

Bushmans Kariega Estuary  
Care Management Forum  
P.O.Box 297  
Kenton-on-Sea 6191  
22<sup>nd</sup> December,2005

The Municipal Manager  
P.O.Box 13,  
Port Alfred 6170

**Notice No. 301/2005 Ref AR/346/8**  
**Re Rezoning of Klipfontein No 346 Portion 8, Bushmans River Mouth**

Dear Sir,

We are not against development but believe that it should be done in an ecologically sustainable manner and must take into account all aspects of water management and waste disposal. It is on this basis that we object to the rezoning and subdivision of portion 8 (a portion of portion 1) of the farm Klipfontein No 346, Bushmans River Mouth. A second principal reason for our objection is that there has not been a correct procedure of environmental impact assessment (EIA) where an open meeting was held, plans submitted and all interested and affected parties could comment in an open forum. Transparency in these matters is paramount.

Specific objections are the following:

- 1) There is no plan for **sewerage P8**. The plan as stated is "plug into the existing system" There is no existing system and no capacity. It is the duty of the developer to put the sewerage system in place and to contribute to the capacity of the sewerage works.
- 2) **Waste disposal P8**. " Use the existing waste disposal site" There is no registered waste disposal site and any increase in waste disposal would detrimentally affect the existing facilities. It is unacceptable as a " plan".
- 3) **Power supply. P8** The comment is, "are in discussion with ESCOM". This is not satisfactory as a plan for the proposed development. We already have too little capacity. How would power be supplied? Under ground or above ground. Where is the perspective plan. Where is the substation etc, etc.
- 4) **Surface water P55**. What provision is made to provide for disposal of surface runoff. There is already a problem with the over flow of the "vlei" into the Bushman's Village and occasional flooding. To state that the water will just seep away is not satisfactory.
- 5) There needs to be **open space** provided for esthetics. It appears to be maximum no of erven with minimum land in residential zone 2 which is **high density housing**. This is not in keeping with the village.
- 6) There needs to be **a pay in/ buy in** by the developer into the local infrastructure and not a sell and leave approach which could happen without specifics.
- 7) **Provision/ storage of water** is not sufficient. 105 households with 6 occupants in each. 630 people using 200 l per day (which is conservative) relates to 0.125 mega litres per day. Storage is equivalent to 4 days supply. On site

- storage should be mandatory and at least 10,000l per bathroom. This should be stated in the title deeds. The water supply problem is on going in the area and the developers should take a leaf out of the proposed Kariega Eco Estate book as far as water supply and management is concerned.
- 8) There needs to be a **perspective plan** and detail plan with regard to infrastructure i.e roads, water, sewerage, electricity and stormwater.
  - 9) No building should be allowed in the vicinity of the "**Aquifer**" of which the vlei forms part. Some plans with the documents indicate footprints of buildings in this area which is totally unacceptable.
  - 10) The proposed development should conform to the **Government White Paper on Coastal Development** which includes all areas within 1 km of the coastline. The white paper is in the process of being transformed into a bill and will be enacted in the first half of 2006.

Yours faithfully,

Johann Smuts  
Deputy Chairman Bushmans Kariega Estuary Care Management Forum