from Zutari welcomed all attendees.
2	Round of introductions All meeting attendees introduced themselves.
3	Background to the project Refer to slides 3 to 9 of the attached presentation.
4	Purpose of the SEA Refer to slide 10 of the attached presentation.
5	Approach to the SEA Refer to slides 11 to 13 of the attached presentation.
6	Authority consultation & engagement Refer to slide 14 of the attached presentation.
7	Desired outcomes Refer to slide 15 of the attached presentation.

8	Discussion and Questions Dominic Wieners (DW) commented that, with his focus on biodiversity, he picked up that the presentation specifically mentions an assessment of birds, mammals and butterflies. He queried if the team considered looking at other faunal species and reptiles. Reuben Heydenrych (RH) mentioned that Zutari will confirm the terms of reference for the terrestrial ecologist and will have some discussions with Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife on the matter. Dr Dee Fischer (DF) also added that the DEFF screening tool would be able to assist with identifying the required faunal species to be assessed. MP confirmed that Groundtruth will be responsible for the faunal study and will also provide guidance on the key sensitivities to consider. Michelle Lotz (ML) requested confirmation whether the Spatial Development Framework (SDF) was used to inform the proposed development layout options. Rowan Albertyn (RA) indicated that the SDF and Local Area Plan (LAP) were used. He also added that they have undertaken site visits and have had discussions with local planners. The proposed layout plan is a concept plan, although demarcated in proposed stands, with the purpose of informing the bulk service and financial viability. The team has also consulted with Mr. Rayven Moodley (RM) about the proposed layout options. Greg Mullins (GM) opined that the <i>“horse is before the cart”</i> far as conceptual layouts is concerned. He added that the SEA is intended to be a negative mapping exercise to see what is left after sensitivities have been considered to inform a development footprint. He also mentioned that if offsets are considered, this is concerning, since it is almost impossible to offset in certain scenarios. He said that eThekweni Municipality would not likely want to accept the loss of KZN Sandstone Sourveld (KZV SS) as there is not much left. GM explained that the current layout, particularly the loss of the high quality KZN SS, is unacceptable in its current form. MP indicated that the purpose of the SEA process is to use the available and specialist information to guide further limitation of the development options to balance development and conservation to get closer to a sustainable outcome. ML enquired if Zutari has been in contact with Joanne Douwes from eThekweni Metro, who is completing a SEA for the entire Durban area. ML recommended that the project team speak to Jo Douwes to get some input. ML remembers during her consultation that they commented on the air quality problems of the area, linked to the Assmang Smelter. She added that it would be interesting to see how that plays out when developing the Cato Ridge area. ML asked whether air quality studies will be done as part of the SEA? MP responded that air quality assessments have not been included and the intention was to utilise existing air quality data and studies for the region. DF commented that the project team should be looking at options to streamline environmental authorisation processes. Jeanne-Louise Wiese (JW) commented that it is sometimes difficult to combine applications due to a 20-25-year development horizon, different landowners and issues on certain applications which can delay the broader process. DF responded that combined applications for separate landowners is allowed. She also added that the project team should make sure that all information is properly geo-referenced in terms of GIS and that sensitivities are identified spatially so that it can be used during future authorisation processes. The team must make sure that electronic spatial data are made available. Asia Khan (AK) asked if there would be any data ownership rights issues and MP responded that the spatial data would be made available electronically as well as in hard copies for future use and that there should not be any ownership issues in that regard. GM cautioned against how much detail is reflected in the SEA and how much authority support is given to the SEA vs. what happens in environmental authorisation processes. He said that there is a danger of conflict between information that is provided in the SEA and detailed information generated in EIAs. He added that if Assmang sells off land with a potential development footprint, then an EIA would be restricted and aimed at that. If that is not achieved at the EIA phase, there is a risk to Assmang as the seller of land. MP noted that the project team would like to closely consult with the municipality to tap into the experience on these matters to ensure this SEA is a process that adds value. GM indicated that they are very happy to continue engaging. He also pointed out the importance when considering offsets. Offsets would not be resolved at SEA phase, so what the team will be producing is map of a potentially developable areas. However, when calculating the offset ratios, the costs and practicality might make projects unviable and one would have a very concerned developer. These are risks that the project team needs to highlight early on in this process. A clear understanding is needed of where the SEA starts and stops and what onus there would be on the developers themselves. DF mentioned it is problematic to consider offsets before the study has commenced. She would recommend to rather start with clear objectives of what we want to achieve from the SEA process, such as no net loss of sensitive vegetation. She added that the team should identify no-go areas. The team should set some environmental, social and economic objectives for guidance through this process. MP responded that at this stage the project team have not considered offsets. The team is
---	--

Item	Topic Discussion
	presenting conceptual areas (from the concept and pre-feasibility studies) and from here one needs to assess where the balance is. RM advised that the authorities follow the process to see how the SEA will shape the proposed development areas and the eventual recommendations and compatibility of proposed land uses. RM added that they will continue to engage with the project team, mainly towards the latter part of the project, and would like to stay involved to see how this unfolds. DW wanted to know to what extent the cumulative impacts will be considered in the SEA. This will fit nicely to issues in terms of disjuncts between the SEA and EIA processes. Cumulative impacts for this area might be helpful to assess during the SEA process to alleviate issues later in EIAs. MP stated that he agrees and that the nature of cumulative impacts in the broader region will definitely be included. This is where authority consultations will be of value in terms of regional development pressure and sensitivities. In addition to air quality and ecology, MP asked if there was else the team should focus on. DW agreed that ecological impacts must be considered as part of the cumulative considerations. Mdu Zondo (MZ) said that he joined the meeting a little late but that he was not sure what will be the outputs of the SEA process. MP responded that based on the scale, magnitude and sensitivity of the area it was decided to look at potential development from a strategic importance point of view to facilitate a more holistic approach on developments. He also added that Assmang will probably not develop the land themselves and that the intention is to sell parcels of land to potential developers. The final deliverable will be the SEA and Strategic Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) and within that the proposed development plan or footprint that could potentially be allowed. This will include management and mitigation measures for sensitive areas and no-go areas. MP also added that all biodiversity requirements that would need to be met needs to be outlined. MZ noted that there are many policy documents and "plans" applicable to this region (such as SIP and LAP) and requested that the proposed project align with the local and national policies. MZ indicated that these policies should not be superseded by the requirements of national legislation. In addition, MZ explained that there are various proposed developments for the broader Cato Ridge region and this Project should not prevent or limit other Projects. Zutari will arrange a meeting with MZ as a matter of urgency to get clarity on the matter as discussed. Felicity Elliott (FE) said that she had missed the presentation but that they have information available for faunal sensitivities. She also asked that Zutari include the spatial planners from adjacent local municipalities. RA responded that the team has considered their policy document but have not approached the Mkhambathini Municipality yet. This engagement will be completed as part of the SEA. Velile Ndaba (VN) added that there is alignment between Cato Ridge and Mkhambathini Municipality and that the planner to be contacted is Zinhle Mbonambi. AK enquired how current land use pressures will be dealt with. Ashley Mcleod (AM) responded that in terms of illegal sand mining, many challenges were experienced in 2019/20. He added that they have intervened with various authorities to ensure they are monitored and stopped. He noted that they continue to monitor the situation with security services and that as far as they are aware, the illegal mining on their property is no longer an issue. George Karsten (GK) added that as far as grazing is concerned, it is a minor issue on the site. JW noted the importance of a discussion about land use pressure when defining no-go areas that would be excluded from development, but which would then be open to other unwanted land uses. This discussion should ensure that areas earmarked for conservation should indeed be managed as such. Carlos Magalhaes (CM) thanked everyone present and highlighted that the proposed development plan is just a view of what could be developed at this stage and it does not define any developments as such developments will take place as and when land is sold. He added that the strategic work was started because Assmang is aware of the LAP and SIP2. Assmang, as an land owner, realised that they can assist and stimulate development in the Cato Ridge area. The intention of the SEA is for Assmang as the landowners to know what land can be made available for sale and development. The intention is not to change current planned development for the area, but to identify what can be sold to developers. The meeting was adjourned at 10:58am.