

Loretta Gillion - Nuwe lae koste behuising h/v Stil & Kerkstraat

TP - A Theart
C H Olivier

From: "Freddie Cronje" <jf.cronje@telkomsa.net>
To: <holivier@overstrand.gov.za>
Date: 14/02/2016 03:38 PM
Subject: Nuwe lae koste behuising h/v Stil & Kerkstraat



Beste Mnr. Olivier .

Ek verwys na bovermelde aangeleentheid en wil graag die volgende punte onder u aandag bring.

1. Ek wil u en die Munisipaliteit bedank dat met die ontwikkeling beding is:
 - i. Dat daar permanente strukture opgesit gaan word
 - ii. dat daar omheining om die gebied sal wees
 - iii. dat daar volledige infra struktuur voorsien word , alhoewel in die fase die huise nie van badkamers voorsien sal word nie, maar volgens die voorlegging daar voldoende toilet geriewe sal wees.

2. Ek wil ook graag die volgende punte van bekommernis aan u voorlê nl.:
 - i. Dat die persone nie weer uit die huise verwyder sal kan nie , veral as daar nie aan hulle huise voorsien gaan word nie , maar alleenlik gedienste erwe
 - ii. Dat die gevaar bestaan dat die inwoners tydelike strukture by die huise gaan oprig .
 - iii. Hoe die Munisipaliteit dit gaan polisieer om bogemelde te voorkom.
 - iv. Dat die toilet geriewe instand gehou gaan word
 - v. Dat die voorgestelde 1.8 meter muur te laag is om te verhoed dat die inwoners hulle rommel daaroor gou of hulle wasgoed daarop ophang soos nou die geval is met die huise op die h/v Stil en Swartdamweg.
 - vi. Dat daar nie spaza winkels sal opgerig word op die oopruimte vir besigheid toegelaat.
 - vii. Dat daar geen Taxi staanplek op die h/v Stil en Kerkstraat opgerig sal word nie.
 - viii. Hoe gaan lawaai beheer toegepas word.

By voordaank dank

Freddie Cronje
57 Rockland straat,
Westcliff
Hermanus
Sel no : 082 827 6529

FILE NO:	Even 1938 + 2018
	ZW
SCAN NO:	29
COLLABORATOR NO:	876000

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

TP- A- Theart
(Cholivier)



FILE NO:	Erven 1938 + 2018
SCAN NO:	2W
	30
COLLABORATOR NO:	876003

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

Manfred Klocke
68 Whale Rock Estate
Whale Close
Hermanus
7200

26 January 2016

Per Registered Mail

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Intended Low-cost Housing Development
Cnr. Still and Church Streets, Hermanus

For over 60 years our family has been owing property in Hermanus.

First in Voelklip and for the last 20 years at Whale Rock Estate.

On December 20, 2015 we had our Annual General Meeting at which stage I heard for the first time about the intention to create a Low-Cost Housing Development on the corner of Still and Church Streets.

To ensure that the correct facts were relayed to us during the AGM and to give you the opportunity to rectify any incorrectly relayed information, I herewith include some relevant items discussed during the meeting.

We were advised at our AGM that:

- A member of the Whale Rock Estate Executive (supported by other affected persons) initiated an information gathering meeting with the municipal executive regarding the proposed development.
- This meeting was the first formal exposure that any of the New Harbour Precinct residential owners (comprising Whale Rock Estate, Whale Bay Cascades and Hermanus Beach Club) had regarding the intended development.
 - Comment:
 - Note was taken at this informative meeting that a document had apparently been sent to someone at Hermanus Beach Club in response to a query a month or so prior to the meeting (August 2015).
 - This document was dispatched well after all municipal decisions on the development had been made and therefore afforded no one the opportunity of input.
- The following transpired at the informative meeting:
 - The informative meeting was opened and chaired by yourself.
 - As part of your opening address you stated that:
 - The Municipality was committed to the protection of our property values.
 - Nothing would be done that would negatively affect our property values.

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

- Reference was made to the intention to develop a commercial zone on the corner of Still and Church streets.

Regarding this:

- Concerns were raised that Spaza shops, taxi ranks, etc. could potentially be developed there.
- Assurances were given that nothing was planned as yet and that nothing would be done that could have an adverse effect on the area
- Statements were made that every effected owner would be consulted beforehand (hopefully not as per the housing development project)
- The Municipality planned a formal, SR1 zoned housing development on the site.
As an explanation it was stated that:
 - The intended development is planned as a government subsidised formal low-cost housing development.
 - The intention is to build both single and double storey units on the site.
 - Houses on the Church Street side would have the rear of the houses facing Church Street
 - A request was made that no double-storey units be constructed along Church Street
The mentioned request had apparently been agreed to by those present but nothing was documented or contracted in this regard and no supportive minutes of the meeting were issued.
- Site occupation was discussed and the following was recorded:
 - It is the intention to start off by constructing "shell structures" comprising either :
Provisional zinc structured housing
-or-
Shell structures of the intended semi-detached housing units.
 - The value of the "Shell Structures" will be in the region of R25,000 per unit
 - Each Shell Structure would initially house two families
 - Once constructed:
Temporary occupants would be located in these "shell structures"
Formal houses will then be built for the provisional dwellers at their ultimately intended relocation site
The provisional occupants will be relocated to their new houses on completion of construction
Other temporary occupants will then be housed in the "shell housing structures"
This "temporary housing provision" process would likely continue for a period of about *three years*
- Access road to Church Street:
 - Objection was raised to the intended access road from the intended development onto Church Street - The targeted location was intended to be positioned close to a "near blind" bend in the road and was considered as dangerous and totally unacceptable to the New Harbour Precinct members .
 - The executive was advised that this request would be "looked at".
 - Whether this was "looked at" or not is immaterial as the access road has been constructed without communication with any of our affected owner-members - This does not bode well for the commitment of "no negative impact on property values".
- Wall enclosure
 - An application was apparently made for the funding of a wall of minimum 1,8 metre in height to enclose the development.
 - The requested funding is to be supplied by provincial government

- It was advised that the funding had not as yet been approved
- It was clearly stated that there can be no guarantee that the wall will be constructed before the start of the development or even within the first year or before the end of the three year provisional housing project period or in fact ever.
- Property value safeguard
 - Throughout the meeting as well as in closing of the meeting those present were advised that the Municipality had considered all aspects of the development and that our interest as property owners will not be affected.

I have made a very material investment in my property and pay a substantial amount of rates and taxes on a monthly basis which you, our municipality, employ in the provision of services, not only to Whale Rock Estate but other areas of Hermanus as well, including that of the less fortunate communities in our region.

Over and above the rates and taxes, I pay a substantial monthly levy towards the upkeep and development of Whale Rock Estate to ensure the sustainability and investment growth of my property.

I am sure that given the above you will understand that it was with shock, disbelief and concern that I took note at our Annual General Meeting of the Municipality's intention to construct the referred to low-cost housing development without having afforded me the opportunity of raising objections or stating concerns or the gaining of prior assurances that the development will not disintegrate into an unsightly informal development site over time and destroy my property value.

This municipal-targeted development site is situated at the ONLY access road to our development and once developed has the potential to destroy the investment that I have made over the years. I accordingly feel aggrieved at the lack of direct communication with myself as an affected party.

I have always considered the Hermanus Administration as one that holds the interest of ALL of their citizens at heart and one that will not wittingly damage the property value of investors that have faithfully for years and years been contributing to the upkeep of Hermanus as a whole. I now I have raising concerns that my trust in the administration was ill founded.

There are many issues that were not addressed in the informative meeting, issues that require explanations and commitment to. I, and I am sure other members too, require more detail explanations on outstanding issues and more formal commitment to the protection of our property values and social environmental issues.

It concerns me that it appears as if the Overberg Municipality has taken it upon themselves to place my property value and potential for future growth at risk without even having consulted with me or any of the other property owners in Whale Rock Estate **at all**.

I am told that it is the Municipality's belief that the correct procedures were followed in the decision-making and execution process. In my view all of those processes are subservient to my constitutional rights:

- to be informed of intended issues that affect me;
- to submit my views and concerns on such issues;
- to be properly and extensively consulted before decisions are taken for me that are likely to have a very material impact on my property value and social well-being.

I well understand the need to provide housing for the less fortunate and have no issue with that. I do however insist that where such a development has the potential to materially affect my property value, safety and living standards that I have dearly paid for over a long period of time, it is only correct that my constitutional rights to consultation and notification be taken into consideration and properly complied with.

I, and I am sure other members too, are willing to assist in making the development a success but I need to be afforded the opportunity of consultation and objection before the project is progressed beyond the point of no alteration. Supportive cooperation becomes very difficult when issues such as the non-negotiable and non-acceptable placement of the access road to Church Street are forced upon me as a rate-paying member. How am I to rely on the acceptable implementation of possible non-acceptable issues if I am not afforded the opportunity of input and the gaining of contracted commitments or the opportunity of contributing towards the project in the effort to make it acceptable to all impacted and affected parties?

I appeal to you not to ignore my constitutional rights to participation and consultation on an issue that is likely to have a very material effect on the social conditions, investment value and marketability of my property. The positioning of the intended development site clearly serves as an exclusive gateway to my investment and whatever is planned for on this site as well as the way in which it is executed, maintained and how municipal rules and regulations are enforced over the years to come will without a doubt have a very real impact on many aspects of the development and therefore also on my property value.

When afforded the opportunity of negotiating a commonly acceptable settlement (not just notification of what the municipal decision is targeted at) I am convinced that all home owners will make a special effort to ensure that there are represented by members who will be able to act and commit on their behalf.

I request you to invite myself and the other owner-members of the New Harbour Precinct (Whale Rock Estate, Whale Bay Cascades and Hermanus Beach Club) to a consultative meeting wherein we are afforded the opportunity to discuss our concerns and recommendations and to negotiate an acceptable settlement structure should what you have in mind not be totally acceptable to us. Assuming one can resolve issues of concern then I for one am willing to assist in being supportive of the project as far as possible to the benefit of all parties.

I look forward to receiving your invitation to such a consultative meeting at your earliest convenience as I know that the project needs to be progressed as soon as possible.

Kindly respond by return mail or email to the following address:

Manfred Klocke
30 De Hoop Avenue
Tamboerskloof
8001

Tel No: 082-8310361
manfred@icon.co.za

With kind regards,
yours sincerely
Manfred Klock

TP - A Theart
CH Olivier

Loretta Gillion - Planned Transit Site Development at Stil Street, Westcliff, Hermanus

From: "Chris Micklethwaite" <chris_mick@onetel.com>
To: <nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za>
Date: 15/02/2016 11:42 AM
Subject: Planned Transit Site Development at Stil Street, Westcliff, Hermanus
Cc: <smuller@overstrand.gov.za>, <rkuchar@overstrand.gov.za>



The Mayor
 Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie
 P.O. Box 20
 Hermanus
 7200

FILE NO:	CI Micklethwaite
SCAN NO:	Even 1938 + 2016
COLLABORATOR NO:	31
	2W
	876004

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

I am a property owner in Westcliff and I reside at 6 Orothamnus Avenue. I have recently learned of the proposal to create a Transit Site on the corner of Stil and Church Streets and I am writing to summarise my objections and concerns about the proposed development.

- I believe that you, as Mayor, have made a commitment that nothing would be done that would negatively affect Westcliff's property values. But I fail to see that the proposed Transit Site – if it were to go ahead – could have anything but a negative impact on property values in the surrounding area. I object to the proposal for this reason.
- If the intention of the municipality is to allow a commercial zone on the corner of Stil and Church streets to be developed, then I would be concerned about the potential negative environmental impact of this if developed in a piecemeal fashion, without proper controls and regulation.
- 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 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

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

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 support this objection. The intended access position is close to a blind bend with viewing further restricted by an abalone farm wall. 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

- 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.

- Toilet and washing facilities

I request a written assurance from the Municipality that planned washing and toilet facilities will be fit for purpose, of a high standard, and will be kept clean on an everyday basis.

Lastly, I understand the need to provide housing for people and have no argument in principle with that. However, I do not understand why, after the initial plans were drawn up in September 2014 for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take the route this route of transit accommodation. Surely the permanent dwellings could be built and the people who qualify for them could be moved directly into the houses. The dwellings in Zwelihle, when they become vacant, could then be upgraded.

Please acknowledge receipt of my letter of objection.

Yours sincerely,

Christopher Micklethwaite

Ps. Please respond in writing to my given email address (see email header).

Loretta Gillion - Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

From: "Llewellyn Tiltmann" <llewellyntiltmann@lantic.net>
To: <nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za>
Date: 13/02/2016 05:31 PM
Subject: Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus



The Mayor
 Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie
 P.O. Box 20
 Hermanus

7200

Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za
 29 January 2016

*TP-ATheart
 CH Olivier*
 L. P. & M.A. Tiltmann
 84 Canterbury Street

FILE NO:	Westcliff Hermanus 7200
SCAN NO:	<i>2w</i>
COLLABORATOR NO:	<i>876005</i>

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 socially. I object to

TP

15 FEB 2016

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,

L & M Tiltmann

Ps. Please respond to the following address

L. P. & M.A. Tiltmann

P.O. Box 800

Hermanus

7200

Tel no: 028 3131858

Mobile: 083 3771729

Email: llewellyntiltmann@lantic.net

TP - A Theart
(Hollivier)

Loretta Gillion - FW: PROPOSED DEPARTURE OF DEVELOPMENT CONER STIL AND CHURCH STREETS HERMANUS

From: Eugene Botha <eugeneb@tyrecorporation.net>
To: "nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za" <nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za>, "...
Date: 15/02/2016 02:12 PM
Subject: FW: PROPOSED DEPARTURE OF DEVELOPMENT CONER STIL AND CHURCH STREETS HERMANUS
Attachments: Objections regarding proposed Transit Area on cnr Stil and ChurchStreets Hermanus.docx

Geagte me N. Botha-Guthrie

Na aanleiding van nuwe inligting aangaande die transito soos bo wat onder my aandag gekom het, wil ek graag die aangehegte besware terug trek.

Ek vertrou voorts dat u alle belanghebbenes soos myself op hoogte sal hou van enige verdere verwickelings, en sal dit waardeer indien ek as gekose voorsitter van Mariners Village geken sal word in gesprekvoering aangaande die Westcliff area.

Beste Groete – Eugene Botha

FILE NO: Eren 1938 E 2018-2w
SCAN NO: 37
COLLABORATOR NO: 876016

From: Eugene Botha
Sent: 15 February 2016 08:59 AM
To: 'acairns@overstrand.gov.za'
Subject: FW: PROPOSED DEPARTURE OF DEVELOPMENT CONER STIL AND CHURCH STREETS HERMANUS

Good morning

I have sent the attached letter to the mayor and asked for acknowledgement of the letter. I have not received any correspondence and can you please acknowledge receipt and inform us of the "mistake" on the dates, e.g. Friday the 15th??

Beste Groete – Eugene Botha

From: Eugene Botha
Sent: 12 February 2016 03:39 PM
To: 'nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za'
Subject: PROPOSED DEPARTURE OF DEVELOPMENT CONER STIL AND CHURCH STREETS HEP

Dear Me Botha-Guthrie

TP
15 FEB 2016

Attached please find our response on the proposed development in Westcliff, Hermanus.

Could you please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Beste Groete – *Eugene Botha*

DISCLAIMER: This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions presented are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Tyre Corporation (Pty) Ltd. If you are not the intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited.

The Mayor

Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie

P.O. Box 20

Hermanus

7200

Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za

11 February 2016

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

Introduction

I the undersigned, representing my wife, stand 10509 and myself, stand 10412 as owners at Mariners Village, would like to respond to council notice declaring the intention to construct a Transit Area on the corner of Church and Still Streets, Westcliff, Hermanus.

Application for departure – documented acknowledgements

The application for departure to erect a Temporary Relocate Area on corner Still and Church Street refers:

- *The application acknowledges the fact that care has to be taken with the planning and implementation of the proposed TRA, specifically so as the positioning is defined as being "Close to high income developments" and "located on the main entrance routes to the Hermanus Harbour".*
- *The application document further acknowledges the fact that the TRA development will have "impact on the surrounding properties".*
- *The application document further acknowledges the fact that the TRA development will "impact on the privacy of surrounding properties".*
- *The application is for a "Temporary Departure to use the site as a TRA"*

*Given the above stipulations in the application there can be no disputing the fact that approval of requested departures is going to result in a **very and material negative impact on all the deemed affected areas such as Whale Rock Estate, Whale Bay Cascades, Hermanus Beach Club, Mariners Village and surrounding Westcliff properties - no doubt with loss of capital value, safety of surroundings and current accepted social well-being status.***

You would be aware of the background of Mariners Village and how it came about and how it was advertised and marketed initially. At that early stage, Mariners Village was described as a "wonderful address" with views beautiful sea and mountain views in a safe and tranquil area. Since that time a lot has changed and the latest proposed departure from what was originally agreed on, leaves us as owners feeling totally deflated.

In fact, I can inform you that neither me, my wife and many other owners whom I have spoken to would not have invested in Mariners and then specifically in the Westcliff area had we all known about this and the previously approved low cost development, and now the departure of the originally agreed development. We, as do all and/or any of the other recorded Affected Parties act as contributing S.A. tax payers and rates and tax contributors in the Overstrand to enable the upkeep and development of Hermanus including areas such as the proposed Temporary Relocation Area.

It needs to be clear therefore that the only way that we, the Exco, can accommodate the request for departures is if we, as materially affected parties, are assured that the requested departures will be developed in such a way that it has absolutely no negative effect that could lead to loss of capital value, safety of surroundings and current accepted social well-being status. It is after all our tax monies that are to be used to provide these facilities and services!

With the aforesaid in mind and given the reports and feedback I have had from other affected parties, clear statements by the applicant that the affected parties have no option but to state that, and excuse the BOLD letters but we are quite serious about this issue;-

WE IN PRINCIPLE REJECT THE PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR DEPARTURE TO ERECT A TEMOPRATRY RELOCATION AREA ON ERF 1938, IN TOTAL.

That having been said and with an understanding that there is the need for housing in the area and given your very clear statement as mayor that you will not allow any development to take place if it should be done in such a manner whereby it negatively affects property values of near or surrounding properties and residential areas, we would also like to state the following, all be it somewhat "politically";-

As South Africans we have seen the disruption and protest in other areas in South Africa in similar situations, but ESPECIALLY here in the Western Cape, by not only affected dwellers but also from outside parties with questionable political agendas and ulterior motives from "Democratic Alliance-politically-opposed-parties" to capitalise on such sensitive and emotional situations. Should this happen in this case, even the very best intentions of the honourable Mayor may not be enough to reverse the situation.

During the very recent State of the Nation address we noticed how the ruling party could just change rules at a whim to suit their aims and disregard all objections by other political affiliations.

General Concerns and requirements

The extent of potential damage to our living & social well-being conditions, safety and property values being forced upon us by this proposed development (if not performed in consultation with us as Affected parties) by this undesired development and has made us, as two of the Affected Parties, acutely aware of the fact that there are other issues that could in future, if not planned at an acceptable level to the Affected Parties, result in similar, if not even more damaging prospects.

In light of this, we require of Council a written agreement that all of the Affected Parties will be consulted to ensure universal acceptance of proposal, if and when :

- *The intended Church Street extension to link with the Schulphoek road is planned. Clearly this forms a potential access path to Hermanus and the access route via this road will materially influence safety, social lifestyle and property values if unacceptably planned.*
- *We as Affected Parties herewith state our formal rejection of any road structure and route that could adversely affect us. We do not wish to encounter road routes that lead to situations such as the termed "Hell Run" of the N2 or the section of road just prior to the Grabouw turnoff or situations such as Nekkies in Knysna.*
- *We also ask for guarantees from the council that the standard of housing and rules and regulations are within the high levels set by neighbouring estates such as Mariners Village with a Body Corporate and strict Building Rules & Regulations, and sensible and appropriate House Rules.*
- *Walls and other safety measures such as control of movement of non-permanent residents and that the newly proposed development will not merely be an extension of the Zwelihle township.*
- *It is quite common in the low cost housing developments for new owners of such houses to allow other squatters to erect shabby and unsafe dwellings on their land, which in a short space of time has the end result of just another area of squalor and unruly inhabitants. We need guaranteed that the council will not allow this to happen*
- *We also have not been given clarity on what the development would look like in 5 years' time and at what prices these homes would be sold at. Surely this land is well positioned to add value to Westcliff;- but only if the council recognise that cheap and shabbily built homes are not acceptable for most of the South African citizens. I also believe it is up to us as tax paying citizens and responsible government to uplift the living standard, quality of life and pride of our people by aspiring to provide better and more convenient, safe accommodation.*

Mariners Village

As the Chairperson of Mariners Village and owner of property, you are aware that I am and always were optimistic that Mariners will become one of the prime residential areas in Hermanus and that it will also become one of the largest rates and tax contributors, PLUS it would add immensely to the revenue all businesses in the greater Hermanus and Overberg area.

Once all the properties are occupied, Mariners Village with a functioning retirement section and amenities, residents such as ourselves will provide employment to many people of the neighbouring areas and we trust that the council will take note that any negative impact on existing areas and owners which may damage the relationships between people in adjacent areas.

You will be aware of the new development of a Retirement Segment at Mariners Village, and this development with older and more vulnerable people will be most affected by any dwellings right next to them. Surely the safety and tranquillity of these senior citizens must be taken into consideration with any dubious area a stone throw away from them? As the most directly affected party, we believe that the council should take note of their responsibility to ensure the safety and harmonious living with our "neighbours" in that part of Hermanus.

We have recorded some of our objections and wish to state that we trust that you will record our concerns in conjunction with the concerns of all other affected parties, owners and developments, whom we agree with.

Lastly, South Africa can be the "rainbow nation" as Bishop Tutu labelled our wonderful country now many years ago. This dream will however only realise when we agree that we are not all the same, that all of us belong in South Africa, regardless of our race, religion or political affiliation and when we accept that all South Africans, even minorities, have the right to rebel against dictatorial legislation and bully tactics.

Yours in objection and with great anticipation that you will be guided to do the best for all affected parties.

Eugene Botha

E. E. Botha

Mariners Village

TP-A Theart
(H Olivier)



The Mayor

Mrs. Nicolette Botha-Guthrie

P.O. Box 20

Hermanus

7200

Email : nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za

11 February 2016

FILE NO:	Enven 1938 + 2016
SCAN NO:	34
COLLABORATOR NO:	876007

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

Introduction

I the undersigned, representing my wife, stand 10509 and myself, stand 10412 as owners at Mariners Village, would like to respond to council notice declaring the intention to construct a Transit Area on the corner of Church and Still Streets, Westcliff, Hermanus.

Application for departure – documented acknowledgements

The application for departure to erect a Temporary Relocate Area on corner Still and Church Street refers:

- The application acknowledges the fact that care has to be taken with the planning and implementation of the proposed TRA, specifically so as the positioning is defined as being "Close to high income developments" and "located on the main entrance routes to the Hermanus Harbour".
- The application document further acknowledges the fact that the TRA development will have "impact on the surrounding properties".
- The application document further acknowledges the fact that the TRA development will "impact on the privacy of surrounding properties".
- The application is for r a "Temporary Departure to use the site as a TRA"

Given the above stipulations in the application there can be no disputing the fact that approval of requested departures is going to result in a **very and material negative impact on all the deemed affected areas such as Whale Rock Estate, Whale Bay Cascades, Hermanus Beach Club, Mariners Village and surrounding Westcliff properties - no doubt with loss of capital value, safety of surroundings and current accepted social well-being status.**

TP

15 FEB 2016

15 FEB 2016

You would be aware of the background of Mariners Village and how it came about and how it was advertised and marketed initially. At that early stage, Mariners Village was described as a "wonderful address" with views beautiful sea and mountain views in a safe and tranquil area. Since that time a lot has changed and the latest proposed departure from what was originally agreed on, leaves us as owners feeling totally deflated.

In fact, I can inform you that neither me, my wife and many other owners whom I have spoken to would not have invested in Mariners and then specifically in the Westcliff area had we all known about this and the previously approved low cost development, and now the departure of the originally agreed development. We, as do all and/or any of the other recorded Affected Parties act as contributing S.A. tax payers and rates and tax contributors in the Overstrand to enable the upkeep and development of Hermanus including areas such as the proposed Temporary Relocation Area.

It needs to be clear therefore that the only way that we, the Exco, can accommodate the request for departures is if we, as materially affected parties, are assured that the requested departures will be developed in such a way that it has absolutely no negative effect that could lead to loss of capital value, safety of surroundings and current accepted social well-being status. It is after all our tax monies that are to be used to provide these facilities and services!

With the aforesaid in mind and given the reports and feedback I have had from other affected parties, clear statements by the applicant that the affected parties have no option but to state that, and excuse the BOLD letters but we are quite serious about this issue;-

WE IN PRINCIPLE REJECT THE PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR DEPARTURE TO ERECT A TEMOPRATRY RELOCATION AREA ON ERF 1938, IN TOTAL.

That having been said and with an understanding that there is the need for housing in the area and given your very clear statement as mayor that you will not allow any development to take place if it should be done in such a manner whereby it negatively affects property values of near or surrounding properties and residential areas, we would also like to state the following, all be it somewhat "politically";-

As South Africans we have seen the disruption and protest in other areas in South Africa in similar situations, but ESPECIALLY here in the Western Cape, by not only affected dwellers but also from outside parties with questionable political agendas and ulterior motives from "Democratic Alliance-politically-opposed-parties" to capitalise on such sensitive and emotional situations. Should this happen in this case, even the very best intentions of the honourable Mayor may not be enough to reverse the situation.

During the very recent State of the Nation address we noticed how the ruling party could just change rules at a whim to suit their aims and disregard all objections by other political affiliations.

General Concerns and requirements

The extent of potential damage to our living & social well-being conditions, safety and property values being forced upon us by this proposed development (if not performed in consultation with us as Affected parties) by this undesired development and has made us, as two of the Affected Parties, acutely aware of the fact that there are other issues that could in future, if not planned at an acceptable level to the Affected Parties, result in similar, if not even more damaging prospects.

In light of this, we require of Council a written agreement that all of the Affected Parties will be consulted to ensure universal acceptance of proposal, if and when :

- *The intended Church Street extension to link with the Schulphoek road is planned. Clearly this forms a potential access path to Hermanus and the access route via this road will materially influence safety, social lifestyle and property values if unacceptably planned.*
- *We as Affected Parties herewith state our formal rejection of any road structure and route that could adversely affect us. We do not wish to encounter road routes that lead to situations such as the termed "Hell Run" of the N2 or the section of road just prior to the Grabouw turnoff or situations such as Nekkies in Knysna.*
- *We also ask for guarantees from the council that the standard of housing and rules and regulations are within the high levels set by neighbouring estates such as Mariners Village with a Body Corporate and strict Building Rules & Regulations, and sensible and appropriate House Rules.*
- *Walls and other safety measures such as control of movement of non-permanent residents and that the newly proposed development will not merely be an extension of the Zwelihle township.*
- *It is quite common in the low cost housing developments for new owners of such houses to allow other squatters to erect shabby and unsafe dwellings on their land, which in a short space of time has the end result of just another area of squalor and unruly inhabitants. We need guaranteed that the council will not allow this to happen*
- *We also have not been given clarity on what the development would look like in 5 years' time and at what prices these homes would be sold at. Surely this land is well positioned to add value to Westcliff;- but only if the council recognise that cheap and shabbily built homes are not acceptable for most of the South African citizens. I also believe it is up to us as tax paying citizens and responsible government to uplift the living standard, quality of life and pride of our people by aspiring to provide better and more convenient, safe accommodation.*

Mariners Village

As the Chairperson of Mariners Village and owner of property, you are aware that I am and always were optimistic that Mariners will become one of the prime residential areas in Hermanus and that it will also become one of the largest rates and tax contributors, PLUS it would add immensely to the revenue all businesses in the greater Hermanus and Overberg area.