

APPENDIX M: COMMENTS & RESPONSE REPORT

PROPOSED AD HOC SETBACK LINE FOR PORTION 91 OR FARM 516, SWELLENDAM

Opened February 2026 at PHS Consulting Offices

No.	Name & Presenting Unit	COMMENT	RESPONSE
Application Circulated from 18 March – 21 April 2026			
1	Bernadette Osborne Directorate: Development Management, Region 1	<p>Letter received via email dated 5 February 2026:</p> <p>RE: REQUEST FOR THE ADOPTION OF A DEVELOPMENT SETBACK FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF TWO RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS ON PORTION 91 OF THE FARM POTTEBERG ESTATES NO. 516, SWELLENDAM.</p> <p>1. The electronic copy of the request for the adoption of a development setback, as received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) (“this Directorate”) on 25 November 2025, this Directorates letter dated 5 December 2025 and the additional information received on the same day, refer.</p>	Noted
		<p>2. This letter serves as an acknowledgement of receipt of the additional information by this Directorate.</p>	Noted
		<p>3. It was confirmed in the additional information provided on 5 December 2025 that the clearance footprint of residential unit 2 will be over a partly cleared area. Activity 12 of Listing Notice 3 will not be triggered by the proposed development since less than 300m² of the endangered Overberg Dune Strandveld vegetation will be cleared. It was also confirmed that the site is not</p>	<p>An Aquatic Specialist confirmed that no watercourse or wetland indicators were identified within the proposed development areas. Ground-truthing of the site confirmed that the proposed development footprint is located more than 32 m from the nearest NEMA-defined watercourses</p>

		located within a wetland or close to a wetland. Please note that this must be confirmed by a freshwater specialist or the relevant water authority.	
		4. Your request will be further considered on receipt of the information requested above.	Noted
		5. Kindly quote the abovementioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the proposal.	Noted
		6. This Directorate reserves the right to revise or withdraw its comments and request further information from you based on any new or revised information received.	Noted
2	Bernadette Osborne Directorate: Development Management, Region 1	<p>Letter received via email dated 17 March 2026:</p> <p>RE: REQUEST FOR THE ADOPTION OF A DEVELOPMENT SETBACK FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF TWO RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS ON PORTION 91 OF THE FARM POTTEBERG ESTATES NO. 516, SWELLENDAM.</p> <p>1. The electronic copy of the request for the adoption of a development setback, as received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) ("this Directorate") on 25 November 2025, this Directorates letter dated 5 December 2025 and the additional information received on the same day, this Directorates letter dated 5 February 2026 and the additional information received on 9 March 2026, refer.</p>	Noted

		<p>2. This letter serves as an acknowledgement of receipt of the additional information by this Directorate.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>3. It was confirmed by the freshwater specialist in the Aquatic Screening report dated March 2026, that the site is not located within a wetland.</p>	<p>An Aquatic Specialist confirmed that no watercourse or wetland indicators were identified within the proposed development areas. Ground-truthing of the site confirmed that the proposed development footprint is located more than 32 m from the nearest NEMA-defined watercourses</p>
		<p>4. A public participation process must be undertaken as part of the request for the adoption of a development setback.</p> <p>4.1. As a minimum you are required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • inform the adjacent neighbours, the local authority (Swellendam Municipality) and all relevant Organs of State/State Departments including this Department's Directorate: Coastal Management of your intentions (these interested and affected parties will be regarded as registered interested and affected parties); and • allow a minimum 30 day commenting period; for these interested and affected parties; <p>4.2. Written comments must be obtained from the above-mentioned parties and all other relevant Organs of State/State Departments; and</p> <p>4.3. Proof of the public participation undertaken including all comments received and responses thereto must be submitted to this Directorate.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adjacent Landowners were informed - Noted DEA&DP did not specify the relevant Organs of State therefore the EAP identified those based on informants from the SSVR and site conditions - DE&DP CMU was informed - 30 Day PPP were conducted - Proof of PPP provided in Appendix N

		5. Kindly quote the abovementioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the proposal.	Noted
		6. This Directorate reserves the right to revise or withdraw its comments and request further information from you based on any new or revised information received.	Noted
3	Bernadette Osborne Directorate: Development Management, Region 1	Letter received via email dated 16 April 2026: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND COMMENT ON THE DRAFT REPORT FOR THE ADOPTION OF A DEVELOPMENT SETBACK FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF TWO RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS ON PORTION 91 OF THE FARM POTTEBERG ESTATES NO. 516, SWELLENDAM. 1. The electronic copy of the draft report for the adoption of a development setback, as received by the Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) (“this Directorate”) on 18 March 2026, refers.	Noted
		2. This letter serves as an acknowledgement of receipt of the document and as comment by this Directorate.	Noted
		3. Based on the information provided, the following is noted: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal entails the expansion of an existing house with 2 residential units with parking and associated infrastructure and the “like for like” resurfacing of a section of the existing access road on Portion 91 of the Farm Potteberg Estates No. 516, Swellendam. 	Correct

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expansion is located within 100m inland of the high-water mark of the adjacent Breede River estuary but outside the 1:100-year flood line and coastal management line. • The expansion is not located within a watercourse. • The expansion entails the clearance of 295.1m² of indigenous vegetation, namely Overberg Dune Strandveld vegetation, which is classified as an endangered ecosystem. • The site is located outside an urban area on a property zoned Agriculture. 	
		<p>4. This Directorate has the following comment:</p> <p>4.1. The applicability of Activity 48 of Listing Notice 1 should also be confirmed in the final Report. If applicable, it should also be included request for the adoption of a setback line.</p>	<p>An Aquatic Specialist confirmed that no watercourse or wetland indicators were identified within the proposed development areas. Ground-truthing of the site confirmed that the proposed development footprint is located more than 32 m from the nearest NEMA-defined watercourses. Therefore LN 1 No 48 is Not Applicable</p>
		<p>4.2. It was indicated that a bedroom for 4 people will be demolished, therefore there will be no increase in services with the development of the 2 residential units that will accommodate 4 people. Clarity must be provided whether the proposed development will be a tourism facility as this may have implications for the setback request.</p>	<p>It is a private house, and it will not be used for tourism purposes</p>
		<p>4.3. Confirmation of services Adequate information must be provided on how effluent will be managed on the site. If the proposed development will be connected to a conservancy tank for effluent management, written</p>	<p>The existing sewer system is in place for many years, its functional, it doesn't require any upgrade or service provider and no additional users</p>

		confirmation from a registered service provider/municipality for the removal and disposal of effluent from the tank must be obtained.	are added to the system. The proposal therefore doesn't change the status quo.
		<p>4.4. Public Participation</p> <p>4.4.1. Comments from the following authorities, but not limited to these, must be obtained and included in the final report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department's Directorate: Coastal Management; • Relevant water authority; • CapeNature; • Department of Agriculture; and • Swellendam Municipality. <p>4.4.2. Proof of all the steps undertaken for the Public Participation Process must be included in the final report.</p> <p>4.4.3. A comprehensive Comments and Response Report that includes all the comments received and the responses thereto must be included in the final report. In addition, please ensure that copies of all the comments received are attached to the final report.</p>	<p>We have informed all relevant Organs of State as per your request on 17 March 2026.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CMU; Cape Nature provided comment see below sections. - "Relevant water authority" – Development is not located within 32m of a wetland, no watercourse related NEMA triggers apply, therefore comment from BOCMA/DWS was not required. - "Dept of Agri" – The SSVR confirms the low sensitivity and no influence on agriculture because the area of works is very small its next to an existing house and its not close to any agricultural activities. From experience the DOA normally does not provide input on minor matters as per this case. However, the site is zoned for agriculture; therefore the Dept of Agriculture was notified. - The Swellendam Municipality was notified note they are in process of a consent use application. <p>Proof of PPP and C&R Report provided under Appendix N & M</p>
		5. This Directorate reserves the right to revise or withdraw its comments and request further information from you based on any new or revised information received.	Noted
4	Monique Mulder – Malgas Ratepayers Association	Email dated 3 April 2026 :	The no objection is noted

		We have no objection on application. It seems like responsible development with conservation in mind.	
5	Rhett Smart – CapeNature	<p>Letter received via email dated 21 April 2026:</p> <p>Application for Adoption of an Ad Hoc Setback Line for Expansion of a Dwelling on Portion 91 of Farm Potteberg Estates 516, Infanta (DEA&DP ref: 16/3/3/6/2/E3/10/1489/25)</p> <p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application and would like to make the following comments.</p>	Noted
		The proposed footprints for the north-east expansion of the dwelling and road upgrade are mapped as Critical Biodiversity Area 1 (CBA) in the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan, while the south-western expansion is mapped as No Natural. We wish to note that the existing dwelling and road are below the scale which is accurately detected for the input criteria for the BSP. The vegetation on these footprints is mapped as Overberg Dune Strandveld, listed as endangered.	Noted
		The footprints are adjacent to the Breede River Estuary with slight encroachment into the estuarine functional zone (EFZ) and floodplain wetland as mapped in the National Wetland Map (NWM). With regards to coastal/estuarine constraints, the footprint is located above the 1 in 50 year and 1 in 100 year future risk floodlines for the Breede River Estuary. It is also behind the coastal management line in terms of the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, but encroaches into the coastal protection zone.	Noted

		<p>It is understood that adoption of an ad hoc setback line does not require application of the screening tool and site sensitivity verification as informed by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning. The screening tool has however been applied as best practice which is supported. The results from the screening tool indicate very high sensitivity for terrestrial biodiversity and aquatic biodiversity, high sensitivity for animal species and medium sensitivity for plant species.</p>	<p>The SSVR is important to guide the level of specialist input and the relevant Organs of State to notify and the level of comment or input required.</p>
		<p>The only specialist study undertaken was an aquatic biodiversity screening wetland confirmation report. This would have been the only specialist study recommended by CapeNature in the absence of using the screening tool, since there is minor encroachment of the proposed footprint into wetlands delineated in the National Wetland Map.</p>	<p>An Aquatic Specialist confirmed that no watercourse or wetland indicators were identified within the proposed development areas. Ground-truthing of the site confirmed that the proposed development footprint is located more than 32 m from the nearest NEMA-defined watercourses.</p>
		<p>While it is evident that the vegetation surrounding the dwelling is in good condition, the clearing will be small in extent, in particular in relation to the large extent of the same vegetation within the surrounding area. Based on the photographs, the classification of the vegetation type may not be correct (it appears to be riparian thicket grading into renosterveld).</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>It must nonetheless be ensured that vegetation clearing is minimized as far as possible. There is no Environmental Management Programme (EMPr), and we would support that one is compiled. As a minimum, specifications should be added to the ad hoc setback line report ensuring that disturbance to terrestrial vegetation is minimized as far as possible. We further wish to highlight that specifications</p>	<p>PHS consulted DEA&DP on the EMP and the following feedback was required "It would be best practice to compile an EMPr for implementation by the building contractors and to make the proponent aware of this requirement and their responsibility to ensure its implementation. Please note that an EMPr cannot be approved as part</p>

		<p>should be included regarding the resurfacing of the road, in particular with regards to erosion prevention as the section which is being resurfaced is on a steep slope vulnerable to erosion e.g. water bars.</p>	<p>of a development setback process and may not include any conditions. The onus will therefore be on the proponent to ensure that this requirement is met.”</p> <p>An EMP was compiled and attached (Appendix O) to the application as a response to CN request. The Architects confirm that the EMP will form part of the contract with the builders and the Principal Agent will act as the ECO.</p> <p>The road has a 4% fall plus the engineer included on his drawing two drainage humps to divert water off the road, that will drain into dry pack stone drains to dissipate the water energy and trap silt. These measures will avoid the road and surrounds being eroded.</p>
		<p>For the animal species theme, the six bird species flagged as high sensitivity are mentioned along with basic habitat preferences. While not stated, these species could occur in the surrounding area to varying degrees of probability, however we agree that the footprint expansion would not be of a scale that would impact any of these species. The plant species theme should refer to plant species of conservation concern which would require botanical expertise, however the same applies whereby there is a very low likelihood of any species occurring within the footprint that are not much better represented in the surrounding area.</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>
		<p>The aquatic biodiversity screening study includes a delineation of the estuarine habitat. The ground-truthed delineation of the estuarine habitat does not extend as far upslope as the mapping of the EFZ and floodplain wetland in the NWM. It is</p>	<p>An Aquatic Specialist confirmed that no watercourse or wetland indicators were identified within the proposed development areas. Ground-truthing of the site confirmed that the proposed development</p>

		<p>delineated slightly below the 5 m contour which is the proxy for the EFZ. The report states that there is a clear differentiation in the vegetation between the estuarine habitat and terrestrial habitat. The conclusion is that the proposed development will not impact on estuarine habitat, and a number of mitigation measures are proposed which are supported. We wish to note that SANBI has informed CapeNature that the updated NWM will contain mapping of estuarine habitat where available as opposed to the 5 m proxy EFZ and will therefore be considered more accurate.</p>	<p>footprint is located more than 32 m from the nearest NEMA-defined watercourses.</p> <p>The Aquatic Specialist mitigating measures were included in the attached EMP.</p>
		<p>It should be highlighted that the delineation of the estuarine habitat is not the same parameter as the delineation of the floodlines, however both need to be taken into consideration in the application and relate to different impacts. As stated above, the development footprint is located outside of the floodlines and behind the coastal management line, therefore it does not need to be addressed further.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>We wish to highlight that the property is included in the National Protected Area Expansion Strategy and previous versions of the Provincial Protected Area Expansion Strategy (PPAES), although it is not highlighted as a priority in the latest version of the PPAES. Therefore, if the landowner wishes to formally conserve the property, CapeNature can be contacted in this regard.</p>	<p>The landowner and applicant is a founding member of the Lower Potberg Conservancy and Cape Nature was part of the process and have registered the conservancy.</p>
		<p>In conclusion, CapeNature is satisfied that that impacts have been adequately addressed within the scope of the application and does not object provided mitigation measures are implemented, including those recommended above.</p>	<p>The no objection to the Ad-Hoc SBL is noted</p>

		CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.	Noted
Cape Nature		<p>- Email received 28 April 2026:</p> <p>According to our records there is no Sea Shore Lease for the jetty on this property. The applicant must therefore contact Rowena Crowe (rcrowe@capenature.co.za) in this regard.</p>	The applicant confirmed that they are in contact with Rowena Crowe re the jetty registration. Note the jetty was constructed pre-NEMA.
6	Mercia Liddle- DEADP Directorate Biodiversity and Coastal Management	<p>Letter received via email dated 21 April 2026:</p> <p>RE: REQUEST FOR COMMENT FROM THE SUB-DIRECTORATE: COASTAL MANAGEMENT ON THE APPLICATION FOR AN AD HOC SETBACK LINE FOR A DEVELOPMENT WITHIN A DISTANCE OF 100M INLAND OF THE HIGH-WATER MARK OF THE ESTUARY ON PORTION 91 OF FARM 516, POTTEBERG ESTATES, INFANTA.</p> <p>Good Day, Your request for comment from the Sub-directorate: Coastal Management on the above mentioned application received on 30 March 2026, refers.</p>	
		<p>1. CONTEXT</p> <p>1.1. The Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008) ('NEM: ICMA') is a Specific Environmental Management Act under the umbrella of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ('NEMA'). The NEM: ICMA sets out to manage the nation's</p>	Noted

		<p>coastal resources, promote social equity and best economic use of coastal resources whilst protecting the natural environment. In terms of Section 38 of the NEM: ICMA, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning ('the Department') is the provincial lead agency for coastal management in the Western Cape as well as the competent authority for the administration of the "Management of public launch sites in the coastal zone (GN No. 497, 27 June 2014) "Public Launch Site Regulations".</p>	
		<p>1.2. The Department, in pursuant of fulfilling its mandate, is implementing the Provincial Coastal Management Programme ('PCMP'). The PCMP is a five (5) year strategic document, and its purpose is to provide all departments and organisations with an integrated, coordinated and uniform approach to coastal management in the Province. The Department has developed the next generation PCMP that includes priority objectives for the next 5 years. This PCMP was adopted on 19 May 2023 and is available upon request.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>1.3. A key priority of the PCMP is the Estuary Management Programme, which is implemented in accordance with the NEM: ICMA and the National Estuarine Management Protocol ('NEMP'). Relevant guidelines, Estuarine Management Plans, Mouth Management Plans need to be considered when any listed activities are triggered in the Estuarine Functional Zone.</p>	<p>The proposal is outside of the EFZ</p>

		<p>The Department is in the process of approving a series of Estuarine Management Plans.</p>	
		<p>1.4. The facilitation of public access to the coast is an objective of the NEM: ICMA as well as a Priority in the WC PCMP. The Department developed the Provincial Coastal Access Strategy and Plan, 2017 ('PCASP') and commissioned coastal access audits per municipal district to assist municipalities with identifying existing, historic, and desired public coastal access. These coastal access audits also identify hotspots or areas of conflict to assist the municipalities with facilitating public access in terms of Section 18 of the NEM: ICMA. The PCASP as well as the coastal access audits are available upon request.</p>	<p>The site is on a private farm, public access is not affected</p>
		<p>2. COMMENT</p> <p>2.1. The sub-directorate: Coastal Management ('SD: CM') has reviewed the information as specified above and have the following commentary:</p> <p>2.1.1. The applicant is applying for an Ad Hoc Setback Line for Farm 91/516, Swellendam and the proposal consists of a small-scale expansion of the main house that entails the constructions of two additional units, water tanks, parking and associated infrastructure, located on both sides of the main house and the resurfacing of a section of the existing access road. The area for works proposed on the farm is located within 100m of the HWM.</p>	<p>Correct</p>

		<p>2.1.1.1. The applicant indicated that there are no signs of Breede River flood or tidal erosion on the site, considering the farmhouse is located at 12-13m above msl, behind the dense intact indigenous vegetation. The access road that requires resurfacing along the steepest part does have signs of erosion, but due to rainwater erosion in the tracks and not due to Breede River Estuarine actions.</p>	Correct
		<p>2.1.1.2. The applicant further added that the farm borders the Breede River Estuary that floods during extreme rain events and its also tidal. The area of works will be above the 1:100 year flood line, which is also the highest level the river has been recorded at and the tidal affect is lower than the flood line. The area of works is therefore well above the HWM of the estuary/sea.</p>	Correct
		<p>2.1.2. The applicant accurately noted Critical Biodiversity or Ecological Support Areas as per the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (2023) in relation to the existing structures as well as the proposed works.</p>	Noted
		<p>2.1.3. The applicant confirmed that the subject area of Farm 91/516 falls within the Coastal Protection Zone ("CPZ") as defined in Section 16 of the NEM: ICMA and it should be noted that the purpose of the CPZ is to avoid increasing the effect or severity of natural hazards in the coastal zone and to protect people and properties from risks</p>	Correct

		<p>arising from dynamic coastal processes, including the risk of sea level risks. Due to the subject property's location within the CPZ, Section 63 of the NEM: ICMA must be considered where an authorisation is required in terms of Chapter 5 of the NEMA. Furthermore, Section 62 of the NEM: ICMA obliges all organs of state that regulates the planning of land to apply that legislation in a manner that gives effect to the purpose of the CPZ. As such, Section 63 of the NEM: ICMA must be considered by local authorities for land use decision making. The applicant is of the opinion that the proximity of the CPZ in relation to the site is negated by the facts that the site proposed for expansion form part of an existing development footprint with primary rights.</p>	
		<p>2.1.4. In terms of coastal risk modelling commissioned by the Department, the subject area for the proposed works and additions as well as the existing dwelling on Farm 91/516, occurs landward of the Overberg coastal management line ("CML"). The delineation of the CML is based on the methodology that was informed by various factors including S25(1B) of the NEM: ICMA, taking into consideration ownership and zonation of vacant land. Although the property is located landward of the CML, it is located within the Rural Risk Zone as per the Departments' coastal risk modelling for the Overberg CML project, and as such a precautionary approach should be applied in such areas as they are vulnerable due to risk of flooding. It is</p>	<p>Noted and agreed</p>

		<p>suggested that developments in the Rural Risk Zones should be elevated to ensure safety of users of the space, minimise flood risk and to not interfere with ecological processes of existing ecosystems. The applicant has considered the position of the Departmental CML as well as the 1: 100-year floodline which were used to inform the position of the proposed ad hoc setback line for Farm 91/516.</p>	
		<p>2.1.5. The applicant further stated that it must be considered that the area of works is outside the estuarine functional zone (EFZ) but inside the EFZ 100m buffer zone. It should however be noted that this buffer zone allows an estuary to swell within the floodplain of an estuary in the event of flood events, inundation as well as sea-level rise due to climate change and as such cannot simply be disregarded and , and again, a precautionary approach must be adopted with respect to land use decisions within risk areas as such zones also allows for the inclusion of some terrestrial fringe vegetation that contribute detritus to the system and refuge areas for many animal species during floods. The EFZ also equates to the 5m contour around an estuary as it encapsulates the most dynamic areas influenced by long-term estuarine sedimentary processes.</p>	Noted
		<p>2.1.6. The Departmental Circular, DEA&DP 0004/2021, regarding 'The consideration of coastal risk in land use decisions as well as the way forward with respect to the establishment and implementation of</p>	Noted and correct

		<p>Coastal Management Lines in terms of the NEM: ICMA', states development parameters should be considered for general estuarine risk areas. This Circular advised that any new development be set as far back from the EFZ as possible and that existing coastal processes and indigenous vegetation within the EFZ must be maintained. The Circular further states that historic development within the EFZ has resulted in an increased need to actively manipulate ecological processes, such as breaching of an estuary to protect human life. To ensure the resilience of coastal communities, especially within the EFZ, development and densification of urban areas within this zone should be prohibited. The SD: CM can confirm that the applicant's proposed works and additions would occur landward of the both the EFZ and CML.</p>	
		<p>2.1.7. Properties located along estuaries or riverbanks are subject to natural processes such as flooding, storm surges and inundation, and as such adequate buffers must be preserved to allow natural processes to be unrestricted. Given Farm 91/516 proximity to the estuary, SD: CM advises the applicant must consider the Breede River Estuarine Management Plan.</p>	<p>The farm is a nature farm no agriculture is taking place, the farm is part of the Lower Potberg Conservancy and managed accordingly. A dedicated EMPr was drafted to manage potential environmental impacts during the construction phase.</p>
		<p>2.1.8. Based on the above, the SD: CM does not object to the request for an ad hoc development setback line for Farm 91/516 as the proposed ad hoc setback line aligns with the positions of the Departmental</p>	<p>The no objection is noted. The As-Hoc SBL has considered all aspects, the process also resulted in an EMPr to mitigate impact during construction. The applicant confirmed that the recent flood of 12-13</p>

		CML, the EFZ as well as the 1:100-year floodline – provided that all the above-mentioned items are taken into consideration.	May 2026 did not rise above the bottom road, meaning this extreme flood was below the determined Ad-Hoc SBL.
		3. The applicant must be reminded of their general duty of care and the remediation of environmental damage, in terms of Section 28(1) of NEMA, which, specifically states that: “...Every person who causes, has caused or may cause significant pollution or degradation of the environment must take reasonable measures to prevent such pollution or degradation from occurring, continuing or recurring, or, in so far as such harm to the environment is authorised by law or cannot reasonably be avoided or stopped, to minimise and rectify such pollution or degradation of the environment...” together with Section 58 of the NEM: ICMA which refers to one’s duty to avoid causing adverse effects on the coastal environment.	Noted. The application and the EMPr is a notion from the applicant to undertake their duty of care.
		4. The SD: CM reserves the right to revise or withdraw its comments and request further information from you based on any information that may be received.	Noted
Public Participation to date			
See proof of public participation conducted under Appendix N			