

- The identification and prioritisation of special places is a positive aspect to the proposals of the IDF which will provide guidance to subsequent plans emanating from the document.

2.4.3 The following table looks at each plan individually as depicted in part 4 of the IDF:

PLAN	COMMENT
Plan 14: Rooiels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2006 Overstrand SDF proposes a heritage overlay zone for the northern area Rooiels. Has this been reviewed, as it is not indicated on Plan 14.
Plan 15: Pringle Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial development is proposed within an area earmarked as "watercourse/wetland". This appears to be an environmentally sensitive area. It is stated that the industrial activity should be restricted to service and clean light industry, but it should also be made clear that the industry proposed should be compatible with the environmental sensitivity of the area. • It is encouraging to see the public open space network being prioritised and linkages being created.
Plan 16: Betty's Bay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A provincial heritage site as well as local heritage sites are identified on the 2006 Overstrand SDF and has not been identified on plan 16. • It is encouraging to see that open space corridor/linkages have been identified
Plan 17: Kleinmond	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open space linkages have been prioritised between the mountain/golf course and the estuary. However, any amenities that take place in the vicinity of the estuary should be done in consultation with the relevant Estuarine Forum. • Local heritage sites and a heritage overlay zone have been identified in the 2006 Overstrand SDF, however, they have not been earmarked in the IDF key actions and plan 17.
Plan 18: Arabella/Benguella Cove	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is clear that this area is rich in biodiversity and ecological functions. It must be ensured that any proposed development is done in a sensitive manner. It is expected that further unpacking of this area will be done in the SDF review and appropriate and comprehensive

	spatial planning proposals made.
Plan 19: Hawston/ Fisherhaven	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large portions of CBA's have identified on the plan. Any proposed development will have to be done in a manner that is sensitive to the environment. • Industrial development has been earmarked close to the CBA area. What type of industrial development is proposed here? • The urban edge is quite extensive and reflects the urban edge that was proposed in the 2006 Overstrand SDF. It would be useful to see what areas are to be designated for residential development and whether it is proportional to the housing demand or backlog. • A heritage overlay zone is proposed in the 2006 Overstrand SDF. Has this been taken into account with the compilation of the IDF?
Plan 20: Greater Hermanus (West)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The coastal setback line study should be taken into account as there might be possible planning implications. • This IDF proposal does not deviate from the 2006 Overstrand SDF.
Plan 21: Greater Hermanus (East)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This IDF proposal does not deviate much from the 2006 Overstrand SDF. • It is encouraging to see that open space linkages between the mountain and the urban environments have been prioritised.
Plan 22: Stanford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is encouraging to see that the urban edge has been reduced in comparison to the 2006 Overstrand SDF urban edge proposal. • Industrial activities have been earmarked adjacent to the area earmarked "rivers/wetlands". It should be specified that whatever industrial activities are proposed should be compatible and sensitive to these areas.

Plan 23: Gansbaai	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The urban edge indicated on this plan does not deviate from the 2006 Overstrand SDF. However, we maintain that the smallholding area which has been included inside the urban edge should be excluded. • It is noticed that the open space linkages have been reduced in comparison to the 2006 Overstrand SDF. Has this been reviewed and have the corridors been degraded to such an extent that they are no longer being considered? • The heritage overlay zones on plan 23 have been reduced significantly in comparison to the 2006 Overstrand SDF. What is the reasoning behind reducing the areas of heritage significance?
Plan 24: Pearly Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been noticed that the urban edge has expanded slightly in comparison to the 2006 Overstrand SDF proposals for Pearly Beach. Has the land been earmarked for something specific? • It is encouraging to see that "special places" have been prioritised in order to strengthen tourism opportunities.
Plans 25 – 27: Rural Settlements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would appear that there are no major proposals for these areas and maintaining the status quo is encouraged. Rural settlements have a unique sense of place and protecting the character of these settlements is imperative.

2.5 Part 5: Action Plans

2.5.1 This section of the IDF relates to the possible actions that could emanate from the IDF document. Many of these actions seem to already be in progress, however, some are identified as still to be investigated. It should be ensured that these actions be prioritised and in order for them to be acted upon, it must be ensured that they are aligned with the IDP so that they can find a place in the Municipal budget.

2.5.2 In terms of spatial planning and the actions prescribed under this section, it is noticed that many of the actions are to be done in terms of the current SDF which is dated 2006. The action plans do not indicate whether it is the municipality's intention in future to update the SDF and Overstrand Growth Management Strategy, 2010. It is advisable that these documents be updated. The 2011 census data may have provided additional information that might have an impact on the existing plans and may indicate that reviewing these documents might be necessary.