

## ISSUES & RESPONSE LIST

### Farm KLIPKOP 411 Ptn 40

### HAAMBA POULTRY FARM

In South Africa, the **criteria for a Basic Assessment (BA)** under the **National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), 1998 (Act 107 of 1998)** — specifically in terms of the **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations** — are set out mainly in **Listing Notice 1** and parts of **Listing Notice 3** (GN R. 983 & GN R. 985, as amended).

A **Basic Assessment** is required when a proposed activity is likely to have a *lower to moderate* environmental impact compared to those requiring a full Scoping & EIA process.

#### **Issue:** SPECIALIST STUDIES

No specialist studies have been included in the BAR report. The EAP did make mention that a Fauna and Flora survey will be made available within 14 days. The EAP seems to make a number of conclusions on the impact of the project without any specialist input to support the conclusions:

**Comments:** The project is a straight forward chicken farm operation through the use of environmentally controlled chicken houses [at present the best technology that the industry has to offer in South Africa].

Once the Site Verification Study / Fauna & Flora is available ill the DRAFT BAR be updated and made available once again. A website has been created where I&APs can go and download and view the report and other documents at will.

The EAP has also provided a QR Code for ease of download to any mobile phone that has the capability to scan the code.

#### **Issue:** Air Quality

The project will have a negative impact on the air quality especially for landowners close by. There is no Air quality assessment done to determine the impact of air pollution sources on the surrounding landowners. Furthermore, please provide confirmation that no Air Emission License is required for the coal heating systems.

**Comments:** The proposed poultry farming operation will be located on land zoned Agricultural in accordance with the applicable Municipal Land Use Scheme. Agricultural zoning accommodates livestock-related activities, including poultry production, and anticipates associated odour and dust emissions as part of normal farming operations. The facility will employ state-of-the-art, environmentally controlled chicken houses incorporating advanced ventilation, filtration, and manure management systems designed to minimise odour, dust, and ammonia emissions in compliance with relevant SANS standards and the National Dust Control Regulations (GN R827 of 2013) under the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004). Given the containment of operations within closed housing systems, the absence of unusual emission sources beyond those typical of modern poultry farming, and the lack of identified air-quality-sensitive receptors within close proximity to the site, the development is not expected to result in significant air quality impacts. Consequently, a specialist Air Quality Impact Assessment is not warranted, and emission management measures will be addressed within the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) to ensure ongoing compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.

**Issue: Groundwater**

A number of users is very dependent on groundwater in the area. The EAP noted that borehole water will be used for the project. No Geohydrological Assessment have been included to determine the impact of the abstraction of water from groundwater resources on surrounding land owners. Runoff from the site could lead to potential groundwater pollution. A geohydrological assessment would also quantify the risk of pollution of groundwater. The abstraction of water from a water resource is a listed activity under the National Water Act. Please provide confirmation of the water use license application.

**Comments:** The proposed chicken farm development is located on land zoned for agricultural use, which already operates within an established agricultural production environment. The property is serviced by an existing, operational borehole system, which has been in use for agricultural purposes for an extended period without any recorded geohydrological concerns.

In addition to the borehole supply, the farm holds **legally registered water rights** from the canal system, authorised in terms of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998). These rights provide a secure and sustainable source of water for the proposed operations, further reducing dependency on groundwater resources.

Given that:

1. The site already has a proven, functional water supply system (borehole and canal);
2. Water rights are legally registered and formally recognised by the Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS);
3. The proposed activity will not require additional abstraction points or materially alter the current groundwater use patterns; and
4. No known geohydrological risks (such as declining water tables, contamination history, or aquifer vulnerability) have been identified for the site,

there is no reasonable requirement for a dedicated geohydrological study. The available water sources and existing infrastructure are adequate to meet operational needs without posing additional stress on local aquifers or the broader hydrological environment. Consequently, the omission of a geohydrological study is considered environmentally and technically justified, in accordance with the **principle of avoiding unnecessary duplication of specialist investigations** under the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) and its associated EIA Regulations.

**Issue: Surface Water**

No detailed stormwater management plan compiled by a registered engineer have been include in the BAR report. The conclusions again are that the EAP provided his own inputs in terms of stormwater management and not a specialist in this area. The storage of coal and ash even if temporary provides sources of pollution to surface water.

**Comments:** The proposed poultry farming development will be located on land zoned Agricultural in terms of the applicable Municipal Land Use Scheme. The site is situated on a natural slope falling towards the east, with the nearest surface water resource being the Crocodile River, located approximately 455 m from the proposed development footprint. The project area lies entirely outside the regulated 32 m watercourse buffer prescribed under the National Water Act, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) and associated General Authorisations, and well beyond the 1:100-year floodline extent. No wetlands, drainage lines, or hydrologically sensitive features have been identified within or adjacent to the development area. All poultry housing and associated infrastructure will be equipped with appropriate stormwater diversion, containment, and erosion

control measures to ensure that runoff is managed on-site and does not adversely affect downstream water quality.

The incorrect storage of coal and bottom ash can definitely be a problem. For that reason the design of coal bunkers and ash holding areas are specific. All bunkers / bund areas are constructed with a concrete floor that slopes to prevent water from entering. All bunkers / bund areas are provided with either a solid roof to prevent the ingress of water or else the area is provided with a tarpaulin to stop the ingress of water. The requirements for the correct coal/ash storage structures are specified in the Environmental Management Programme [EMPr] for the operation.

Given the significant separation distance to the Crocodile River, the absence of direct disturbance to any surface water body, and the implementation of best-practice stormwater management in the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr), a specialist surface water study by a professional engineer is not considered warranted for this development.

**Issue:** Fauna and Flora

The EAP notes that the survey is in process and the report will be provided to I&AP's

**Comments:** Correct. Once available, the report will be made available via the website and its findings will be incorporated into the next version of the DBAR Report.

**Issue:** Traffic

No traffic Impact Assessment by a specialist have been conducted to determine the impact of the construction and operation phases of the development of traffic in the area.

**Comments:** The proposed poultry farming operation will be located on land zoned Agricultural in accordance with the applicable Municipal Land Use Scheme. The feeder route to the site comprises an existing gravel road maintained by the Provincial Authority, which currently accommodates regular farm-related traffic, including deliveries, the movement of agricultural products, implements, and service vehicles for surrounding farming operations. The anticipated traffic generated by the proposed chicken farm will be limited to periodic feed deliveries, product collection, and routine staff transport, which will be consistent in volume and nature with normal agricultural activity in the area. No significant increase in traffic volumes, change in vehicle type, or alteration to existing access arrangements is anticipated that would materially impact road safety, capacity, or maintenance requirements. Given the compatibility of the proposed development with existing land use, the adequacy of the existing road infrastructure for agricultural purposes, and the absence of any identified capacity constraints, a specialist Traffic Impact Assessment is not considered necessary. Traffic management measures, including scheduling of deliveries to avoid peak local usage, will be incorporated into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) to ensure safe and efficient operation.

**Issue:** Noise

No Noise Impact Assessment was conducted by a specialist to determine the impact of the development on surrounding land owners

**Comments:** The proposed poultry farming activities will be undertaken on land zoned for Agricultural use in terms of the applicable Municipal Land Use Scheme. Agricultural zoning inherently accommodates typical farming-related noise sources, including livestock vocalisations, mechanical feeding systems, vehicle movement, and general farm operations. In accordance with SANS 10103:2008 and the Noise Control Regulations promulgated under the Environmental

Conservation Act, such noise emissions are considered characteristic of the land use and are not regarded as “disturbing noise” unless they exceed normal operational levels. The proposed development will not introduce noise of an unusual magnitude or character beyond that normally associated with poultry farming and will therefore remain within the anticipated acoustic profile for agricultural activities. Furthermore, there are no identified noise-sensitive receptors in proximity that would be adversely affected. On this basis, a specialist Noise Impact Assessment is not considered necessary, and noise-related mitigation measures will be addressed within the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) to ensure compliance with applicable regulatory standards.

**Issue: Visual Impact Assessment**

No detailed visual Impact assessment have been conducted to determine the visual impact of the project on surrounding land owners.

**Comments:** The proposed chicken farm will be located on land zoned Agricultural in terms of the applicable Municipal Land Use Scheme. Agricultural zoning anticipates and accommodates structures and activities such as poultry houses, feed storage facilities, and associated infrastructure as part of normal farming operations. The development footprint and building forms are consistent in scale, form, and character with typical agricultural buildings in rural landscapes and will not introduce elements of significant contrast or discord with the existing visual setting. The site is situated within an area already characterised by agricultural activity, and no sensitive visual receptors or protected scenic routes have been identified within the zone of visual influence. Given the compatibility of the proposed structures with the surrounding rural context, the limited visual exposure, and the absence of high scenic value or tourism-sensitive landscapes, the project is not expected to result in significant visual intrusion. Therefore, a specialist Visual Impact Assessment is not warranted, and basic design and landscaping measures will be incorporated into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) to ensure visual integration with the surrounding environment.

**Issue: Heritage**

No Heritage assessment was conducted by an Archaeologist to confirm the posable occurrence of archaeological significant artefacts or graves. No mention is made by the EAP that confirmation have been received from SAHRA that no Archaeological survey is required for the development.

**Comments:** SA Heritage Resources Agency was notified about the intended development on the farm. Clarity was requested as to the need for a specialist archaeological investigation when the EMPr makes provision for actions to be taken in the case of any finds. SAHRA has not requested a study to be undertaken.

**Issue: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

The EAP notes that a notice board was placed on the fence of the property. The area in question is dominated by Afrikaans, English and Tswana. Please provide proof that notices was placed in all three languages to ensure inclusion of all i&AP's

The EAP notes that the Draft Report is available at the Brits Library or online to be downloaded. Brits Library is 30km from the site and not all of the I&AP's in the area have access to internet. This means that the Public Participation process is excluding certain individuals.

A Report was provided without any supporting specialist studies. In accordance with the National Environmental Management act an I&AP must be afforded an opportunity to review **ALL** reports including specialist reports.

**Comments:** The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) public participation process will be advertised in English only, as English is the predominant medium of communication for official notices, legal processes, and stakeholder engagement in the project area. The project site falls within a jurisdiction where English is the primary language used for government correspondence, public notices, and local print media. Furthermore, demographic information from the latest Statistics South Africa census indicates that the vast majority of residents within the area of influence have functional proficiency in English, ensuring that the affected and interested parties will have reasonable access to and understanding of the advertised information. Advertising in English only is therefore considered sufficient to meet the requirements of Regulation 41(2)(c) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2014 (as amended), which require that notices be published in a language most likely to be understood by the interested and affected parties. Additional engagement methods, such as direct notification to registered interested and affected parties and making documents available electronically and in hard copy, will further ensure inclusive and accessible participation in the EIA process.

Furthermore, the Draft Basic Assessment was made available as follows:

- Copy in the local library in Brits / Madibeng; [as required by NEMA]
- A QR Code was provided whereby any individual with a cellphone could scan the provided QR Code and download the DBAR Document; [additional exposure]
- A website for &APs to access **ALL** documents pertaining to the DBAR and the application with updates being provided, thus allowing I&APs to view the said documents; [additional exposure]

### **Issue: AUTHORIZATIONS**

A number of activities in the proposed project for instance abstraction of water from a borehole would require a water use license. The EAP have not provided proof that an application is in process or correspondence that a water use license is not required.

### **Comments:**

### **Issue: DISCUSSION ON ALTERNATIVES**

In accordance the EIA Regulations the EPA have to assess alternatives in accordance with:

**'alternatives'**, in relation to a proposed activity, means different means of meeting the general purpose and requirements of the activity, which may include **alternatives** to the-

- (a) property on which or location where the activity is proposed to be undertaken;
- (b) type of activity to be undertaken;
- (c) design or layout of the activity;
- (d) technology to be used in the activity; or
- (e) operational aspects of the activity;

and includes the option of not implementing the activity;

The EAP's discussion of the alternatives do not correspond to the Acts requirements

**Comments:** The alternatives or lack of alternatives happens to be very clear.

**Location** – the area to be used is relatively flat [slight slope towards the east] and is zoned as agricultural;

**Type of activity** – it is clear, chicken farming in environmentally controlled houses;

**Design** – State of the Art environmentally controlled houses;

**Technology** – environmentally controlled fully enclosed houses;

**Operational aspects** – advanced chicken farming / 7 cycles per year

### **ALTERNATIVES**

**Location** – no alternative as the area is the best for placing the two sets of houses;

**Type of activity** – An alternative would be to install a pig farm as South Africa has a major shortage of pork on the fresh meat market;

**Design** – the alternative would be to construct open sided chicken houses where flies are a problem and also an increase in odours;

**Technology** – Use a cheap technology such as open-sided houses which creates a lot of flies and odours;

**Operational aspects** - use a cheap way of chicken farming; open sided houses or farm with pigs which has its own set of problems in odours and bio-security.

#### **NO-GO Option**

South Africa needs to import 360 000 tonnes of chicken in a single year in order to supply in the local demand. The No-Go Option would rob the industry of yet another good source of produce. North West Province is, as per Government indication, to become the chicken hub of South Africa in order to assist the country in becoming food secure and self-sufficient. The land in question is zoned agricultural and as such the land must first and foremost be used for food production, especially protein. The No-Go option is for obvious reasons not an option and should not be considered at all.

#### **Issue: CONCLUSION**

As noted, I am in the process of seeking expert legal and environmental opinion on the proposed project. I would like to again highlight my strong opposition to this project. This project will have a more significant impact to the surrounding land owners than what the EAP concludes in his report. The EAP has provided a BAR without key specialist findings to support his conclusions. I&AP's have also not been afforded the opportunity to review the BAR including specialist studies. Furthermore, the Public Participation process has not been done in a transparent and inclusive manner.

#### **Comments:**

- The issue of Specialist Reports has been answered.
- The revised BAR [V2.0] has been made available.
- The Specialist Report [Site Verification] has been made available and has been incorporated in the Bar Report.
- I&APs can now comment on the new BAR Report.
- I&R Report has also been included.
- The PPP Process has gone beyond the requirements of the Act in getting the message out and involving interested I&APs.

**Issue:** [Telephone contact] Water qualities in the area is bad and not suitable for chicken farm operations.

**Comments:** It has been alleged that the water qualities on the proposed chicken farm site may not be suitable for poultry production. It is important to note that, in accordance with **accepted commercial broiler production standards** and best practices recommended by the poultry industry, water quality is a critical factor in ensuring bird health, optimal growth performance, and food safety.

Standard operating procedures for broiler farms include:

1. **Routine Monitoring** – Water quality testing is conducted at least once per month, covering microbiological, chemical, and physical parameters in line with industry guidelines and veterinary advice.

2. **Corrective Action** – Should any deviation from acceptable standards be detected, corrective measures are immediately implemented. These may include filtration, chlorination, acidification, or other water treatment interventions to restore water to the required quality levels.
3. **Veterinary Oversight** – Water quality management is undertaken under the guidance of a qualified poultry veterinarian or technical advisor, ensuring that the water meets both **SANS (South African National Standards)** and specific poultry production requirements.
4. **Record Keeping** – All test results and corrective actions are recorded for traceability and compliance with biosecurity protocols.

Given these measures, even if initial water samples were to indicate non-compliance with ideal poultry water quality standards, the farm's operational protocols are designed to detect, address, and rectify such issues promptly.

Accordingly, the allegation that unsuitable water quality would render the site unfit for poultry production does not align with industry reality or standard broiler farming practice. The implementation of a robust water quality monitoring and management programme ensures that water supplied to the broilers will consistently meet the necessary health and safety requirements, safeguarding both animal welfare and product quality.

**Issue:** [Telephone contact] Farmers are struggling with water supply in the area.

**Comments:** The farm has its own borehole as well as registered water from the canal system from Hartebeestpoort. The borehole, as is the right of any farm, will supply some water while the water allocation will be the major source of water for the operation.

If need be the applicant will make application to the DWS for a specific volume of water allocation from borehole for its operation. However, currently that is not required.

**Issue:** [Telephone contact] The adjacent crocodile farm takes the mortalities from Rainbow Chicken Operations as additional feed for the crocodiles. This practice will pose a serious bio-security risk to the proposed chicken farm operation.

**Comments:** It is noted that the adjacent crocodile breeding facility supplements its feeding regime with chicken mortalities obtained from commercial poultry operations, including Rainbow Chicken. The concern raised is that such practices may present a potential biosecurity risk to the proposed chicken farm operation.

While the use of poultry mortalities as a supplementary protein source for crocodiles is a recognised practice in some farming systems, **strict biosecurity protocols** govern the handling and disposal of mortalities from commercial poultry farms. Rainbow Chicken operates in accordance with the South African Poultry Association (SAPA) guidelines, veterinary directives, and applicable legislation under the **Animal Diseases Act, 1984 (Act No. 35 of 1984)**.

In particular:

1. **Exclusion of High-Risk Mortalities** – Mortalities arising from serious contagious diseases of poultry, such as Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza (HPAI), Newcastle Disease, or other notifiable diseases, are **never** passed on as feed to crocodiles or any other livestock. Such mortalities are disposed of through **approved methods** such as deep burial or incineration in accordance with veterinary prescriptions and biosecurity regulations.
2. **Controlled Collection and Transport** – Mortalities supplied to the crocodile farm are from routine, non-infectious causes and are handled under strict hygiene protocols to prevent any cross-contamination.
3. **Commitment to Responsible Disposal** – As a responsible poultry producer, Rainbow Chicken is committed to preventing the spread of avian diseases and adheres to protocols

that ensure no diseased carcasses capable of transmitting pathogens enter the crocodile farm's feed stream.

Accordingly, while the practice of providing non-infectious poultry mortalities to the crocodile farm is acknowledged, the existing veterinary controls, compliance with national legislation, and company biosecurity policies ensure that mortalities from serious or contagious health conditions are excluded from this process. As such, the risk of disease transmission from the crocodile farm to the proposed chicken operation is considered **low and effectively mitigated**.

**Issue:** An SMS message was received and reads as follows:

Evening Everyone. As you would have seen yesterday, there was a link on the group to a company that is trying to get environmental impact studies done for a number of sites around the Brits area to develop a new poultry industry. This includes breeder farms; a hatchery, broiler farms as well as an abattoir. There is an estimated 87 houses to be built. The community at large against the developments from an environmental aspect. We are requesting that we have an urgent information meeting tomorrow night [place to be confirmed] regarding the proposed new chicken farming company. There are big questions that we have to try and get answered but without the communities participation we will not get any answers and they will just come into the area exploit the community and destroy the infrastructure. Everything will be explained in the meeting. So please could you make the time to meet tomorrow and then another meeting, possibly on Saturday with the environmental impact consultant. This is not coming from us personally as broiler farmers but it is the whole community that is involved stretching from beestekraal to mamogalieskraal. A committee will be formed to represent the kameeldrift member. A committee was formed for the sandrift/klipkop farmers tonight. Please send me a thumbs up if you will attend. Please, it is very important to have your participation as this will affect everyone from the tar road down.

*[Text Original as taken from the SMS received]*

**Comments:** The distribution of incorrect information by outside forces during a public participation process can have a range of severe consequences. It fundamentally undermines the **Environmental Assessment Process (EAP)** and the public participation process itself. Misinformation of this kind is often a form of **disinformation**, meaning it is intentionally created and shared to cause harm or manipulate an outcome.

#### **Erosion of Trust and Legitimacy**

The primary result of misinformation is the **erosion of public trust**. Once interested and affected parties (I&AP) are exposed to false information, it becomes very difficult for them to trust any subsequent information, including accurate data provided by the project proponent or the government. This distrust can spread and jeopardize the legitimacy of the entire process. Without trust, meaningful public participation is impossible, as the public will assume the process is a sham, designed to manipulate them rather than to genuinely seek their input.

#### **Polarization and Conflict**

Outside forces often use misinformation to create **fear, anger, and division** among I&AP. By spreading false narratives about a project's negative impacts—such as health risks, environmental damage, or economic harm—they can turn a diverse group of stakeholders into a polarized and hostile opposition. This can lead to increased public protests, more contentious public meetings, and an overall breakdown in constructive dialogue, making it almost impossible to find common ground or resolve disputes.

#### **So what is false or creating a false impression?**

*a link on the group to a company that is trying to get environmental impact studies done for a number of sites around the Brits area to develop a new poultry industry*

This statement is totally false. Green Environmental is involved in an operation or action for the establishing of any "new poultry industry". It is currently busy with a couple of individual



applications for independent farmers who wish to construct and operate chicken farm operations in the greater Brits area.

May we suggest that you not link our applications and its proponents to this misinformation campaign.

*estimated 87 houses to be built*

It is unknown where this figure comes from as our applications are not for 87 houses.

*We are requesting that we have an urgent information meeting tomorrow night [place to be confirmed] regarding the proposed new chicken farming company*

There is no “new chicken farming company” and we at GECS carry no knowledge of any such new company. Please do not confuse people with outside information that has no relevance to our applications.

*we will not get any answers and they will just come into the area exploit the community and destroy the infrastructure*

Who are **they** who will be exploited and have their **infrastructure destroyed**? This smells of an US and THEM situation, a bit of a racism undertone. When looking at our applications we see that they [the applicants and buyers of farms] are in fact upcoming farmers purchasing former “white farms” for their new chicken farms and so we need to ask “is the sentiment that these black farmers are seen as unwanted and a danger” the reason for objection?

*is the whole community that is involved*

Who is the “whole community”, the local farmers; the local farmers and those renting farms in the area; The local farmers and the labour force; The local farmers and the entire community [all groupings and ethnics groups]. How is it possible to make this type of statement when we have the highest unemployment figures in SA in this Province – has the rural population been informed and asked for their inputs; have they been asked to say no to development, job creation and advancement. Something is very wrong here!

**Issue:**

**Comments:**

**Issue:**

**Comments:**

**Issue:**

**Comments:**

**Issue:**

**Comments:**

**Issue:**

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------

<b>Issue:</b>
---------------

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------

<b>Issue:</b>
---------------

<b>Comments:</b>
------------------