

Table 2: Summary table of comments received on the Final BAR, with responses from CCA and the project technical team, as appropriate

NO.	ISSUE	NAME	DATE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	COMMENTS FROM CAPE NATURE				
1.1	General	CapeNature - Rhett Smart	2017.01.30	<p>Please find attached comment from CapeNature on the Final Basic Assessment Report for the Proposed Improvements to the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch.</p> <p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development and would like to make the following comments. Please note that our comments only pertain to the biodiversity related impacts and not to the overall desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>	These comments have been noted.
1.2	Overall project comment	CapeNature - Rhett Smart	2017.01.30	There have not been any changes to the project proposal since the Revised Basic Assessment Report (BAR) for which we did not indicate any objection and supported the findings of the specialist studies and the implementation of relevant mitigation measures. Therefore our previous comments remain relevant and should be referred to for more detail.	These comments have been noted.
1.3	Future transport planning	CapeNature - Rhett Smart	2017.01.30	We have noted the concerns raised regarding addressing traffic issues at a regional level and recommend that biodiversity constraints should be taken into account during the planning phase for which the provincial biodiversity spatial plan should be the primary informant.	These comments have been noted.
2	COMMENTS FROM STELLENBOSCH MUNICIPALITY				
2.1	Comments in response to Final BAR	Stellenbosch Municipality - Dupré Lombaard	2017.01.31	<p>Herewith the comment from Stellenbosch Municipality.</p> <p>This is the response from the Stellenbosch Municipality to the notice of the availability of the final basic assessment report (BAR) dated 12 December 2016, focusing mainly on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the purpose of the proposed project; assessment of related and downstream impacts; and need for joint planning and design between the relevant authorities/spheres of government. <p>The municipality addressed a letter to the Department of Transport and Public Works on 15 November 2016, a copy of which is attached hereto as further background to this letter of comment on the final BAR.</p> <p>[Note: The full text of the above-mentioned letter is included as Comment 2.2 below.]</p> <p>The basic assessment report indicates that the project rationale is to improve the mobility function of the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch. The Municipality is of the view that this is a very short section of the R44 and that an improvement on mobility on this section of roughly 12 km is immaterial. In addition</p>	Subsequent to submission of the comment, a representative of the applicant (DTPW) and the design engineer (Kantey & Templer Consulting Engineers (Pty) Ltd (K&T)) met with Stellenbosch Municipality in February 2017. The implications of the DTPW undertaking to assist with investigations into the development of a Stellenbosch Western Bypass for the proposed improvements of the R44 were discussed (also refer to item 2.2 below). DTPW reiterated its position that the Stellenbosch Bypass is not considered as an alternative to the proposed project. The reason is that the proposed project aims to alleviate safety concerns along the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch while retaining the current Level of Service. This aim has to be achieved within the context of the R44 as a mobility route in the wider context of the provincial road network. The Stellenbosch Bypass, on the other hand, has the specific aim of diverting through traffic away from the town. Whilst the R44 as a mobility route will have to be taken into consideration in a feasibility study regarding the proposed Stellenbosch Bypass, safety improvements to the affected section of the R44 does not form part of and is not dependent on the outcome of such a study.

Proposed Improvements to the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch

NO.	ISSUE	NAME	DATE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
				<p>thereto, the BAR does not give appropriate consideration to the nature of activities developed along this section of the road with approval of the roads authorities over years, if not decades. The need for mobility (through Stellenbosch town) necessitates the development of the Stellenbosch Western Bypass, as approved in the Stellenbosch roads Master Plan 2012 to 2017, with the approval of the relevant roads authority. The Western Bypass would have significant effect on the Annandale intersection and the remainder of the study area, being the section of the route between Annandale and Van Rheeede. This matter is noted in paragraph 3.4 on page viii of the BAR, but it is then not addressed in detail in the BAR.</p> <p>The Western Bypass is of such importance that it should feature in the BAR, or then at least in a larger study, i.e. the BAR might not be the appropriate study to address the real issue, namely mobility between Somerset West / the N2 and Klipmuis / the N1. The basic assessment report only assesses one sector of roughly 12 km of the mobility route between two major urban areas causing obstructions in the longer route. This seems to be a contradiction in terms, as mobility is not being improved through these areas of obstruction, but only between them.</p> <p>The BAR refers to, but is silent on the extent and cost of the stated significant lowering of the level of service on roads and intersections inside of Stellenbosch town. Moreover, none of these impacts are addressed in the proposed mitigation measures (paragraph 8 from page xxviii and further), which leads to the assumption that none of the cost/impacts which are mentioned and acknowledged were assessed. Instead, the basic assessment report narrowly focuses on the construction, visual, biophysical and related impacts and not on the cost, safety and traffic level of service impacts in Stellenbosch as a result of the proposed upgrading of the section between Somerset West and Stellenbosch. At least that part of the BAR that deals with the relevant section of the route, namely from Annandale to Van Rheeede that overlaps with the proposed and acknowledged Western Bypass, should have included last mentioned as an alternative and assessed the relevant impacts, costs and benefits and made appropriate recommendations in the mitigation chapter.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Municipality is of the opinion that the basic assessment report is inappropriate for the evaluation of the proposed upgrading and that a full environmental impact assessment considering all the related and downstream impacts should be undertaken.</p> <p>The relevant authorities should jointly plan the mobility route to ensure maximum benefit is derived along the entire route from the N2 to the N1, failing which it should remain an activity corridor as it has developed over time with authority approval.</p>	<p>An additional further request from Stellenbosch Municipality was that DTPW provide them with visual video imagery of the Annandale and Winey Road proposed grade-separated interchanges for their better understanding of the proposals. This has been made available to Stellenbosch Municipality and DTPW awaits any additional response from them. The DTPW project manager further confirmed that there was ongoing interaction between his Department and the Stellenbosch Municipality in the process of endeavouring to resolve the issues raised in conflicting comments in responses to the Revised Draft BAR and the Final BAR.</p> <p>In respect to the effect of the Western Bypass on the Annandale Intersection: This issue was raised in the previous comment round and the response provided remains valid – please refer to item 2.2 below for detail in this regard.</p> <p>Against the above background, it is appropriate that the Final BAR focuses on the specific road section included in the project scope, i.e. from Steynrust Road Bridge in Somerset West to Van Rheeede Street in Stellenbosch.</p>
2.2	Previous comments in	Stellenbosch Municipality –	2016.11.15	<p>[Note: The full text of the letter referred to in paragraph 2 of Comment 1.1 above is represented as Comment 2.2 for easy reference.]</p>	<p>The letter attached to the submission on the Final BAR was dated 15 November 2016, and differed slightly from the version dated</p>

Proposed Improvements to the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch

NO.	ISSUE	NAME	DATE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
	response to Revised Draft BAR	Willem Pretorius		<p>PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS TO THE R44 BETWEEN SOMERSET WEST AND STELLENBOSCH: REVISED STELLENBOSCH MUNICIPALITY'S POSITION</p> <p>The meeting of 15 November 2016 between the Western Cape Government, represented by Minister Donald Grant and [Head of Department] HOD Lenn Fourie and the Municipality of Stellenbosch represented by Executive Mayor Gesie van Deventer, Mayco councillor Jan de Villiers, Acting Municipal Manager Dupre Lombaard and Acting Director Infrastructure Willem Pretorius on issues pertaining [to] the interaction between the two entities has reference. Due to the current standing of the municipality's reaction to the BAR of the R44 safety improvements it was crucial that common ground be found on this matter in order for Province to move positively forward in implementing their plans on the R44.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>Over the last few years since 2011, a total of 1 469 accidents occurred on the roads between Somerset West and access to Welgevonden on both the R44 and the R304 west of Welgevonden. Of these accidents, 436 (29%) occurred on the rural section between Stellenbosch and Somerset West. The balance of the accidents on the provincial road system through Stellenbosch (71%) occurred in the built up area of Stellenbosch. It therefore remains a challenge for Stellenbosch to reduce the traffic congestion and high accident rates on provincial roads within Stellenbosch. If the number of accidents is expressed per km travelled in the urban and rural sections of the provincial roads, the figures are 39 accidents/km on R44 south of Stellenbosch and 115 accidents/km on the R44 provincial road in Stellenbosch. It is thus clear that the accident situation on the provincial roads within Stellenbosch is three times worse than on the R44 south of Stellenbosch. The Stellenbosch Municipality would therefore support any assistance in addressing this serious road safety situation. The original "non-support" of the BAR for the R44 was based on these figures and through the meeting and discussion of the broader planning principles it was realised that the support of the BAR of the R44 could indeed be connected to the possible solution to the regional problem in the form of the Western by-pass that will allow for the 40% through traffic to not enter the congested situation within Stellenbosch and reduce the risk of accidents. We are still of the opinion that to achieve optimal solutions in this particular case a combination of interventions would be far more beneficial and allow maximum financial gain. Province indicated that they do not have the Western Bypass as an option on their priorities and challenged the Municipality to investigate the possibility and provide them with a workable solution. [NOTE: This highlighted section was included in the letter dated 23 Nov 2016 submitted in response to the Revised Draft BAR; however, it was not included in the letter dated 15 Nov 2016 which was attached to the Final BAR submission.]</p> <p>Stellenbosch adhered to the challenge in determining the route for this Western bypass and appointed a consulting team to do the preliminary feasibility and layout of this crucial</p>	<p>23 November 2016, which was submitted in response to the Revised Draft BAR. The full text of the attached version of the letter is included as Comment 2 in the Comment column, and the previous response is included below for easy reference (Item 2.2 of Revised Draft BAR Comments and Responses Report 2 – Appendix F12):</p> <p>It was noted that the most recent meeting between the Western Cape Government and Stellenbosch Municipality served to find common ground regarding the proposed safety improvements to the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch. As a result, Stellenbosch Municipality decided to recall their initial non-support of the BAR for the proposed project.</p> <p>The accident figures provided in the comments underlines the urgent need to improve safety conditions on the R44.</p> <p>DTPW has indicated that it will provide assistance to Stellenbosch to identifying a solution. It can further be confirmed that DTPW will take over the feasibility study into addressing the proposed "western bypass". This study will inter alia serve to provide clarity on possible alternative route alignments and link points for a bypass road.</p> <p>In 2017 DTPW will commence with a R 100 million upgrade of Annandale Road along the existing alignment. The construction contract of two years is due to commence in January 2017. This confirms, by implication, that DTPW will not be considering any changes to the Annandale Road alignment and its intersection with the R44 Intersection anytime in the future. Any future development of a bypass would thus have to link into the existing intersection location.</p>

Proposed Improvements to the R44 between Somerset West and Stellenbosch

NO.	ISSUE	NAME	DATE	COMMENT	RESPONSE
				<p>route. A proposed route layout and planning principles were tabled at the meeting and it was agreed that it would definitely influence the final decision on the R44 safety initiatives from Province and the request was for the municipality to involve province in the planning stage in order for them to effectively take over at a point in time to finalise the detail design of the road. The "shifting" of the Annandale intersection with the R44 towards Stellenbosch also needed a relook after the concept of the Western Bypass indicated that the entire road network in that vicinity would benefit from this move.</p> <p>Based on the positive discussions around the Western Bypass and how this road would alleviate various traffic problems on the R44 in and around Stellenbosch the Municipality decided to recall their initial non-support of the BAR and commit themselves to working together with Province in achieving a functional and safe road network in and around Stellenbosch</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned should you require any further information.</p>	
3	COMMENTS FROM HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE				
3.1	Covering email	Andrew September	2017.02.22	See attached for the above-mentioned Final Comment for the above-mentioned case. The attached file is incorrect in saying it is an Interim Comment as it is in fact a Final Comment. I do apologise for the delayed response.	This correction that the comment is in fact a Final Comment is noted.
3.2	Final Comment	Mxolisi Dlamuka	2017.02.17	<p>HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED R44 UPGRADE BETWEEN SOMERSET WEST AND STELLENBOSCH, CAPE WINELANDS, SUBMITTED IN TERMS OF SECTION 38(8) OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT (ACT 25 OF 1999)</p> <p>CASE NUMBER: 14070316AS0714D</p> <p>The matter above has reference.</p> <p>Heritage Western Cape is in receipt of your application for the above matter received on 12 January 2017. This matter was discussed at the Impact Assessment Committee (IACom) meeting held on 8 February 2017.</p> <p>The Committee noted that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee acknowledged the high traffic volumes experienced on the R44 and the DTPW's mandate to explore improvements and enhance safety. HWC however confines itself to the protection of heritage resources and this comment is purely based on heritage considerations. The Committee agreed with the Second HIA Addendum in its assessment of cultural landscape and R44 as a scenic drive, as well as the gradings assigned by the consultant. These include a general grading of grade III for R44 scenic drive, 	<p>The comments and recommendations of the HWC IACom as stated in the submission have been noted, and specifically the second bullet point noting that the comment confines itself to heritage considerations. Thus the HWC Final Comment endorses the heritage specialist study, which concluded that the project in its current form and all alternatives that have been considered should not be developed.</p> <p>However, as stated in the Final BAR conclusions, this should be considered within the context of the R44 as a dual carriageway which has existed since the 1970s. When the four-lane dual carriageway replaced the existing single lane road, this could be regarded as when the major change to the cultural landscape actually occurred. The safety and LOS improvements that are now being proposed would largely take place within the confines of the existing road reserve (except at the two interchanges) and should be considered in this context. The proposed project scheme is based on the premise that the safety issue can only be addressed by closing the median openings as DTPW has proposed. Thus, although recognising the cultural heritage value of these openings, their closure is the key component of the project rationale. Should the median openings not be closed, the safety concerns associated with vehicles using the openings would continue – with the safety risk</p>