

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE RADISSON BLU SAFARI RESORT

**Draft Minutes
of
FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE PESTANA KRUGER LODGE**

Date: 4 May 2011

Time: 09h30

Venue: SANParks Pretoria Head Office Boardroom

In Attendance:

Project Team	Organisation
Environmental Consultants:	
Karen Botes (KB)	Interdesign Landscape Architects (ILA) - Managing Director
Claudia Coetzee (CC)	ILA – Environmental Manager
Tania Ahlers (SC)	ILA – Environmental Assessment Practitioner
SANParks:	
Giju Varghese (GV)	Head Business Development
Annemi van Jaarsveld (AvJ)	General Manager Business Development Unit
Glenn Phillips (GP)	Managing Executive Tourism and Marketing
Professor Willem van Riet (WvR)	Projects Communications Co-coordinator
Feziwe Renqe (FZ)	RK Inc (Legal Representative for SANParks)
Interested and Affected Parties	
Chris Engelbrecht (CE)	Director, Esselens Engelbrechts Inc
Ivan Pauw (IP)	Ivan Pauw & Partners
Thato Mamahlodi (TM)	Ivan Pauw & Partners
Stephan Barkhuizen (SB)	Bokamoso
Mientjie Coetzee (MC)	Bokamoso
Chris Engelbrecht (CE)	Director, Esselens Engelbrechts Inc

Welcome and Introduction

Ms. Karen Botes from Interdesign Landscape Architects (ILA) Pty Ltd (the Environmental Assessment Practitioners), introduces herself and welcomes everyone present. Everyone is given opportunity to introduce themselves.

Presentations

1. Mr Glenn Phillips (Managing Executive Tourism & Marketing) from SANParks gives a Powerpoint Presentation on SANPark's Vision and Mission.
2. Prof Willem van Riet (Projects Communications Coordinator) gives a Powerpoint Presentation titled "Kruger National Park, Radisson Blue Malelane Development, Decision making support" discussing the following topics:
 - Regional Perspective
 - Conservation Footprint
 - South Region
 - Proposed Developments (3D)
 Prof van Riet remarks that it is the intention of the development to fit into the natural habitat of the area. He therefore informs everyone that no gardens will be allowed.
3. Ms Karen Botes gives a Powerpoint Presentation on the current status of the EIA application. Ms Claudia Coetzee (ILA) remarks that the footprint of this development amounts to $\pm 13\,500\text{m}^2$.
4. Ms Karen Botes confirms that all presentations will be available on the ILA website (www.ilaweb.co.za).

Question & Answer Session

Commentators	Comments
IP	What is the target date for occupation with specific reference to the general timeframe of a Water Use License (2 to 3 years)?
KB	Occupation is dependant on the issuing of a positive decision by the Department of Environmental Affairs and all other applicable Government Departments such as the Department of Water Affairs in terms of the Water Use Licence.
IP	What was the process followed with regards to the tender bidding process. Was the location of the site predetermined or were alternative sites considered?
CC	Bidding took place on 5 alternative sites.
IP	Is SANParks committed only to this one site, or will the alternative sites still be considered?
AvJ	The specific site was chosen by the developers and it is still subject to EIA approval. If this site is not approved, another site will be considered and the site will have to go through the same process (EIA). If none of the sites are suitable the proposal will be discarded.
WvR	The site is the furthest East of all sites that were considered and it will be much tougher to get approval on any of the other sites as they are within high sensitivity area as per Biodiversity Map.
IP	Will a study be done to determine what the impact of this development will be on other hotels in the area in terms of need and desirability? A Social Impact Assessment is important due to a lot of investment which has taken place outside park boundary due to previous agreements which were made.
CC	Existing information from Socio Economic Studies conducted in the past will form part of the EIA. All comments received by I&AP's will be included in EIA Report for review by DEA. DEA will have confirm whether information provided is sufficient to issue a decision or whether a separate Social Impact Assessment is required.
IP	Pressure for development in KNP will increase if this application is approved as a door will have been opened. Have SANParks considered how they will manage this into the future?
WvR	The carrying capacity of the Kruger Park has been determined as part of the Park's zoning.
GV	SANParks is managed differently from any other type of business. SANParks will always put conservation first and tourism is only a sub-function. Mr Varghese then proceeds to explain the way in which revenue is generated within SANParks. Since funding has reduced over the years, SANParks now has to look at smarter ways to generate funds. Kruger Park has a framework to guide them on areas where they can develop.

Commentators	Comments
WvR	Success of peripheral development is proven well by all the successful businesses on the border of the Kruger Park. Good planning is critical and SANParks will be able to manage impacts more effectively with development inside the Park boundary.
KB	Every proposed development within the Park will have to go through the EIA process and a feasibility study/ the carrying capacity will precede any decision to develop.
CE	Why was the site originally identified for the development [opposite Leopard Creek] discarded?
AvJ	Bidders preferred the current site, based on their risk analysis. The original site could however still be considered should the current site be found to be unsuitable. However, the site opposite Leopard Creek was discussed between Leopard Creek Management and management of SANParks, and it was not supported by Leopard Creek.
CE	Is Leopard Creek aware that the original site could still be considered as an alternative?
CC	Yes. This information was included in the Draft Scoping Report. Leopard Creek was notified of the availability of the Scoping Report
AvJ	Yes.
CE	Why was the Strategic Decision separated from EIA Process?
CC	ILA was requested by DEA to separate the two matters.
IP	Were the formal comments from Bokamoso received and included in the scoping?
CC	Except for two letters received from Bokamoso (17 August registration & 1 December request for information), no formal comments were received.
MC	Submits letter of objection from Bokamoso to ILA.
CC	Objection will be included in Draft EIA Report. (Refer to Appendix A of the minutes).
IP	What is the current status of the EIA application?
CC	ILA is awaiting a decision from DEA on the Final Scoping Report which was submitted in March.
MC	What Public Participation is planned for the EIA phase?
CC	All registered I&AP's will be requested to comment on the Draft EIA Report.
IP	Will any Public Meetings be held?
AvJ	Yes.
KB	Should it be decided that a Public Meeting be held, all registered I&AP's will be notified as such.
SB	Is the rerouting of Rhenosterkoppies Road included in this EIA application?
CC	Yes. Details will be included in EIA Report. Draft Minutes will be distributed for comment.

Way Forward

KB discussed the way forward as per the slide show presentation.

KB further explained that the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment report will be available for public review.

KB thanked everyone for attending the meeting.

**APPENDIX A:
OBJECTION BY BOKAMOSO**