

## OBJECTIONS COMMENTS OR REPRESENTATION – AMENDED 01/08/2017

In objection to: PROPOSED SUBDIVISION AND REZONING ERF 13372 CONSTANTIA AT WESTLAKE  
APPLICATION NUMBER / CASE ID **70268371**

### ERF No: 13372

Description and physical address:

Steenberg Road Westlake

Full name of objector/commenter:

Glynis Coetzee (Estate Manager) on behalf of Stonehurst Mountain Estate Owners Association

PO BOX 30124 TOKAI 7966

ERF No: 170322

### CONTACT DETAILS

Email address: estateman@stonehurstmountainestate.org

Cell number: 086 1106 394

Postal address: PO BOX 30124 TOKAI 7966

Reason for interest: HOA of Stonehurst Mountain Estate (Representative) and affected party

### OBJECTIONS (including but not limited to):

- This siting of this utility on this land will further divorce the various sectors of the Westlake communities from each other in the abhorrent 'apartheid' tradition of using utilities to provide 'buffer zones' between economically disparate sections of a community.
- We contend that these type of utility facilities attracts activity from the unemployed and displaced persons looking for work and materials gathered for scrap. This will increase the risk for the local community and potentially introduce a criminal element into the area.
- We do not believe that this development is at all sensitive to the economic, social and environmental needs of the greater Westlake Community, and the area would be better suited to provide opportunities to Westlake Village.
- A further objection related to the environmental impact and the rights of **protection of economic activity** is that the Oude Raapkraal bee farm, will be severely adversely affected by this utility activity in such close proximity
  - Bees are highly sensitive to noise, light and pollution and there is a potential that the hives will relocate if there are any significant changes to their current surrounding 24 hours of operation and noise levels.
  - If this occurs Oude Raapkraal will lose their income, and their services are vital to the provision of pollinating services in the Western Cape farming community.
- The proposal does not adequately address issues of site security and how this would be addressed (with fencing etc)

- **Steenberg Road is designated by Province as a “Scenic Route” and as such we believe that this electrical depot is a highly unsuitable use of the land and will destroy the ‘scenic’ nature of this area. Please see the images included below which is an example of the appearance of the current depot on Muizenberg.**

## **OBJECTIONS TO SPECIFICS IN PROPOSAL**

In consideration, of the proposal submitted by Elco Property Development (attached), we contest certain of the details which are used to provide motivation for the application, as set out below:

1. Clause 5.5 omits the high residential land use and private open spaces to the South, immediately bordering on Cape Nature Reserve.
  - 1.1. Land use South of Steenberg Road should not be considered in applications for use of land North of Steenberg Road as this is considered a buffer zone to the light industrial / business usage North
  - 1.2. The precincts of land use are quite distinct from one another in that there are no large areas with extensive mixed use. This property will in effect have multiple land use in a relatively small area
2. Please note there is no Clause 6.2 in the proposal
3. Clause 6.3 denotes Objective 2 of Western Cape Spatial Development Framework of “human development programs” – *This is not the case as this is not an additional depot with the implied increase in manpower and job creation but is merely a relocation of existing facilities and we therefore contest that the Objective 2 can be used as a motivation as this need is already being satisfied elsewhere.*
4. Clause 6.4 is contradictory in that by placing a utility in this position the valuable agricultural land and ‘green space’ buffer is lost.
  - 4.1. Since this is located immediately adjacent to a high income high value residential facility, with limited access due to residential traffic flow, the contention that this meets the “fair and equal access to public facilities” is false
  - 4.2. Similarly, the redressing of imbalances consideration would only have an impact during the build phase, as this is not a new additional facility.
  - 4.3. Also, as the services in this area currently meet the needs of the adjacent community, we contest the view that the new investment is in fact being directed to the area of greatest need.
  - 4.4. This installation would also **not** meet the directive of the framework that the facility should sited in such a way that minimum damage is done to the natural and urban development.
5. Clause 6.5 cites Spatial Development Principles as to “Improve urban efficiency and align planned growth with infrastructure provision”, but the proposal makes no mention of where this need arises and which community would benefit from such infrastructure provision.

~~6. Clause 7.2 describes the proposed erven and portion sizes, but this does not correlate with the sizes indicated on the site plan provided (attached) – for example erf 13372 Remainder is shown in the document as 13935m<sup>2</sup> and on the drawings indicated as 13535m<sup>2</sup>, Portion 1 in the document is indicated at 7886m<sup>2</sup> and on the drawing as 7620m<sup>2</sup>~~

7. Clause 7.2 indicates uses as (among others) :

7.1. Docking Stations – please provide detail of this use

7.2. Truck Port – we object to this in relation to and objection to the traffic load and contamination of the ground water by fuel etc, which will be detailed later

7.3. Store Rooms – as these are likely to store high value material, we object on the basis of the potential for increased crime in the area, since the area has experienced historical increased criminal trends particularly related to cable theft (Navy Base as a case in point), opportunistic crime related to scrap metal and the like

7.3.1. We also object to the stores and “Oil Trailer” (please clarify this use) on the basis of increasing the potentially flammable particularly as the immediate area is considered a ‘Red Fire Zone”

7.3.2. and watercourse contaminants, as well as being highly environmentally sensitive to water course contamination (note the Stonehurst Mountain Estate approvals were stringent with regard to environmental management pertaining to water courses)

7.4. Workshops – we object on the basis that this is likely to increase the ambient noise level, adjacent to resident properties and topography suggest that the noise pollution will travel up the hill to the residential properties.



7.5. There is no mention of waste / recycling skips typical of such utility facilities (see attached photos from the current Muizenberg Depot) – we believe that full disclosure has not been made regarding all the potential installations

7.6. Clause 8.2 refers to a new traffic circle. This is erroneous as there is an existing traffic circle, and the drawing is not accurate for Westlake Drive, as it does not show the middle reservation extending down to the traffic intersection with Steenberg Road. The submitted diagram is therefore misrepresentative of the existing condition

7.6.1. We strongly object to the road configuration leading into the proposed service road for a number of reasons:

- 7.6.1.1. It appears that the construction of this service road will mean that mature trees would have to be removed
- 7.6.1.2. The configuration where the service road exits into the circle is highly unusual and we contend that large utility vehicles will not be able to negotiate this and would require a large bell mouth
- 7.6.1.3. This circle is already under significant traffic load in peak times, with domestic traffic, and we contend additional load by utility vehicles would compound the congestion
- 7.6.1.4. The configuration is also such that we contend it will increase the danger of accidents due to limited sight lines and the abovementioned congestion
- 7.6.1.5. The Estate has already requested traffic calming measures to be considered on the East West section of Westlake Drive from Boyes Drive to this existing circle as a result of excessive speeding in this 60km/hour zone (see attached correspondence)
- 7.6.1.6. There is a dedicated bicycle lane which traverses this circle, along Westlake Drive which has high usage by cyclist both for recreation and commuting, and we contend that additional utility vehicle usage of this roadway would pose a significant additional safety risk to cyclist.
- 7.6.1.7. Clause 8.2 also notes that "The proposed access also ensures that the current access to De Oude Raapkraal remains unrestricted" however the drawing indicates gates situated at this access, which currently do not exist
- 7.6.1.8. Clause 8.2 speaks of "future developments on the northern portion of the property" – we would like full disclosure as to what has been proposed for this northern portion
- 7.6.1.9. Due to the taxi pick up points on Steenberg Road, there is a high incidence of pedestrian activity in the area of the access and through the existing roadway in front/ North of the Oude Raapkraal buildings. Additional traffic at this junction would result in an increased safety risk to these pedestrians, putting the local community in danger

7.7. Clause 8.3.1 – it must be noted that as part of the approval of the Stonehurst Mountain Estate, the Estate undertook to maintain the verges and middle reservation in the North South section of Westlake Drive, including the provision of irrigation at the HOA's cost. There is not mention of how any new landscaping would be managed or irrigated and whether the new installation would therefore negate the HOA's responsibility in this regard.

7.8. We dispute Guillaume Nel Environmental Consultants contention that no environmental Basic Assessment Report is required, on the basis that their assertion of, "no watercourses on or near the site" is incorrect. There is a natural spring, which is the water source for Oude

Raapkraal, in the immediate area, and the geography is such that any ground water contamination on the proposed site would likely feed into the highly sensitive Zandvlei wetland. Again the controls imposed on Stonehurst Mountain Estate during the approval will support this view. *We therefor request a full EIA*

7.9. We dispute the contention that *"no negative impact will be experience by the traffic and surrounding road network"* as per our previous notation.

7.10. Clause 8.3.2 suggests minimal visual impact but cites only the horizontal sight lines, and only from Oude Raapkraal. We contend that there will be negative visual impact, typical of utility yards, from the properties located in the Estate itself, as these will overlook the installation (see attached images of existing Muizenberg Depot)

7.11. Another control imposed on Stonehurst Mountain Estate, was that of lighting limitations, to ensure that the development remained 'dark sky' to minimise visual impact to surrounding area. We object to the installation on the basis that this is likely to operate 24 x 7 x 365 ¼ days and will likely require overhead and flood lighting, which will contravene the above principle and will disturb residents, who have already complained about the back lit signage on the Achievement Awards building situated on the opposite side of Steenberg Road (as submitted to the Ward Committee)

7.12. The location of the depot will prejudice a portion of the workforce, as the site is remote from the train infrastructure and would place additional load on the already overloaded road transport / taxi services in this area.

**OTHER OBJECTIONS** include, but are not limited to :

- Subdivision approval of this proposal will mean that any future development on lower / North portion will exclude the HOA / Resident as an affected party which is unacceptable.
- Please provide details of any other suitable council owned properties which were considered as alternative sites for the Electrical Depot (e.g. land within the Westlake Business Park buffer zone / adjacent to Pollsmoor / Reddam or adjacent to the existing Westlake Conservation Office, Ou Kaapse Weg Environmental Resource Management Department (ERMD))
- As the reservation to utilize a portion of Erf 13372, Westlake for an electrical depot was approved on 22 September 2015, we question why notification of this approval and request for objections from affected parties has taken until 18 April 2016 to be sent (almost 7 months) IN this regard we therefor also request an extension of the period for objections until 31 July 2016
- Also wrt to the above please urgently provide the documentation proving approval and by which authority (cited as Annexure F in the proposal)



MUIZENBERG DEPOT



---

Signature

---

Date