



## Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd

Simondium Road  
PO Box 44  
Klapmuts 7625

Telephone: 021 875 5272  
Facsimile: 021 875 5515  
e-mail: [doug@dougjeff.co.za](mailto:doug@dougjeff.co.za)

25 January 2010

Dear Interested and Affected Party

---

### NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

---

#### PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ON THE REMAINDER OF FARM OOSTEWAL NO. 292, LANGEBAAN.

---

Notice is hereby given of a Public Participation Process in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), as amended and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2006.

**DEA&DP Reference Number:** E12/2/3/2-F2/7-0460/08  
**Proponent:** Dormell Properties 391 (Pty) Ltd  
**Listed Activity:** 1k, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, 16, 18 (GN No. R 386) and 2 (GN No. R387).  
A full EIA is being undertaken for this project.  
**Location:** The property is located in Langebaan, along Park Drive. The property is bordered by the Langebaan Lagoon, agricultural land, residential development (Myburgh Park Phases 1 and 3), and is en-route to the West Coast National Park (WCNP). There are a number of properties separating the proposed site and the WCNP.  
**Activity:** The proposed development entails the construction of approximately 109 single residential units, roads, public parking and ablution facilities, open spaces and conservation areas.  
**Environmental Consultant:** Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd

Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) are invited to **register as I&APs**, to provide written comments on the **Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR)** and to attend an **Open House Meeting**.

In order to **register or submit comment**, you must refer to the DEA&DP reference number above; must provide your name, postal address and preferred method of communication (e.g. email, fax, post) and must give an indication of any direct business, financial, personal or other interest which you may have in the application. If you have already registered as an I&AP, please check that your name is on our database (Appendix 9g of the Draft EIR) and that your contact details are correct. If we do not have your postal address, please send it to the contact details below since we are required by law to notify you of the Environmental Authorisation by means of registered mail. Correspondence will only be distributed to registered I&APs.

I&APs who are unable to read or write or who otherwise need special assistance to state their views on the proposal, may, by appointment (during office hours) request a member of Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants to assist them to record their comments or objections.

The **Draft EIR** will be available for public review and comment from **Friday 29 January 2010** at:

- The Langebaan Public Library (Cnr Oostewal & Bree Street).
- Saldanha Bay Municipality (Langebaan office).

The **Open House Meeting** will be held at the Langebaan Auditorium, located at the Langebaan Public Library, on **Friday 12 February 2010**, from **15:00 to 20:00**. Information will be presented in poster format and the environmental and planning consultants, engineers and specialists will be at the meeting to answer questions and to record issues. There will be no formal presentation, you are free to attend at any time between 15:00 and 20:00.

To register as an I&AP, send your name and contact details to the details below or send your comments to:

Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants  
(Attention: Lindsay Speirs)  
PO Box 44 Klapmuts 7625

Telephone: 021 875-5272 Facsimile: 021 875-5515 Email: [lindsay@dougjeff.co.za](mailto:lindsay@dougjeff.co.za)

**COMMENTS MUST BE SUBMITTED ON OR BEFORE WEDNESDAY 10 MARCH 2010.**

Yours faithfully,

Lindsay Speirs



## Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd

Simondium Road  
PO Box 44  
Klapmuts 7625

Telephone: 021 875 5272  
Facsimile: 021 875 5515  
e-mail: [doug@dougjeff.co.za](mailto:doug@dougjeff.co.za)

25 Januarie 2010

Geagte Belanghebbende en Geaffekteerde Party

### KENNISGEWING VAN PROSES VAN OPENBARE DEELNAME VOORGESTELDE ONTWIKKELING OP RESTANT VAN DIE PLAAS OOSTEWAL NO. 292, LANGEBAAN

Kennis is gegee van die publieke deelname proses ingevolge die Wet op Nasionale Omgewingsbestuur, 1998 (Wet Nr. 107 van 1998) *soos gewysig* en die Omgewingsimpakbepaling- Regulasies 2006.

**DOS&OB Verw Nr:** E12/2/3/2-F2/7-0460/08  
**Aansoeker:** Dormell Properties 391 (Pty) Ltd  
**Gelyste Aktiwiteite:** 1k, 2, 3, 5, 6, 15, 16, 18 (GK Nr. R 386) en 2 (GK Nr. R387).  
Let wel dat 'n **volledige Omgewingsinvloedbepaling** gevolg sal word vir hierdie beoogde ontwikkeling.  
**Ligging:** Die eiendom is in Parkrylaan, Langebaan geleë. Die eiendom grens aan die Langebaan Lagoon, landbou grond, residensiële ontwikkeling (Myburgh Park Fases 1 en 2) en is op pad na die Weskus Nasionale Park (WKNP). Daar is 'n aantal eiendomme wat die voorgestelde ontwikkeling van die WKNP skei.  
**Aktiwiteit:** Die voorgestelde ontwikkeling behels die konstruksie van ongeveer 109 enkel residensiële eenhede, paaie, publieke parkering en ablusie fasiliteite, oop ruimte en bewarings areas.  
**Omgewingskonsultante:** Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants (Pty) Ltd

Belanghebbende en Geaffekteerde Partye (B&GPe) word **uitgenooi om as B&GP te registreer**, skriftelike kommentaar op die **Konsep Omgewingsinvloedbepalingsverslag (OIV)** te lewer, en 'n **Ope Huis Vergadering** by te woon.

Om te **registreer of kommentaar te lewer** behoort B&GPe na die DOS&OB verwysingsnommer soos hierbo gemeld te verwys. Voorsien u kommentaar, naam en kontakbesonderhede en meld voorkeur kontakmetode bv. epos, faks, ens.) en moet 'n aanduiding van enige direkte-, besigheids-, finansiële-, persoonlike- of ander belang welke u in die aansoek het aan die kontakpersoon soos hieronder gemeld. Indien u reeds as 'n B&GP geregistreer het, maak asseblief seker dat u naam wel op die databasis verskyn (Aanhangsel 9 van die Konsep OIV) en dat u kontakbesonderhede korrek is. Indien ons nog nie u posadres het nie, stuur dit asseblief na die adres hieronder aangesien ons dit volgens wet sal benodig om 'n geregistreerde kennisgewing aan u te stuur met die Departementele Magtiging. Korrespondensie sal voortaan slegs aan geregistreerde B&GPe gestuur word.

B&GPe wie nie kan lees of skryf nie of andersins spesiale bystand benodig om hul opinie te lig, mag per afspraak (gedurende kantoor ure) versoek dat 'n lid van Doug Jeffery Omgewingskonsultante hul bystaan om kommentaar of beswaar in te dien.

Die **Konsep OIV** sal beskikbaar gestel word vir publieke nagaan en kommentaar vanaf **Vrydag 29 Januarie 2010** by die:

- **Langebaan Publieke Biblioteek (Hoek van Oostewal & Breëstrate).**
- **Saldanhaai Munisipaliteit (Langebaan kantoor).**

Die Ope Huis Vergadering sal by die Langebaan Auditorium gehou word en is geleë by die Langebaan Publieke Biblioteek. Die vergadering sal op **Vrydag 12 Februarie 2010**, tussen **15:00 en 20:00** plaasvind. Inligting sal in plaakkaat formaat voorgestel word. Ingenieurs en spesialiste sal teenswoordig wees om u vrae te beantwoord of besommernisse aan te teken en geen formele vergadering sal gehou word nie. U is dus welkom om enige tyd tussen 15:00 en 20:00 die vergadering by te woon.

Om te registreer as B&GP moet u, u naam en kontakbesonderhede na die onderstaande adres stuur, of stuur u kommentaar na:

Doug Jeffery Omgewingskonsultante

(Aandag: Lindsay Speirs)

Posbus 44 Klapmuts 7625

Telefoon: 021 875-5272 Faks: 021 875-5515 Epos: [lindsay@dougjeff.co.za](mailto:lindsay@dougjeff.co.za)

**KOMMENTAAR MOET ONS VOOR OP/OP WOENSDAG 10 MAART 2010 BEREIK.**

Die uwe,

Lindsay Speirs

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION

Consideration is being given to the development of 109 single residential erven, roads, public parking and ablution facilities, open spaces and conservation areas on the Remainder of the Farm Oostewal No. 292, Langebaan, hereinafter referred to as 'the property' or 'the site'.

The proposed development was originally called *Myburgh Park Phase 2* and then later *Baja Sardina* but at the request of a number of Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) it was renamed *Shark Bay*. Although these names were created for ease of reference, the site proposed for development remains the *Remainder of the Farm Oostewal No. 292, Langebaan*.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

The National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) (NEMA) makes provision for the identification and assessment of activities that are potentially detrimental to the environment and which require authorisation from the relevant authorities based on the findings of an environmental assessment. NEMA is a national act, which is enforced by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT). These powers are delegated in the Western Cape to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP).

According to the regulations of Section 24(5) of NEMA – Government Notice No. R358 dated July 2006, authorisation is required for the following activities related to the proposed Shark Bay development:

Government Notice No. R386 – Basic Assessment:

*The construction of facilities or infrastructure, including associated structures or infrastructure, for:*

- **1k** - the bulk transportation of sewage and water, including storm water, in pipelines with (i) an internal diameter of 0.36 metres or more; or (ii) a peak throughput of 120 litres per second or more;
- **2** - Construction or earth moving activities in the sea or within 100 metres inland of the high-water mark of the sea, in respect of (f) buildings; or (g) infrastructure.
- **3** - The prevention of the free movement of sand, including erosion and accretion, by means of planting vegetation, placing synthetic material on dunes and exposed sand surfaces within a distance of 100 metres inland of the high-water mark of the sea.
- **5** - The removal or damaging of indigenous vegetation of more than 10 square metres within a distance of 100 metres inland of the high-water mark of the sea.
- **6** - The excavation, moving, removal, depositing or compacting of soil, sand, rock or rubble covering an area exceeding 10 square metres in the sea or within distance of 100 metres inland of the high-water mark of the sea.
- **15** - The construction of a road that is wider than 4 metres or that has a reserve wider than 6 metres, excluding roads that fall within the ambit of another listed activity or which are access roads of less than 30 metres long.
- **16** - The transformation of undeveloped, vacant or derelict land to (b) residential, mixed, retail, commercial, industrial or institutional use where such development does not constitute in full and where the total area to be transformed is bigger than 1 hectare.
- **18** - The subdivision of portions of land 9 hectares or larger into portions of 5 hectares or less.

Government Notice No. R387 - Scoping and EIA:

- **2** - Any development activity, including associated structures and infrastructure, where the total area of the developed area is, or is intended to be 20 hectares or more.

### PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Remainder of the Farm Oostewal No. 292, Langebaan is located in Langebaan along Park Drive. Two main roads cross the site, the existing Oostewal Road and Park Drive, with a number of smaller dirt tracks also present. The property is bordered by the Langebaan Lagoon (designated as a Ramsar site), agricultural land, residential development (Myburgh Park Phases 1 and 3), and is en-route to the West Coast National Park (WCNP). There are 5 properties separating the proposed site and the WCNP. The property is ± 82 ha in size and is zoned Subdivisional Area.

The beach at Shark Bay will remain open to the public and will continue to be used for recreational purposes. People using the beach will use Park Drive to access the area and the public parking and ablutions provided on the site.

## BIOPHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS

Old agricultural lands cover about 50% of the site, with undisturbed vegetation on the remainder. No permanent wetlands are found on site, but there is a small seasonal drainage line coming off the eastern side of Stompneusrots, which may hold surface water after heavy rains.

### Geology and Geohydrology

The site is dominated by a large weathered granite outcrop, the Stompneusrots, situated in the west. To the south and east of the outcrop the granite is overlain by unconsolidated sands and calcrete horizons. The sands are thickest to the north and east of the Stompneusrots but decrease in depth in a southerly direction towards the lagoon where the calcrete horizons are exposed. The granite bedrock on the site is likely to be an aquitard and groundwater flow is limited to an ephemeral perched water table in poorly developed sediment cover, and as a very low flow along fractures in the bedrock.

### Vegetation

The natural vegetation found on the property proposed for development consists of two main types: Saldanha Granite Strandveld on the upper areas, and Langebaan Dune Strandveld on the lower, coastal areas. The earlier C.A.P.E. (Cape Action for People and the Environment) project mapped the area as Langebaan Fynbos / Thicket Mosaic but this classification does not differentiate between granite, calcrete, and alkaline sands, and is therefore not considered sufficiently accurate.

The recent Fine Scale Conservation Plan for the Saldanha Peninsula indicates that about 85% of this site is a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA), and the applicant's preferred layout alternative takes this into account, as the layout is heavily informed by the Helme (2005) baseline sensitivity mapping.

### Fauna

For the mammal fauna, the relative importance of the proposed site is moderate at regional and low to moderate at national scale. Although several Red Data birds species are known from the region, only the *Near Threatened* African Black Oystercatcher (*Haematopus moquini*) is likely to be negatively affected by the proposed development. For the bird fauna, the relative importance of the site is moderate at regional and low to moderate at national scale. No Red Data reptile species are likely to occur at the site, although the Southern Adder (*Bitis armata* – provisional status = *Vulnerable*) may possibly occur. For the reptile fauna, the relative importance of this site is moderate at regional and low to moderate at national scale. No threatened amphibian species are known from the Langebaan/Saldanha/WCNP region. For the amphibian fauna, the relative importance of this site is low at regional and national scale.

### Langebaan Lagoon

The Langebaan Lagoon borders the site to the west. The Lagoon forms part of the West Coast National Park, it is a proclaimed Marine Protected Area, according to the Marine Living Resources Act, 1998 (Act 18 of 1998) and is designated as a Ramsar wetland, as it is important for many waterfowl.

The lagoon and most of the land along its perimeter is administered by the West Coast National Park, according to a draft management plan. It is divided into three different utilisation zones namely: wilderness, limited recreational and multipurpose recreational areas. Access to the Wilderness zone (which contains key refuge sites of the waders and breeding seabird populations) is limited by the SANParks and is restricted to certain sites. Sail boat and board sailing is permitted in the limited recreational zone and the multi-purpose recreational zone allows most water sports, e.g. kite surfing, water skiing, snorkelling, diving, kayaking, swimming, fishing, angling and boating. However, no collecting or removal of perlemoen and crayfish is allowed in the lagoon. The proposed site is located adjacent to the multipurpose zone, Zone A.

### Visual Characteristics

The highest point on the site is Stompneusrots which rises to 93m. This koppie and the ridge/escarpment of which it is part, form a viewshed between the site and the rest of the town, specifically Myburgh Park, with only the houses directly along the ridge being afforded views towards the east over the site. From Stompneusrots the site falls away, steeply in places, towards the coastline of Langebaan to the south and south-east.

## PLANNING CONTEXT

Although the site is zoned *Subdivisional Area* for township development purposes, and in principle designated for some form of development, the under mentioned policy directives should be noted:

- Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework
- Growth Potential of Towns in the Western Cape, 2004

- Draft Coastal Zone Policy for the Western Cape, 2000
- West Coast Area: Velddrif - Bokpunt Structure Plan, 1988
- Vredenburg – Saldanha and Environs Urban Structure Plan, 1992
- West Coast Sub-regional Structure Plan, 1995
- Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve, 1999
- Document for Integrated Planning: West Coast Region, 2002
- Draft West Coast District Municipal Spatial Development Framework, 2006-2007
- Langebaan and Environs Structure Plan, 1999
- West Coast National Park & Langebaan Lagoon Use Zones
- Draft Saldanha Bay Municipal Spatial Development Framework, 2002

A synopsis of the policy directives indicates that the overarching philosophy for the site could be described as "conservation with development".

## PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were scoped out during the Scoping Phase of this EIA process.

### Alternative 2 (July 2005)

This development alternative was compiled, taking into account the initial constraints that were identified (i.e. botanically sensitive areas, development setback line) during discussions with the project team, and therefore the original proposal was amended by Planning Partners to constitute the following components:

- A restaurant
- 114 single residential erven
- 24 group housing units
- Parking and ablution facilities
- Open spaces / conservation areas

The existing main S-shaped east-west road through the site is retained, with internal access routes connected thereto. The main east-west internal access route follows the alignment of the existing main gravel road. The development components are grouped into 5 single residential development pockets, a group housing site and a restaurant, parking and ablution facilities site.

This alternative was scoped out based on visual considerations, as well as the need for wider ecological corridors.

### Alternative 3 (September 2006)

Further input from the project team regarding issues pertaining to botany, fauna and visual considerations were taken into account in the revision of the development proposal, resulting in Alternative 3 – comprising the following amendments:

- The group housing site has been replaced by a lodge / hotel facility (i.e. 40 bedrooms and associated uses)
- The number of residential erven has been reduced from 114 to 100
- 25 holiday housing units/erven have been provided in lieu of single residential erven
- More open space has been provided within residential clusters between residential units
- The width of ecological corridors has been increased to more than 50m
- Greater provision has been made for natural drainage
- A SANParks gateway office facility has been provided

Following the Open House Meeting held in September 2006, several questions were raised regarding the legal history of the site. The proponent then requested legal advice from Johan du Plessis Attorney to confirm the current legal status of the property, as well as the applicability of the ECA, and the new NEMA regulations. Based on confirmation received from the Department, the proponent decided to amend the layout, in line with previous approvals given for this property, thus no EIA would be required.

### Alternative 4 (March 2007)

After further public and authority scoping, as well as clarification regarding the legal history of the property, Alternative 3 was amended as follows:

- The lodge / hotel facility (40 bedrooms and associated uses) has been replaced by 10 single residential erven
- The 25 holiday housing erven have been replaced by 25 single residential erven
- The restaurant site has been replaced by 3 single residential erven
- The SANParks gateway office facility has been omitted

The replacement of the lodge / hotel and restaurant will result in the reduced impacts on the Langebaan Lagoon, as well as the traffic. These impacts will however be assessed in the EIA phase of the process.

**Alternative 1, Alternative 5 and the No Development Alternative were assessed in this report.**

#### Alternative 1 (October 2001)

This development proposal was generated by the previous land owner. The main components of this proposal consist of the following:

- 109 single residential erven
- S-shaped east-west road through the site
- Parking facilities
- Natural Open Space

The sensitivity analysis undertaken on behalf of the new land owner revealed that this layout encroaches very high and high conservation value areas, and that a number of residential erven are situated below the development setback line (i.e. are located too close to the lagoon's edge).

#### Alternative 5 (August 2007) - the developer's preferred alternative.

A low-density, high income development is required in order to preserve the natural assets and generate sufficient funds for rehabilitation and protection. This will ensure the social, environmental and economic viability of the development and the successful long-term management and rehabilitation of the property.

The concept proposed for the property attempts to reach the optimum intersection of the three global imperatives, satisfying the needs of the community, environment and market place. Alternative 5 resulted from an iterative process that was followed during the Scoping Phase and attempts to consider all the specialists issues.

Based on comments received from I&APs, DEA&DP, the project architect and the visual impact consultants, the following amendments were affected to Alternative 4:

- A residential cluster to the north of the S-shaped tar road has been omitted. This increases the width of the ecological corridor between the remaining two clusters to 216m at its narrowest point
- Residential erven 'lost' with omitting the abovementioned cluster has been repositioned at the other residential clusters
- The total number of residential erven has been reduced from 113 to 109

#### No Development Alternative

The no-go option will result in the status quo of the site being maintained for the present. Should no development take place on this site, the following should be noted:

- The land would retain its zoning of Subdivisional Area, with the likelihood of future development applications being submitted
- In the short term, the owner would be able to construct two residences
- There may well be continued degradation of the environment, which is currently taking place as a result of uncontrolled use of the property.
- There will be no socio-economic benefits created [e.g. extensive portion of public land created ( $\pm$  70 ha); public access to the lagoon from the roadway and walkways; public parking and ablution facilities; public pathways; job opportunities; residential opportunities; infrastructure development; spin-offs to other sectors; and revenue to the local, district and central governments).

## **SERVICES**

### Electrical Services

The Saldanha Municipality is the Electricity Service Provider for the area affected by the development. All new services to supply the new erven will be done according to the Municipal Standards and shall consist of underground cables and street furniture in accordance with Municipal Standards, and to match adjacent Residential Standards.

### Water

The existing network or new network, if required, will be connected to an existing 100mm water main which forms part of the Myburg High reservoir sub-district. No upgrading of the existing reservoir capacity has been proposed due to the available spare capacity of the Country Club Middle reservoir and the Myburg Park pump station. The existing 200/150 mm diameter supply pipe from the Myburg Park reservoir already is inadequate, resulting in low working pressures. The

proposed new development will worsen the situation and the existing supply pipe therefore must be upgraded by providing an additional supply pipe along the existing line.

#### Sewage

The internal sewer network will be 160mm dia uPVC class 34 pipes and will drain towards the topographical low point on the site. A pump station will be required to pump the sewerage into the existing sewer network in Oostewal Road. The existing network and treatment plant have adequate capacity to accommodate the expected peak wet weather flow of 4,3 l/s from the proposed development. The pump station will be an underground 1,8m diameter manhole with two submerged pumps inside (one standby). The only structure above the ground will be the electrical switch board and the fence around the pump station.

#### Stormwater

Stormwater will not be discarded into the lagoon. Stormwater will be channeled into detention/filtration ponds. The proposed development will be divided into six development pockets and the runoff from each development pocket will be dealt with individually. All stormwater will be channeled into detention/infiltration ponds, via pipe or road, where the water will disperse by means of infiltration. All pipes will be underground. The size of the ponds will be determined by the actual infiltration rate of the site.

#### Roads

Access to the site will be from the existing Park Drive that runs through the site. All internal road surfaces will be asphalt treated with kerbs on both sides of the roads. Alternative surfacing, such as brick paving, can be considered if necessary.

#### Solid Waste

Saldanha Bay Municipality have indicated that they have sufficient capacity to deal with the additional solid waste that will be generated by the proposed development.

### **TASKS TO BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE EIA PHASE**

Full copies of the EIR will be placed at the Langebaan Library and at the Saldanha Bay Municipal Offices. Interested and affected parties will be notified of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) by means of advertisements in Die Weslander, Die Burger and the Cape Times. In addition to the advertisements, I&APs on our database will be notified via registered mail and email and the executive summaries of the EIR will be circulated. This EIR will be made available for a 30-day comment period. The Draft EIR will also be made available on the company website: [www.dougjeff.co.za](http://www.dougjeff.co.za). I&APs will also be invited to attend an Open House Meeting that will be held in Langebaan. At the end of the comment period, the report will be revised in response to feedback received from I&APs. All comments received and responses to the comments will be incorporated into the Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). The Final EIR will be made available for a 30-day comment period, after which it will then be submitted to DEA&DP for a decision.

### **BOTANICAL ASSESSMENT**

Alternative 1 encroaches on high botanically sensitive areas which could be mitigated by redesigning the layout. Alternative 5 is the result of an iterative process and the negative impacts are mostly on the least sensitive portions of the site and are broadly acceptable at a regional scale. Mandatory mitigation measures should succeed in minimising most potential impacts, which should be at acceptable (though not necessarily optimum) levels. Alternative 5 is therefore the preferred development option, from a botanical perspective.

The direct (and some of the indirect) negative impacts could be further reduced by a reduction in the area of the total development footprint, but this is the case for almost all development applications, and specialist's Terms of Reference (as mandated by CapeNature and the Botanical Society of South Africa) are to assess the overall significance of the issues, at various scales, and to identify both positive and negative impacts.

Alternative 5 is considered to be adequately responsive to the botanical constraints on the site, and there are significant positive impacts that may be associated with this application if all mitigation is successfully put in place (such as formal conservation of up to 80% of the site, including all key botanical areas). Alternative 5 is likely to have a Low to Medium negative botanical impact on a local scale (Langebaan), and a Low to Medium negative impact on a regional scale (St Helena Bay - Langebaan area), after mitigation. Reducing the number of units by anything up to 30% is not likely to significantly alter the overall botanical impacts.

The development as proposed is not ideal from a botanical perspective, as obviously the ideal scenario would involve formal, permanent conservation of the entire site, but this is unfortunately not an alternative. Unfortunately in this case the

No Development Alternative carries with it a number of very important unknowns, in terms of the potential impacts on the vegetation (possible livestock grazing, possible future development applications and consequent lack of securing conservation tenure for key areas, etc.). It is possible that impacts could range from Low to Medium negative, and it is thus not necessarily a preferred alternative.

Should Alternative 5 be approved, all mitigation and management measures outlined above, must be considered mandatory, and must be included as conditions of approval in the Environmental Authorisation.

## FAUNAL ASSESSMENT

The faunal importance of the site is moderate at regional and low to moderate at national scale for mammals, birds and reptiles. For frogs the importance of this site is low at regional and national scales. The site is thus not particularly important from a faunal perspective and it does not meet the criteria of a no-go (i.e. no-development) zone. As such it is not inappropriate to consider the various proposed development alternatives, bearing in mind that mitigating measures are nevertheless applicable to lessen the impact on the natural environment. In other words, there is scope to accommodate the proposed development and still maintain an adequate level of ecosystem functioning.

The mitigating measures as proposed by the botanical and faunal reports are key to the integration of the natural environment and the proposed development, and these must be incorporated in full to allow for a residential scenario that is acceptable in terms of maintaining the ecological integrity of the site. Alternative 5 is the preferred development option as it meets with the all the faunal recommendations, and most of the botanical recommendations. The no-development alternative is also desirable, and it may be preferential to Alternative 5, depending on the scale of any future activities proposed for the site and the management of public activities at the lagoon zone.

The overall scale of this development alternative is deemed appropriate in the context of the existing neighbouring landuse scenarios, i.e. it represents an apt transition between the intensely developed Langebaan residential zone and that of the nature zone of the WCNP. In fact, with the development footprint being only 15% of the site, this particular development alternative favours the environmental considerations substantially more than what would generally be required in these circumstances. A further reduction of housing units will of course lessen the development footprint, but it will not reduce the overall negative impact that is currently projected to be low to medium. The negative impact of the no-development alternative is also likely to be low to medium, even though the development footprint is substantially less than that of development alternative 5.

## VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Alternative 1 is flawed in that the visual impact on the shoreline is considered unacceptable and also because of the encroachment into the conservation worthy fynbos areas which will affect the visual nature of the site.

The site is visually very sensitive and the wrong form of development on it could have highly negative visual consequences for the surrounding areas. Considering that the principle of development on the site has been established and that it falls within the town of Langebaan, it is believed that the Alternative 5 layout together with the proposed architectural treatment, would allow for limited development that will blend into its surroundings, while preserving and protecting the natural features of the site. This can also be done with the minimum of visual intrusion into the West Coast National Park, the estate forming a transition zone between Myburgh Park with its relatively dense layout and large structures to the west and the open areas and national park to the east and south.

The fact that 85% of the fynbos on site will be preserved and made available to the general public through its zoning as public open space, is considered positive in terms of the visual impact.

The overall significance of the visual impact of the development of Alternative 5, with the implementation of the design guidelines and mitigation measures, will be medium-low negative in the long-term. Lowering the number of erven will not change the significance of the visual impact even though the intensity of the visual impact may be slightly lower. It is believed that, in terms of the visual issues, Alternative 5 allows for a realistic amount of development on the site while preserving its visual qualities as far as possible.

It is therefore recommended that the implementation of Alternative 5 be allowed to proceed but that regular environmental audits are carried out on the site to ensure that the development remains within the visual limits stated in the VIA.



## HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The no-development option for the site is unrealistic, given that the site does have development rights. In fact, the real possibility exists that future proposals may not be as environmentally and contextually sympathetic as the current proposal. Given the nature of the revised design guidelines, there is a good possibility of introducing development on this site that would, with mitigation, become a successful spatial transition between the urban development patterns of Langebaan South and the natural/rural landscapes of the West Coast National Park.

The Preferred Alternative 5 is a considerable improvement on the original development proposals for the site i.e., as stopped by court order during implementation (Alternative 1). In fact, the preferred alternative constitutes an improvement out of all recognition to the original proposals, particularly in terms of visual impact, and impacts on the site's biophysical heritage.

Alternative 5 performs well when measured against the HIA Design Informants. By comparison, Alternative 1 (the original proposal) performs poorly when measured against these Design Informants. Alternative 5 has the potential to be precedent-setting for the area in terms of sensitive response to the landscape, if implemented strictly in accordance with these guidelines. Once the development and its landscaping have matured, visual impacts will be low during the daytime. This is clearly illustrated by the 3D montages, where the proposed units have had to be arrowed, as they are not readily visible. Impacts at night due to the additional lighting are rated as medium, although significance would be considerably less than the light spill-over from the adjacent Myburgh Park 1&3 where it crests the ridge above Stompneusrots.

It must be said that the type and scale of the proposed development of Alternative 5 is considered appropriate, from a heritage perspective, in the context of the site. Reductions in density would not significantly reduce heritage impacts provided that the revised Architectural and Landscape Guidelines are diligently applied and adhered to.

Development of the area promises to enable much needed control over the floral, faunal and archaeological resources on the site, while, at the same time, providing formal public ablution and parking facilities, and formalised public walkways and footpaths that protect sensitive areas.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Provided that Stompneus Rocks conservation area is maintained, impacts to archaeological heritage are likely to remain low.

## SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The facts are that the site is privately owned, has "subdivisional" zoning rights and the Saldanha Municipality has also indicated that the site will be included within the revised urban edge.

Within this context, the findings of the SIA indicate that the proposed development (Alternative 5) will not impact on public access to the majority of the site and Langebaan Lagoon. Public access to Langebaan Lagoon will be improved via the provision of a parking area and ablution facilities. While the development of 109 residential units will impact on the current, undeveloped sense of place, the findings of the Visual and Heritage Assessment indicate that the potential impacts can be effectively addressed. Within the context of the sites subdivisional zoning Alternative 5 is, therefore, regarded as an acceptable and appropriate development option for the site.

With regards to the no development alternative, the property will remain in its current undeveloped state. Due to the site having subdivisional zoning rights and it will be included in the urban edge, if the current development is not approved some form of development will be proposed in the future. This form of development may or may not be as environmentally sensitive and may or may not permit public access to the site and Langebaan Lagoon.

Should a lower density alternative be assessed, the key issue affecting such an assessment is where on the site the units would be removed. If one removes units from the section along the lagoon, then this is likely to reduce the visual and sense of place impact associated with the preferred alternative, Alternative 5. For example, reducing the number of units by 33 (30% reduction, for example) would enable all 19 units in the north-western node located next to the lagoon to be removed. The visual and sense of place impacts associated with this node would therefore no longer exist. The potential visual impact of this node on the adjacent landowners in Langebaan would also be removed. In addition, 14 units located adjacent to the lagoon near Shark Bay could also be removed. This would also reduce the visual and sense of place impacts associated with the proposed development on the Langebaan Lagoon and Shark Bay.

A 30% reduction in the number units, specifically the units located along the Langebaan Lagoon, will reduce the overall visual and sense of place impacts associated with the proposed development (Alternative 5). A 30% reduction on the number of units therefore represents a positive mitigation measure. As such the reduced density option is the preferred option. However, the findings of the various specialist studies, including the Visual and Heritage Assessments, indicate that the impacts associated with Alternative 5 are acceptable and can be effectively mitigated.

## GROUNDWATER STUDY

It has been determined that the proposed development does not pose a risk to the groundwater or potential receptors.

## DEVELOPMENT SETBACK LINE

Should the recommended development setback line (50m) be implemented, the proposed development will be placed a sufficient distance away from the present beach to meet sound coastal management principles.

## TRAFFIC IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Sufficient sight distances and space for emergency and fire fighting vehicles must be provided on site. No road improvements are required.

## CONCLUSION

Detailed specialist assessments were undertaken as part of this Environmental Impact Assessment. During the initial stages of the process, baseline studies were undertaken, in response to the initial alternative proposed. An iterative process was then followed, in order to arrive at a development proposal/alternative, which would have the least impact on the surrounding environment. This alternative is deemed to be Alternative 5 and is considered as the developer's preferred alternative.

Alternative 1 encroaches into very high and high conservation value botanical areas, sufficient ecological corridors are not provided, a number of residential erven are situated below the development setback line and it is unacceptable from a visual and heritage point of view.

**It is clear from the specialist assessments that the type and scale of the proposed development alternative (Alternative 5) is within acceptable limits, considering the context of the site. Reducing the number of units will not result in a lower significance rating of the identified impacts. The type of development, i.e. low density residential, is believed to be appropriate for the location of the site. Alternative 5 represents a suitable transition zone between the intensely developed Langebaan residential zone and that of the nature zone of the West Coast National Park. The proposed development will also be set back at least 50 m from the high water mark of the lagoon. It varies between 56 m and 112 m for the erven fronting onto the lagoon.**

In this case, the **No Development Alternative** has too many unknowns. What is known is that the site will retain its Subdivisional Area zoning and it will be included within the urban edge of Langebaan. The current developer has the right to construct two residential dwellings on the site and to prevent the public from using the private surfaced road as access to the beach. Should the developer sell the land, there may be future development applications which may have little regard for the environment, especially key conservation areas.

The specialist studies therefore show that Alternative 5 is acceptable with full mitigation. It is recommended that Alternative 5 be approved.

Should development be approved on the site, the recommendations listed in the report must be implemented.

## BESTUURSOPSOMMING

### INLEIDING

Oorweging word gegee aan die ontwikkeling van 109 residensiële erwe, paaie, openbare parkering en ablusiegeriewe, oop ruimtes en bewaringsgebiede op die Oorblewende Deel van die Plaas Oostewal Nr. 292, Langebaan, hierna verwys na as 'die eiendom' of 'die perseel'.

Die voorgestelde ontwikkeling is oorspronklik *Myburgh Park Fase 2* genoem en daarna *Baja Sardina*, maar op die versoek van 'n aantal Belangstellende en Geaffekteerde Partye (B&GPs) is dit hernoem na *Shark Bay*. Hoewel hierdie name vir doeleindes van maklike verwysing geskep is, bly die perseel wat vir ontwikkeling voorgestel word die *Oorblewende Deel van die Plaas Oostewal Nr 292, Langebaan*.

### OMGEWINGSVEREISTES

Die Wet op Nasionale Omgewingsbestuur (Wet 107 van 1998) (WNOB) maak voorsiening vir die identifikasie en assessering van bedrywighede wat potensieel tot nadeel van die omgewing kan wees en wat magtiging van die relevante owerhede vereis gebaseer op die bevindinge van omgewingsassessering. WNOB is 'n nasionale wet, afdwingbaar deur die Departement van Omgewingsake en Toerisme (DOST). Hierdie magte word in die Wes-Kaap aan die Departement Omgewingsake en Ontwikkelingsbeplanning (DO&OB) gedelegeer.

Volgens die regulasie van Artikel 24(5) van WNOB – Goewermentskennisgewing Nr R358 gedateer Julie 2006, word magtiging vir die volgende bedrywighede ten opsigte van die voorgestelde Shark Bay ontwikkeling vereis:

#### Goewermentskennisgewing Nr R86 – Basiese Assessering:

*Die konstruksie van fasiliteite of infrastrukture, insluitende verwante strukture of infrastruktuur, vir:*

- 1k - die grootmaatvervoer van rioolvuil en water, met inbegrip van stormwater, in pyplyne met –
  - (i) 'n interne deursnee van 0,36 meter of meer; of
  - (ii) 'n spitsstoevoer van 120 liter per sekonde of meer;
- 2. Bou- of grondverplasingbedrywighede in die see of binne 100 meter van die hoogwatermerk van die see land inwaarts, betreffende – geboue; of (g) infrastruktuur.
- 3. Die voorkoming van die vrye beweging van sand, met inbegrip van erosie en aanslibbing, by wyse van die plant van gewasse, die plasing van sintetiese materiaal op duine en blootgestelde sandoppervlakke binne 'n afstand van 100 meter vanaf die hoogwatermerk van die see land inwaarts.
- 5. Die verwydering of beskadiging van inheemse plantegroei van meer as 10 vierkante meter binne 'n afstand van 100 meter vanaf die hoogwatermerk van die see land inwaarts.
- 6. Die uitgraving, verskuiwing, verwydering, afsetting of saampersing van grond, sand, rots of ru-klip wat 'n gebied wat groter is as 10 vierkante meter die see in dek, of wat binne 'n afstand van 100 meter vanaf die hoogwatermerk van die see land inwaarts is.
- 15. Die bou van 'n pad wat breër is as vier meter of wat 'n reserwe het wat breër is as ses meter, uitsluitende paaie wat binne die strekking val van 'n ander gelyste bedrywigheid, of wat toegangspaaie van minder as 30 meter in lengte is.

- 16. Die omvorming van onontwikkelde, vakante of verlate grond om (b) residensiële, gemengde, kleinhandel-, kommersiële, nywerheids- of institusionele gebruik waar sodanige ontwikkeling nie gapingvernouing is nie, en waar die totale gebied wat omvorm word, groter as een hektaar is.
- 18. Die onderverdeling van gedeeltes van grond wat nege hektaar of groter is, in gedeeltes van vyf hektaar of minder.

Goewermentskennisgewing Nr. 387 – Konsep en OIV:

- 2. Elke ontwikkelingsbedrywigheid, met inbegrip van verwante strukture en -infrastruktuur, waar die totale gebied van die ontwikkelde gebied 20 hektaar of meer is, of so beplan word.

## EIENDOMSBEKRYWING

Oorablewende Deel van die Plaas Oostewal Nr 292, Langeaan is in Langebaan langs aan Park Rylaan geleë. Twee hoofpaaie kruis die perseel, die bestaande Oostewalweg en Park Rylaan, met 'n aantal kleiner grondpaaie wat ook teenwoordig is. Die eiendom is aangrensend tot die Langebaan Strandmeer (geoormerk as 'n Ramsar-perseel), landbougrond, residensiële ontwikkeling (Myburgh Park Fases 1 en 3) en is op die pad na die Weskus Nasionale Park (WNP). Daar is 5 eiendomme wat die voorgestelde perseel van die WNP skei. Die eiendom is ± 82 ha in omvang en is as Subdivisionele Gebied gesoneer.

Die strand by Shark Bay sal vir die publiek toeganklik bly en sal steeds vir ontspanningsdoeleindes gebruik kan word. Mense wat die strand gebruik sal vanaf Park Rylaan toegang tot die gebied, openbare parkering en ablusie wat op die perseel verskaf sal word, verkry.

## BIOFISIIESE KARAKTEREIEKAPPE

Ou landbougrond dek ongeveer 50% van die perseel, met onversteurde plantegroei op die res. Geen permanente vleilande is op die perseel gevind nie, maar daar is 'n klein seisoenale dreineringslyn wat van die oostelike deel van Stompneusrots kom, wat dalk oppervlakwater na swaar reëns mag behou.

### Geologie en Geohidrologie

Die perseel word deur 'n goot granietrif, die Stompneusrots, geleë in die weste, gedomineer. Na die suide en ooste van die rotsrif word die graniet bedek met ongekonsolideerde sand en kalkreethorisonne. Die sand is die dikste aan die noorde en die ooste van die Stompneusrots maar verminder in diepte in 'n suidelike rigting na die strandmeer waar die kalkreethorisonne blootgelê word. Die graniet rotsbodem op die perseel is waarskynlik waterweerstandig en grondwatervloei is beperk tot 'n opslag watertafel in 'n swakontwikkelde sedimentdekking en as 'n baie stadige vloei langs frakture in die rotsbodem.

### Plantegroei

Die natuurlike plantegroei wat op die voorgestelde eiendom vir ontwikkeling gevind word bestaan uit twee soorte: Saldanha Graniet Strandveld langs die boonste gebiede en Langebaan Duine Strandveld op die laer kusgebiede. Die voorafgaande C.A.P.E (Cape Action for People and the Environment) projek het die gebied as Langebaan Fynbos / Struikgewas Mosaïek karteer, maar hierdie klassifikasie differensieer nie tussen graniet, kalkreë en alkakiese sand nie, en word dus nie as akkuraat genoeg beskou nie.

Die onlangse Fynskaal Bewaringsplan vir Saldanha Skiereiland dui aan dat ongeveer 85% van hierdie perseel 'n Kritiese Biodiverse Gebied (KBG) is, en die aansoeker se voorkeur uitleg-alternatief neem dit in ag, waarvolgens die uitleg deeglik deur die Helme (2005) basislyn sensitiviteitskartografie ingelig is.

### Diere

Vir die soogdiere is die relatiewe belang van die voorgestelde gebied matig op streeksskaal en laag tot matig op nasionale skaal. Hoewel verskeie Rooi Data voëlspecies aan die streek bekend is, word slegs die *Amper Bedreigde Afrika Swartobie (Haematopus moquini)* geag om waarskynlik negatief deur die voorgestelde

ontwikkeling geaffekteer te word. Met betrekking tot die voëls, is die relatiewe belang van die perseel matig op streeksskaal en laag tot matig op nasionale skaal. Geen Rooi Data reptielspesies behoort op die perseel voor te kom nie, hoewel die Suiderlike Adder (*Bitis armata* – voorlopige status = *Weerloos*) moontlik mag voorkom. Vir reptiele is die relatiewe belang van hierdie perseel matig op streeksskaal en laag tot matig op nasionale skaal. Geen amfibiese spesies is aan die Langebaan/Saldanha/WNP streek bekend nie. Vir die amfibiese fauna is die relatiewe belang van hierdie perseel laag op streeks- en nasionale skaal.

#### Langebaan Strandmeer

Die Langebaan Strandmeer vorm die perseel se westelike grens. Die Strandmeer is deel van die Weskus Nasionale Park en 'n benoemde Mariene Beskermd gebied, volgens die Wet op Mariene Lewende Bronne, 1998, (Wet 18 van 1998) en is as Ramsar vleiland benoem, omdat dit so belangrik is vir soveel watervoëls. Die strandmeer en meeste van die omliggende grond word deur die Weskus Nasionale Park volgens 'n konsep bestuursplan geadministreer. Dit word in drie verskillende gebruiksones verdeel, naamlik wildernes,, beperkte ontspanning- en veeldoelige onspanningsgebiede. Toegang tot die Wildernessone (wat belangrike huisvesting vir waadvoëls en broeiende seevoëlpopulasies bied) is tot die SANParke beperk en dit net tot op sekere dele. Seilbote en seilplanke word in die beperkte ontspanningsone toegelaat terwyl die veeldoelige onspanningsone meeste watersport toelaat, b.v. vlieëerbranderplankry, waterski, snorkel, duik, roei, swem, visvang en bootry. Geen uithaal en verwydering van perlemoen en kreef word egter in die strandmeer toegelaat nie. Die voorgestelde perseel grens aan die veeldoelige sone, Sone A.

#### Visuele Karaktereienskappe

Die hoogste punt op die perseel is Stompneusrots, wat tot 93m hoog styg. Die koppie en die rif/platorand waarvan dit deel is, vorm 'n sigwig tussen die perseel en die res van die dorp, spesifiek Myburgh Park, met slegs die huise direk langs die rif wat uitsig na die ooste oor die perseel bied. Van Stompneusrots hel die perseel afwaarts, styl in sekere plekke, tot die kuslyn van Langebaan na die suide en suid-ooste.

### **BEPLANNINGSKONTEKS**

Hoewel die perseel as *Subdivisionele Gebied* vir dorpsontwikkeling gesoneer is en in beginsel toegeken is vir een of ander vorm van ontwikkeling, moet daar van die onderstaande beleids-aanwysers kennis geneem word:

- Wes-Kaap Ruimtelike Ontwikkelingsriglyn
- Groeipotensiaal van Dorpe in die Wes-Kaap 20040
- Konsep Kussone Beleid vir die Wes-Kaap, 2000
- Weskusgebied: Velddrif – Bokpunt Struktuurplan, 1988
- Vredenburg – Saldanha en Omgewing Dorpstruktuurplan, 1992
- Weskus Substreek Struktuurplan, 1995
- Kaapse Weskus Biosfeer Beskermingsgebied, 1999
- Dokument van Geïntegreerde Beplanning: Weskustreek, 2002
- Konsep Weskus Distrik Munisipale Ruimtelike Ontwikkelingsriglyn, 2006 - 2007
- Langebaan en Omgewing Struktuurplan, 1999
- Weskus Nasionale Park & Langebaan Strandmeer Gebruiksones
- Konsep Saldanhabaai Munisipale Ruimtelike Ontwikkelingsriglyn, 2002

'n Sinopsis van die beleidsaanwysers dui aan dat die oorkoepelende filosofie van die perseel as "beskerming met ontwikkeling" beskryf kan word.

### **VOORGESTELDE ONTWIKKELINGSALTERNATIEWE**

**Die volgende alternatiewe konsepte is gedurende die Bestekfase van hierdie OIA proses oorweeg:**

Alternatief 1 (2 Julie 2005)

Hierdie ontwikkelingsalternatief is opgestel met die inagneming van die aanvanklike beperkings (d.i. botaniese sensitiewe gebiede, ontwikkeling terugsettingslyn) wat gedurende besprekings met die projekspan geïdentifiseer is, dus was die oorspronklike voorstel deur Planning Partners aangepas om die volgende komponente te bevat:

- 'n Restaurant
- 114 enkel residensiële erwe
- 24 groepsbehuisingsseenhede
- Parkering en ablusiegeriewe
- Oop ruimtes/bewaringsgebiede

Die bestaande hoofpad met sy S-vorm wat oos-wes deur die perseel loop, word behou, met interne toegangsroetes wat daarmee verbind. Die hoof oos-wes interne toegangsroete volg die lyn van die bestaande hoof grondpad. Die ontwikkelingskomponente word in 5 enkel residensiële ontwikkelingstrosse gegroepeer, 'n groepsbehuisingsperseel en 'n restaurant, parkering en ablusiegeriewe.

Hierdie alternatiewe konsep het gefaal op grond van visuele oorwegings, asook die behoefte aan breër ekologiese korridors.

Alternatief 3 (September 2006)

Verdere insette van die projekspan aangaande kwessies met betrekking tot botaniese, fauna en visuele oorwegings is in ag geneem met die hersiening van die ontwikkelingsvoorstel, wat tot gevolg gehad het Alternatief 3 – bestaande uit die volgende aanpassings:

- Die groepsbehuisingsperseel is deur 'n lodge/hotelfasiliteit vervang (d.i. 40 slaapkamers en verwante gebruike)
- Die hoeveelheid residensiële eenhede/erwe is verminder vanaf 114 tot 100
- 25 vakansie behuisingsseenhede/erwe is verskaf in plek van die enkel residensiële erwe
- Meer oop ruimtes is verskaf binne residensiële groeperings asook tussen residensiële eenhede
- Die breedte van die ekologiese korridors is met meer as 50 m verbreed
- Groter voorsiening is gemaak vir natuurlike dreinerings
- 'n Fasiliteit vir 'n SANPark hekkantoor is verskaf

Na aanleiding van die Ope Huis Vergadering wat in September 2006 gehou is, is verskeie vrae geopper aangaande die regsgeeskiedenis van die perseel. Die voorsteller het toe regsadvies van Johan du Plessis Prokureurs aangevra om die huidige regstatus van die eiendom te bevestig asook die toepaslikheid van die "ECA" en die nuwe WNOB regulasies. Gebaseer op bevestiging verkry vanaf die Departement het die voorsteller besluit om die uitleg aan te pas, in lyn met vorige magtiging wat vir hierdie eiendom gegee is en wat dus geen OIA benodig het nie.

Alternatief 4 (Maart 2007)

Na verder openbare en magtigingsondersoek, asook met die opklaar van die regsgeeskiedenis van die eiendom, is Alternatief 3 soos volg aangepas:

- Die lodge/hotelfasiliteit (40 slaapkamers en verwante gebruike) is deur 10 enkel residensiële erwe vervang
- Die 25 vakansiehuiserwe is deur 25 enkel residensiële erwe vervang
- Die restaurantperseel is deur 3 residensiële erwe vervang
- Die SANPark hekkantoorfasiliteit is uitgelaat

Die vervanging van die lodge/hotel en restaurant sal verminderde impakte op die Langebaan Strandmeer, sowel as verkeer tot gevolg hê. Hierdie impakte sal egter deur die OIA fase van die proses geassesseer word.

## **Alternatief 1, Alternatief 5 en Geen Ontwikkeling Alternatief word in hierdie verslag geassesseer.**

### Alternatief 1 (Oktober 2001)

Hierdie ontwikkelingsvoorstel is deur die vorige grondeienaar opgestel. Die hoofkomponente van die voorstel bestaan uit die volgende:

- 109 enkel residensiële erwe
- S-vormige oos-wes pad deur die perseel
- Parkeringsfasiliteite
- Natuurlike Oop Ruimtes

Die sensitiviteitsontleding wat namens die nuwe grondeienaar onderneem is, het aan die lig gebring dat hierdie uitleg baie hoog inbreuk maak op hoë bewaringswaardige gebiede en dat 'n aantal van die residensiële erwe onder die ontwikkeling terugsettingslyn is (d.i. te naby geleë aan die rant van die strandmeer).

### Alternatief 5 (Augustus 2007) – die ontwikkelaar se voorkeur alternatief.

'n Lae-digtheid, hoë inkomste ontwikkeling is van pas om die natuurlike bates te bewaar en om genoeg fondse vir rehabilitasie en beskerming te genereer. Dit sal die maatskaplike, omgewings- en ekonomiese lewensvatbaarheid van die ontwikkeling verseker asook die suksesvolle langtermyn bestuur en rehabilitasie van die eiendom.

Die konsep wat vir die eiendom voorgestel is, poog om die optimal oorvleueling van drie globale bindende mandate te bereik: die bevrediging van die behoeftes van die gemeenskap, omgewing en ekonomiese mark. Alternatief 5 is die resultaat van 'n herhalende proses wat gedurende die Bestekfase gevolg is en poog om al die spesialiskwessies in ag te neem.

Gebaseer op die kommentaar ontvang van die B&GPe, DO&OB, het die projek-argitekte en visuele impakkonsultante die volgende aanpassings aan Alternatief 4 gemaak:

- 'n Residensiële tros na die noorde van die S-vormige teerpad is uitgelaat. Die ekologiese korridor tussen die twee oorblywende trosse is verbreed na 216m by die nouste punt.
- Residensiële erwe wat 'verloor' is met die uitlating van die bogenoemde tros, is by die ander residensiële trosse gevoeg.
- Die totale aantal residensiële erwe is van 113 na 109 verminder.

### Geen Ontwikkelingsalternatief

Die geen ontwikkelingsopsie sal tot gevolg hê dat die status quo van die perseel huidiglik behou word. Indien geen ontwikkeling op hierdie perseel plaasvind nie, moet daar van die volgende kennis geneem word:

- Die grond sal sonering as Subdivisionele Gebied behou, met die waarskynlikheid van toekomstige ontwikkelingsaansoeke wat voorgelê sal word.
- Op korttermyn sal die eienaar toegelaat word om twee wonings te bou.
- Daar mag wel voortgehoue aftakeling van die omgewing wees, soos wat tans gebeur as gevolg van die onbeheerde gebruik van die eiendom.
- Daar sal geen maatskaplik-ekonomiese voordele geskep word nie (b.v. skepping van 'n uitgepreide deel as openbare grond ( $\pm 70$  ha); openbare toegang tot die strandmeer vanaf die pad en voetpaaie; openbare parkering en ablusiefasiliteite; openbare voetpaaie, werksgeleentheid, residensiële geleentheid, infrastruktuur ontwikkeling, afwenteling vanaf ander sektore, en inkomste aan die plaaslike, distrik- en sentrale owerhede.)

## **DIENSTE**

### Elektriese dienste

Die Saldanha Munisipaliteit is die Elektriese diensverskaffer van die gebied wat deur die ontwikkeling geaffekteer word. Alle dienste om elektrisiteit aan die nuwe erwe te verskaf sal volgens die Munisipale Standaard geskied en sal bestaan uit ondergrondse kables en straatmeublement volgens die Munisipale Standaard om aan te pas by die aangrensende Residensiële Standaard.

### Water

Die bestaande netwerk of nuwe netwerk, indien vereis, sal met 'n bestaande 100 mm water hooftoevoerpyp gekoppel word wat deel vorm van die Myburgh Heights Reservoir sub-distrik. Geen opgradering van die bestaande reservoir kapasiteit word voorgestel nie as gevolg van die beskikbare spaar kapasiteit van die Country Club Middel reservoir en die Myburgh Park pompstasie. Die bestaande 200/150 mm deursnit toevoerpyp vanaf die Myburgh Park reservoir is egter reeds onvoldoende, en het tot gevolg lae werkingsdruk. Die voorgestelde nuwe ontwikkeling sal die situasie versleg en die bestaande toevoerpyp moet dus opgegradeer word deur 'n addisionele toevoerpyp langs die bestaande lyn te verskaf.

### Riool

Die interne rioolnetwerk sal 160mm deursnit uPVC klas 34 pype bevat en sal volgens die topografiese lae punt van die perseel dreineer. 'n Pompstasie sal vereis word om die riool na die bestaande rioolnetwerk in Oostewalweg te pomp. Die bestaande netwerk en behandelingsaanleg beskik oor genoegsame kapasiteit om die verwagte spitstoevoer van 4,4 l/s vanaf die voorgestelde ontwikkeling te hanteer. Die pompstasie sal 'n ondergrondse 1,8m deursnit mangat hê met twee ondergrondse pompe (een bystandpomp). Die enigste bogrondse struktuur sal die elektriese skakelbord wees en die heining rondom die pompstasie.

### Afloopwater

Afloopwater sal nie in die strandmeer gestort word nie. Afloopwater sal na opslag/filtreerdamme gelei word. Die voorgestelde ontwikkeling sal in ses ontwikkelingsnodules verdeel word en die afvloei van elkeen van hierdie nodules sal op 'n individuele basis hanteer word. Alle afvloeiwater sal in opslag/infiltreringsdamme, via pype of paaie gelei word, waar die water versprei sal word deur middel van infiltrasie. Alle pype sal ondergronds wees. Die grootte van die damme sal deur die infiltrasietempo bepaal word.

### Paaie

Paaie tot die perseel sal vanaf die bestaande Park Rylaan wat deur die perseel loop, kom. Alle interne padoppervlakke sal sypaadjies aan beide kante van die paaie hê. Alternatiewe oppervlakke soos baksteenplaveisel, sal oorweeg word indien nodig.

### Vaste Afval

Saldanha Munisipaliteit het aangetoon dat hulle oor genoegsame kapasiteit beskik om die bykomende vaste afval te hanteer wat deur die voorgestelde ontwikkeling gegenereer sal word.

## **TAKE OM GEDURENDE DIE OIA FASE TE ONDERNEEM**

Volledige afskrifte van die OIV sal in die Langebaan Biblioteek en by die Saldanha Munisipale kantore geplaas word. Belangstellende en Geaffekteerde Partye sal van die Omgewingsimpakverslag (OIV) in kennis gestel word deur middel van advertensies in Die Weslander, Die Burger en die Cape Times. Benewens die advertensies, sal B&GPe op ons databasis via geregistreerde pos en e-pos in kennis gestel word en die bestuursopsomming van die OIV sal versprei word. Hierdie OIV sal vir 'n 30-dag periode beskikbaar gestel word. Die Konsep OIV sal ook beskikbaar gemaak word op die maatskappy se webtuiste: [www.dougjeff.co.za](http://www.dougjeff.co.za). B&GPe sal genooi word om 'n Ope Huis Vergadering wat in Langebaan gehou sal word, by te woon. Aan die einde van die kommentaarperiode sal die verslag hersien word in reaksie op die terugvoering van vanaf die B&GPe verkry is. Alle kommentaar ontvang en reaksies op die kommentaar sal by die Finale Omgewingsimpakverslag (Finale OIV) ingesluit word. Die Finale OIV sal vir 'n 30-dae kommentaar periode beskikbaar gemaak word, waarna dit aan die DO&OB vir besluitneming voorgelê sal word.



## BOTANIESE ASSESSERING

Alternatief 1 maak inbreuk op die hoë botaniese sensitiewe gebiede wat versag kan word deur die herontwerp van die uitleg. Alternatief 5 is die resultaat van 'n herhalende proses en die negatiewe impakte is meestal in die minder sensitiewe areas van die perseel en word breedweg as aanvaarbaar op 'n streekskaal gesien. Verpligte versagtingsmaatreëls behoort suksesvol te wees in die minimalisering van potensiële impakte, wat teen aanvaarbare vlakke behoort te wees (maar nie noodwendig teen optimale vlakke nie). Alternatief 5 is vanaf 'n botaniese perspektief dus die voorkeur ontwikkelingsopsie.

Die direkte (en sommige van die indirekte) negatiewe impakte kan verder verminder word deur die afskaling in die gebied van die totale ontwikkelingsvoetspoor, maar dis die geval vir die meeste ontwikkelingsaansoeke, en spesialiste se Bepalings van Verwysing (soos vereis deur CapeNature en die Botaniese Vereniging van Suid-Afrika) is om die oorkoepelende beduidenheid van die kwessies te assesser teen verskeie skale, en om beide die positiewe en negatiewe impakte te identifiseer.

Alternatief 5 word beskou om as genoegsaam reagerend tot die botaniese beperkings van die perseel te wees en daar is beduidende positiewe impakte wat met hierdie aansoek geassosieer kan word indien alle versagtingsmaatreëls suksesvol uitgevoer kan word (soos die formele bewaring van tot 80% van die perseel, insluitende alle sleutel botaniese areas). Alternatief 5 sal waarskynlik 'n Lae tot Medium negatiewe botaniese impak op plaaslike skaal (Langebaan) hê, en 'n Lae tot Medium negatiewe impak op 'n streekskaal (St Helenabaai- Langebaangebied), na versagting. Om die getal eenhede met tot 30% te verminder sal na alle waarskynlikheid nie die oorkoepelende botaniese impakte beduidend verander nie.

Die ontwikkeling soos voorgestel is nie ideal gesien vanaf 'n botaniese perspektief nie, omdat die ideale scenario formele, permanente bewaring van die hele perseel sal behels, maar dit is ongelukkig nie 'n alternatief nie. Ongelukkig in hierdie geval bring die Geen Ontwikkelingsalternatief 'n aantal baie belangrike onsekerhede mee, veral ten opsigte van die potensiële impakte op die plantegroei (moontlik vee wat daar kan wei, miskien toekomstige ontwikkelingsaansoek en die daaropvolgende gebrek om sleutelareas vir bewaring te verseker, ens.) Dit is moontlik dat die impakte kan wissel van Laag tot Medium negatief, en is dus nie noodwendig die voorkeur alternatief nie.

Indien Alternatief 5 goedgekeur sou word, moet alle versagtings- en bestuursmaatreëls soos hierbo genoem, as verpligtend beskou word en moet dit as voorvereistes vir die goedkeuring van Omgewingsmagtiging ingesluit word.

## FAUNA ASSESSERING

Die belang van die diere op die perseel is matig op streek- en laag tot matig op nasionale skaal vir soogdiere, voëls en reptiele. Vir paddas is die belang van hierdie perseel laag op streek- en nasionale skaal. Die perseel is dus nie besonder belangrik vanaf 'n diere oogmerk nie en dit voldoen nie aan die kriteria van 'n geen-ontwikkelingsone nie. As sulks is dit nie onvanpas om die verskeie voorgestelde ontwikkelingsalternatiewe te oorweeg nie, met die inagneming dat versagtingsmaatreëls tog toepaslik is om die impak op die natuurlike omgewing te verminder. Met ander woorde, daar is beweegruimte om die voorgestelde ontwikkeling te akkommodeer en steeds 'n genoegsame vlak van ekostelsel funksionering te handhaaf.

Die versagtingsmaatreëls soos deur die botaniese en diereverslae voorgestel, is die sleutel tot die integrasie van die natuurlike omgewing en die voorgestelde ontwikkeling en moet dus ten volle ingeskakel word om 'n residensiële gebied daar te stel wat aanvaarbaar is ten opsigte van die instandhouding van die ekologiese integriteit van die perseel. Alternatief 5 is die voorkeur ontwikkelingsopsie omdat dit aan al die fauna vereistes voldoen en meeste van dié van die botaniese voorstelle. Die geen ontwikkelingsalternatief is ook wenslik, en mag dalk voorkeur bo Alternatief 5 geniet, afhangende van die skaal van enige toekomstige aktiwiteite wat vir die perseel en die bestuur van openbare aktiwiteite by die strandmeersone voorgestel word.

Die algehele skaal van hierdie ontwikkelingsalternatief word as geskik gesien in die bestaande naasliggende grondgebruik scenarios, d.i. dit verteenwoordig 'n toepaslike oorgang tussen die dig-ontwikkelde Langebaan residensiële sone en die natuurlike aard van die sone van die WNP. Trouens, met die ontwikkelingsvoetspoor wat slegs 15% van die perseel beslaan, is hierdie spesifieke ontwikkelingsalternatief heelwat meer gunstig ten opsigte van omgewingsoorwegings as wat onder normale omstandighede vereis word. 'n Verdere vermindering van huiseenhede sal natuurlik die ontwikkelingvoetspoor nog kleiner maak, maar sal nie die algehele negatiewe impak wat tans as laag tot medium geprojekteer word, verminder nie. Die negatiewe impak van die geen ontwikkelingsalternatief sal waarskynlik ook laag tot medium wees, al is die ontwikkelingsvoetspoor heelwat minder as dié van Alternatief 5.

### **VISUELE IMPAKASSESSERING**

Alternatief 1 het gebreke deurdat die visuele impak van die kuslyn as onaanvaarbaar beskou word en ook omdat dit inbreuk maak op die bewaringswaardige fynbosgebiede wat die visuele aarde van die perseel sal affekteer.

Die perseel is visueel baie sensitief en die verkeerde vorm van ontwikkeling daarop kan hoogs negatiewe visuele gevolge vir die omliggende gebiede hê. Aangesien die prinsiep van ontwikkeling op die perseel reeds gevestig is en omdat dit binne die dorpsgebied van Langebaan geleë is, word daar geglo dat die Alternatief 5 uitleg saam met die voorgestelde argitektoniese behandeling beperkte ontwikkeling sal toelaat wat met die omgewing sal saamsmelt en terselfdertyd die natuurlike eienskappe van die perseel sal bewaar en beskerm. Dit kan ook gedoen word met die minimum visuele inbreuk op die Weskus Nasionale Park, met die landgoed wat 'n oorgangsvorm tussen Myburgh Park en sy redelik digte uitleg en groot strukture na die weste en die oop ruimtes en nasionale park na die ooste en suide.

Die feit dat 85% van die fynbos op die perseel bewaar sal word en vir die algemene publiek deur sonering toeganklik gemaak sal word as openbare oop ruimte, word ten opsigte van die visuele impak in positiewe lig gesien.

Die algehele beduidenheid van die visuele impak van die Alternatief 5 ontwikkeling, sal met die implementasie van ontwerpriglyne en versagtingsmaatreëls medium-laag negatief op die langtermyn wees. Vermindering van die aantal erwe sal nie die beduidenheid van die visuele impak verminder nie hoewel die digtheid van die visuele impak effens laer mag wees. Daar word geglo dat, ten opsigte van visuele kwessies, Alternatief 5 'n realistiese mate van ontwikkeling toelaat terwyl visuele eienskappe terselfdertyd so ver moontlik bewaar word. Daar word dus aanbeveel dat die implementasie van Alternatief 5 toegelaat word om voort te gaan maar dat gereelde omgewingsoudits op die perseel gedoen word om te verseker dat die ontwikkeling binne die visuele beperkings val soos uiteengesit deur die VIA.

### **ERFENIS IMPAKASSESSERING**

Die geen ontwikkelingsopsie vir die perseel is onrealisties, gegewe dat die perseel reeds ontwikkelingsregte het. Trouens, die werklikheid is dat toekomstige voorstelle nie so omgewings- en kontekstueel simpatiek sal wees soos die huidige voorstel nie. Gegewe die aard van die hersiende ontwerpriglyne, is die moontlikheid groot om ontwikkeling op hierdie perseel te begin wat met versagting 'n suksesvolle ruimtelike oorgang tussen die dorpsontwikkeling van Langebaan Suid en die natuurlike/landelike landskappe van die Weskus Nasionale Park sal vestig.

Die Voorkeur Alternatief 5 word as beduidende verbetering op die oorspronklike ontwikkelingsvoorstelle vir hierdie perseel beskou, soos met hofbevel gestop gedurende die implementasie (Alternatief 1.) Trouens, die voorkeur alternatief is 'n verbetering wat onherkenbaar is van oorspronklike gedaante, veral ten opsigte van visuele impak en impakte op die perseel se biofisiese erfenis.

Alternatief 5 presteer goed wanneer gemeet word teen die EIA Ontwerpriglyne. By vergelyking presteer Alternatief 1 (die oorspronklike voorstel) sleg wanneer dit teen hierdie ontwerpriglyne gemeet word. Alternatief 5 het die potensiaal om 'n presedent te stel vir die gebied ten opsigte van sensitiewe reaksie op die landskap, indien dit streng binne hierdie riglyne geïmplementeer word. Soos wat ontwikkeling en landskap verouder, sal die visuele impak gedurende die dag laag wees. Dit word duidelik deur die 3D montages bewys, waar die voorgestelde eenhede met pyltjies aangewys moes word omdat dit nie duidelik sigbaar is nie. Impakte gedurende die aand word as medium bereken, hoewel die beduidenis daarvan heelwat minder is as die lig-oorspoeling van die naburige Myburgh Park 1 & 3 waar dit bo-oor die rif van Stompneusrots skyn.

Daar moet genoem word dat die tipe en skaal van die voorgestelde ontwikkeling van Alternatief 5 vanaf 'n erfenis perspektief as geskik gesien word in die konteks van die perseel. Vermindering in digtheid sal nie die erfenisimpakte verlaag nie, solank die hersiende Argitek- en Landskapriglyne streng toegepas en gevolg word.

Ontwikkeling in die gebied beloof om broodnodige beheer oor die plant-, fauna en argeologiese bronne op die perseel daar te stel terwyl dit terselfdertyd formele openbare ablusie en parkeerfasiliteite sal verskaf asook geformaliseerde voetpaaie en wandelpaai wat sensitiewe areas sal beskerm.

### **ARGEOLOGIESE ASSESSERING**

Solank die Stompneusrots bewaringsarea in stand gehou word, sal die impakte van die argeologiese erfenis na alle waarskynlikheid laag bly.

### **MAATSKAPLIKE IMPAKASSESSERING**

Die feite is dat die perseel privaat besit word, dat dit "subdivisionele" soneringsregte het en dat die Saldanha Munisipaliteit ook aangedui het dat die perseel by die hersiende dorpsgrens ingesluit sal word.

Binne hierdie konteks is die bevindings van die OIA dat die voorgestelde ontwikkeling (Alternatief 5) nie 'n impak op die openbare toegang na die grootste deel van die perseel en Langebaan Strandmeer sal hê nie. Openbare toegang tot Langebaan Strandmeer sal verbeter word met die voorsiening van 'n parkeerarea en ablusiefasiliteite. Terwyl die ontwikkeling van 109 residensiële eenhede op die huidige, onontwikkelende gevoel van die plek 'n impak sal hê, toon die Visuele en Erfenis Assessering dat die potensiële impakte effektief aangespreek kan word. Binne die konteks van die perseel se subdivisionele sonering word Alternatief 5 dus as 'n aanvaarbare en gepaste ontwikkelingsopsie vir die perseel beskou.

Met betrekking tot die geen ontwikkelingsalternatief, sal die eiendom in sy huidige onontwikkelde staat bly. Omdat die perseel subdivisionele regte het en dit in die dorpsgrens ingesluit sal word, indien die huidige ontwikkeling nie goedgekeur sou word nie, sal een of ander ontwikkeling wel in die toekoms voorgestel word. Hierdie vorm van ontwikkeling mag of mag nie so omgewings sensitief wees nie en mag of mag nie openbare toegang tot die perseel en Langebaan Strandmeer toelaat nie.

Indien 'n laer-digtheid alternatief geassesser word, is die sleutelkwessie wat so 'n assessering sal beïnvloed waar op die perseel die eenhede verwyder sal word. Indien eenhede van die deel langs die strandmeer verwyder word, sal dit die visuele impak en gevoel-van-plek impak wat met die voorkeur alternatief, Alternatief 5 geassosieer word, verminder. Byvoorbeeld, indien die aantal eenhede met 33 verminder word (30% vermindering, byvoorbeeld) sal dit tot gevolg hê dat al 19 eenhede in die noord-westelike tros wat reg langs die strandmeer geleë is, verwyder kan word. Die visuele en gevoel-van-plek impakte wat met hierdie tros verwant is, sal dus nie meer bestaan nie. Die potensiële visuele impak van hierdie tros op die aangrensende grondeienaars in Langebaan sal ook verwyder word. Daarmee saam, sal 14 eenhede wat langs die strandmeer naby Shark Bay geleë is, ook verwyder kan word. Dit sal ook die visuele gevoel-van-plek impakte op die Langebaan Strandmeer en Shark Bay wat met die voorgestelde ontwikkeling verwant is, verminder.

'n 30% vermindering in die getal eenhede, spesifiek die eenhede wat langs die Langebaan Strandmeer geleë is, sal die algehele visuele en gevoel-van-plek impakte wat met die voorgestelde ontwikkeling (Alternatief 5) verwant is, verminder. 'n 30% vermindering van die getal eenhede verteenwoordig dus 'n positiewe versagtende maatreël. Daarsulks is die verminderde digtheidopsie die voorkeur opsie. Die bevindings van die verskeie spesialisstudies, insluitende die Visuele en Erfenis Assessering, toon egter aan dat die impakte wat met Alternatief 5 verwant is, aanvaarbaar is en effektief versag kan word.

### **GRONDWATER STUDIE**

Daar is vasgestel dat die voorgestelde ontwikkeling geen risiko vir die grondwater of potensiële reseptors is nie.

### **ONTWIKKELING TERUGESettingsLYN**

Indien die voorgestelde ontwikkeling terugsettingslyn (50 m) geïmplementeer word, sal die voorgestelde ontwikkelig 'n voldoende afstand weg van die huidige strand wees om goeie kusbestuursbeleide na te kom.

### **VERKEER IMPAKASSESERING**

Genoegsame sigafstande en ruimte vir nood en brandbestrydingsvoertuie moet op die perseel verskaf word. Geen padverbeterings word vereis nie.

### **OPSOMMING**

Gedetailleerde spesialisassesserings is as deel van hierdie Omgewingsimpakassessering onderneem. Gedurende die aanvanklike stadiums van die proses is basislyn studies onderneem in reaksie op die aanvanklike alternatiewe wat voorgestel is. 'n Herhalende proses het toe plaasgevind om by 'n ontwikkelingsvoorstel/alternatief uit te kom wat die minste impak op die omliggende omgewing het. Alternatief 5 word as hierdie alternatief beskou en is ook die ontwikkelaar se voorkeur alternatief

Alternatief 1 maak inbreuk op hoë en baie hoë bewaringswaardige botaniese gebiede, voldoende ekologiese korridors word nie verskaf nie, 'n aantal residensiële erwe is onder die ontwikkeling terugsettingslyn geleë en word gesien as onaanvaarbaar vanaf 'n visuele en erfenis oogpunt.

**Dit is duidelik vanuit die spesialisassesserings dat die tipe en skaal van die voorgestelde ontwikkelingsalternatief (Alternatief 5) binne aanvaarbare beperkings val, gesien binne die konteks van die perseel. Deur die getal eenhede te verminder, sal nie 'n laer beduidenheidsgraad in geïdentifiseerde impakte tot gevolg hê nie. Die tipe ontwikkeling, nl. Laedigheid residensiël, word as geskik vir die ligging van die perseel beskou. Alternatief 5 verteenwoordig 'n toepaslike oorgangsonne tussen die intensiewe ontwikkelde Langebaan residensiële sone en dié van die natuurlike sone van die Weskus Nasionale Park. Die voorgestelde ontwikkeling sal ook ten minste 50 m vanaf die hoogwatermerk van die strandmeer teruggesit word. Dit wissel tussen 56 m en 112 m vir die erwe wat vooraan teen die strandmeer lê.**

In hierdie geval behou die **Geen Ontwikkelingsalternatief** te veel onsekerhede. Wat wel bekend is, is dat die perseel sy Subdivisionele Gebiedsonering sal behou en dat dit by die dorpsgrens van Langebaan ingesluit sal word. Die huidige ontwikkelaar het die reg om twee residensiële wonings op die perseel te bou en die publiek daarvan te verhoed om die private paaie wat toegang tot die strand bied, te gebruik. Indien die ontwikkelaar die grond sou verkoop, mag daar toekomstige ontwikkelingsaansoeke wees wat minder agting vir die omgewing toon – veral die sleutel bewaringsgebiede.

Die spesialisstudies toon dus dat Alternatief 5, met volle versagtingmaatreëls, aanvaarbaar is. Daar word aanbeveel dat Alternatief 5 goedgekeur word.

Indien die ontwikkeling op die perseel goedgekeur sou word, moet die aanbevelings soos in die verslag gelys word, geïmplementeer word.