Development phase

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impacts on Fauna**	
Nature of impact:	Clearing of existing habitat for the building of houses.	Clearing of existing habitat for farming purposes.
Extent and duration of impact:	Site specific. During construction phase (and permanently afterwards).	Site specific. Continuous duration in the course of farming activities, unless a change of land-use management occurs.
Consequence of impact or risk:	Degradation of natural habitat, and consequent fragmentation and reduction of faunal communities as a result of the housing development.	Degradation of natural habitat, and consequent fragmentation and reduction of faunal communities as a result of alien plant infestations.
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable.	Probable, if farming activities are initiated.
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable loss of resources on development footprints.	Marginal to significant loss of resources, depending on the extent of farming activities.
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Generally, not reversible.	Partially reversible, should farming activities be halted.
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts envisaged.	No indirect impacts envisaged.
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative.	Medium negative.
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative.	Medium to high negative.
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Generally unavoidable, due to the nature of the development.	Generally unavoidable, due to the nature of the farming activities.
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	The impact can be partially managed, e.g. by promoting indigenous gardening.	The impact can be partially managed, e.g. by scaling down farming activities.
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Moderate, i.e. the impact can be partially mitigated.	High, if all farming activities are halted. Otherwise moderate.
Proposed mitigation:	The development footprint must not overlap with the conserve sensitive habitats as were identified by the botanical assessments, i.e. the patches of De Hoop Limestone Fynbos and the natural drainage line.	Prohibit agricultural development at botanically sensitive nodes.
Residual impacts:	The degradation of natural habitat will reduce the long-term ecological viability of certain species, and these may end up disappearing from the property.	The degradation of natural habitat will reduce the long-term ecological viability of certain species, and these may end up disappearing from the property.
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative.	Low to medium negative.
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative.	Medium negative.

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Damage the soil structure and destroy or shade out plants growing in and around the stream.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on the condition of the stream habitat	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and short term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in stream Present Ecological State	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts due to low intensity and local scale of the impact.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low to medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	high	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	high	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• Ensure that all building materials and equipment are stored at least 50m away from the watercourse corridor, as demarcated prior to construction. • Materials must be stored in piles that do not exceed 1.5m in height and must be protected from the wind, to prevent spread of fine materials across the site.	N/A
Residual impacts:	None	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Negligible	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Negligible	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Pollution of the stream corridor through leakage of fuels, oils, etc. from construction machinery.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on the water quality within the stream and coastline	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Long term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in water quality in the stream	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partially reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	This may impact negatively on water quality on the coastline (intertidal and tidal zone), which may manifest during or after construction.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Medium	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• Any construction activities close to the stream cease during periods of heavy rain, to reduce the risks of contamination of the stream and ocean through rainfall and runoff. • Machinery prone to oil or fuel leakage must be located at least 50 m away from any sensitive ecosystem, and the area bunded in order to contain leakages. • Water pumps and cement mixers shall have drip trays to contain oil and fuel leaks – these must be cleaned regularly. • Suitable toilet and wash facilities must be provided to avoid the use of sensitive areas for these activities.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Even with mitigation, there may be some soil contamination around the construction site, which will slowly wash into the stream and the sea. The intensity is likely to be low.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Destruction or deterioration of freshwater habitat as a result of foot and vehicular traffic.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on stream habitat	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Short term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in condition of stream habitat	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Unlikely to be any indirect impacts due to the low intensity and local scale of the impact	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	High	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	High	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The watercourse corridor must be well marked during the pre-construction phase. • Pathways and access roads must be routed away from the stream corridor and coastline.	N/A
Residual impacts:	None	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Negligible	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Negligible	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Disturbance of freshwater fauna and flora due to light and noise pollution.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on biodiversity - stream fauna and flora	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Short term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Movement of fauna off site, and deterioration in condition of plant communities leading to loss of biodiversity on the site	N/A

Probability of occurrence:	Definite	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partially reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Fauna may move off the site and onto other properties, increasing inter-species interactions elsewhere. This is likely to be of low intensity, as the neighbouring areas to the north and west of the site can probably accommodate the number of individuals that may be impacted in this manner.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to Medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Medium	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The construction site and access pathways should avoid sensitive areas, which must be demarcated during the pre-construction phase. If lights are used, these should be directed away from the stream corridor and coastline. • Any animals found during site preparation or construction must be recorded and handed to the ECO. • An education programme for all employees must be run at the start of construction, and when new contractor teams start on site.	N/A
Residual impacts:	This impact is difficult to mitigate completely, so there is likely to be a residual impact, although of low intensity.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Introduction and spread of alien invasives – top material brought onto the site, for filling and landscaping can lead to the introduction of alien or invasive seed banks.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on biodiversity, condition of the stream habitat, and hydrology (uptake of water by IAPs)	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Long term	N/A

Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in condition of the stream habitat, and altered hydrology.	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Highly Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partially reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Altered hydrology over the long-term may be considered an indirect impact, but has been included here as a direct impact.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Medium	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• All soils and top material must be bought from a reliable source and must be free of alien seeds or grass runners.	N/A
Residual impacts:	It is virtually impossible to rid soils of all IAP seed, so it is likely that there will be some residual impact after implementation of all mitigation measures recommended here.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to Medium negative	N/A

	PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE			
Alternative:	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**No-go alternative**
Potential impact and risk:	**Potential impacts on the vegetation and flora.**			
Nature of impact:	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos
Extent and duration of impact:	Medium-term	Medium-term	Medium-term	Long-term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	No further loss of limestone fynbos and strandveld
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	Highly probable	Highly probable	Unlikely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Low	Low	Medium	Low

Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partly reversible	Partly reversible	Partly reversible	Reversible
Indirect impacts:	None identified	None identified	None identified	None identified
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	High negative	Medium negative	Moderate negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	High negative	Low negative	High negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Low	Low	Low	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Medium	Medium	Medium	Not required
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low	High	High	High
Proposed mitigation:	No mitigation possible	Exclusion of two erven on limestone area; (Alternative 4 is a mitigation action to offset the negative impacts of Alternative 3)	Management of the greater part of the 'limestone area' site for conservation ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled, especially along the entrance road.	Management of the site for conservation purposes ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled
Residual impacts:	High negative	Low negative	Low negative	Low negative
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	High negative	Low negative	Low negative	High positive
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	High negative	Low negative	Low negative	High positive

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE			
Alternative:	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impact of the construction of the rising main on the botany of the conservation area**		
Nature of impact:	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos
Extent and duration of impact:	Medium term	Medium-term	Long-term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Loss of intact limestone fynbos	Loss of intact limestone fynbos	Loss of intact limestone fynbos
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	Highly probable	Likely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	High	Medium	Low
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Very low	Partly reversible	Reversible
Indirect impacts:	None identified	None identified	None identified
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	High negative	Low negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Very high negative	Medium negative	Low negative

Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Low	Low	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Low	Low	High
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low	Medium	High
Proposed mitigation:	No mitigation possible	Strict adherence to recommended mitigation measures.	Management of the 'conservation area' for conservation purposes ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled
Residual impacts:	Medium negative	Low negative	Low negative
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	High negative	Low negative	High positive
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	High negative	Low negative	High positive

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Employment and business opportunities during the construction phase.**	
Nature of impact:	Creation of employment and business opportunities during the construction phase**.**	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and medium term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Temporary employment and business opportunities for local contractors and communities will be created.	
Probability of occurrence:	Highly Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	N/A	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	N/A	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Creation of benefits for local construction companies and contractors based in the SLM	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low positive	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium positive	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	N/A	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Impact can be fully managed (enhanced) by employing locally based contractors and workers are employed	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be enhanced:	Moderate to High	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The developer must inform the local authorities, local community leaders, organizations and councillors of the project and the potential job opportunities for locals.	N/A

	• The developer must establish a database of local construction companies in the area, specifically SMME's owned and run by HDI's, prior to the commencement of the tender process for the bulk services component of the project. These companies should be notified of the tender process and invited to bid for project related work. • The developer, in consultation with the appointed contractor/s, must look employing a percentage of the labour required for the construction phase from local area in order to maximize opportunities for members from the local HD communities; In terms of the individual property owners, they will be free to employ the building contractors of their choice, however the EMP will recommend that local contractors must be employed. Given the location of Infanta the majority of property owners are likely to employ locally based building contractors.	
Residual impacts:	No significant residual impacts as the employment and business opportunities are temporary in nature and are linked to the construction phase.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Medium positive	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium positive	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Risks posed by presence of construction workers, including petty theft and crime.**	
Nature of impact:	Potential increase in petty theft and crime in the area due to the presence of construction workers on site.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and medium term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Loss of personal goods, damage to property, potential bodily and psychological damage and harm	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable, however, likely to be confined to a limited number of households	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Yes, if leads to loss of life and or family heirlooms or sentimental goods are stolen	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Yes, if stolen goods are recovered and or damage repaired.	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Potential lingering injuries and or psychological damage	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	N/A

Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	The developer and or contractors cannot be held responsible for the off-site, after-hours behaviour of all construction employees. However, the contractors appointed by the developer and individual homeowners must ensure that all workers employed on the project are informed at the outset of the construction phase that any construction workers found guilty of theft will be dismissed and charged. All dismissals must be in accordance with South African labour legislation. In addition, with the exception of security personnel, no construction workers should be allowed to remain on the site over weekends. The contractor should make necessary arrangements to transport workers to and from the area on a weekly basis. • For the bulk services phase, the construction workers will be required to stay in a facility located to the west of the site on the developer's property during the week (Figure 4.1). No construction workers will be permitted to stay in the facility over weekends. The contractor must transport all construction workers to their homes on Friday afternoon and back to site on Monday morning. The duration of the bulk services phase will be 4-6 months. • The facility has three rooms and an ablution room. The suitability of the facility to accommodate workers should be confirmed by the local authorities before commencement of the construction phase.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Potential lingering injuries and or psychological damage	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Potential risk to the areas natural resources, such as poaching etc.**	
Nature of impact:	The presence of construction workers poses a potential risk to the areas natural resources, such as poaching etc.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and medium term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Loss of natural resources.	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Marginal loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	N/A

Indirect impacts:	Impact on other species that rely on impacted species	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The contractors appointed by the developer and individual homeowners must ensure that all workers employed on the project are informed at the outset of the construction phase that any construction workers found guilty of poaching and or theft will be dismissed and charged. All dismissals must be in accordance with South African labour legislation. In addition, with the exception of security personnel, no construction workers should be allowed to remain on the site over weekends. The contractor should make necessary arrangements to transport workers to and from the area on a weekly basis. • It is recommended that the developer appoint the EIA consultants to prepare a General Environmental Management Plan (EMP) that must be implemented by all private owners.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Impact carrying capacity of impacted species and potential impact on other species that rely on impacted species. However, should be noted that marine resources are also threatened by other users.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Increased risk of veld fires.**	
Nature of impact:	Potential loss of livestock, crops and houses, damage to farm infrastructure and threat to human life associated with increased incidence of veld fires.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and medium term.	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Potential harm of property, loss of livestock and even possible loss of life.	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Marginal to complete (see above comments).	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully if there is no loss of life and material losses are fully compensated for and veld recovers. Irreversible if there is a loss of life.	N/A

Indirect impacts:	Impact on farming operations, holiday homes and veld	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium to High	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• These mitigation measures apply to both the bulk civil component of the development and to individual homeowners: • Contractors must ensure that open fires on the site for cooking or heating are not allowed except in designated areas. • Contractors must ensure that construction related activities that pose a potential fire risk, such as welding etc., are properly managed and are confined to areas where the risk of fires has been reduced. Measures to reduce the risk of fires include clearing working areas and avoiding working in high wind conditions when the risk of fires is greater. In this regard special care must be taken during the high risk dry, windy summer months. • Contractors must provide adequate fire fighting equipment on-site; • Contractors must provide fire-fighting training to selected construction staff; • In the advent of a fire being caused by construction workers and or construction activities, the appointed contractors must compensate property owners, including farmers, for any damage caused to their properties and losses incurred. The contractor should also compensate the firefighting costs borne by farmers and local authorities.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Impact on on-going farming operations and veld	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Construction activities and traffic.**	
Nature of impact:	Potential noise, dust and safety impacts associated with movement of construction related traffic to and from the site.	

Extent and duration of impact:	Local and medium term.	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Potential noise, dust and safety risks to local inhabitants and other road users.	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss.	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Reversible.	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Damage to road surface on main access road to Infanta.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium to High	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• Construction activities should not be permitted over weekends, specifically long weekends (such as the Easter Weekend) and the December school holidays, specifically the period 14 December to 6 January. This is to reduce the impact on those people who live in Infanta permanently and or who visit the area over weekends and holiday times. • Construction activities during week days should be confined to the following hours – 07h30 and 17h30. This is to reduce the impact on the permanent residents of Infanta or and people who visit the area during the week. • Dust suppression measures must be implemented for heavy vehicles such as wetting of gravel roads on a regular basis and ensuring that vehicles used to transport sand and building materials are fitted with tarpaulins or covers. • All vehicles must be road-worthy and drivers must be qualified, made aware of the potential road safety issues, and need for strict speed limits.	N/A
Residual impacts:	None, impacts linked to temporary construction phase activities	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Damage to the Infanta Road.**	
Nature of impact:	Impact on road is minimal and temporary (construction period)	No development will result in any construction related traffic.
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Short-term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	No permanent damage expected	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Unlikely	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts expected	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	See above	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	The pavement structure of roads is designed based on the volume of heavy vehicles and light vehicles and have very little impact on the structural capacity of a road. As is the case for all proclaimed main roads, Main Road 268 was constructed to a high standard, and it should therefore be able to carry the additional light vehicular traffic as a result of the proposed development without any serious damage to it.	N/A
Residual impacts:	No residual impacts	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

OPERATION PHASE

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impacts on Fauna.**	
Nature of impact:	Disturbance of on-site and adjacent fauna due to the presence of residential units and their occupants.	Disturbance of on-site and adjacent fauna cause by farming activities.
Extent and duration of impact:	Mostly site specific, and marginally into immediate surroundings. Permanent.	Mostly site specific, and marginally into immediate surroundings. Continuous duration,

		unless a change of land-use management is imposed.
Consequence of impact or risk:	Species richness and abundance may decline as a result of the disturbance factors.	Species richness and abundance may decline as a result of the disturbance factors.
Probability of occurrence:	Probable.	Probable.
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partially replaceable.	Partially replaceable.
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Generally, not reversible if land-use remains a residential venture.	Partially reversible, should farming activities be halted.
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts envisaged.	No indirect impacts envisaged.
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative.	Low negative.
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative.	Low negative.
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Generally unavoidable, due to the nature of the development.	Generally unavoidable, due to the nature of the farming activities.
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	The impact can be partially managed.	The impact can be partially managed, e.g. by scaling down farming activities.
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low.	High, if all farming activities are halted. Otherwise, moderate.
Proposed mitigation:	• Limit the hindrance of faunal movements. • Control alien invasive plants to optimise the conservation of the undeveloped sections. • Promote indigenous gardening.	• Prohibit agricultural development at botanically sensitive nodes. • Control alien invasive plants to optimise the conservation of the entire site.
Residual impacts:	The continued disturbances emanating from the residential units may over time reduce the long-term ecological viability of certain species, and these may end up disappearing from the property.	The continued disturbances emanating from farming activities may over time reduce the long-term ecological viability of certain species, and these may end up disappearing from the property.
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative.	Low negative.
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative.	Low negative.
OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Development of open space.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on movement and health of local fauna and flora.	N/A
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and permanent	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Fragmentation of landscape connectivity could lead to deterioration in habitat condition within the watercourse corridor, and loss of biodiversity as fauna move off the site.	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A

Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Irreversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Flora and fauna may move off the site and search for habitat elsewhere, which may place pressure on habitat, communities and populations elsewhere	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Low	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	High	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• While the open spaces within the development – in the north-western corner and around the watercourse – will mitigate to some extent against the impacts associated with the loss of open space and hardening of the property, there is limited connectivity between these two areas. These spaces are connected by a fairly narrow corridor along the western edge of the property adjacent to the gravel road. The movement of fauna and flora across the site would be improved through not constructing fences between the houses, thus allowing fauna to move between the houses. A further mitigation would be through ensuring that all gardens are planted with locally indigenous plant species. • The open spaces provided for in Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, and the proposed SUDS infrastructure should allow for sufficient area for the infiltration of runoff across the site. No further mitigation measures are recommended in this regard. • Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 will result in the setting aside of a considerable portion of the site as conservation area. While there is no detail on how this area will be managed, this represents a positive impact that it is unlikely would apply to the no development alternative, due to the uncertainties associated with this option.	N/A
Residual impacts:	There will be a residual impact on the flora and fauna around the watercourse, due to the change in the local landscape, despite mitigation. This will be low of low intensity, due to the available open space surrounding the property.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Pollution of the watercourse and coastline from stormwater.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on water quality in the stream and coastline	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Permanent	Regional and Permanent
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in water quality in the stream and the sea along the coastline	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	Unlikely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	Irreplaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partly reversible	Partly reversible
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts likely	No indirect impacts likely
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	High	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	• The proposed stormwater management system, if implemented in full, would adequately mitigate against the negative impacts associated with the generation, storage and discharge of stormwater on the site. It is understood that all stormwater generated by the development will be minimised at the point of accumulation, with only high discharge volumes and natural runoff being directed towards the watercourse and coastline. • The stormwater pipe carrying water under the road must be cleaned out, so that this does not pose a flood risk for the proposed development. In addition, stormwater runoff from the dirt road into Cape Infanta must be formalised.	N/A
Residual impacts:	None	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Negligible
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Negligible

OPERATION PHASE

Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Pollution of the watercourse, groundwater and coastline through on-site treatment of wastewater.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on water quality in the stream, groundwater and coastline.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Permanent	Regional and Permanent
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in water quality in the stream, groundwater and the sea along the coastline.	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	Unlikely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	Irreplaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partly reversible	Partly reversible
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts likely	No indirect impacts likely
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Moderate	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	• The proposed septic tanks are unlikely to discharge polluted water directly into the river area, however, over time, these systems do release water which may contain nutrients into the soil. The only mitigation against this, is to ensure that all septic tanks are placed outside the 1:100 year floodline. • Septic tanks must be checked to ensure that they are working, at least annually. • Residents of the development must be educated in the use of household chemicals, detergents and solvents. It is inappropriate to use substances that could affect the efficiency of the septic tanks. Certain chemicals, such as bleaches, can destroy the bacterial communities in the septic tank.	N/A
Residual impacts:	It is likely that there will be low intensity negative residual impacts associated with the septic tanks, as there is always slow leakage of organic pollutants from these systems over time. Even if the septic tanks are outside the 1:100-year floodline, there may still be some seepage towards the stream.	Although there may also be some pollution from the existing septic tank, this is likely to have a negligible effect on the local environment.
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Negligible
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Negligible

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Increased volumes of runoff.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on hydrology of the coastline	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Permanent	Regional and Permanent
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in condition of the stream due to altered hydrology.	
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	Probable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	Irreplaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	Fully reversible
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts likely	No indirect impacts likely
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	Low to medium negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	High	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	See above	N/A
Residual impacts:	There is likely to be some residual amount of stormwater flowing into the watercourse as a result of the development, even with the proposed mitigation. This will be of low intensity and so of low significance.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Low
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Negligible

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Abstraction of water from groundwater resources with risk of drawdown of local water table.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on local ecosystems dependent on groundwater, due to drawdown of local water table.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Permanent	Regional and Permanent
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in condition of ecosystems dependent on groundwater, leading to loss of biodiversity and altered hydrology.	

Probability of occurrence:	Probable	Unlikely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Irreplaceable	Irreplaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	Fully reversible
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts likely	No indirect impacts likely
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Medium	Medium
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	• Both permanent residents and occasional visitors must be encouraged to use water sparingly, as groundwater is a precious resource, and the impacts of increased abstraction relatively unknown. • Use of rainwater must be facilitated through construction of rainwater tanks, and use of rainwater encouraged. • Only locally indigenous plants shall be allowed in gardens and landscaped areas. Grassed lawns must be of indigenous species, such as *Cynodon dactylon* (kweekgras).	N/A
Residual impacts:	Water will be consumed, and this cannot be avoided. Mitigation should reduce the likelihood of there being a negative consequence of water use down to low.	None
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Negligible
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Low negative

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Disturbance of fauna and flora through noise light and trampling.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on biodiversity - stream fauna and flora	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Permanent	Local and Permanent
Consequence of impact or risk:	Movement of fauna off site, and deterioration in condition of plant communities leading to loss of biodiversity on the site.	

Probability of occurrence:	Probable	Improbable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	Partly replaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	Fully reversible
Indirect impacts:	Fauna may move off the site and onto other properties, increasing inter-species interactions elsewhere. This is likely to be of low intensity, as the neighbouring areas to the north and west of the site can probably accommodate the number of individuals that may be impacted in this manner.	
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	High	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	• Residential and road lights must be directed away from the stream corridor and coastline. • Residents, visitors and their pets must be discouraged from walking into and through the stream corridor. • Boardwalks can be used to allow pedestrian access into the corridor, while protecting the fauna and flora.	N/A
Residual impacts:	This impact is difficult to mitigate completely, so there is likely to be a residual impact, although of low intensity.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Negligible

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Introduction and spread of alien invasives through landscaping activities and gardening.**	
Nature of impact:	Negative impact on biodiversity, condition of the stream habitat, and hydrology (uptake of water by IAPs)	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Long-term	Regional and Long-term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Deterioration in habitat condition, and reduced water availability.	
Probability of occurrence:	Highly Probable	Probable

Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	Partly replaceable	Partly replaceable
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partly reversible	Partly reversible
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts are likely. All impacts are direct.	
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	High	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Partly mitigated	Partly mitigated
Proposed mitigation:	• The stream corridor must be planted with appropriate indigenous vegetation, where necessary, and a barrier provided between landscaped areas (gardens or roadsides) and the corridor (e.g. a pathway). • Kikuyu grass must not be allowed on the site. • The spread of alien plant species into the natural areas must be prevented and monitored.	N/A
Residual impacts:	It is virtually impossible to rid soils of all IAP seed, so it is likely that there will be some residual impact after implementation of all mitigation measures recommended here.	
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low to medium negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Low negative

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Clearing alien vegetation from the site.**	
Nature of impact:	Positive impact on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Long-term	Regional and Long-term
Consequence of impact or risk:	-	
Probability of occurrence:	Definite	Improbable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	N/A	N/A

Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Fully reversible	Fully reversible
Indirect impacts:	None.	
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Medium positive	Low to medium positive
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium positive	Low to medium positive
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Low	Low
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	-	-
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	N/A	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	N/A	N/A
Residual impacts:	N/A	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	N/A	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	N/A	N/A

	OPERATION PHASE			
Alternative:	**Alternative 1**	**Alternative 2**	**Alternative 3**	**No-go alternative**
Potential impact and risk:	**Potential impacts on the vegetation and flora.**			
Nature of impact:	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, especially limestone fynbos
Extent and duration of impact:	Permanent	Permanent	Permanent	Long-term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	Loss of intact limestone fynbos and Overberg Dune Strandveld	No further loss of limestone fynbos and strandveld
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	Highly probable	Highly probable	Unlikely
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	High	Medium	Medium	High
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Irreversible	Partly reversible	Irreversible	Reversible
Indirect impacts:	None identified	None identified	None identified	None identified
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	High negative	Low negative	High negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	High negative	Low negative	Medium negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Low	Low	Low	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Medium	Medium	Medium	High
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low	High	High	High
Proposed mitigation:	No mitigation possible	Appropriate management of 'green' areas for biodiversity	Management of the greater part of the	Management of the entire erf site for conservation

		conservation (Alternative 2 is a mitigation action to offset the negative impacts of Alternative 1)	'limestone area' site for conservation ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled, especially along the entrance road.	purposes ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled
Residual impacts:	High negative	Low negative	Low negative	Low negative
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Medium negative	Low negative	Low negative	High positive
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Low negative	Low negative	High positive

OPERATIONAL PHASE			
Alternative:	**Alternatives 2**	**Alternatives 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impact of the operation of the water main on the botany of the conservation area**		
Nature of impact:	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos	Impact on natural flora and vegetation, mainly limestone fynbos
Extent and duration of impact:	Long term	Long term	Long term
Consequence of impact or risk:	Minimal further loss of limestone fynbos	Minimal further loss of limestone fynbos	Minimal further loss of limestone fynbos
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	Highly probable	Probable
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	High	Medium	High
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Irreversible	Partly reversible	Reversible
Indirect impacts:	None identified	None identified	None identified
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	High negative	Low negative	Low negative
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	High negative	Low negative	Low negative
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Medium	Medium	High
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	High	High	High
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Medium	Medium	Medium
Proposed mitigation:	No mitigation possible	Ongoing clearance of alien vegetation to encourage natural vegetation to regenerate on the area disturbed by construction. Ongoing removal of any alien plants that may attempt to establish.	Management of the 'conservation area' for purposes, ensuring that alien invasive plants are controlled
Residual impacts:	Low negative	Low negative	Low negative

Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Medium negative	Low negative	High positive
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	Low negative	High positive

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Creation of opportunities for new homeowners.**	
Nature of impact:	The benefits to new homeowners include ownership of a coastal property in a small, quiet, coastal town.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and long-term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Benefit associated with ability to own a home next to the coast, including ability to get away from the city and relax with family and friends at quiet, coastal settlement.	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Completely Reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Long terms well-being benefits associated with having a place to get away to and relax.	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium positive	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Fully, by not developing the houses	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Fully, by developing the houses	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced:	Ownership of a coastal property in Infanta is regarded as enhancement. No additional measures are required.	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	Ownership of a coastal property in Infanta is regarded as enhancement. No additional measures are required.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Well-being and lifestyle benefits associated with having access to a coastal property.	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium positive	N/A

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impact on sense of place.**	

Nature of impact:	Impact of new development on Infanta's sense of place and character as a small, quiet, coastal town.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Permanent	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	Potential change to the current character and areas sense of place	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Highly probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partially reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Limited as area is located within area identified for residential development	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Medium negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Fully to Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The developer must ensure that strict design guidelines that are in keeping with the current scale of development in Infanta and are sympathetic to the local environment are attached to the deed of sale for all properties. As indicated above, Architectural Guidelines for the development have been drawn up by IG Architects and Urban Design (April 2013). These guidelines appear to address the concerns raised by local residents. • The establishment of a security type estate, with controlled access is not recommended or supported. As indicated above, the developer has indicated that public access to the area will not be controlled or restricted.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Limited as area is located within area identified for residential development	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A

OPERATION PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Impact on amenities.**	
Nature of impact:	Impact of new development on existing coastal amenities, specifically during peak season.	
Extent and duration of impact:	Local and Permanent	N/A

Consequence of impact or risk:	Crowding resulting in impact on carrying capacity of existing amenities in the area	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Probable	N/A
Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Partially reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	Limited, as the impacts will be confined to peak season	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated/enhanced:	Medium	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	• The Infanta Ratepayers and Residents Association, in consultation with the local authorities, must investigate the need to up-grade the existing slipway and the option of developing a tidal pool. • The SLM SDF notes that the municipality is responsible for up-grading the slipway.	N/A
Residual impacts:	Limited, as the impacts will be confined to peak season	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Negligible	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low positive	N/A

PLANNING, DESIGN AND DEVELOPMENT PHASE		
Alternative:	**Alternatives 1, 2 and 3**	**No-Go**
Potential impact and risk:	**Damage to the Infanta Road.**	
Nature of impact:	Additional traffic and generation of dust by additional traffic.	No development will result in any construction related traffic.
Extent and duration of impact:	Regional and Long term	N/A
Consequence of impact or risk:	The pavement structure of the roads is designed based on the volume of heavy vehicles and light vehicles and have very little impact on the structural capacity of a road. As is the case for all proclaimed main roads, Main Road 268 was constructed to a high standard and it should therefore be able to carry the additional light vehicular traffic as a result of the proposed development without any serious damage to it.	N/A
Probability of occurrence:	Unlikely	N/A

Degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources:	No loss	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be reversed:	Reversible	N/A
Indirect impacts:	No indirect impacts expected	N/A
Cumulative impact prior to mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact prior to mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be avoided:	Partly	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be managed:	See above	N/A
Degree to which the impact can be mitigated:	Low	N/A
Proposed mitigation:	If it is taken into consideration that there are currently 200 houses in Cape Infanta, Infanta Park and Kontiki of which roughly 20% are permanently occupied, the proposed 22 erven, if fully developed and with the same percentage of permanent residents, will result in only 4 to 5 houses that will be permanently occupied. The additional traffic due to the proposed development is thus expected to have very little negative effect on the dust problem. The streets within the development will, however, all have surfaced roads (pavers, tar or concrete slabs). This will resolve the dust issue.	N/A
Residual impacts:	No residual impacts	N/A
Cumulative impact post mitigation:	Low negative	N/A
Significance rating of impact after mitigation (e.g. Low, Medium, Medium-High, High, or Very-High)	Low negative	N/A