

Urban Dynamics:

COMMENTS ON IDF AND EMF:

Hermanus West:

Plan 20:

The Sandbaai N4 on plan: The blue business colouring for business is not in line the Growth Management Strategy.

The N4 – No description of community.

Sandbaai Meent adjacent to Habonim was rezoned for school (Currio) and residential.

Mount Pleasant: east of the Dandbaai Industrial is Authority and a cemetery.

Hermanus East:

Why only certain beaches mentioned?

Plan 21

Magnetic observatory includes the hospital?

Industrial, circus grounds has been rezoned to industrial

CBD: The blue coulering above Boiling Point along the coast, blue?

Sportsgrounds, school and Church, blue?

Caravan Park must refer to De Mond as well

Urban Edge above R43, which includes Lake View must follow cadastral, more towards the mountain.

EMF:

General: The footnotes are excessive.

Copying of legislation, why not essential aspects or reference.

Figure 5: Could the figure be more up to standard.

Table 4: Why include if outside Overstrand jurisdiction area?

4.2.10: Why summarized the Heritage Study?

P 47: The example Parma, why the extensive explanation

P50: Vision quoted the same as IDF?

P51: 5.3.2 -: the PSDF is under review. The Draft Rural.. (2009) is a draft since 2009. Is it really relevant?

P61: ENV 4 -point (d) under Policies: The must be removed and rather say should. Except where legislation clearly indicates the responsibility to the Municipality, the word must is not applicable. Ensure that this is throughout the document.

P62: ENV5 -PSDF under review, objectives may change.

P64: ENV 6 (a), (b): Why?

(d): No- it is a draft-if some of the underlying principles is relevant, why typed the whole document-reference

P66: (f) Please note that a strict urban edge has never prevented urban sprawl.

P68: Should SDP not read SDF

(b) Who is funding this exercise?

(d) Impossible –to expensive for the poor and low cost housing

(e) same

ENV10: Policies:

(b) Why the whole explanation and not referenced

(c) Again must- the reference documents is still White Papers

(d) No. KBRMP is for a specific area and cannot be generic to the whole coastline.

(e) Ecological setback line not possible, there is already a development setback line. This will only lead to confusion.

Under policies is the ICM Act, LUPO and Water Act – are the legislative requirements and not the PSDF

P75: (l) Who is responsible?

P81: The setback line does not prohibit. There will not be a coastal scheme, but an overlay. This is under discussion, so please write in such a manner as to the more than one option is possible.

P87 Table 11 Core 1:

Commercial activities are prevalent in all National, Provincial parks, which is not a resort, botanical gardens etc., which is not resorts. Address as to why the Overstrand must have such a restriction not applicable to National, Provincial and Sanbi etc.

Core 2: Services be allowed with approval of relevant legislation. Essential services are more important than the physical environment and this aspect be re-looked.

P92 –p118: Summarized versions of Overstrand Policies, plans etc. Why the state the obvious and rather address where there may be shortfalls of environmental concerns that needs to be addressed.