

EIA 5809 SIBAYA PRECINCT
Public Meeting to present findings of specialist studies
Thursday, 8th February 2007, 5pm
Natal Sharks Board, Herrwood Drive, Umhlanga Rocks

AGENDA

1. Introduction (Guy Butler, GAEA Projects)
2. Confirmation of agenda (Guy Butler, GAEA Projects)
3. Presentations of specialist study findings:
 - a. Planning/ urban design (Nathan Iyer, Iyer Rothaug Collaborative)
 - b. Landscaping/ rehabilitation (Marcel Henry, Urban Architects)
 - c. Architecture (Rodney Choromanski, CNN Architects)
 - d. Visual impacts (Wouter Jordan, SRK)
 - e. Traffic Impact (Dave McFarlane, DMA)
 - f. Sewer (Brendan Magill, VelaVKE & GOBA)
 - g. Stormwater management (Dale King, Sagen Projects)
 - h. Wetland functionality (Craig Cowden, LRI)
 - i. One Planet Living (Michele Bovet, WWF)
4. Questions of clarity (Chaired by Guy Butler, GAEA Projects)
5. Recording of issues (Chaired by Guy Butler, GAEA Projects)
6. Way forward (Guy Butler, GAEA Projects)

Name	Company	Abbreviation
Guy Butler	GAEA Projects	GB
Debbie Donkin	GAEA Projects	DD
Nathan Iyer	Iyer Rothaug Collaborative	NI
Marcel Henry	Urban Architects	MH
Rodney Choromanski	CNN Architects	RC
Wouter Jordan	SRK	WJ
Dave McFarlane	DMA	DM
Brendan Magill	GOBA	BM
Dale King	Sagen Projects	DK
Craig Cowden	LRI	CC
Michele Bovet	WWF	MB
Rory Wilkinson	Moreland Developments	RW
Richard Boon	eThekwini Municipality Environmental Management Dept	RB
Graham Cairns	WESSA	GC
Heather Cairns	WESSA	HC
Wade Holland	WESSA, Umdloti Conservancy	WH
Arthur Wilmans	Nile Properties	AW
Richard Siedle	UBRA	RS
Neil Slatter	Company – MI Investments, Umdloti Business Assoc, and Umdloti Resident	NS

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
Introduction		
1.	GB	Welcomed all to meeting. Introduced team from GAEA Projects (Guy Butler, Kevin Weerts & Debbie Donkin). Stated that the aim of the meeting was to present initial findings from specialist studies. The specialists had four tasks, namely:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion																																																																			
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. assess the proposed development in their professional opinion 2. respond to the I&AP issues specific to their expertise 3. look at the issues raised by GAEA 4. identify any possible mitigative measure, and make recommendations 																																																																			
Confirmation of agenda																																																																					
2.	RB	Asked how the boutique hotel, boardwalks etc will be dealt with as they do not appear on the agenda.																																																																			
3.	GB	GAEA's recommendation is that separate EIAs will be carried out for certain aspects/ specific activities.																																																																			
Presentations of specialist study findings																																																																					
Planning/ urban design (NI)																																																																					
4.	NI	<p>Presented the initial charrette layout and how this had been refined. Presented the movement lattice through the precinct as not only being roads but also pedestrian walkways, raised walkways, cycle tracks and the possibility of an overhead gondola. Presented a breakdown of the nodes as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="509 821 1284 1058"> <thead> <tr> <th>Node</th> <th>Commer/ Mixed Use / Office</th> <th>Hotel Rooms</th> <th>Residential (DU's)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>65800</td> <td>130</td> <td>1140</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2</td> <td>35520</td> <td>490</td> <td>1100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>9600</td> <td>230</td> <td>605</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4</td> <td>37350</td> <td>0</td> <td>1970</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>37900</td> <td>105</td> <td>1185</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>186170</td> <td>955</td> <td>6000</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NI discussed heights and the reasoning behind an iconic structure on each hilltop to give each area a sense of place and identity and provide a means of orientating oneself in the environment.</p> <p>Presented the following information pertaining to the contribution of each landuse to the overall framework composition:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="509 1249 1297 1696"> <thead> <tr> <th>USE</th> <th>AREA(HA)</th> <th>%</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>COMMERCIAL/ MIXED USE</td> <td>16.3</td> <td>1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL</td> <td>53.8</td> <td>6.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MEDIUM DENSITY RES/MIXED USE</td> <td>46.7</td> <td>5.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MIXED USE/RESIDENTIAL</td> <td>7.38</td> <td>0.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RECREATION/ENTERTAINMENT</td> <td>21.7</td> <td>2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RESORT/RESIDENTIAL</td> <td>14.2</td> <td>1.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EDUCATION</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>0.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>EXISTING USE</td> <td>15.0</td> <td>1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SUB TOTAL: BUILT ENVIRONMENT</td> <td>178.58</td> <td>21.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OPEN SPACE (ALL TYPES & INCL URBAN SPACE)</td> <td>423.4</td> <td>49.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MOVEMENT CORRIDORS</td> <td>248</td> <td>29.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL</td> <td>850</td> <td>100.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Node	Commer/ Mixed Use / Office	Hotel Rooms	Residential (DU's)	1	65800	130	1140	2	35520	490	1100	3	9600	230	605	4	37350	0	1970	5	37900	105	1185	Total	186170	955	6000	USE	AREA(HA)	%	COMMERCIAL/ MIXED USE	16.3	1.9	LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	53.8	6.3	MEDIUM DENSITY RES/MIXED USE	46.7	5.5	MIXED USE/RESIDENTIAL	7.38	0.9	RECREATION/ENTERTAINMENT	21.7	2.6	RESORT/RESIDENTIAL	14.2	1.7	EDUCATION	3.5	0.4	EXISTING USE	15.0	1.8	SUB TOTAL: BUILT ENVIRONMENT	178.58	21.0	OPEN SPACE (ALL TYPES & INCL URBAN SPACE)	423.4	49.8	MOVEMENT CORRIDORS	248	29.2	TOTAL	850	100.0
Node	Commer/ Mixed Use / Office	Hotel Rooms	Residential (DU's)																																																																		
1	65800	130	1140																																																																		
2	35520	490	1100																																																																		
3	9600	230	605																																																																		
4	37350	0	1970																																																																		
5	37900	105	1185																																																																		
Total	186170	955	6000																																																																		
USE	AREA(HA)	%																																																																			
COMMERCIAL/ MIXED USE	16.3	1.9																																																																			
LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL	53.8	6.3																																																																			
MEDIUM DENSITY RES/MIXED USE	46.7	5.5																																																																			
MIXED USE/RESIDENTIAL	7.38	0.9																																																																			
RECREATION/ENTERTAINMENT	21.7	2.6																																																																			
RESORT/RESIDENTIAL	14.2	1.7																																																																			
EDUCATION	3.5	0.4																																																																			
EXISTING USE	15.0	1.8																																																																			
SUB TOTAL: BUILT ENVIRONMENT	178.58	21.0																																																																			
OPEN SPACE (ALL TYPES & INCL URBAN SPACE)	423.4	49.8																																																																			
MOVEMENT CORRIDORS	248	29.2																																																																			
TOTAL	850	100.0																																																																			
Landscaping/ rehabilitation (MH)																																																																					
5.	MH	<p>Presented the open space framework for the Precinct and provided cross sections through different sections of the area. The landscaping/ rehabilitation plan presents information on specific sections such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The restoration of grasslands and rehabilitation of the N2 buffer 																																																																			

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<p>zone</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The restoration of valleys, including wetlands and buffers 3. River edge and wetland zone 4. Protecting and enhancing the M4 buffer zone with coastal forest planting 5. The protection of the existing forest, buffers and extending the forest matrix
Architecture (RC)		
6.	RC	<p>Presented the process in developing the guidelines to the architecture for the Sibaya Precinct. Emphasised the One Planet Living principle of for example, reducing one's carbon footprint so as to reduce environmental impact.</p> <p>Gave examples of good "African" architecture as seen in the Constitution Court, Johannesburg, Gauteng; the use of an iconic structure in Melrose Arch with a South African identity.</p> <p>Also presented the type of architecture that the development team did not want to see developed within the Precinct.</p> <p>Explained the principles of using South African materials and more specifically the use of those within the Durban area; the use of colour palettes; the use of clip-ons; the need to look at the environment within which the building is being constructed and to then design the building accordingly.</p>
Visual impacts (WJ)		
7.	WJ	<p>Explained that SRK had been commissioned to carry out the VIA for Sibaya Precinct to address issues raised by I&APs during the scoping process. Explained that the aim of the VIA is to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe existing visual character and visual quality of the area and compare against the development proposal 2. Spatially assess the broader area of influence by means of digital modelling 3. Determine the magnitude of the visual impact; and 4. Present findings based on comparison <p>Described the methodology used for the study and presented results.</p> <p>Described the current visual character of the site as follows: Current vacant area has a "unstructured open space" character which can be attributed to the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surrounding sugar cane and forests; 2. Ancillary infrastructure in place such as roads and the service station next to the Sibaya Casino; 3. The area earmarked for the Precinct is demarcated and separated from the surrounding areas by roads on three of the four boundaries, two being main roads 4. Character of the proposed Precinct not affected by Umhlanga due to Havaan Forest buffer 5. Character of the proposed Precinct not affected by Umdloti due to natural dune system running along coastline and the steep topography <p>Explained that the development of the Precinct will result in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A change in character of the site 2. Will have a stronger defined character

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<p>3. Natural character will be kept due to flowing development i.t.o. landform, enhanced natural corridors and landscaping</p> <p>4. Other proposed developments will further change character of wider area, e.g. Dube TradePort</p> <p>Defined landscape quality and described the quality as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The landscape surrounding the Sibaya Casino and Entertainment World comprises sugarcane and roads and thus has a low visual quality compared to the surrounding area which includes forest areas, lagoons and rivers 2. The precinct aims to enhance the visual quality of the area. Thus it must be visible and aesthetically pleasing 3. Moreland proposes creating flowing green corridors, water bodies, planting of trees, following natural topography etc <p>Defined sense of place and how it related to the Precinct. Currently the site is associated with the Sibaya Casino as the “memorable” feature. The sense of place is for the site is transient and therefore low</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Currently the sense of place of Umdloti and Umhlanga can be described as being high as they are active holiday towns- people can relate to these towns, 2. Lower Umhlanga Rocks adjacent to the coast line is well separated from the town centre by a prominent ridge and this has led to Umhlanga Rocks beach front keeping its holiday destination flair. 3. Umdloti shares the same ridge /dune as Umhlanga which will separate the village from the Precinct <p>Described the issues raised by I&APs during the scoping process including the issues of maximum heights, overshadowing of Umdloti, loss of inland views from the Ohlanga River mouth, appropriateness of developing on the hilltops and the skyline.</p> <p>Explained that in order to assess the impacts, viewpoints were selected at key locations and the line of sight determined in the direction of the Precinct and hence the development. Explained that Umdloti residents would not be able to see the development from the beach. Motorists on the N2 and the M27 would be able to view the development but it would be transient as they would be moving through the area.</p> <p>Defined Visual Absorption Capacity as being the potential for the area to conceal the proposed development. In terms of Sibaya Precinct, The development will follow the shape of the topography. Higher buildings are planned around iconic structures which would absorb the first few storeys. The visual absorption capacity is rated as moderate as some screening of the development will be provided by the undulating topography, clustered trees and forest vegetation.</p> <p>Defined the landscape or townscape compatibility as the compatibility of the proposed development with the existing landscape and townscape. In terms of Sibaya Precinct, the landscape / townscape</p>

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<p>compatibility rating for the Precinct is rated as moderate-low based on its current visual inconsistency with the character of the surrounding environment. Further development around the site would likely result in a moderate - high landscape integrity rating.</p> <p>Defined viewer sensitivity and how this relates to Sibaya Precinct. The overall sensitivity of the viewers for the site is rated as moderate due to the existing Sibaya Casino and related infrastructure as well as the development plans of the broader area.</p> <p>The findings of the study can be summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The areas that would be sensitive to the development would be residents of Umdloti travelling in and out of the area and people travelling on the M4. The impact is transient; 2. The buildings including iconic buildings will not be visible from Umdloti. A calculation was done on shadows. The shadows will not reach any residential houses; 3. The development would enhance the visual quality of the site; 4. The visual exposure is further than 3km. The visibility from residential areas is reduced by the undulating topography of the area as well as natural features such as the forests and dunes. 5. Visual absorption will be provided by the development as it will be following the natural topography, will be less dense in the lower areas, as a result of the proposed architectural proposals and as a result of the proposed landscaping plans. Hilltop development ensures that the development is not totally obstructive. 6. Most residents or “receptors” will be screened from the visual impact of the proposed Precinct or will only experience transient visual impacts 7. Although not analysed specifically, the cumulative visual impact of the Precinct is likely to contribute positively to the new character of the Umhlanga-Ballito area 8. The visual impact at the site is regarded as being acceptable due to planned development in the area. By developing the site the visual impact will be enhanced positively 9. Mitigation will be necessary during construction. Specific measures must be included in EMP.
Traffic Impact (DM)		
8.	DM	<p>Described the existing traffic scenario and the spare capacity of the N2 and the M4 at present. Looked at the regional context and the development of the airport and Dube Tradeport at La Mercy and how this will affect the current road networks. Explained that the development of the Sibaya Precinct would lead to a marginal additional (in terms of the region) increase in traffic, which could be handled through an upgrade of the current Sibaya Casino N2 interchange (for the ultimate development) and an upgrade of the M27 in the vicinity of the Precinct. Explained that there would be no need to upgrade the M4 for this development, however, taking other developments in the area into account, there may be a need to increase the number of lanes on the N2 to six. This can be achieved through re-stripping. In terms of the ultimate, long term development of</p>

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		the region a decision will need to be made on the option of either widening the M4 to 4/5 lanes or the N2 to 8 lanes. This is a decision for the City and SANRAL to make in time.
Technical Solutions for Wastewater Disposal (BM)		
9.	BM	<p>Showed the location of existing sewerage works in relation to the location of the Sibaya Precinct. Gave an overview of the existing infrastructure. Described the natural fall of the site, with the majority of natural flow being towards the south.</p> <p>Explained that the southern catchment could be serviced by two gravity trunks towards the Phoenix works and that the area in the south east would need a pump station and rising main to pump the wastewater towards the Phoenix works.</p> <p>Explained that the northern catchment had a number of options, one being to utilise the limited spare capacity within the Umdloti sewer reticulation and Umdloti Works, the second option being to gravitate to a new sewer treatment works on the Umdloti River and the third, interim option was to pump the sewerage into the Ohlanga catchment until the new works on the Umdloti River was commissioned. . The preferred option was the latter with a single gravity being used to collect all sewer and a pump station near to the M4/M27 interchange being used to pump into a new gravity main that would connect to the existing Sibaya trunk. This pump station could be used in the future to send the sewerage to the future treatment works on the Umdloti River. There is a small section in the north west corner which would need to be serviced by a separate pump station which would also pump the wastewater into a gravity main in the southern catchment.</p> <p>Explained that directing all Mdloti-catchment-generated wastewater flows to phoenix works is a solution that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - utilises spare capacity in the Sibaya system in the short to medium term (the southern catchment would therefore not be developed unless there was available capacity in the Phoenix Works system or until a new works on the Umdloti River had been commissioned.; - is scalable in the event of it needing to develop into a longer term solution; - minimises redundancy of infrastructure in the event of the envisaged ultimate treatment configuration being realised; and - complements current thinking in terms of the ultimate treatment configuration in the Mdloti catchment. <p>Explained that directing all Mdloti-catchment-generated wastewater flows to the Umdloti works via the existing Umdloti infrastructure is a solution that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consumes the limited available spare capacity in the Umdloti system; - increases the environmental risk to the beachfront in the event of pump station mishaps; and - is a very short term solution due to the capacity issues. - Is not preferred and not recommended
Stormwater management (DK)		
10.	DK	Described the scope of work as including:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To investigate the hydrological runoff regime of the development area under pre-development and post-development scenarios. ○ To investigate the functionality of the wetlands under the pre-development and post-development scenarios. ○ To inform the stormwater management plan accordingly. <p>Showed the delineation of the catchments making up the Sibaya Precinct.</p> <p>Described the Pre-Development Scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major landuse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Intensive farming (Sugarcane) ○ High soil water uptake (Evapotranspiration) ○ Drainage channels (Farming Practices) ○ Pressure on wetlands (Functionality) ○ Good vegetated cover over soil (Erosion) • Minor landuses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Urban ○ Localised impermeable surfacing (Runoff) <p>Described the Post-Development Scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major landuses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rehabilitated open natural spaces (Valleys) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overall, lower water uptake (Soil water levels) ○ Natural channels rehabilitated (Slower streamflow) ○ Good vegetated cover over soil (Erosion) ○ Wetlands rehabilitated (Hydrological functioning) Urban <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Localised impermeable surfaces (Runoff) ○ Promote infiltration (Soils) ○ Large open spaces amongst buildings (Infiltration) <p>Explained that the total annual streamflow would increase across all sub-catchments and major tributaries in the post-development scenario, with the most affected being the sub-catchments making up tributaries B & D.</p> <p>Explained that the total Increase in streamflow runoff per year = 656 773m³, over the total area of catchments = 6 680 000m². Total area proposed for development = 5 850 000m², giving a total streamflow increase = 575 200m³. This works out to be 98mm of extra runoff per year, and about 0.27mm extra runoff per day (average) over the whole development area.</p> <p>The way forward includes the need to assess the hydrologically sensitive areas (environmental) in each catchment vs. the areas requiring the strongest stormwater management (flood risk). Then to plan and design a stormwater system that incorporates sound engineering strategies for safety and civil development, while promoting increased functionality in the natural hydrological environment, e.g. wetlands, which will in turn support the man made stormwater system.</p>

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<p>Explained that where possible, promote subsoil infiltration of stormwater from urban areas at the localised scale, before reaching the main streams; attenuate the increased flood peaks in attenuation structures that further promote wetland functionality. Plant vegetation, where ever possible, to stabilise slopes and promote uptake of soil water. Rehabilitate the stream channels and riparian areas from being narrow, deep and clean to being wide, shallower and well vegetated.</p> <p>Explained that there are strict guidelines in place and legislature to adhere to – DWAF, DEAT, Municipal Bodies, etc.</p> <p>Said that the overall philosophy should be to increasing the functionality and environmental status of the pre-development hydrological environment to assist in post-development conditions. This can be achieved through adopting a “no-net-loss” approach to the wetland area; acknowledging areas with flood risk vs. environmental potential and rehabilitating where possible to increase natural hydrological regimes so as to better facilitate stormwater management.</p>
Wetland functionality (CC)		
11.	CC	<p>LRI's scope of work included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ carrying out a functional assessment study ○ reviewing the proposed development layouts by carrying out functional assessments for post-development scenarios <p>Described the methodology used in assessing the wetland functionality and the use of the tool, WET-EcoServices.</p> <p>Explained that 14 hydrogeomorphic units were identified within the project area, ranging from Unit A to N The ecoservices supplied by the wetland systems are ranked according to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 0 - Low – 1 – Moderately Low – 2 - Intermediate – 3 – Moderately High – 4 – High <p>Values recorded were generally Moderately Low to Intermediate due to the modified and disturbed nature of these systems.</p> <p>Gave examples of the results for two of the wetlands within the Precinct.</p> <p>Explained that the wetlands were ranked in an attempt to show the relative importance in terms of wetland benefits and services of each of the HGM units within the Sibaya development site taking into consideration the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – WET-Ecoservices Scores, – Size, and – Link to the Estuary <p>The ranking is as follows:</p>

Ref	Speaker	Discussion																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>HGM Unit</th> <th>Rank</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Unit A</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit D</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit J & K</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit C & G</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit B</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit H & I</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit E, F, L, & M</td> <td>7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unit N</td> <td>8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Unit A being the Ohlanga floodplain and unit D being a major tributary in the vicinity of the floodplain.</p> <p>In terms of the post-development scenario, post-development functional assessments were carried out. It was assumed that the wetland habitat would be rehabilitated using appropriate methods. The values recorded improved: from Moderately Low to Intermediate to Intermediate.</p>	HGM Unit	Rank	Unit A	1	Unit D	2	Unit J & K	3	Unit C & G	4	Unit B	5	Unit H & I	6	Unit E, F, L, & M	7	Unit N	8
HGM Unit	Rank																			
Unit A	1																			
Unit D	2																			
Unit J & K	3																			
Unit C & G	4																			
Unit B	5																			
Unit H & I	6																			
Unit E, F, L, & M	7																			
Unit N	8																			
One Planet Living (MB)																				
12.	MB	<p>Explained that the principle behind one planet living (OPL) was to promote sustainable development. Said that WWF have been working with BioRegional to use the OPL concept for the Sibaya development. Said that Moreland were introduced to OPL via WWF-SA and that Moreland have visited BioRegional in the UK and invited BioRegional out to South Africa to run workshops for all the consultants involved in the Sibaya Precinct. Said that Moreland, BioRegional and WWF hoped to conclude an agreement shortly allowing this development to be a verified “One Planet Living” sustainable community.</p> <p>Explained the principles behind OPL and the definition of ecological footprinting which refers to a way of measuring how our lifestyles impact upon the planet and on other people. Explained that it calculates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • how much biologically productive land, fresh water and sea is needed to feed us and provide all the energy, water and materials we use. • The emissions we generate from coal, oil and gas, • how much land is required to absorb our waste. <p>Said that it is measured in global hectares per person and gave examples from the UK, USA and SA.</p> <p>Highlighted the ten principles of OPL, namely: Zero Carbon Sustainable Water Zero Waste Natural Habitats and Wildlife</p>																		

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		<p>Sustainable Transport Culture and Heritage Local & Sustainable Materials Equity and Fair Trade Local and Sustainable Food Health and Happiness</p> <p>Said that the OPL approach is about lifestyle as much as buildings and about long-term estate-management as much as initial design.</p>
Questions of clarity and recording of issues		
13.	GC	Asked what are the time frames are for the development.
14.	GB	Asked if GC meant in terms of the EIA process or Morelands. In terms of the EIA process, the draft EIR is still to be compiled and circulated for comment.
15.	GC	Acknowledged that the development would be phased. Referred to the last presentation (OPL) which presupposes control and a management system. Asked if developers would be punished if these systems were not adhered to?
16.	GB	Explained that the EMP provides the initial control. Key to OPL is that there are architectural and development controls etc to manage the planning and initial development phases and then later organisations such as residents associations will control the operational phases of the development. Explained that controls can be tied into the ROD & EMP. OPL is a lifestyle measured over time.
17.	RS	Asked if the 41% referred to the natural forest of whole area including the Hawaan forest.
18.	GB	Yes, it does include the Hawaan.
19.	RS	Said that if it did then the figures presented by NI are misleading because the Sibaya Precinct ends on the north bank of the Ohlanga river. Said that the figures should include Umdloti which would result in figures of 25% built area bulking up to 50%. Said that he would like accurate figures.
20.	RW	Explained that the site is 855ha which includes the Hawaan forest. Forest and open space areas make up 49% of the Precinct area and the actual hardened surface makes up approximately 10%.
21.	RS	Said that GAEA has not addressed the UBRA issue of the impact on Umdloti and beach access. Vague reference to back of beach, but asked where one parks and how one then gets to the beach. Asked if there was a study in progress.
22.	GB	Stated that all issues will be covered in the EIR. Said that there is acknowledgement of UBRA's issues, and that parking has been proposed in the node behind Umdloti. Said that there is a need for the City and Moreland to come together to find a solution. GB also noted that Gaea Project's responses were reliant on specialist studies providing more information on which to make a comment. Only now was this information becoming available.
23.	HC	Said that a current publication at Moreland states that the largest botanical garden is going to be included in the Sibaya Precinct. Asked if Moreland can give an idea of the approximate area of the botanical gardens and where they will be situated.
24.	GB	Said that there was a proposal towards the Ohlanga river mouth/ M4 bridge area but that the general approach was to push Moreland to look at the whole Precinct as being likened to a botanical garden.

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
25.	RW	Stated that the botanical garden was not a formal part of this application but that Moreland are looking at it as a possibility for the area. It fits into the concept but requires detailed investigation and testing.
26.	HC	Said that they need clarity as to whether a botanical garden is to be developed or whether the whole development is a botanical garden and then whether it is to be indigenous.
27.	AW	Asked how long the process is anticipated to take. 10 years? Asked what the timeframe was for everything to be done or only starting to develop.
28.	RW	Said that the development was expected to be fully occupied in 10 years.
29.	GB	Said that in terms of the EIA process, GAEA needs to look at the results and implications of the specialist studies, their recommendations and conclusions, before committing to timeframes for completion of the EIA process.
30.	AW	Said that the development was not an open chequebook, and that there must be a set date for completion.
31.	GB	Reiterated that once specialist study feedback was received, GAEA would need to ensure that all issues have been addressed and that nothing further has been raised. The next step is to get I&AP comments on the reports and the draft EIR. Following this the report goes to DAEA and it is necessary to ensure that they feel all issues have been adequately addressed.
32.	AW	Said that the urban plan varied from the previous public meeting. Studies apply to the development. The plan should have specific land uses defined by applicant.
33.	NI	Said that the principles haven't changed in terms of landuse. Said that the idea is to develop the framework guided by the open space. Where changes have occurred it is due to the defining of the location of the wetlands, more detail on the roads etc. Overall very little has changed.
34.	AW	Said that the area adjacent to the naval base previously had no hotel now it is suggested that there will be 2 hotels. The previous layout identified 5 but not near that site. Asked if Moreland are now going to follow that specific plan.
35.	NI	Explained that the zoning is resort/ residential i.e. can be either depending on what best suits the land.
36.	AW	Asked if NI was given a mandate by Moreland when drawing up the alternative concept?
37.	NI	Stated that the charrette/ group were given a "blank slate" so to speak with the intention to be innovative and find the most appropriate solutions
38.	AW	Asked if an EIA been applied for.
39.	GB	Stated that an EIA had been applied for and that the alternative layout presented was part of that same EIA with the same EIA number (i.e. EIA 5809).
40.	AW	Said that the first point is to make an application, then get file number etc. GB mentioned that 2 previous EIAs had been withdrawn. Asked again if this application had been made. Asked if the one withdrawn was for the same land with a different plan.
41.	GB	Explained that GAEA had done the EIA for the Mhlanga Forest Estate. Explained that during the scoping process, a public meeting

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		was held during which the need for looking at the area on a broader scale was identified. Moreland therefore withdrew this previous EIA and restarted the process for a larger area (i.e. the Sibaya Precinct) with a new application and file number (EIA 5809).
42.	??	Posed the question that Moreland are proposing to build hotels in the area but they will never be built by 2010.
43.	GB	NI has given an indication of the new layout but said that how that goes ahead is up to the developers. The Record of Decision (RoD) will have a 2 year validity period so development will have to have started within that time. The exact location the developer starts at is at their discretion.
44.	WH	Said that the layout is still similar to that presented before. Said that the layout was still not consolidated. Said that there is a need for an SEA for the area. Expressed disappointment that the area was being looked at as an isolated pack and that there are still cityscapes on the hilltops with iconic structures. Said that eThekweni are trying to consolidate services under the flight path. Said that this will have a huge effect on the area. Raised the issue of the appropriateness of the M4 vista and the idea of a cityscape stuck on the M4. Said that the fact that the development cannot be seen from Umdloti is not the issue but rather that while buffer zones are welcome, there is no buffer between Umdloti and the proposed cityscape.
45.	NS	Said that the management of the precinct had not been touched on. Asked what the envisaged plan for the management/ operation/ sustainability of the Precinct was.
46.	GB	Said that with respect to maintenance of open space areas, controls would be put forward in the EMP, and through residents associations. Said that the issue will be discussed more fully in the EIR.
47.	NS	<p>NS expressed his appreciation to Moreland and the professional team in finding constructive design improvements. Asked that as the overall precinct had been planned, and it is a large area, if Moreland is going to manage this for the long ride, or develop and run.</p> <p>Said he has attended all 3 public meetings and would like to state appreciation for the solutions put forward in terms of the wastewater disposal. Said that it was good to see constructive solutions being put forward.</p> <p>NS requested that Moreland consider managing the whole new Sibaya Precinct.</p> <p>Did express concern about whether this planning from a town planning point of view is right. Asked what the purpose is of the whole precinct. Said that it is a beachfront development with 6000 residential units, 900 beds and large commercial areas. Estimated that there would be 50000 people in 10-12 years time. Said that the objective is to create a nice environment but is reiterated that it is on the beachfront and that the 3 pedestrian routes proposed to go down to the beach are hectic walkways. Said that the Precinct can't be done in isolation and that the planners need to consider what their neighbours are looking at and let development happen jointly.</p>
48.	GB	Said that the aim of the scoping report was to gather issues. Explained that some could be addressed in the scoping report, while

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
		others were to be addressed in the EIR/ specialist studies. Said that GAEA need to see if the specialist studies can/ have/ can't address the issues. Submit environmental impact report (EIR) and say how the issues were addressed. Then the report is to be submitted to DAEA who need to ensure that all issues have been addressed properly.
49.	WH	Asked for feedback on the noise issue (relating to the airport).
50.	DD	GAEA have been in contact with Jenny Mander of INR and will be getting the flight paths, noise contours etc from them to overlay on the precinct. The results of which will be included in the EIR.
51.	GB	Reiterated that this issue would be included in the EIR.
52.	WH	INR have had to withdraw the noise report and have it redone.
Way forward		
53.	GB	Stated that the way forward would be to finalise the specialist reports, ensuring that all issues pertaining to the specialist studies have been addressed. Once these reports are finalised, GAEA will ensure that all issues have been addressed and documented in the EIR. The draft EIR will be sent out for comment. Comments received will then be addressed in the final EIR to be submitted to DAEA. If DAEA happy that the document addresses the issues adequately, they will issue a Record of Decision (RoD). The timeframe for this last step is totally dependent on DAEA.
54.	WH	Asked if there would be a computer graphic model done showing the whole site.
55.	GB	Will ask NI to do sections through the development and this will then be sent out to I&APs.
56.		Meeting closed at 9pm.

**SIBAYA PRECINCT
PUBLIC MEETING - ATTENDANCE REGISTER**
Thursday, 8th February 2007, Sharks Board, Herrwood Drive, Umhlanga Rocks

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Bean, Judy	Umdloti Ratepayers and Residents Association	PO Box 14 Umdloti 4350	Tel: 031 568 1861 Fax: Cell: Email: pjbean@mweb.co.za	JB
Bean, Pat	Umdloti Ratepayers and Residents Association	PO Box 14 Umdloti 4350	Tel: 031 568 1861 Fax: Cell: Email: spindrift@mweb.co.za	PB
Blackbeard, Toni		PO Box 43 Umdloti 4350	Email: toni@alleycat.co.za	TB
Boon, Richard	eThekweni Municipality Environment Branch	PO Box 680 Durban 4000	Tel: 031 311 7877 Fax: 311 7134 Email: boonr@durban.gov.za	RB
Bovet, Michele	WWF	154 Currie Road Musgrave Durban 4001	Tel/Fax: 031 202 2355 Cell: 083 655 2395 Email: mbovet@wwf.org.za	MB
Bromham, Charles	Natal Estates Angling Club (Club co-ordinator)	Hyper by the Sea 4053	Cell: 083 649 7772 Email: charlesb@telkomsa.net	CB
Bromley, Stan	ULTRA	13 Kingston Drive Umhlanga Rocks 4320	Tel: 031 561 1811 Fax: 031 561 5393 Cell: 082 560 0216 Email: stanb@intekom.co.za	SB
Butler, Guy	GAEA Projects	PO Box 30258 Mayville 4058	Tel: 031 303 7505 Fax: 086 614 1572 Cell: 082 551 8185 E-mail: guy@gaea.co.za	GB
Cairns, Graham	Wildlife & Environment Society of Southern Africa – Umhlanga Rocks Branch	2 Frome Drive 20 Somerset Valley Hambridge Ave Somerset Park 4319	Tel: 031 562 0257 Email: gandhcairns@svnet.co.za	GC

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Cairns, Heather	Wildlife & Environment Society of Southern Africa – Umhlanga Rocks Branch	2 Frome Drive 20 Somerset Valley Hambridge Ave Somerset Park 4319	Tel: 031 562 0257 Email: gandhcairns@svnet.co.za	HC
Choromanski, Rodney	CNN Architects		Tel: 031 303 5031 Email: rodc@global.co.za	RC
Cook, John	Moreland Developments (Pty) Ltd	PO Box 22319 Glenashley 4022	Tel: 031 560 1900 Fax: 031 566 1619 Email: John.Cook@moreland.co.za	JC
Cowden, Craig	LRI	PO Box 1211 Pietermaritzburg 3200	Tel: 033 392 8360 Fax: 033 345 6982 Email: ccowden@lri.co.za	CC
Craig, Rod	Prestondale Action Committee	c/o PO Box 2239 Prestondale 4021	Tel: 031 566 1371 Fax: 031 566 1371 Cell: 083 725 5669 Email: rod.craig@intekom.co.za	RC
de Vlieg, Gille	Private	PO Box 201903 Durban North 4016	Tel: 031 568 2234 Fax: Cell: 072 236 7077 Email: gille@mweb.co.za	GdV
Dennis, Michelle	Northglen News	Newport Avenue Glenashley	Tel: 031 572 3749 Fax: 031 572 2134 Cell: 076 824 3689 Email: northg@iafrica.com	MD
Donkin, Debbie	GAEA Projects	PO Box 30258 Mayville 4058	Tel: 031 303 7505 Fax: 086 614 1572 Cell: 083 556 4087 E-mail: debbiedonkin@iafrica.com	DD
Duke, Dave	Vela VKE	21 West Riding Row Sherwood 4091	Tel: 031 240 7300 Fax: 031 209 4514 Cell: 083 795 1969 Email: duked@velavke.co.za	DDu
Fenton, S		42 Romsey Grove Durban North	Cell: 082 603 9198	SF
Francis, John	Peace Cottage	PO Box 21 Hillcrest 3650	Tel: 031 765 1888 Fax: 031 765 1888 Cell: 082 557 1749 Email: roches@iafrica.com	JF

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Garach, YR	Hawaan Investments	PO Box 2363 Prestondale 4021	Tel: 031 561 3515 Fax: 031 561 2976 Cell: 084 444 7748 Email: yatin@hawaan.com	YG
Gwala, Cyril	Sivukile	PO Box 105 Pinetown 3600	Fax: 031 709 1261 Email: Cyril@sivukile.com	CG
Henry, Marcel	Urban Architects		Tel: 031 209 0023 Fax: 0312090024 Cell: 0837855009 Email: marcel@urbangroup.co.za	MH
Holland, Wade	WESSA & Umdloti Conservancy	PO Box 81 Umdloti Beach 4350	Tel: 031 568 1839 Email: sealodge@iafrica.com	WH
Iyer, Nathan	Iyer Rothaug Collaborative		Tel: 031 202 9550 Fax: 031 202 9551 Email: nathan@iyerrothaug.co.za	NI
Jevon, Pierre	Private	PO Box 123 Umdloti 4350	Tel: 031 568 1821 Fax: Cell: 083 777 1821 Email: yooit@iafrica.com	PJ
Jollands, David	Moreland Developments (Pty) Ltd	PO Box 22319 Glenashley 4022	Tel: 031 560 1900 Fax: 031 566 1619 Email: David.Jollands@moreland.co.za	DJ
Jordaan, Wouter	SRK Consulting	20 Kinley Place Westville 3629	Tel: 031 279 1213 Fax: 031 279 1204 Cell: 072 374 3156 Email: wjordan@srk.co.za	WJ
King, Dale	Sagen Projects	PO Box 208 Mtunzini 3867	Tel: 035 340 2777 Fax: 086 633 0946 Cell: 082 451 1740 Email: dale@zulucom.net	DK
Koekemoer, M	Vela VKE		Cell: 082 961 2379 Email: koekemoerm@velavke.co.za	MK

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Lovatt, Mike	Nile Properties	PO Box 1053 Hillcrest 4062	Tel: 031 765 2912 Fax: Cell: 083 626 0893 Email: mlovatt@telkomsa.net	ML
Magill, Brendan	GOBA (Pty) Ltd	1 Burnside Durban North 4051	Tel: 031 564 8884 Fax: 039 975 3201 Cell: 072 203 2135 Email: Brendan.magill@gmail.com	BM
Malcolm, Jim	Prestondale Action Committee	P.O. Box 2039 Prestondale 4021	Tel: 031 566 1452 Fax: 031 566 1371	JM
McFadyen, Lucille	Private	PO Box 282 Ilala Ridge 4021	Cell: 083 779 4546 Email: lucillek4you@3i.co.za	LM
Momberg, Vicky	Nile Properties		Cell: 083 228 3444 Email: properties@worldonline.co.za	VM
Moodley, Keshan	SRK	PO Box 26211 Isipingo Beach 4115	Tel: 031 902 0888 Cell: 084 604 9475	KM
Naicker, Pat	Hawaan Investments	P O Box 2147 MECCE Durban 4301	Tel: 031 5613515 Fax: 031 561 2976 Email: pnaicker@hawaan.com	PN
Noah, Dawn		PO Box 816 Umhlanga Rocks 4021	Tel: 031 572 3306 Fax: 031 572 3306 Cell: 082 373 2585 Email: lfm@mweb.co.za	DN
Noah, Les		PO Box 816 Umhlanga Rocks 4021	Tel: 031 572 3306 Fax: 031 572 3306 Cell: 082 373 2585 Email: lfm@mweb.co.za	LN
Norris, Mike		PO Box 298 Umdloti 4350	Tel: 031 568 1129 Fax: 031 312 1485	MN
Nxumalo, B	BPSA		Cell: 083 401 7184 Email: bongekile.nxumalo@bp.com	BN
Patel, Hareesh	Ithala	PO Box 791 Westville 3670	Tel: 083 751 6363 Fax: 088 031 262 1328 Email: hpatel@ispace.co.za	HP

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Pearson, Keith	URNTC/ La Lucia Ridge Office Estate Management Association	PO Box 4104 The Square Umhlanga Rocks Drive	Tel:031 5662638 Fax: 031 566 2662 Cell: 082 8048213 Email: llroema@mweb.co.za	KP
Pullan, Geoff	Councillor		Tel: Fax: Cell: Email: geoffpullan@iafrica.com	GP
Ramlagaan, Rakesh	eThekwini Municipality	PO Box 272 Durban 4000	Tel: 031 311 4335 Fax: 031 337 1004 Cell: 083 780 5656 Email: ramlagaanr@durban.gov.za	RR
Ridgeway, Jen	Remax	PO Box 1032 Umhlanga 4320	Tel: 031 561 4543 Cell: 083 248 4808 Email: ridgeway@wol.co.za	JR
Rubelli, Trevor	Natal Estates Angling Club		Tel: Fax: Cell: Email: TrevorR@dmws.durban.gov.za	TR
Sewpersad, Sanjiv	GOBA (Pty) Ltd		Tel: 031 583 3400 Fax: 031 583 3401 Cell: 082 546 7906 Email: sanjivs@goba.co.za	SS
Siedle, Elsa	Umdloti Ratepayers and Residents Association		Tel: 568 1033 Fax: Cell: Email: zalbroker@wol.co.za	ES
Siedle, Richard	Umdloti Ratepayers and Residents Association		Tel: 568 1033 Fax: Cell: Email: zalbroker@wol.co.za	RS
Slatter, Neil	Company – MI Investments, Umdloti Business Assoc, and Umdloti Resident	PO Box 1908 Umhlanga 1 South Beach Umdloti	Tel: 031 568 1283 Fax: 031 568 1200 Email: nslatter@mweb.co.za	NS
Van Rooyen, Kobus	SRK Consulting	20 Kinley Place Westville 3629	Tel: 031 279 1200 Fax: 031 279 1204 Cell: 082 873 2715 Email: rooy@srk.co.za	KvR

Contact Person	Company/ Organisation	Postal Address	Telephone/Fax/ E-mail	Abbreviation
Vickers, Hilary	Lake Victoria Conservancy	PO Box 71 Umdloti Beach 4350	Tel: 031 568 1671 Fax: Cell: 083 454 3090 Email: vickht@iafrica.com	HV
Weerts, Kevin	GAEA Projects	PO Box 30258 Mayville 4058	Tel: 031 765 1756 Fax: 031 765 1957 Cell: 082 883 0779 E-mail: kevin@gaea.co.za	KW
Wicks, Ronnie	Private	42 Romsey Grove Durban North 4051	Cell: 083 286 4262 Fax: 031 361 8310 Email: ronaldw@npa.co.za	RWi
Wilken, Angie	Mount Moreland Ratepayers Association	PO Box 141 Umdloti Beach 4350	Tel: 031 568 1557 Fax: 031 568 1557 Cell: 083 603 2060 Email: parlay@mweb.co.za	AW
Wilkinson, Rory	Moreland Developments (Pty) Ltd	PO Box 22319 Glenashley 4022	Tel: 031 560 1900 Fax: 031 566 1619 Email: rory.wilkinson@moreland.co.za	RW
Wilmans Arthur	Nile Properties	PO Box 1053 Hillcrest 4062	Email: wilmans@mweb.co.za	AW
Włodarczyk, Tomasz	Orison Investments	PO Box 25020 Gateway 4321	Tel: 031 564 2996 Fax: 086 606 4853 Cell: 082 491 8713 Email: tom@trainingchain.co.za	TW
Wright, Brian	Private	PO Box 990 Umdloti 4350	Cell: 083 324 3367 Email: brian@bundusouthafrica.co.za	BW