

Date: 31 March 2015

Our Reference: P0164

Your Reference: T01.DUR.000274

Attention: Mr Yolán Pillay

RHDHV (Pty) Ltd
6 Payne Road
Pinetown
3610

Dear Sir

**REVIEW OF TRAFFIC IMPACT STATEMENT PREPARED BY RHDHV FOR THE PROPOSED
SWWTW UPGRADE, MEREWENT**

As requested, we have undertaken our review and report back below.

1) DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FOR THE REVIEW

Two documents were received as the basis of the review:

1. "Traffic Impact Statement, Southern Wastewater Treatment Works", March/February 2015"
2. EIA Background Information Document, January 2015.

2) METHODOLOGY FOLLOWED

We believe the methodology followed in preparing the TIS report is generally consistent with what one would expect in such a report. Some of the base information used is however questioned, as discussed in section 3 below.

3) GENERAL COMMENT

The EIA Background Information Document gives information on what is proposed at the facility. In essence it describes a change in the way waste water is to be treated on the site [with no mention of any growth or change in the volume of waste water to be processed into the future, which to us is a possible oversight]. This clearly states a higher level of processing with additional infrastructure on the site for this additional processing and an increase in the final output of the plant [dewatered sludge] which needs to be removed from site by road.

In any traffic impact assessment of such a situation, we would have expected the following questions to have been raised and clarity obtained on, and if significant incorporated in any assessment [or if negligible then not considered further]:

1. With the large increase in additional infrastructure, is there a large increase in staff required, and if so how significant is this staff in terms of traffic generated by the site.
2. Quantification of traffic generated by the removal of the dewatered sludge from the site.

By contrast, the TIS only considers an *increase* in raw effluent brought *onto* site by road tankers into the future, an item not even mentioned in the EIA Background Information Document.

We do believe that it is unlikely that the TIS recommendations will change significantly, however.

4) SPECIFIC POINTS IN THE REPORT

The following specific points are raised regarding the report itself:

1. The TIS report cover states the date as "MARCHFEBRUARY 2015", which is confusing.
2. Chapter 3.1 (iii), first paragraph states "Sidewalks are provided on either side however there is no pedestrian ... facilities along this road". This is contradictory and makes no sense.
3. Chapter 4, second paragraph, format is inconsistent with the remainder of the report.

We trust this meets your requirements. Please feel free to contact us should you have any queries or further requirements in this regard.

Yours faithfully,



D.G. McFARLANE Pr Eng

DMcF/P0164/cmcf