

1056

The Overstrand is committed to serve the interests of the people in the Overstrand in a free and fair way.

Regards

Ald / Rdhr Nicolette Botha-Guthrie

Executive Mayor / Uitvoerende Burgemeester
Overstrand Municipality/Munisipaliteit

T: + 27 (0) 28 313 8058 | F: + 27 (0) 28 313 8067

E: nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za

Overstrand Municipality

A: 1 Magnolia Street, Hermanus, 7200 | P: P.O Box 20, Hermanus, 7200

T: +27 (0) 313 8000 | F: +27 (0) 312 1894

E: enquiries@overstrand.gov.za | W: www.overstrand.gov.za

Vision Statement: " To be a centre of excellence for the community "

Disclaimer: This e-mail (including attachments) is subject to the disclaimer published at:
<http://www.overstrand.gov.za> .

Please read the disclaimer before opening any attachment or taking any other action in terms of this e-mail.

1057

By replying to this e-mail or opening any attachment you agree to be bound by the provisions of the disclaimer.

P Please consider the environment before printing this correspondence.

>>> "Magical Mystery Tours" < info@magicalmysterytours.co.za > 2016/02/01 04:31 PM >>>

>

Mrs Botha-Guthrie

Mr Steve Müller

Mr R Kuchar

Loretta Gillion - TRANSIT CAMP WESTCLIFF



From: <rinanel@hermanus.co.za>
To: <nbotha-guthrie@overstrand.gov.za>, <smuller@overstrand.gov.za>, <rk...>
Date: 09/02/2016 05:48 PM
Subject: TRANSIT CAMP WESTCLIFF
Cc: "Rina NEL" <rinanel@hermanus.co.za>

FILE NO:
SCAN NO: Even 1938+2018
37 2W
COLLABORATOR NO:
875036

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

MRS RINA H NEL,
86 CANTERBURY
STREET HERMANUS
7200
Cell: 072 903 9577
rinanel@hermanus.co.za

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

TP

12 FEB 2016

13 FEB 2016

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 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.

1061

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,

R H NEL

Ps. Please respond to the following address

R H NELP
86 CANTERBURY STREET
WESTCLIFF
HERMANUS.
7200
Tel no: 072 903 9577
rinanel@hermanus.co.za

TR-A Theat (Holidays)
1062

P.O. Box 74



WILDERNESS

6560

14.02.2016

THE DIRECTOR

INFRA STRUCTURE & PLANNING
HERMANUS

FAX 028-3132093

DEAR SIR

UNREGISTERED ERF 1938
ZWELITHE - PROPOSED
DEPARTURES.

YOUR LETTER DATED 14.1.16
HAS REFERENCE.

I AM THE OWNER OF
ERF 10493 MARINERS
VILLAGE, CHURCH ST, HERMANUS
AND WISH TO COMMENT
ON THE ABOVE DEPARTURES
AS FOLLOWS.

WHILE AT THIS POINT I DO
NOT HAVE ANY OBJECTION

FILE NO:	Even 1938+2018
SCAN NO:	2W
	35
COLLABORATOR NO:	875026

12 FEB 2016

Z
1063

TO WHAT IS PROPOSED
IT IS IMPERATIVE THE
DEVELOPER AND COUNCIL
GIVE SERIOUS THOUGHT
AND ATTENTION TO BOTH
THE OVERALL AESTHETICS AND
LANDSCAPING OF THE AREA
SO THAT AT THE END OF
THE DAY WHATEVER IS
DONE IS PLEASING TO THE
EYE FOR EVERYONE.

IN THE PAST OVER THE
YEARS VERY LITTLE REAL
ATTENTION HAS BEEN PAID
TO THE FOREGOING IN
DEVELOPMENTS AS ZWELIKE
SO IT IS NOW TIME TO
TRY AND MAKE ALL TOWNSHIPS
PRETTY FOR BOTH RESIDENTS
AND THE PUBLIC IN
GENERAL.

IT MAY EVEN BE AN
IDEA TO SOMEHOW GET
THE RESIDENTS OF THE

2
1064

AREA COMING UP WITH
IDEAS FOR THE DEVELOPER
AND COUNCIL TO FOLLOW?

I WOULD ALSO APPEND TO
THE DEVELOPER TO ENSURE
ALL ANY STREET BOUNDARY
WALLS ARE DESIGNED AND
CONSTRUCTED SO AS ALSO TO
BE PLEASING TO PASSERS
BY AND BE AN ASSET
TO THE SUBURB.

IT CAN BE DONE!

YOURS FAITHFULLY

KF Cameron

KF Cameron

4
1065P.S. PLANNING OF HOUSE

I HAVE ALSO LOOKED OVER THE PROPOSED PLAN OF THE 2 BEDROOM HOUSE AS DESIGNED BY OSCAR SCHMIDT (HIS DRG NO. 2018 DATED DEC 2015) AND I WOULD STRONGLY PROPOSE THAT THE ENTRANCE DOOR NEXT TO THE BATHROOM ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE HOUSE BE SET BACK ABOUT A METRE OR SO TO CREATE A TYPE OF ENTRANCE PORCH TO THE HOUSE IMPROVING THE AESTHETICS.

SURELY THE ACCESS DOOR ON THE WEST ELEVATION SHOULD BE ON THE NORTH ELEVATION RATHER THAN OPENING INTO A ONE METRE SIDE CANE.

Norma Cameron

FILE NO:	Even 1938 & 2018
SCAN NO:	2W
COLLABORATOR NO:	875059

1066



Rene Picard
Gordon Byrne

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

TP- A Theart
(H Olivier)

Address Line 45
Rocklands Road
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

TP 12 FEB 2016

12 FEB 2016

1067

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

1068

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.

1069

- 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 in September 2014 (information gained from Mrs G Bucker, 106 Canterbury Street) for permanent built housing, the Municipality wants to take this route. 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 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,

Your signature here Rene Picard & Gordon Byrne

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

Ps. Please respond to the following address

Rene Picard & Gordon Byrne

45 Rocklands Road

Westcliff

Hermanus

7200

Tel no: 028 312 1494

Email address if relevant

FILE NO:	1070
Even 1938 & 2018	
SCAN NO:	ZW
40	
COLLABORATOR NO:	875056



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

TP A Theart
 CH Olivier)

HH & SE HANEKOM
 Your address here
 19 STRANDSTREET
 PO BOX 487
 Hermanus

Dear Mrs. Botha-Guthrie

Planned Transit Site Development, Westcliff, Hermanus

I am a property owner in Westcliffe, Hermanus.

I have just been informed of the intention to create a Transit Site on the corner of Still 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 14th 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 residence in the affected surrounding 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 West Cliff'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

TP 12 FEB 2016

101 1010

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 Still 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. This 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 remove 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 house is eventually transferred to the eventual owners and that till 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 or more immediate families and family members that apparently planned for (two families per unit comprising ONLY actual family members.. not friends and extended family members of any sorts)
- 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 positioned is close to a blind bend with viewing further restricted by an Abalone wall and is a disaster in waiting. Few of the intended residents have transport and even one access road to the site should surely be sufficient

1072

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 an unacceptable risk 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 the 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 metre 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 unless a wall is constructed BEFORE a single occupant is placed on the development site.

- 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 dwelling.

I need a written commitment from the Municipality which states that the washing facilitates 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.

1073

- 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 but 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 wiliness to place your commitment to ensure our safety and property values in writing.

Yours in objection,

HH HANEKOM

Ps. Please respond to the following address

HH & SE HANEKOM
19 STRANDSTREET
WESTCLIFF
POBOX 487
HERMANUS
7200

Tel no: 028 3124 717

Tel no: 082 8921 107

1074

FILE NO: Even 1938+2018
 SCAN NO: 48
 COLLABORATOR NO: 874495



Mr & Mrs A Mortimore

23 Windsor Crescent
 Westcliff
 Hermanus 7200

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

*TR A Theart
 (H Olivier)*

Email : nbotha.guthrie@overstrand.gov.za
 2nd February 2016

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

10 FEB 2016 *TR*

10 FEB 2016

1075

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