

## COMMENT ON THE DRAFT 217 SDF submitted to the CAPE AGULHAS MUNICIPALITY for the WAENHUIS ARNISTON RATE PAYERS ASSOCIATION (WARA).

(Note: "Waenhuiskranz Arniston" is shortened to "Arniston")

WARA would like to compliment the Planners on the Draft SDF, that in terms of more accurate assessments and realistic interventions is a considerable improvement on the 2012 SDF. The document covers issues of preservation of the environment and addressing issues raised in compliance with SPLUMA guidelines. The SDF indicates awareness that these primary concerns are not isolated from the retention and protection of desirable physical and economic environments that attract investment, tourism and ensure the wellbeing of all permanent residents. Of particular importance to WARA is the requirement to: "Promote predictability in the utilisation of land". This principle needs to be applied.

**What must be emphasised is the exceptionalism of Arniston's environment. Uniquely, in world terms primeval nature of exceptional beauty can be accessed directly from high quality hotel and urban environments. WARA expects future planning of Arniston to acknowledge and promote this.**

The cross-section of the CAM citizens straddle extremes in terms of wealth, opportunity and ease of access. With careful developmental constraints and guidance there should be an opportunity to enhance the wellbeing of all of the CAM residents.

- WARA wishes to thank the Planning team for the opportunity to discuss issues and the rational and considerate responses we received.

The following are issues of concern to WARA's membership.

### 1 POPULATIONS NUMBERS and SERVICES:

The important role of TOURISM, RECREATION AND HOLIDAY ACCOMMODATION is emphasised as the primary economic role of the CAM's coastal towns, and this is to be sustained, and developed further.

The draft SDF, as it is mandated to do, identifies areas for new population and other activity in all towns, attempting to meet criteria such as social re-integration, equity of access, work opportunities in favour of poorer communities. This meets SPLUMA and the Provincial SDF requirements.

However, CLAUSE 2.6.1 : **Population figures** supplied for each town are based on permanent residents only. It is common knowledge that the populations of the coastal towns multiply by orders of magnitude at peak periods..

This expansion of demand during peak period is estimated to be as much **as a factor of 10 times** the permanent populations.

**It is difficult to know how rational planning to cater for expansion of a town's housing, commerce and industry and beach and social facilities can be done without peak loading as the basis for action**

The issue is referred to under INFRASTRUCTURE on page 46/47, but the recommendations are at best vague and contradictory as regard coastal towns.

Yet, despite this, for example: Page 41/42, regarding **WATER** states : Currently, "All Towns have sufficient water sources, except for Struisbaai **owing to numerous residential developments and holiday makers**".

The impression is that the expansion of housing and visitors comes as a problem rather than the stated desirability for these developments.

"Water purification .....have adequate capacity..." "Potable water is problematic in Struisbaai and Agulhas".

- Sewage tanker services in Struisbaai likewise are said to barely cope with demand. .

On page 43 **ELECTRICAL** supply capacity to Arniston and Denel, at 60KVa, is described as barely adequate. It can be assumed that Denel's demand will be guaranteed, yet Eskom has no plans for increasing this supply any time soon.

Is any expansion of electrical demand at Arniston equitable to its owners, visitors and stake-holders ?

Provision of services is clearly not the Planners' responsibility. But the SDF can be structured to expose a **co-relation between peak demand services adequacy and future development**, and for the CAM to held to account for outages.

In the tables prioritising future development an additional column would flag any mismatch.

## 2 LOCATION OF FUTURE HOUSING.

The location of future housing, low income / low-coat housing has drawn strong reaction from WARA's members. We believe graphic illustrations in the Map are partly to blame.

Map, page 81 : two large areas designated "Assisted Housing". (This designation has been acknowledged in discussion as being non-existent). Nevertheless, implied, is housing for low-income owners across the two areas, though partly in the long term, juxtaposing two economic groups, without integrating them .

### North area (Site C)

200 houses earmarked in the Pipeline ; (MAP page 98 , Site C), is a considerable increase in the population of Arniston,. (if in the Pipe-line ? = time to plan services by 2025).

- On page 47 : SPLUMA requirements for location of low income housing should maximise services, access and economic prospects. Query : job prospects in Arniston for 200 households even by 2025 ?  
Potentially 600 extra children added to social services and school enrolment : Planning for this ?
- Creative Planning models might indicate 200 house units + **internal open green areas and allowance for social amenities**, (creche, additional clinic, etc..) can be possible, rather than simply extending the Self-bou model. A detail example of creative planning would allay a lot of resistance.

### Informal settlement

Informal settlement on the MAP page 81. There is no known or proven demand for this settlement. But isolated from all the town's communities, services and opportunities, we query need or viability.

### Area 2 : "Green belt"

The second area, erven 325 and 216, shown for Assisted Housing is currently Zoned as a "public open space", and is currently zoned as Public Open Space. It has also been suggested, (outside of the Draft SDF document), that some up-market plots could be accommodated off existing peripheral roads.

The past two SDF's have initially proposed this area be re-zoned for housing. On each occasion this has been challenged and agreement was reached by adjacent residents for the CAM to give an assurance that 325/216 would remain Public Open Space. This position for local residents has not altered.

(For lengthy Motivation please refer to a Submission to this Draft SDF by Peter Gird : "Re: Draft Spatial Development Plan: OBJECTION to proposed development of Erf 325 and Erf 216" dated 02 May 2017).

## **OPEN AREA : SITE 260. A greenfield site.**

While the 2012 SDF expanded potential development to include the whole of 262, this is, fortunately reversed in the draft SDF.

But it remains a concern that for a number of years, development on parts of this large, un-zoned and open and pristine area of land has been ear-marked for up-market plots in order to raise funds for the CAM

The Draft SDF MAP p.80, has a 'general' note: "Precinct Planning": (explained in discussion), as incremental development are envisaged. Open, natural space is retained, diversity of use includes **eco experience areas**. This concept is an economic approach to otherwise very expensive greenfield development.

The SDF also indicates a potential best and equitable use for this quality land could be a limited number of sites for **Lodge accommodation**. But CAM has designated an area for a double row strip of houses behind Harbour road housing. This, despite the unsuitable geography, that varies from a high, dune formation, (north end), to very low lying land, not well drained, land along the remainder. Adjacent residents have voiced very strong resistance to this particular development over a number of years.

But the core issue is that no overall study has been done to realise the intrinsic value of the flora and fauna that could lead to an entirely different and positive outcome for the land, than merely making piecemeal incremental developments to meet contingency financial problems.

- We believe a proper **bio-physical study** of this prime, natural land should be the first step in determining its future, to expand Arniston's **attraction as an eco-tourism destination**. Flora, fauna and bird life can be structured for many **job opportunities in maintenance and guiding**.

## **HARBOUR ROAD TRAFFIC to Roman beach**

Peak period traffic is becoming seriously disruptive. Roads and pedestrian lanes feed into Harbour road to the beach and beyond, and it has become a highly desirable **pedestrian friendly** route. At peak holiday periods, vehicle traffic, that now includes large busses, is becoming excessive and dangerous, while joggers and cyclists have increased. This is likely to worsen in future despite the beach facility development north of Kassiesbaai.

The SDF suggests a possible NEW ROAD **direct to the beach**. Starting from the Main Road, west of the Caravan Park, located south of the last house in Harbour road, it would lead directly to a **new parking facility** at the beach. (This will require a small servitude from Cape Nature)

While it could serve any identified Lodge sites, provide a spine for eco-activity along the way with parallel jogging / cyclist path, it is a long-term possibility that must be **conditioned by a full study of erf 260**.

- bearing in mind biodiversity opportunities are equal to any in the adjacent Cape Nature land, a **holistic assessment of erf 260**, should be done as a proper exercise before any planning.
- the need for and funding of infrastructure for new housing **plots must be justified and proven**.

## **OTHER PROBLEMS .**

A number of social problems that Arniston experiences, can and should be addressed in spatial terms, ideally by being planned to be incorporated into one Precinct :

- 1 A **Parking area for cars owned by Caravan Park** renters. Available parking is over-stretched, all over the Main road. This situation will become chaotic and detrimental when the shop and restaurant on erf 599 become operational.

- 2 A **POLICE** facility, discussed for years, is a necessity that all agree on. CRIME is an unfortunate fact of life for Arniston residents. Holiday-makers, often unaware of the danger, are particularly vulnerable. This is having a considerable effect on visitors. Large infusions of new housing brings people unknown to the locals, whose ability to monitor their community is diminished.
- 3 **RECREATIONAL FACILITIES** for young people has been a problem for many years. "Jolling" in the open land, near the beach houses disturbs the peace and creates unsociable waste; broken bottles etc.. During rainy periods boredom causes behavioural problems.
- 4 **POP-UP SHOPS:** The phenomena of sale of goods, hand-made or fresh produce, at seasonally opportune times, already featuring at the Munis Hall, has become characteristic of all Western Cape Towns. Again, these would be ideally located in the Central Place.
- 5 The **GRAVEYARD** is a long-neglected space, has Heritage status, contains much of Arniston's hidden social history. With a careful up-grade, and proper recognition, it could become an asset to the Town and its Owner, the Church, as well as provide seasonal jobs in guiding visitors.
- 6 A **CENTRAL PLACE** or identifiable, typical 'town' centre is suggested in the SDF. Areas in front of the hotel are important public space, but mostly designated to the hotel for parking and other functions. It is thus congested with parking and vehicle movement. Furthermore, the location does not relate to the whole town.

But, doubling as a **POINT OF ARRIVAL** to Arniston, a widened part of Main road, well paved with trees to create a piazza at its end. This urban element could coordinate all of the above inter-related requirements, para 1-6. This will have to be the subject of a Precinct Plan.

### **HARBOUR precinct**

The Harbours of Arniston and Struisbaai have been earmarked and funded by the National Government for up-grading. However, the CAM will have to take ownership, pay staff and maintain the harbour. Arniston will have a new freezer room for fish and the slip-way upgraded.

The Draft SDF indicates a detail Plan will be done for the Harbour precinct, including the Vishuis, and areas in front of the Hotel, though no design requirements are given.

We would like to anticipate that the Harbour up-grade and precinct :

- will be **visitor friendly** and provide for **sale of fresh fish** to the public by local fishermen.
- Will acknowledge the adjacent **Heritage** graded buildings of Kassiesbaai.
- Will acknowledge the significance and intended role of the finely designed **Vishuis**.

Further:

- We would like to see the sea wall, currently a stone "tip", properly built, in keeping with the quality of visitor accommodation.
- The steps at the front re-designed to quality standards,
- re-routing of the storm-water outfall away from the swimming beach.
- No further stone seat monuments.

Prepared for WARA Executive.

May 07 201