

Annexure 1: Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework

Public participation process and comment received

1. Appointment of consultants

As per letter dated 21 January 2008.

2. Meetings with officials from Bergrivier Municipality

Chief Town Planner/ Director: 14 January 2008; 08 February 2008, 16 April 2008, 30 May 2008, 13 June 2008; 29 July 2008;

Engineers: 10 April 2008;

Attended a Housing meeting: 23 June 2008;

Presentation to Mayoral Committee: 18 March 2008, 17 June 2008; 19 August 2008

3. Public participation

Notice of Intent

Advert placed in local newspapers: May and June;

Public meetings

01 April 2008	Piketberg;
02 April 2008	Porterville;
08 April 2008	Eendekuil;
09 April 2008	Redelinghuys;
10 April 2008	Aurora;
15 April 2008	Velldrif/ Dwarskersbos;
08 May 2008	Velldrif Farmers;
17 June 2008	Eendekuil;
17 June 2008	Porterville;
18 June 2008	Redelinghuys;
18 June 2008	Piketberg;
19 June 2008	Aurora;
19 June 2008	Velldrif Farmers;
19 June 2008	Velldrif/ Dwarskersbos

4. Meetings with Interested and Affected Parties

State Departments

Provincial Government Western Cape: 22 January 2008, 21 April 2008, 06 June 2008; 08 July 2008; 18 August 2008;

Cape Nature: 05 March 2008;

Department of Agriculture: 05 March 2008;

Department of Land Affairs: 26 May 2008;

CAPE/ Cape Nature/ SANBI: 05 May 2008;

Obtain comment on Draft Bergrivier Spatial development Framework: 23 June 2008

West Coast District Municipality

Mr N. Faassen: 10 April 2008;

State Agencies

SANRAL (Mr N. Brink): 01 April 2008;

Developers:

Urban Dynamics: 11 March 2008, 05 May 2008;

Arnold Bredenkamp: 17 January 2008;

Developers (De Plaat): 09 May 2008;

Developers (110/4 and Klipplaat): 23 June 2008

5. Public Participation: June 2008

Bergrivier Municipality/ Bergrivier Munisipaliteit

KENNISGEWING VAN PUBLIEKE DEELNAME PROSES NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

BERGRIVIER SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Hereby to inform all interested and affected parties and the public of the participation process to discuss the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework. Emphasis will be on the current strategic spatial issues confronting planning and development in the municipal area, being:

- The delineation of the urban edge;
- To determine spatial planning categories for the farms to the south of the Bergrivier (areas included in the municipal area after the re-demarcation); and
- To indicate the spatial implications of the Bergrivier Integrated Development Plan.

Specifics on the availability of the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework will be discussed at the meetings. Please call the Municipality for any enquiries. Contact details below.

Date/ Datum	Town/ Dorp	Place/ Plek	Tyd/ Time
17 June 2008; 17 Junie 2008	Eendekuil	Community Hall – Eendekuil - Gemeenskapsaal	16h00
17 June 2008; 17 Junie 2008	Porterville	Community Hall - Bettie Julies - Gemeenskapsaal	19h00
18 June 2008; 18 Junie 2008	Redelinghuys	Community Hall – Redelinghuys - Gemeenskapsaal	16h00
18 June 2008; 18 Junie 2008	Piketberg	Community Hall – Allan Boesak - Gemeenskapsaal	19h00
19 June 2008; 19 Junie 2008	Aurora	Community Hall – Aurora - Gemeenskapsaal	14h00
19 June 2008; 19 Junie 2008	Velddrif	Community Hall – Noordhoek - Gemeenskapsaal	19h00
Date/ Datum	Place/ Plek	Interested Parties/ Belangegroepes	Tyd/ Time
19 June 2008; 19 Junie 2008	Guestfarm - Kliphoek - Gasteplaas	Landowners – properties south of the Berg River; eiendomme suid van die Berg Rivier - Grondeienaars	16h30

BERGRIVIER RUIMTELIKE ONTWIKKELINGSRAAMWERK

Hiermee alle belangegroepes en die publiek in kennis te stel van die deelname proses om die Konsep Bergrivier Ruimtelike Ontwikkelingsraamwerk te bespreek. Die klem sal wees op bestaande strategiese ruimtelike aspekte wat beplanning en ontwikkeling binne die munisipale gebied beïnvloed, naamlik:

- Die bepaling van die stadsrand;
- Die bepaling van ruimtelike beplanningskategorieë vir die plase ten suide van die Bergrivier (gedeeltes wat ingesluit is in die munisipale gebied as gevolg van die herafbakening); en
- Die aanduiding van die ruimtelike implikasies van die Bergrivier Geïntegreerde Ontwikkelingsplan.

Inligting oor die beskikbaarheid van die Konsep Bergrivier Ruimtelike Ontwikkelingsraamwerk sal tydens die vergaderings bespreek word. Skakel gerus die Munisipaliteit vir verdere inligting. Kontakbesonderhede word hieronder voorsien.

Bergrivier Municipality/ Bergrivier Munisipaliteit
Section Town Planning/ Afdeling Stadsbeplanning
Mr W.Wagener/ Mr E. Howburg: Piketberg: 022-9131126

For additional information/ vir addisionele inligting: Rode & Genote	web page/ webtuiste
Telephone number/ Telefoon nommer: 0861 22 44 88	www.rode.co.za

G.W. Louw
Municipal Manager/ Munisipale Bestuurder

Town	Attendance
Eendekuil	1
Porterville	4
Redelinghuys	16
Piketberg	3
Aurora	3
Velldrif (Farmers)	13
Velldrif	12

The purpose of the meetings was to inform and consult with the public and I&APs on the progress and content of the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework. The Mayoral Committee of the Bergrivier Municipality, at a mayoral committee meeting on 17 June 2008, supported the Draft SDF in principle.

The meetings were characterized by a presentation with subsequent questions and answers. The main concerns expressed were the following:

- Lack of capital investment by the Municipality in the “isolated villages”;
- The restrictions on development imposed by the Municipality due to limited capacity of infrastructure; and
- The involvement of the Municipality in the SDF process.

The meeting at Velldrif raised certain issues that need mention, i.e.

- The legality of the public participation process conducted;
- The possibility of the Project Team influenced by developers;
- The concern that “infrastructure” was not considered as part of the formulation process; the shortage of water;
- The essential contribution of new investments to the rates base of the Municipality;
- The necessity for economic growth through focused investment;
- The concern of ecological deprivation in the demarcation of the urban edge;
- The applicable norm for the provision of open space in a town;
- The importance of linkages between Velldrif and the Saldanha area;
- The essence of maintaining a rural character within Velldrif;
- The “changed” circumstances of the past six years given the opinion by the consultant (as official at the West Coast District Municipality) on development south of the Berg River;
- That PGWC demand a “solid, uninterrupted and rigid urban edge rather than a soft edge;

- That the inclusion of sections of land on the southern side of the river within a soft edge, would allow the “developer” and / or property owner to proceed with the normal regulatory processes to obtain development rights;
- A concern on the average size of erven in Port Owen; and
- The reasons behind the inclusion of the riparian farms on the southern side of the Berg River into the Bergrivier municipal area.

Discussion around the issues raised occurred and it was mentioned that the Draft SDF would be made available from the 23rd of June 2008, for comment. Comment can either be sent to the Municipality or the consultant.

6. Interested and Affected Parties

A notice was placed in the media to invite the public to register until the end of February 2008, as an interested and affected party.

The Project Team also accommodated any organization or individual that wanted to register as an I&AP after the end of February.

INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES

Company	Name	Address	Contact Numbers	e-mail address	Notes
	Mr Robin Ellis	P.O.Box 614 Velddrif 7365	(c) 083 422 7690 (t) 022 783 0310	robrooi@telkomsa.net	Registered on 28/01/08 via fax
Vereniging van grondeienaars en belastingbetalers – Eendekuil	Mnr L Burger (sekretaris)	Posbus 14 Eendekuil 7335	(t) 022 942 1601 (f) 086 621 3209		Registerd via fax dated 14.02.08
Mnr HJ Coetzee	ID: 7412245177084	Posbus 789 Velddrif 7365	(t) 022 783 1686 (c) 082 339 2196		Bovenplaat Plaas Deel 115, Piketberg
Dian Muller			(c) 083 338 7922 (t) 022 784 0642	'dmuller@telkomsa.net'	Registered per fax – 22.02.08
Jan Viljoen			(c) 082 450 3441 (t) 022 784 0607		Registered per fax – 22.02.08
Trevor Payne			(c) 082 327 0759 (t) 022 784 0009		Registered per fax – 22.02.08
Albert en Jeanette Teubes	A E Teubes	Posbus 85 Hopefield 7355	(t) 022 723 0925 (c)083 760 6594 (f) 022 723 0925	jteubes@xsinet.co.za	Plaasnaam : Heuwelfontein Grootte : 1037 ha

Company	Name	Address	Contact Numbers	e-mail address	Notes
ROS Ontwikkelingskonsultante BK	Bertus Smit	Heritage Rylaan 18 Cape Heritage Somerset Wes 7130	(t) 021 851 6865 (c) 082 921 3199	rosbk@mweb.co.za	
Velddrif Bergrivier Bewaringsassosiasie	Voorsitter: Jurgen Kotze	Posbus 168 Velddrif 7365	(c) 082 393 4593	Louise.jacobs@telkomsa.net	Sekretaresse: Louise Jacobs
Dwarskersbos Boerderytrust	Theunis smit	Posbus 18 Dwarskersbos	(t) 022 784 0093 (c) 073 017 6734		
Dwarskersbos Landgoed Edms (Bpk)	Theunis Smit				
Van Dyk Stads en Streekbeplanners	Retha van Dyk	Posbus 414 Piketberg 7320	(t) 022 913 3189 (c) 082 880 5928	'vandyktrp@lantic.net'	
Weskus Boere Unie	B.C.Liebenberg (Voorsitter)	Posbus 99 Porterville 6810	(t) 022 931 2879	'liebenberg@patat.za.net'	
Kliphoek	Mnr JJP Kotze	Posbus 168 Velddrif 7359	(t) 022 783 0822 (c) 082 854 8828 (f) 022 783 0822	kliphoek@mweb.co.za	

Company	Name	Address	Contact Numbers	e-mail address	Notes
	Bowen Boshier	1 Dover Road Muizenberg 7945	(t) 021 788 6851	'Sally and Bowen'	
Environment & Science Writer Cape Argus	John Yeld	PO Box 56 CAPE TOWN 8000	(t) 021 488-4552 (f) 021 488-4793 (c) 082 853-4078	john.yeld@inl.co.za	
WESSA	Philippa Huntly	P O Box 30145 Tokai 7966	(t) 021 7011397	'Philippa Huntly'	
	Pat Titmuss		(t/f) 021 557 3748 (c) 083 701 4318	'pat@friendsofrietvlei.co.za'	
Erf 2530	Paul Botha	P.O Box 260 Porterville 6810	(t) 022- 931 3295 (f) 022- 931 2437 (c) 082-478 3538		
Paul Olden - URBAN DYNAMICS WESTERN CAPE	Debbie Kemp	PO Box 2445 BELLVILLE 7535	(t) 021 948 1545 (f) 021 948 1588	'Paul Olden'	Seaview Building No. 3 DJ Wood Way Bellville 7530
	Yntze Schrauwen.	PO Box 166, Velddrif 7365.	(c) 083 650 8888	yntze@telkomsa.net .	Registered on 29 May 2008
CBC Conservation Committee.	Dave Whitelaw (Chairman)			amsterdam@new.co.za	Registered on 12 June 2008

Company	Name	Address	Contact Numbers	e-mail address	Notes
	Frank Stuyck			stuyck@mweb.co.za	Registered on 13 June 2008
	Adam Kane-Smith		(t) 021 794 7061 (c) 082 824 9667 (f) 0866 77 1839 (f) 021 794 0534	adam@acmefundadvisors.com	Registered on 18 June 2008
	Anelia Coetzee	Posbus 488, Malmesbury 7299		springersbaai@telkomsa.net	Registered on 12 June 2008
	Jo-Marie Botes	35 Fairwinds, Eversdal, 7650		springersbaai@telkomsa.net	Registered on 12 June 2008
	Michelle Tiedt	Seeff Properties	(c) 072 299 3767 (t) 022 783 2123		Registered on 19 June 2008
	Marion Ward	Seeff Properties	(c) 072 228 2607 (t) 022 783 2123		Registered on 19 June 2008

7. Letters to various role players

The letter below (as well as a CD) was forwarded to the following State and Provincial Departments, namely:

- Provincial Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning: M Kedzieja; P. Hardcastle; S van der Merwe; J. Manuel; R. Massey (CDs);
- Provincial Department of Agriculture: J.Smit (CD);
- Cape Nature (CD)
- Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (CD);
- Heritage Western Cape (CD + hardcopy)
- Department of Transport and Public Works (CD).

Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (June 2008)

Dear Interested and Affected Party – State Departments/ Provincial Departments

Request for comment

All interested and affected parties are hereby given the opportunity to comment on the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (BSDF).

The Draft BSDF received, in principle, approval from the Mayoral Committee of the Bergrivier Municipality at a meeting held on 17 June 2008.

Attached to this letter is the following documentation:

- Cover page; and
- Source document.

The Draft BSDF and annexures are available on the webpage of Rode & Associates. An electronic copy of all documentation will also be provided, by mail, to the relevant authorities.

All comments can be referred to the Bergrivier Municipality on or before 25 July 2008.

Contact details

**Bergrivier Municipality/ Bergrivier Munisipaliteit
Section Town Planning/ Afdeling Stadsbeplanning
Mr W.Wagener/ Mr E. Howburg: Piketberg: 022-9131126**

The Municipal Manager
Bergrivier Municipality
P.O.Box 60
Piketberg
7320

For additional information/ vir addisionele inligting: **Rode & Genote** web page/
webtuiste
Telephone number/ Telefoon nommer: **0861 22 44 88** www.rode.co.za

Yours faithfully

.....
Berchtwald Rode
23 June 2008

The letter below was electronically forwarded to the following interested and affected parties (owners of properties to the south of the Berg River):

'langriet@new.co.za'; 'ottenfam@yebo.co.za'; 'cmai@theboatshed.co.za';
'androtredoux@telkomsa.net'; 'swart@vredebest.co.za';
'hathersage@cybersmart.co.za'; 'annekevh@telkomsa.net';
'jacob@cerebos.co.za'; 'piketbergogb@telkomsa.net';
'kuifkop@telkomsa.net'; 'lancaleng@gmail.com';
'gerharddiane@adept.co.za'; 'kruispad@xsinet.co.za';

'johanm@mkb.co.za'; 'theunis@mkb.co.za'; 'info@kersefontein.co.za';
 'swart@vredetest.co.za'; 'cmai@theboatshed.co.za';
 'paul@fmoncull.co.za'; 'callie@cssonline.co.za'; 'kliphoek@mweb.co.za';
 'teubes@xsinet.co.za'

Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (June 2008)

Dear Interested and Affected Party

Request for comment

All interested and affected parties are hereby given the opportunity to comment on the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (BSDF).

The Draft BSDF received, in principle, approval from the Mayoral Committee of the Bergrivier Municipality at a meeting held on 17 June 2008.

Attached to this letter is the following documentation:

- Cover page;
- Source document; and
- Annexure 6.

The Draft BSDF and annexures are available on the webpage of Rode & Associates. The map that contains the spatial planning categories is in annexure 13 (see map X). A hard copy of all documentation will be provided on request.

All comments can be referred to the Bergrivier Municipality on or before 25 July 2008.

Contact details

**Bergrivier Municipality/ Bergrivier Munisipaliteit
 Section Town Planning/ Afdeling Stadsbeplanning
 Mr W.Wagener/ Mr E. Howburg: Piketberg: 022-9131126**

The Municipal Manager
 Bergrivier Municipality
 P.O.Box 60
 Piketberg
 7320

For additional information/ vir addisionele inligting: **Rode & Genote** web page/
webtuiste
 Telephone number/ Telefoon nommer: **0861 22 44 88** www.rode.co.za

Yours faithfully

.....
 Berchtwald Rode
 23 June 2008

The owners of properties that could not be reached by using email were provided with a CD of the draft SDF.

The following letter was forwarded to all interested and affected parties as stipulated in the list as described in point 6.

<p>Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework - June 2008 -</p> <p>Dear Interested and Affected Party</p>	
<p>Request for comment</p>	
<p>All interested and affected parties are hereby given the opportunity to comment on the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (BSDF).</p> <p>The Draft BSDF received, in principle, approval from the Mayoral Committee of the Bergrivier Municipality at a meeting held on 17 June 2008.</p> <p>Attached to this letter is the following documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover page; and • Source document. <p>The Draft BSDF and annexures are available on the webpage of Rode & Associates. A hard copy of all documentation will be provided on request.</p> <p>All comments can be referred to the Bergrivier Municipality on or before 25 July 2008.</p>	
<p>Contact details</p>	
<p>Bergrivier Municipality/ Bergrivier Munisipaliteit Section Town Planning/ Afdeling Stadsbeplanning Mr W.Wagener/ Mr E. Howburg: Piketberg: 022-9131126 – wagenerw@bergmun.org.za</p> <p>The Municipal Manager Bergrivier Municipality P.O.Box 60 Piketberg 7320</p>	
<p>For additional information/ vir addisionele inligting: Rode & Genote webtuiste</p>	<p>web page/</p>
<p>Telephone number/ Telefoon nommer: 0861 22 44 88</p>	<p>www.rode.co.za</p>
<p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>..... Berchtwald Rode 23 June 2008</p>	

8. Meetings subsequent to the approval of the Draft Bergrivier Spatail Development Framework

- 23 June 2008 – a meeting with the Bergrivier Municipality to discuss the proposals with regard to low-cost housing;

- 23 June 2008 – a meeting with owners of properties “outside” the proposed urban edge that have already submitted a rezoning application to the Municipality; and
- 08 July 2008 – a meeting with two officials (J.Manuel and R.Massey) from PGWC on the environmental aspects of the Draft BSDF.

Public comment on the Draft Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (BSDF): August 2008

Comment period: from 23 June 2008 until 25 July 2008. Not all responses were received within the time allowed.


Comment was received from the following interested and affected parties, namely

1. Robin Ellis: Town and Coastal Planner
2. Yntze Schrauwen Consultants
3. Margeret Matzener
4. Jan Truter: Assoc. Van Dyk TRP
5. Cape Nature
6. Bowen Boshier
7. Mr K and Ms P Titmuss (27 July 2008)
8. Jo MacRobert Attorney and Associates (on behalf of the Eland’s Bay Environmental and Development Action Group; “EBEDAG”)
9. Bergrivier Belastingbetalers Vereniging
10. Urban Dynamics Western Cape Town and Regional Planners

The comment is summarised thematically together with a concise response.

Commentator	Description
BSDF status	
Jan Truter	The SDF exceeds the original brief but cannot replace the 2002 SDF; concern as to the “treatment” of the document by the Council;
Response	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following is an extract from the BSDF (2008): “This initiative does not comprehend as outcome a fully fledged broad-based Spatial Development Framework as most prominently promoted in the Local Government Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) but rather a more issue-orientated approach to address strategic spatial planning elements that require immediate consideration (page 2)”. “This Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework (BSDF) focuses on the urban environment and for completeness only, includes some of the original content of the old version that specifically relates to the rural spatial component that literary falls outside the scope of the appointment (page 2)”. • The consultant team proposed to the Client that the study be completed under a different title as an SDF; this was also discussed with the PGWC; • The consultant team advocated throughout the process that the Council will approve the BSDF (2008) i.t.o. the Local Government Municipal Systems Act, 2000 (Act 32 of 2000) and PGWC would probably consider the document i.t.o. the Land Use Planning Ordinance, 1985 (Ord. 15 of 1985). 	
Public Participation	
Yntze Schrauwen	Questions the approval of the document by the Mayoral Committee “when the public participation process was still active”; State that the document was not available, as advertised, in April 2008;

	State that the consultant did not inform all I&APs that attended the meeting on 22 April; Indicate that the public participation process was “flawed and unacceptable”;
Margeret Matzener	Insufficient public participation;
Jan Truter	The public participation process was announced as covering the three key issues and thus compromises the eventual outcome as far as public input is concerned; The participation of 52 people in the second round of public participation process is too little; Has the Municipality tried “everything possible to get the community involved”;
K and P Titmuss	Suggest that a simpler version be provided for more residents to understand That the public process was flawed due to – restricted information, discrepancy between information provided, not all I&AP’s informed of meetings How and when would the public comment received be dealt with? Was the document approved before public participation was held?
Bergrivier Belastingbetalers Vereniging	That all I&AP’s as registered (not only with regard to this intervention) at the municipality should have been informed
Response (to public participation since June 2008) – see Annexure 1 for information regarding the process before June 2008	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following sentence in the Planning Brief directed the extent of public participation: “I&AP participation should take note of budget restraints and the fact that the result of this study will give effect to various activities that will necessitate participation and communication. New innovative ways to allow for participation and communication should be forthcoming albeit on a small and cost effective scale”; • The tender document of Rode & Associates included consultation with ward committees, the IDP Representative Forum and individual landowners (the latter refers to landowners of properties on the southern side of the Berg River); in the absence of functional committees, the service provider conducted two rounds of public participation that constituted 14 open meetings with I&APs and the general public; • All I&APs that registered with either the consultant or with the Municipality, as well as all those that registered after the deadline of February 2008, were included on a list of I&APs; • All I&APs, as registered, were informed and invited to all public interactions that were part of the formulation process; • An advert to inform the public about the second round of public participation executed in June, was placed in the printed media; • The Draft BSDF received, in principle, approval from the Bergrivier Mayoral Committee on 17 June 2008; • The second round of public participation constituted 7 meetings with affected communities and started on 17 June 2008; the period for comment and the availability of the draft document was discussed at each of the public meetings; • The draft document was placed in the library and / or municipal office in each of the towns; • The draft BSDF was either emailed to or an electronic copy provided via mail to all I&APs that included the landowners of properties on the southern side of the Berg River as well as identified departments; the cover letter that accompanied the CD indicated that the complete version of the draft BSDF was available on the website (www.rode.co.za) and that a hard copy of the document would be provided on request; 	
BSDF proposals	
Robin Ellis	Support proposed northern “hard” urban edge for Velddrif; Support the extension of the “soft” urban edge at De Plaat as the eastern urban edge; Support development on the southern banks of the river and the “soft” urban edge; also the establishment of another nucleus on the southern bank; Support the “contribution“ of the proposed developments on the urban function; Support the economic significance of the proposed developments (included in the urban edge) as “bold forward planning”;
Yntze Schrauwen	Question the legitimacy of the “new concept of a soft-boundary Urban Edge based on a new Score Card System” Argue that the amount of vacant erven does not warrant “to extend the urban edge at this stage of Velddrif’s development”;

Margeret Matzener	Inadequate consideration of “open erven” in Piketberg; The proposal of gap housing on cemetery grounds is questioned;
Jan Truter	The reference in Chapter 4 to the 2002 SDF is “not enough”; should be “completed”; It is difficult to “follow the document’s motivation for the specific alignment for the urban edges around each town”; The proposal of the proposed development of mid value housing on erf 354 is not supported;
Bowen Boshier	That the adding of De Plaat and Flaminke Vlei as well as expanding Dwarskersbos along the coast “will however set a precedent for further expansion, potentially destroy the natural environment and the sense of place” and compromise or facilitate negatives for the area Support the sentence that specify that “any proposal to accommodate urban-related activities on the southern side of the river should be subjected to thorough environmental research and investigation” – with a concern that this was not done “BEFORE finalizing the BSDF”
Bergrivier Belastingbetalers Vereniging	Support the proposal that a density of 25 du / ha is not feasible
Urban Dynamics	<p>BSDF “has adequately considered the dynamic equilibrium which exists between political, social, built and natural environmental elements for each urban area”; the spatial interventions described in the Draft BSDF will have the potential to not only sustain economic growth but to significantly increase the growth over a 5 – 10 year planning horizon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comment on the proposal of a “soft” edge: favour a “solid uninterrupted rigid urban edge line” as a level of certainty; propose a revised urban edge boundary to the soft edge as proposed in the Draft BSDF as a more conservative boundary;  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Comment on the identification of urban edge informants in Velddrif A number of natural environmental informants is relevant to the proposed urban edge demarcation; “elements in the environment which offers the most defensible buffers and growth boundaries should be used as a natural mechanism to delineate urban edges”; in this context it is deemed that “the urban edge should represent an identifiable line in the landscape i.e. a cadastral boundary or natural feature”; proposes a Stewardship Conservation Programme; question the eastern boundary at De Plaat as proposed in the BSDF – Comment on the limited future spatial expansion of Dwarskersbos

	<p>Considers the expansion of Dwarskersbos as “too expensive in scale and particularly inappropriate as future growth should be focused in Velddrif” A couple of alternative development proposals for Flaminke Vlei are discussed and it is mentioned that the development proposal is currently in the Scoping Phase i.t.o. the NEMA legislation</p>
Response	
<p>The concept of a “soft” urban edge was developed not to foreclose any land-use opportunity, be it conservation, development or even rehabilitation but to create a “window of possibility” that needs to be evaluated at a lower level of planning that includes “further site-specific research and investigation”. Until the completion of site-specific research and investigations, the “soft” urban edge is a migrating line and does not represent a cadastral boundary or a natural feature but incorporates an area on which the most appropriate land-use is still to be considered for its likely impact on the urban structure and function. These parcels of land should be the subject of consideration within a 5 to 10 year planning horizon.</p> <p>The possible conflict between a mid value housing development on erf 354 (Piketberg) and local heritage, cultural and open space concerns, is acknowledged, with amendments to the proposal in the draft BSDF accordingly</p>	
General urban structure	
Robin Ellis	<p>Described the historic development trend of Velddrif and surrounds; Refer to the nodal and linear development patterns that were created over time; also the “recent” development of Noordhoek and Port Owen; emphasise the continued development of nodes according to own characteristics; Propose an extended eastern “hard” urban edge up to the railway line;</p>
Margeret Matzener	<p>The “municipal ground across the N7” should have been looked at; Should have included the “present dump site” with alternative use after closure as well as the commonage, the reserves of PPC Quarry and the Winkelshoek property;</p>
Jan Truter	<p>The possible influence of land-use along the N7 on the urban structure needs to be assessed – in line with the approach of planning as a result of strategy rather than circumstance;</p>
Response	
<p>In the delineation of the urban edge all relevant informants were considered in order to provide the Municipality with a product that would be scientifically sound and locally accepted and in agreement with the appointment.</p>	
Concerns/ Suggestions	
Robin Ellis	<p>Take special cognisance of the environment in developments at De Plaat and Flaminke Vlei; Suggest the eastern urban edge to coincide with the railway line;</p>
Margeret Matzener	<p>Failure to explore opportunities for Tourism; Failure to look at the deterioration and utilization of certain areas; Failure to consider the lack of facilities for Steynville and on top of the mountain; Failure to consider the transport problems;</p>
Jan Truter	<p>The SDF does not consider the heritage or tourism nodes in Piketberg; The “sense of place” as defined in the SDF creates a negative perception of the inherent attributes of Piketberg; The SDF does not address the spatial consequences of the proposed N7 upgrade; The SDF should propose a desired “end state” for Piketberg’s urban structure; The “urban precincts of Steynville and Piketberg” should have been addressed to ensure spatial integration; Too little focus on the impact of the N7 on the urban development patterns of Piketberg; The SDF should have provided guidelines for the re-alignment of public spending priorities; The SDF indicates that the numbers on the housing waiting-list for Piketberg exceeds those for Velddrif which begs the question why spending on infrastructure focuses on Velddrif rather than Piketberg; The SDF does not elaborate on development proposals for the 500 ha commonage owned by the Municipality; A general lack of proposals to Council to pro-actively guide the market to undertake densification;</p>

	<p>Questions the proposal and shape of the proposed soft urban edge to the east of Velddrif; Include the to-be decommissioned solid waste dump in Piketberg in the urban edge;</p>
Cape Nature	<p>Concerned “that the biodiversity value of the Berg River has not been adequately highlighted”; Propose that the Fine Scale Biodiversity Plans “serve as the primary spatial biodiversity informant guiding proactive conservation action and directing land-use planning”; Concerned “with the mixed message that the report gives regarding urban edges (i.e. these are suggested to be both soft and hard)”; Concerned “with some of the proposed extensions of the urban edge where development applications are underway”; this does not imply prior approval “to all the necessary assessments being undertaken and authorisation granted”; Concerned about setting a precedent “for example, allowing development on the southern bank of the Berg River could open the floodgates for further development applications in the area, which would not be desirable”;</p>
Bowen Boshier	<p>The SDF “contains contradictions in that it points to the importance and value of the natural environment, but then concludes that expanding the urban edge to allow for proposed developments, at the expense of the natural areas is justifiable”; Considers the conclusions and proposals at the end of each Chapter and makes suggestions accordingly; Further investigation necessary regarding inter alia nodes and corridors; Concerned that the development of Flaminke Vlei and De Plaat would create further nodes; Suggest that “if Dwarskersbos is to be expanded, it should be inland from the coast”; Make the following suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Economic contribution of the fynbos – How much actual and ongoing employment is generated by the “holiday housing; also the use of “outside labour” – That a study should be completed to consider ongoing destruction of the natural vegetation in the coastal area – Ask the recommendations of the “West Coast Biosphere” – That the SDF should include a SEA, and – That the rehabilitation of the Cerebos Salt Mine should be as a bird sanctuary – That the BSDF define certain terms. <p>Suggestions w.r.t. decisions by the Council</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Consider the importance of the biosphere – Benefit to the area will come about through the formation of a nature reserve – Increase “the monthly rates” on undeveloped erven – Consider developing a central plaza for Velddrif – Develop “old age homes in the main town area” – Do not destroy the sense of place as it is hard to recreate – Protect the natural water systems through buffer zones (1 – 4 km) <p>Protect the scenic value of the area “Be cautious of developing for development’s sake”</p>
Mr K and Ms P Titmuss	<p>Concerned that the disclaimer to the document creates the impression that the “document is being hurriedly and partially done to accommodate some pressure by developers” Questions the listing of the natural and physical environment in the document Ask when studies such as a SEA and Environmental Mangement Framework would be undertaken No reference to the West Coast Integraed Environmental Programme No mention of issues such as the impact of sea-level rise, climate change etc Also consider the economic impact to the Municipality in instances of floods, etc as well as the cost to the Municipality should development on the southern side of the river “go wrong” Suggest that the BSDF “cannot be finalized, nor accepted by the Bergrivier</p>

	Municipal Council, nor Province, until such time as detailed environmental information is added to the study and the public is properly and comprehensively informed and given an opportunity to comment on ALL documentation”.
Jo MacRobert Attorney and Associates	Agree “that ecologically sensitive tourism opportunities in these coastal towns should be developed, but strongly disagree that increasing urban sprawl will promote tourism Object to the expansion of the urban edge in Velddrif and Dwarskersbos
Bergrivier Belastingbetalers Vereniging	That the appointment to formulate the BSDF excludes an Environmental Impact Study; also that there is no provision in the 2008/2009 budget for this situation to be rectified The terms of reference for the BSDF was deficient
Urban Dynamics	That the following benefits can be derived from “the inclusion of the area south of the Berg River within the demarcated edge boundary” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Rehabilitate and re-use the Cerebos Salt Works (a brownfields site) – Establish a world class aquaculture facility – Address the supply side of tourism along the R27 and R 399 tourism routes – Address the fragmented town structure

Response

The Bergrivier Spatial Development Framework is to be a proposal of spatial guidelines to take effect within the municipal area in order to direct future spatial interventions as a result of growth, development and policy and to reduce developmental disparities (page 6). In the context of the BSDF (2008) it needs to be understood that certain restrainers i.e. the terms of reference, restricted the development of present-day spatial guidelines to merely “address strategic spatial planning elements that require immediate consideration” (see page 2 of BSDF).

The challenge was for the BSDF to create a position of compromise albeit still within the legal framework and relevant policy, but where certain spatial interventions (within the scope of appointment) can be considered as contributing positively to the broader strategic development path and municipal goals. This dilemma would necessitate progressive thinking beyond the obvious or “prescribed” and particularly within a spatial context with regard to land-use management (page 7). The municipal goals and objectives were articulated so as to inform spatial proposals with the subsequent guidelines limited to cover only the three “strategic spatial planning elements that require immediate consideration”.

All in all, planning of the future spatial order in the Bergrivier municipal area necessitates a focused approach where actions (decisions) are taken in response to strategy rather than an incremental approach where actions (decisions) are taken in response to circumstances. The delineation of the urban edge occurred within a strategic approach where the preferred urban edge was considered to manufacture a certain urban environment cognisant of regional and local circumstances, trends and occurrences as well as local perception and sentiment.

The planning process of the BSDF did include the consideration of various informants, such as the biophysical, natural, economic, social, built and political environments but did not include specialist planning outputs regarding inter alia the natural environment in the form of a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The delineation of an urban edge must also be subject to the consideration of ecological sensitivities incorporated into the process through discussions with Cape Nature and the interpretation, analysis and use of data i.e. ENPAT, RAVA and Fine Scale Biodiversity Planning Data.

Furthermore, the set of criteria used in the evaluation model incorporated a judgement of local informants in the measurement of the desirability of land on the urban structure and function.

As part of the appointment the consultant team was under no obligation to provide the Municipality with rural development plans, an integrated transport plan, a tourism strategy, urban development guidelines, precinct plans, growth management strategies, site development plans and heritage / landscape management plans. In the process to identify strategic vacant land for infill development opportunities all available information was considered as well as information and data surveyed and assembled by the consultant team.

Throughout the study it is stated that the consideration of a land-use change on any property is subject to the normal legislative processes. The concept of a “soft edge” was created to facilitate further site-

specific research and investigation that should include Environmental Impact Assessments. Environmental informants were considered but only at a scale that is not comparable to the level of an environmental impact assessment as required by the National Environmental Management Act, 117 of 1998. In addition the assessment of environmental indicators (informed by the fine scale biodiversity program) at local level was also considered in the determination of the spatial planning categories for the farms south of the Berg River” (page 32).

Annexure 8 and Chapter 1 (Section 1.2) address the components of an SDF that was not part of the Terms of Reference for the appointment to review the Bergrivier SDF.

Minutes of meetings with PGWC

Minutes of meeting held on 21 April 2008

Meeting between PGWC (DEADP), Bergrivier Municipality, Provincial Department of Agriculture and Project Team.

Present – M Kedzieja (chair), S van der Merwe, L de Klerk, J Manuel, R Massey, A Julies, A van der Merwe, P Hardcastle, G Gerber, Jan Smit, A de Kock (consultant), W Wagener, B Rode (consultant).

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 January was accepted.

Issues mentioned:

- Chairman concerned about official representation from Bergrivier Municipality;
- Mr Gerber asked for attendance by Provincial Dept. Local Government and Housing;
- Additional items
 - Situation with applications outside urban edge;
 - Mr Manuel mentioned a possible meeting between the project team, himself and SANBI/ CAPE/ Cape Nature to discuss issues with regard to the Fine Scale Biodiversity Data;
 - Chairman raised a concern about land reform and the inclusion thereof in the SDF;
- Mr Rode did a Power Point Presentation on mainly the factual situation within the Bergrivier municipal area.
- Discussion took place around the legal status of the SDF – it was mentioned that it should be approved in terms of both the MSA (by the local authority) and by PGWC in terms of LUPO (Section 4.4; 4.6);
- Chairman mentioned the nature of an SDF is to provide “the window towards the Municipality”; He also referred to the new planning paradigm;
- Mr Gerber discussed the provision of municipal services - infrastructure - (cost/ capacity/ distance);

- Mr Hardcastle mentioned the urban / rural linkages with specific reference to Piket-bo-Berg and Porterville mountains;
- It was mentioned that a SDF should be formulated within a framework that is socially and economically justifiable with no compromise on environmental integrity;
- Mr Hardcastle explained that for urban expansion there should be a need and a desirability;
- The issues of climate change and drought was mentioned as relevant to the formulation of spatial proposals;
- Mr Smit highlighted a concern of depleting resources because of some developments;
- Mr Manuel mentioned a roadshow the following day in Piketberg w.r.t. the CBA's;
- Mr De Klerk suggested to add to the definition of a SDF the fact that it should be aligned to higher order policy and stated further the interaction between towns;
- Me. Julies complemented the presentation;
- Me. Massey reiterated that fine scale biodiversity planning exist for the Bergrivier municipal area;
- Mr van der Merwe mentioned that the importance of the GIS as part of a SDF; that a meeting between the respective consultants for this project and the Saldanha Bay SDF and PGWC should take place to discuss the GIS.

The next meeting was to be held at the end of May 2008.

Meeting adjourned at 13h00.

Minutes of the meeting between the consultant team, PGWC and an official from the Bergrivier Municipality, as held on 6 June 2008

PGWC:

- MR M Kedzieja (chairperson);
- Ms A Julius
- Mr J Manuel
- Mr L De Klerk

Consultant Team:

- Mr E Rode
- Mr B Rode
- Ms A De Kock

Bergrivier Municipality

- Mr E Howburg

Apologies: Mr W Wagener, The Mayor, Ms R Massey, Ms S van der Merwe, Prof Thomas and Ms Z Els.

1. Matters arising

The issues of need and desirability as mentioned at the previous meeting were discussed.

- It was mentioned that the concepts of need and desirability would be placed in the NEMA legislation with subsequent definitions;
- The emphasis is on a development application to prove the need and desirability, if outside an urban edge;
- All applications should be in line with a “credible” SDF;

2. Items on agenda

- i. Ms Julius needs a progress report in order to transfer the remaining funds to the Municipality;
- ii. There was discussion on a questionnaire regarding credible IDPs to be provided to the consultant to complete;
- iii. The chairperson asked about xenophobia as the “topic of the week” and possible displaced people; with the response from Mr Howburg that there were no reported incidents in the municipal area; The chairperson mentioned that there should be “inventive measures” forthcoming from the SDF in the event of a repeat of this unfortunate situation;
- iv. Mr B Rode then continued with a power-point presentation;
- v. There was more discussion of the national target to protect biodiversity features that can be met in ~28% of the municipal landscape; that CBAs represent the most efficient (least hungry) configuration of these features, in a design that is sensible at a landscape level. Although areas in the landscape may “look the same” or even constitute the same vegetation type (with the same ecosystem status), it is important to realise that CBAs strive to meet multiple biodiversity targets in the same areas in order to be as efficient as possible.
- vi. It was mentioned that the SPCs would determine site-specific development guidelines;
- vii. The chairperson remarked that the integrity of the SDF should not compromise on national targets; it is proposed that a meeting be held between Ms R Massey, Mr J Manuel and the consultant team to discuss the integration of the CBAs and Fine Scale Biodiversity Planning into the SDF proposals;
- viii. The issue of the non-availability of the meta data was raised by the consultant team;
- ix. The chairperson requested that the following issues be dealt with in more detail
 - a. the relationship between the local economic growth rate, as determined, and the national rate;
 - b. the merit to extend the urban edge to include an area south of the Berg River in relation to the PPSDF and local structural features; and
 - c. local sentiment on the extended urban edge to the south of the river;

The meeting adjourned at 12h00.

Minutes of the meeting between the consultant team, PGWC and an official from the Bergrivier Municipality, as held on 18 August 2008

PGWC:

- Mr M Kedzieja (chairperson);
- Ms A Julius
- Mr G Gerber
- Mr P Hardcastle
- Ms L Engel

Consultant Team:

- Mr E Rode
- Mr B Rode
- Ms A de Kock
- Prof W Thomas
- Ms Z Els

Bergrivier Municipality

- Mr W Wagener

The minutes of the meeting held on 06 June 2008, were accepted as a true reflection;

1. Matters arising

None

2. Items on agenda

- Mr B Rode made a power-point presentation;
- The chairperson questioned the connectivity between the BSDF and the Housing Master Plan;
- Response from Mr Wagener and Mr Rode allayed fears that there might be contradictions or non-integration; the Housing Plan has been considered once it became available in June 2008; an SDF proposal is to not allow any further residential development to the south of Monte Bertha (Porterville); the Housing Master Plan indicates this to be the preferred direction for development; the before mentioned issue will be discussed at the Mayoral Committee meeting on 19 August via a presentation to the Committee by Mr Rode;
- Mr Hardcastle emphasised the sensitivity of coastal development and indicated that detailed planning and investigation is necessary to consider development in the coastal area; he requested that the SDF should accommodate government objectives regarding, particularly, coastal development;
- Mr Rode responded in that the SDF targets a specific level of planning and that the terms of reference of the consultant team excluded the proposal of spatial development guidelines for the coastal area outside the urban edge; this implies that the area between Laaiplek and Dwarskersbos, as a sensitive coastal area under pressure of development, was considered only w.r.t. the immediate surrounds of Dwarskersbos and Laaiplek. He mentioned that other studies have made some proposals in that regard;
- The chairperson discussed the planning approach for development to benefit the affected community as a whole;

- Prof Thomas warned against mechanically absolute boundaries as urban edges; he mentioned that one needs to consider the long-term sustainable development of Dwarskersbos and plan accordingly to allow and direct investment; he suggested the inclusion of capital contributions from developers;
- Mr Wagener questioned the scope of legislation as a medium to negotiate contributions; he mentioned that the IDP identified that there is a need for business expansion at Dwarskersbos; he also highlighted that there is no labour force at Dwarskersbos with labourers travelling from amongst others Velddrif;
- Mr Hardcastle said that the proposed urban edge for Dwarskersbos should include less coastal area and facilitate inland development;
- The chairperson acknowledged their accountability for the failure of past planning models with planners to “think afresh” on what is appropriate planning; “i.e. we should be driving battery-operated cars by now”; he also mentioned that compaction rests heavily on the landscape;
- Mr E Rode highlighted that there are severe differences between the make-up of a place like Velddrif and the South Peninsula area that needs to be considered in the delineation of the urban edge; he mentioned that the unique selling points of each town need to be identified and articulated;
- Mr Hardcastle mentioned that he is in principle not in support of an extended urban edge to the south of the Berg River and eastwards along the river; he posed the question of whether the development proposals presented by these interventions would be sustainable; he cautioned on the possibility of no or minimum trickle-down effect of supposed advantages to the community and environment at large;
- The chairperson mentioned that the development on the southern side of the river represents a third-generation transformation that needs further unpacking; he acknowledge the existence of the “soft edge”; he also mentioned that any rehabilitation in accordance with the mining plan would jeopardise avifauna;
- The chairperson asked whether the Bergrivier municipal councillors grasp the meaning and intent of the urban edge; he acknowledged that the process kick-started with everybody on board;
- Mr B Rode replied that he had two previous engagements with the Mayoral Committee and that he is uncertain about internal communication and reporting linkages to top management and councillors;
- Mr Wagener replied that councillors do not necessarily understand the full extent of an urban edge and that the perception exists that PGWC intrudes in the autonomy of the local authority;
- Procedural steps to be taken
 1. it is acknowledged that the brief does not represent a fully-fledged SDF but that certain priority issues can be “ticked” off as an review of the SDF 2002;
 2. Mr B Rode mentioned that he is to present the amended draft BSDF to the Mayoral Committee on 19 August 2008; the amendments are as a result of the public comment and today’s meeting;
 3. Mr Wagener mentioned the possibility of different opinions from Council to the SDF proposal w.r.t. the extension of the urban edge to include land to the south of Monte Bertha for housing;

4. Mr B Rode mentioned that with the approval of the Mayoral Committee the SDF would be provided to PGWC for consideration i.t.o. LUPO;
 - The chairperson stated that he gives recognition to the consultant team for the attempts made to ensure broad-based participation; that he would still propose that the consultant team complete the gap-analysis w.r.t. outstanding elements of the BSDF;
 - The chairperson also mentioned that the inherent characteristics of erf 354 , Piketberg be acknowledged and flagged for further research and consideration;
 - Mr B Rode mentioned that Ms Z Els would be available on request from PGWC to partake in a co-ordinating meeting w.r.t. the GIS;

The meeting adjourned at 13h00.