



Knysna

Municipality • Munisipaliteit • uMasipala
INCLUSIVE. INNOVATIVE. INSPIRED.

KNYSNA MUNICIPALITY

PRE-APPLICATION MEETING

Minutes of meeting held on the

28 October 2021

At

11:00

Microsoft Teams

MINUTES

| No | Item | Presentation |
|----|--|--------------|
| 1. | Opening and Welcoming | Mr S Madumbo |
| 2. | Attendance Mr S. Madumbo (Chairperson) – KM : Town Planning (KM) Mr S. Mqhele – KM : Town Planning (KM) Ms N. Vonya – KM: Town Planning Mr M Mdena- Applicant Planner (MM) Ms De Bruyn- Applicant Planner (MDB) Mr H Labuschagne- Applicant Planner (MV) Mr D Bastian- Applicant Planner (MV) Ms M Vreken- Applicant (MV) Apologies Ms L. Mniki | |

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| 3. | Items for consideration | |
| 3.4 | <p><u>Erf 1633, Knysna- Application for departure</u></p> <p><u>Discussion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant motivate that the owners of Erf 1633, Knysna bought the subject property in 2019 and plan to do some additions and alterations on the existing single storey house. The improvements will entail changes to the garage and kitchen, two new en suite bedrooms, covered patios as well as internal changes. • An application (hereinafter referred to as the 2020-application), to adjust the particular land use rights was submitted in 2020 but it encountered resistance from an immediately adjoining neighbour and then the Leisure Isle Residents Association [LIRA]. The application was subsequently refused by the Knysna Planning Tribunal. After due consideration of their options (as explained below), the landowners then decided not to appeal the decision but rather to submit a revised application (hereinafter referred to as the 2021-application). • The applicant argues that after the refusal letter the owners of the subject property, had the idea of developing the property within the development parameters of the zoning scheme, but this according to the applicant would have left the objector to the 2020-application at a disadvantage. The owner then reached a compromise with the objector and opted to submit a revised application. • The applicant was asked to explain the differences between the current proposed application and the one that was refused, to which he responded by stating that the owners compromised on the design of the proposed house and obtained support from the objector, which they did not have in the initial application. The applicant however admitted that the end product of the proposed dwelling unit is not going to be vastly different. <p><u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant was informed that the reasons for the refusal of the previous application are important factors to consider. In addition to this, the applicant would need to motivate whether circumstances have changed from the initial application to the currently proposed one. It is important for the applicant to demonstrate whether the reasons for the | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>refusal of the initial application is still valid in this application. The rule is that for a new application to be considered it has to be different from the old one.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant was advised to highlight what the agreement was that was reached by the two parties and how it influences that proposed application. • The normal submission requirements in terms of Section 38 of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-law. | |
| 4. | The Chairperson closed the meeting. | |

/smq