

10

R'cid 19/4

15 April 2013

To whom it may concern

**RE: Proposed Upgrade of the Piet se Bos and Grotto – Registration as an affected party**

*Ref no. 16/3/1/1/ED/14 2026/13*  
I & AP Registration: Johan Georg Carinus, family and grandchildren (10 people)  
Gender: male and female  
Po Box: 12017.Die Boord, Stellenbosch 7600  
Tel: 021 8652128 Fax: same as landline

**Our concerns:**

We have owned our Hermanus property, which is located in 9<sup>th</sup> street directly above Grotto, since the 1980s. We would like to highlight that we are unhappy about the proposed erection of the amphitheatre at Grotto. We sincerely object to the noise and traffic that would be caused by establishing of such a venue.

Hermanus has been absolutely exemplary in establishing clean, family friendly beaches, in controlling traffic and in regulating the presence of unwanted elements in the vicinity of public beaches. And most importantly – at night all residents close to Grotto can relax to the sound of crashing waves, safe in the knowledge that neighbours will respect each other’s peace and quiet and property rights. That is after-all why one owns a holiday home.

We understand and respect the desire of residents to have such a facility in the Hermanus – but perhaps a more secluded location like the pending De Mond development or perhaps even one of the commercial farms outside Hermanus will be more suited to the plans.

We do not object the general upgrading of the area or conversion thereof to it’s natural state, but we do object to the erection of open-air facilities that can substantially increase traffic volumes and unwanted noise levels during any time of the day and especially in the evening.

We hope to be consulted further with regards to the proposed plans.

Kind regards

Johan Carinus



10a

# EnviroAfrica

Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Consultants  
Omgewingsbeplanning en Impakbeoordeling Konsultante

---

25 April 2013

Mr J Carinus  
P O Box 12017  
Die Boord  
STELLENBOSCH  
7600

Dear Mr Carinus

**16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH AREA,  
HERMANUS**

Your fax received on 19 April with regard to the abovementioned project refers.

We wish to confirm that you are registered as Interested and Affected Party who will be further involved in the impact assessment process.

With specific regard to the proposed upgrade of Piet se Bos, some questions raised in your letter dated 16 April 2013 that can be answered now with are as follows.

In the conversations that we have had with municipality they are not looking for an area where an amphitheatre can be constructed, but is looking at the upgrading and rehabilitation of the Piet se Bos area. A feasible option that the Municipality has come up with is an amphitheatre that will meet the requirement under the Integrated Coastal Management Act, which requires that coastal areas be made more accessible to the general public. The proposed amphitheatre use is in keeping with the concept and regulations of the Blue Flag Beach.

With regard to your concerns about traffic and noise, these can only be answered by the Municipality and have been referred to them. Their response was that these issues will be addressed as soon as the comment period on the draft BAR has closed. Once this information becomes available from the Municipality it will be disseminated to registered I&APs.

Yours sincerely



Charel Bruwer

---

P O Box 4  
ONRUS RIVER 7201  
Tel: (028) 3162888  
Fax: 0865132141  
Cell: 0828050190

CK 2007043835/23  
VAT No 4380237091

Charel Bruwer Snr  
Jerry Avis  
Charel Bruwer Jnr  
Bernard de Witt

# EnviroAfrica

Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Consultants  
Omgewingsbeplanning en Impakbeoordeling Konsultante

5 September 2013

Mr J Carinus  
P O Box 12017  
Die Boord  
STELLENBOSCH  
7600

Dear Mr Carinus

**16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH AREA, HERMANUS**

Your fax received on 19 April 2013 with regard to the abovementioned project refers.

We wish to inform you that, apart from our reply dated 25 April 2013, we have received the following answers from the municipality to your questions.

The municipality reiterated that it must be noted that the Piet se Bos and Grotto Beach under jurisdiction of the Overstrand Municipality has been used as a recreational area for a very long time and is also indicated as such in the Spatial Development Framework. It is also a highly utilized area during the summer holidays, over weekends and public holidays when the weather is good and with this the associated noise, vehicular and pedestrian traffic is to be expected during such periods.

From information that we have obtained from the Overstrand Municipality, they have indicated that Hermanus has as its prime focus to be an excellent tourist destination. Thus with the increasing growth of tourism in the area, increased affluence among a large sector of the Overstrand community and a younger population who requires amenities and activities according to their needs, the public utilization of areas such as the Grotto area has increased and will continue to increase in future. It is also one of the few areas in Hermanus where visitors and patrons can access the beach and have the opportunity to enjoy the restaurant and bar facilities that go with such public places.

Question:

**What alternative locations have been considered by the Municipality to cater for such events and what process was followed to proceed with the development in this location**

Answer: There are no suitable sites available with existing facilities. The municipality is not looking for an area where an amphitheatre can be constructed, but is looking at the upgrading and rehabilitation of the Piet se Bos area. A feasible option that the municipality has come up with is an

amphitheatre that will meet the requirement under the Integrated Coastal Management Act, which requires that coastal areas be made more accessible to the general public.

Question:

**To what specific type of event has the Municipality in mind to be staged in this proposed Amphitheatre. This will give an idea of the additional facilities that have to be provided for such events.**

Answer: The municipality has in mind plays, classical performances or suitable musical events as per request, under strict conditions such as suitability, time limits and conditions of the temporary removable infrastructure that has to be put in place by the individual organisers

Question:

**How often is it intended to be put to use (no of uses per month over each month of the full year)**

Answer: This can only be determined once requests for use of the amphitheatre are submitted by individual organisers.

Question:

**What are the proposed operating times and on which days of the week will such events be staged**

Answer: This will once again be dependent upon request, but all performances will end before 12:00 pm.

Question:

**What considerations have been given to the existing road system being able to handle the additional traffic**

Answer: The existing road network is deemed adequate and the current parking at the Groffo area makes provision for all types of vehicles. The existing parking is deemed adequate and when necessary, Overstrand municipal traffic officials will deal with the traffic flow.

Question:

**What loudspeaker and amplification system is envisaged – location, height and direction of loudspeakers and wattage**

Answer: This is not known at the moment as it will be dependent on the individual event and organiser requirements, but will be approved by the municipality for each event.

Question:

**How is it envisaged to attenuate the sound emanating for events being held in the amphitheatre and to what extent**

Answer: This will only be attended to in detail once the business plan for the amphitheatre is drawn up.

Yours sincerely

*Copy*

Charel Bruwer

*Rec'd 19/4*

marieke van rooyen

ATTORNEYS  
151 DORP STREET STELLENBOSCH 7600  
P O BOX 859 STELLENBOSCH 7599  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel 021-886 6300 Fax 021-886 6301  
INTERNATIONAL CODE: +27 21  
mvr@adept.co.za

2013-04-19

Your ref: 16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13  
Our ref: MVR/S0844

EnviroAfrica  
P O Box 4  
ONRUS  
7201

BY FAX: 086 513 2141

Dear Sir

DEA&DP REF NO 16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13  
PROPOSED UPGRADE OF THE PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH  
AREA, HERMANUS

The above matter in which we act on behalf of the PLCL Family Trust refers.

In your letter to interested and affected parties dated 15 March 2013 and the annexure thereto it is stated that application for exemption is made from certain provisions required or regulated by NEMA Regulations.

Our enquiry to the DEA&DP revealed that it had not received an application for exemption.

In light of the aforesaid your clarification is requested.

Yours faithfully



Per: M VAN ROOYEN

Copy to: Directorate: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B)  
Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning  
BY FAX: 021- 483 4372

# EnviroAfrica

Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Consultants  
Omgewingsbeplanning en Impakbeoordeling Konsultante

---

25 April 2013

Ms M van Rooyen  
Marieke van Rooyen Attorneys  
P O Box 859  
STELLENBOSCH  
7599

Dear Ms Van Rooyen

**16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH AREA,  
HERMANUS**

Your fax dated 22 April 2013 and our correspondence dated 2 April 2013 regarding the abovementioned project refers.

We wish to inform you that while our letter dated 15 March 2013 and the annexure thereto states that application is made from certain provisions required or regulated by NEMA regulations, no application for exemption from such regulations has yet been made, nor have any been lodged with DEA&DP. The regulations regarding such exemptions, if any, will be followed as required under NEMA.

Yours sincerely

*Copy*

Charel Bruwer

ATTORNEYS  
151 DORP STREET STELLENBOSCH 7600  
P O BOX 859 STELLENBOSCH 7599  
SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel 021-886 6300 Fax 021-886 6301  
INTERNATIONAL CODE: +27 21  
mvr@adept.co.za

116 Receipt 30/4

2013-04-26

Your ref: 16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13  
Our ref: MVR/S0844

EnviroAfrica  
P O Box 4  
ONRUS  
7201

BY REGISTERED MAIL

Dear Sir

**DEA&DP REF NO 16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13**

**PROPOSED UPGRADE OF THE PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH  
AREA, HERMANUS**

We attach for your consideration the preliminary comments of Prof Pierre du Toit and Mrs Laura du Toit, who are Trustees of the PLCL Family Trust.

In addition to the Trustees' attached comments, which are made from the point of view of their personal experience of the area and environment of the proposed upgrade, we were instructed to raise the following preliminary issues on behalf of the PLCL Family Trust for your consideration and response:

1. In our letter of 19 April 2013, to which we have not yet received a reply, we pointed out that the Department has not received an application for exemption or deviation, despite your letter of 15 March 2013 advising I&APs that an application for exemption has been made.
2. The time frames as stipulated in the EIA Regulations were not adhered to, resulting in I&APs having been deprived of the initial commenting period of at least 21 days.

Your letter to I&APs is dated 15 March 2013 and was delivered to our client on an unknown date later in March 2013. At that time the Draft Basic Assessment Report was already available at the Hermanus Library, as is confirmed in the last paragraph of the letter to I&APs.

In terms of the EIA Regulations, after the application has been accepted, the EAP is required to notify the I&APs of the application and allow for a period of at least 21 days during which the I&APs can register and respond to the initial notification.

3. There are patent mistakes in at least sections D, E and F of the Draft Basic Assessment Report where it is stated amongst other inaccuracies that “the land portions are zoned Agricultural”, “there is an existing farming operation” and “these fields are the only areas where the Oewerzicht Farm can expand its economic viability”. These mistakes cause the accuracy of the whole of the Draft Basic Assessment Report to be called into question.
4. At point 11 in section D of the Draft Basic Assessment Report it is stated the development will have no impact on people’s wellbeing e.g. in terms of noise, visual character and sense of place, etc. – which is a conclusion, if made in relation to the Piet se Bos and Grotto Beach upgrade (refer to the preceding paragraph hereof), with which the Trustees of PLCL Family Trust strongly disagrees. The construction of the proposed upgrades will not only be unsightly, but will cause noise pollution.
5. The Declaration included in the Draft Basic Assessment Report is given by Oewerzicht Boerderye BK, a wholly unrelated-entity.
6. The Draft Basic Assessment Report does not include a register of I&AP as is required by the EIA Regulations.
7. Towards the end of March 2013 Prof Du Toit requested the letter to I&AP in electronic format from your Mr Bruwer and was told by him in a rude manner that it would not be made available as Prof Du Toit would then be sending it

“to everyone from Helen Zille to Jacob Zuma” resulting in Mr Bruwer’s office being inundated with unwanted responses. This comment is unfortunate and calls into question the independence and objectivity of the EAP.

8. Your Mr Bruwer states in his declaration dated 13 March 2013 (two days prior to writing a letter to adjacent land owners) that he is aware of the responsibilities in terms of NEMA, that he has ensured that the information containing all relevant facts in respect of the application was distributed or made available to interested and affected parties and the public and that participation by interested and affected parties was facilitated in such a manner that all interested and affected parties were provided with a reasonable opportunity to participate and to provide comments, that he has ensured all the comments of all interested and affected parties were considered, recorded and submitted to the competent authority in respect of the application, that he has kept a register of all interested and affected parties that participated in the public participation process. Given the facts set out herein above the Trustees strongly disagree with the accuracy of the content of this declaration.
  
9. As the Overberg coastal set-back line has not yet been determined and this proposed upgrade is not urgent in any manner, it is submitted it would be prudent to wait for the set-back line to be determined before considering applications for upgrade in this area.

For the aforesaid reasons we submit that the process is fatally flawed and, should the Municipality wish to proceed with the application, the only manner in which to remedy the extensive errors made thus far will be to start the process afresh.

We look forward to receiving your response.

Yours faithfully



Per: M VAN ROOYEN

Copy to:

Directorate: Integrated Environmental Management (Region B)  
Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning  
Private Bag X9086  
Cape Town  
8000  
BY FAX: 021-483 4372  
AND BY REGISTERED MAIL

# EnviroAfrica

Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Consultants  
Omgewingsbeplanning en Impakbeoordeling Konsultante

6 May 2013

Ms M van Rooyen  
Marieke van Rooyen Attorneys  
P O Box 859  
STELLENBOSCH  
7599

Dear Ms Van Rooyen

**16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH AREA,  
HERMANUS**

Your letter dated 26 April 2013 regarding the abovementioned project refers.

We wish to respond to the points raised in your letter using a system of even numbering as follows.

1. We have responded in writing on 2 April 2013, confirming yourself as the registered I&AP for the PLCL Family Trust. We have requested that you raise issues, concerns and impacts that you would like to see addressed, which you have done in your letter dated 26 April 2013. We have also responded in writing on 25 April 2013 to your letter dated 19 April 2013 regarding the issue of exemption from certain provisions required or regulated by NEMA in terms of Regulation 50 of the EIA Regulations, 2010r.
2. The letter to the PLCL Family Trust was posted on 15 March 2013 to Simonsbergstraat 18, Stellenbosch, which was the only address that we could find for the entity. We respectfully wish to point out that the draft Basic Assessment Report was only delivered to the Hermanus Library on the 18<sup>th</sup> of April 2013. We do not understand your reference to the 21-day issue as this is not reflected in the timeframes set by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning to which we adhere.
3. With regards to your Points 3 and 5 there was one other person that also referred to a copy that had these mistakes in them. It would appear that an interim copy of the draft BAR got into circulation that should not have happened. It should have been quite clear when viewing such a copy, that there was obviously some mistake somewhere. An immediate phone call would have rectified the matter without having had to go to all the trouble to comment on an obvious wrong document. We have included for you a CD with the correct document that went out as well as some information on the profile that have been requested. This information will also be made available to all registered I&APs once all the issues, concerns and impacts have been discussed with the Overstrand Municipality, in the form of a revised final Basic Assessment Report, again for their written comments.
4. The purpose of the draft BAR is exactly that: to solicit written comment from I&APs which will be taken into consideration in informing the proposed development as to which alterations should be made to the proposed development to be included in the final BAR. Note that the purpose of the draft BAR is to solicit comment from parties at the earliest stage of the proposal. As such it is obvious that it will contain information that is based on the earliest

P O Box 4  
ONRUS RIVER 7201  
Tel: (028) 3162888  
Fax: 0865132141  
Cell: 0828050190

CK 2007043835/23  
VAT No-4380237091

Charel Bruwer Snr  
Jerry Avis  
Charel Bruwer Jnr  
Bernard de Witt

concept of the proposed development, available at the time and this concept may differ substantially from what is ultimately contained in the final BAR, taken the responses on the draft BAR into consideration. This is the essence of the environmental impact assessment process.

5. See Point 3 above.
6. As stated before the draft BAR was compiled from information available at the very onset of the impact assessment process at the time to provide more detail than the Background Information Document contained. At the time of compilation there were no interested and affected parties and therefore no register existed. The list of registered I&APs can only be compiled once the comment period has closed. For your information a list of initially identified I&APs are included in this letter.
7. This is not a true reflection of the events that took place during that telephone discussion. Prof du Toit started the conversation and soon became very aggressive when he was questioned on the reasons why he could not just copy the document in pdf format and he would have an electronic copy. He then furthermore became very prescriptive and adamant on how the process should be run and made all sorts of nasty comments about our integrity. He would not listen at all when we tried to explain to him the opportunities for further comment and in the end he ended the conversation before we could reach the point where we could get his contact details to supply him with further information. We regard this matter as water under the bridge and closed and will continue to engage with PLCL Family Trust through yourself as the representative I&AP.
8. In the case of this draft of the BAR based on the information available at the time, we are adamant that Prof du Toit and all other initially identified I&APs that we have strictly adhered to the contents of the declaration.
9. The 2010 NEMA regulations and listed activities make provision for an impact assessment process to be followed in instances where reference is made to a development setback line that does not exist, or that an application for the approval of an *ad hoc* development setback line can be made on a form specifically designed for such an application. We have opted for the impact assessment process route for other obvious reasons as well.

Please use the CD included in a constructive manner and provide further comments if you have any. We are in the process of compiling the initial Comments and Responses Report that will list the issues, concerns and impacts raised during the public participation process to date. This initial report will be used to have discussions with the Overstrand Municipality and to obtain answers to the questions that pertain to them. Once these answers are available and decisions have been taken on how the proposed development need to be adjusted, if applicable, we will compile the Basic Assessment Report that will again be made available to registered I&APs for comment as per 2010 NEMA requirements.

The supplements attached to your letter will be dealt with in a separate letter to you once the answers to the questions have been made available by the municipality.

Yours sincerely



Charel Bruwer

## Initially Identified Interested and Affected Parties: Piet se Bos and Grootto Beach Upgrade

Simon Pickstone Trust		c/o WM Pickstone	Lekkerwijn	P O Box 83	GROOT DRAKENSTEIN	7680
TG & GW	Joubert	24 St John's Estate			HIGGOVALE	8001
Jean-Mandi Trust		c/o Odendaal		P O Box 3293	TYGER VALLEY	7536
AE	Boynon			P O Box 1458	HERMANUS	7200
F	Ferucci			P O Box 341	PAARL	7620
Carey Investments Ltd				P O Box 3	VLOTTENBURG	7604
D Dicey Family Trust		4 Innesbrook Village	Fairways Ave		HERMANUS	7200
Beekay 182 Inv (Pty) Ltd		c/o Dr MC Dempsey		P O Box 216	HERMANUS	7200
Antro Trust		c/o Me B du Toit		P O Box 2170	HERMANUS	7200
PLCL Familietrust		Simonsbergstraat 18		Posbus 1504	STELLENBOSCH	7600
Eureka Trust		c/o DP Janse van Rensburg			HERMANUS	7200
CardInox (Prop) Ltd		Proforum Building	5 van Rensburg Street		NELSPRUIT	1200
Tania Investments		c/o ID Smith	9 Sunrise Close		CONSTANTIA	7806
Mr NH	Walton	4A Elismore	Victoria Rd	P O Box 941	BANTRY BAY	8005
Matterson Cynthia-Trustees		c/o Mrs Diana Elliot			RIVER CLUB	2149
Mr DN	Fine & 3 Olliers	c/o Mr DN Fine		P O Box 48263	KOMMETJIE	7976
AC	Beukes	Dennegeur		Posbus 51	GRABOUW	7160
Corwin Trust		p/a JJ Sjazus		Posbus 15189	PANORAMA	7506
Nacuka Trust		c/o KHKV Albrecht		P O Box 4750	CAPE TOWN	8000
CH	de Villiers	2184 Taboriako Circle	LEXINGTON	KY 40502	USA	
FM	de Wet			P O Box 17	ASHTON	6715
Bishoplea Trust		c/o CRH Knight		P O Box 25	GREENPOINT	8051
Kardre Inv CC		p/a Mev IA Claassens		Posbus 2157	NORTHLIFF	2115
ML	Cloete	Berghof Retirement Complex	44A Hof Street		GARDENS	8001
Seetuin Trust		p/a DM Hoogenhout	Jonkershoekweg 21		STELLENBOSCH	7600
Tiendestraat 215 Trust		c/o E Neethling		Posbus 1142	HERMANUS	7200
The Johannes W Louw Trust		Upper Waterkloof No 20	Regulusstraat 173		WATERKLOOFRIF	0181
PA	King			P O Box 4392	CAPE TOWN	8000
Roorstock Capital(PTY) Ltd		p/a Mr M du Toit		Posbus 723	STELLENBOSCH	7599
AM&GD	Blom&Grieve	223 Eleventh Street			VOELKLIP	7200
AGB	Grieve	34 Fairway Heights			RONDEBOSCH	7700
Municipal Manager		Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
A	Canham-Duffel	Cape Nature		P/Bag X5014	STELLENBOSCH	7599
A	Roux	Dept of Agriculture		P/Bag X1	ELSENBURG	7607
The	Director	Dept of Water Affairs		P/Bag X16	SANLAMHOF	7532

The	Director	Heritage Western Cape		P/Bag X9067	CAPE TOWN	8000
Clr P	Scholtz	Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
Clr M	Lerm	Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
The	Chairman	Hermanus Ratepayers Ass		P O Box 134	HERMANUS	7200
Aesthetics	Committee	c/o Mr J Simpson		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
Chief Executive Officer		BOCMA		P/Bag X3055	WORCESTER	6849

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS ON, QUESTIONS ABOUT AND OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED ERECTION  
OF AN OPEN-AIR STAGE AND AMPHITHEATRE INSIDE Piet-se-Bos AND GROTTO BEACH IN  
VOËLKLIP, HERMANUS, REF NO. 16/3/1/1/e2/14/2026/13.

LEGAL

The envisaged upgrading of Piet-se-Bos and the erection of permanent buildings (an Amphitheatre and a restaurant) in the Grotto Beach area requires permission from particular authorities in terms of particular legislative requirements.

- The legal jurisdiction of each authority is determined in this case, by the **Overberg Coastal Set-back line**. The jurisdiction for developments above the line is set by the ICM Act, and for below the line by the NEMA EIA Regulations. These two are said to be (at the time of writing) not compatible with one another.
- This line is currently under review, and will eventually be determined through a long process that includes three rounds of public participation.
- Only after the set-back line has been set for the Grotto Beach/ Piet-se-Bos area can it be established if the proposed development falls above or below the line; and
- to which authority the applicants should address this proposal; and what criteria should be met.
- Therefore, there is no current legal framework within which this proposal can proceed. Any attempt by the Overstrand Municipality to do so exposes them to litigation.

GENERAL COMMENT ON THE DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

This document is only relevant to the end of section D. Sections E and F describe an agricultural development plan on a site named Oewerzicht farm, on the R406 road. These sections need to be re-written in order to be considered at all.

GENERAL ON SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES: SERVING THE INTERESTS OF THE WHOLE COMMUNITY

There are certain aspects of the proposed changes that in our view do meet the general requirement of being in the interests of the whole community, and are certainly worth endorsing. These include the re-instatement of parts of the wetland that existed prior to it being destroyed by landfill, and also the raised boardwalk with the re-established fringe of fynbos alongside it. We are particularly appreciative of the plan to remove the palm trees from the forest, as they are extremely unsightly invasive aliens. All of these proposed changes will most likely meet aesthetic standards, will undo some of the destruction caused by the original landfill, and is likely to contribute to the restoration of the Piet-se-Bos area at Grotto Beach.

It needs to be re-stated that the Grotto/Piet-se-Bos area is very, very special in the sense that it is one of the very few remaining areas along the Southern Cape coastline where an open beach is framed by a pristine Milkwood forest that descends to the high-water without permanent buildings restricting this almost unique sight. This invaluable natural spectacle is now at risk of being lost.

We argue that if an open-air stage and amphitheatre is erected, such a construction will not be in the *interests of the whole community*, for the following reasons.

NEMA

3  
0

Legal  
MR

1. For a start, the proposal does not include a **motivation** for why the nature reserve of Piet-se-Bos, and by extension, why the Voëlklip single residential area needs an open air amphitheatre at all. What is the **rationale** for another entertainment venue to be built within the perimeters of a nature reserve, instead of in the commercial area of the town, which would contribute to its economic viability. What is the rationale for erecting an open air amphitheatre with the tax payers' money, if more job-creation, and other humanitarian needs can be met by using the tax payer's money for a different project? Is the construction of an amphitheatre in Piet-se-Bos the optimal use of scarce funds for such ends?

*SM determines this*

The **Draft Basic Assessment Report** of March 2013 offers one motivation, described in **paragraph 8** of the report. This comprises of a statement describing the presumed socio-economic and demographic characteristics of the Voelklip residential area, as well as the architectural characteristics of the dwellings. These descriptions are irrelevant to the questions raised above, and do not constitute any rationale or describe any need for the proposed amphitheatre.

2. Such a motivation needs to build on **another prior motivation** about why the greater Hermanus area needs another such venue. Hermanus already has at its disposal the auditorium at the Library in Harmony Street, with adequate roof cover, easily accessible to everyone and suitably located within the established commercial part of the town. And there is another open air amphitheatre in the Hemel-and-Aarde Valley. Why the Overstrand municipal area needs yet another such venue, and why it needs to be located in the Piet-se-Bos at Grotto is not in any way self-evident. If reasons are apparent, then the proposal has to state them.

**Paragraph 8** referred to above does not address these issues either.

3. The building of an amphitheatre with seven tiers of seats (according to the map), as well as an elevated picnic platform within the area that was originally despoiled by a landfill, does not constitute rehabilitation of Piet-se-Bos by any definition. It entails a huge permanent building which is erected right within Piet-se-Bos, as it is almost entirely surrounded by the forest (probably 340 degrees of the 360 degree view). It amounts to the further degradation of the area. Part of the original landfill will now have added to it a huge open air venue, with a ramp leading up to the top picnic area, and access and exit roads for an "events stage truck". On the embankment of this building, above the floor level of the current land-fill site, and therefore at its most visible to all, the plan makes provision for the placement of a row of 4 mobile toilets, arguably one of the most unsightly products of human construction there is. This amounts to yet further despoilation of the original area, and in no way can be considered as rehabilitation of the Piet-se-Bos and its original wetland.
4. The proposed re-activation of the **Nautilus site** for a restaurant builds on preceding attempts to construct a viable economic enterprise on this site, every one of which has failed. If this is to be done under the flag of an "upgrade" (as is indicated in the proposal), then the building has to blend with the natural vegetation on or adjacent to the site. A single story building will most likely be below the crest of the surrounding Milkwood trees, and can thus blend with the natural skyline of the site. A double story building is likely to rise above the trees, and will adversely affect the natural profile of the Piet-se-Bos area at this site.

5. It is not stated what kind of productions the amphitheatre will host. This needs to be specified in writing in order for the public to assess the nature of the project. As it stands, the Overstrand municipality has in effect certain rules pertaining to the use of the beach of Grotto. These rules stipulate, amongst others, that **no Music** be produced and that **no Alcohol** be consumed at this site. There are two bill boards that clearly set these requirements (photo's attached). In addition, a boom has been erected to prevent motor vehicles from parking on the site in question. If this amphitheatre is to be a venue for music productions and theatre, then both kinds of productions will require electronic amplification, as this is an open-air venue with the background sounds of the sea, thus necessitating such amplification. The NO MUSIC rule will then have to be scrapped in its entirety. If this is the case, then the proposal will need to explicitly state this, so that the public can consider it.

While people who pay attendance fees and are sitting in the amphitheatre to view and listen to the production may find these productions to their taste, it does not apply to anybody outside the venue. For them/us it constitutes noise, and thus, **noise pollution**. And noise travels.

There are understandable reasons for the restrictive measures imposed by the Overstrand municipality onto the Grotto site in question. We have it from our own experience that noise generated from the Grotto has an extraordinary reach into the surrounding residential areas of Voëlklip.

Before the beach was declared a Blue Flag site, almost every weekend night a motley assembly of truck drivers, vagrants and other alcohol consumers congregated in the Grotto at weekend nights to build fires, braai meat and play music from the sound systems of their cars. This noise, even from appliances with the small amplification capacity of car-based systems cut through every wall in our house (198 Tenth Street), and on many weekends we, as well as our neighbours living right behind us had to call the after-hours phone number of the Overstrand municipality to complain about this noise, which constituted a public disturbance.

To control for such anti-social behaviour the Overstrand Municipality erected the boom, so as to prevent vehicles from accessing the site, a reason not mentioned in the proposal, and added the prohibition on music and the use of alcohol. These sound management rules by the Overstrand Municipality effectively dealt with these problems of public disturbance.

The noise generated by amplifiers from a professional theatre group or music group will exceed the strength of any car-based system many-fold, and the noise pollution will, in our view, based on our own previous experience, be magnified to extend to even more Voëlklip properties. Such noise pollution does not in any way serve the interests of the whole community. In this sense alone, what is proposed is not an upgrading of the site, but a degradation, as it is a site of noise pollution, even worse than it was before Grotto Beach acquired its Blue Flag status.

6. The document outlining the proposed construction of this noise generating facility is lacking in both general and specific detail about the project which is vital to assessing the impact it will have on the surrounding residential areas, as well as on Piet-se-Bos itself.

For a start, the plan does not show the number of **seats** in the amphitheatre, (only seven rows of seats ??) and therefore does not indicate the number of people and their attendant needs that have to be accommodated.

These needs include **parking sites**. We do not find any provision for more parking sites in the plan, than is presently available, and we argue that any construction of new parking sites within walking distance of the amphitheatre would constitute a serious violation of the ecological integrity of Piet-se Bos.

The plan also does not show additional **toilet and ablution** facilities. It can be safely assumed that a full house in the amphitheatre will entail an audience of at hundreds of people, and will thus require the erection of more than the current plan of only **four** on-site mobile toilet facilities, but will have to be proportional to the needs of a full house audience capacity.

Nor does it show the **height** of this permanent construction, and we therefore do not know whether the (four or more) mobile toilets on the embankment will be in direct sight of many of the residents in the area. This has to be specified in the plan so that residents can gain an accurate understanding of the scale of the intervention being planned for Piet-se-Bos. It is not unrealistic to envision a huge embankment adorned with a row of mobile toilets rising out of the centre of Piet-se-Bos, in full view of each and everyone who wishes to visit Grotto beach only to enjoy the ocean. How can it be dared to label such a gross construction as an upgrading of Piet-se-Bos? If this is not the case, then the residents need a plan that gives such an assurance in writing.

We also need a full explanation of the proposed **kiosks** on the site. Will they be permanent or not, and what merchandise will be for sale?

The Darft Basic Assessment Report also presents contradictory information about widening of **access roads**. On one page it admits to the need for "...construction/maintenance to road infrastructure required for improvement to the recreational area", while in another section the query about the building of infrastructure "(e.g. roads, power and water supply/storage)" is met with a response of "no". If the current access road is going to be widened to accommodate busses, as well as event stage trucks, then this has to be stated clearly in the application. If this is not going to be done, we need this reassurance in writing.

7. This leads into the next concern, which is that of **economic viability**. Given that there are already two competing venues, why would a third one, with distinct disadvantages compared to the other two, be more or even equally viable? The venue in Harmony street, Hermanus is at least under-roof-cover, which means that events are not subject to cancellation through adverse weather. The Hemel-and-Aarde venue is at least some distance removed from the seafront, and also shielded from some weather conditions. By contrast, the Grotto beach venue is about 50 meters from the ocean, at about ½ metres above-sea level, making it exposed to every kind of adverse weather generated from the ocean. Most evenings in Voëlkip are cool at best. During winter and spring the weather is cold, damp, misty and windy more often than not, with rain possible on any day. The area is also subject to "Voëlkip weather". This entails cool afternoon overcast weather, with early evening rain-showers, and these can occur during any time of the year. All of these factors affect the economic viability of the site, and the number of days that it is suitable for open air events.
8. The historically proven lack of economic viability of the **Nautilus site** speaks for itself.
9. This leads to the further issue of **responsibility towards the tax payers and the wider community** of the entire Overstrand municipal area. Should the proposed project be

approved, as is, then, irrespective of sub-contracting, the Municipality of Hermanus will be the ultimate responsible party for erecting, managing and gaining income from these buildings, with the backing of the tax payers' money. Given the very long list of urgent humanitarian needs of the municipal area, this entertainment venue (amphitheatre) project can only be described as frivolous and one of lesser importance, but at the same time, one of a high risk nature, verging on the irresponsible towards the needy within the municipal area. If the site proves to be economically non-viable in the longer term, then any public expenditure on such a venue will be wasted at the cost of the tax payer.

10. The fact that **all tax payers' interests** are at stake in the expenditure on this project makes all tax payers, by definition, **affected parties** with respect to this project.
11. Agreement on the **Overberg Coastal Set-back line** also requires three rounds of public participation in which all landowners are to be informed and consulted. This process has yet to be undertaken.



P.vdP. du Toit.

22 April 2013.

Answer: The existing parking is deemed adequate and when necessary, Overstrand municipal traffic officials will deal with the traffic flow.

Question 14:

**What considerations have been given to the existing road system being able to handle the additional traffic**

Answer: The existing road network is deemed adequate and the current parking at the Grotto area makes provision for all types of vehicles. The existing parking is deemed adequate and when necessary, Overstrand municipal traffic officials will deal with the traffic flow.

Question 15:

**What loudspeaker and amplification system is envisaged – location, height and direction of loudspeakers and wattage**

Answer: This is not known at the moment as it will be dependent on the individual event and organiser requirements, but will be approved by the municipality for each event.

Question 16:

**What lighting system is envisaged – location, height and direction of all spot lights and their type and wattage**

Answer: The municipal lighting will be flood lighting. The individual lighting is not known at the moment as it will be dependent on the individual event and organiser requirements.

Question 17:

**How is it envisaged to attenuate the sound emanating for events being held in the amphitheatre and to what extent**

Answer: This will only be attended to in detail once the business plan for the amphitheatre is drawn up

Question 18:

**How will the sewerage be disposed – I hope not into the sea at Grotto beach!**

Answer: It will be linked to the existing sewage reticulation system in the Grotto area and in addition portable toilet facilities may also be a condition in individual instances for organisers of events, depending on the requirement.

With regard to your question about coastal public property in your letter dated 9 May, we suggest that you access the Integrated Coastal Management Act that describes it formally in detail, to prevent any further questions related to that subject that we have to answer.

With regard to your second letter dated 9 May 2013 the responses received are as follows.

Point 1-Yes

Point 2-The areas mentioned in the upgrade is totally devoid of any natural vegetation, therefore cannot be regarded as "critical-diversity area" as you refer to it.

Point 3-We notified two municipal counselors namely P Scholtz and M Lerm by post. We have no e-mail addressed for them and you may contact the Overstrand Municipality at 028-3138000 to put you in touch with them.

---

Point 4a-This refers to a process that O'Connor (a sociologist that I worked with in Canada during 1981) devised and is contained in his 1977 publication on Public Participation. It consists of a whole series of elements that are evaluated. In our instance we have drawn on our experience of having worked 15 years as environmental consultants in the Overberg area, amongst other and have formed a pretty good idea of the different social groupings and profiles of the communities in our interactions with them. There is no document that was produced that describes the determination.

Point 4b- Complete lists of all initially identified as well as registered I&APs will be contained in the final BAR which will be available shortly for written comment. We have included lists as they are to date for your information. The date of the letter is of little consequence, but the date stamp on the envelope indicates the day that the letter was posted. We can get the letter to your post box in one day.

Point 5-See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

Point 6- See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

Point 7-See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

Point 8- See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality as well as the introductory paragraphs in this letter.

Point 9-We have submitted the proposed upgrade to Heritage Western Cape who indicated that no further processes were required under the National Heritage Resources Act

Point 10- This is a public recreational area and the purpose of the municipality is to make the area more accessible to a wider variety of the community. There will be noise that is associated with the type of event that will be hosted at the amphitheatre, but the type and duration of the events will be managed by the Overstrand Municipality and will conform to the municipal noise regulations for such events. The municipality has been successful in managing noise levels at the area in the past. The visual character will be altered in that where there is an open grass area at the moment with the milkwood thicket as backdrop, the erection of the amphitheatre will form a visual entity against the backdrop of the milkwood thicket. A reasonable area of the wetland will also be restored and cumulatively there will be visual impacts that differ from what there is at present, but in the consensus of the municipality, as well as a number of respondents, this will constitute a visual improvement and offer an enhanced utilisation of the public recreational area. This is a public recreation are and with the changing socio-political and economical situation of local communities as well as visitors to the area it can be expected that there has to be a change in the sense of place as the changing recreational requirements in a public area changes over time. This is a process which will also continue in future and has occurred in virtually all seaside holiday destinations over time in South Africa.

Point 11- See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

Point 12- The cumulative positive impact will be the rehabilitation of part of the old wetland as well as enhancing the use of the public open space area and extending the

---

public use opportunities to meet the changing tourism and recreational use requirements of the area. The cumulative negative impact is that there will be more noise associated with this enhanced use that will be negatively perceived by those immediate residents that expect peace and quiet at all times.

Point 13-The site Plan that was given to you during your visit to us indicates quite clearly that there will be plantings of some indigenous trees. In addition the BAR also makes mention that there will also be plantings of indigenous trees that occur in the milkwood thicket in the area in the forest area itself. The environmental section of the municipality has indicated that these plantings will also focus on areas where the protected indigenous large milkwoods have been illegally removed.

Point 14-Noted

Point 15- This was an initial estimate before any tenders were obtained and may change substantially. See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality. R70000-00 equates to ~R5800-00 profit per month which equates to R40-00 per person profit for 145 persons per month, which most probably can be done with one show a month.

Point 16-Any household also produces waste oil which is probably dispensed of in the domestic drain system. There are special facilities where one can discard waste oil. There are also institutions that recycle this oil into usable products.

Point 17- See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

Point 18-NG refers to No-go Alternative, A1 refers to Alternative 1 and A2 refers to Alternative 2.

Point 19- See the Questions and Answers section given by the municipality.

As mentioned in our previous correspondence, we also wish to reiterate the contents of our letter dated 9 May 2013 that states "note that the issues, concerns and impacts raised on the draft BAR will be taken into consideration, with input from the municipality, in the compilation of the final BAR". The final BAR will also contain all the correspondence as well as a list of registered Interested and Affected Parties that participated in the impact assessment process. You will also have opportunity as required under the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998), within the timeframes stipulated under NEMA, to provide written comment on the final BAR, the correspondence which will be included with the final BAR to be submitted to Dept of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning.

Yours sincerely

Charel Bruwer Snr

---

## Initially Identified Interested and Affected Parties: Piet se Bos and Grotto Beach Upgrade

Simon Pickstone Trust		c/o WM Pickstone	Lekkerwijn	P O Box 83	GROOT DRAKENSTEIN	7680
TG & GW	Joubert	24 St John's Estate			HIGGOVALE	8001
Jean-Mandi Trust		c/o Odendaal		P O Box 3293	TYGER VALLEY	7536
AE	Boynton			P O Box 1458	HERMANUS	7200
F	Ferucci			P O Box 341	PAARL	7620
Carey Investments Ltd				P O Box 3	VLOTTENBURG	7604
D Dicey Family Trust		4 Innesbrook Village	Fairways Ave		HERMANUS	7200
Beekay 182 Inv (Pty) Ltd		c/o Dr MC Dempsey		P O Box 216	HERMANUS	7200
Antro Trust		c/o Me B du Toit		P O Box 2170	HERMANUS	7200
PLCL Familietrust		Simonsbergstraat 18			STELLENBOSCH	7600
Eureka Trust		c/o DP Jansz van Rensburg		Posbus 1504	HERMANUS	7200
Cardinox (Prop) Ltd		Proforum Building	5 van Rensburg Street		NELSPRUIT	1200
Tania Investments		c/o ID Smith	9 Sunrise Close		CONSTANTIA	7806
Mr NH	Walton	4A Elsipote	Victoria Rd		BANTRY BAY	8005
Matterson Cynthia-Trustees		c/o Mrs Diana Elliot		P O Box 941	RIVER CLUB	2149
Mr DN	Fine & 3 Others	c/o Mr DN Fine		P O Box 48263	KOMMETJIE	7976
AC	Beukes	Demnegeur		Posbus 51	GRABOUW	7160
Corwin Trust		p/a JJ Slazus		Posbus 15189	PANORAMA	7506
Nacuka Trust		c/o KHKV Albrecht		P O Box 4750	CAPE TOWN	8000
CH	de Villiers	2184 Taboriacke Circle	LEXINGTON	KY 40502	USA	
FM	de Wet			P O Box 17	ASHTON	6715
Bishoplea Trust		c/o CRH Knight		P O Box 25	GREENPOINT	8051
Kardre Inv CC		p/a Merv IA Claassens		Posbus 2157	NORTHCLIFF	2115
ML	Cloete	Berghof Retirement Complex	44A Hof Street		GARDENS	8001
Seetuin Trust		p/a DM Hoogenhout	Jonkershoekweg 21		STELLENBOSCH	7600
Tiendestraat 215 Trust		c/o E Neethling		Posbus 1142	HERMANUS	7200
The Johannes W Louw Trust		Upper Waterkloof No 20	Regulusstraat 173		WATERKLOOFRIF	0181
PA	King			P O Box 4392	CAPE TOWN	8000
Roorslock Capital(PTY) Ltd		p/a Mr M du Toit		Posbus 723	STELLENBOSCH	7599
AM&GD	Blom&Grieve	223 Eleventh Street			VOELKLIP	7200
AGB	Grieve	34 Fairway Heights			RONDEBOSCH	7700
Municipal Manager		Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
A	Capham-Duffel	Cape Nature		P/Bag X5014	STELLENBOSCH	7599
A	Roux	Dept of Agriculture		P/Bag X1	EISENBURG	7607
The	Director	Dept of Water Affairs		P/Bag X16	SANLAMHOF	7532

The	Director	Heritage Western Cape		P/Bag X9067	CAPE TOWN	8000
Clr P	Scholtz	Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
Clr M	Lerm	Overstrand Municipality		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
The	Chairman	Hermanus Ratepayers Ass		P O Box 134	HERMANUS	7200
Aesthetics	Committee	c/o Mr J Simpson		P O Box 20	HERMANUS	7200
Chief Executive Officer		BOCMA		P/Bag X3055	WORCESTER	6849

PLCL Familietrust		c/o M van Rooyen		P O Box 859	STELLENBOSCH	7599
TG & GW	Joubert	24 St John's Estate	9 Higgs Crescent		HIGGOVALE	8001
J	de Klerk			P O Box 603	NEWLANDS	0049
J	Taylor			P O Box 269	HERMANUS	7200
Seetuin Trust		p/a DM Hoogenhout	Jonkershoekweg 21		STELLENBOSCH	7600
J	Heyns			P O Box 1077	HERMANUS	7200
Nacuka Trust		c/o KHKV Albrecht		P O Box 4750	CAPE TOWN	8000
NG	Fine		1 Vale Road		RONDEBOSCH	7700
J	Carinus		P O Box 12017	Die Boord	STELLENBOSCH	7600
The	Director	Heritage Western Cape		P/Bag X9067	CAPE TOWN	8000
D	Heard		12 Sepia Avenue	Vermont	ONRUSRIVIER	7201
Tania Investments		c/o ID Smith	9 Sunrise Close		CONSTANTIA	7806
Roorstock Capital(PTY) Ltd		p/a Mr M du Toit		Posbus 723	STELLENBOSCH	7599
Chief Executive Officer		c/o P van Coller	BOCMA	P/Bag X3055	WORCESTER	6849
AE	Boynton			P O Box 1458	HERMANUS	7200
Antro Trust		c/o Me B du Toit		P O Box 2170	HERMANUS	7200
SC	Hibberd			P O Box 2063	HERMANUS	7200
Cardinox (Prop) Ltd		c/o Dr J van Zyl		P O Box 782	SOMERSET MALL	7137
JL	Nel			P O Box 2103	HERMANUS	7200
Eureka Trust		c/o DP Janse van Rensburg		Posbus 1504	HERMANUS	7200
Mrs L	du Toit		27 Woltemade Street		STELLENBOSCH	7600
Mrs Z	Rens		7 Steenkamp Street		ALIWAL NORTH	9750
Dr J	Slazuz		Hennie Winterbachstraat 55		PANORAMA	7500
JW Louw Trust		c/o M Louw		P O Box 118	NEWLANDS	0049
M&L	Cloete	Berghof Retirement Complex	44A Hof Street		GARDENS	8001
P	Cillie			Posbus 66	WELLINGTON	7654
Tiendestraat 215 Trust		c/o E Neethling		Posbus 1142	HERMANUS	7200
A	Roux	Dept of Agriculture		P/Bag X1	ELSENBURG	7607
L&M	le Roux			Posbus 1514	HERMANUS	7200
Stehan Grobler Trust		c/o S Grobler		P O Box 6245	UNIEDAL	7612
A	Wolfaardt			P O Box 38	PRINCE ALFRED'S HAMLET	6840
Frans Nell Kindertrust		c/o FJ Nel		P O Box 6083	UNIEDAL	7612
Simon Pickstone Trust		c/o WM Pickstone	Lekkerwijn	P O Box 83	GROOT DRAKENSTEIN	7680
Simon Pickstone Trust		c/o S Pickstone- Taylor	Lekkerwijn	P O Box 83	GROOT DRAKENSTEIN	7680
G	Grieve		5 Kedah Road		RONDEBOSCH	7700

Jean-Mandi Trust		c/o I&M Odendaal		P O Box 3293	TYGER VALLEY	7536
J	Armstrong		64 Jonkershoek Road		STELLENBOSCH	7600
C&J	McCulloch		64 Jonkershoek Road		STELLENBOSCH	7600
R	Smart	Cape Nature		P/Bag X5014	STELLENBOSCH	7599
A	Grieve			P O Box 74	WORCESTER	6849
T	Schreuder	No 2 Tenth Avenue	Voelklip		HERMANUS	7200
J	Scott			P O Box 1497	STELLENBOSCH	7599

Our Ref: HMNOVERBERGIOVERSTRANDIHERMANUSIERF 4771

Enquiries: Troy Smuts  
Tel: 021 483 9543

Email: [justin.bradfield@pwc.gov.za](mailto:justin.bradfield@pwc.gov.za)

Date: 17/04/2013  
Case No.: 130320TS24  
Auto IDs: 2160 - 2365



**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP**  
**In terms of section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)**  
**and the Western Cape Provincial Gazette 6061, Notice 298 of 2003**

Attention: Mr Charel Bruwer  
Enviroafrica  
PO Box 4  
Onrus  
7201

**CASE NUMBER: 130320TS24**  
**NID: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF ERF 4771, GROTTO BEACH, HERMANUS**

The matter above has reference.

Your NID dated 15 March 2013 was tabled and the following was discussed:

1. Proposal is to improve an open picnic area.
2. The area used to be a wetland which has been filled in.
3. The upgrade will re-instate a portion of the wetland by removing a portion of the fill material.
4. The removed infill material will be use to create a sloped amphitheater.
5. A raised boardwalk will be built to allow pedestrian access to the wetland and surrounding milkwood.
6. A wooden double story building will be constructed and rented out.

**Decision:**

1. You are hereby notified that, since there is no reason to believe that the proposed development will impact on heritage resources, further processes under Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) do not apply.

**Terms and Conditions:**

1. This approval does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining local authority approval or any other necessary approval for the proposed work.
2. If any heritage resources, including archaeological material, palaeontological material, graves or human remains, are encountered work must cease and they must be reported to Heritage Western Cape immediately.
3. Heritage Western Cape reserves the right to request additional information as required.

**Should you have any further queries, please contact the official above and quote the case number above.**

Yours faithfully

Andrew B Hall  
Chief Executive Officer  
Heritage Western Cape

12 Sepia Avenue  
Vermont  
Onrusrivier  
7201  
22 April 2013

EnviroAfrica Overberg (Fax : 086 513 2141)  
P.O. Box 4  
Onrus

Dear Charel

**PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTO BEACH AREA, HERMANUS**  
(Ref.: 16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13)

As Chairperson of the adjoining Fernkloof Nature Reserve Advisory Board, I would like to register as an Interested and Affected Party and would like to receive the available draft Basic Assessment Report.

My contact details are listed below.

Kind regards



Duncan Heard  
12 Sepia Avenue, Vermont, Onrusrivier. 7201. SOUTH AFRICA  
Tel: +27(0) 28 316 3386 | Cell: +27(0) 82 495 3943 | Fax: +27(0) 86513 4452 |  
Email: [duncanheard@telkomsa.net](mailto:duncanheard@telkomsa.net)

# EnviroAfrica

Environmental Planning and Impact Assessment Consultants  
Omgewingsbeplanning en Impakbeoordeling Konsultante

---

23 April 2013

The Chairperson  
Fernkloof Nature Reserve Advisory Board  
12 Sepia Avenue  
Vermont  
ONRUSRIVIER  
7201

**Attention Mr D Heard**

Dear Chair

**16/3/1/1/E2/14/2026/13: PROPOSED UPGRADE OF PIET SE BOS AND GROTTA BEACH AREA,  
HERMANUS**

Your letter dated 22 April 2013 regarding the abovementioned project refers.

We wish to confirm that the Fernkloof Nature Reserve Advisory Board with yourself as the telephonically confirmed representative at the address on your letter, is registered as Interested and Affected Party.

We note that your organization has not raised any issues, concerns or impacts that you would like to see addressed in the final Basic Assessment Report and therefore assume that you have none. The newspaper and on-site adverts as well as the Background Information Document clearly indicate that these issues, impacts and concerns need to be raised now before the end of the 40 day comment period, in order for them to be addressed in the final BAR. Attached for your information is also a copy of the draft BAR as requested in your letter of 22 April. Thank you for the interest that you take in the environment

Yours sincerely



Charel Bruwer

620

15

R'celd 23/4

5438

# fax message

To: Overberg Municipality Town EPIA

Attention: CAREL BRUWER

From: Ian Smith Erf No 5438, 193, 9<sup>th</sup> Street

2013-04-23

## AFFECTED PROPERTY OWNER

Dear Sir,

I have been made aware of a proposed redevelopment of the picnic area adjacent to Grotto Beach and consider myself to be an Affected Property Owner and hereby apply to your office to register me as such and include me in all future correspondence.

Our home overlooks the sea and has an uninterrupted view of Walker Bay and I believe I have the right to know when that view will be interfered with and I object to any development that will affect the general quiet of the area.

The proposal thus far has not included any detail as far as I can see and some of the questions I would like answered are:-

1. How big will the amphitheater be and what number of people will it accommodate.
2. Where will visitors to the development find parking.
3. Will events at the venue involve noise that will affect an otherwise peaceful environment. - are there not more suitable venues.
4. What will this development cost the taxpayer of Hermanus and will it be in the general interest of the average taxpayer.
5. What will the amphitheater cost to run and what is the anticipated revenue
6. Is the establishment of a restaurant and bar complex suitable for a site adjacent to a Blue Flag beach amongst others.

I believe we all need to be consulted and included in any decisions that affect the area.

Yours faithfully,



Ian D Smith