

to the residential areas beyond that point and it would be unacceptable to create a potential risk area like this that can lead to the closing of the road to their development. I herewith state my objection to the access street to Church Street and lend my support to objections to the intended road already made by the other parties and support a proposal to a second access road from Stil Street if a second access point is indeed required.

- Wall enclosure

I understand that there is apparently now going to be provision made for a 1.8 metre wall around the perimeter of the development. This wall is apparently only going to be "bagged". I feel the height of the wall does not provide sufficient security for the residents and should be increased in height and the bagging of the wall does not enhance the area and will not prevent our property values from devaluing.

I was told that there are thoughts of increasing the height of the wall to 3 metres and to the plastering & painting of the wall and the placement of security lighting and gardens along Church Street and possibly even the planting of a tree lane down Church Street from Stil Street onwards towards Beach Club.

This wall and garden area and the maintenance thereof (including the painting of the walls) need to be committed to in writing by the municipality.

I support an enhanced featured wall as referred to above and reject as inadequate the intended 1.8 metre bagged wall and state my total objection to the intended Transit Area.

- Toilet and washing facilities

I do not have clarity on the intended toilet and washing facilities and herewith object to any facility being created which is not intended to serve ONLY the occupants of the intended dwellings.

I need a written commitment from the Municipality which states that the washing facilities will be of such a nature that no petitioning or mass action can or will originate because of the nature or inadequacy thereof and a further commitment that there will be sufficient thereof to ensure that no resident needs to relieve him or herself in any other place and in so doing foul the environment and place the health of our community at risk. I need your commitment in writing that the toilet facilities will be kept in a clean and functional operational status at all times and that there will be sufficient water per living unit to adhere to washing, toilet and living requirements.

- Objections

I have recorded my objections and acceptance terms above and wish to state that should these acceptance terms not be considered as achievable by yourselves then any apparent acceptance that may be considered as being derived from the content of this document of objection of mine be considered as withdrawn and a blanket objection to the intended development be considered as in its stead.

I understand the need to provide housing for people and have no argument in that regard. However, I do not understand and it does not make sense at all why, after the initial plans were drawn up September 2014 (information gained from Mrs G Bucker, Canterbury 106) for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take this route. Surely the permanent structures can be built and then the people can be moved into the houses, and then Zwelihle can be upgraded?. I state that where such a development is very likely to materially affect property values, safety and living standards of myself, my family and friends then our needs and rights need to be given serious attention and if not attended to then you should expect my serious objection and expect repercussions as a result thereof.

Please acknowledge receipt of my objections and I request your confirmation of your willingness to place your commitment to ensure our safety and property values in writing.

Yours in objection.




Ps. Please respond to the following address

So downer 64 @ g.m.c. d.

TP A Theart
(C H Olivier)

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| FILE NO: | Erven 1938 + 2018 |
| SCAN NO: | ZW |
| | 23 |
| COLLABORATOR NO: | 875987 |

The Mayor
Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie
P.O. Box 20
Hermanus
7200
Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za
2 February 2016

Mr Dave Bakker

26 Springfield Ave
Westcliff
Hermanus

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

I am a property owner in Westcliff, Hermanus.

I have just been informed of the intention to create a Transit Site on the corner of Stil and Church Streets and that the municipality has apparently placed an advertisement about the intended development in some newspapers to advise the residents of the project and provided time for objections till the 15th of February. I have not as yet seen this advert and therefore do not know the full extent of the intended project. I do however not need to know every aspect thereof to know that such a Transit Area can have a very material negative influence on my property value and am surprised that an issue of such cardinal importance to the residents in the affected surrounding area was not informed by personal mail of the intention thereof as opposed to the simple placement of an advert which has obviously not been seen by the majority (if not all) of the affected property owners.

I have been advised that the management of Beach Club and others have been having discussions with the municipal executive during a stage when they were under the impression that the development area was going to be a low-cost housing area and that these discussions were semi-concluded before there was a decision taken to place a Transit Site on the development area. I understand the following from feedback so received and I append my comments, concerns and objections thereto below:

- You as Mayor have apparently made a commitment that nothing would be done that would negatively affect Westcliff's property values. How am I to believe this if I have not even been advised of the intended development of a Transit Site that is very likely to materially affect my living conditions if not controlled properly – I see this as an infringement of my constitutional rights to be consulted on issues that could affect me both financially and

13 FEB 2016

TP

15 FEB 2016

socially. I object to the fact that I as a property owner in an affected area was not directly advised of either of these intended development scenarios.

- It is apparently the intention to develop a commercial zone on the corner of Stil and Church streets. I have been told that Beach Club and others have raised their concern about potential spaza shops, taxi ranks and possibly free trading areas that could be developed there. How is this area going to be kept clean and clear of vagrants and rubbish and all types of unwanted elements that will negatively affect our complete residential zone? I herewith object to this potential development site unless written assurances are given that the development site will be kept in a pristine condition. I further require written assurances that we as affected property owners will be consulted about potential development plans of the site before decisions are taken, and thereafter provided information on the preferred development and a period to object to such a development if it is considered as having a potentially negative impact on the residential area.
- The Municipality apparently initially planned a formal SR1 zoned housing development on the site. This has now apparently been altered to cater for a Transit Area that may remain as such for a period of up to 5 years.

I object strongly to this strategy unless you can provide our community with written assurances of such a nature that we can take legal action against the municipality for failure to perform. These performance terms should cover commitments that the intended site will be kept clean, that regulations regarding noise be applied strictly, no informal trading be allowed anywhere along Church or Stil streets, no shacks or any form of extension to the initial housing structure be allowed, refuse be removed on at least the same regular basis as served on the rest of our residential community and that facilities be provided to the residents to enable them to keep the living area clean (waste bins) and that you contractually bind yourselves to manage the site according to rules and regulations as if it was a SR1 zoned property development (other than the transit occupational provision)

- I understand that you have committed that no double-storey units be constructed within the bottom half (i.e. the half towards Church Street). I wish to gain your commitment that this restriction will be placed in the title deeds when the houses are eventually transferred to the eventual owners and that until that time you undertake in writing that the houses will not under any circumstances be altered to accommodate double or any other form of multiple storey structure, and that only the owners and their immediate family members may occupy the units.
- Access road to Church Street:
 - I have been advised that Beach Club and other representatives objected to an intended access road from the proposed development onto Church Street – I have inspected the proposed access position and fully support their objection to any access road into Church Street. The intended access position is close to a blind bend with viewing further restricted by an abalone farm wall. Few of the intended residents have transport and even one access road to the site should surely be sufficient bar the fact that provision need possibly be made for fire safety reasons. Church Street provides the only access

to the residential areas beyond that point and it would be unacceptable to create a potential risk area like this that can lead to the closing of the road to their development. I herewith state my objection to the access street to Church Street and lend my support to objections to the intended road already made by the other parties and support a proposal to a second access road from Stil Street if a second access point is indeed required.

- Wall enclosure

I understand that there is apparently now going to be provision made for a 1,8 metre wall around the perimeter of the development. This wall is apparently only going to be "bagged". I feel the height of the wall does not provide sufficient security for the residents and should be increased in height and the bagging of the wall does not enhance the area and will not prevent our property values from devaluing.

I was told that there are thoughts of increasing the height of the wall to 3 metres and to the plastering & painting of the wall and the placement of security lighting and gardens along Church Street and possibly even the planting of a tree lane down Church Street from Stil Street onwards towards Beach Club.

This wall and garden area and the maintenance thereof (including the painting of the walls) need to be committed to in writing by the municipality.

I support an enhanced featured wall as referred to above and reject as inadequate the intended 1,8 metre bagged wall and state my total objection to the intended Transit Area.

- Toilet and washing facilities

I do not have clarity on the intended toilet and washing facilities and herewith object to any facility being created which is not intended to serve ONLY the occupants of the intended dwellings.

I need a written commitment from the Municipality which states that the washing facilities will be of such a nature that no petitioning or mass action can or will originate because of the nature or inadequacy thereof and a further commitment that there will be sufficient thereof to ensure that no resident needs to relieve him or herself in any other place and in so doing foul the environment and place the health of our community at risk. I need your commitment in writing that the toilet facilities will be kept in a clean and functional operational status at all times and that there will be sufficient water per living unit to adhere to washing, toilet and living requirements.

- Objections

I have recorded my objections and acceptance terms above and wish to state that should these acceptance terms not be considered as achievable by yourselves then any apparent acceptance that may be considered as being derived from the content of this document of objection of mine be considered as withdrawn and a blanket objection to the intended development be considered as in its stead.

I understand the need to provide housing for people and have no argument in that regard. However, I do not understand and it does not make sense at all why, after the initial plans were drawn up September 2014 (information gained from Mrs G Bucker, Canterbury 106) for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take this route. Surely the permanent structures can be built and then the people can be moved into the houses, and then Zwelihle can be upgraded?. I state that where such a development is very likely to materially affect property values, safety and living standards of myself, my family and friends then our needs and rights need to be given serious attention and if not attended to then you should expect my serious objection and expect repercussions as a result thereof.

Please acknowledge receipt of my objections and I request your confirmation of your willingness to place your commitment to ensure our safety and property values in writing.

Yours in objection,



Ps. Please respond to the following address

Mr Dave Bakker
Whale Rock Lodge
26 Springfield Avenue
Westcliff
CODE 7200
Tel no: 079 526 8093
info@whalerock.co.za

TP A Theert
(C H Olivier)



Mrs . R.S. Barlow

The Mayor

Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie

P.O. Box 20

Hermanus

7200

Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za

29 January 2016

| | |
|------------------|-------------------|
| FILE NO: | Erven 1938 + 2018 |
| SCAN NO: | 25 |
| COLLABORATOR NO: | 875990 |

80 Canterbury Street

Westcliff

Hermanus

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

I am a property owner in Westcliff, Hermanus.

I have just been informed of the intention to create a Transit Site on the corner of Stil and Church Streets and that the municipality has apparently placed an advertisement about the intended development in some newspapers to advise the residents of the project and provided time for objections till the 15th of February. I have not as yet seen this advert and therefore do not know the full extent of the intended project. I do however not need to know every aspect thereof to know that such a Transit Area can have a very material negative influence on my property value and am surprised that an issue of such cardinal importance to the residents in the affected surrounding area was not informed by personal mail of the intention thereof as opposed to the simple placement of an advert which has obviously not been seen by the majority (if not all) of the affected property owners.

I have been advised that the management of Beach Club and others have been having discussions with the municipal executive during a stage when they were under the impression that the development area was going to be a low-cost housing area and that these discussions were semi-concluded before there was a decision taken to place a Transit Site on the development area. I understand the following from feedback so received and I append my comments, concerns and objections thereto below:

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

- You as Mayor have apparently made a commitment that nothing would be done that would negatively affect Westcliff's property values. How am I to believe this if I have not even been advised of the intended development of a Transit Site that is very likely to materially affect my living conditions if not controlled properly – I see this as an infringement of my constitutional rights to be consulted on issues that could affect me both financially and socially. I object to the fact that I as a property owner in an affected area was not directly advised of either of these intended development scenarios.
- It is apparently the intention to develop a commercial zone on the corner of Stil and Church streets. I have been told that Beach Club and others have raised their concern about potential spaza shops, taxi ranks and possibly free trading areas that could be developed there. How is this area going to be kept clean and clear of vagrants and rubbish and all types of unwanted elements that will negatively affect our complete residential zone? I herewith object to this potential development site unless written assurances are given that the development site will be kept in a pristine condition. I further require written assurances that we as affected property owners will be consulted about potential development plans of the site before decisions are taken, and thereafter provided information on the preferred development and a period to object to such a development if it is considered as having a potentially negative impact on the residential area.
- The Municipality apparently initially planned a formal SR1 zoned housing development on the site. This has now apparently been altered to cater for a Transit Area that may remain as such for a period of up to 5 years.
I object strongly to this strategy unless you can provide our community with written assurances of such a nature that we can take legal action against the municipality for failure to perform. These performance terms should cover commitments that the intended site will be kept clean, that regulations regarding noise be applied strictly, no informal trading be allowed anywhere along Church or Stil streets, no shacks or any form of extension to the initial housing structure be allowed, refuse be removed on at least the same regular basis as served on the rest of our residential community and that facilities be provided to the residents to enable them to keep the living area clean (waste bins) and that you contractually bind yourselves to manage the site according to rules and regulations as if it was a SR1 zoned property development (other than the transit occupational provision)
- I understand that you have committed that no double-storey units be constructed within the bottom half (i.e. the half towards Church Street). I wish to gain your commitment that this restriction will be placed in the title deeds when the houses are eventually transferred to the eventual owners and that until that time you undertake in writing that the houses will not under any circumstances be altered to accommodate double or any other form of multiple storey structure, and that only the owners and their immediate family members may occupy the units.
- Access road to Church Street:
 - I have been advised that Beach Club and other representatives objected to an intended access road from the proposed development onto Church Street – I have inspected the

proposed access position and fully support their objection to any access road into Church Street. The intended access position is close to a blind bend with viewing further restricted by an abalone farm wall. Few of the intended residents have transport and even one access road to the site should surely be sufficient bar the fact that provision need possibly be made for fire safety reasons. Church Street provides the only access to the residential areas beyond that point and it would be unacceptable to create a potential risk area like this that can lead to the closing of the road to their development. I herewith state my objection to the access street to Church Street and lend my support to objections to the intended road already made by the other parties and support a proposal to a second access road from Stil Street if a second access point is indeed required.

- Wall enclosure

I understand that there is apparently now going to be provision made for a 1,8 metre wall around the perimeter of the development. This wall is apparently only going to be "bagged". I feel the height of the wall does not provide sufficient security for the residents and should be increased in height and the bagging of the wall does not enhance the area and will not prevent our property values from devaluing.

I was told that there are thoughts of increasing the height of the wall to 3 metres and to the plastering & painting of the wall and the placement of security lighting and gardens along Church Street and possibly even the planting of a tree lane down Church Street from Stil Street onwards towards Beach Club.

This wall and garden area and the maintenance thereof (including the painting of the walls) need to be committed to in writing by the municipality.

I support an enhanced featured wall as referred to above and reject as inadequate the intended 1,8 metre bagged wall and state my total objection to the intended Transit Area.

- Toilet and washing facilities

I do not have clarity on the intended toilet and washing facilities and herewith object to any facility being created which is not intended to serve ONLY the occupants of the intended dwellings.

I need a written commitment from the Municipality which states that the washing facilities will be of such a nature that no petitioning or mass action can or will originate because of the nature or inadequacy thereof and a further commitment that there will be sufficient thereof to ensure that no resident needs to relieve him or herself in any other place and in so doing foul the environment and place the health of our community at risk.

I need your commitment in writing that the toilet facilities will be kept in a clean and functional operational status at all times and that there will be sufficient water per living unit to adhere to washing, toilet and living requirements.

- Objections

I have recorded my objections and acceptance terms above and wish to state that should these acceptance terms not be considered as achievable by yourselves then any apparent acceptance that may be considered as being derived from the content of this document of objection of mine be considered as withdrawn and a blanket objection to the intended development be considered as in its stead.

I understand the need to provide housing for people and have no argument in that regard. However, I do not understand and it does not make sense at all why, after the initial plans were drawn up September 2014 (information gained from Mrs G Bücker, Canterbury 106) for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take this route. Surely the permanent structures can be built and then the people can be moved into the houses, and then Zwelihle can be upgraded?. I state that where such a development is very likely to materially affect property values, safety and living standards of myself, my family and friends then our needs and rights need to be given serious attention and if not attended to then you should expect my serious objection and expect repercussions as a result thereof.

Please acknowledge receipt of my objections and I request your confirmation of your willingness to place your commitment to ensure our safety and property values in writing.

Yours in objection,

Mrs. R.S Barlow

Please respond to the following address

Tel : 0283132597

E-Mail : rbarlow@telkomsa.net

The Mayor

Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie

P.O. Box 20

Hermanus

7200

Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za

15 February 2016



VR & J Kruger

53 Church Str

Westcliff

Hermanus

TP- A Thant
CH Olivier

| | |
|------------------|----------------|
| FILE NO: | Enen 1938+2018 |
| SCAN NO: | 2w |
| | 26 |
| COLLABORATOR NO: | 875991 |
| | |

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

I am a property owner in Westcliff, Hermanus.

I have just been informed of the intention to create a Transit Site on the corner of Stil and Church Streets and that the municipality has apparently placed an advertisement about the intended development in some newspapers to advise the residents of the project and provided time for objections till the 15th of February. I have not as yet seen this advert. Such a Transit Area will have a very material negative influence on my property value and am surprised that an issue of such cardinal importance to the residents in the affected surrounding area of Westcliff was not informed by personal mail of the intention thereof as opposed to the simple placement of an advert which has obviously not been seen by the majority (if not all) of the affected property owners.

I have been advised that discussions with the municipal executive indicated that the development area was going to be a low-cost housing area and that these discussions were semi-concluded before there was a decision taken to place a Transit Site on the development area. I understand the following from feedback so received and I append my comments, concerns and objections thereto below:

- You as Mayor have apparently made a commitment that nothing would be done that would negatively affect Westcliff's property values. How am I to believe this if I have not even been advised of the intended development of a Transit Site that is very likely to materially affect my living conditions if not controlled properly – I see this as an infringement of my constitutional rights to not be consulted on issues that could affect me both financially and socially. I object to the fact that I as a property owner in an affected area was not directly advised of either of these intended development scenarios before the projects were initiated.

TP 15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

- It is apparently the intention to develop a commercial zone on the corner of Stil and Church streets. I object to this completely. The municipality cannot control the area in Swartdam Rd opposite the new clinic, so why should we believe this will be the case here? The state that the area referred to is in is totally unacceptable. It will also have the result that the area will turn into a pick up zone for contract workers etc, causing further traffic problems let alone loitering and the likes. This is absolutely unacceptable.
- The Municipality apparently initially planned a formal SRI zoned housing development on the site. This has now apparently been altered to cater for a Transit Area that may remain as such for a period of up to 5 years.
I object strongly to this strategy. Law enforcement agencies are unable to protect our properties and lives against possible protest actions that will certainly arise, as they do everywhere else, when the municipality tries to enforce envisaged rules and regulations on the occupants of this area. Legal action against the municipality for failure to perform these commitments that the intended site will be kept clean, and managed according to municipal regulations, will certain be taken if and when deemed necessary. However, that will be too late to prevent damage and harm from coming to residents of Westcliff. I OBJECT in the strongest terms against this development on the corner of Church & Stil Str even taking place. You are acting irresponsibly towards me, my family and property.
- I understand that you have committed that no double-storey units be constructed within the bottom half (i.e. the half towards Church Street), and that only the owners and their immediate family members may occupy the units. How and who is going to enforce this?
- Access road to Church Street:

I have been advised that Beach Club and other representatives objected to an intended access road from the proposed development onto Church Street - I have inspected the proposed access position and fully support their objection to any access road into Church Street. The intended access position is close to a blind bend with viewing further restricted by an abalone farm wall. Few of the intended residents have transport and even one access road to the site should surely be sufficient bar the fact that provision need possibly be made for fire safety reasons. Church Street provides the only access to the residential areas beyond that point and it would be unacceptable to create a potential risk area like this that can lead to the closing of the road to their homes & properties. And yet, it appears that the access road is forging ahead. My inspection today reveals that the access point is under construction. This demonstrates the cold and callous disregard this council holds towards any of our objections. How are you going to deal with this issue? It will increase pedestrian traffic in Church street and have the corner become a collection point for contract workers and the like, similar to Swartdam Rd. Once again, I object!

- Wall enclosure

If the wall surrounding the area is not at least 2.5m high, preferably 3.0m, it may as well not even be there. From the elevated street position we can see right into the current housing scheme in Stil street. This is simply a comment or observation, not an acceptance.

- Toilet and washing facilities

The proposed toilets and washing facilities are totally inadequate and it is inhumane to expect 20+ people to use the same outside facility. In fact, if there is one single burning point that will cause problems, this is it. Expecting people to perform their daily cleaning & relieving rituals in such circumstances is the ultimate insult and slap in the face. The natural result of this is that people will start looking for alternative areas to relieve themselves, which happens to be the over grown bushy area across the road from my residence. I OBJECT IN THE STRONGEST TERMS TO THIS POSSIBILITY!!! I also want to point out that I will collect all of this human waste, should it happen, and deliver it to the municipal offices for disposal, along with all the potential disease that may spread in this manner.

- Objections

I have recorded my objections and I am seeking legal council on this matter. As previously stated, this development will destroy property values. In fact, this for me amounts to a sentence of either being stuck here for the remaining term of my bond and then abandoning my property and walking away empty handed, or abandoning my responsibilities towards my bond and facing the resulting unpleasant consequences. Both of these options sound to me like they breach my constitutional right to a peaceful existence.

I understand the need to provide housing for people and have no argument in that regard. However, I do not understand why this has to be done at the detriment of other residents and property owners. I state that where such a development is very likely to materially affect property values, safety and living standards of myself, my family and friends, then our needs and rights need to be given serious attention and if not attended to then you should expect my serious objection and expect repercussions as a result thereof.

Please acknowledge receipt of my objections and I request your confirmation of your willingness to place your commitment to ensure our safety and property values in writing.

Yours in objection,



CC: smuller@overstrand.gov.za rkuchar@overstrand.gov.za holivier@overstrand.gov.za

Ps. Please respond to the following address

Kobus Kruger
153 Church Str.
Westcliff
Hermanus
7200
Tel no: 082 623 6100
kobus@actionphotoz.co.za



HERMANUS BEACH CLUB

MASTER HOME OWNERS' ASSOCIATION

PO BOX 5004, HERMANUS. 7200 SOUTH AFRICA
 CHURCH STREET EXT. HERMANUS 7200
 TELEPHONE +27 (0) 28 312 1432 FAX 086 512 4128
 E MAIL hbclub@hermanus.co.za

FILE NO: Even 1938 + 2018

SCAN NO: 221
27

COLLABORATOR NO: 875992

TR A T heart
 C H Olivier

15 February 2016

Per email

The Overstrand Municipality
 Department: Town Planning
 ATTENTION: LORETTA loretta@overstrand.gov.za



COMMENTS:

UNREGISTERED ERF 1938, ZWELIHLE, HERMANUS (PREVIOUSLY ERF 315, ZWELIHLE AND REMAINDER ERF 243, HERMANUS) AND UNREGISTERED ERF 2018, C/O STIL AND CHURCH STREETS, ZWELIHLE, HERMANUS, OVERSTRAND MUNICIPAL AREA: PROPOSED DEPARTURES FROM A TEMPORARY RELOCATION AREA (TRA) AND RELAX A STREET BUILDING LINE: MOTLEKAR OVERSTRAND ON BEHALF OF OVERSTRAND MUNICIPALITY

We do have an understanding of the need for housing in the area, but as yet can only **CONDITIONALLY ACCEPT** the application for the proposed departure following the outcomes of the following comments and questions:

- Approval of requested departures is going to result in a material negative impact on all the deemed affected areas including Whale Rock Estate, Whale Bay Cascades, Hermanus Beach Club, Mariners Village and surrounding Westcliff properties – inevitably with loss of capital value, safety of surroundings and current accepted social well-being status.
 Assurance that the requested departures will be developed in such a way as to have no negative impact that could lead to loss of capital value, safety to surroundings and current accepted social well-being status to be provided.
- Application is made for a “Temporary Departure” - Council to provide a legally binding document which clearly states the latest date by when this temporary Departure will be considered as having reached its legally expired timeframe.
- Church Street access road
 - The internal design of the proposed TRA clearly suggests that this proposed access-road is to function as the main access road to the TRA
 - Church Street is targeted as becoming a main through road to link up to the Schulphoek Boulevard which is definitely going to increase traffic flow and unacceptable risk of disaster

1

DIRECTORS: V FARIA (CHAIRMAN), B PRETORIUS (VICE-CHAIRMAN), H VERSTER, N EBRAHIM, M LAWSON,
 B BROWN, M JAY, A SCHEUN, E VORSTER, J RIEKERT, H KLOPPERS
 REG. NO. 97/017908/08

TP
 15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

shopping and other social factors suggest that an additional access on Stil Street are a requirement.

- Intended Commercial Zone on corner of Stil and Church Street

At the Mayoral Committee meeting held on 26 February 2015 it was approved that 1 x Local Business (B3) erf be approved on unregistered Erf 1938.

- We state our OBJECTION to this intention in fear of lack of control of the provisional open ground leading to:

controlled or uncontrolled Spaza shops, taxi ranks, free trading areas, vagrants, sports fields, squatting or informal housing of any nature starting to take occupation of the site, loitering and accompanying site abuse, any and all types of other unwanted elements and abuse of the site that will negatively affect our complete residential zone. Business nodes were built by the Municipality on Swartdam Road – these not being used and being vandalized.

- We are willing to ACCEPT the proposal subject to:

- ❖ a written assurance being provided to Hermanus Beach Club declaring that, as affected property owners, we will be consulted about potential development plans before decisions are taken and be requested to provide preferred use recommendations for the site once it comes to development planning stages and thereafter provide documented information on the Municipal preferred development and a period to object to such a development if it is considered as having a potentially negative impact on affected residential areas;
- ❖ the site being enclosed with a fence of minimum 1 metre in height;
- ❖ the site being kept in 'n neat manner devoid of any alien shrubs or bush by council;
- ❖ the site not being used as a recreational area or provisional area for any function, facility or service;
- ❖ municipal acceptance that we as rate payers will be entitled to claim damage from the municipality for occurrences of infringement of the above terms if not acted upon immediately after the lodging of a complaint and that the affected Rate Payers Association (or another body as may be elected by the affected parties) may have the breaches rectified at the expense of the municipality should the municipality fail to rectify any breach within 3 days of notification thereof;
- ❖ a municipal officer will be nominated as the contact person to address any concerns of infringements related to the above terms and that an alternate is made available in his absence
- ❖ Council providing the above organisations with written guarantees that the site will be kept in adherence of all the elements referred to above

- Wall enclosure

The application dated 22 December 2015 requests that in keeping with prior approvals a 1,8 metre tall wall be erected around the TRA BEFORE occupation of any buildings.

Our understanding is that the proposed wall is going to be constructed of cement blocks and will be "bagged". We are comfortable with the proposed height.

- Housing Structure Development

Prior approval for the development states that both single and double-storey structures were approved. This application states that only single storey units will be constructed to ensure improved privacy of surrounding affected parties.

- ❖ council withdraws the previous approval for double storey structures to be erected so that once the TRA is completed, no subsequent approvals of double storey structures are catered for at any stage
 - ❖ the signed condition of sale and transfer documentation details clearly define this construction limitation
 - ❖ the title deed document reflect this limitation and that no subsequent alterations thereof be allowed
 - ❖ Council provides a contractual agreement to the executive of the affected parties as documented in this document of objection, committing to ensure that the construction limitations will not be altered in future
- TRA and subsequent site occupation requirements
It is advised that TWO families are to be placed per structure and two structures are to be semi-detached thereby making provision for four TRA families.
One of the largest risks that we are exposed to is the likelihood of occupant expansion on the TRA.
Is there any control in place regarding the number of occupants per family per unit? If not, this is a requirement. If there is a control mechanism, how will this be administered?
 - Stormwater connection
Is there any consideration by Council to make use of the Hermanus Beach Club storm water piping system to interlink with any other piping system now or in the future?
 - Other
 - How will the site will be kept clean?
 - Will regulations regarding noise be applied strictly?
 - How will informal trading anywhere along Church or Stil streets be prevented?
 - How will it be included that no shacks or any form of extension to the initial housing structure will be allowed?
 - How regularly will refuse be remove (within the development and on the exterior of the development) and what facilities will be provided to the residents to enable them to keep the living area clean (waste bins)?
 - Is there any contractually binding mechanism to manage the site according to rules and regulations as if it was a SR1 zoned property development (other than the transit occupational provision)?
 - What type of structure is the ablution facility to be provided during the TRA and what mechanisms are in place to ensure that the facilities are kept clean and in working order? Will this facility be strictly for only the legal and registered occupants of the dwellings?
 - What type of washing facilities will exist?

We look forward to your responses.

(per email)

M VAN DER WESTHUIZEN
COMPLEX MANAGER

Loretta Gillion - Transit site development

TR A J heart
C Holivier

From: Angela Heslop <angela_heslop44@gmail.com>
To: <nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za>
Date: 14/02/2016 01:18 PM
Subject: Transit site development
Cc: <smuller@overstrand.gov.za>, <rkuchar@overstrand.gov.za>

Planned Transit Site Development. Westcliff. Hermanus

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie,

I am a property owner in Westcliff, Hermanus. I understand the need to provide housing for people and believe that this is one of the municipality's priorities. I do however share the view as stated in the petition letter that the initial plans were drawn up in September 2014 for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take the route of a transit site instead.

It would seem to me that transit sites are demeaning, associated with refugees and may easily become an area of neglect where people are not valued. It is envisaged that the site will be a 5 year plan, time to deteriorate and become over populated leading to associated consequences. Surely the permanent structures can be built and then the people who qualify for them can be moved directly into the houses, and the areas in Zwelihle where they vacate from can then be upgraded?

I do think that the local residents must learn more about the thinking underpinning this plan.

Kind regards.

Angela Heslop

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "AHeslop".

Angela Heslop
 PO Box 149/ 10 Canterbury Street. Westcliff
 HERMANUS
 7200
 SOUTH AFRICA

Tel : 028 312 1663
 Mobile : 072 609 8655
 e-mail : aheslop@hermanus.co.za

| | |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| FILE NO: | Even 1938 + 2018 - ZW |
| SCAN NO: | 28 |
| COLLABORATOR NO: | 875996 |

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016