



J H SMIT

Rem of Portion 82 of Farm Ruygte Valley 205
and Erf 1638 Sedgfield

COLLAB: 354576

KNYSNA
Municipality
Munisipaliteit
uMasipala

TEL: 044-302 6319

2015-05-28

By email to: lizemarie@vpmsa.co.za

Ms. L. Botha

Dear Madam,

Knysna SDF compatibility request of the proposed development on Rem of Portion 82 of Farm Ruygte Valley 205 and Erf 1638, Sedgfield (referred to as "The Hill").

Your email of 25 May 2015 has reference.

With reference to your document, the Hill compatibility ruling (April 2015), I want to confirm that my response will only focus on the compatibility of the proposed development with the 2008 Knysna Spatial Development Framework. Matters such as the availability of services and land legal matters will have to be dealt with during the land use application as well as the application for environmental authorization.

The writer does concur with your interpretation of the 2008 Knysna SDF in that:

1. The Knysna SDF has identified Sedgfield as a secondary node, or a second order settlement in the context of the municipality, making it the most significant 'small town' (2008 KSDF: Pg. 18).
2. The SDF recommends that growth and investment in Sedgfield should be focused on developing its role as:
 - A major tourist and holiday destination;
 - A secondary, yet important centre for administrative and public services functions;
 - A location for limited low income / affordable housing provision;
 - Job creation and socio-economic development of the poorest groups of its population;
 - Significant investment in the tourism and related industry (2008 KSDF: pg. 19).
3. The Sedgfield SDF map on page 44 of the Knysna SDF (2008) earmark the Remainder of Portion 82 of Farm Ruygte Valley 205 as question as "Core Productive Area", whilst Erf 1638, Sedgfield, is earmarked as "Core Natural Area".
4. We do take note of the National Department of Agriculture's support of your view in their letter dated 5 February 2013 in that the "Core Production Area" designation could have been assigned due to the historical forestry activities that occurred on the site and that the prevailing conditions limits the agricultural potential of the site.
5. In respect of Erf 1638, Sedgfield, being earmarked as "Core Natural Area", kindly note that the Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) and SDF mapping are inaccurate on a site specific scale and requires a verification exercise to confirm the conservation value of the property.
6. With regards to the future development direction of Sedgfield, the 2008 Knysna SDF states the following of page 43: *"The establishment of a sustainable village at Ruigtevlei should, however,*

be investigated, owing to the presence of existing facilities (school and church). In order to avoid a segregated dormitory village, consideration is to be given to extending the urban edge to include properties to the north of the N2 through which a road link can be created to link the proposed Ruigtevlei integrated village with Sedgefield without having to use the N2. Care would need to be taken in the form and placement of development along the ridgeline north of the N2. Formalization of the railway crossing and construction of the roadway need to be attended to as part of the development process."

It can therefore be concluded that the proposed residential development, known as "The Hill", is in broad strategic terms in line 2008 Knysna SDF. Detailed specialist studies will however be required during the land use and environmental authorization applications. It must further be noted that the compatibility of the proposed development with the 2008 Knysna SDF does not guarantee approval of the land use application.

I trust that the information provided is in order.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'G. Easton', written over a horizontal line.

G EASTON
MUNICIPAL MANAGER
/hs

CC Director: Planning & Development
 Senior Town Planner