SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS
6.1 SALDANHA BAY MUNICIPALITY

6.1.1 VISION

The municipal area is shown in Figure 6.1.1b.

The vision for the whole municipality promotes compliance with the SPLUMA principles (See SPLUMA Section 21 (a) (b) (c) and Chapter 2 Section 7), and Section 5 of this report:

- Spatial Justice
- Spatial Sustainability
- Efficiency
- Spatial Resilience
- Good administration

- Consolidate the coastal wilderness areas and rural hinterland including agricultural resources and promote tourism and job creation thereon. (Strategy 3, EDS, 2017)

- Consolidate inland CBA corridors with coastal corridors into a practical and effective network of open space supporting biodiversity conservation, the recreational needs of residents and the coastal and rural tourism economies. (Strategy 3, EDS, 2017)

- Promote the industrial area, including high-tech economic development, to take advantage of global demand opportunities and encourage local employment and capacity building. (Strategies 1, 2, 4, 7, EDS, 2017)

- Promote the restructuring of the urban settlements so that they become socially and functionally integrated, attractive places for all to live in, and convenient for most residents to walk to a significant percentage of their destinations, particularly work. (Strategies 5 and 6, EDS, 2017)
Figure 6.1.1b  Saldanha Bay Municipality: Aerial Photograph
Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Vision:
The strategic intent of Council as per the 4th generation Integrated Development Plan (IDP) over the next few years will be to enhance municipal service delivery and growth and development offerings. The following vision has been adopted by the Council as the municipality’s road map, indicating both what the municipality wants to become and guiding transformational initiatives by setting a defined direction for the municipality’s growth:

SMART is an acronym for the following aspects to give guidance to the formulation of Council’s objectives:

- **S**uperior service – The rendering of service which exceed normal expectation.
- **M**andate – The effective and efficient execution of Council’s mandate.
- **A**chievable – The setting of objectives which are realistically achievable.
- **R**esponsive – The setting of objectives that respond to the needs of the public.
- **T**eam – The promotion of a consolidated approach to address the challenges.

The vision is thus to enable a future of prosperity for all through effective objectives promoting service excellence.

Future Through Excellence

Integrated Development Plan (IDP) Mission:
The following IDP mission statement has been adopted by the Council to guide the actions of the Municipality, spell out its overall goal, provide a path, and guide decision-making. It serves to provide the framework or context within which the Council’s strategies are formulated.

**SBM is a caring institution that excels through:**

- Accelerated economic growth for community prosperity
- Establishment of high quality and sustainable services
- Commitment to responsive and transparent governance
- The creation of a safe and healthy environment
- Long term financial sustainability

**SDF Goals and Strategic Objectives:**
The SDF strategic objectives below provide a more detailed direction to achieving the vision as set out in the IDP.

**Goal 1:** To develop and maintain a strong local economic base, through the promotion of non-consumptive tourism, industrial development and the role of agriculture in the municipal area’s economy

**Objectives:**

- To develop a clear and appropriate tourism management / capture strategy based on the natural and heritage resources of the area;
- To develop and stimulate economic activity in a responsible and appropriate manner;
- To market the area more effectively;
- To promote tourism as a community based and community driven industry with substantial potential for providing direct and indirect economic benefits to the community;
- To promote industrial development in the municipal area and to support the Saldanha Bay Industrial Development Zone in the municipal area;
- To investigate opportunities and requirements for incorporating agricultural activities into the tourism strategy for the area;
- To promote the development of tourism infrastructure that conforms to place-specific architectural, environmental and aesthetic requirements;
- To promote partnerships in the development of tourism facilities between private, public and community sectors.
Goal 2: To protect and conserve the heritage resources of the area

Objectives:
- To promote the conservation and inclusion of important heritage resources into a municipal area’s tourism strategy;
- To improve and develop tourism related facilities.

Goal 3: To provide an environmentally and economically sustainable bulk service infrastructure and road transport network

Objectives:
- To ascertain the overall carrying capacity of existing bulk services related to existing and future growth, where appropriate, consider risk zones;
- To identify critical problem areas relating to bulk water supply, ground water extraction and quality;
- To improve and maintain the standard of bulk services with particular reference to bulk water supply, sewerage and solid waste and sewage management;
- To create an efficient, well defined hierarchy of roads;
- To promote co-ordinated flood control management.

Goal 4: To address the social needs and expectations of all sections of the community

Objectives:
- To provide all sections of the community access to a full spectrum of social services and facilities;
- To ensure the provision of basic housing and services to all sections of the community;
- To facilitate liaison between the local authority and all sections of the community;
- To encourage public participation in all issues of public concern;
- To co-ordinate the joint management of certain facilities on a municipal area level, e.g. sporting facilities, educational and health facilities.

Goal 5: To promote the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources in the Saldanha Bay Municipality

Objectives:
- To protect, conserve, and rehabilitate where appropriate, all areas deemed to be conservation worthy;
- To ensure that the impact of existing and proposed development is adequately evaluated from a holistic environmental perspective;
- To promote the sound management of natural areas to ensure their sustainability;
- To address the rehabilitation of degraded or disturbed environments;
- To address and rectify the unsustainable utilisation of natural resources, i.e. agricultural land, fish, flora and ground water;
- To limit and control development and activities within environmentally sensitive and / or conservation worthy areas so as to ensure their sustainability taking into account effects on biodiversity;
- To promote the sustainable extraction of groundwater;
- To promote the efficient use of freshwater and energy resources.

Goal 6: To ensure that ongoing development pressure and its spatial implications are managed in a sustainable manner that protects the unique character of the existing cultural landscape and the place-specific character and form of the existing settlement pattern

Objectives:
- To promote a spatial development pattern that contains urban sprawl / urban development and promotes compact well-defined settlements;
- To retain and strengthen the unique identity of the municipal area and its districts;
- To determine clear limits to urban development and define the urban edge / limits of existing settlements;
- To conserve and improve the visual quality of the landscape and the scenic route experience of the primary movement corridors;
- To improve the aesthetic quality of the built environment.
6.1.2 SWOT ANALYSIS

6.1.2.1 STRENGTHS (INTERNAL)

• Extensive Agriculture
• Fishing – deep sea fishing and mariculture in bay
• Industry – deep water port and related port infrastructure
• Rail infrastructure to the port and IDZ
• Tourism
• Phosphate, lime, gypsum resources
• WCNP
• Fossil Park
• Attractive coastline and bio-diversity
• Implementing urban upgrading – Oostewal Street Langebaan, RSEP Vredenburg
• Retirement potential
• Possible aquifer water recycling (Atlantis/Windhoek model – requires strict land use management)
• Coastal settlements’ scenic settings; Langebaan, Jacobsbaai, Paternoster, St Helena Bay, Saldanha
• Saldanha boardwalk/waterfront potential
• Hopefield rural tourism and agricultural node
• Biodiversity linked to eco-tourism

6.1.2.2 OPPORTUNITIES (EXTERNAL)

• Industrial Policy Action Plan (IPAP) which provides policy support for IDZ and infrastructure as part of the Strategic Infrastructure Plan (SIP)
• Western Cape government policy support for IDZ and infrastructure
• Western Cape government support for road upgrades
• West Coast international floral attraction
• City of Cape Town day tripper and weekend getaway demand
• Gauteng and other provinces “semigration”

6.1.2.3 WEAKNESSES (INTERNAL)

• Pollution – air/water – around port
• Low rainfall
• Water supply dependent on Berg water system
• Marginalisation of local business
• Urban decay – Saldanha
• Lack of municipal land for non-residential development in certain towns
• Inefficient settlements in terms of low densities and urban sprawl:
  - Vredenburg
  - Saldanha
  - St Helena Bay

6.1.2.4 THREATS (EXTERNAL)

• Uncertainty over water supply on industrial development
• Short term South Africa macro political economic uncertainty (country risk)
• Reduced/flat global demand for primary resources and secondary beneficiation
• Eskom reluctance to commit major energy infrastructure upgrades unless significant commitment from investors
• Privatised strategic assets such as Khumba, Arcelor Mittal, Exxaro, Dufersco, vulnerable to global demand and international and national shareholders’ demands
• Some declining fish resources
• Instability in fishing industry
• Decline of 2nd home market after global financial crisis
• Attracting unskilled unemployed labour without jobs being available
• Possibility of marine phosphate mining in bay prejudicing mariculture
• Impact of intensive fish farming on the bay
• Coastal erosion
• Climate change
Employment patterns show declines in only two sectors, namely agriculture and fishing, and manufacturing. However, agriculture, especially fishing remain the second largest employment category.

The largest employment sector is now wholesale, retail, catering and accommodation. This includes the tourism sector.

This indicates the importance of the SDF promoting those spatial resources which encourages tourism and retail services. Municipalities that are attractive to live in have strong financial service sectors. Employment in this sector is also growing. Therefore, it can be argued that the SDF proposals, while not neglecting the manufacturing sector and programs such as the IDZ, must ensure that this sector does not negatively impact on those sectors which clearly have the most long term potential in terms of economic growth, and most importantly employment creation.

6.1.3.2 Estimating future housing need - Population Growth (SPLUMA Sec 21(e))

Note: this section examines growth rates from 2011 to 2021 (10 years). Estimates beyond this time horizon need to be regarded with caution as the further into the future the more likely trends will change and uncertainties increase.

Future housing need as a result of population growth and in migration into the municipality must also be assessed.

Table 6.1.1 indicates the population increase from 2001 to 2011.

These figures suggest there will be an approximately additional 40 000 people, and the municipal population will increase to 140 000 people.
Other population growth estimates include:
- DEA&DP – socio-economic profile: 122 265 by 2023
- MERO 2016 - 215 029 by 2031

The latest LGMTEC Assessment 2018/19 suggests a population growth rate of 1.7% (LGMTCE p6)

The following estimates assume that the household size of 3.2 in 2011 continues when this is applied to the estimated population growth. It suggests that an additional 12 715 housing units will be required by 2021.

6.1.3.4 Distribution of future growth between BNG, GAP and Market Housing

Section 3.3.4.6 in the Status Quo estimates that approximately 48.5% of households earn less than R3 200 per month and would qualify for BNG housing, and 31.8% would fall into the GAP/social housing market. These percentages are applied to the forecast future household growth to estimate each demand category in Table 6.1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Income distribution %</th>
<th>12 709 (est additional hh 2021)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>6 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP/Social</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>4 041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>2 504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1.2 Estimated market distribution of future growth

6.1.3.5 Summary of Housing Demand Requirements (SPLUMA Sec 21(f))

The following summarises the combined impact of accommodating the current backlog as well as accounting for future growth:

- **Current backlog (DoHS waiting list) = 8 866**
  - Assume: 2/3 BNG = 5 911
  - 1/3 Social/GAP = 2 955

- **Future Growth (to 2021) = 12 715**
  - BNG (CRU, IRDP, PHP, UISP) = 6 166
  - Social/GAP = 4 043
  - Market = 2 504

Therefore,

**Total housing requirements to 2021 in all sectors of the market:**

- BNG (CRU, IRDP, PHP, UISP) = 12 077 (5 911+6 166)
- GAP/Social = 6 998 (2 955+4 043)
- Market (private) = 2 504
- Total = 21 579
6.1.3.6 Land Requirements

Table 6.1.3 estimates land requirements for the different market categories using the plot size assumptions indicated. It is understood that greater land take efficiencies will be achieved if CRU apartment units are provided, but BNG housing, assumed to occupy 100m² plots, is used for this exercise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Market Category</th>
<th>Plot Size (m²)</th>
<th>no of Units</th>
<th>Net Land (ha)</th>
<th>gross %</th>
<th>Total Land (Ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNG</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12077</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP/Social</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6998</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2504</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1.3 Total land requirements for backlog and future growth

This figure suggests that a total of 326 hectares of public land will be required to accommodate BNG and GAP/Social housing by 2021.

This is far less than the 1002 hectares contained in the housing pipeline, see Table 6.1.4 overleaf. This suggests that the land identified in the pipeline is more than sufficient.

The market related housing will be driven by the private sector using its own land. In this regard, attention should be given to encouraging the development of the many vacant approved and serviced plots in the municipality, particularly in St Helena Bay, Paternoster, Hopefield and Langebaan.

6.1.3.7 Inclusionary Housing

In terms of Section 21(i) SPLUMA the designated areas for inclusionary housing must be identified by the municipality. This can occur once their inclusionary housing program has been completed and approved.

6.1.3.8 Incremental Upgrading (Sec 21(k) SPLUMA)

This strategy is usually applied in in-situ upgrading projects of informal settlements. However, the roll-over approach to informal settlement upgrading is usually preferred by the department of Human Settlements and municipal human settlement departments. The municipality needs to identify where it might implement in-situ incremental upgrading programs.

6.1.3.9 Spatial Co-ordination, alignment and integration of municipal departure sectoral policies (Sec 21(n) SPLUMA)

The draft SDF proposals were circulated for comment by all municipal departments and where necessary amendments were made.

The land use management scheme (SPLUMA Sec 21(o)) is being prepared through a separate process.

6.1.3.10 Implementation Plan (Sec 21(p) SPLUMA)

This is contained in Section 7.

6.1.3.11 Infrastructure (Sec 21(h) SPLUMA)

The nature, quantity and locational requirements of engineering services is included in the engineers’ infrastructure and services provision sections for each settlement in sections 6.2 to 6.9.

The required capital projects to cater for the future engineering infrastructure and services provision are contained in Section 7.1.1.
### Table 6.1.4 Housing Pipeline Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SALDANHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site  A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Midlopes Informal</td>
<td>IRDP/UISP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site B1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Midlopes 189</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site C2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Diazville 559</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site D</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Midlopes PPC</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diazville 559</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Diazville</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Infill</td>
<td>RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site F12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville 24 Rect</td>
<td>CRU</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site G1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>White City Naval Wall</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site G2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>White City Naval Wall</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site G3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>White City Naval Wall</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diazville Road Hostel</td>
<td>GAP/PVT</td>
<td>RSA/PVT</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saldana North</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldana Site K</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Saldana East</td>
<td>BNG/GAP/PVT</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>161.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11845</td>
<td>342.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1.5 Projects per Settlement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HOPEFIELD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfield Site A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clinic Site</td>
<td>GAP/PVT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfield Site B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Keedloos Str</td>
<td>UISP/GAP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfield Site C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Hopfield South</td>
<td>UISP/GAP</td>
<td>SBM/PR</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfield Site D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hopfield 62</td>
<td>UISP</td>
<td>SBM/Unregist.</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopfield Site E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hoit Str</td>
<td>GAP/PVT</td>
<td>SBM/RA/PVT</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2732</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1.6 Settlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST. HELENA BAY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>IRDP (537) / UISP (176)</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP</td>
<td>SBM/PVT</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>MIXED USE/GAP</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>UISP</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay E</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>UISP</td>
<td>DPW</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helena Bay F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Langeville</td>
<td>UISP</td>
<td>PVT</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7384</td>
<td>154.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1.7 Paternoster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATERNOSTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternoster Site A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Paternoster 202</td>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternoster Site B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paternoster East</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>598</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1.8 Langebaan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LANGEBaan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langebaan B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Coolabul</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP/RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>7100</td>
<td>127.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langebaan C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Langebaan</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP/RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langebaan D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Langebaan</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP/RENT</td>
<td>SBM/RA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langebaan D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Langebaan</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP/RENT</td>
<td>SBM/RA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langebaan E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Langebaan</td>
<td>IRDP/GAP/RENT</td>
<td>SBM</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7540</td>
<td>141.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.1.9 TOTAL FOR ALL SETTLEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Site</th>
<th>Social Facilities</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Housing Program</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
<th>Site Yield (Number)</th>
<th>Extent (ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45216</td>
<td>1002.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Figure 6.1.4  Summary of Existing Land Use Patterns
6.1.4 SUMMARY OF EXISTING LAND USE PATTERNS

The existing land use pattern in the municipality can be summarised as follows, see Figure 6.1.4:

6.1.4.1 Conservation Land Use as well as Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs), see Photo 6.1.1

- Along the Atlantic coast;
- A corridor along the hill slopes above St Helena Bay;
- A patchy corridor along Besaansklip hill, south of Vredenburg linking from the coast near Trekoskraal through to Saldana Bay east of the port;
- A large belt between the West Coast National Park and the Berg River estuary; Some important areas of vegetation are protected, e.g. in the West Coast National Park or partially protected in a series of provincial and private nature reserves including SAS Saldana Provincial Nature Reserve, Swartriet near Jacobsbaai, Cape Columbine, Duyker Island and West Point private nature reserves. These nature reserves could form the basis of a continuous coastal nature reserve from SAS Saldana to the Berg River estuary. There is a large private nature reserve near Hopefield;
- Many CBAs are not protected but should be conserved subject to ground truthing; The CBAs are supported by Ecological Support Areas (ESAs) which may be suitable for extensive farming (grazing) if managed according to proper veld management systems which will also improve biodiversity; and,
- The WCBSP spatial data was used to develop the Greater Saldanha EMF (April 2017) which is more concerned with issues related to land use and development and indicates the environmental management priorities for the municipal area. The Strategic Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) facilitates the incorporation of sustainability issues into spatial development and land use planning and identified seven Environment Management Zones (EMZs) based on a combination of environmental and development attributes, namely: urban conservation, rural conservation, controlled development, restoration, agricultural development, industrial activity and urban development. The EMZs act as a tool to assist in identifying appropriate locations for development proposals as it outlines management guidelines for each of the EMZs in order to promote sustainability. The EMZ maps assist with the identification of factors that should be taken into account in formulating and assessing development proposals. The relevant EMZ maps are attached as Annexure A.

6.1.4.2 Agriculture

- There are two large consolidated areas of agriculture, see Photo 6.1.2:
  - The West Coast Peninsula; and,
  - Hopefield hinterland.
6.1.4.3 Mining

- Most of the municipality is underlain by phosphate except for a wide band from Vredenburg through to St Helena Bay. Mining prospecting is occurring in this area except in Protected Areas. Phosphate mining has started at Elandsfontein between two sections of the West Coast National Park.

6.1.4.4 Wind farms

- Two windfarms are operating, one north of Vredenburg and one east of Hopefield. They form the core of two much bigger areas currently under application for further wind farms.

6.1.4.5 Industrial development

- There are a number of large industrial plants dispersed along the rail corridor north of the port as well as the IDZ representing the incipient stages of a large industrial development area.
- The public participation process for this SDF review revealed that this industrial area, together with its negative externalities such as its heavy industrial character and red dust plume, see photo 6.1.3, must not be linked to Saldanha town, but identified as a separate focus area with its own identity.

6.1.5 EXISTING AND FUTURE HAZARDS AND IMPACTS (Sec 12(j) SPLUMA)

There are a number of existing and future hazards and impacts that the municipality needs to manage in its SDF so as to ensure its economic, job creation and environmental sustainability, see Figure 6.1.5. These include:

6.1.5.1 Visual attractiveness of coastal wildernesses

- To find a balance between extent of wind farms / PV plants and development proposals, and maintaining wilderness appeal and attractions for coastal settlements, residents and visitors.

6.1.5.2 Traffic hazards

- High risk intersections at the Saldanha Road/Jacobsbaai junction and R 45/R27.
- Prevalence of heavy freight traffic (interlinks, 22 wheelers) outside of the industrial area (entering towns and on R27/R45).

6.1.5.3 Air and marine pollution and erosion

- Red dust plume staining buildings and vegetation from the tippler plant at the port to the southern extremities of Vredenburg.
- Pollution from inputs into mariculture operations in Saldana Bay affecting natural fish habitat.
- Pollution from ore loading facilities at terminal (manganese, lead, heavy metals and rare earth)s affecting marine habitat.
- Ocean dynamics created by port extensions eroding beaches particularly at Langebaan.

6.1.5.4 Sustainable aquifer recharge

- Land use activities above Langebaanweg and Elandsfontein aquifers which may or are polluting these ground water reserves.
- Unsustainable water extraction from aquifers which could impact on groundwater movements between the Berg River estuary and Saldana Bay and Langebaan lagoon.
Figure 6.1.5 Existing and Future Hazards and Impacts
6.1.5.5 Avifauna movement

- Possible impact of industrial and other activities on bird flight patterns between Saldanha Bay and Langebaan lagoon and the Berg River Estuary.

6.1.5.6 Biodiversity Conservation

- The DEA&DP, DEDAT and CapeNature investigated the possibility of pursuing a strategic biodiversity offset (Saldanha Industrial Corridor Strategic Offset Strategy, 2018) to unlock development potential in this growth node whilst ensuring that conservation targets for the ecosystem types in the municipality can be met and maintained properly.
- Loss of threatened habitat and species particularly in and around the proposed industrial area. The proposed offset strategy is intended to address this.

6.1.6 MUNICIPAL WIDE SDF

Overall Spatial Management Concept

(i) Areas of major growth (level 1 on Hierarchy, refer Figure 6.1.6)
- Vredenburg
- Saldanha
- Saldanha Port

Vredenburg and Saldanha have both been identified by the Growth Potential of Towns as towns with a relatively high growth potential in the Western Cape Province.

Figure 6.1.6 Spatial Management Concept and Hierarchy of Towns (source: Saldanha Bay SDF, 2011)

Significant growth is therefore expected within these urban areas and thus the spatial management concept proposes to focus this growth inwards via corridors and nodes to form a major growth centre.
It is envisaged that this proposal will eventually result in Vredenburg, Saldanha and the Port, growing together over time into a combined sustainable city area.

(ii) Areas of intermediate growth (Level 2 and 3 on Hierarchy, refer Figure 6.1.6)
- Langebaan
- St Helena Bay

The abovementioned areas have limited future development potential but play a specific regional role in supporting Vredenburg and Saldanha.

Langebaan and St Helena are identified as having substantial tourist potential but limited industrial activity. Langebaan furthermore has been identified as a classical example of a ‘dormitory town’ which serve Saldanha and Vredenburg. As such, future development in these towns should be focused around the following aspects:
- Strengthening the tourist potential of each of town;
- Developing Langebaan further to support the level 1 hierarchy centres;
- Providing a support base for, and encourage improvements in, the current fishing related industries in St Helena Bay.

(iii) Areas of limited growth (Level 4 on Hierarchy, refer Figure 6.1.6)
- Paternoster
- Hopefield
- Jakobsbaai

Paternoster and Jakobsbaai’s primary economic function is tourism. Hopefield is a rural service centre with limited growth potential. Potential does however exist to expand Hopefield’s regional role by expanding the West Coast National Park in the direction of Hopefield and relocating the entrance to the park to the Hopefield area. Should the relocation of the entrance be relocated in the near future, Hopefield’s regional role may have to be reconsidered.

The Growth Potential of Towns clearly states that limited infrastructural investment should be made in areas with limited growth potential. Subsequently, it is proposed to curb the urban extension of Paternoster, Jakobsbaai and Hopefield.

For various reasons, the extensive growth of these towns is either undesirable from a historical conservation point of view (Paternoster) or would be counterproductive to achieving sustainable development principles. The growth potential of Paternoster, Jakobsbaai and Hopefield is envisaged to be limited and investment in infrastructure would be more effective if focused in the major growth centres of the Saldanha Bay municipal area. Notwithstanding the above, protecting the natural and historical heritage, investing in the social infrastructure and creating compact quality environments for residents remain important aspects to address.

It is recommended that the hierarchy of towns as set out above be adopted and that all future decisions regarding the investment of public funds in infrastructure and community facilities be prioritised in accordance with the development / investment priorities as set out above.

(iv) Lower Order Rural Nodes
- Trekoskraal
- Green Village
- Koperfontein

A number of rural nodes or urban uses can be found in the rural hinterland of the Saldanha Bay Municipality. These commonly consist of a number of smallholdings or a school, post office, railway station and a shop in close proximity, serving the surrounding farms and farmworker communities. It can also be a resort in a rural setting or a forestry station or mining village, such as Green Village, located within the Saldanha Bay municipal area.

Existing non-agricultural development outside of urban areas must be managed to the advantage of the environment, rural character and agricultural development of the area. The range of land uses that could be permitted within a demarcated rural settlement are farm schools, places of instruction, agri-industries, tourist facilities and accommodation and bulk infrastructure.

Further to the above, it is important to note that the primary objective of identifying an area as a rural settlement and demarcating a rural edge, is to improve the level of land use control and environmental management for a specific area.
The following general guidelines should be applied to these rural settlements:

- Promote appropriately scaled tourism development based on the agricultural and heritage value of the region.
- Encourage rural cottage industries.
- Residential development should only be allowed subject to extensive investigation on the scale and form that retains the rural character of the settlement.
- Allow appropriately scaled tourism development based on the agricultural and heritage value of the region.
- The development footprint should be contained within the defined rural edge of the settlement.
- The provision of services, i.e. potable water, sewerage, solid waste disposal, etc. must be sustainably addressed before any further development in these areas can be considered.

Although Trekoskraal is not currently a bona fide rural settlement, it is proposed to develop this area as a future tourism and nature orientated resort development. A detailed development plan should be compiled for the Green Village node, to maximise its tourism potential and direct its future growth. Kopertfontein has an important service function to the agricultural sector of the surrounding area and its role and function requires further investigation.

It is recommended that the hierarchy of towns as set out above be adopted and that all future decisions regarding the investment of public funds in infrastructure and community facilities be prioritised in accordance with the development / investment priorities as set out above.

(v) The Urban Activity Corridor between Saldanha and Vredenburg

An important aspect of the overall spatial development concept is the promotion of the concept of a proposed activity corridor which is to link Saldanha and Vredenburg. Saldanha and Vredenburg are envisioned to function as two major metropolitan nodes. It is proposed that the link between these nodes takes the form of an Activity Corridor.

Conceptually, the following inputs are regarded as important:

- The corridor must support mobility as well as accessibility. Public transport provision is essential to structurally reinforce the proposed activity corridor.

Higher density uses abutting the proposed activity corridor will be enhanced by a public transport system and increases in population density will further serve to accumulate economies of scale and ensure that public transport use thresholds are sufficient to ensure the feasibility of establishing an efficient public transport system.

- Higher densities and mixed land uses (vertical and horizontal) must be encouraged along the corridor. At the outset, the increased densities will be moderate and applicable only to those properties fronting onto Saldanha Road, but over time, as the corridor develops, densities should be increased in the 800m walking distance zone along each side of the corridor.

- The third most important aspect to focus on is ensuring the spatial grouping of higher order uses into activity nodes which will support the corridor. A corridor consists of various projects which are developed over time. It is important that the incremental development of the corridor occurs in an orderly fashion. The character of the activity corridor will vary along its length, and it will for example not consist only of a uniform strip of business development. Variation is important for quality urban environments. Planning the corridor on a detail level is thus necessary to identify the different characteristics and varying densities along the length of the corridor. This will enable the incremental (but co-ordinated) development of individual projects over time which will collectively make up the “Saldanha-Vredenburg” Activity Corridor.

- The direction of growth must be focused to ensure the orderly development of the corridor. To this end, the following guidelines are proposed:

![Figure 6.1.7 Growth Management Concept for the Corridor](source: SBM SDF, 2011)
Growth must be stimulated from Vredenburg towards Saldanha by encouraging higher order facilities to locate along Saldanha Road in Vredenburg. Saldanha Road in Vredenburg is the logical ‘anchor point’ of the proposed corridor and it is envisaged that higher order facilities will be attracted to this location and direct growth in the direction of the proposed corridor (refer Figure 6.1.7).

Redevelopment within the Saldanha Central Business District area has been identified as an important issue to address to prevent urban stagnation. It is anticipated that growth along, and in the direction of the corridor, will follow at a slower pace in Saldanha due to the necessity for redevelopment of the existing area. For example, much of the existing urban fabric along the Main Road in Saldanha has been identified for moderate densification. Greenfields residential expansion is encouraged from the Saldanha end of the Corridor.

In the short term, the intersection at the Saldanha Road R45 (MR238) Road and Trunk Road 85 are envisaged to develop as a third node. This intersection will form the “hub” in a wheel, linking Jakobsbaai and Saldanha Port to the Activity Corridor (refer Figure 6.1.8).

The proposed corridor is the most significant proposed urban structuring element in the Municipal area and is regarded as a major opportunity for urban growth and future development in the Municipal area.

The above analysis, SPLUMA, LUPA and municipal policies, and inputs from GSRSIF and SBM SDF review public participation processes give rise to the following proposals for the SDF review at the municipal scale, see Figure 6.1.9 SDF map i.t.o SPLUMA Sec 21(b) and (d).

Figure 6.1.10 shows the spatial planning categories.

6.1.6.1 The coastal wilderness areas and rural hinterland including protecting agricultural resources, and promoting tourism and job creation.

- Create a continuous wilderness and biodiversity conservation fringe along the coast from Saldana Bay town to the municipal boundary with Berg river Municipality, building on the current private coastal nature reserves.
- Include a continuous walking and cycling trail from Tabakbaai to Berg River Municipal boundary.
- Linear strip developments in these locations should not be permitted. Tourism accommodation facilities not based on alienation of these units, clustered and sensitively set back from rocky headlands designed and positioned so that they don’t undermine the visual wilderness quality of the coast could be considered on merit. For example, promoting redevelopment of underutilised agricultural buildings for alternative tourism related facilities such as accommodation facilities, recreational facilities and similar that does not detract from the rural character and ambience.
- No further smallholdings are permitted. Tourism activities in addition to residential and market gardening activities are permitted on existing smallholdings.
- Wind turbine footings should be placed not closer than the 40m amsl contour to the coast so as to protect the scenic coastal landscapes.


The Western Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan (WC BSP) spatial data was used to develop the Greater Saldanha EMF which is more concerned with issues related to land use and development and indicates the...
Figure 6.1.9 Saldanha Bay Municipal Spatial Development Framework
environmental management priorities for the municipal area. The Strategic Environmental Management Plan (SEMP) facilitates the incorporation of sustainability issues into spatial development and land use planning and identified seven Environment Management Zones (EMZs) based on a combination of environmental and development attributes, namely: urban conservation, rural conservation, controlled development, restoration, agricultural development, industrial activity and urban development.

The EMZs act as a tool to assist in identifying appropriate locations for development proposals as it outlines management guidelines for each of the EMZs. In addition, the EMF identifies conflicts between land use objectives, i.e. EMZs that overlap and have differing aims (conservation vs. development).

Government intended to integrate the SDF and GS EMF spatially, given the shared objective of these two documents, and the red tape reduction that would arise from such an integration. Although this proposed integration would still result in two documents, the objective was to ensure that the spatial reflection of these documents was mirrored in both. The GS EMF made great strides in ensuring that the Spatial Planning Categories (as reflected in Figure 6.1.10) and the EMZs (as defined by the GS EMF) are aligned in their objectives. However, when comparing the town proposals, these two documents do not reflect the same proposed land use.

These areas were identified as “areas of competing land use” and in order to relay these unresolved areas of competing land use, each town map denotes affected NDAs with an asterisk, with an explanation inserted in the associated table. Readers are urged to interpret town proposal maps in conjunction with the GS EMF and to make use of the competing land use maps (see Figures 6.2.4, 6.3.4, 6.4.4, 6.5.4, 6.6.4, 6.8.4 and Annexure A) when formulating development proposals. Through continued intergovernmental collaboration, improved clarity and certainty will be provided in terms of the desired future land use.

6.1.6.3 The Strategic Biodiversity Offset Strategy

The offset trigger area (i.e. the Besaansklip Industrial Area) was examined and the initial availability and feasibility of offset receiving areas to compensate for the potential loss of biodiversity features were identified and evaluated, see Figure 6.1.11.

Five primary offset receiving areas are identified within SBM, but in order to meet the targets for ecosystems and other important biodiversity features additional areas are also identified, see Figure 6.1.12.
Figure 6.1.10  Saldanha Bay Municipal Spatial Planning Categories
Offset requirements for all impacted features in the trigger area would be fully achieved, if all primary offset and additional areas are secured for conservation. The core purpose of a strategic approach to offsets within the Besaansklip Industrial Area is that it would provide clarity in terms of required offsets for biodiversity impacts for development proposals within the corridor and streamline the offset assessment, design and approval process. Importantly, although it can provide guidance on the process both for the authorities involved with decision making and the developers, and result in more streamlined processes, it cannot replace or remove any legal requirements under NEMA or any other applicable law.

Biodiversity offsets should only be considered as a mitigation option once all feasible actions and alternatives, first to avoid or prevent impacts on important biodiversity, then to minimize impacts, and then to repair or rehabilitate areas harmed by impacts, have been taken into account. An important outcome of the strategy is the identification of the features which cannot be offset and which led to the designation of the core climate change corridor through Besaansklip Industrial Area as “non-developable”, see Figure 6.1.13.

The public and private sector all have a role to play to ensure their actions do not undermine this corridor indicated as Core Corridor: Industrial Area in Figure 6.1.14.

6.1.6.4 Inland CBA corridors with coastal corridors and network of open space supporting bio-diversity conservation, recreational needs of residents and the coastal and rural tourism economies.

- Promote continuous corridors through the industrial area, linking to the coastal strip to the west and the West Coast National Park to the Berg River in the east by extending existing protected areas including the West Coast National Park and the Hopefield nature reserve. Priority should be given to the West Coast National Park to Berg River / Hopefield linkage due to the presence of more intact natural remnants enabling a more easily achievable continuous corridor.

- Set back all development and ploughing 32m or to a setback line as determined by a freshwater ecologist or flood line specialist from the banks of all rivers and wetlands.
• Mining in the proposed CBA corridors should be discouraged. Mining can only possibly be considered if proposed mining areas are outside of existing mapped CBAs and if topsoil seed banks are stockpiled and the land properly shaped and rehabilitated afterwards. Attention must also be given to conservation of groundwater resources.

• A practical, rational approach should be taken to CBA conservation that sees consolidation of CBAs into corridors capable of being efficiently managed by a relevant conservation organisation or association.

• The WCESP advocates integrating: areas of climate change resilience; areas of large intact ecosystems; and ecological corridors that facilitate the movement of species in response to a changing environment. Within the municipality it identifies the West Coast National Park – Berg River Corridor as one of the Western Cape’s six priority landscape scale conservation corridors. The other municipal landscape level conservation corridor identified is the Vredenburg Peninsula Coastal Corridor.

6.1.6.5 The industrial area: high-tech economic development to take advantage of global demand opportunities and promote local employment and capacity building.

• Consolidate the industrial area in a quadrant between Vredenburg, Saldanha Town and the rail corridor. Industrial development east of the rail corridor (excluding the immediate back of port area) should only commence once a sufficient critical mass has been reached with industrial development to the west.

• Should developers wish to develop on the east, all develop costs and infrastructure related costs should be borne by the developer.

• This should be served by a dedicated road freight transport corridor along TR 85/1 on the R27 thus freeing up the other municipal roads from freight traffic.

• Development in the industrial area must take cognisance of Critical Bio-diversity area conservation Offset Strategy, see section 6.9.

6.16.6 Electricity

• The proposed line upgrade servitude route to the Blaauwklippen substation to abut the western and southern borders of the R27 and TR85/1 roads before heading south to the substation.

6.1.6.7 Transport

• The regional road system should be rationalised as follows:
  – MR533 - tourism gateway off R27 to St Helena Bay
  – R45 - urban gateway off R27 to Vredenburg and Paternoster
  – TR85/1 - freight road to IDZ and port
  – MR23 - urban/tourism gateway to Langebaan and Saldanha town and Jacobsbaai via MR559
  – MR559 - scenic route around to Saldanha town and Jacobsbaai

• Geometric design, signage and management (weigh bridges) to discourage industrial freight traffic on all routes except TR85/1.

• Cross-sections of routes to facilitate public and non-motorised transport.

• The rail line through Vredenburg between the OREX line rail over rail bridge and TR85/1 to be removed and a replacement link constructed between OP764 and Duferco siding.

• Jacobsbaai/Saldanha Road and R27/R45 intersections to be upgraded to ensure optimal safety and mobility.

• Consideration should be given to the development of a freight strategy and implementation plan.

• Truck stops may be located outside of the Urban Edge if this can be motivated with respect to traffic movement patterns and social factors.

6.1.6.8 Agriculture

• Dryland cropping agricultural areas around Vredenburg and east of Hopefield to be protected.

• The proposed Farmer Production Supply Unit (FPSU) program on the agricultural land east of Hopefield should be supported by ensuring that land uses that may undermine agricultural activity are discouraged.

6.1.6.9 Fishing and Aquaculture

• Inshore fishing areas and aquaculture within Saldanha Bay to be promoted.
• Strict controls with respect to pollution including phosphate mining to be implemented with respect to aquaculture in the Aquaculture Development Zone (ADZ) within Saldanha Bay so as to protect the marine ecology of the bay and Langebaan Lagoon.
• Small harbour development at St Helena Bay, Pepper Bay and Saldanha Bay harbours to be supported with respect to fishing and tourism.

6.1.6.10 Urban Areas

• Existing towns and villages should be compacted and made more walkable by infill and projects and densification opportunities.
• These opportunities within the Urban Edge should be fully exploited before further outward expansion occurs.
• Conventional services should be promoted and upgraded only within existing urban areas.
• Long term growth of Saldanha town towards Vredenburg to be promoted.
• Development proposals consistent with urban development in existing urban areas should be permitted.

6.1.6.11 Proposed resort development node at Trekkoskraal

• A development is proposed at Trekoskraal west of Vredenburg and midway between Jacobs Bay and Paternoster along the coast. The area has been contentious for rampant illegal camping which have resulted in degradation of the natural environment, presenting problems for land owners as well as the authorities. Land use proposals have been submitted aimed at development in the subject locality.
• Development of the area should be centered around the historic tourism use and build upon the established reputation that the area has for recreational use. Any development should illustrate a sense of place and character which can rival the established townships of Paternoster and Jacobs Bay and create a tourism destination of exceptional distinction, based on the urban fabric and design. Development should be restricted to the degraded land portions.

6.1.6.12 The Need for Detailed Precinct Plans (Sec 21(l) (l) SPLUMA)

• Sections 6.2 to 6.11 show more detailed plans for each of the settlements. For some settlements the need for further detailed precinct plans is indicated on their spatial plans.
• Where appropriate, in terms of the SPLUMA Sec 21(l) (ii), the municipality may deem it necessary to create overlay zones for certain areas or precincts in which shortened land use development procedures may be applicable and land use schemes may be so amended.