



LORNAY
ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING

APPENDIX F2C
PART 3: PUBLIC COMMENTS



COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE I&APs PART 3			
Number	Name	Comment	Date:
600.	Helene Smith	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT I am representing myself ,Helene Smith 5510060046086.I have direct interest as i have property in Struisbaai and stand in Aghulas . I have a close bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood, I am totally against this development. Please contact me if you need any further information. Safety greetings, Helene Smith CEO 0828555828	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 13:40
601.	Andre Swanepoel	Email dated 28 February 2025 AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT 28 FEBRUARY 2025	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 14:10

		Dear Michelle, SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . • I am representing myself, Andre Swanepoel ID 560101 5084 080 Address: 3481 Retha Close, Oceanview Heights, Struisbaai • I have a direct interest in the application please register me as an Interested and affected person • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. ○ I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is that we visit Struisbaai often due to beautiful scenery and object against this development as we need to protect nature. Refer to Spookdraai Generic objection 1.	
602.	Elizabeth Odendaal	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development Struisbaai Hi Please register my objection against the Spookdraai Development. Regards Elizabeth Odendaal	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 14:26
603.	Matthys Odendaal	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: Spookdraai struisbaai development Hi. Please register my objection against the proposed development plan on Spookdraai. Refards Matthys Odendaal	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 14:29
604.	Marlise du Toit on Behalf of LA Wentzel	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: Objections: Proposed Spookdraai Development Struisbaai Good day, Please find attached correspondence regarding abovementioned.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 14:30

		Regards Marlise du Toit LORNAY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING Attention: Michelle Naylor michelle@lornay.co.za Our ref : MDT/ Your ref : Date : 28 February 2025 Dear Madam RE OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI DEVELOPMENT: STRUISBAAI We are contacting you on behalf of our client, Mr LA Wentzel, owner of Erf 1002 Struisbaai. As our client is of a similar mindset, we attach a comprehensive report by Mr JW Conradie, with his permission. Yours truly MULLER TERBLANCHE & BEYERS Refer to Spookdrai generic objection 1.	
605.	Agulhas Heritage Society	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: Registering as an Interested and Affected Party Good day Please register the Agulhas Heritage Society (HWC reg nr: HM/CB/28-02-2020/06) officially as an Interested and Affected Party. Thank you. Emmerentia de Kock Secretary Agulhas Heritage Society Agulhas Heemhuis Jim van Drutensingel L'Agulhas	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 14:45

		7287 e-pos: agulhas.heritage@gmail.com	
606.	Hasn Jurie Human	Email dated 28 February 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . - I am representing myself, Hans Jurie Human ID No: 4701105033087. - I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Address or I vacation here or 4 Margo Street, Struisbaai. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ - Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is is given below. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
607.	Marile Giliomee	Email dated 28 February 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . - I am representing myself Name, Surname ID# Marile Giliomee, 8409200260086 - I have a direct interest, in the application as I own property in Struisbaai- Address or I vacation here or 19 Patrys Street, Struisbaai. - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have visiting this area since my childhood. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ - Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is is given below.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 16:25

608.	Catharina Margaretha Giliomee	Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1. Email dated 28 February 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID# 8004100118086. • I have a direct interest, in the application as I own property in Struisbaai- Address or I vacation here or Protea Weg 43, Struisbaai, 7285. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is is given below. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 16: 25
609.	CJ Giliomee	Email dated 28 February 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID# CJ Giliomee, 820808142087 • I have a direct interest, in the application as I own property in Struisbaai- Address or I vacation here or 2 Church Street, Struisbaai, 7285 • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is is given below.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 16:25

		Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
610.	Catharina Margaretha Giliomee	Email dated 28 February 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID# Catharina Margaretha Giliomee 5609300012088 • I have a direct interest, in the application as I own property in Struisbaai- Address or I vacation here or • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 16:25
611.	Elmine H Steenkamp	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: OBJECTION TO THE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SPOOKDRAAI To: Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 15 FEBRUARY 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Elmine H Steenkamp ID no. 510620 0026 086 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in L’Agulhas – Hoofweg 40, Mount Pleasant, L’Agulhas • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely	Date:28/02/25 Time: 17:51

		inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Elmine H Steenkamp Name Surname Mobile 082 788 3732 Email steenkampelmine@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
612.	Jan H G Richter	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: OBJECTION TO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT IN SPOOKDRAAI To Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 15 FEBRUARY 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Jan H G Richter ID no 580524 5085 086 • I have a direct interest in the application as my wife owns property in L’Agulhas – Sceptre cl 4, L’Agulhas and we live here permanently • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below.	

		Regards Jan H G Richter Name Surname Mobile 066 266 0019 Email richter.spectrum@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai Generic objection 1.	
613.	Wanda Richter	Email dated 28 February 2025 To Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 15 FEBRUARY 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Wanda Richter ID no 660213 0049 083 - I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Sceptre cl 4, L’Agulhas and I live here permanently - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ - Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Wanda Richter Name Surname Mobile 082 464 3689 Email wandatruiter66@gmail.com Refer to spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 18:06
614.	Anita Bagshaw	Email dated 28 February 2025 Subject: Spookdraai	Date: 28/02/25 Time: 23:03

		Dear Michelle This development and the legality of it must be placed before Western Cape compliance. How can this possibly be allowed given the Coastal Management Act of 2008? I understand that as of August last year that Municipal Managers may be held criminally liable should they allow developments to happen which are contrary to our National Environmental Laws. This development will ruin a very special piece of our coastline. Anita Bagshaw	
615.	Conrad Vlok	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Objection to proposed development of the spookdaai estate TO Whom it May concern . As a resident in Protea weg 24 In Struisbaai I would like to make strong objection to the proposed development of erwen along the coast as indicated. It seems like we have AGULHAS COUNCIL CAPTURE. How is it possible that we have so many developments pushed thru that was not allowed all these years . I refer to the ugliest 5 story building in our pristine coastline along Marine drive, this has scarred Agulhas for every body , for the sake of a few greedy people. Now they want to destroy own of our most iconic fishing, picnic beaches for yet another development . This is our heritage , we have grown up here ! Where are the rules about no new developments within 100 m of the highwater mark. Again this proposal is flawed with corruption and weakness from our council to stand up for what is right for the community Please register me as a affected party to stay informed on this horrific idea. Groete / Kind Regards	Date: 01/03/35 Time: 10:32
616.	Adelle Dirker	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai ontwikkeling Hiermee maak ek kapsie teen die ontwikkeling van Spookdraai	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 10:45
617.	Henry Dowling	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai development. Good day. I object to the development planned for Spookdraai. Regards. Henry Dowling.	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 11:09

618.	Dirker Willem	Summervale Lifestyle Estate. House 122. Lemoenboom St. Gordon's Bay. Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai ontwikkeling Hiermee maak ek kapsie teen die ontwikkeling by Spookdraai!! Behou ons natuur!! Groete Willem Dirker	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 11:16
619.	Johannes du Toit Stegmann	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. Dear Sir / Madam I am representing myself: Johannes du Toit Stegmann, ID # 5507315009083 I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Winston Street L'Agulhas. I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since 2013 and I therefore wish to register as an affected and interested party. I reserve the right to supplement this objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions and I wish to be informed of all further developments around this matter. The grounds and details of my objection is given in the attached document. Please acknowledge receipt of this email and the attached document. Regards Johannes du Toit Stegmann Mobile 084 556 9980 Email jdstegmann@gmail.com FORMAL OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT Proposed Development of Split Portion of Farm 281-RE, Marine Drive, Struisbaai To Whom It May Concern, I hereby submit a formal objection to the proposed development of the split portion of Farm 281-RE, Marine Drive, Struisbaai, as outlined in the different Impact Assessments prepared for Helemika (Pty) Ltd. This objection represents the concerns of an interested and affected member of the public who believe that the development will have significant negative impacts on biodiversity, cultural heritage (especially public access), palaeontological resources, and architectural/landscape integrity. This objection used the reports as an organising factor. 1. Biodiversity Impact 1.1. Loss of Endangered Vegetation The site contains critically endangered Overberg Dune Strandveld and Cape Seashore Vegetation. Developing this area would lead to the irreversible loss of these critical vegetation types, which are critical to the region's biodiversity. Arguing that this site houses only a small portion of Overberg Dune Sandveld and, therefore, can be destroyed does not make sense since similar	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 12:43

		“developments” caused the Overberg Dune Sandveld to become critically endangered! The proposed biodiversity offset is impractical, and the environmental damage would be permanent and unmitigable. 1.2. Critical Biodiversity Area and Ecological Support Function The site is classified as an Ecological Support Area under the Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan. The development would disrupt its ecological functions and threaten regional ecological networks, impacting species uniquely adapted to the coastal environment. 1.3. Irreversible Environmental Impact The proposed development would result in the permanent loss of Overberg Dune Strandveld vegetation and coastal habitats, leading to ongoing significant ecological degradation. These impacts are irreversible and would undermine the environmental sustainability of the region even further. 1.4. Conflict with Conservation Objectives The site lies within a coastal buffer for the SANParks Agulhas National Park, which supports species adapted to harsh coastal environments and part of the site is classified as ESA1. The development contradicts conservation goals for the area, particularly for the narrowly distributed Southwestern Strandveld, which faces threats from invasive species and habitat loss. 2. Heritage Impact 2.1. Loss of Public Access and Cultural Landscape Integrity The site forms part of a coastal cultural landscape with high scenic, cultural, and historical significance. It has been historically accessible to the public, especially to the local fishing community, fostering a sense of cultural identity. The proposed privatisation would impede public access and disrupt cultural continuity, undermining the area's historical identity. 2.2. Negative Visual and Scenic Impact The proposed development would obstruct the uninterrupted scenic views along Marine Drive, a recognised scenic route. Introducing residential units would significantly alter the visual character of the coastal landscape, negatively affecting its cultural landscape integrity and diminishing its historical value. 2.3. Incompatibility with Heritage and Spatial Planning Frameworks The site is located in a sensitive cultural landscape and the Coastal Protection Zone. The Cape Agulhas Municipality's Spatial Development Framework discourages development within the coastal setback and scenic risk areas. The proposed development contradicts these policies, threatening the natural and cultural landscape. 2.4. Heritage Significance and Policy Non-Compliance The site is graded as having Grade IIIA cultural landscape significance. The development does not conform to heritage and visual indicators, resulting in high negative impacts on the coastal and scenic landscape. The proposal fails to comply with Section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, compromising heritage protection objectives. Spookdraai is part of the Cape Agulhas Coastline Heritage Conservation Zone. The Cape Agulhas Municipality describes the coastline in its Zoning By-law as a: “very important heritage conservation zone, not to mention a scenic drive route zone.” (NW 3. Palaeontological Impact 3.1. High Palaeontological Sensitivity of Underlying Bedrock The site is underlain by the Peninsula Formation bedrock, known for its high palaeontological sensitivity. This formation preserves trace fossils that provide critical insights into ancient environmental conditions. Excavation could lead to irreversible loss of these non-renewable scientific resources. 3.2. Potential Fossil Finds in Klein Brak Formation Deposits The site includes raised beach deposits of the Klein Brak Formation, which may contain fossil shells and marine mammal bones. These fossils are valuable for understanding historical biodiversity and biogeographical patterns. Development poses a significant risk of fossil destruction. 3.3. Inadequate Mitigation Measures and Monitoring While mitigation measures are proposed, they rely on construction personnel	
--	--	--	--

		identifying fossils during excavation, which is unreliable. The absence of continuous monitoring by a qualified palaeontologist significantly increases the risk of fossil loss. 3.4. Inconsistent with Heritage Protection Objectives The National Heritage Resources Act emphasizes the protection of palaeontological resources as part of South Africa's national heritage. The proposed development threatens these objectives by risking significant fossil deposits, undermining best practices for heritage conservation. 4. Architectural / Landscape Impact 4.1. Disruption of Visual and Scenic Quality The development would introduce residential units that obstruct scenic views along Marine Drive, impacting the area's visual character and diminishing its cultural landscape integrity. This disruption would negatively affect both local and international tourism, reducing the area's appeal as a scenic destination. 4.2. Environmental Threats from Architectural Guidelines The architectural guidelines permit structures up to 8m in height, obstructing views of historical landmarks such as Spookdraai and the sea. The guidelines also allow for swimming pools and grey water systems, posing risks of contaminated water entering the sea as well as affecting endangered fynbos. Additionally, inadequate provisions for sewage management threaten the eco-sensitive environment of the site. 4.3. Incompatibility with Coastal Protection and Scenic Route Designations The site is within the Coastal Protection Zone, regulated to preserve natural coastal landscapes. The proposed development contradicts the objectives of the Integrated Coastal Management Act and Coastal Set-back Lines policies, which aim to protect scenic values and ecological integrity. 5. Conclusion and Request In terms of South Africa's Constitution, everyone has the right to • have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that prevent pollution and ecological degradation; promote conservation; and secure ecologically sustainable development. • Coastal public property intends to prevent exclusive use of the coast by facilitating access for the benefit of all South Africans. But while Private Property on Coastal Land is Owned by private individuals or entities and is located inland from the High-Water Mark (HWM) and not part of the coastal public property, it is still subject to regulations and restrictions to ensure that private use does not negatively impact the coastal environment or public access. In light of the substantial negative impacts on biodiversity, cultural heritage, palaeontological resources, and architectural/landscape integrity, as well as non-compliance with heritage and spatial planning policies, I respectfully request that the application for the proposed development be rejected. This precautionary approach is necessary to protect the cultural, historical, environmental, and scenic integrity of Struisbaai, L'Agulhas and Suiderstrand and its community. I trust that this objection will receive the serious consideration it warrants to preserve the region's invaluable heritage and environmental sustainability. Sincerely, J du T Stegmann	
620.	Jan Gressmann	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: spookdraai Ons absoluut gekant teen jul aansoek vir onderverdeling. Sleg vir omgewing en onwettig.	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 14:01

		Volgens die kaart , val daai hele be-oogde projek binne in die Admiraliteits-zone van die Staat. En hierdie zone behoort aan die Staat eksklusief en dus die Nasionale Regering. Geen Provinsie of plaaslike Munisipaliteit het enige se oor hierdie Zone en kan geen ontwikkeling aldus toelaat of goedkeur in hierdie omskryfde definisie gebied. Die woordelike definisie van die Admiraliteits Zone volgens die wet, is dat hierdie zone beslaan/strek 100 voet (33 en 'n derde tree) van die hoogste hoogwater storm merk op land, tot 100 voet (dus weer 33 en 'n derde tree) tot die laaste laagwater merk in die see. Dus strek hierdie Admiraliteits Zone in totaal 200 voet (66 en twee derde tree) vanaf in die see tot op land. Niemand privaat (behalwe die Staat self) mag in hierdie zone enige see of privaat grond of Strukture besit of oprig nie. Hierdie kwessie en wet, is al dikwels in die howe getoets en veral hofbeslissings gekry onder die sogenaamde Vestustas beginsel. Hier die beoogde ontwikkeling val totaal binne die Admiraliteits Zone en behoort in 'n komende hofsak, baie gou gestuit te kan word.	
621.	Margaux Loubser	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Objection against the rezoning of Spookdraai Dear Michelle, I am writing to strongly object to the proposed rezoning and development at Spookdraai. This stretch of coastline is an ecologically and culturally significant area, and I am deeply concerned about the impact this development will have. The fragile coastal ecosystem is at risk of irreversible damage, with construction threatening native flora and fauna, increasing erosion, and introducing pollutants into the marine environment. Beyond environmental concerns, the development would compromise the scenic beauty and heritage of the area, detracting from its value to both residents and visitors. Spookdraai is not just a landscape; it is a cherished place for recreation, fishing, and tourism. Building here would limit public access and undermine the local economy that depends on the natural appeal of the coastline. I urge you to reconsider this rezoning and prioritize the long-term preservation of this special place over short-term development gains. At the very least, a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment and community consultation should be required before any decisions are made. Thank you for your time and consideration. Best regards, Margaux Loubser	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 17:57
622.	ANNETTE VAN WYK	Email dated 01 March 2025 Subject: Kapsie teen ontwikkeling van Spookdraai Hiermee teken ek Annette van Wyk, Inwoner van Agulhas kapsie aan teen ontwikkeling van Spookdraai. Die ontwikkeling sal die ongerepte natuur skend, wat 'n gevaar stel aan mens se higiëne en dier en seelewe oorlewens.Daar is net 2 paaie na Agulhas wat reeds re vol is van verkeer, water tekort en beurtkrag. Gte Annette van Wyk Tel 0847995033, email annettevanwyk10@gmail.com	Date: 01/03/25 Time: 20:37
623.	Reinhardt van der Ryst	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Hi Michelle Registreer asseblief vir my en Melinda om projek teen te staan.	

		Mooi loop. Reinhardt van der Ryst +27 83 441 0062 Melinda van der Ryst +27 83 441 0061	
624.	Melinda van der Ryst	Email dated 02 March 2025 Requested to be added to the I&Ap list	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 09:24
625.	Susan White	Email dated 02 March 2025 To Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 2 MARCH 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Susan White, Owner, Driftwood, 170 Ocean View Drive, Struisbaai, 7285 • I have a direct interest in the application please register me as an Interested and affected person. • I have a close emotional bond with this area as an owner of a property here overlooking the proposed development since 2002, and have been visiting this area since 1999. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • We are already shocked by the destruction of natural heritage following the commencement of works on the new 5 storey property on marine drive, and will never support any such development so close to the ocean in Struisbaai or Agulhas. This proposed development will very much harm and permanently alter and destroy for current and future generations a very special and heritage significant part of this natural seaside coastline/stretch of coast between Struisbaai and Agulhas. And might set a precedent for even more tampering and attempts to sneak undesirable developments through that will forever destroy the natural beauty that is so rare to find. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection are given below. Regards Susan White +44 77 961 708 66 susan@soukya.life Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
626.	Tashka Tack	Email dated 02 March 2025	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 09:48

		Subject: SPOOKDRAAI ontwikkeling Geagte Michelle Registrasie as belanghebbende en geaffekteerde party tot die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Registreer my asb. as 'n belanghebbende en geaffekteerder party vir die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai). My persoonlike gegewens is soos volg: Volle name en van: Natasha Thackwray ID nommer: 9210270436088 Telefoon/Selfoonnommer: 0768670204 E-pos adres: tashka.thackwray@gmail.com Vriendelike groete Natasha Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
627.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Ellin Davids	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTION TO THE BUILDING OF HOUSES ON SPOOKDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 1/31. Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 09:53
628.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Willem Kaptein	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 2/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards.	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 09:54

		LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments: doc 00943820250302094704	
629.	Ruby Kleinhans	Email dated 02 March 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Ruby Kleinhans, full time resident at Driftwood, 170 Ocean View Drive, Struisbaai, 7285 • I have a direct interest in the application please register me as an Interested and affected person. • I have a close emotional bond with this area as a long time resident at a property here overlooking the proposed development since 2004, and have been visiting this area since the 1980's and have enjoyed exploring and spending time on the Spookdraai beach and surrounding rocks and coastline for over 20 years. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • We are already shocked by the destruction of natural heritage following the commencement of works on the new 5 storey property on marine drive, and will never support any such development close to the ocean in Struisbaai or Agulhas. • This proposed development will very much harm and permanently alter and destroy for current and future generations a very special and heritage significant part of this natural seaside coastline/stretch of coast between Struisbaai and Agulhas. And might set a precedent for even more tampering and attempts to sneak undesirable developments through that will forever destroy the natural beauty that is so rare to find. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection are given below. Regards Ruby Kleinhans +27 762 660 575 susan@soukya.life Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 09:58
630.	Les Holtzhausen on behalf of Francina Abrahams	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 3/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 09:59

		development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments: doc00943820250302094704	
631.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Elizabeth Newman	Email dated 2=02 March 2025 STRUISBAAI 4/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments: doc00943820250302094704	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:00
632.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Christiaan Abrahams	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 6/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you.	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:05

		Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments: doc00943820250302094704	
633.	Les Holtzhausen on behalf of Jennifer Abrahams	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 5/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments: doc00943820250302094704	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:03
634.	Les Holtzhausen on behalf of Edwill Newman	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 7/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:05

635.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Gert Adams	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 8/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:07
636.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Justin Thompson	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 9/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:11
637.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Wilmren	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 10/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:12

		Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
638.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Efrom Adonis	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 11/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:14
639.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Sonia Matthys	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 12/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:15
640.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Jan Matthys	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 13/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards.	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:16

		LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
641.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Kotie Deplessis	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 14/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:17
642.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Johnny Snyders	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 15/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:18
643.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Elmarie Kluyts	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 16/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities.	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:19

		Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
644.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Roswell Arends	Email dated 02 Mqarch 2025 STRUISBAAI 17/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: -02/03/35 Time: 10:20
645.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Gideon Ahrends	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 18/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:20
646.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Lilecia Stanely	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 19/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities.	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:21

		Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
647.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of M. Joumai	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 21/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:22
648.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Philippus Jacobus Claasen	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 21/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:23
649.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Jewille Daniels	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 22/31 Good day Michelle,	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:24

		I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
650.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Khama Billiart	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 23/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:24
651.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf Hardoldine Newman	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 24/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:25
652.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Zaandry	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 25/31	Date: 02/03/05 Time: 10:26

	Kock	Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	
653.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of D Arewds	Email 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 26/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 10:27
654.	Les Holtzhause n on behalf of Cepude Ahrendse	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: FW: OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOUSES AT SPOOKRDRAAI IN STRUISBAAI 27/31 Good day Michelle, I have been asked to submit this objection to the above-mentioned development by a resident of the community who does not have email facilities. Please acknowledge receipt. Thank you. Regards. LES HOLTZHAUSEN Cell: 083 441 0043 Email: unitprop@iafrica.com	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 10:28
655.	Kerstin Ueberl	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Objection	

		Attached please find my objection to spookdraai development . Regards K. Ueberl RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Kerstin Ueberl ID 4006030018082 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own a property in Struisbaai/L'Agulhas – 4, im van Druten Crescent. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAPin the draft BAR document. ○ Referring to NEMA act and ICMA Act as “Guidelines” it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it is entirely inconsistent with proporrties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection are given below. Regards	
656.	Seanel Paxton	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Good day I object to the development of 5 houses at spookdraai. Séanel Paxton 071 770 8686 Thank you Séanel	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 11:29
657.	Hannes Wilken	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Registration as interested party - RE 281 Struisbaai Hi Michelle	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 12:14

		I hereby register as an interested party regarding RE 281 Struisbaai. Regards JW Wilken Ocean View 134 hwilken@360troy.co.za	
658.	Pieter De Wet	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: signed petition RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID # xxxxxx xxxx xxx • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here ..or ... • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname Pieter Jacobus de Wet Mobile 0794950316 Email pieter007dewet@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 13:24
659.	Caren Haikney	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Objection letter	Date: 02/03/35 Time: 15:33

		For the attention of MICHELLE NAYLOR Please find herewith my letter of objection for the proposed Spookdraai/Struisbaai development. Kind regards, Caren Haikney TO LORNAY ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING For the attention of MICHELLE NAYLOR I Caren Haikney ID 6804070118087 have been a resident of L'Agulhas for 21 years. I am representing myself in an objection to the proposed residential development of Spookdraai\Struisbaai on the following points. 1. Over the years as resident I have seen this specific area change with nature. Storm surges and spring tides have changed the beaches from pebble to sand then pebble again. This I feel is a very important environmental aspect that has definitely not been given the long and intensive attention it deserves. 2. The Main Road backing the proposed development is busy and dangerous. There was an accident most recently 1st March 2025. In holiday season and weekends it becomes exceptionally busy. 3. This road is also showing wear and tear where sand and bush meet sidewalk and road in many areas backing the proposed development. 4. This area has been used for decades by the public. Removing this access impacts residents as well as holidaymakers. 5. Developing this area will not add any visual value to our towns as this particular stretch of road is wildly beautiful without development and should stay that way as it is part of the 'sense of place' that our towns are known for. 6. Job creation is a very misleading reason to go ahead with this development as it is only short-term creation and as a longtime resident, we see this argument used again and again and we live with the falsehood and what is left behind when the job is done. It is temporary job creation and leaves a void thereafter. 7. Our existing sewer system is already under severe stress as is our water supply. The weeks of holiday seasons brings these issues under the spotlight as some areas can sit days without water as the infrastructure cannot cope. This has occurred many times. 8. It is taken for granted that we have a great water supply from a study done far too many years ago. The climate and town have changed drastically in that time. 9. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact" - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions.	
--	--	--	--

		The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Kind regards, Caren Haikney +27 76 437 9184 car247daw@yahoo.com	
660.	Leon Groenewald	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Beswaar teen Spookdraai Ontwikkeling Struisbaai Goeie dag, Hiermee my gee ek my amptelike beswaar teen die beoogde ontwikkeling by Spookdraai Struisbaai. Ek kom al vir meer as 50 jaar Struisbaai toe en Spookdraai hou baie sentimentele waarde en herinneringe vir my. Soos deur verskeie persone aangedui, is hierdie ontwikkeling teen die Wet (soos uiteengesit in die aangehegte dokument). U kan my naam asseblief byvoeg tot enige verdere korrespondensie rakende die besware teen die ontwikkeling. Leon Groenewald leon@whalemail.co.za 0827722784	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 16:22
661.	Ters Conradie	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: STRUISBAAI: PERSONAL OBJECTION AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (DEA&DP Reference: 16/3/3/6/7/1/E1/13/1406/23) Hello Michelle Please find attached the following: STRUISBAAI: OBJECTION AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. (as described in the Pre-application Basic Assessment Report (BAR) for the Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder of the Farm No. 281, Struisbaai. (DEA&DP Reference: 16/3/3/6/7/1/E1/13/1406/23) Mrs Bekko and team, I will appreciate it if you can file my document in your DEA&DP Reference: 16/3/3/6/7/1/E1/13/1406/23 and against my formal registration of a complaint /queries submitted on 18 September 2024 as shown below (thanks!) Regards Ters Conradie STRUISBAAI: OBJECTION AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. (as described in the Pre-application Basic Assessment Report (BAR) for the Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder of the Farm No. 281, Struisbaai. (DEA&DP Reference: 16/3/3/6/7/1/E1/13/1406/23) INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Ters Conradie (ID 610124 5054 085), 159 Marine Drive Struisbaai as an Interested and Affected person - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years. - The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated in the Draft BAR will have a significant negative	

		impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai. The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fishermen, families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our coastal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Ters Conradie Mobile 0833866133 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
662.	Gert Boerssen	Subject: Ek voel geboue aan die seekant van skulpiesbaai sal die karakter van Struisbaai heel verander . Ek gaan soon toe vir die ongerepte natuur en rustigheid . Is van plan om daar af te tree.	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 17:40
663.	Paul le Roux	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: REM-281 (Spookdraai) Goodday, Please find attached correspondence for your attention. Groete / Regards Paul le Roux PO Box / Posbus 180 Paarl 7620 Tel: 082 578 3050 REMAINDER OF FARM 281, STRUISBAAI LORNAY REF: REM-28{ Refer to published Notice of Public Participation I, the undersigned, Paul le Roux, SA ID No 680326 5014 085, an adult male citizen hereby wish to make the following comments with regard to abovementioned impact study. I am an interested party in that I regularly vacation in Agulhas and use abovementioned property for recreational purposes. I am wholly opposed to the development of the property for, inter alia, the following reasons: • The property constitutes a beach which has been used by the general public for recreational purposes since time immemorial. • The property forms part of the Spookdraai hiking route which attracts many ecologically sensitised visitors to the area. The property consists of undeveloped coastal land with rock outcroppings and indigenous vegetation, giving habitat to various bird and reptile species. Development will destroy this. • The development will intrude on the natural beauty of this pristine piece of coastline.	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 17:14

		• The bend in Marine Drive is not suited to have extra access points in the form of entrances to the private properties that the developer intends. If access barriers or walls are erected for the benefit of the property-owners, these can have a serious impact on the line-of-sight of vehicles using Marine Drive and be hazardous. • The development will create little or no economic upliftment for the community as most materials for the intended type of structure are not available from local suppliers and will be trucked in from elsewhere. • The construction of structures will necessitate specialized construction techniques, such a sinking of pylons or blasting of rock which can create unintended consequences for adjacent or even further-lying properties. In addition, this type of construction will make minimal use of local workforce. • The excessive heavy vehicle traffic during the construction phase can cause Serious damage to the road surface of Marine Drive, the only tarred access route to L'Agulhas, to the detriment of local inhabitants and property owners. • Based on the scale of the structure to be developed, this development is an elitist development. It is probable that the occupants of these properties will source the minimum of products and groceries from local stores, therefore also not contributing to the local economy to any great extent'. I trust that the developer's application will not succeed. Yours sincerely Paul le Roux	
664.	Bernie Marthinus Groenewald	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development Appeal SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Bernardis Marthinus Groenewald, 5204095032085 , Freesia street 12 Struisbaai 7285 • I have a direct interest in the application please register me as an Interested and affected person. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Bernardis Marthinus Groenewald 082 667 8639 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
665.	Jaco Moelich	Email dated 02 March 2025 Subject: Objection against the development at Spookdraai Struisbaai	Date: 02/03/25 Time: 21:36

		Dear Michelle Herewith find my objection against the proposed development of Spookdraai Struisbaai. Regards, Objection against proposed Spookdraai residential development in Stuiskaai Introduction: ☑ I am representing myself Jacobus Wessels Moelich, 6610175125087 ☑ I often visit Struisbaai and Agulhas for weekends visits and a holiday destination. I have been visiting this area since my childhood. ☑ This development will have a very negative impact on the scenery of the area for all residents and holiday goers to the benefit of only a few individuals. ☑ The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the Struisbaai & Agulhas area. ☑ There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. ☑ The grounds and detail of my objection is given below.	
666.	Lynnette Langenhoven	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection against planned development at Spookdraai, Agulhas Importance: High TO Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 03 March 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. • I am representing myself, Lynnette Langenhoven, ID Number: 791028 00090 088. • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Agulhas, address 36 Main Road, Agulhas, in very close proximity to the planned development. • I also have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. Agulhas was also my and my late	

		husband's dream to retire at prior his death in 2021. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact' ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is provided in the attached document. Regards Lynnette Langenhoven 083 285 1080 lynnette@finbondsa.co.za	
667.	Lorraine Uys,	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REM-281: Objection to the Spookdraai Residential Development on Struisbaai Farm No. 281 To: Lornay Environmental Consulting Subject: REM-281: Objection to the Spookdraai Residential Development on Struisbaai Farm No. 281 Dear Michelle, I am writing to formally object to the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on the remainder of Struisbaai Farm No. 281. This development poses significant environmental, aesthetic, and safety concerns that will negatively impact the surrounding area and community. Kindly refer to the attached document. In light of these serious concerns, I urge the authorities to reconsider approving the Spookdraai Residential Development. Preserving this land in its natural state will ensure the long-term sustainability, safety, and aesthetic appeal of Struisbaai. I kindly request that my objection be taken into full consideration and that alternative development sites be explored that do not compromise the environment or the well-being of the community. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to your response. Sincerely, Kind regards	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 08:56

		Lorraine Uys RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Mrs Lorraine Uys, ID: 7708240045089 • I have a direct interest in the application as we have property in Struisbaai – 161 Marine drive. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Lorraine Uys	
668.	Rosie le Roux	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Helemika Number 1 Pty Ltd - REM-281 : Spookdraai Development I refer to the attached advert and submit herewith my comments. Groete / Regards Rosie Refer to published Notice of Public Participation I, the undersigned, Rosie le Roux, SA ID No 7309190003085, hereby wish to make the following comments with regard to abovementioned impact study. I am an interested party in that I regularly vacation in Agulhas and use abovementioned property for recreational purposes for more than 45 years. I am wholly opposed to the development of the property for, inter alia, the following reasons: • The property constitutes a beach which has been used by the general public (especially fisherman and hikers) for recreational purposes since time immemorial. This area is used by the general public for coastal access. The property forms part of the Spookdraai hiking route which attracts many ecologically sensitised visitors to the area and is used by the general public. • The property consists of undeveloped coastal land with rock outcroppings and indigenous vegetation, giving habitat to various bird and reptile species. Development will destroy this. The proposed development is in clear contravention of the essence of protection as outlined in the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act 24 of 2008. The construction of structures will necessitate specialized construction techniques, such a sinking of pylons or blasting of rock which can create unintended consequences for adjacent or even further-lying properties and to the natural environment and coastal and sea biosphere/habitat. • As this area is situated within 100m of the high-water mark, it is reckless to develop human housing there, especially with climate change and natural disaster occurring more often. • The development will intrude on the natural beauty of this pristine piece of coastline.	Date:

		• The bend in Marine Drive is not suited to have extra access points in the form of entrances to the private properties that the developer intends. If access barriers or walls are erected for the benefit of the property-owners, these can have a serious impact on the line-of-sight of vehicles using Marine Drive and be hazardous. The limited parking in the area would also been lost to the general public. And, with so many other coastal developments, the “new” owners will try and limit public access to the coast by erecting walls and fences. • The excessive heavy vehicle traCic during the construction phase can cause serious damage to the road surface of Marine Drive, the only tarred access route to L’Agulhas, to the detriment of local inhabitants and property owners. This will also cause the only access route to be blocked by delivery and construction vehicles. I trust that the developer’s application will not succeed based on the fact that it is too close to the ocean and would put human lives in jeopardy. Yours sincerely R le Roux	
669.	Carlo Roux	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Carlo Roux, 7601205233081 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress – or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below.	

		Regards Name Surname – Carlo Roux Mobile – 082 940 7636 Email – carlo.roux@gmail.com	
670.	Helen Dolphin and Anthony Dolphin and Brian Dolphin	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection to Spookdraai development Importance: High Dear Madam Please find attached our objection to the Spookdraai development in Struisbaai. Should you require any more information, do not hesitate to contact me. Regards, Helen Dolphin Anthony Dolphin and Associates 19 Haraldene Road Glenwood Durban 4001 Docex 15 Musgrave Tel: 031 202 2013 Fax: 031 202 2061 e-mail: helen@dolphinlaw.co.za Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 2 MARCH 2025 1. Registration as an Interested and Affected Party 2. To register objections against proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Struisbaai. INTRODUCTION • We are registering in our capacity as residents of and property owners in Struisbaai. • We have a direct interest in the application as we own property in Oceanview Drive.	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 09:48

		-We believe that the application is against the law and undesirable as a residential development. Anthony Brian Dolphin ID 6507275013082 anthony@dolphinlaw.co.za 192 Oceanview Drive, Struisbaai Helen Dolphin ID 6701260067084 helen@dolphinlaw.co.za 192 Oceanview Drive, Struisbaai GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION 1. We believe, primarily, that the proposed development contravenes the National Environmental Management Act and the Integrated Coastal Management Act of 2008. Specifically with regard to Clauses 63.1 (c) and (f) and 63.2(a);(b);(d) and (g). 2. We believe that the Developer has been disingenuous with regards to their statement that they have no other property in the area to develop. 3. We believe that the Developer deliberately tried to circumvent or mitigate the level of response in a public participation process by posting the public notices in obscure places with incorrect dates for closure of objections. 4. This is a very scenic, visually uninterrupted part of the coastline before entering Agulhas and the iconic Lighthouse precinct at the southern tip of Africa. It places the Lighthouse in context of east and west coastlines. 5. It is a public space visited by the whole of the community, not just the rich and privileged. It should be prevented from excluding members of the public from accessing traditional shore angling and recreational spots visited for generations.	
671.	Gary Williams	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Opposition to development "Spookdraai estate." To Whom it may concern As a owner of two properties in the area namely 28 and 48 De Waal street, Struisbaai. I oppose the intended development in Spookdraai for the following reasons: 1) The proposed development will impede access to the coast in a area which is extremely important for our eco-tourism. With activities like fishing, hiking beach going and foraging being negatively impacted. 2) The development on the sea side of the road will negatively impact the allure of the area spoiling the natural beauty of the area for all those visiting the area. 3) The proposal appears to be denying access to the area below the high water mark which is unacceptable and the drawn high water mark on the plans I believe is disputable. 4) The piece of coast in question is synonymous with images of the town and forms part of it heritage for the fishing community that frequent the area. I am not anti-development as long as it is planned and executed in a way which uplifts the status of the town for the benefit of all its residents and tourists to the area and in doing so adding value to the town as a hole. In the case of the "Spookdraai Estate" I only see financial gain for a select few to the detriment to the rest of the residence and the town as a whole. The coastline of the area is the largest draw card to the area cutting access to it and obscuring it from view is certainly not in the best interest of the community who rely on our vital tourism industry	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 09:50

		in the area. Regards Gary Williams Gary Williams Operations Director APL Cartons (Pty) Ltd t +27 23 348 5500 [ext 2207] c +27 82 883 8834 e GWilliams@apl.co.za a Abattoir Street Industria Worcester 6850 p P.O. Box 345 Worcester 6849 w www.apl.co.za	
672.	Dennis Cornelius Swart	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete Esmerelda Krediteure RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Dennis Cornelius Swart, 7809065005081 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 09:48

		extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Dennis Cornelius Swart Mobile – 082 447 3840 Email – dennisswart78@gmail.com	
673.	Maria Elizabeth Reynolds	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself – Maria Elizabeth Reynolds, 5911010079088 - I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress – Marine Drive 157. - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is given below.	

		Regards Name Surname – Maria Elizabeth Reynolds Mobile – 082 960 4608 Email – pbreynolds@cwnet.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
674.	Le Roux Lourens	Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Le Roux Lourens, 8905085091082 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 09:52

		Name Surname – Le Roux Lourens Mobile – 073 958 5053 Email – lerouxlourens31@gmail.com	
675.	Jarmaine Heinrich Otto	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Jermaine Heinrich Otto, 8906035003086 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Jermaine Heinrich Otto	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 09:52

		Mobile – 081 394 6094 Email –	
676.	Jaco Johannes Bothma	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Jaco Johannes Bothma, 8709245107089 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Jaco Bothma Mobile – 073 574 1838 Email – bothmasaggies@gmail.com	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 09:52
677.	Esterlita	Email dated 03 March 2025	Date: 03/03/25

	Swart	Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Esterlita Swart, 8610190132082 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Esterlita Swart Mobile – 079 911 4030 Email – swart.dennis.lita@gmail.com	Time: 09:52
678.	Francois Willem Jordaan	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More,	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 09:52

		Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Francois Willem Jordaan, 8407225061083 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Francois Willem Jordaan Mobile – 071 368 2074 Email – willemjordaan1984@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
679.	Gerhard Calitz	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed?	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 09:52

		Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Gerhard Calitz, 7601305128082 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - o Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - o Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - o Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” - o Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Gerhard Calitz Mobile – 074 034 7473 Email – gerhardchrisna@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
680.	Frank Weighill and Kobus Pretorius	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: FW: REM-281 Registration I&AP - SBV - Comment 2 Re: Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Remainder Portion 281, Struisbaai Comment 2: Comments Relating to BAR Please find attached additional comments from the Suidpunt Bewaringsvereniging.	

		Frank Weighill Ecological Support Area. Page 33. <i>The classification shows that part of the site is classified as ESA1.</i> The western end of the property is classified as ESA1 – an Ecological Support Area that is functional i.e. in a natural, near natural or moderately degraded condition. The Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan states that the desired management for such areas is ‘Maintain in a functional, near-natural state. Some habitat loss is acceptable, provided the underlying biodiversity objectives and ecological functioning are not compromised.’ The proposed development area abuts the ESA hence development will unavoidably have adverse effects on the near-natural state. For this reason the proposed development should be rejected. Storm Water Drainage. Page 36. <i>It must be noted that this stormwater system drains onto the proposed development and would need to be redirected around the proposed development as it is currently causing erosion on site.</i> Stormwater flow is causing erosion. Redirecting it will have unknown effects. The report does not address who will be responsible for providing stormwater drainage. The proposed development should not be accepted unless the provisions for stormwater drainage (technical and financial) have been clearly defined and accepted by Cape Agulhas Municipality, the Developer and all Interested and Affected parties. Visual Impact. Page 65. <i>Photo 14. A clear green buffer is left open between Marine Drive and the ocean, built fabric only located on the other side of the road.</i> Page 68. <i>Figure 20: Settlement Patterns surrounding site: clear pattern of residential developments placed on the side of Marine Drive, far side from ocean. Leaving a green buffer between ocean and road.</i> Page 69. <i>Photo 15. Settlement Patterns surrounding site: clear pattern of residential developments placed on the side of Marine Drive, far side from ocean. Leaving a green buffer between ocean and road.</i> Page 69. <i>Photo 16. Settlement Patterns: large green buffer between building and ocean.</i> Page 70. <i>The position of the site and proposed development lies within this crucial interface or cusp in the landscape, both in the cross-section from coast to top reaches of the landform and along the stretch of the scenic route along the coast. In both aspects of the landscape and the experience of the landscape the site and proposed development will have an impact.</i>	
--	--	---	--

		Page 77. <i>Significance of Sensitivity to Visual Change.</i> <i>As a function of landscape sensitivity and anticipated magnitude of change as a result of the development, above, the sensitivity to visual change is deemed to be of High Significance.</i> <i>Visual Exposure Visual Intrusion of Development (Magnitude Of Visual Change) .</i> <i>The development is proposed to occupy a portion of the coastline which is pristine and with no adjacent development to form a continuous pattern. This urban intrusion will result in a High Visual Intrusion.</i> Page 78 <i>Visual Absorption Capacity of Site.</i> <i>The particular landscape quality of the site and the fact that there is no adjacent Significance of Anticipated Visual Impacts.</i> <i>As a function of receptor sensitivity and anticipated magnitude of change as a result of the development, above, the sensitivity to visual change is deemed to be of Major Significance should no mitigation measures be implemented.</i> Page 174. <i>Visual Impact Assessment findings</i> → <i>Although the area of visual influence is relatively contained and local in nature the significance of the coastal landscape setting, the unique position of the site in relation to the rest of development in Struisbaai and the scenic route of Marine Drive, results in the proposed development to have a significantly high visual impact on the scenic, heritage and visual resources.</i> → <i>Negative Visual Impact may be expected – resulting directly from site clearance, bulk earthworks and removal of existing vegetation; with construction vehicles / building activity causing noise / dust</i> The proposed development will have severe adverse effects on an area that is valued for its unique, attractive scenery. For this reason the proposed development should be rejected. Coastal Management Line (CML). Page 42. <i>site is located seaward of the Coastal Management Line (CML),</i> Page 87. → <i>The option only considered the high-water mark in its planning, and did not take specific cognisance of the other coastal management lines.</i> Page 92 <i>This property is situated along the coastline, within the delineated Coastal Protection Zone and Coastal Management Line, which highlights its sensitive environmental and geographical context.</i> According to ‘A User-friendly Guide to South Africa’s Integrated Coastal Management Act’ ‘The coastal protection zone is established to manage, regulate and restrict the use of land that is adjacent to coastal public property, or that plays a significant role in the coastal ecosystem. More specifically, the coastal protection zone aims: - To protect the ecological integrity, natural character, and the economic, social and aesthetic value of the neighbouring coastal public	
--	--	---	--

		property.’ The proposed development is not in accordance with this aim and should be rejected. Socio-Economic Impacts. The report states that the proposed development will have a positive socio-economic impact by creating temporary jobs during the construction phase. It does not, however, consider: The number of tourists who will be deterred from visiting Struisbaai if the existing rugged, natural coastal environment is degraded. The number of potential residents who will decide not to buy property in the surrounding area if the existing rugged, natural coastal environment is degraded. The adverse economic effects of reduced numbers of tourists and residents will be significant and last forever. For this reason the proposed development should be rejected.	
681.	Zelda Coertze	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> B. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Zelda Coertze, ID # 810813 0005 088 • I have a direct interest in the application as I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ◦ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ◦ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ◦ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ◦ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Zelda Coertze Mobile 0833880274 Email: zelda@herberg.co.za Refer to Spookdraai Generic objection 1.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 10:24
682.	Hendrik Wilken	Email dated 03 March 2025	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 10:25

		Subject: SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT. Michelle Registreer my asseblief as n n belangstellende en geafekteerde party namens die eienaars van Minnetokka Straat 10, Struisbaai. By voorbaat dank. Hendrik Wilken 082 7737200 hswilken@gmail.com	
683.	Jeremie Swart	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Proposed Spookdraai Development Dear Michelle I strongly object to the Proposed Spookdraai Development. The said development will negatively impact on the general scenery and also spoil the scenic drive from Struisbaai to L'Agulhas, a scenic drive enjoyed by locals and tourists alike. I appreciate the chance to object to this developement. Kind Regards Jeremie Swart 082-415 8774	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 11:24
684.	Wendy HWolhuter and Adre F Wolhuter	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Hello Michelle Sien soos aangeheg. Groete, Wendy Wolhuter JDW Transport 082 859 5954 155 Marine Drive Struisbaai,7285	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 11:45

		 GROUNDS FOR OBJECTION 1. We believe, primarily, that the proposed development contravenes the National Environmental Management Act and the Integrated Coastal Management Act of 2008. Specifically with regard to Clauses 63.1 (c) and (f) and 63.2 (a);(b); (d) and (g). 2. We believe that the Developer has been disingenuous with regards to their statement that they have no other property in the area to develop. 3. We believe that the Developer deliberately tried to circumvent or mitigate the level of response in a public participation process by posting the public notices in obscure places with incorrect dates for closure of objections. 4. This is a very scenic, visually uninterrupted part of the coastline before entering Agulhas and the iconic Lighthouse precinct at the southern tip of Africa. It places the Lighthouse in context of east and west coastlines. 5. It is a public space visited by the whole of the community, not just the rich and privileged. It should be prevented from excluding members of the public from accessing traditional shore angling and recreational spots visited for generations.	
685.	Nick Smith	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO PRE-APPLICATION DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT Dear Ms. Naylor Please see the attached documents, the contents of which are self-explanatory. We look forward to your substantive responses in the next draft of the BAR. In the interim, please acknowledge receipt of this email. Yours faithfully N.D Smith <i>RE: MEMORANDUM OF COMMENTS IN RE: PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (REMAINDER PORTION 281, STRUISBAAI)</i> Introduction 1. These comments are delivered to you in your capacity as the environmental assessment practitioner (“you” or “the EAP” as the context requires) responsible for reporting on the proposed development that is the subject of your pre-application draft basic assessment report (“DBAR”) dated 31 January 2025. 2. We deliver these comments at the behest of the individual objectors described in annexure “A” hereto. Please ensure that each of them is included in your database of registered interested and affected persons (“I&APS”). 3. These comments follow the sequence of the information presented in your DBAR and where relevant, the specialist reports upon you rely	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 12:20

		therein. The substance of the application 4. The proposed Spookdraai residential development represents a significant development on a portion of land within the coastal zone and on the seaward side of Marine Drive in Struisbaai.¹ 5. If permitted, it would set a significant, and environmentally and socially unsustainable precedent, for development on the seaward side of Marine Drive. 6. It is correct, as you would have it, that the land is “<i>strategically positioned along the coastline</i>”² but a development proposal entailing six single residential dwellings is neither environmentally nor socially sustainable in the circumstances. What is more, such a development would derogate significantly from the principles respectively articulated in (and legal parameters provided by) the National Environmental Management Act and in the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act. 7. It is somewhat ironic to speak of preserving “the area’s ecological integrity” when a total of 7,024 square metres of the immovable property out of its total of 0,71 hectares (7,113 square metres to be exact) is proposed either for development under the single residential zone, or is proposed to be zoned as private open space. Only 89 square meters of the subject-property is proposed for retention as public open space.⁵ The principal economic beneficiary of such a development would be the applicant, notwithstanding the EAP’s (faintly argued) proposition that it would create significant employment opportunities. A benefit to the applicant is insufficient reason to permit the development in a situation which would create a dangerous and unsustainable precedent pertaining to immovable property on the seaward side of Marine Drive in Struisbaai and its environs. That fact is recognised by the specialists retained by the EAP but somewhat underplayed in the EAP’s reporting thereon in the DBAR, as these comments demonstrate. 8. The twin premises for the development are that it will “... ensure minimal impact on the coastal ecosystem, while also meeting the demand for upmarket residential opportunities in the Struisbaai area”. To the extent that there is any demand for additional upmarket residential development in Struisbaai, we point out (and the EAP is strangely silent on this aspect in the DBAR) that the applicant is also the owner of a second portion of the subject-property, measuring some 448,71 hectares. A significant portion of the latter immovable property falls within the Cape Agulhas Municipality’s most recently approved Spatial Development Framework. 9. We submit on behalf of the objectors we represent that the only way to ensure minimal impact in the coastal ecosystem of which the subject-property forms part is to leave it undisturbed. There is no factual premise for the claims that there is any demand for upmarket residential opportunities in the coastal protection zone in or adjacent to Struisbaai, much less significant demand. The visual impact assessment (“VIA”) final report is instructive in this regard. It states the following: “The site is within a semi-rural cultural landscape of high visual significance and aesthetic value, (given the degree of intactness, integrity, and legibility) with a coastal character, outside the urban periphery, with important components of distinctive character, valued for tangible as well as intangible attributes. As it is potentially susceptible to changes of the types proposed; this assessment will consider the potential impact of the proposal from a cultural landscape perspective, with respect to the landscape character analysis of the site within its local and broader context.” (Bold text as in the original.) 10. We note that in respect of appendix E5 (comments from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (now the Department of Agriculture)) that the EAP records that any such comment is not applicable. We submit that that cannot be correct in a situation where rezoning of agricultural land for single residential purposes and subdivision of that land is obliged of the applicant. 11. We note that in section B2 of the DBAR, the EAP records the following: “The proposed site is classified as a greenfield site because it is currently undeveloped and predominantly consistent of natural features such as rocky outcrops and indigenous vegetation. The site has also been disturbed by adhoc (sic) footpaths, general use and stormwater erosion.” 12. As these comments show, the asserted disturbance regarding “adhoc (sic) footpaths” pertains to the legal right of the public to access the coastal zone, and in particular, the component thereof that constitutes coastal public property and within that, the coastal protection zone. We submit furthermore that there is no indication as to the “general use” as asserted by the EAP. Any stormwater erosion on the property is limited (with reference to the photographs attached to the DBAR as well as those included in the botanical impact assessment⁸) to a particular portion of the property. 13. (We point out for the sake of completeness that the author of the botanical impact assessment refers incorrectly to the pursuit of	
--	--	--	--

		the application process to develop the subject-property as requiring a scoping and environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) process. He also states that the scoping assessment would, if required, be followed by an EIA. As a matter of fact, the listed activities as determined by the EAP in her capacity as the author of the DBAR pertain to NEMA-listed activities that require basic assessment, rather than scoping and EIA. Alternatively, it may be that scoping and EIA is in fact required as foreshadowed by Dr. McDonald, in which case the authors of the DBAR have produced the incorrect report in the circumstances, which renders the report unfit for purpose. This will no doubt be clarified in an updated botanical impact assessment and the EAP’s further reporting thereon.) 14. We submit that the description cited in paragraph above is therefore somewhat misleading in the circumstances. It is noteworthy that there is currently no development footprint on the property. That is consistent with the broader area on the seaward side of Marine Drive as is clearly evidenced from the photographic images included within the botanical impact assessment and the archaeological impact assessment as well as the visual impact assessment. 15. At paragraph 4 on page 14 of the DBAR10 the EAP records the following: “With the water shortages previously experienced in the Western Cape and the possibility of this shortages (sic) occurring again in the future, water saving and harvesting measures must be investigated and implemented for the proposed development.” (Our emphasis.) 16. We submit that this should form part of any further iteration of the DBAR. It cannot be left as some kind of vague and unsubstantiated future commitment. 17. As regards stormwater and the current situation “it must be noted that this stormwater system drains onto the proposed development and would need to be redirected around the proposed development as it is currently causing erosion on the site” we submit that this speaks of municipal neglect. It is inappropriate to prioritise the purported remediation of the status quo regarding the absence of any stormwater management regime against the asserted benefits associated with the proposed development. It is also manifestly clear that the hardened surfaces that would comprise the proposed development of six residential erven would significantly increase the stormwater discharge which the EAP acknowledges “... will exit to the sea [albeit] managed through a stormwater dissipation, silt and debris trap to prevent any contamination at the coast”. 18. In the EAP’s analysis of the policies considered, certain glib and superficial statements are made. For example, and in the context of the Cape Agulhas Municipality’s Spatial Development Framework (“CAMSDF”), the EAP states the following: “The proposed development complies with the [CAMSDF]. The property is located within the demarcated urban edge, as outlined in the [CAMSDF] which encourages development that aligns with the strategic urban growth objectives of the Municipality. The [CAMSDF] promotes compact, efficient urban areas to optimize the use of existing infrastructure while limiting urban sprawl.” That is not a correct proposition when considered against key strategies 3 and 5 in the CAM SDF. 19. Under the heading “Key Strategies” in section 7.3 of the CAM SDF, the following is set out: “The spatial development vision for CAM-aimed at achieving the five spatial development goals while ensuring alignment with the spatial development principles of SPLUMA11 - comprises eight key strategies, as outlined below.” Key strategy 3 is as follows: “Protect and conserve protected areas, critical biodiversity areas and ecological support areas by keeping these areas in a natural or near natural state and only allowing low impact, biodiversity sensitive land uses as appropriate.” (My underlining.) Key strategy 5 entails the following: “Protect and enhance historic and culturally significant precincts and places. 20. Against this backdrop, and with particular reference to the applicant’s ownership of the 448,71 hectare portion of the subject-property which falls within the new urban edge identified in the CAM SDF, the proposed development of the coastal portion is entirely inappropriate. At the very least, the DBAR is substantively lacking in that no reasonable nor feasible alternative pertaining to the proposed development of the larger portion of the subject-property is posited. 21. As regards the development’s purported compliance with the CAM SDF the EAP goes on to state the following: “The proposed subdivision and rezoning align with these principles by utilizing (sic) land within the urban edge to create a low-impact, well-planned opportunities (sic). The development adheres to the [CAM SDF’s] goals by enhancing sustainable urban development and maintaining a balance between agricultural activities and urban growth. Furthermore the provision of infrastructure within the development footprint ensures minimal impact on surrounding agricultural land uses, reinforcing the [CAMSDF’s] objectives of protecting agricultural resources while accommodating growth where appropriate. 22. We point out for the sake of completeness that in the VIA report and under the heading “Nature of the Development”¹² the following is recorded: “The site and the proposed layout for the development is (sic) currently not in the urban edge in terms of the approved	
--	--	--	--

		Cape Agulhas Municipality Spatial Development Framework, however it has been included in the as yet approved revised SDF. Although the inclusion is noted, the nature of the context is significant and the proposed development will have a significant impact on the character of the area. Residential dwelling (sic) will have an impact on the public use and views of the sea and coastal edge.” (Our emphasis.) 23. The following comments are relevant in this regard: 23.1. Firstly, the “compact, efficient urban areas” within the Struisbaai area are almost exclusively to be found on the landward side of Marine Drive. One of the significant and substantive benefits of no development on the seaward side of Marine Drive is the sense of place (genius loci) that this creates. 23.2. Secondly, there is no agricultural land use on the subject-property per se. It is apparently zoned for agricultural purposes but not utilised as such. There is some conjecture as to whether the EAP is correct in referring to the subject-property’s zoning as being for agricultural purposes. That aspect will be traversed in the necessary detail in our clients’ objections to any application to rezone and subdivide the property (assuming for the moment that the BAR process is continued upon receipt of what are likely to be wholesale and substantive objections from various sectors of the Struisbaai community, as well as by public stakeholders such as South African National Parks, the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning [including its Coastal Management Unit] and the Cape Nature Conservation Board trading as CapeNature). The property is a significant component of an unbroken tapestry of undeveloped properties on the seaward side of Marine Drive. The coastline and the clear green buffer on the seaward side of Marine Drive is well-illustrated by various photographs in the VIA report including figure 21;13 figure 28;14 figure 29;15 figure 38;16 figure 40;17 figure 44;18 and figure 46. 23.3. The VIA report also confirms that the site “... is still part of a coastal landscape which has a high degree of integrity, particularly the portion below Marine Drive designating this a very good quality landscape.” (Emphasis supplied.) 23.4. As the botanical expert points out, the botany present on the subject-property comprises at least three vegetation types, namely Southwestern Strandveld, Cape Seashore Vegetation, and Agulhas Limestone Fynbos (with the latter predominant on the western end of the site). (We point out for the sake of completeness that there is some confusion in this regard both in the DBAR and in the botanical specialist’s report where statements that are at odds with each other are made: In the one instance both the EAP and the botanical specialist state that Agulhas Limestone Fynbos is “... not found at the site at all, but further inland”20 which On page 30. 14 On page 34. 15 On page 35. 16 On page 41. 17 On page 42. 18 On page 44. 19 On page 45 20 See for example page 12 of the botanical impact assessment report statement is contradicted by other assertions to the effect that Agulhas Limestone Fynbos does occur at the western end of the site.21). 24. As regards the EAP’s treatment of guidelines, the EAP incorrectly refers to the National Environmental Management Act22 (“NEMA”) and the NEMA Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) Regulations as a guideline. That is obviously incorrect: NEMA and the NEMA EIA Regulations23 amount to legislative and regulatory provisions rather than guidelines. 25. In a similar theme, the EAP incorrectly suggests that in the context of heritage impact assessment, the “... final decision relating to the Heritage theme is pending with Heritage Western Cape (“HWC”) in line with their application protocols”. We point out that this is incorrect, having regard to section 38(8) of the NHRA in terms of which DEADP is the competent authority. This aspect of the DBAR must be corrected and supplemented in any further draft of the BAR that the applicant is minded to commission from the EAP. 26. We also point out that it is incorrect for the EAP to assert that the proposed development is in line with the existing residential development in the area. It is more correct to state that the proposed development is entirely inconsistent with the immovable properties on the seaward side of Marine Drive. 27. As regards the assertion by the EAP that the proposed development “... will have a moderate negative visual impact”, this is denied. It is incontrovertibly clear that the development, even if mitigated, would amount to a precedent-setting construction of six residential dwellings in a portion of the coastline within the coastal protection zone that is at present entirely undisturbed by any such development.	
--	--	--	--

		28. As regards the socio-economic assessment, the EAP asserts that the proposed development "... will contribute to positive social and economic impacts for the community". We suggest that this broad statement is not based on objectively verifiable baseline information. 29. We point out that in the context of the EAP's description of bulk services (principally water, sewage, roads, stormwater, solid waste and electricity), that there is a significant degree of repetition in the DBAR. These topics are traversed for the first time on pages 14-15 of the DBAR and again on pages 25-26 of the DBAR as well as pages 36-37 of the DBAR. All that this results in is a duplication of information that can readily be provided once and then cross-referred to in a truncated version of the DBAR. 30. As regards the EAP's analysis of population and households (including population and household growth; gender, age and race dynamics; and the level of urbanisation) the EAP asserts that the proposed development "... allows for investment in the Struisbaai area and provision of both short and long term job opportunities for varied skills levels in the population". On behalf of our clients we assert that these limited benefits do not meaningfully outweigh the significant ecological and social impacts of the proposed development of immovable property on the seaward side of Marine Drive. 31. As regards the largely undeveloped aspect of the coastline on the seaward side of Marine Drive figure 524 well-illustrates the general lack of development on the seaward side of Marine Drive. The same can be said of figure 5 in the archaeological impact assessment 32. The EAP's assertions pertaining to the need for the development as well as its purported desirability amount to an entirely superficial treatment of need and desirability. The reality is that it is the developer's necessity to generate income from the property and the desirability for the developer of generating such income that predominates. It may be that the site is located within the built-up urban edge of Struisbaai but it is not a developed area per se. As already explained in these comments there is very limited development on the seaward side of Marine Drive in Struisbaai. There are various unsupported (and insupportable) statements under the general head of the need for development including the assertion that it contributes to addressing housing demand in Struisbaai. To the extent that there is any such demand that is for low-cost housing which is not the development's aim. It is also incorrect to suggest that the development provides opportunities for residential growth ("in a controlled and sustainable manner") as has already been pointed out. The job creation that the proposed development would supply is very limited in the circumstances. Any assertion that the rehabilitation of the site is contingent upon development is inappropriate and does not take account of the owner's obligations in that regard. 33. As regards desirability, it is manifestly incorrect to suggest that the development should provide an opportunity for managing invasive species when that obligation arises by virtue of separate and applicable legislation such as the national Veld and Forest Fires Act. We deny that the development is consistent with the principles of sustainable development, properly interpreted in terms of section 24 of the Constitution read together with the principles set out in section 2 of NEMA. 34. As regards biodiversity and with particular reference to the vegetation found on site we have already alluded to the inconsistency between the statements to the effect that Agulhas Limestone Fynbos "is not found at the site at all, but further inland"²⁶ and what is set out in figure 8 which confirms that Agulhas Limestone Fynbos occurs at the western end of the site. 35. Photograph 3 on page 43 of the DBAR provides another example of the largely untouched nature of the area seaward of Marine Drive and proximate to the subject-property. 36. We point out that there is a significant inconsistency between the EAP's summary regarding the botanical specialist's findings and what the botanical expert in fact stated in his report. At paragraph 4.727 the following is stated by the EAP: "The botanical specialist highlights that no bird species were observed using the habitat for feeding or nesting." Placed in its proper context we point out that the botanical expert undertook a limited site visit of approximately 2 hours. We suggest that the 2-hour field visit was entirely insufficient in the circumstances.	
--	--	--	--

		37. Of equal concern is the statement made by the botanical impact assessor which is incorrectly reflected in the DBAR. Set out above is the summary included at paragraph 4.7 of the DBAR. In fact what the botanical impact assessor stated was the following: “The field visit was a snapshot in time so the observations made cannot be taken as definitive. However, no bird species were obviously using the habitat for feeding or nesting.” (Our underlining.) 38. It is only at paragraph 49 that the EAP belatedly recognises the spatial integrity of the coastal area seaward of Marine Drive, with the following statement: “At the western-most coastal edge of the rural holiday town of Struis Baai (sic), the site is located on the seaward side (south) of Marine Drive at the point that the village of Struisbaai merges into that of L’Agulhas. It is within a semi-rural cultural landscape of high visual significance and aesthetic value, (given the degree of intactness, integrity, and legibility) with a coastal character, outside the urban periphery, with important components of distinctive character, valued for tangible as well as intangible attributes. As such it is potentially susceptible to changes of the types proposed.” (Our underlining.) 39. Also relevant in this regard is the statement on page 50 of the DBAR where the following is recorded: “Although the adjacent area of the site is highly altered from its natural state, it is still part of the coastal landscape which has a high degree of integrity, particularly the portion below Marine Drive designating this a very good quality landscape.” (Our underlining.) 40. We submit on behalf of our clients that this landscape should remain as such rather than being developed as a six-erf residential development. 41. The inappropriateness of a development on the seaward side of Marine Drive becomes ever more apparent on a consideration of photograph 14.29 That photograph depicts the coastline and residential strip looking towards the subject-site. As the EAP points out, a “clear green buffer is left open between Marine Drive and the ocean, built fabric only located on the other side of the road.” The same applies to photographs 15 and 16.30 There is no residential development for some distance on either side of the proposed development and seaward of Marine Drive. That is echoed in the EAP’s treatment of the contextual significance where the following is stated: “The site holds high contextual significance due to its position within the Coastal Protection Zone (CPZ) and its location on the coastal shelf. It forms part of a larger coastal cultural landscape characterized (sic) by areas and resources of scenic, cultural, and historical value. The landscape integrity is particularly notable below Marine Drive, where the absence of visual intrusions enhances the site’s visual and cultural quality. This portion of the site contributes to the scenic quality of the Marine Drive route and the adjacent areas of Agulhas, making it visible and influential within its surroundings. The site’s contribution to the coastal cultural landscape warrants a Grade IIIA significance designation, highlighting its local importance in maintaining the cultural and aesthetic qualities of the region.” (Our underlining.) On behalf of our clients, we submit that this could not be better stated as a rationale for refusing the development. 42. Section H of the DBAR purports to deal with alternatives. What is entirely clear is that the second and third alternatives are neither reasonable nor feasible on the basis of the facts set out by the EAP. As such they do not meet the legal threshold of reasonableness and feasibility and cannot properly be included as purported alternatives. 43. As already adverted to above in these comments, the EAP (and more particularly, the applicant) has been somewhat selective in the presentation of reasonable and feasible alternatives within the area demarcated for purposes of urban development in the CAM SDF. As we have pointed out, the subject-property as owned by the applicant comprises two discrete portions being the coastal portion that is the subject of the DBAR (some 0,71 hectares) which is identified by the EAP as the “only preferred alternative”; and a second much larger portion (some 448,71 hectares), a large part of which falls within the identified urban edge as depicted in the CAM SDF. The location of the latter portion is adjacent to the area where most of the recent significant and high-end property development has occurred in Struisbaai and it presents the applicant with a large number of suitable alternative sites. It follows that the claim made by the applicant, to the effect that no alternative sites exist is both fallacious and disingenuous. 44. Furthermore, and on behalf of our clients we submit that the no-go alternative is, as a matter of fact, the objectively preferred alternative in the circumstances. Alternative 4 (the preferred alternative) is not so different from alternatives 2 and 3 (much less substantially different) that it justifies the development. It also fails to meet the threshold criteria of reasonableness and feasibility.	
686.	Emilius Tomlinson	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 11:25

		Hi Michelle Naylor I would like to add my name and vote to the "Objection List" of the proposed residential development in Marine Drive,named SPOOKDRAAI,Struisbaai/Agulhas. Details: Emilius Tomlinson 118 Malvern Drive Struisbaai Erf: 00001177 Cell no 0829003312	
687.	Nina Reynolds	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> C. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID # • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here ..or ... • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname: Jonathan Edmunds Mobile: 0763166683 Email: ja.edmunds07@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
688.	Jonathan Edmunds	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u>	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 12:50

		D. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Name, Surname ID # • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here ..or ... • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname: Jonathan Edmunds Mobile: 0763166683 Email: ja.edmunds07@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
689.	James Marais	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection against proposed Spookdraai Development Struisbaai Wie dit mag aangaan Hierby aangeheg is my vertoe teen beogde ontwikkeling the Spookdraai, Struisbaai. Ek het direkte belange synde my adres, Marine Drive 153 , Struisbaai is. Kind Regards 03 Maart 2025 Wie dit mag aangaan. Volgens die kaart , val daai hele be-oogde projek binne in die Admiraliteits – zone van die Staat. En hierdie zone behoort aan die Staat eksklusief end us geen Nasionale Regering. Geen Provinsie of plaaslike Munisipaliteit het enige se oor hierdie Zone en kan geen ontwikkeling	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 13:39

		aldus toelaat of goedkeur in hierdie omskryfde definisie gebied. Die woordelike definisie van die Admiraliteits Zone volgens die wet, is dat hierdie zone beslaan/strek 100 voet (33 en `n derde tree) van die hoogste hoogwater storm merk op land, tot 100 voet ( dus weer 33 en `n derde tree) tot die laaste merk in die see. Dus strek hierdie Admiraliteits Zone in total 200 voet (66 en twee derde tree) vanaf in die see tot op land. Niemand privaat (behalwe die Staat self) mag in hierdie Zone enige see of privaat grond of Strukture besit of oprig nie. Hierdie kwessie en wet, is al dikwels in die howe getoets en veral hofbeslissings gekry onder die sogenaamde Vestustas beginsel. Hierdie beoogde ontwikkeling val total binne die Admiraliteits Zone en behoort in komende hofsaak , baie gou gestuit te kan word. Daar moet ook van die geoogde Ontwikkelaars se presiese penne aan te vra van die gebied wat hulle wil betree en ons soek ook die bouplanne om te verseker van die area wat betree gaan word. Groete James Marais	
690.	Pamela Falck	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON RE FARM NO. 281, BREDASDORD DIVISION, AT STRUISBAAI Good Afternoon Michelle I trust that this email finds you well. Kindly find attached objection to the proposed Spookdraai Development. Receipt confirmation would be much appreciated, thank you. Kind Regards, Pamela Falck 076 486 9996 RE: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON RE FARM NO. 281, BREDASDORD DIVISION, AT STRUISBAAI I hereby wish to formally register my objection to the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder Portion 281, Struisbaai. Representing myself: Pamela Falck with ID: 880926 0055 088 as a permanent resident of Struisbaai. The following factors have been taken into consideration: PENDING COMMENTS: The application indicates that comments are still pending from several crucial departments, including Cape Nature, DEA: Oceans and Coast, WCG: Department of Agriculture, DEA&DP: Coastal Management, the Local & District Municipality, and Heritage Western Cape. This presents an obstacle to meaningful public participation. The public rely on the expertise and insights of these agencies to fully understand the potential impacts of the proposed development. Without their input the public is being asked to comment on an incomplete picture, which I feel is unfair. The current public comment deadline of March 3rd, 2025 appears premature and, I feel, inadequate given the absence of these departmental comments. COASTAL SIGNIFICANCE: The Heritage report emphasizes that the land is part of the coastal environment and within the Coastal Protection Zone. This makes it very important from a heritage perspective. This coastal area, while privately owned, has a long-established history of public access, particularly	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 13:55

		for the fishing community. Residents of all ages can confirm many decades of continuous public use of this site. This access is a vital community resource and a defining element of the area's character. <i>Refer to the following as well: The case of J.d.P. Botha and the Grootklaar Community (24611/11) in the High Court of South Africa, Western Cape.</i> Legal Arguments: The community argued that their long-term use had created a "public servitude," a legal right for the public to use the land for specific purposes. They relied on the principle of <i>vetustas</i>, which recognizes rights established through long-standing custom and usage. Court Decision: The court ruled in favor of the community, recognizing their right to use the land for the established purposes. This decision was significant because it acknowledged the rights of a community based on historical use, even though the land was privately owned. I personally know people who have been residing and vacationing in Struisbaai since before 1970. During the time of the noted longtime residents as well as my personal time visiting and residing in Struisbaai, spanning from 2007 to the present, we have never encountered any signage on the property in question prohibiting public access. The small beach and adjacent areas, known locally as "The Draai," have consistently served as a popular picnic and fishing spot for the broader Struisbaai and Agulhas communities. To assert exclusive ownership over this area, after decades of unrestricted public use, is unreasonable. "The Draai," in the local understanding, belongs to the people of these towns. This is further evident on the SG Diagram of the property that was done in 1836. It relates to the "right to the Public of Fishing" – and this almost 200 years ago. The Heritage report also mentions the presence of footpaths along the coastal edge, in the green open space... The report highlights the long history of public access to the coastline, especially for fishing, referencing the original land grant's mention of "retaining the privilege of unteaming and fishing." It also notes the public's likely assumption that the property and beach are part of the accessible coastline and the legal presumption of public right of way below the high water mark. The application form is also in confirmation of the site usage by the public - reference is made to Section B – Point 2 of the application re greenfield/brownfield and quotes: "The site has also been disturbed by adhoc footpaths, general use.." If the Grootklaar Case is anything to go by, it should be clear that the proposed Spookdraai development is not only undesirable, but most likely also illegal. THE HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT: The Heritage Impact Assessment provides strong grounds for objecting to this development, delivering a negative assessment. The HIA emphasizes the site's location within a coastal area of high scenic, cultural, and historical value, noting a recommendation to grade the site to "Grade IIIA significance". The relatively untouched nature of the area, especially closest to the sea, contributes significantly to its visual quality, a quality further enhanced by its prominence along Marine Drive, a recognized scenic route and gateway to Agulhas. The proposed development threatens to alter this valued landscape which will diminish the scenic value and predicts significant negative impacts. The HIA expresses skepticism about the effectiveness of standard mitigation measures. Ultimately, the HIA does not seem to support the proposed subdivision and rezoning, concluding that no social or economic benefits justify the negative environmental and heritage impacts. TRAFFIC: As the name suggests, the Spookdraai development will be located along a stretch of road where numerous vehicle accidents have taken place, in the bend of the busy M319 / Marine Drive. This is the only route between Struisbaai and Agulhas and thus carries high volumes of traffic – pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicles. To allow vehicle and driveway access to six units here will be irresponsible and will go against all conventional traffic rules.	
--	--	--	--

		Accidents frequently occur in this vicinity as well, particularly on weekends and during holiday periods. Most recently, on Saturday, March 1, 2025, a vehicle overturned in this area, resulting in a temporary road closure. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED False presentation is made regarding the alternatives available with the misleading statement below: “the subject property is the sole asset available to the developer” - see Page 84: This statement is not true. Alternative property owned by Helemika: Farm Paapekuilsfontein It is crucial to recognize that Helemika owns a substantial area within the CAM Urban Edge, as indicated by the dotted red line. This ownership provides the developer with viable alternative development sites, thereby eliminating the necessity to develop in this particularly sensitive location. Furthermore, it should be noted that a significant portion of Paapekuilsfontein 281 also lies within the designated CAM Urban Edge. SEWAGE: The ecological sensitivity of this coastal area is very important. Renowned for its angling, this location regularly sees community members fishing from its rocks. A single sewage spill here would be devastating, a risk amplified by the proposed development’s reliance on septic tanks. The inherent dangers of residential development in such a sensitive environment, particularly man-made hazards like these, render this location unsuitable. The potential for irreversible environmental damage far outweighs any perceived benefits. Furthermore, the application materials fail to provide clear measures to prevent septic tank seepage or leaks into the surrounding environment. Adding to the above concern is the existing strain on the area's sewerage system. During peak season, the Cape Agulhas Municipality (CAM) system is demonstrably overloaded, requiring two to three sewerage trucks to operate continuously, 12 hours a day, seven days a week, between Agulhas and Struisbaai to manage overflowing tanks. Residents have witnessed—and experienced the odor of—these trucks operating even on Sundays at the Agulhas campsite and restaurant area. This proposed development will inevitably exacerbate this existing problem. Increased demand will necessitate more frequent and potentially faster sewerage truck trips along Marine Drive, a road heavily used by pedestrians, joggers, and cyclists. This increased traffic poses a significant risk of accidents and further compromises the safety of those using Marine Drive. The lack of clarity around septic tank management, coupled with the overloaded existing sewerage system, makes this development an unacceptable risk to both the environment and public safety. RAIN & STORM WATER DRAINAGE: The same applies to run-off water and stormwater drainage. With residential development, rain will no longer be able to drain into the soil. Instead, the hard surfaces (roofs, gutters and paving) found in residential development will result in the accumulation of increased amounts of water, only to follow the natural route down into the sea. With this it is inevitable that rubbish and contaminants will ruin the natural environment which plays such a big part of this community. As a side note, it would be interesting to see what the proposal is for grey waters from washing machines etc... or will bath, sink & machine water fill into the septic tanks?	
--	--	--	--

		HIGH WATER MARK: The application asserts that the proposed development site has been surveyed and is located above the high-water mark and outside designated risk zones. If this is the case, we would like to specifically ask: ▪ Where are the boundary pegs or markers that delineate the surveyed boundaries of the site? ▪ Why are these markers not visible to the public? The absence of visible boundary markers raises concerns about the accuracy of the claimed survey results. The public should be able to physically verify the site's boundaries and its suitability for development. Without this visible evidence, the applicant's claims remain unsubstantiated and subject to doubt. Looking at the boundary description of the property, it sets “the Sea” as a boundary. However, in South Africa, this means that the high-water mark is the boundary. In the Google Imagery below, it is clear that the southern boundary of the property is well below the high-water mark. It is essential that, prior to any decisions being made, the site be re-surveyed to determine the actual boundary on the southern side. This will most likely result in the boundary shifting to the north, resulting in an even more narrow shape and making it unsuitable for development. With further reference to a recent case in Hermanus, where such a shift in the boundary resulted in what was thought to be private property, turned out to be public land – a similar scenario is most likely applicable to the Spookdraai development. The dangers of rising sea levels are well known and do not require much elaboration. As the property in question is located directly adjacent to the coast, this is a real danger to take into consideration. A recent example of the disasters attached to allowing a building right next to the coast is the Nostra Pub and Grill, that was located on Struisbaai’s Main Beach. It was a popular spot next to the main beach, but over time, the forces of the sea eroded the land on which it was built. The foundations became unstable due to high tides and erosion. The owner of the Nostra building was quoted in an article where she stated: <i>“For four years I watched as my restaurant's foundations became unstable. We desperately tried to save the building by bringing in tons of sandbags, but this was in vain”</i> October 2011 the front wall of the building collapsed during a high tide, the structure was deemed unsafe, and eventually demolished. This should serve as a reminder of the dynamic nature of coastlines and the risks associated with building too close to the sea. VIEW CATCHMENT AND VIEWSHED: The visual assessment photographic figures in the Application form seem to omit views from the closest Marine Drive properties, those most likely to experience the most direct visual disruption. Is there an explanation for this omission? I am particularly interested on the choosing of ERF 956 (noted in image above – circled in red) as one of the chosen view points with the claims that vegetation blocks the view of the proposed development. This specific property as a view point does not lessen the visual impact of the proposed development and still begs the question of why viewpoints weren’t shown from the more adjacent properties. ERF 956 is located in Oceanview Drive which is situated higher up from Marine Drive and is an undeveloped vacant residential stand. The property was transferred in 2018, and it's reasonable to assume the owners intend to eventually build a home there, precisely to capitalize on the views this location offers. The current vegetation is temporary and will most likely change once developed to avoid obstruction of their views. Therefore, using this currently vacant stand as one of the primary viewpoints presents an inaccurate picture of the long-term visual	
--	--	---	--

		impact of the development. Furthermore, the visual assessment omits viewpoints from several other directly affected properties, specifically ERFs 1993, 1994, 1995, 1003, 1004, 1005. These omissions raise concerns about the objectivity of the visual impact assessment. Viewpoints from these properties, which are in much closer & direct proximity are more likely to experience direct negative visual impacts and would provide a more accurate and representative assessment. Appendix "G4 Visual Assessment report" cannot be downloaded; I receive an error message stating, "The document cannot be opened because it is corrupted or damaged." This has made it very difficult to form a complete understanding of the development's visual impacts as I am unsure whether further viewpoints were provided or not. This development, as evidenced by the summarized report and my personal observations and knowledge of the area (being a property practitioner), will have a severely negative impact on the views of adjacent property owners, Oceanview Drive residents, and every single person who uses Marine Drive to access Agulhas. COASTAL PROTECTION ZONE: It feels like the application is downplaying the significance of the site's location within the Coastal Protection Zone by (refer to Page 33 point 7 and Page 92 point 1.8 for examples of this): 1. Generalization: While it's acknowledged that Struisbaai falls within the Coastal Protection Zone, this application specifically addresses a unique and sensitive site within that zone. The fact that the entire town is designated as such does not diminish the individual ecological importance of this particular property. It's crucial to remember that the bulk of Struisbaai's development occurred prior to the establishment of the Integrated Coastal Management Act (ICMA) in 2008. The harbour, for example, was established around 1959, and subsequent town development would have progressed without the regulatory framework of the ICMA. Developments approved <i>after</i> the ICMA's implementation would have been subject to its requirements, including those within the 100-meter Coastal Protection Zone. It is noteworthy that since the ICMA, no new erven or developments have been approved within this 100-meter zone in Struisbaai. (As a stark contrast, the property where the recently erected high-rise 'monstrosity' near the seaside in Skulpiesbaai appeared, was approved in 1975, long before the ICMA, and would be impossible under today's regulations.) This context underscores the heightened scrutiny this proposed development must face, and the applicant's attempts to minimize the site's importance are both inappropriate and misleading. 2. Highlighting Degradation: The applicant's emphasis on the partially degraded state of the site does not justify further development. The site remains in active public use and is not in a state of ruin that necessitates development to maintain or enhance its utility for the community. 3. Focusing on "Minimization": Claiming to avoid the highest risk areas while building alarmingly close to the high-water mark gives the impression of prioritizing development over genuine environmental precaution. 4. Emphasizing Design Features: Promoting the design's open spaces and public access as a balancing factor is misleading. While open spaces are mentioned, they are small compared to the overall property size, failing to adequately compensate for the loss of unrestricted public access to the entire site. As indicated in the table (Page 13) only 89m2 of the existing total of 7,113m2 will be allowed public... indicating that this favourite fishing, hiking, swimming and picnic spot will forever be lost to the public. • To note on the map on Page 34 encircled in red below is the "existing footpath to be removed" and also that the beach is shown as "Private: Erf 8 . This footpath has been there for generations and will now disappear	
--	--	--	--

		As the southern borders of the 6 erven will practically be on the rocks - the existing footpaths will disappear and access to fishermen and hikers will impossible. (remember Hermanus Pooles bar drama) Section 63 of the ICMA sets out guidelines for coastal zone activities, designed to protect the environment and maintain public access. The application, under Section 3 – Coastal Environment, claims that a specialist study is "not applicable" while simultaneously discussing the development's alignment (under 3.3) with Section 63 of the ICMA. This is confusing and concerning given that DEA&DP: Coastal Management, the body responsible for reviewing such studies and determining ICMA compliance, has yet to provide comment. Therefore, my question is: If no specialist study was conducted, and the designated authority has not yet issued its assessment, how can there be certainty that the development aligns with the provisions of Section 63 of the ICMA? Recommendation: This piece of land should be transferred to Cape Agulhas Municipality as public land. The only argument that Helemika has for the planned transgression of the Law is that there are some areas in Struisbaai within 100m from the High water mark but this was constructed long before the Integrated Coastal Management Act “ICM act” came into effect in 2008. WITH REFERENCE TO POINT 12 ON PAGE 37 – NEED & DESIRABILITY I am trying to fully understand the rationale behind the application's claims of "Need and Desirability," because some of the points raised require further explanation and supporting data to be persuasive. 1. Densification: To say that the development aligns with densification goals is questionable. Until this proposal surfaced, there was never any indication from the town that this specific site was ever needed for development, especially given its coastal location and high scenic value. 2. Housing Demand: The claim that six high-end properties will address housing demand in Struisbaai and Agulhas is very far from the truth. The housing demand in Struisbaai is for the previously disadvantaged people in Struisbaai- North that is living in make- shift huts in backyards. The likely multi-million Rand price range of these units clearly targets a niche market, not the general housing needs of the community. Furthermore, a simple search on Property24 dated on 03 March 2025 reveals a substantial number of existing vacant stands and available houses/apartments. Even accounting for potential duplicate listings, this readily available inventory demonstrates a clear lack of need for these six additional, high-priced units. 3. Job Creation: While temporary job creation during the construction phase cannot be denied, the application fails to explain how <i>six residential properties</i> will generate significant long-term employment or local spending during the <i>operational</i> phase. These are not commercial or tourism-focused properties. The claim of significant investment through employment and local spending appears unsubstantiated. 4. Tourism Attraction: The application suggests the development will attract tourists. This is very illogical. The very attraction of the site, its current natural and undeveloped state, will be destroyed by the development itself. It is unlikely that six residential properties will attract more tourists than the pristine coastal landscape they replace. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT 107 OF 1998, AS AMENDED (NEMA): Referring to the NEMA act “Guidelines” is incorrect as it is legislative provisions. Inevitably, the development of the land will result in the removal of natural vegetation. This is supposed to be protected by NEMA, and the mere fact that this development proposal is being entertained, makes a mockery of the understanding of the issues at hand. Also NEIGHBOURING LAND VALUES:	
--	--	--	--

		The issue of derogation of value to adjoining properties should also be considered. Case law stipulates that derogation can be claimed where the adjoining owner could not reasonably envisage the development of a specific property (such as this portion of RE Farm 281) and this development having a negative effect on the value of his property. The three properties to the north of Marine Drive (Erven 1993, 1994 and 1995) could not have foreseen that their views will be lost by the development of this narrow strip of coastal land and will therefore have a real claim for the derogation in value to their properties. If one looks at the value of sea-front properties such as these three erven, such a claim could run into R millions. Lastly I feel that is worth mentioning the accessibility of the documents that the public is expected to review and comment on. Your website, www.lornay.co.za, is currently being blocked by MalwareBytes on both my laptop and cellphone, with the reason stated as "compromised site." If I am experiencing this issue, it is likely that others may be facing the same problem as well, making it difficult for the public to access the full assessment report. This raises serious concerns about whether sufficient efforts have been made to ensure that all affected parties are both aware of the report and able to review it for comment. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to confirmation of receipt of this objection and my registration as an Interested and Affected Party. Kind Regards Pamela Falck 076 486 9996 Johnson.pampie@gmail.com	
691.	Stefan Jacobs	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REM-281 Register and Objection of Proposed Development Struisbaai FARM-281 MarineDrive (Spookdraai) Good afternoon Michelle I would hereby like to register as an interested party to the applications process and objection to the Proposed Development of the property as per the attached. I have been coming to Struisbaai since 1987, and we are part-owner of a property in Struisbaai since 1997. Since 1992, we have been coming to Struisbaai during June/July and December/ July, with the rest of the family spending time at our house during the rest of the year. The proposed development sticks in the throats on a number of levels. I have reviewed the Draft BAR and have had conversation with Prof Gavin Manefeldt of UWC, who along with his students have been doing research in the Agulhas region since 2012. In 2023 he said the following: "The Struisbaai-Agulhas area is unique. Some species occurring here cannot be found anywhere else in the world." - UWC Marine Biologist, Prof Gavin W. Maneveldt The coastal rocky shores around the SANParks Agulhas National Park are so uniquely endowed with natural assets that they merit designation as a Marine Protected Area." He specifically refers to two range-resisted endemic seaweed species that has a small ecological range of roughly 10km between Struisbaai	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 14:02

		and Agulhas, even though they fall within the intertidal region, during the construction phase of the proposed development, any spills and activities outside of the boundary could have a severe negative impact on the intertidal zone. Secondly Struisbaai and Agulhas make use of septic tanks and overflows and spillage are notorious and well documented, Any such spill will have a severe impact. Further to this, even the City of Cape Town has published a white paper to proposed restricted development so close to the high-water mark, due to potential rising sea-levels and increasing severity of sea storms, A case in point is the restaurant that was build just above the high-water mark in Struisbaai and slowly washed away. The Western Cape province is already seeing the impacts of almost seasonal one in 50-year, and one in 100-year floods these past two years, suggesting that better planning simply MUST be the focus of our thinking. From an ecological impact perspective, the draft document talks about minimal impact on the flora and fauna, this is only the case if this portion is seen in isolation. From an ecological perspective, this proposed needs to be seen as being part of the end to end coast line, not only this single piece with boundaries Any of the local fishermen, or like myself frequent hikers will tell you that there are Cape Otters that use this corridor to move up and down the coast, and this development will have a severe impact on this. Furthermore the Black Oystercatcher are a frequent visitor to these rocks on the High-level mark. Additionally the rocks are home to <i>Cordylus cordylus</i>, and the vegetation host the likes of <i>Rhabdomys pumillio</i>. On the issue of traffic, the draft assessment talks about low volumes. It is obvious that this was done outside of the holiday season, when this road is notoriously busy and difficult to navigate, with cars, pedestrians and cyclists. This development will further increase traffic issues. On an aesthetic level, it is unthinkable that any development in such a location can be thought as desirable or even beneficial to the environment. I have shared the details of this development with some of my work colleagues in the USA and Europe, they are in shock that this can be even considered during a planning phase, to destroy the sea landscape forever just because a developer wants to increase his wealth, and that this is not stopped outright by you as so-called environmentalist and the authorities as a step back in civilization, not a step forward. This will be a major tourist detractor to Struisbaai. Regards Stefan Jacobs 063 196 9076	
692.	Bernie Badenhorst	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . To: Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor	

		<u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> <u>A. INTRODUCTION</u> • I am representing myself: Bernie Badenhorst, ID 4812275037087 of 7 Vasco da Gama Street, STRUISBAAI. • I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and Affected person.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Bernie Badenhorst Mobile: 083 627 5912 Email: bernie.badenhorst@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai Generic objection 1.	
693.	Koenie Pretorius	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Rem Farm No.28 Struis Baai Good day Michelle Please register me too in connection with impact assessment of Rem farm no. 28 It will have a huge input on conservation, fyn bos and the sea	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 14:36

		K.F. Pretorius ID 6205185096087 Property Address 89 Hoof Straat Agulhas NOTICE OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION FOR BASIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN TERMS OF NEMA. I have only now been made aware of your notification via a link to your website. Please would you register me as a interested and affected party, provide me with any further application and note my intent to provide comment on the submission of any planning application on Rem Farm No. 281 Struisbaai. I am a longtime property owner in the area and have both an interest and knowledge of the applicable area, coastline and history of the property, material to the statutory review of any application for development on Rem Farm 281 Struisbaai. In particular I note that the Terrestrial Biodiversity Impact Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment are questioned and I request the opportunity to provide expert review of the same for inclusion in any eventual application for review. I look forward to being included in your further correspondence in due course.	
694.	Bill Skinner	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai development Hi Michelle I have been coming to Struisbaai/Agulhas for 53 years. The development in this beautiful part of our country exploded in the last 20 years. The pristine coastal fynbos as part of the beachfront "green zone" should not be open to any residential or hotel developments. The greedy and self-serving business orientated developers are not going to add any value to the coastal environment. The three or four seaside erven in the coastal "green zone" was sold somewhere in the past without ever thinking of protecting the very sensitive coastal environment. The result of this can be seen on the Struisbaai side of Marine Drive. I call it the Monstrosity on Marine Drive. I wonder how this fight was lost?? The petition to have the Spookdraai coast protected against development will go the same way(South) if this area cannot be re-zoned as pristine coastal property and the ownership changed to KAM or Cape Nature. Not for the faint hearted. Be blessed in your efforts. "No development on the sea side of Marine drive--ever again" Bill Skinner Clinical Psychologist Note: I am starting a "verlangbankie voetslaanroete/memory bench hiking trail" from the lighthouse to the Struisbaai harbour (7km) along the coast. People should walk and sit a while in nature to reminisce. This will help them realize that we should not get caught up in this fast "flat screen life" or get sucked into the "greed to make money" We are here to add value to nature. Those benches are environmentally friendly and their stories add value to the people sitting on them.	Date: 03/03/35 Time: 14:36

695.	Barie van Niekerk	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. Good day Please find the completed objection for your attention. RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION ▪ I am representing myself : Barrie van Niekerk ID 6004205103084 ▪ I have a direct interest in the application as I reside in Struisbaai at 11 Disa Street ▪ I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for the past 11 years. ▪ The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. ▪ There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact" ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. ▪ I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Barrie van Niekerk Mobile 0824617222 Email barrie.vn@outlook.com Refer to Spookdraai objection 1.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 15:05
696.	Natio van Rooyen	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Residential Development Pre-application Basic Assessment Report for the Proposed – Lornay Environmental Consulting: Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder of the Farm No. 281, Struisbaai, Bredasdorp RD. Your request for comment on the aforementioned proposed project refers. Please register De Punt Estate (Pty) Ltd. as an Interested and Affected Party. The preferred communication method is by email to natio@mexm.co.za / niel.coetzer@googlemail.com / wynand@wepex.co.za .	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 15:15

		We have the following comments on the Pre-Application BAR: 1. We want to register our opposition to the proposed project. 2. There is a significant discrepancy between the date for comment on the Notice (03/02/2025) and the date on your website (03/03/2025). 3. The initial efforts to download the visual impact assessment was thwarted by the unavailability of the report on your website link. 4. The visual impact assessment is considered to be woefully inadequate. Non of the impacts of the proposed development was adequately discussed as per the norms of visual impact assessments. Building heights of houses, view from the road, view from the beach, discussion of the tunnel effect on the coastal road by building on both sides of the road and various other issues was not addressed. 5. The current use patterns of the site are not qualified nor quantified. The particular site is one of the highest use areas for shore fishermen and the Spookdraai beach is used by families for beach activities. Absolutely no admission to this use patterns is reflected in the PA-BAR. This is a major oversight. 6. The EAP's opinion on the effect the project will have on tourism and the character of Struisbaai is questioned. The portion of Marine Drive from Ocean View Drive to Spookdraai, with its coastal views, is exactly what gives Struisbaai its character. 7. Spookdraai and surrounds is one of the major tourism marketing tools of Struisbaai and L'Agulhas. This development will negatively impact on tourism. Therefore to claim that the development will be positive for tourism is fundamentally wrong and should be revised as negative. 8. The SSVR assessment by the EAP that there is no need for a socio-economic assessment is wrong. A socio-economic study has to be done because this development will have a major impact on the town. 9. The PA-BAR admits that access to the shoreline and Spookdraai beach will be restricted to "community members and visitors". The developer is therefore removing public access and are thus annexing / expropriating state land for private use. There is no discussion on the admiralty zone above the high water mark and how it was taken into account. 10. The needs and desirability assessment are strongly disagreed with and should read: • Very negative impact on sense of place, • Very negative impact on the historic Spookdraai, • High negative impact on tourism, • High negative impact on public access, • High negative impact on the character of Struisbaai. • Definitely no positive community contribution. • The only positive contribution this project will bring is to pockets of the developer. 11. The EAP's assessment that the project positively align to provincial development frameworks is strongly disagreed with. 12. This proposed development is totally against the purposes of the Coastal Protection Zone. The EAP's view on this strongly disagreed with. A specialist must assess the impact on the Coastal Protection Zone. 13. The major impact of this project is social and on the character of Struisbaai and this has been inadequately addressed and must be reassessed in great detail. Kind regards, Natio van Rooyen	
697.	M M Olivier	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> E. INTRODUCTION	

		- I, M M Olivier (ID 54082500150880), object both in my personal capacity and as a trustee and capital beneficiary of the CJO Familietrust (IT 2/2013). - The CJO Familietrust has a direct interest in the application as it owns property in Struisbaai (16 Ocean View Avenue). I have been spending my vacations in Struisbaai since 1984, together with my family. - We have a close emotional bond with this area. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> - Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards M M Olivier Mobile 084 766 8862 Email mm1954olivier@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
698.	C J Olivier	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> F. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself, C J Olivier (ID 5512115102055), and the CJO Familietrust (IT 2/2013), of which I am an authorised trustee and capital beneficiary. - The CJO Familietrust has a direct interest in the application as it owns property in Struisbaai (16 Ocean View Avenue). My wife and I live at the above address for extended periods, as we are both retired, and my family and I have been spending our vacations in Struisbaai since 1975. - We have a close emotional bond with this area. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> - Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the</i>	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 15:00

		<i>developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
699.	Sonja van Niekerk	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Condensed Objection Importance: High Good day Michelle, Attached is my condensed objection to the development at Spookdraai – Struisbaai. Kind Regards Sonja van Niekerk RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION ▪ I am representing myself, Sonja van Niekerk (ID 6507100084084) ▪ I have a direct interest in the application as I live in my father's property in Struisbaai – 11 Disa Street. ▪ I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. ▪ The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. ▪ There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines " it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact' ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. ▪ I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. ▪ The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Sonja van Niekerk M: 0829263454 e-mail: Sonja.vn@outlook.com	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 15:18

700.	Jenny Falck	Email dated 03 March 2025 RE: PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ON RE FARM NO. 281, BREDASDORD DIVISION, AT STRUISBAAI I hereby lodge my objection against the above development, in the strongest possible terms. This application goes against all that is supposed to protect the environment and if it is approved, it will make a mockery of the NEMA regulations. In this regard I would like to point out the following: 1. The dangers of rising sea levels are well known and I don't have to elaborate on this. As the property in question is located directly adjacent to the coast, this is a real danger. A recent example of the disasters attached to allowing a building right next to the coast is the Nostra Pub and Grill, located on Struisbaai Main Beach. This had to be demolished after the sea decided to reclaim the land – an excellent example of why not to allow the Spookdraai development. 2. The erection of buildings between the sea and the road will be an abhorrence from a scenic point of view. This route between Struisbaai and Agulhas offers some of the most visually pleasing vistas one can hope for. The residents of the towns already have to contend with the multi-storey apartment block built between the road and the coast recently, despite opposition from various sides. To now even contemplate the development of The Draai is a slap in the face of the residents and visitors who love this area and the natural beauty it offers. 3. As the name suggests, the Spookdraai development will be located along a stretch of road where numerous vehicle accidents have taken place, in the bend of the busy M319 / Marine Drive. This is the only route between Struisbaai and Agulhas and thus carries high volumes of traffic – pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicles. To allow vehicle and driveway access to six units here will be irresponsible and will go against all conventional traffic rules. 4. The ecological sensitivity of the area cannot be emphasized enough! This area is known for the good angling spots and there has hardly been a moment that I have not seen fishing folk on the rocks here. One single sewage spill and all this is lost. The location of the property really does not lend itself to a residential development, where man-made hazards such as septic tanks can jeopardize nature! 5. The same applies to run-off water and stormwater drainage. With residential development, rain will no longer be able to drain into the soil. Instead, the hard surfaces (roofs, gutters and paving) found in residential development will result in the accumulation of increased amounts of water, only to follow the natural route down into the sea. With this it is inevitable that rubbish and contaminants will ruin the natural environment which plays such a big part of this community. 6. Inevitably, the development of the land will result in the removal of natural vegetation. This is supposed to be protected by NEMA, and the mere fact that this development proposal is being entertained, makes a mockery of the understanding of the issues at hand. 7. The shape of the property is not suitable for development. At its widest point, it is only ±41m, and this in an area with a severe slope. At its narrowest point, it is only ±23m. There should be no reason why the existing town planning prescriptions with regard to building lines and setbacks should be changed to allow development here, and in my experience as property professional, this is what will be required to build an efficient and feasible dwelling. The residents of Struisbaai and Agulhas should would be insulted if the local authority grants departures to suite this developer! 8. The issue of derogation of value to adjoining properties should also be considered. Case law stipulates that derogation can be claimed where the adjoining owner could not reasonably envisage the development of a specific property (such as this portion of RE Farm 281) and this development having a negative effect on the value of his property. The three properties to the north of Marine Drive (Erven 1993, 1994 and 1995) could not have foreseen that their views will be lost by the development of this narrow strip of coastal land and will therefore have a real claim for the derogation in value to their properties. If one looks at the value of sea-front properties such as these three erven, such a claim could run into R millions.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 15:03
------	-------------	---	---------------------------------------

		9. If one looks at the boundary description of the property, it sets “the Sea” as the boundary of the property. However, in South Africa, this means that the high-water mark is the boundary. In the below Goole Imagery it is clear that the southern boundary of the property is well below the high-water mark. It is essential that, prior to any decisions being made, the site is resurveyed to determine the actual boundary on the southern side. This will in my opinion most likely result in the boundary shifting to the north, resulting in an even more narrow shape and making it unsuitable for development. 10. The environmental practitioner should be aware of the recent case in her hometown, Hermanus, where such a shift in the boundary resulted in what was thought to be private property, turned out to be public land – a similar scenario is most likely applicable to the Spookdraai development. 11. The last and most important issue is that of ownership, as discussed in the case between J.d.P. Botha and the Grootklair Community (24611/11, in the High Court of SA, Western Cape). Although Mr Botha and the other applicants had title to the property, it was found that, as the community had uninterrupted use of the property for more than 30 years, they were entitled to continue their use of the property by means of acquisitive prescription. I have been a visitor to Struisbaai since 1989, and my husband has been vacating there from 1970. At no time was there signage prohibiting access or a warning from the owners not to use their land. In fact, the small beach and the areas adjacent to it has always been a picnic and fishing spot for the wider Struisbaai and Agulhas communities. To now claim ownership is ludicrous, as The Draai (as it is known) “belongs” to the people of the town. 12. This is evident on the SG Diagram of the property that was done in 1836. It relates to the “right to the Public of Fishing” – and this almost 200 years ago already. If the Grootklair Case is anything to go by, it should be clear that the proposed Spookdraai development is not only undesirable, but most likely also illegal. It can be noted that I will circulate this letter of objection to other owners and residents of Struisbaai and Agulhas, as well as people who holiday here. I will also give them permission to use any / all information contained herein, insofar as it will aid in the halting of this development. Yours sincerely J.L. Falck 083 270-4587	
701.	Peter Bens Reynolds	Email dated 03 March 2025 More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> G. INTRODUCTION	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 10:02

		• I am representing myself - Peter Bens Reynolds, 6601205016081 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress – Marine Drive 157. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Peter Bens Reynolds Mobile – 082 556 7633 Email – pbreynolds@cwnet.co.za	
702.	Roan Vincent Hough	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: REYNOLDS ELEKTRIES More, Hoop dit gaan goed? Meneer Reynolds het gevra dat ek die aangehegde dokumente moet aanstuur. Mooi dag! Groete <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> H. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself – Roan Vincent Hough, 0309125150081 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress – or I vacation here.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 10:02

		• I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname – Roan Vincent Hough Mobile – 071 217 4456 Email – roanhough8@gmail.com	
703.	Pieter Nel	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection against proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Hi Michelle Please accept the below summary as my formal <u>objection</u> against the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development: https://lornay.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Pre-App-Draft-BAR-re281-Struisb-310125.pdf 1. <u>INTRODUCTION</u> 1. I am representing myself Pieter Nel. 2. I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> 3. I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. 4. The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. 5. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document: 1. Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions 2. Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive 3. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact</i> 4. Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the</i>	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 16:34

		<i>only asset available to the developer.</i> 6. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. 7. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Michelle, grateful if you could please confirm receipt of my objection? I strongly believe the proposed development is against the Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 and is situated within the Coastal protection zone – This will be an undesirable development from a future sustainability point of view as the coast of Struisbaai/Agulhas needs to be protected for future generations. Regards, Pieter Nel Refer to Spookdraai objection 1.	
704.	Fred Koopman	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection Good day I hereby express my objection and oppose the development at Spookdraai. We are new property owners is Struisbaai and we fell in love with the place for its natural beauty and breathtaking coast line. This development will only spoil this beautiful place. Unhappy residents	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 19:29
705.	Herman Du plessis	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection to Spookdraai development. I WH du Plessis, an homeowner in Agulhas, object against the developmnt of Spookdraai. I would be an absolute disrace to develop and to build on this prestine stretch of coastline. Not sure how they will get past the 100m building line of the high water mark anyway. Kind regards, Herman du Plessis 82 Main road Agulhas	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 19:36
706.	Thalita Gresse (Born Olivier)	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> I. INTRODUCTION • I, T Gresse (ID 8112230045085), object both in my personal capacity and as a capital beneficiary of the CJO Familietrust (IT 2/2013). • The CJO Familietrust has a direct interest in the application as it owns property in Struisbaai (16 Ocean View Avenue). I have been spending my vacations in Struisbaai since 1981, together with my family. • We have a close emotional bond with this area.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 20:17

		• The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ◦ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ◦ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ◦ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ◦ Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards T Gresse (Born Olivier) Mobile 083 375 7494 Email thalitaolivier@yahoo.com	
707.	Petra Giliomee Lemmer	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai ontwikkeling Hi, Please see attached. Regards, Petra Lemmer RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Petra Lemmer (ID 7907020072087) • I have a direct interest in the application as I have vacationed in Struisbaai and Agulhas my entire life and my parents are permanent residents of Agulhas. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ◦ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ◦ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ◦ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’ ◦ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 20:32

		documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. ● The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards PETRA LEMMER Mobile: 082 535 9317 Email: petragiliomeelemmer@gmail.com	
708.	Surene Botha	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development No no no to any development in the area around spookdraai!!! This heritage should be saved from any tom dick and harry wanting to develop there!!!! Regards SB	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 20:29
709.	Frank Truter	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Objection to Proposed Spookdraai Development Struisbaai To whom it may concern, I hereby wish to object to the proposed development. This application is undesirable as the development will have a significant negative impact on the Struisbaai & Agulhas area on many different levels(aesthetics, heritage & ecological). The alternative and preferred layouts are incorrect as the southern boundary of this portion of Farm 281 is the high-water mark and not the line drawn across the sea from approximately “erf 3” – “erf 7”, hence you can’t create a private open space over state land. The land below the high-water mark is state land. The 17.5m building line for the Main Road must be drawn from the centre of the road reserve and not the physical centre of the road surface. The town planner that ever drawn these layouts needs to get further education. The layouts seem to ignore the fact that the culvert shown around Erf 1 is substantial, the outlet pipe is 600mm, and this stormwater originates from as far as Ocean view drive, catch pit, between erven 956 & 1984 Struisbaai. In January 2009 there were major rains in Struisbaai & Agulhas and this culvert along with all the other storm water structure from the catch pit in Ocean view drive down to the culvert was all washed away. This fact will render Erf 1 useless and unusable. With reference to page 84 of the draft BAR, “The subject property is the sole asset available to the developer, making it the only viable option for the proposed development”. This is a blatant lie and totally dishonest. The developer still owns a large section of Farm 281, see annexure 1 attached. Yes, this was subdivided in 2013 but never registered hence not transferred. The high-water mark shown on the layouts and topographical plan is incorrect and was never surveyed in the presence of the Surveyor General’s office. No notification was received by the Surveyor General’s office in terms of section 32 of the Land Survey Act 8 of 1997. From past experiences of surveying high-water marks in the presence of the SG’s office, the high-water mark should be set further back as where it is currently shown, hence making there less usable space to develop. From my calculations and survey, I determine that this portion of	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:07

		remainder Farm 281 is approximately 5550 sqm in extent. See attached annexures 2 – 3. This is the LUPO approval for the general plan 8909/1994, copies of sheets 1 – 5 attached. Looking at the approved layout plan it is blatantly clear that “portion 81” is public open space as per the land use table. In terms of the land use planning ordinance 15 of 1985, section 28, see annexure 4, which states that with confirmation of the subdivision, this meaning that the subdivision comes into effect, which it did with the registration of the erven, the public places vest in the local authority. This split remainder portion of Farm 281 is public open space and vests in the local authority, so in actual fact the developer doesn’t actually own the proiroperty any more but vests in the local authority. I suggest you get a legal opinion on this before you waste your time any further. The 2007 zoning plan shows this portion of Farm 281 as being public place, see annexure 5. I can provide you with a full copy of this zoning plan if you wish. Due to the incompetence of the Cape Agulhas municipality’s GIS operator, the concept of a split remainder couldn’t be handled, that is why once the plan went to a digital format using GIS, this portion of the spilt remainder of Farm 281 miraculously changed overnight from public place to agriculture. A zoning of a property can’t change by a mistake. As the high-water mark is the southern boundary of this property, a path way or strip of at least 3m wide must be given to the local fisherman and beach walkers so as to continue there free movement along this coast because, if it is a spring high tide, they will not be able to walk here without traversing the newly created erven as the layouts are in there current form due to the nature and steepness of the terrain. There is no need for this development, it is solely for GREED. In conclusion, this development is completely in appropriate and is undesirable from a local and a heritage perspective. Kind Regards / Vriendelike Groete Frank Truter	
710.	Kobus Pretorius	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Proposed development of the Remainder of Erf (Farm) 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai). To Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 3 MARCH 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI</u>	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:30

		<u>RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> A. INTRODUCTION I am representing myself, JJ PRETORIUS, ID 5511245079083, 33 OCEAN VIEW DRIVE 33, STRUISBAAI, 7285. I have a direct interest in the application. Please register me as an Interested and affected person. I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since December 1986. The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given in attachment A and in the article of Dr NW Walters - "The gentrification of Spookdraai - our portal to paradise (Attachment B). Regards JJ Pretorius Mobile 0826723500 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
711.	Robert Meyer	Email dated 03 March 2025 RE: REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INTRODUCTION • I, Robert Meyer, ID. 690225 5274 087, 19 Blouvin Street, Struisbaai, hereby formally object to the proposed development, and register as an interested and affected person, for reasons as set forth below in this objection. • I have a direct interest in the application as a Project Affected Party ["PAP"] and hereby register my objection to this development. • I have recently invested in property because of the pristine coastline, which is now under threat, should this development be	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:32

		approved. • The main reason for investing and settling in Struisbaai is because of its heritage and natural beauty, especially, but not exclusively, its unique fauna, flora and supreme coastline. • The proposed development is undesirable, as it will destroy one of the most scenic coastlines in South Africa, from Struisbaai to Agulhas. • The proposed development will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and could discourage future responsible and sustainable development, especially in eco-tourism. • This development will not create long term sustainable employment opportunities for the impoverished local community, as claimed in the application. To the contrary, this development if approved, will further damage the coastline, which could result in even less large scale responsible development, as the area may lose its appeal as a desirable tourist attraction. • The conservation of the unique coastline is in the public interest and must be preserved for future generations. • One of the main objectives of the Integrated Coastal Management Act [“ICM Act”] to guide the behaviour and actions of humans and development in coastal zones, ensuring its benefits can be sustainably and equitably distributed and not only for the benefit of the privileged few. The coastline is a national asset that could and should be exploited as a tourist attraction, which could result in sustainable medium to high density responsible development, whilst not encroaching the 100 metre high water mark. • Notwithstanding the irreversible damage to the coastline, destroying the scenic attraction by allowing the development of low density residential development is not in the interest of the broader community of Struisbaai, Agulhas and surrounding areas, as will discourage responsible and sustainable development, especially in the hospitality sector, which creates permanent employment and skills transfer opportunities. • I reserve my right to supplement this objection with further submissions, additional scientifically proven information and documentation, currently being collated. • The grounds of my objection is set forth below. The listed objections and arguments are not exhaustive, but limited to time constraints and pending legal opinion and external specialist analysis still outstanding. Yours sincerely Robert Meyer robert.meyer.sa@gmail.com +27 83 444 2976	
712.	Antoinette Conradie	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Stop die ontwikkeling by Spookdraai Ek is 'n inwoner van Struisbaai. Hoofweg 127. Ek maak ten sterkste beswaar teen enige ontwikkeling by Spookdraai. Dit is absoluut teen alle reëls om "n stukkie erfenis weg te neem van die gemeenskap. Die deel tussen Skulpiesbaai en Agulhas is absoluut historiese erfenis gebied wat bewaar moet bly vir die nageslag. Soveel plaaslike inwoners gebruik die gebied vir ontspanning, visvang. Keer enige ontwikkeling aan die seekant van die pad. Dis nasionale bewaringsgebied. Antoinette Conradie.	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:51
713.	Dalene Meyer-Josling	Email dated 03 March 2025 RE: REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT INTRODUCTION	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:49

		• I, Daléne Meyer-Josling, ID. 710102 0210 083, 19 Blouvin Street, Struisbaai, hereby formally object to the proposed development, and register as an interested and affected person, for reasons as set forth below in this objection. • I have a direct interest in the application as a Project Affected Party [“PAP”] and hereby register my objection to this development. • I have recently invested in property because of the pristine coastline, which is now under threat, should this development be approved. • The main reason for investing and settling in Struisbaai is because of its heritage and natural beauty, especially, but not exclusively, its unique fauna, flora and supreme coastline. • The proposed development is undesirable, as it will destroy one of the most scenic coastlines in South Africa, from Struisbaai to Agulhas. • The proposed development will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and could discourage future responsible and sustainable development, especially in eco-tourism. • This development will not create long term sustainable employment opportunities for the impoverished local community, as claimed in the application. To the contrary, this development if approved, will further damage the coastline, which could result in even less large-scale responsible development, as the area may lose its appeal as a desirable tourist attraction. • The conservation of the unique coastline is in the public interest and must be preserved for future generations. • One of the main objectives of the Integrated Coastal Management Act [“ICM Act”] to guide the behaviour and actions of humans and development in coastal zones, ensuring its benefits can be sustainably and equitably distributed and not only for the benefit of the privileged few. The coastline is a national asset that could and should be exploited as a tourist attraction, which could result in sustainable medium to high density responsible development, whilst not encroaching the 100-metre-high water mark. • Notwithstanding the irreversible damage to the coastline, destroying the scenic attraction by allowing the development of low-density residential development is not in the interest of the broader community of Struisbaai, Agulhas and surrounding areas, as will discourage responsible and sustainable development, especially in the hospitality sector, which creates permanent employment and skills transfer opportunities. • I reserve my right to supplement this objection with further submissions, additional scientifically proven information and documentation, currently being collated. • The grounds of my objection is set forth below. The listed objections and arguments are not exhaustive, but limited to time constraints and pending legal opinion and external specialist analysis still outstanding. Yours sincerely Daléne Meyer-Josling dmeyerjosling@gmail.com +27 83 411 8453	
714.	Joanie Pretorius	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> A. INTRODUCTION	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:39

		I am representing myself, JM PRETORIUS, ID 5712140127080, 33 OCEAN VIEW DRIVE, STRUISBAAI, 7285. I have a direct interest in the application. Please register me as an Interested and affected person. I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since December 1986. The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given in attachment A and in the article of Dr NW Walters - "The gentrification of Spookdraai - our portal to paradise". Regards JM Pretorius Mobile 0826723500 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1, also refer to The gentrification of Spookdraai	
715.	Andre Louw	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Fwd: Objection against proposed Spookdraai Residential Development (Andre Louw) Michelle, I hereby formally object against the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development. After reading the Pre-application / Draft basic assessment report (https://lornay.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/Pre-App-Draft-BAR-re281-Struisb-310125.pdf), I strongly believe the proposed development is against the Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 and is situated within the Coastal protection zone. This will be an undesirable development from a future sustainability point of view as the coast of Struisbaai/Agulhas needs to be protected and the proposed development would not be in the interest of the wider community. This is an iconic part of Struisbaai and needs to be protected for the future generations. Grateful if you could please confirm receipt of my objection? Regards,	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 21:53

		Andre Louw Mobile: 082 453 9239 Email: andre.louw1950@gmail.com <u>Further detail of my objection below:</u> Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
716.	Salome Erasmus	Email dated 03 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> J. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Salome Erasmus 22 L'Afrique Verte Franschhoek • I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Salome Erasmus <u>OBJECTIONS 2: HERITAGE, VISUAL AND OTHER IMPACTS</u> I object against the development of this specific area, due to the social and cultural impact it will have. • This area is child friendly, calls for a family spending time together, as many fishermen where taught how to fish from the rocks in this specific area • These fishermen have in turn, taught their children to fish from the rocks. • Removing access to this specific area, or restricting access removes a part of the cultural and family heritage of people in this area. • Teaching children safely about the organicism's in the shallow pools, was part of every mothers role, who raised their children in the awareness to conserve and protect. • My son is an ecologist, due to the time we spent in nature, his daughter is passionate about nature because of many hours spent in sharing the greatness of God's creation. With this development, a lucrative commercial deal is removing a big part of past generations history and the basis of the future generations of good memories. Please respect the wishes of the community, as each time they go back to that area, there is a story to tell, a memory, a	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 22:12

		sense of discovery every time you have success after casting a line into that beautiful clear water.	
717.	Alma Jute	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai ontwikkeling Goeie dag Registreer my asb as 'n geaffekteerde party teen die Spookdraai ontwikkeling. Baie dankie Alma Jute Tel: 0826512601	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 23:20
718.	Louna Truter	Email dated 03 March 2025 Subject: Residential development on a portion of the Remainder of Farm 280, Bredasdorp RD (Struisbaai) Dear Michelle Please see attached an objection to the proposed development. Can you please register me as an interested and affected party. Kind Regards Pre-application Basic Assessment Report for the Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder of the Farm No. 281, Struisbaai, Bredasdorp RD With reference to the above and the public participation process underway. Please register me as an interested and affected party. I wish to object against the proposal for the following reasons: 1. OPEN SPACE NETWORK 2. The proposed development site forms part of an open space network that runs along the entire proclaimed town area of the Agulhas and Struisbaai coastline (approx. 12,5km). The public open space network is only interrupted by the portion of the Remainder of Farm 281, the adjacent portion 22 of Farm 281, Erf 848 (Struisbaai Harbour Cafe, but with a public servitude) and the Struisbaai harbour property, erf 848. It is believed that the intend was for this portion of the Remainder of Farm 281, to also be public open space, as can be seen in the attached stamped subdivision plan of 1994. With the approval of the application for the development north of the development site, the area now proposed for development, was indicated as public open space (indicated as portion 81 on the stamped subdivision plan). It is unknown why it did not get a separate erf number and why it wasn't registered in favour of the Municipality. The Surveyor General's office could not find any record of later amendments. It can only be assumed that there was an oversight. This same area was also indicated as public open space on the 2007 zoning plan. With the next revision it was indicated as Agriculture. This might be due to GIS programs that make split zonings difficult. 2. HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT Archaeological: It is believed that the traversing of the site and only referring to shell scatters visible on footpaths, is not what is intended with	Date: 03/03/25 Time: 23:52

		an archaeological impact assessment. With the site daily used by fishermen and the public, one can believe that there will be very limited archaeological material visible. The area above the high-water mark is covered with natural vegetation and archaeological deposits will not be visible. It can be anticipated that this could very well be a very rich archaeological site, due to its location. Test pits will be required to assess the archaeological value of the site. It is noted on page 3 of this document: 'e) Sites of Historical or Social significance: The site has long been separated from the parent Paapekuilfontein Farm and has no remaining associations of historical or social significance.' - The social and historical significance of this portion has nothing to do with the parent Paapekuilfontein. Its significance lies in its connection with the adjoining open spaces. This area has been used for much more than 60 years as a well-known fishing spot. Residents from Agulhas and Struisbaai walk along this route, along the water for recreational purposes on a daily basis. It forms part of a heritage landscape. - I do not see the public interviews that were conducted with residence, etc as part of the document. The Heritage Western Cape decision on the NID (September 2023), asked for: 3. IN GENERAL - We could not timeously obtain a copy of the title deed. It is unknown whether there are any deed restrictions pertaining to the littoral zone. - The area falls within the littoral zone. Development of this nature should not be considered in this area. - The area of the proposed development site is wrong. The southern boundary is the highwater mark and not a straight line. This area of the portion of the Remainder of Farm 281 appears to be approximately 5600m². It would appear that portions of the proposed erven, for example a large portion of proposed Erf 8, proposed open space, is not even located on the erf. - Should mitigation proposed in the Heritage document be implemented, with specific reference to the green buffer, the internal road reserve will have to be widened, necessitating erven to move further south, which is not possible. The property is too narrow to allow for the proposed erven. The narrow 4m road and turning circle is not wide enough to accommodate emergency vehicles, for example the fire brigade. It will not be able to accommodate a large moving / relocation truck. - Huge amounts of stormwater run over this portion of land. The proposal does not make provision for the rerouting of this water. It is believed that rerouting this water will also necessitate an additional environmental process, since it will also be within 100m from the high-water mark. - Unsure if a Geotech was done, to determine the suitability of the soil for development. - The area is too close to the sea to even consider the installation of conservancy tanks for sewer purposes. Any damage to the tanks will have a severe impact on the natural environment. The conservancy tanks will be, depending on where they are placed, approximately 20m from the high-water mark. - From the Elsenburg GIS plans, an area of this portion is indicated a terrestrial CBA, with Overberg Dune Strandveld. - The development site forms part of a split remainder. There is no reason for the portion to be developed. With a planning approval in 1994, this area was already designated for public open space purposes and according to this, should have been transferred to the municipality. - The portion of land is located next to a scenic route. This scenic route was already irrevocably spoiled with the development of Erf 1252 in a fashion completely out of character with Struisbaai. Development of this site will be just as destructive. - From a planning point of view, the development of this site is not sustainable. It is out of place in terms of proposed use, it is environmentally unsuitable and from a service point of view not practical. With 0m rear building lines proposed, in most cases right next to the high water mark, no room is left for sea level changes in future. Hope you find all in order.	
719.	CJ Potgiegter	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 06:17

		<u>RE Farm No. 281, Bredasdorp Division, at Struisbaai</u> 1. The abovementioned matter refers. 2. The Wessels family has been landowners in Struisbaai since the very first erven were proclaimed. We have been living in or visiting Struisbaai and Agulhas for five generations. 3. This letter aims to object to the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on RE Farm No. 281, Bredasdorp Division, at Struisbaai (hereinafter “the development”), by raising several concerns that have not been adequately addressed in the developmental proposal. Background to this letter: 4. This letter will be based on the principles of the Coastal Management Act that can be found in the ICM Act – User Friendly Guide (hereinafter “the ICM Act”). 5. We refer specifically to the following principles: 5.1. <u>Economic Development</u> “Coastal economic development opportunities must be optimised to <u>meet society’s needs</u> and to <u>promote the wellbeing</u> of coastal communities.” 5.2. <u>Accountability and Responsibility</u> “Coastal management is a shared responsibility. All people <u>must be held responsible</u> for the consequences of their actions, including financial responsibility for negative impacts.” 5.3. <u>Duty of Care</u> “All people and organisations must <u>act with due care to avoid negative impacts</u> on the coastal environment and coastal resources.” (Own emphasis added). 6. In light of this, we believe that the development is not in line with our society’s needs, therefore we find it our duty to inform you of such in the reasons as outlined below. Impact on Fauna and Flora 7. We refer to Alternative 4, as set out on page 34 of the Botanical Impact Assessment, especially “this revision further enhances and expands the retention of flora areas within the overall development.” 8. This refers to the rezoning of the development in order to conserve the critically endangered Overberg Dune Strandveld that can be found on the western part of the site (refer to page 27 of the Botanical Impact Assessment). 9. Our concern is that, even though the rezoning theoretically accommodates the conservation of this plant species, we do not believe it to practically come to pass. The reason for this is that the construction site for the development will be large, and no assurance can be made that the plant species will not be permanently destroyed in the construction process. Visual Impact 10. Reference is made to page 53 of the Basic Assessment Report of April 2024, specifically the paragraph “VISUAL INTRUSION OF DEVELOPMENT.” “The development is proposed to occupy a portion of the coastline which is pristine and with no adjacent development to form a	
--	--	---	--

		continuous pattern. <u>This urban intrusion will result in a High Visual Intrusion.</u> (Own emphasis added). 11. The vista that the site of development provides for locals, and more importantly tourists, will remove the aesthetics of the coastline. Retention of this buffer zone is critical, and the introduction of residential structures will alter the landscape and detract from the visual appeal of the coastline. 12. Struisbaai is a coastal town and depends on the tourism of the peak seasons for its economic injection. The preservation of these views is crucial for maintaining the aesthetic value and charm of Struisbaai. Furthermore, this road is the only way of obtaining access to the southernmost tip of Africa. Erosion 13. We refer to page 15 of the Botanical Impact Assessment, specifically: “This image shows erosion of the accumulated aeolian sand. Note the thickness (depth) of the sand. The cause of the <u>erosion</u> is the egress of <u>stormwater</u> from a culvert at the edge of Marine Drive.” 14. We furthermore refer to page 26 of the Botanical Impact Assessment, specifically: “At this location, a <u>stormwater</u> culvert has been constructed. This is a good thing but the flow of water below the culvert should be appropriately managed. It is <u>eroding</u> the sandy soil and leaving and undesirable <u>erosion gully</u>.” 15. It is clear that the current inadequate management of stormwater is causing erosion in and around the potential site of development. Systems would need to be implemented to mitigate these already existing risks, as well as potential risks from the development, i.e., large construction vehicles and equipment, new stormwater management and pumping trucks (as is the current method of managing sewerage). 16. It is our concern that this area is not being protected from the adverse hydrological risks of erosion, and that the potential development will only add to these risks. Coastal protection zone 17. The ICM Act defines the coastal protection zone on page 23 of its user-friendly guide: “...a continuous strip of land, starting from the HWM and extending 100 metres inland in developed urban areas zoned as residential, commercial, or public open space...” 18. The Basic Assessment report gives the following description of the development site on page 2: The property is strategically positioned alongside the coastline, within 100 meters of the high-water mark. 19. It is thus clear that the development site forms part of the coastal protection zone, which leads to Chapter 7 of the ICM act, namely the Protection of Coastal Environment. 20. Page 53 of “the ICM Act provides for additional criteria that must be considered by the relevant competent authority when evaluating an application for an activity which will take place in the coastal zone,” and same is set out on page 74.	
--	--	--	--

		21. The reader hereof is encouraged to consider question 2 which sets out the circumstances under which the competent authority may not issue environmental authorisation, especially points 2 and 6: 2. Is situated within the coastal protection zone or coastal access land, and does not further the purposes for which this land was designated; and 6. Will not be in the interests of the community as a whole. 22. Firstly, this letter is proof that the development will not be in the interests of the community as a whole. 23. Secondly, considerable debate has arisen regarding the intended use of this land. However, it is our position that for decades, this strip of land has served as a recreational space, supporting activities such as fishing, hiking, and picnicking—its appeal being closely tied to the scenic views (see paragraphs 11 and 12 above). Moreover, this area is a highly frequented route for hikers, joggers, and cyclists, and the proposed development would significantly diminish its attractiveness for these purposes. Preserving this natural space in its established role is not only more practical but also ensures continued public access, whereas development would restrict it to six erven with limited public access. Correction of error 24. We would lastly like to bring to your attention an error on page 32 of the Basic Assessment Report. 25. The location of the red arrow indicates an area close to Skulpiesbaai, and not Spookdraai as indented. Thus, erroneously indicating the location of the proposed site. 26. Added to this excerpt from the report is a blue arrow which indicates the correct location:	
720.	Cornelius Lemmer	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Beswaar teen voorgestelde Spookdraai ontwikkeling Hi Michelle, Sien aangeheg getekende brief om beswaar aan te teken teen die voorgestelde ontwikkeling op Spookdraai. Groete, Cornelius Lemmer RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself, Cornelius Lemmer ID # 7506065055088 • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 06:25

		Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards, Cornelius Lemmer Mobile: 083 277 4205 Email: corneliuslemmer@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
721.	Petro Botha	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Development of Spookdraai Good day Please we cannot loose this historic place to people who only care about money making projects and to hell with the environment. This is a big NO NO for this project. SP BOTHA	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 06:29
722.	Karlien Walker	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai development Goeiemoere, ek is ten sterkste teen die hele bouery by Spookdraai. Dis ons plekkie waar ons soms visvang en braai. Wanneer die 6 huise daar gebou word sal ons nooit meer daar kan kom nie. Karlien Walker	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 06:57
723.	JL Olivier	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: OBJECTION to intended SPOOKDRAAI DEVELOPMENT Good morning Herewith my formal objection to the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development. Regards	

		<u>Adv J L Olivier</u> Northern Cape Society of Advocates Chambers Kimberley <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> K. INTRODUCTION • I, J L Olivier (ID 8409235012080), object both in my personal capacity and as a capital beneficiary of the CJO Familietrust (IT 2/2013). • The CJO Familietrust has a direct interest in the application as it owns property in Struisbaai (16 Ocean View Avenue). I have been spending my vacations in Struisbaai since 1984, together with my family. • We have a close emotional bond with this area. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Adv J L Olivier Mobile 082 298 1115 Email jlolivier@law.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objective 1.	
724.	Jessie Swart	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Residential Development Objection Dear Michelle, I would like to express my strong objection to the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development. Below are my reasons for this opposition. Firstly, the area designated for the proposed development falls within a specific urban edge characterized by a rhythm of greenbelt (coastal), urban belt (along Marine Drive), greenbelt, and another urban belt (along Ocean View Drive). This proposal disrupts the clear aesthetic visual rhythm of the area and contradicts the existing relationship between the green and urban belts. The green belts provide various benefits to both the environment and urban developments: 1. They encourage biodiversity in flora and fauna, as these areas are effectively unofficial protected zones. 2. They serve as a temperature relief for the houses on Marine and Ocean View Drive. 3. They enhance the visual appeal of the surroundings.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:53

		Secondly, Figure 2 in the document APP-I2-SSVR-STRUISBAAI.pdf indicates an overlap between the proposed development and the coastal edge, which is currently used as a recreational area by the public. I am concerned about how this proximity will affect public access to the coastal edge. Moreover, the diagram shows that a large part of the coastal edge is zoned as OS (Open Space - private). The purpose of Open Space is defined as providing for active and passive recreational areas and public spaces in urban contexts. What does the term "private" imply in relation to this definition? I am particularly worried about the impact this development will have on public access to the greenbelt. We have previously witnessed how new developments restrict public access to important environmental assets. For instance, the construction of two private residences on the hill overlooking Agulhas led to the closure of Hangness Street from Main Road, which used to be accessible to hikers and cyclists. This previously enjoyed route is no longer available to the public. The approval of this development will negatively impact the Cape Agulhas and Struisbaai areas, setting a precedent for similar projects in the future. Therefore, I do not support the proposed Spookdraai Residential Development. Kind regards, Jessie Swart	
725.	Ters Conradie	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Please received 16 objections against the proposed Spookdraai development - please acknowledge 16 thx	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
726.	Truda van Der Westhuizen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Object against the proposed development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
727.	Catharine E Crous	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
728.	Gezina Maria Steenkamp	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
729.	Jacobs F van Staden	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
730.	A H Kuyler	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
731.	E.C Kuyler	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
732.	Starvroola Mostert	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
733.	JM vd Merwe	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
734.	HJ vd	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

	Merwe	Objection against the development	Time: 07:54
735.	Ursula Johanna Laas-Kloppers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
736.	Herman Kloppers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
737.	Alida Haman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
738.	Dieter Haman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
739.	DJ van der Merwe	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
740.	Heather Third	Email dated 04 March 2025 Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the remainder of Erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai).	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
741.	Jamie Third	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:54
742.	Deon Dalhouzie	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
743.	Kyle Dalhouzie	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
744.	Karin Dalhouize	Email dated 04 March 2025 Is this development going to be above the high water mark. It does not look like it. As far as I know, nobody is allowed to build under the highwater mark.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
745.	Jakobus F Steenkump	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
746.	Irene Ritsbergen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
747.	Elizabeth Maria Falck	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
748.	Rene Stander	Email dated 04 March 2025 One "sore eye" has already been built on the pristine coastal strip. Will support all efforts to resist further defacement. See what the sea will do when you build on Sand!	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
749.	Johan	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

	Stander	It seems as if money power is the Driving force here and not the voice of the people or the interest of the environment.	Time: 07:56
750.	Heinrich Janse van Kensburg	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
751.	Zelda CC Janse van Rensburg	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
752.	Andrikus Janse van Rensburg	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
753.	Celine Jومات	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
754.	Werner Steyn	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
755.	Benita Steyn	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
756.	(Libertas)	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
757.	PJJ Reyneke Reyven Trust	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
758.	Frederick Christie Afrika	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
759.	Gert Gabriels	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
760.	M.J Pienaar	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
761.	V. Potgieter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:56
762.	Tertius de Wet	Email dated 04 March 2025 Objection against the development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
763.	Thomas	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

	Christopher Falck	I am representing myself Thomas Christopher Falck I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Time: 07:57
764.	B. Landman	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself B. Landman I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
765.	J.J Robberths	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself J.J Robberths. I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
766.	A.M Postma	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

		I am representing myself A.M Postma I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Time: 07:57
767.	M. Postma	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself M Postma I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as "guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
768.	Frederick Retief	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Frederick Retief I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as "guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		permitted for submissions.	
769.	Tania Retief	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Tania Retief I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
770.	Sandra Joy Senekal	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Sandra Joy Senekal I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
771.	Berinda Steyn	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Berinda Steyn I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		permitted for submissions.	
772.	Anton Steyn	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Anton Steyn I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA actand ICM Act as"guidelins" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line wth existing residential development in the area while it is entirely incosistant with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
773.	Ankia Swart	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Ankia Swart I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
774.	Izak Johannes Schoombee	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Izak Johannes Schoombee I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		permitted for submissions.	
775.	Marianne W Venter	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Marianne W Venter I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
776.	Corrie Kasselmann	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Corria Kasselmann I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
777.	Wilma Kasselmann	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Wilma Kasselmann I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		permitted for submissions.	
778.	NP Joubert	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself NP Joubert I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
779.	Elise Retief	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Elise Retief I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
780.	Anthony Retief	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Anthony Retief I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants fo close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		permitted for submissions.	
781.	Lorriane Burger	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Lorriane Burger I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
782.	Anorina Burger	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Anorina Burger I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. To whom it may concern OBJECTION AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI DEVELOPMENT. The Struisbaai /Agulhas area is home to a variety of people who love the heritage and culture of this southern most little community, welcoming both new residents and holiday makers with a unique hospitality. Currently Spookdraai and the coastline can be accessed by everyone. It is a special spot for fishermen, animals and all nature lovers. It has so much to offer and add to the character, and this will be gone/ lost if CAM allows only certain people to build on this pristine coastal stroke. I am not against development and growth is good, but please don't let it be at the cost of our little town's heritage.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

783.	Johann Senekal	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Johann Senekal I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. Spookdraai When you drive in Balito KZN you drive for kilometres before you see the sea because it is so built up that you cannot see the sea. Drive in Hermanus you have the same experience. For kilometres you can't see the sea because everythin is built up. The planned building is going to have the same impact and once a building goes up there is no stopping the expansion all along the shoreline. The argument that why some people were allowed to build and other not, is going to have major repercussions in the future. People come from all over the world to experience the most Southern point of Africa, and to marvel in the in the stunning nature and views. To allow chasing profit to damage this is going to have major repercussions for tourism and all the people relying on this income. Looking at the area there is going to be major construction tomake this place liveable and have a major impact on the natural beaty and wildlife. How will the main road be accessed from these sites, keeping in mind the current traffic issues in peak seasons already. If the developer donate this area to nature conservation, he can leave a legacy that will be accredited to him from many years to come, and for many generations to enjoy.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
784.	Leonie Doering	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Leonie Doering I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. To whom it may concern I, Leonie Doering, as a permanent resident of this area am deeply concerned and opposed to this development proposed in Spookdraai. It has been an attraction for locals, fisherman and tourists for many years. The beach provides so many hours of desire to all using it. This part of the coast is unspoilt and it would be a very sad day if this section of Spookdraai that has a beautiful view that is unrestricted and available to the public should be taken away. There are so many beautiful views to be seen all along the drive from Struisbaai to Agulhas. Many people make use of that corner. Locals, fisherman, families with children where it is safe to teach then about marine life and leave a legacy to them and future generations. I sincerely hope that the proposed development will be reconsidered taking into concern that a beautiful part of natural coastline will be spoilt by this proposed development. From a very concerned resident.	
785.	Barbara Harder	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Barbara Harder I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
786.	Monique Mc Laren	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Monique Mc Laren I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	
787.	Erik Frans Vorster	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Monique Mc Laren I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
788.	Helena Maria	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Monique Mc Laren I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

789.	Ingrid Anne Kriel	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Ingrid Anne Kriel I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
790.	Chriswill Jومات	Email dated 04 March 2025 Registeer my asseblief as "interested and affected person" vir hierdie beoogde ontwikkeling in Spookdraai Struisbaai	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
791.	FJ Kuikkuik	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself FJ Kuikkuik I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
792.	Jason Roelof Gouws	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Jason Roelof Gouws I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	
793.	Deirdre and Dawid du Toit	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Deirdre and Dawid du Toit I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. A Big No Please Please. Tidal pool in jeopardy for our small children. No Access to Beach for us walkers. No more views on drive by.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
794.	Andre Marais	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Andre Marais I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
795.	Monique Antonette	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

	Venter	I am representing myself Andre Marais I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	
796.	Sarel Johannes Venter	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Sarel Johannes Venter I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
797.	Maryke Guse	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Maryke Guse I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
798.	Vernon Guse	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		I am representing myself Vernon Guse I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	
799.	Denise Joubert	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Denise Joubert I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
800.	Jessie Franzsen	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Jessie Franzsen I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
801.	Marieta Lubbe	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57

		I am representing myself Marieta Lubbe I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	
802.	W.A.T Burger	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself W.A.T Burger I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 07:57
803.	Willem Brand	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Willem Brand I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
804.	Philippa Brand	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00

		I am representing myself Philippa Brand I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for years now. The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions.	
805.	Ronald Dunsmore McGhie	Email dated 04 March 2025 <u>RE: OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> Mr Ronald Dunsmore McGhie is an elderly man and asked me to mail his objection to you. He can be contacted at any time to verify. Introduction I am representing myself; My name is Ronald Dunsmore Surname McGhie ID # 430915073082. I have a close emotional bond with this area since 1995. I have been staying here permanently since 2000. The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1. Regards C Visser on behalf of Ronald Dunsmore McGhie	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
806.	Coleen Anne McGhie	Email dated 04 March 2025 <u>RE: OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> Mr Coleen Anne McGhie is an elderly man and asked me to mail her objection to you. He can be contacted at any time to verify. Introduction	

		I am representing myself; My name is Coleen Anne McGhie. I have a close emotional bond with this area since 1978. I have been staying here permanently since 1998. The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
807.	Aina janse van Rensburg	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Aina janse van Rensburg I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
808.	Liezl Odendal	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Liezl Odendal I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00

		permitted for submissions	
809.	Hennie Eksteen Trust	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Hennie Eksteen Trust I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
810.	CP Klopers	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself CP Klopers I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
811.	DWJ van Schoor	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself DWJ van Schoor I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00

		permitted for submissions	
812.	Maureen Ann Arseley	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Maureen Ann Arseley I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
813.	Freida Freyer	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Freida Freyer I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions NB Some of the oystercatchers' breed in that area. They are an endangered species. Have the impact study looked into animals that breed and live there??	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
814.	Anna Siegelaar	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Anna Siegelaar I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00

		Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions NB Some of the oystercatchers' breed in that area. They are an endangered species. Have the impact study looked into animals that breed and live there??	
815.	Leah Freyer	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Leah Freyer I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive. Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions NB Some of the oystercatchers' breed in that area. They are an endangered species. Have the impact study looked into animals that breed and live there??	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00
816.	Bennie Crous	Email dated 04 March 2025 I am representing myself Bennie Crous I live in Struisbaai and is very anxious about this application, what will be kept of our children and grandchildren one day? Fishing and walking are always a highlight. Looking and teaching children and especially the children of Struisbaai North about the plants so close to the shore. Furthermore, the application is undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai and Agulhas area. There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft BAR document referring to NEMA act and ICM Act as "guidelines" it is legislative provisions asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in the area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:00

		Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a moderate negative visual impact. Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extend time permitted for submissions NB Some of the oystercatchers' breed in that area. They are an endangered species. Have the impact study looked into animals that breed and live there??	
817.	Anton Stroh	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spook draai Ek wil net graag bevestig dat my siening is dat wat die geskiedenis en natuur erfenis van Spookdraai vir ons en ons nageslagtes gaan beteken, in geen geld of 'n nuwe ontwikkeling vervang kan word nie. Ek sou dus ook stem dat die Munisipaliteit dit in ag moet neem. Ek kan dus nie die voorstel ondersteun nie. Groete, Anton Ströh Ocean View Heights Struisbaai, 7285	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:14
818.	William F Cambell	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Objection Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed above development. William F Cambell ID 53041225082082 4 Short street, Agulhas 0798890841	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:19
819.	SONJA COETZEE	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development I, hereby object to the development in Spookdraai. Name: Sonja Coetzee 477 Dominie Street L'Agulhas 0827470145 Regards Sonja Coetzee	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 08:40
820.	Annina	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

	Coetzee	Subject: Spookdraai ontwikkeling Hiermee teken ek beswaar aan teen ontwikkelingby spookdraai Annina Coetzee Sent from my iPhone	Time: 09:00
821.	Marzell Newman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Development I, hereby object to the development in Spookdraai. Name: Marzell Newman- van Wyk Adress: 30 Shannon Straat L' Agulhas 082 376 4013 Regards Marzell Newman van Wyk	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 09:01
822.	Armand van Wyk	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Re: Spookdraai Development I, hereby object to the development in Spookdraai. Name: Armand van Wyk Adress: 30 Shannon Straat L' Agulhas 079 517 3170	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 09:19
823.	Celia Van Zyl-Lourens	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: DEA&DP Ref:16/3/3/6/7/1/E1/13/1406/23 LORNAY Ref: REM-281 FOR ATTENTION: MICHELLE NAYLOR As per my mandate from the Suidpunt Residents Association (Rate Payers), our comments on the above are attached. Yours sincerely	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 09:19

		Celia Lourens 083 461 4311 The above refers. Without repeating what you've no doubt heard from other parties, we will comment as follows: 1. The application is based on the misconception that your client has only 7,000+ square meters to develop. It is based on the misconception that 450+ hectares are not enough to develop: 2. Erf 3495, Struisbaai, more than 12 hectares, was subdivided from RE/281 for development. 3. We believe that your client is attempting to develop what is supposed to be a public open space. (Helemika 1 already developed on the opposite side of Marine Drive, as well as the entirety of Oceanview Heights.) Apart from various other reasons, this development will have a lasting, negative visual impact and change the landscape for humans, small animals, and flora forever. It should not be allowed, and the developer should be forced instead to disclose what their intentions are with the almost 450 hectares they still own in Struisbaai. Yours sincerely CM Lourens Chairperson 083 461 4311	
824.	Danie Schutte	Email dated 04 March 2025 For Attention Me Michelle Naylor. 1. Kindly register me as an interested party in this matter. My details are as follows: Name : DPA Schutte. Address: Vleilaan 11, Suiderstrand. Email: dpaschutte1@gmail.com. Cell: 083272 0113. I am a permanent resident and owner of tax paying property in the relevant area. 2. I oppose the establishment of a residential area as proposed for the following reasons interalia: (a) The development will permanently devastate the visual and scenic natural beauty of a significant environmental asset. (b) The development will permanently devastate an area of significant cultural and historical importance. (c) The development will reduce public access to the sea front, which have been established over millennia, from 7113m² to a mere 89m². (d) The proposed development is in clear contravention of the Integrated Coastal Management Act. (e) The Applicants, or their predecessors in title, have sold many residential plots on the land side of Marine drive overlooking the relevant area on the specific or implied undertaking that the land on the sea side would not be developed. Please note that I reserve the right to amplify the above mentioned reasons at a later stage. Yours Faithfully, DPA Schutte	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 10:03
825.	Ella Saayman	Email dated 04 March 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Ella Johanna Saayman, ID # 621105 0016 085	

		• I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Hoofweg, Agulhas. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will • have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact” ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Name Surname: Ella Johanna Saayman Mobile: 0827921037 Email: eliosaayman1@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
826.	ELISCA BESTER	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Objection to Proposed Coastal Development at Struisbaai, Spookdraai, Remainder of Farm No. 281 -- REF: REM-281 and DEA&DP REFERENCE 16/3/3/6/7/1/e1/13/1406/23 Dear Michelle, Subject: Objection to Proposed Coastal Development at Struisbaai, Spookdraai, Remainder of Farm No. 281 I am writing to formally express my objection to the proposed coastal development project at Struisbaai, Spookdraai, on the remainder of Farm No. 281. I am deeply concerned that this development threatens the natural beauty of our coastline and could fundamentally alter the character of our small town. Struisbaai is a community that prides itself on its unspoiled coastline and tranquil environment. The proposed development risks disrupting this balance by introducing large-scale commercial or residential projects that could drastically change the town’s character and affect the peaceful, small-town atmosphere that attracts both residents and visitors. Preserving the natural beauty of the coastline is essential to maintaining the lifestyle and charm that make Struisbaai a special place to live and visit. Coastal areas like the one proposed for development are especially vulnerable to degradation, and large-scale development could lead to significant ecological impacts, such as the loss of local wildlife habitats, increased pollution, and disruptions to the delicate coastal ecosystem. Additionally, such developments could put increased pressure on local infrastructure and services, which are not designed to accommodate rapid urbanization. It is important that we balance growth with the preservation of what makes Struisbaai unique. We must protect the coastline not only for	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 11:55

		environmental reasons but also to maintain the character of our town, which is an essential part of its identity and appeal. I urge the authorities to carefully evaluate the potential impacts of this development and consider alternatives that prioritize sustainable growth while safeguarding the coastal environment and the small-town lifestyle that makes Struisbaai so distinctive. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will carefully consider the long-term effects of allowing this development in such a sensitive and cherished location. Kind regards, Elisca Bester 082 670 6104	
827.	Dr NM Walters	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Comments regarding Spookdraai development <i>Comments regarding the proposed Spookdraai development. By DR NM Walters (PhD, MSc, MBA)</i> To whom it may concern The following is a brief extract from an article submitted for publication, titled: <i>The gentrification of Spookdraai – our portal to paradise</i>. Southern Tip residents have spoken out strongly against the proposed Spookdraai project and are concerned about the continued trend of development in a town that has already suffered from flooding and power shortages at times . The scope of the article was not to peer review each of the Lornay Environmental Consultancy assessments. The focus is rather to show that this and similar developments will be a turning point in the history of Spookdraai and L'Agulhas through having a permanent negative impact on the culture, ambiance and sense of place. • The small beach of about 100 meter is marked as open space private. The Sea-shore act strictly forbid any private ownership of beaches. Public must have unencumbered access where possible. The small footpath leading to the beach, left of the private property shown, leads to the beach for visitors and anglers. • The small footpath in the middle of the development leading to the rocks for angling, will be removed, effectively giving no access to anglers, sightseers and hikers. • The erven, especially erf 4 and erf 6, are virtually on or close to the high-water mark and will encumber any angling. • The "Shark Bay" cove is located at the proposed development site. This is a unique location because the local circulation patterns in the bay cause shark teeth to be washed ashore at the site. Any development in this area would potentially not only limit access to the area, but could impact on the local circulation patterns if the region below the high-water mark is affected. This is also a very pronounced boulder beach, which in itself is a unique type of shore ecosystem compared to the immediate surrounding marine areas. • All residential houses in L'Agulhas, apart from the two houses near the historic water trough being 20 meters from the high-water mark, were built more than 50 meters from the high-water mark. This development therefor will set an unaccepted precedent for building on the high-water mark. Generally, you cannot build directly on the high-water mark; most coastal regulations prohibit construction within a certain distance inland from the high-water mark due to environmental concerns and potential damage from tides and storms, requiring a setback area where building is not permitted. Please refer to the Integrated Coastal Management Act.	

		The rich coastal vegetation, defining the Spookdraai will be destroyed and underneath the vegetation there may be significant paleontological and archaeological treasures despite the normal reports that are conducted without detailed drilling, excavation and laboratory analysis. A systems approach is required to really understand the complex eco-system in order to strategically make rational decisions regarding development in this highly important and sensitive heritage conservation zone. This approach should be used to look at Spookdraai as a whole, including inter alia the history, culture, natural environment, heritage, archaeology, paleontology, eco-tourism, sense of place, recreation and scenic route. All of this form the organs of a body and each is vital for the system to live. Frivolous compliance reports do not in any way support the system but support developers who paid for them. Factual peer reviewed reports are a prerequisite but should play a small part in systems decision making. It must be recognised that the Southernmost tip of Africa is a National and not only a Provincial or regional heritage asset. The time therefore has come to escalate the gentrification of sensitive coastal areas of the Southern Tip such as Spookdraai and Skulpiesbaai directly through the Provincial MEC of Environment to the National Minister who is empowered by the Coastal Management Act to take action. A request should be made to immediately stop all coastal developments close to the high-water mark at the Southern Tip, redefine the affected area and declare it as a national sensitive coastal zone prohibiting any new development in this zone. Your Sincerely Dr NM Walters Strategy Consultant	
828.	Gerrit Burger	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Ek is gekant teen die beoogde ontwikkeling en glo dat dit glad nie gaan inpas by Struisbaai/Agulhas se omgewing nie Gerrit Burger	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 12:27
829.	Petro Venter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai As this is a noticeable place along the beach, we want to object to the development of this peace of land/beach. SAFE THIS SPECIAL SPIT FOR GENERATIONS TO COME . AS THERE IS SO LITTLE MISTERY LEFT FOR COMING GENERATIONS. Surely impact studies has been done and we are sure that there is ample other beautiful spots along this coastal line that can be developed. Why make any development between the road and this small piece of beach??????? Surely this is very near to the water break line..... Has anybody though about storms and high water levels.... NO please NO Thank you	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 12:28

		Petro Venter 263 Langvlei dunes Wilderness As a visitor I am objecting this development	
830.	Gwen Theron	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON To Lornay Environmental Consulting Att: Michelle Naylor Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 22 FEBRUARY 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> L. INTRODUCTION • I am representing a Land owner of Struisbaai • I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected party.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • II include the objections that was received by several other land owners, but reserve my right to add to these comments once the Draft Reports have been made available for review. Regards Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 12:35
831.	Henk Aggenbach	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Kusontwikkeling Hiermee bevestig ek my teenkanting teen spookdraaiontwikkeling Daar is reeds in 1996 n raadsbesluit geneem op die destydse sdr raad dat daar geen verdere lintontwikkeling langs agulhas struisbaaikus toegelaat word nie. Henk aggenbach	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 12:44
832.	Hendrick Nicolaas Kotze and Lydia Christina Kotze	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Objection Against Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Struisbaai I, Hendrik Nicolaas Kotze (Id: 4906035071097) and my wife Lydia Christina Kotze (Id: 5111290073089) object strongly against the proposed development as mentioned above. We are perminant residents since 2014 and we own a property in Struisbaai, Oceanviewdrive 54 and owned property 52 since 1994. We have also been visting Struisbaai regularly since 1988 and have strong emosional bonds with Struisbaai and specifically with the proposed area	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 13:14

		earmarked for development. As a family we visited the specific area regularly for liaison purposes during the holidays. I'm of the opinion that the proposed development of this area would have a significant negative impact on Struisbaai and Agulhas in the sense that: It will spoil the scenery of the area, which was a tourist attraction for decades. It is against law (see the Integrated Coastal Management Act) 2008, which forbid residential development within 100m from the high water mark. The privatization of the area and the beach through the development will make the area inaccessible and exclude residents and tourists to use the area for liaison. Footpaths used by residents as well as tourists and unique flora, will be destroyed. Marinedrive is the main route to Agulhas, the most southern monument, the historical Lighthouse, the Nature Reserve and Suiderstrand. This is an extremely busy road. Tourist busses use this route on a daily basis, which make development of this area extremely dangerous, especially during construction, weekends and holidays. The newly development of the restaurant and other facilities at the Lighthouse will enhance the problem. I'm further of the opinion that this part of the Plaas Papenkuil, should have been reclassified as state owned property. We also strongly support the objections of more knowledgeable people in this regard. We propose strongly that environmental experts (for example independent university experts) be consulted and appointed to investigate the impact and feasibility of this development. This area is the property of the of South Africa and should therefore be protected for generations to come. Kind regards, HN Kotze, LC Kotze (celnr. 079 651 5575)	
833.	Marie Vlok	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai development objection Good day EIA's are related to social environments too. If the community is unhappy, this development can not go through. From the specialists assessments it is evident that the impact on terrestrial biodiversity and heritage and landscape will be significant. After taking a look at the various specialist assessments that have been done, I must object against the development of this estate. At this stage it is better to develop in areas that are already built up and not destroy nature and heritage. This estate will not have a positive economic impact and is not a necessity. Very few people will be benefitted by this. The spookdraai development should not commence. Strandveld local Marié Vlok	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 13:49
834.	Jamie Du Toit	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Ontwikkeling Rakende die kwessie van die be-oogde ontwikkeling by Spookdraai as 'n persoon wat hier groot geword het, as ook my ouers en grootouers. Van sover terug as 1934 het my oupa ,sy broer ,neef en sy seuns (almal Vuurtoringwagters by L'Agulhas) visgevang by Spookdraai. Nooit in hierdie tyd tot nou was daar borde opgesit wat lees dat dit privaatgrond is nie. Is dié gebied nie by die landmetergeneraal l as 'n "public open space" beskryf nie?	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 14:42

		Om n ontwikkeling toe te laat voel ek gaan die kuslyn bederf asook n president skep vir ontwikkelaars om n voet in die deur te kry. Laaste scenario is dat die kuslyn net beskore is vir sekere mense wat grond/huise bekom teen onaardige bedrae - en ontoeganklik maak vir publiek en plaaslike inwoners wat soveel plesier en rustigheid kry vir dit wat verniet is! Ons kuslyn is ons dorp se grootste aantrekkingskrag, nie net vir plaaslike mense nie maar ook vir toeriste van heinde en ver, veral nou met die voltooiing van die Vuurtoringprojek. Soos een van die plaaslike legendes ene oom Koos Boor gesê het "Die see is almal sin, ou Maat!" Charmaine Auret du Toit	
835.	Soné van der Merwe	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai residential development objection Dear Michelle, Kindly find attached my objections to the proposed development on Remainder 281 Spookdraai, Struisbaai. Thank you Soné van der Merwe 083 699 8990 Dear Michelle, We are residents of 23 Clingen street in Agulhas. Although we are not situated directly across from the proposed development, the development will have a huge impact within the greater community. Please see my objections listed below: 1. The application to Heritage Western Cape states that the proposed development will impact on heritage resources and HWC requires that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) that satisfies the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA be submitted – this clearly indicates that there is an impact on the heritage significance of this area. 2. Bulk of the development is located within an ESA2 earmarked for restoration which coincides with sustainable and conservation-minded development with goals to meet conservation targets of CR and EN vegetation types as shown in image below. Development within these areas thus directly contradicts conservation goals 3. This development will have an immense impact on the visual & cultural character of Spookdraai and the coastal scenic drive – this is motivated by Section 3.1 of the visual impact assessment stating the following: “The site is within a semi-rural cultural landscape of high visual significance and aesthetic value, (given the degree of intactness, integrity, and legibility) with a coastal character, outside the urban periphery, with important components of distinctive character, valued for tangible as well as intangible attributes.”. Simply stating mitigation measures should be adhered to is not enough of a motivation or proof that this development will not cause visual disturbance within this highly scenic route. 4. Although the development area might be interpreted as within the urban edge the SDF clearly states the area is an IMPORTANT PLACE OF ARRIVAL (technically it is situated outside of the Agulhas & Struisbaai urban edge) and it can clearly be seen that the surrounding properties are sparsely populated with big erven and high volumes of natural undisturbed vegetation. The proposed development will in no way resemble the surrounding developments in the area. Motivated by section 1.7 of the visual impact study: “The character of this landscape is a	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 15:17

		coastal landscape shaped and define by the natural processes. The urban patterns are adhoc and mostly intrusive in this landscape.” It is easy to mention buzzwords like “sustainable development” and how the by-laws development?? The proposed development is not sustainable in any way. Building stand-alone 6. Historically the Critically Endangered Agulhas Limestone Fynbos has a conservation and SDF promotes sustainability, but in what way is the proposed development sustainable?? What about it is sustainable? And how is it promoting sustainable target of 32% and is only ~8% statutorily conserved, while the Endangered Overberg Dune Strandveld / now Southwestern Strandveld has a conservation target of 36% and is only ~30% statutorily conserved. The data on which the Red List of Ecosystem spatial dataset is based on modelled data and requires specialist refinement. The specialist stated that the site, although disturbed, experiences revegetation albeit slow. To foster sustainable and conservation-minded development of the community it is irresponsible to develop in the disturbed-natural area when it could contribute significantly to conservation targets. 7. To add to point 6 above Overberg Dune Strandveld / now Southwestern Strandveld is listed as ENDANGERED. 8. Although there is an EMPr document annexed, we all know that building sites produce a substantial amount of waste, be it from the building materials or from the staff – having property so close to the ocean under construction and human influence can contribute to the pollution of the bay. 9. The property is currently zoned as agricultural zone – Has a Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970 (SALA) application been submitted, where is the comment/approval of DALRRD?? 10. Even though this is an “urban” environment the DFFE Screening for animals is still required even though the impact may be low/medium. Thus, the terrestrial biodiversity report is incomplete and does not comply with minimum reporting requirements. The report also does not include a compliance statement, required for low/medium sensitivity reporting. It is the specialists responsibility to report on this as well, it should not just be noted within the BAR. As a resident I have personally seen/come across Bitis armata (southern adder) and thus find the reduction of the sensitivity to “low” questionable because not enough data is given to motivate. I strongly object to this development that is clearly for one individual monetary gain and does not take the community or environment into consideration. Anyone that has the pleasure of experiencing the untouched scenic route of Agulhas would never agree to something this detrimental to the character of this area. Thank you, S van der Merwe	
836.	Sybil Goosen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Objection to Spookdraai Residential Development Dear Michelle Please see attached my objection letter to the Spookdraai Development in L'Agulhas. Kind regards, Sybil Goosen Refer to Spookdraai objection 2	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 15:33
837.	Janke Van Wyk	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai development	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 16:13

		I, herby object the development in Struisbaai, Spookdraai. Name: Janke van wyk 477 Montgomery street Lagulhas 0665659229 Kind Regards, Janke	
838.	Monique Marais	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai). Goeiedag Michelle, Sien asb aangeheg. Vriendelike groete Monique Marais Geagte Michelle Rigistrasie as belanghebbende en geaffekyeerde party tot die beogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai. Registreer my asb. As'n belanghebbende en geaffekteerder party vir die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281. Struisbaai (Spookdraai). My persoonlike gegewens is soos volg Volle name en van: Monique 259083 M. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Monique Marais, ID 7011150259083 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – 23 Natasha Street, Struisbaai • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been living here since 1998. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only</i>	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 16:29

		<i>asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
839.	Jan Bester	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Register me as an interested and affected Party for proposed development of the remainder of erf 281 Struisbaai Geagte Michelle Please register as an interested and affected Party for proposed development of the remainder of erf 281 Struisbaai spookdraai, The development of this area between struisbaai and Agulhas will destroy an already disappearing fynbos area and the effect on the wildlife will be devastating. There are thousands of flora and fauna plants in this small area and building on this green strip of coastline will be devastating. Abraham J Bester 0720612165 8711125136089 Regards AJ Bester	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 16:40
840.	Ilza Louw	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: register as a IAP for Erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Dear Michelle Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the remainder of Erf 281 Struisbaai(Spookdraai) Ilza Louw 6608190203087 id 2040 Constantia drive Wilderness and 89 Cooperstreet Agulhas 082 477 4877 I object against the proposed Spookdraai development on the highly negative visual impact it will have and the disturbance of the "Sense of place."	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 17:09

		Spookdraai in its natural state is part of the distinctive character to the entrance of Cape Agulhas, a place where you arrive! It is a scenic landscape of natural beauty within 100m of the highwater mark, an area of high visual significance. It is part of the scenic route along the coast between Struisbaai and Agulhas and is very visible. A housing development of six erven in Spookdraai will be an intrusion into this unique setting and will be "death by a thousand cuts" to the sense of place of Agulhas. I also object to the statement that it will have a minimum impact on the coastal ecosystem and fauna and flora. I spent a lot of time at Spookdraai last week to photograph Haemanthus coccineus. I was specifically looking for them and the only place I could find them was in Spookdraai where I know they flower every year in February/March. As I was taking photos of the Haemanthus coccineus flowers (photos can be provided) I saw a family of the endangered Black Oystercatcher birds. They were there every day foraging on the rocks where the development will be. They were very nervous of my presence even when I kept a far distance. Any development and human activity will definitely impact negatively on their presence and feeding ground. A resident black headed heron was also present every day searching for food in the same spot in Spookdraai. Spookdraai is part of our heritage. I have been going to Cape Agulhas since I was a child, for more than 50 years now. My mother, who is 90, and my grandparents always went to Agulhas since the early 1900s and have had property in Agulhas since then. Spookdraai, with its unique rocks and setting, always had the feeling of "we have arrived." We had always unrestrictedly used the path going down to the sea on our regular walks at Spookdraai. This development will not contribute positively to the community and will have no respect for the local character and the sense of place. It will disturb the fauna and flora and will deprive us from our heritage. Regards Ilza Louw	
841.	Lindie Bekker	Email dated 04 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> N. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself lindie Bekker, ID 8403070132087 • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Protea street or I vacation here . • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i>	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 18:18

		○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Lindie Bekker 0726189107 lienkieo@gmail.com lindie@beauatelier.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
842.	Nail Anthony Campbell	Email dated 04 March 2025 Please register me as an interested and affected person by the proposed development of the remainder of r=erf 281 Struisbaai. I am opposed to it. My details are Nail Anthony Campbell Id No 5503305028084 Cell 0829640298 Email: concam@mweb.co.za Address 662 pool straat Agulhas.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 18:43
843.	William F Campbell	Email dated 04 March 2025 Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development Id No 5304125082082 4 Short street, Agulhas 079 8890841	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 18:46
844.	Millicent Gaye Campbell	Email dated 04 March 2025 Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the Remainder of Erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai). My personal details are as follows: Millicent Gaye Campbell ID: 5511070008082 4 Short Street, L'Agulhas Phone: 0826744723 Email: willmill.camp@gmail.com Signature:	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 18:47
845.	Jaco Gresse	Email dated 04 March 2025	Date: 04/03/25

		<u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> O. INTRODUCTION • I, J A Gresse (ID 8009185018085), object in my personal capacity. • I have been spending my vacations in Struisbaai since about 2000, together with my family. • We have a close emotional bond with this area. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards J A Gresse Mobile 083 411 8138 Email jaco.gresse@gmail.com	Time: 18:50
846.	Mieke Matthyser	Email dated 04 March 2025 RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. INTRODUCTION I am representing myself Name, Surname ID Hannelore Mieke Truter 0003010099087 I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai – Adress or I vacation here ..or ... I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area.	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 18:57

		There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draftBar document Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property</i> is the only asset available to the developer. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Hannelore Mieke Truter Mobile 0799956954 Email matthysermieke@gmail.com Refer to Spookdrai generic objection 1.	
847.	Val Bothma	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Beoogde ontwikkeling van res van erf 281 Struisbaai(Spookdraai) Registreer my asb as belanghebbende & geaffekteerde party vir beoogde ontwikkeling van res van erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai). Valerie Bothma 5103060053086 Dassiesingel 31 ,Struisbaai 0828000948 Hierdie beoogde ontwikkeling is absoluut ongewens in ons area . Die kuslyn gaan 'n totale verandering ondergaan met geboue links van die pad na L'Augulhas. Wat van die omgewingswette van 2004 .Dra dit geen gewig meer.? Uitbreiding is reeds besig ons eens pragtige dorp te ontsier . Gaan dit bloot om nog meer geld in reeds welvarende persone se sakke . Help asb dat ons dorp nie in 'n Hermanus ontaard nie ! Dink aan die verkeer in & uit na hierdie 6 erwe .Hoeveel ongelukke moet daar nog op Spookdraai gebeur ?. Daar is fietsryers & drawwers op daardie pad . Wat gaan die bouregulasies wees vir hierdie geboue ? Sekerlik anders as vir die normale belastingbetaler .Dis eenvoudig onregverdig & onaanvaarbaar Wat vir my geld moet ook vir die res van die area se mense geld . Hierdie onooglike ontwikkeling mag nie goed gekeur word nie !! HELP ASB	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 19:11

		Vriendelike groete V Bothma 0828000948	
848.	Nancy Leonora Campbell	Email dated 04 March 2025 Please register me as an interested and affected person by the proposed development of the remainder of erf 281 Struisbaai. I am opposed to it. My details are Nancy Leonora Campbell Id 2810160035085	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 19:17
849.	Gary Lilley	Email dated 04 March 2025 Good evening Michelle Our telephonic conversation of last week refers, in which I informed you that many of the local residents either do not have email or are not sure how to proceed with registering their interest in the proposed development. As discussed, attach hereto, the contact details of first 102 people that requested me on Facebook, Whatsapp and via SMS to help them register as affected or interested parties. Please acknowledge receipt of these first 4 files and confirm that you will add these names and details to the Register of Affected/Interested Parties. We are busy collating more names, which I send tomorrow. Thanking you in anticipation. Best regards Gary Lilley ICON®	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 19:23
850.	Anette van Backstrain	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
851.	Johan Backstrain	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
852.	Tienie Fourie	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
853.	Alicia Visagie	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
854.	Alan Cockckroft	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
855.	Ben Smit	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
856.	Bennie Viljoen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
857.	Rachel Viljoen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
858.	Laris Maartens	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
859.	Eben Barling	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
860.	Karen Meiring	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
861.	Vicki Claasen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
862.	Dennis Collins	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
863.	Annelise Viljoen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
864.	Teni Venter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
865.	Ella Venter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
866.	Jan Swart	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
867.	Zelda Mostert	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
868.	Marianne du Plessis	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
869.	Vaughn O'grady	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
870.	Marinette Ellis	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
871.	James van Zyl	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
872.	Mechau Viljoen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
873.	Stephan de Toit	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
874.	Elmare du Preez	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
875.	Cobus Kellerman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
876.	Evan Kellerman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
877.	Liezel Kellerman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
878.	Zonli Kellerman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
879.	Marika Murray	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
880.	Derrick Murray	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
881.	Sonja Olivier	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
882.	Este vd Merwe	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
883.	Annelene Brink	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
884.	Sunel van Rooyen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
885.	Marisa Willmse	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
886.	Johan Nel	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
887.	Amiel Coetzee	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
888.	Lyndell Coetzee	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
889.	Derek Kaplan	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
890.	Sharan Kaplan	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
891.	Madelein van Wyk	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
892.	Urah Smith	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
893.	Linda Potgieter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
894.	Christoff Le Roux	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
895.	Nico Mostert	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
896.	Ena Viljoen	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
897.	Zarine Grobbelaar	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
898.	Stefne Conradie	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
899.	Hans Swart	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
900.	Andre Pretorius	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
901.	Nico Janse van Renburg	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
902.	Rina Roelofse	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
903.	Theresa Visser	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
904.	Dederick Basson	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
905.	Marselle Kriegler	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
906.	Christa Klose	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
907.	Ronel Breedt	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
908.	Don Breedt	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
909.	Donald Breedt	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
910.	Piet Willemse	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
911.	Carel Willemse	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
912.	Renata Botha	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
913.	Anette van wyk	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
914.	Ronald Penninkof	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
915.	Anina Beyers	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
916.	Arthur Cumpsty	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
917.	Francina Cumpsty	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
918.	Henry Cumpsty	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
919.	Suzannie Magerla	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
920.	Heynes Kotze	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
921.	Tristina Perrins	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
922.	Arthur Beyers	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
923.	Theodora Janse van V	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
924.	Lizelle Mc Mahon	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
925.	Chris Steenkamp	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
926.	Celia de Villiers	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
927.	Rinie Wegers	Email dated 04 March 2025	
		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
928.	Annemarie de Meyer	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
929.	Francois de Villiers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
930.	Stewart Lynn	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
931.	Melody-Jane Seeley	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
932.	Jan du Toit	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
933.	Werna du Toit	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
934.	Dirk de Jongh	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
935.	John Merry	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
936.	Satira Bruwer	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
937.	Johann Bruwer	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
938.	Jan Moolman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
939.	Martin Roos	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
940.	Anna Moolman	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
941.	Kato Rabie	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
942.	Marika Patter	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
943.	Ilse Dreyer	Email dated 04 March 2025	

		Requested to be registered as I&AP	
944.	Sheila Visser	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
945.	JP de Villiers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
946.	Andrew Domoney	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
947.	Sanette Damoney	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
948.	Daniel de Villiers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
949.	Letitia de Villiers	Email dated 04 March 2025 Requested to be registered as I&AP	
950.	Werny Marais	Email dated 04 March 2025 Wie dit mag aangaan Volgens die kaart , val daai hele be-oogde projek binne in die Admiraliteits – zone van die Staat. En hierdie zone behoort aan die Staat eksklusief en dus geen Nasionale Regering. Geen Provinsie of plaaslike Munisipaliteit het enige se oor hierdie Zone en kan geen ontwikkeling aldus toelaat of goedkeur in hierdie omskryfde definisie gebied. Die woordelike definisie van die Admiraliteits Zone volgens die wet, is dat hierdie zone beslaan/strek 100 voet (33 en `n derde tree) van die hoogste hoogwater storm merk op land, tot 100 voet ( dus weer 33 en `n derde tree) tot die laaste merk in die see. Dus strek hierdie Admiraliteits Zone in totaal 200 voet (66 en twee derde tree) vanaf in die see tot op land. Niemand privaat (behalwe die Staat self) mag in hierdie Zone enige see of privaat grond of Strukture besit of oprig nie. Hierdie kwessie en wet, is al dikwels in die howe getoets en veral hofbeslissings gekry onder die sogenaamde Vestustas beginsel. Hierdie beoogde ontwikkeling val total binne die Admiraliteits Zone en behoort in komende hofsaak , baie gou gestuit te kan word. Daar moet ook van die geoogde Ontwikkelaars se presiese penne aan te vra van die gebied wat hulle wil betree en ons soek ook die bouplanne om te verseker van die area wat betree gaan word. Groete Werny Marais 0736439917	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 21:29
951.	Chris Green	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Ontwikkeling Geagte Michelle Registrasie as belanghebbende en geaffekteerde party tot die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Registreer my asb. as `n belanghebbende en geaffekteerder party vir die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 21:29

		(Spookdraai). My persoonlike gegewens is soos volg: Volle name en van: Christoffel Hendrik Groenewald ID nommer: 9308095106082 Telefoon/Selfoonnommer: 0695952623 E-pos adres: chrisgreenconnection@gmail.com Vriendelike groete Chris	
952.	Lourina Klynsmith-Olivier	Email dated 04 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAL.</u> P. INTRODUCTION • I, C L Olivier (ID 8809130094085), object in my personal capacity. • I have been spending my vacations in Struisbaai since about 2012, together with my family. • We have a close emotional bond with this area. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Misleading statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection are given below. Regards, C L Olivier (Born Klynsmith) Mobile 082 628 2437 Email lourinaklynsmith@gmail.com	
953.	Marlene Mann	Email dated 04 March 2025 Subject: RE: Pre-application Basic Assessment Report for the Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development on Remainder of the Farm No. 281 - Registration as an I&AP Att: Michelle Naylor	Date: 04/03/25 Time: 21:40

		Herewith my comments with respect to the pre-assessment Basic Assessment Report of the proposed development. An environmental authorisation for the proposed development of residential units and a private beach on the selected development site contravenes the • NEMA IEA regulations, • the integrated Coastal management Act, • the South African Heritage Resources Act, • and the Provincial and Municipal Spatial development frameworks. The proposed development (1) will unjustly restrict and deny public access to the sea front, which has been accessible to everyone over millennia (reduce from a total of 7113m2 to a mere 89m2) for the exclusive benefit of a small group of wealthy people, (2) is a clear contravention of the Integrated Coastal Management Act, (3) will permanently destroy the visual and scenic natural beauty of the environment that is the major attraction of tourists to our area, and (4) will permanently destroy the “sense of place” of an area of significant cultural and historical importance. Additionally, the Applicants, or their predecessors in title, have sold many residential plots along Marine drive, and this application will be a violation of an undertaking (specific or implied) that the land on the coastal side of Marine Drive would not be developed. I strongly object to the application of the environmental authorisation and reserve my right to appeal should an authorisation be approved by the competent authority. Sincerely Yours Marlene Mann	
954.	Madeleen Nel	Emal dated 05 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> Q. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Madeleen Nel, ID # 7311060220088 • I have a direct interest in the application as I vacation in Struisbaai. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i>	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 04:11

		○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Madeleen Nel Mobile: 0825752857 Email: nelmadeleen@gmail.com	
955.	Rhona De Groot	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Registreer asb vir De Groot as Belanghebbende Party Hiermee versoek ek dat Rhona de Groot geregistreer word as belanghebbende en geaffekteerde party vir die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Naam: Rhona de Groot ID: 5211170046088 Adres: Kusweg Noord 27 Struisbaai 7285 Sel no: 0741039633	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 07:17
956.	Faan Giliomee	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Ontwikkeling Good morning I object to the planned development in my personal capacity as a very interested and affected party who owns property in Struisbaai and have been visiting Struisbaai for over 50 years. My objection is based on the provisions and purpose (set out here below) of the Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008, which clearly prevents any development of this sort and therefore cannot be approved by the authorities. The purpose of the ICM Act that came into effect in 2008 is to ensure that: • The coastal protection zone “CPZ” consisting of a continuous strip of land, starting from the High-Water mark and extending 100 metres inland is protected. • The coast must be retained as a national asset, <u>with public rights to access and benefit from</u> the opportunities provided by coastal resources. • Coastal economic development opportunities must be optimised <u>to meet society’s</u> needs and to promote the <u>wellbeing of coastal communities.</u>	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 07:29

		Coastal management efforts must <u>ensure that all people, including future generations</u>, enjoy the rights of <u>human dignity, equality and freedom</u> None of the above provisions will be met by the planned development and it will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and it's inhabitants, visitors and landowners. The Coastal Management Section - Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government should reject this application with immediate effect. Any building "transgressions" before this Act came into effect are irrelevant and not applicable and cannot be used as a reason or guideline to allow this development. Kind regards Faan Giliomee	
957.	Leanne Nell	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND 57OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> A. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Leanne Nell, ID # 8111250024078 - I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person</u> - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines " .. it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> - Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. We regularly visit this quant beautiful seaside town; we have friends and family that reside within this ecologically sensitive area. It would not only be a sad occasion to allow this said development to take place, but it would reflect very poorly on the so-called municipality who	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 08:00

		aim to “protect” and preserve this area. Exceptionally sad. Regards Leanne Nell 082 788 7020 Nell.leannen@gmail.com	
958.	Caren Vermeulen	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Fwd: Spookdraai Goeie dag As gereelde besoeker aan Agulhas wil ek beswaar maak teen die Spookdraai ontwikkeling. Ons wil nie die landelike atmosfeer van die dorp sien vernietig word nie. Indien die ontwikkeling toegelaat word gaan daar mos op enige stukkie beskikbare grond teen die see gebou word. Ons is ook eienaars van 'n huis in Agulhas. Hierdie MOET gestop word. Groete Caren Vermeulen 084 4404005	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 08:11
959.	Rian Kreuter	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Hi Michelle Can I still register. Regards. Rian Kreuter	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 09:35

960.	Schalk Willem and Petronella Viljoen	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself and my wife Schalk Willem Viljoen and Petronella Viljoen, George street 317, Agulhas <u>as an Interested and Affected persons</u> - We have a close emotional bond with this area and have been living in this area for 58 years and we own a property at the above address. - The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. WE reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - We have been visiting this area since my early childhood and I have endless special memories of the area: From fishing in the coastal pools as a young child, walks along the footpath, sunset picnics with family and friends, etc. This area is inseparably part of my heritage and will always be close to my heart. Has been for 58 years. - Spookdraai is the landmark that indicates the beginning of Cape Agulhas, the most Southern town in Africa visited by numerous tourists from all over the world. They stop here, take photoshoots and stroll on the Spookdraai beach as part of the heritage of Africa's most Southern Town. - In addition, we wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding and engagement events and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Schalk and Landi Viljoen Mobile: 0834419471	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 10:03
961.	Dirk de Vos	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> INTRODUCTION I am representing myself Dirk de Vos (7208155035084), 7285 Aegean Crescent Struisbaai, 153 Lagoon weg, Suiderstrand <u>as an Interested and Affected person</u>	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 09:58

		• I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years and I have a property at the above address. • The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
962.	Evan Bailey	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Evan Bailey ID 8101235249081 • I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area AND I HAVE BEEN FISHING IN SPOOKDRAAI SINCE CHILDHOOD. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and my FISHING THERE • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 10:10

		Regards Evan Bailey 076 559 2141 evan.baileys4@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai objection 1.	
963.	Gian Loreti	Email dated 05 March 2025 STRUISBAAI Good day Michelle, Please find attached my condensed objection to the Spookdraai development proposal. Warm Regards Gian Loreti (B. Eng Mechanical) M.R.E (PTY) Ltd OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself GB Loreti, ID # 8903035028080 • I have a direct interest in the application as I regularly spend my annual break aways at the residences of 159 Marine Drive • I have introduced countless overseas visitors to this area as being one of the few untouched and raw areas nature. • The application for development is in poor taste and no more than an attempt to profiteer in lieu of taking away a small piece of natural beauty which cannot be replicated ever again. • The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Giancarlo Loreti Mobile 071 354 2804 Email gian@mre.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 05/03/25

964.	Armor Smit	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Fw: Spookdraai voorgestelde ontwikkeling te Agulhas	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 10:22
965.	Tertius de Wit	Email dated 05 March 2025	Date: 05/03/25
966.	Sanri Theron	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
967.	Hendrik Theron	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
968.	Nelia Darel	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
969.	Rinie Weyers	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
970.	Annemarie de Meyer	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
971.	Stewart Dynn	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
972.	Gary Lilley	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
973.	Justine da Costa	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
974.	Christine Breytenboch	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
975.	Annete de Jongh	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
976.	Annete Brandt	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
977.	Maarten Brandt	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
978.	Nolene Kritzinger	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
979.	Marnus Kritzinger	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
980.	Nic Kotze	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
981.	Jolla Kotze	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
982.	Junita Kotze	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
983.	Suzette Noude	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
984.	Marika Puttter	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
985.	Anita de Jongh	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
986.	Julius de Jongh	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
987.	Jacques	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25

	Erasmus		
988.	Deon Jacobs	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
989.	Naomi Jacobs	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
990.	Fred Kapman	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
991.	Allen Jeffthas	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
992.	Bianca Vermeulen	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
993.	Karien le Roux	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
994.	Piet le Roux	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
995.	Marialena Knowles	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
996.	Maureen Conradie	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
997.	Sylvester Titus	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
998.	Anina Beyers	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
999.	Annette van wyk	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1000.	Dirkie Fourie	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1001.	Hildegard Fourie	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1002.	Lynette van Schalkwyk	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1003.	Cecelia Basson	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1004.	Elzabie van graan	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1005.	Donie du Preez	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1006.	Ivy du Preez	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1007.	Caren Fengelbrecht	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1008.	Willem Louw	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1009.	Olona Louw	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1010.	Donovan	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25

	Louw		
1011.	Werner Louw	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1012.	Marizelle Louw	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1013.	Ameke Durand	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1014.	Arrie Durand	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1015.	Rianco de Clerk	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1016.	Tearize de Clerk	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1017.	Ennie Taaibosch	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1018.	Gert Makaidi	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1019.	Charne du Preez	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1020.	Durandt Preez	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1021.	Effiene le Roux	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1022.	DA Kuhn	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1023.	Anna Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1024.	Hans Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1025.	Daleen Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1026.	Reze Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1027.	Frederick Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1028.	Barend Visser	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1029.	Inge Muse	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1030.	Rachelle Marais	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1031.	Bianca Vermeulen	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1032.	Junita Vermeulen	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1033.	Mariska Vermeulen	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1034.	Hennie Swart	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25

1035.	Christian Groenewald	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1036.	Phillip Ross	Requested to be registered as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25
1037.	Tarron Lopez	Email dated 05 March 2025 Good day Michelle <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> R. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Cobin Bernard Beukes, ID 6209065256084. • I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area AND I HAVE BEEN FISHING IN SPOOKDRAAI SINCE CHILDHOOD. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and my FISHING THERE • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Cobin Beukes 0824147070 cobin@bergstan.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 11:41
1038.	Shirley Marais	Email dated 05 March 2025 B. INTRODUCTION I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for years now. The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 11:57

		greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area and my FISHING THERE - Referring to NEMA act and ICMA as “guidelines” it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the development will have a moderate negative visual impact - Blatantly misleading and false statement that the development has no other option and that the subject property is the only assert available to the developer - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Refer to Spookdraai objection 1.	
1039.	Annelie Van Rensburg	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Nee.nee nee. Asseblief los Spookdraai soos hy is. Al die belangrike redes is reeds genoem. Almal weet dit. Net die selfsugtige geldgieriges hou aan en aan. Dis n geskiedkundige nalatingskap. Sovel stories en verhale, so pragtige natuurskoon.. gratis daar vir almal om te geniet. Daar bly nie meer veel natuurlike plekke oor met al die bouery nie. Ek is 100% gekant daarteen. Bly al.10 jaar hier. Maar het familie geskiedenis van voor Boy Auret en Derek Auret. En die van Drutens. Lighthouse keepers en vissermanne. Moenie alles vernietig nie asb. Groete Annelie van Rensburg	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 12:57
1040.	Joh-Mari van Heerden	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Objects against Proposed Spookdraai residential development on Remainder of farm No 281, Struisbaai Goodday, My concerns, as permanent resident: 39 Protea Rd, regarding the proposed development: 1. Tourism - negative impact as many tourist visit this particular spot. No-one believes that there will be a public access to the beach, as previous developers have not kept to their agreement for public access as per negotiations with Cape Agulhas Municipality (CAM). As far as the road goes - it is our main scenic route between Struisbaai and L'Agulhas and has to be kept uninterrupted and valuable. 2. Overcapacity of infrastructure - already Struisbaai is negatively impacted by water shortages and we still have to deal with pit sewage systems. CAM cannot afford to supply such services to completely new developments, without alienating the permanent residents and already struggling businesses. 3. Destruction of environment - this development will plunder the environment with rare fauna and flora. Ancient rock formations will be destroyed. 4. Traffic - The proposed turn-off to development will be a huge inconvenience and potentially dangerous, especially coming from L'Agulhas. How will the construction vehicles be regulated? The question is also, how will it impact the renovation and upgrading plans already approved	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 13:28

		and being implemented this year? 5. Heritage - Our towns are still known as 'small towns' and as such need to be safeguarded against developments marring this reputation. Visitors come here for recreation and peacefulness, and this development will destroy the visual impact and our heritage. Thank you,	
1041.	Elfranco Werth	Email dated 05 Mach 2025 SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT . S. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself, Elfranco Werth (ID no 620616 5169 08 4)) of 34 Main Road, Agulhas, as affected person. - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood for many years. We also have a property at the above address as highlighted. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document: - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “.. it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it is entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a “moderate negative visual impact”</i> - Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. - In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Elfranco Werth Mobile: 083 647 2978 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 14:46
1042.	Louis Fletcher	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Objection to proposed development for Erf 281 Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the remainder of Erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdrqqi). Louis Fletcher	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 17:14

		3609090011086 Avala street, Restio 0832334566	
1043.	Janke Van Wyk	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Re: Spookdraai development Reason; erf are in the National Coastal Zone Kind Regards, Janke Grunschloss On Tuesday, March 4, 2025 at 04:13:04 PM GMT+2, Janke Van Wyk <jankevanwyk@yahoo.com> wrote: I, herby object the development in Struisbaai, Spookdraai. Name: Janke van wyk 477 Montgomery street Lagulhas 0665659229 Kind Regards, Janke	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 16:26
1044.	Dirk Streicher	Email dated 05 March 2025 March Dear Michelle Please find attached my objection for the proposed development. Please confirm receipt of this email and attachment. Kind regards RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI. A. INTRODUCTION ☒ I am representing myself DC Streicher, ID # 620527 5023 082 ☒ I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Agulhas – 17 Main Road ☒ I am a permanent resident of this area, and my property is on the opposite side of St Mungo Bay.	

		☒ The application is against the law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. ☒ I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. ☒ The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards DC Streicher Mobile 0825575110 Email dirkie@streichers.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
1045.	Rika Grundlingh	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> T. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Rika Grundlingh, 691210 0220 086, 082 457 4217 - I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person</u> - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines ".. it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> - Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Rika Grundlingh 082 457 4217 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 14:58
1046.	Gert van E V	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai objection Hi All I would like to make objection to this development	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 18:16

		Kind Regards,	
1047.	Desiree Mariette Faber	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: RE: Objection Against The Proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Dear Michelle, Registration as an individual as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the Remainder of Erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Please register me as an interested and affected party for the proposed development of the remainder of Erf 281 Struisbaai (Spookdraai). My personal details are as follow: Full name and surname: Desiree Mariette Faber ID number: 6009080040087 Phone number: 078 034 2369 Email address: dezzie@worldonline.co.za Residential Address: 9 Mentor Street Agulhas 7287 Kind regards. DM Faber	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 17:50
1048.	Abraham Marais	Email dated 05 March 2025 Email: michelle@lornay.co.za 5 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> INTRODUCTION	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 17:15

		- I am representing myself Abraham Marais (ID 6104135035081) Strelitzia Street Struisbaai <u>as an Interested and Affected person</u> - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years and I have a property at the above address. - The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Abraham Marais Mobile 0828769299	
1049.	Gert Van Zyl	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> U. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Gert Van Zyl 32 Roman close Struisbaai - I have a direct interest in the application <u>please register me as an Interested and affected person.</u> - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Gert Van Zyl Mobile 083 302 2640 Email Gert@VzValuations.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 18:21
1050.	Eduard Friedrichs	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> INTRODUCTION I am representing myself Eduard Friedrichs (ID 670212 5021 084), 13 Amandelboom Street, Cape Town <u>as an Interested and Affected</u>	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 18:31

		<u>person</u> - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years and am planning to relocate in the near future. - The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Eduard Friedrichs Mobile 0664754045	
1051.	Paul Mouton	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT .</u> INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself Paul Mouton, 52 Watergang street, Aan de Weber estate, Stellenbosch as an Interested and affected person for above. - I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years. - The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Paul Mouton 0825614119 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
1052.	Edward Ehlers	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Struisbaai Registration as interested and affected person and objections against proposed Spookdraai Residential Development	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 19:07

		Hi Michelle I am writing to formally express my strong objection to the proposed development in this environmentally sensitive area. Having visited Struisbaai and Agulhas my entire life, I find it deeply concerning that individuals are being permitted to encroach upon fragile coastal regions for personal gain, while others are left to witness the degradation of these cherished landscapes due to greed-driven exploitation. This development is not appropriate, and I urge you to reconsider any actions that may lead to the irreversible deterioration of this coastal area. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Edward Ehlers, 33 Hillcrest, Durbanville <u>as an Interested and Affected person for above.</u> • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years. • The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions. Regards Edward Ehlers Mobile 082 458 3014 Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
1053.	Hestee Booyesen	Email dated 05 March 2025 Request to be added as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 21:04
1054.	Danie van den Berg	Email dated 05 March 2025 Request to be added as I&AP	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 21:04
1055.	Linda van	Email dated 05 March 2025	Date: 05/03/25

	den Berg	Request to be added as I&AP	Time: 21:04
1056.	Joh-Mari van Heerden	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Objections against Proposed Spookdraai residential development on Remainder of farm No 281, Struisbaai Dear Madam, We, as Cape Agulhas Business Association (CABA), are writing to formally object to the proposed Spookdraai residential development on the Remainder of Farm No. 281, Struisbaai. We have serious concerns regarding the impact this development will have on our community, environment, and infrastructure. 1. Negative Impact on Tourism This area is a key attraction for both local and international visitors. Previous assurances regarding public beach access have not been upheld by developers, casting doubt on similar promises for this project. Additionally, the proposed development could disrupt the scenic route between Struisbaai and L'Agulhas, which is an essential part of the region's tourism appeal. 2. Strain on Infrastructure Struisbaai is already experiencing water shortages and relies on pit sewage systems in many areas. The Cape Agulhas Municipality (CAM) lacks the capacity to extend services to new developments without negatively affecting permanent residents and local businesses. 3. Environmental Destruction The proposed development threatens rare fauna and flora unique to the area. Furthermore, ancient rock formations, which are of geological and ecological significance, will be irreversibly damaged. 4. Traffic and Safety Concerns The planned turn-off to the development poses a safety risk, particularly for vehicles approaching from L'Agulhas. There is also concern about the regulation of construction vehicles and their impact on road safety. Additionally, how will this project affect the ongoing renovation and infrastructure upgrades already approved for implementation this year? 5. Heritage and Community Character Struisbaai and L'Agulhas are known for their small-town charm, which is a key factor in attracting visitors. Large-scale developments risk altering this identity, diminishing the town's appeal as a peaceful, recreational destination and undermining its historical and cultural heritage. Given these concerns, we strongly urge that this proposed development be reconsidered in the best interest of the local community and environment. Regards, Joh-Mari van Heerden - Ward 5 Representative Cell: 083 719 1110 Email: events@caba.co.za	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 20:37
1057.	Gwen	Emal dated 05 March 2025	Date: 05/03/25

	Theron	Subject: RE: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON Thank you Michelle, I want to add something else please The title deed makes mention of free access to the sea across the land that must be addressed in a social impact assessment. Also the CBA maps shows a terrestrial critical biodiversity area on the site that is not in your report. Please correct and evaluate accordingly Regards	Time: 22:09
1058.	Ters Carstens	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> V. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself, Tertius Carstens, ID 680505 5049 080 • I have a direct interest in the application as I co-own property in Struisbaai – Nerina Street 20, Erf 733 • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since 1971 when my parents build our family home here. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Tertius Carstens Mobile 082 874 5470 Email terscarstens@gmail.com	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 22:52
1059.	Philippa Law	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Objection against proposed Spookdraai development Hi Michelle Please see attached objection.	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 23:15

		Regards Philippa Law <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> W. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Philippa Law, ID # 7006120101084 • I have a direct interest in the application as I vacation here. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as “Guidelines “it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a ‘moderate negative visual impact’</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards Philippa Law Mobile 071 292 4534 Email trailpip@gmail.com Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
1060.	Erna Mouton	Email dated 05 March 2025 <u>SUBJECT: STRUISBAAI REGISTRATION AS INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PERSON AND OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.</u> INTRODUCTION I am representing myself Paul Mouton, 52 Watergang street, Aan de Weber estate, Stellenbosch as an Interested and affected person for above. I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area for many years. The application is against the NICM Act and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area as set out below. I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any	Date: 05/03/25 Time: 11:01

		extended time permitted for submissions. In addition, I wish to note that this development will have a severe impact on the coastal edge of Struisbaai . The area known as Spookdraai includes a natural rock and beach area used by fisherman , families on holiday enjoying a day on the beach, wedding parties and family photoshoots. It is also visited by numerous international tourists on their way to the southernmost point of Africa- why is it even considered to allow this beautiful section of our costal heritage to fall into the hands of short-sighted developers pursuing this development for personal gain and not to the benefit of the greater environment and generations to come. Regards Erna Mouton 0713345993	
1061.	Rae Smit	Email dated 05 March 2025 Subject: Teenkanting: Hersonerig gronde by Spookdraai vir 6 erwe Ek, Rachel Vaughan Smit, ID 4106 22 0045 083 maak ten sterkte beswaar teen die beoogde ontwikkeling Af gesien van besware soos die honderd meter boulyn , toegang tot die gebied en so voorts, Hoekom moet van die laaste natuurlike strokie plantegroei langs die kus vernietig word vir huise? As daar een huis staan sal dit uitbreit tot by die onooglike toring by Skulpiesbaai. Asseblief dat hierdie plan stop. Mense sien 'n manier om geld te maak en het geen idee wat vir altyd verlore gaan Groete R Smit Selno: 083 356 8626 e-pos raevsmit@gmail.com	Date: 06/03/25 Time: 16:45
1062.	Louis Fletcher	Email dated 07 March 2025 Subject: Re: Objection to proposed development for Erf 281 Remove me plse thks	Date: 07/03/25 Time: 07:18
1063.	William Eliot and Beverley Eliot	Email dated 06 March 2025 <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> A. INTRODUCTION - I am representing myself William Eliot and Beverley Eliot - I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai/L'Agulhas– viz 81 Gentoo Street L'Agulhas	Date: 06/03/25 Time: 12:41

		- I have lived in the area for the past 20 years - The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & L'Agulhas area. - There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document - Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions - Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive - Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> - Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> - I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. - The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Regards William Eliot Mobile 0828546276 Email william@eliots.co.za Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1.	
1064.	Eddie & Jolanda Haggard	Email dated 08 March 2025 Subject: BESWAAR: Spookdraai L'Agulhas Vooruitgang is normaal, maar die beplande ontwikkelings op Spookdraai is die vernietiging van n eeu oue baken, Spookdraai. Dit moet GESTOP word. Die huidige ontwikkeling van die blok woonstelle op Marine drive is n bewys dat dit n absolute vernietiging is van ons estetiese kuslyn is. Struisbaai, L'Agulhas bied genoeg grond om te ontwikkel, los ons kuslyn uit!!!! Groete Eddie & Jolanda Haggard	Date: 08/03/25 Time: 06:01
1065.	Annemarie Van Rooyen	Email dated 09 March 2025 Subject: Spookdraai Struisbaai Hi Michelle, Wie sou nou kon dink dat ek van alle mense so erg kan voel vir n plek dat ek selfs n email sal stuur om my misnoeë uit te spreek! My naam is Anne-Marie Botha en ek woon in Struisbaai nou vir amper 6jaar. Die plek lê diep binne in my hart en ek het myself weer hier gevind. Die ongereptheid en lewens styl hier is so gemaklik en eenvoudig en mens raak sommer weer lus vir die lewe as jy deel word van hierdie gemeenskap. Die plek kan nie vir homself praat so toe besluit ek om n gedig te skryf namens Spookdraai en die gaan so;	Date: 09/03/25 Time: 13:12

		Spookdraai se Fluistering Oor die duine, waar die winde kla, staan Spookdraai stil in vaal verslae. Sy sand geslyp deur eeue se gang, 'n plek waar spoke van stories hang. Die seemeeu skreeu oor branders se lied, 'n erfenis vasgeanker in tyd, maar geld fluister sag in gierige ore, 'n droom van staal teen waters se spore. Wie verkwansel 'n hart vir klip en glas? Wie ruil die golwe vir beton se las? Want Spookdraai roep – hy pleit, hy huil, sy asem is bries, sy trane die spruyel. Laat die duine bly, laat die gees nog sweef, laat ons die geskiedenis eer en belee. Nie elke strand moet 'n skatkis wees, soms is sy waarde net in gees. Baie Dankie Anne-Marie Botha 4o	
1066.	Hermanus Abraham Bosman	Email dated 10 March 2025 Subject: Objections against proposed Spookdraai Residential Development Struisbaai Dear Michelle, Please find attached objection as signed by Mr HA Bosman. I must apologise for only sending it now. We act as auditors for mr Bosman and he has asked me to submit the objection on his behalf. Due to an administrative error on my side, I am only submitting the document this morning as suppose to last Monday when it was signed by mr Bosman. Please confirm receipt of this email. Thank you. <u>RE OBJECTIONS AGAINST PROPOSED SPOOKDRAAI RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT STRUISBAAI.</u> B. INTRODUCTION	Date: 10/03/25 Time: 06:42

		• I am representing myself Hermanus Abraham Bosman • I have a direct interest in the application as I own property in Struisbaai- Erf1027, Struisbaai • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & L'Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Refer to Spookdraai generic objection 1	
1067.	Abraham Christiaan Hugo and Tiaan Hugo	Email dated 10 March 2025 Geagte Michelle Registrasie as belanghebbende en geaffekteerde party tot die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai) Registreer my asb. as 'n belanghebbende en geaffekteerder party vir die beoogde ontwikkeling van die res van erf 281, Struisbaai (Spookdraai). My persoonlike gegewens is soos volg: Abraham Christiaan Hugo A. INTRODUCTION • I am representing myself Tiaan Hugo • I have a direct interest in the application as our vacation place in Strisbaai. Our children enjoys the sea and beach infront plac3e. with their environmental studies on the beach, picking up shark teeth regularly. We expect a negative impact on the sea environmental if this goes through. • I have a close emotional bond with this area and have been visiting this area since my childhood. • The application is against the Law and undesirable as the development contemplated therein will have a significant negative impact on the greater Struisbaai & Agulhas area. • There are numerous incorrect statements made by the EAP in the draft Bar document ○ Referring to the NEMA act and ICM Act as "Guidelines "it is legislative provisions ○ Asserting that the proposed development is in line with existing residential development in this area while it entirely inconsistent with properties seaward of Marine Drive ○ Assertion by the EAP that the proposed <i>development will have a 'moderate negative visual impact'</i> ○ Blatantly misleading and false statement that <i>the developer has no other options and that</i>	Date: 10/03/25 Time: 09:37

		<i>the subject property is the only asset available to the developer.</i> • I reserve the right to supplement this letter of objection with further supporting information and documentation within any extended time permitted for submissions. • The grounds and detail of my objection is given below. Refer to Sookdraai generic objection 1.	
1068.	Alta DuToit	Email dated 14 May 2025 Subject: Re: Notice of Pre-Application Public Participation RE281, Struisbaai - Closing 5 March Good day, I am just following up on this Application and what is the next step in the Approval process. Kind regards Alta du Toit VIP AIRPORT TRANSFERS Cell: 0795358598	Date: 14/05/25