



# Eco Route

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANCY  
REGISTRATION NO. 1998/031976/23

DR. COLLEEN EBERSOHN

PhD Univ. Pretoria

e-mail: [ebersohn@cyberperk.co.za](mailto:ebersohn@cyberperk.co.za)

MS. JANET EBERSOHN

BSc. Hons. Environmental Management

Cell: 082 557 7122

Tel: 044 343 2232

e-mail: [janet@ecoroute.co.za](mailto:janet@ecoroute.co.za)

## EIA PROCESS

### Comments and Response Report

The Construction of a Boardwalk to Connect Granny's Pool to Main Beach, St Francis Bay, Eastern Cape

DEDEA EIA Reference: EC08/C/LN1&3/M/31-2019

#### Comments received from the Background Information Document - Public Participation:

COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<b>PUBLIC</b>	
<b>Dr Anton Boonzaier 26/06/2017</b>	
<p>We support the proposal in principal and the community-minded reasons behind it.</p> <p>Sadly, such civic mindfulness is not, and will not be reciprocated by most of the local fisherman who currently fish off the rock revetments at high tide. The concept of littering seems beyond their comprehension. Currently, after almost every occasion fisherman are on the rocks, plastic bags, bait bags, glass bottles, plastic bottles, bait, fishing line, discarded fish pieces etc.etc are simply left behind on the rocks to blow or wash into the sea or between the rocks, or to rot and smell in the case of bait/discarded fish. It would be very naïve to provide amenities to such people as these would only further facilitate such anti-social behaviour. It can be taken as guaranteed that a wooden platform would provide a convenient surface for cutting up bait and fish – with resultant stench and hygiene issues.</p> <p>Also sadly, the boardwalk would probably worsen current security issues regarding access by criminals from the sea-front. Although this would not out-weigh the positive benefits of the</p>	<p><b>Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>In order to address the issue of litter being left on the beach by the public, the applicant has incorporated waste bins into the design of the boardwalk. The applicant has also included erecting notice boards along the boardwalk to remind the public to utilise the waste bins.</b></p> <p><b>The applicant has included the following security measures into the proposal: back railings, lockable gates, signage, and security companies to patrol the boardwalk.</b></p>

<p>proposal, it needs to be borne in mind and mitigated for as far as is possible.</p> <p>Local residents directly adjacent to proposed activity. We utilise the area concerned on a near daily basis and have a direct concern and vested interest over its natural and built environment.</p> <p>We, and some other local residents, currently have to clean-up the area ourselves after the local fisherman on a weekly basis, as the municipality fails in this regard.</p> <p><b>List any potential (reasonable and / or feasible) alternatives for the activity and state why these alternative(s) are recommended:</b></p> <p>'No go' alternative for the proposed "fishing bays/platforms" due to the entirely predictable anti-social behaviour of most fisherman as described above in 1.</p>	<p><b>Noted. The EAP is aware of the existing rock revetments that had to be constructed along the base of the dunes due to erosion damage caused by wave action, storm surges, etc.</b></p> <p><b>With inspection of the specialist reports, it is noted that the boardwalk would overall have little impact on the natural environment; however, the future integrity of the dunes may be compromised where the boardwalk is required to be tied-back into the dune.</b></p> <p><b>Although, the municipality will be required to collect waste from waste bins on a weekly basis, it will be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the area is kept clean.</b></p> <p><b>Noted.</b></p>
---	---

**Barry Platt 22/06/2017**

<p>As a surfer and local resident (Harbour Rd.) I am at Granny's pool most mornings and surf there regularly.</p> <p>I am aware of the proposed walkway from Main beach to Granny's pool and would like to comment as follows;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am quite happy with the idea of building the walkway</li> <li>• My concerns are mainly with maintenance and monitoring of the walkway</li> <li>• I would just like to be reassured that bins will be placed along the walkway and these would be cleaned daily especially after weekends</li> <li>• I am constantly picking up rubbish on the beach and at Granny's pool every morning and managing the bins is key to this area being kept clean</li> <li>• The problem is not with general rubbish but it is fishing line, bit and broken bottles which are a problem</li> <li>• Obviously any bottles thrown into the sea in front of the walkway would endanger surfers coming in over those rocks as often is the case</li> <li>• Can you advise as to the plan for managing the inevitable rubbish?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>The supply of waste bins along the boardwalk would expectantly reduce the amount of waste being thrown into the sea and surrounds.</b></p> <p><b>Although, the municipality will be required to collect waste from waste bins on a weekly basis, it will be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the area is kept clean.</b></p> <p><b>Kromme Enviro -Trust will conduct monthly monitoring. Maintenance will be conducted when necessary.</b></p>
--	---

**Derek Cook**

<p>17/06/2017</p>	<p><b>Thank you for your comments.</b></p>
-------------------	--

Hi Samantha, my name is Derek Cook, resident in SFB and surf on a regular basis at Granny's Pool or Hulleys Reef, which is the surf break immediately in front of the proposed walkway. For this reason I would like more info re: this project

- 1 Who has proposed the walkway
- 2 Who will maintain and police the walkway, in Durban there is a major problem with the fishing community on the beachfront piers. On daily basis piers have to be washed down because of bait, bait boxes, hooks, gut and partially gutted fish left by fisherman from night before
- 3 Ocean pollution as a result of the above
- 4 What materials will be used for completed project, concrete or wood
- 5 What impact will all of the above have on marine environment Unfortunately I do not have a computer only iPhone with email address, so cannot accept or access documents, however I can forward limited info to a printing facility.

22/06/2017

Hi Samantha, have read docs contacted Warren and he said they would have someone monitoring boardwalk, however I'm not convinced that this will stop fisherman or others from throwing bottles or other debris into water. Once discarded, particularly broken bottles would be a problem for surfers who frequently exit the water along the shoreline. I personally got caught up in a fishermans line while surfing there, and although neither I or the fisherman got into an altercation this can happen. Broken bottles and discarded hook and line will be a hazard to surfers

1. The Kromme-Enviro Trust
2. The Kromme-Enviro Trust
3. Noted. This has been assessed within the Draft BAR. Please refer to Section D "Impact Statement" no. 2
4. The walkway is timber-based with concrete casings / foundation used for stability. Please refer to the Activity Description in Section A of the DBAR.
5. This has been addressed in the DBAR Section D. Please review the hardcopy of the DBAR provided at the Kouga Municipal offices in St Francis Bay. Notification of the availability of this report will be provided to you via email.

**The supply of waste bins along the boardwalk would expectantly reduce the amount of waste being thrown into the sea and surrounds. However, it will be the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that the area is kept clean.**

### **G T and Annemarie Ferreira 16/08/2017**

We have owned erf 1282 since 1987. We have experienced the beach disappearing / changing from a wide stretch to the present situation where there is no beach unless it is low tide. The only stretch of the beach that has not changed in all these years is exactly the stretch that has now been proposed to build a Boardwalk. To build a Boardwalk against the side of the existing dune will be insane as the vegetation will be disturbed even if the utmost care is taken. This will destabilize the dune and the houses on this stretch will be compromised as has happened all the way to the mouth of the Kromme River. So instead of alleviating this huge problem of a seaside village that has less and less beach, the stable section will / may now also be compromised if the Boardwalk project goes ahead. If it is not built against the dune then the Boardwalk will have to be constructed on the Sandy Beach area (further limiting access to or space at Granny's Pool) or alternatively upon the rocky area which, in our opinion, will also lead to the destabilisation of that section of the coast line. We all know that, at high tide, there is very little beach (sand or rocks) that is not under water (let alone at Spring tide when the water touches the foot of the dune).

**Thank you for your comments.**

**The boardwalk will not be constructed on the dune; however, in some areas the construction method will require a lateral tie-back into the dune in order to increase the stabilisation of the boardwalk. The future integrity of the dune may be compromised where the boardwalk is required to be tied-back into the dune.**

**The boardwalk will be constructed on the rocky area of the shoreline. Please refer to the Draft BAR Section A for a detailed description of the proposed construction methodology.**

The walkway from Granny's Pool to Port St Francis is not that easy to walk and could be upgraded considerably at little expense as it would then attract more walkers since now it is not used that often. (Would a Boardwalk on this section not be a better idea?)

As far as fishing on this stretch of coast line is concerned. Fishermen mostly use the rocks to the right of Granny's Pool to fish and only very seldom fish to the left. The sea is quite shallow and rocky on that side and does not have much fish (ask any fisherman that has tried to fish there). So, when they do fish to the left they wade in as deep as possible. Where fishing bays will be constructed is not clear and we presume it will not be built where the public swims and surfers enter and exit the water to surf.

The majority of the public usually prefer to go to the Main beach or Granny's Pool by car as umbrellas, towels etc is brought with to one spot for the day and, as such, they would not be moving from one beach to the other despite the fact that there may be a Boardwalk.

Even if a board walk was to connect Granny's Pool to the main beach one can only walk along the main beach when it is low tide and even then one often still has to walk through the water. So, to be able to walk from the harbour to the river mouth this will only be possible on the days that the tide is very low in which case it is also possible to walk fairly easily from Granny's Pool to the main beach without a Boardwalk. Therefore, unless you plan to extend the walkway right up to the Kromme River it appears to us as if you would actually be wasting your money.

In our opinion, if you were able and wish to raise R1 million, we believe it can be much better spent in creating better amenities for the inhabitants of Sea Vista. We would be happy to contribute to such a fund but not to the Boardwalk project.

#### Our comments on some of the logic you use to justify the construction of the Boardwalk

- If the section between Granny's Pool and the Main beach is "impassable" at high tide as you contend then so is the section between the main beach and the Kromme. If you wish for this walk to stretch from Port St Francis to the Kromme mouth you will need to lengthen your Boardwalk by about 2 km. Which begs the question, why do you want to construct such a Boardwalk only from Granny's Pool to the Main Beach?
- The two harbours walk from Port St Francis is **NOT** a "Board walk for most of its length" as the current Boardwalk covers at most 5% of the two harbours walk.
- The statement that should the Boardwalk be built "Both visitors and residents will make use of the variety of amenities offered in the area by using the proposed walk way, with resulting economic benefits to St Francis Bay" is seriously flawed – please explain

**Noted. This assessment deals only with the proposed activity initiated by the applicant.**

**The fishing platforms will also be used as viewing platforms. The exact GPS location of these two platforms has been provided in Section A of the Draft BAR, as well as a Site Plan in Appendix C.**

**Noted. Should the boardwalk be constructed it is envisioned that it would serve multiple purposes *inter alia* safe access between the two swimming areas, scenic walks along the coastline, and possible fishing areas.**

**Noted.**

**Noted.**

**Please note that the EAP is an independent party and the "need and desirability" information provided for the boardwalk was done so on behalf of the applicant as a means to inform the public of the applicants reasoning for initiating an EIA process on the proposed activity. Please refer to Section A no.9 (b) for a discussion on the pros and cons of impacts resulting from the proposed activity.**

**Agreed.**

**It is assumed by the applicant that by connecting the boardwalk to the existing coastal walks this would increase tourist visits into the town of St Francis Bay.**

<p>what economic benefits you are referring to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The statement that “fishermen use this stretch of coast constantly, because of its proximity and abundance of the fish” is even more seriously flawed – “Proximity” maybe but “abundance of fish” – again, please ask the fisherman about their attempts to catch fish here – they normally lose their hooks and sinkers on the rocks and go home without fish.</li> <li>• The stretch between Granny’s Pool and the Main Beach has stood the test of time and the existing foot fall over this piece of land is so negligible that we cannot agree with your statement that the people who are “currently making their way along the existing fringe at the edge of the rocks create erosion of the sandy soil and destroy plant growth, gradually weakening the land forms and causing coastal retreat”.</li> </ul> <p>This stretch of the coast at St Francis is the only section where erosion of the beach and the dunes, on which the houses have been built, has not happened yet and, where it has not, as yet, been necessary to create a bulwark against the sea. ANY construction in this area has the potential to destabilise the dune with consequent disastrous results for the home owners who will hold the constructors of this Boardwalk and the Kromme Trust responsible for damages.</p> <p>If you are keen to proceed with a Walkway you may as well continue with it up to the Kromme River mouth.</p>	<p><b>The following notion is assumed:</b> tourist growth <math>\implies</math> economic growth</p> <p><b>Noted.</b></p> <p><b>Please refer to Appendix B “Site Photographs”, specifically the last photograph which shows evidence of erosion caused by footpaths. Unfortunately, due to the high tide experienced during the EAP’s site visit, the EAP was unable to observe any other areas of erosion caused by foot traffic.</b></p> <p><b>The EAP partially disagrees with this statement. With reference to Appendix B “Site Photographs”, it is evident that the stretch along Granny’s Pool from approximately Erf 1282 up until RE/3640 had to have rock revetments put into place due to coastal erosion.</b></p> <p><b>However, it may be worth noting that the boardwalk is proposed to be constructed on/between the rocks and not on the dune.</b></p> <p><b>Noted. However, it is assumed that this may result in a much more costly project at this stage.</b></p>
<p><b>Mr J &amp; K Hawinkels</b></p>	
<p>We are extremely concerned about the stability of the bank having spent hundreds of thousands of rands on it together with our neighbours 20 years ago.</p> <p>We are a very interested party objecting to this.</p>	<p><b>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>However, it may be worth noting that the boardwalk is proposed to be constructed on/between the rocks and not on the dune.</b></p>
<p><b>Mrs H M Boonzaier</b></p>	
<p>My Erf 241 is next to the public walkway. I would prefer wood or wood composite &amp; not concrete which is currently visible from the beach.</p>	<p><b>Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>The boardwalk is designed to be timber-based with concrete casings installed at regular intervals. Please refer to Section A no.1 for a more detailed activity description.</b></p>
<p><b>Keith Butler-Wheelhouse</b></p>	

I am a controlling shareholder in a property company which owns 20 Frank Road, St Francis Bay. The property is managed through ElJay Financial Services in Johannesburg hence the copy to Suzette in that office. I have written some comments on the registration form which I have attached together with the position of the old staircase which I would hope would be reinstated if the walkway was to be built.

I'm sure you know the coast around St Francis Bay very well but the sea can be particularly damaging in that corner and very few manmade structures have ever survived. This includes the staircase which used to be a short cut to the beach and was rebuilt several times but every time the sea destroyed it. Looking at the sketches of what is proposed I'm surprised that it is substantial enough for the job.

Key issues and concerns:

- 1) The sand dune directly in front of our property has been unstable over the years but is protected by natural rocks at the base, but high tides and storms still affect the footing.
- 2) The durability of any structure over which the storm waves & spring tides affect. The staircase in the letter can never withstand the wave action & storms. The proposal looks flimsy.

I am concerned as the owner and builder (1980) of 20 Frank Road that any disturbance at the bottom of the dune could cause erosion to occur. The lack of traffic / foot or vehicle over this area protects it.

The other main paddling area in the ski canal on the river is ideal for children but needs more beach area. This would be cheaper.

Also, if walkway is to be reinstated so should the steps be replaced/ at the bottom of Frank Road.

There are 14 or 15 properties that will be affected by the traffic & night time noise if the fisherman have a few drinks & start singing, as they do!

Who would maintain the structure? The sea destroys anything other than pile down posts. The staircase has been constantly repaired or never survived.

**Thank you for your comments.**

**Please note that the staircase that you refer to has not been included in the activity proposal.**

**The design of the boardwalk is of a temporary nature and the applicant is aware of this.**

**Noted.**

**As mentioned above, the design of the boardwalk is of a temporary nature and the applicant is aware of this.**

**Noted. It may be worth noting that the boardwalk is proposed to be constructed on/between the rocks and not on the dune.**

**Noted.**

**Noted. As mentioned above, the staircase that you refer to has not been included in the activity proposal.**

**The boardwalk will have lockable gates and security patrolling the area to avoid after-hours use.**

**The Kromme Enviro-Trust are responsible for monitoring and maintaining the boardwalk.**

**Lionel Donnelly**

In favour.

**Thank you for your comments.**

**Paula Stoltz**

Your walkway will start right below my house bringing the criminal element to my front door. Noise and litter, already a factor, will increase. The walkway will be detrimental to the value of my property.

**Noted. Thank you for your comments.**

**It may be worth noting that the boardwalk will have lockable gates and security patrolling the area to avoid after-hours use.**

**Comments received from the Pre-Application Basic Assessment Report:**

COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<b>STATE DEPARTMENTS</b>	
<b>Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism / DEDEA – Nicole Gerber 12/03/2018</b>	
<p><b>PRE-APPLICATION SUBMISSION FOR AUTHORISATION IN TERMS OF SECTION 24 OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT, ACT 107 OF 1998 TO UNDERTAKE A LISTED ACTIVITY AS SCHEDULED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REGULATIONS, 2014: PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF A BOARDWALK FROM GRANNY’S POOL TO MAIN BEACH, ST FRANCIS BAY, WITHIN THE KOUGA MUNICIPAL AREA.</b></p> <p>The Pre-Application Draft Basic Assessment Report (PA-DBAR) with covering letter dated 07 February 2018 and received in the Department 09 February 2018 refers. The Department has reviewed the pre-application DBAR and hereby provides the following comments:</p> <p>1. The layout of the PA-DBAR is not suitable for review of the document. The actual report i.e. the report in the template format from the Department, should be placed first in the bound report. The appendices should follow this report.</p> <p>2. With regard to the Appendices, please note the following:</p> <p>a. Appendix A should include a locality plan showing the site within the broader context of the area, as well as a more detailed site plan;</p> <p>b. The “Vegetation Map” and “Conservation Map” should be included under Appendix G, and both should have legends which detail where the information is taken from, i.e. the vegetation map should indicate whether the vegetation types are from Mucina and Rutherford or STEP</p>	<p><b>Thank you for reviewing and providing comments on the Pre-Application BAR.</b></p> <p><b>Noted. This error has been rectified in the Draft BAR.</b></p> <p><b>Noted. This has been undertaken in the DBAR.</b></p> <p><b>Noted. This has been undertaken in the DBAR.</b></p>

etc., whilst the conservation map should specify what classification was used, i.e. was the ECBCP used in determining the CBA's shown on the map or what planning document was used to indicate the Ecological Support Area;

c. The Protected Areas map should also be included under Appendix G;

d. The Site Photos in Appendix B are insufficient in number and should have co-ordinate points for each photo and should indicate the direction in which the photo was taken. Please note the requirements under Point 7 of Section A of the BAR Report.

Furthermore, each photo should have a small caption describing the area and the positions where the proposed fishing platforms are to be situated must also be photographed and included here;

e. Appendix C, Facility Illustrations should not only have diagrams of the structure but should clearly show where the boardwalk will be constructed in relation to erf boundaries, the High Water Mark and Spring High tide levels, as well as the positions of the two fishing platforms. Furthermore, the diagrams supplied for the preferred alternative and the second alternative do not have any specifications on the diagrams which would allow for a comparison of the actual differences between the two structures;

f. Appendix E – it is noted from the I&AP register that the Department of Environmental Affairs: Oceans and Coasts Directorate, has not been identified as a State Department requiring to be informed. The Department requires that they are included and that comment is obtained, especially as the project is within the coastal protection zone and that the Integrated Coastal Management Act, Act 24 of 2008 pertains to this proposed development, as identified by yourself in Section A: 1 – Activity Description. The Department furthermore requires that comment is sought from the management authority of the three reserves in the vicinity as well. The newspaper advert should also include a photocopy of the actual advert as placed which clearly shows a date. If registered letters have been sent to organs of state, state departments and I&AP's, the Post Office list must be provided which shows the tracking numbers. A site notice board should be a legible photograph of the notice board, as well as a description of where the notice boards were placed. The PPP section should include a comments and

**Noted. This has been undertaken in the DBAR.**

**Noted. The EAP has included a few more photographs. High tide was experienced during the site visit and the EAP was not able to walk the entire stretch of the proposed boardwalk. However, photographs provided show the entire stretch of the coastline where the proposed boardwalk would be constructed.**

**Noted. A site plan has been included in Appendix C: Facility Illustrations. Additional diagrams have also been added.**

**The diagrams provided in the Pre-Application BAR do have measurement specifications. It must be noted that the difference between the preferred alternative and alternative 2 is the viewing / fishing platforms; whereby, the alternative 2 does not include a viewing / fishing platform.**

**The boardwalk is 1.2m wide and extends to 2.4m wide for the viewing / fishing platform. However, in alternative 2 the boardwalk will remain constant at 1.2m wide. All other dimensions of the boardwalk are the same for both alternatives. Please refer to Section A no.1 for a more in-depth description of the proposed boardwalk.**

**Noted. The relevant parties have been included in the I&AP register.**

**A copy of the newspaper advert has been included in Appendix E.**

**The Post Office list with registered mail tracking numbers has been included in this report.**

**A map has been included to inform the reader of the location of the site notice boards.**

**A comments and response report has been included in the DBAR.**

responses report, which also highlights where in the report, comments have been addressed;

g. There seems to be additional appendices which repeat the ones already included – please correct as per these comments.

3. The description of the proposed activity gives no indication of construction methodology, as well as methods of founding the boardwalk, i.e. how much soil etc. will be required to be moved or if any heavy machinery will be required and there is no indication that the boardwalk will require vegetation clearing.

4. The listed activities, as included in the actual report template section, as well as the registered letters, are not captured correctly:

- a. Activity 12 and 19 in LN 1 are not triggered by this proposed development – refers to a watercourse – unless there is a watercourse in close proximity to the boardwalk, but due to the inadequacy of the layout and site plan, this is not evident from the report;
- b. Activity 14 in LN 3 is also not triggered (as above); and
- c. The listed activities should include a description of the project activity that triggers the listed activity and should not be a verbatim re-print of activities in the listing notices, for example, for Activity 12 in LN 3, the description should indicate how much vegetation over the length of the proposed boardwalk is envisaged to be required to be cleared.

5. The alternative section should include details as to the proposed construction methods, materials and lengths of the boardwalk, as well as railing construction alternatives, as the diagrams presented do not show any differences. The fact that the only alternative considered is the exclusion of the fishing platforms, should be described properly, as well as any reasoning behind the identification of these 2 alternatives given.

6. Co-ordinates are to be included in degrees, minutes and seconds, not decimal degrees. The proposed fishing platforms are also to be included and their co-ordinates given.

7. The need and desirability section must address any concerns raised by I&AP's. It must also be shown in the layout and site plan, how and where this boardwalk will “complete” the coastal path from the Kromme River to the St Francis Lighthouse, as well as substantiate how coastal amenities will be linked, and how the boardwalk will protect the ecology of the coastal fringe.

**Noted. This error has been rectified in the DBAR.**

**Please refer to Section A no.1 for a detailed construction methodology.**

**Noted. The incorrect listed activities have been removed from the application.**

**Noted. A description of the project activity has been included for each listed activity.**

**Noted. This has been amended in the DBAR Section A no.2  
The diagrams provided in the Pre-Application BAR do have measurement specifications. It must be noted that the difference between the preferred alternative and alternative 2 is the viewing / fishing platforms; whereby, the alternative 2 does not include a viewing / fishing platform.**

**The boardwalk is 1.2m wide and extends to 2.4m wide for the viewing / fishing platform. However, in alternative 2 the boardwalk will remain constant at 1.2m wide. All other dimensions of the boardwalk are the same for both alternatives.**

**Noted. This has been amended in the DBAR.**

**Noted. This has been amended in the DBAR Section A no.9(b).**

<p>The main question to be answered is the need for this from the community's perspective.</p> <p>8. Furthermore, in light of the problems experienced with regard to erosion of the beaches in the area, as well as the impacts of storm surges and possible climate change impacts such as rising sea levels, the report must address how this has been taken into account in the design of the boardwalk as well as the mitigation measures proposed. Future maintenance requirements and a suitable maintenance management plan must be included in the report.</p> <p>9. The impact assessment portion of the report does not address whether the boardwalk itself could impact on the recession of the shoreline and the possibility of disturbing the balance that currently exists. There is nothing in the report that gives a clear indication of whether the boardwalk will be constructed at the base of the dunes, on the dune area, or more inland, i.e. right against erven boundaries. The construction methodology is also not explained which would further give insight as to the possible impacts. The impacts and risks identified for the proposed development must include a significance ranking and the methodology used must be described. You are required to thoroughly scrutinise the contents of Appendix 1 of the EIA Regulation of 2014, as amended, in GN No.326 and ensure that the report adheres to these requirements or the Department could refuse the application.</p>	<p><b>Noted. This has been included in the assessment details.</b></p> <p><b>Noted. This has been included in the assessment details.</b></p>
--	---

**ORGANS OF STATE**

**Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency / ECPTA – Shanè October 19/02/2018**

<p>Dear Samantha</p> <p>Reference is being made to the notification letter that was sent to the Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency for the abovementioned project. As per the locality information provided, please note that the project area is not located close or within 5 or 10km of the boundaries of any of the Protected Areas managed by the ECPTA. Also the project area is also note located in the priority expansion areas identified by the Eastern Cape Protected Areas Expansion Strategy (ECPEAS). Please let me know if you would like to send us to send you our shapefiles for our mandated protected areas and the expansion areas.</p>	<p><b>Noted. Thank you for confirming that the activity does not occur within 5 or 10km of any of the Protected Areas managed by the ECPTA.</b></p>
--	---

**PUBLIC**

**Hans Hawinkels 13/02/2018**

<p>Dear Samantha</p> <p>We live in 18 Frank Road</p>	<p><b>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</b></p>
--	---

<p>We note the proposed walkway and we object to it for two reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Damage and undermining of the bank in front of our house on which we have spent more than R100 000 to fix and maintain - same for our neighbours on either side viz. Butler- Wheelhouse and Heath</li> <li>- Impact it will have on the security of our property in the front</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Keith Butler-Wheelhouse 19/02/2018</b></p>	
<p>Dear Samantha,</p> <p>Pam and I took a walk along the beach underneath our property on Saturday evening to see whether there had been any significant change. At the present time the rocks seem stable and the effect of the heavy tides of the last year or so have been minimal. Therefore, I would object very much to any disturbance of the area below our property, particularly as the structure that is proposed involves digging large holes for the upright pillars of the walkway. I think, after all the money that people have spent protecting their land and property, this would be very negligent.</p> <p>In addition, I support my fellow neighbours in the question of security. It seems that people climb up the sand dunes even without a walkway and increasing the traffic below here would, I'm sure, increase the number of people crossing the properties without permission. So, all in all, we are definitely not in support of the proposal.</p>	<p><b>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>Please refer to Section A no.9(b) for an assessment of all I&amp;APs concerns.</b></p>
<p><b>Mike Wylie 15/03/2018</b></p>	
<p>Thanks Samantha</p> <p>I am in favour of the board Walk but my concern , and that of my neighbour to the East ( GT Ferriera ) is how we will be able to get onto the rocks/beach at the bottom of our paths</p> <p>You could include a bridge across from our pathway onto the walkway , but then , how do we get from the walk down onto the rocks / beach</p> <p>So the walk way must not cut us off !!</p> <p>Can you please provide some comment on this</p>	<p><b>Noted. Thank you for your comments.</b></p> <p><b>Please note that as part of the activity proposal wooden stairs have been included for Erf 243, Erf 1282, and RE/3640 – the last two being yours and GT Ferriera's properties.</b></p>