

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**FOR THE PROPOSED ISUNDU 765/400 KV SUB-STATION AND
TURN-IN TRANSMISSION LINES (DEA EIA REF: 14/12/16/3/3/2/745;
12/12/20/1397/AM2)**

PROCEEDINGS OF KEY STAKEHOLDER MEETING

11 June 2015

ALOE WILDLIFE ESTATE

1. ATTENDANCE

Attendance was as follows:

Name	Organisation
Hennie Heyns	Aloe Wildlife Estate
Quinton Haynes	Aloe Wildlife Estate
Dave Rigby	Private Developer
Madinare Mukhuba	Eskom
Paul Scherzer	ACER (Africa) Environmental Consultants

2. INTRODUCTION

Mr Paul Scherzer, ACER (Africa) Environmental Consultants, introduced Ms Mukhuba, the Eskom Negotiator, and clarified that her role was to negotiate with landowners after the EIA process, once the impacts upon a specific landowner had been investigated and confirmed.

3. DISCUSSION

Mr Heyns provided the background of their proposed development plans from when it was called Kingsthorpe Estate to the proposed development now referred to as Aloe Wildlife Estate. The various environmental processes and approvals he had gone through were shown. Kingsthorpe Estate had obtained environmental authorization but had not gone through the Development Facilitation Act (DFA) process. He had also obtained approvals to develop the site from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Land Affairs. The plan for Kingsthorpe Estate was to develop 1,200 houses but now, with the Aloe Wildlife Estate, the number of houses had been reduced to 350. He had changed his plans to fit in with the Municipality's aim to only develop agriculture-tourism in this area and other developments like the Mayibuye Game Reserve.

Mr Dave Rigby showed the environmental impact report and authorization he had obtained for his proposed development called Mkhonto Park/Acaciadale Retail Park, located between the proposed Aloe Wildlife Estate and the N3.

Mr Heyns and Mr Rigby reiterated their concerns raised at the public meeting and in correspondence that the proposed sub-station would significantly affect and sterilize their proposed developments, especially after a significant amount of money had been spent obtaining the various approvals necessary to develop.

Ms Mukhuba stated that it is too early to commence negotiations but outlined Eskom's negotiation and compensation process. The process of negotiating with landowners starts once environmental authorisation has been obtained and she is instructed to negotiate with those affected. Thereafter, Eskom appoints an independent private evaluator to evaluate, as instructed, whatever property, business or other rights and activities are affected. The evaluator produces a report and Eskom negotiates with the landowner based on the evaluator's findings. The landowner has the right to object to the evaluation and/or appoint an independent evaluator of their own for a second opinion.

Based on the concerns and layout plans provided by Mr Heyns, Mr Scherzer clarified that although the VSHA authorized corridor was 2 km wide, in this section of the corridor, a specific route alignment had been agreed upon with the Mayibuye Game Reserve and Kingsthorpe Estate (now called Aloe Wildlife Estate) during the VSHA Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).

This alignment, as previously communicated, was to run on the east and parallel to the existing Geogedale-Mersey 275 kV transmission line. Thus, this line would not really affect their proposed development plans. The rest of the VSHA corridor which did fall over their proposed development was not at risk of the VSHA transmission line, due to the specific alignment agreed upon and authorised.

Whilst the project study area for the Isundu Sub-station does extend to the N3 and a little beyond, the current preferred alignment for the double-circuit 400 kV transmission lines from the sub-station is to follow this previously agreed alignment. Mr Scherzer stated that because this line was being proposed as a double circuit line, of which one pair of lines would be a spare circuit, it was probable that any future line to the sub-station approaching from the west side would aim to join this double circuit line where it terminated rather than require another servitude to the sub-station.

Both Mr Heyns and Mr Rigby raised that they were concerned that the sub-station was not compatible with the proposed Municipal land-use development plans. They stated that if Eskom proceeded with the sub-station, Eskom should negotiate with the Municipality to change their land-use plans for the area from agriculture-tourism to light industrial which would be a more appropriate land-use surrounding a sub-station.

Mr Scherzer stated that the issue of incompatible land-uses and the impact upon surrounding land-uses is being investigated in the current EIA.

4. CLOSURE

Mr Scherzer thanked all present for their input and participation, and trusted that the discussions had addressed the current concerns with regard to how Eskom negotiations and the impacts upon surrounding land-use plans would be addressed.