



Knysna

Municipality ♦ Munisipaliteit ♦ uMasipala
INCLUSIVE. INNOVATIVE. INSPIRED.

KNYSNA MUNICIPALITY
PRE –APPLICATION MEETING

Minutes of meeting held on the

29 JANUARY 2026

At

09:00

Microsoft Teams

MINUTES

No	Item	Presentation
1.	Opening and Welcoming	Mr S Madumbo
2.	Attendance Mr S Madumbo (Chairperson) – KM : Town Planning (KM) Ms N Vonya – KM : Town Planning (KM) Ms L Mniki – KM : Town Planning (KM) Miss S. Sitinga: Town Planning (KM) Ms. B Koti: Town Planning (KM) Ms. N Nkoane: Aesthetics Committee (KM) Mr Raymond Talmaggies: Technical Services (KM) Mr Mulalo Maseneke: Environmental Management (KM) Steward Mqhele Vanessa Movius Camille Burger Andre Vercueil Marike Vreken Lourens du Toit	

3.	Items for consideration <i>*Please note: Meeting minutes do not reflect verbatim discussions</i>	
3.1	<u>Erf 653, Rheenendal – Application for Temporary Land Use Departure</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> Steward: the application is for a temporary departure on the property, for a liquor store. Rhenendal currently has a lot of illegal liquor stores, the property owner wishes to legalise the existing liquor store. SHM: the application was already submitted and a few concerns were raised by our department. There has been applications of this kind in the past. One was refused for a rezoning to business as it was not desirable. One was previously successful, a street away. And that was a temporary departure. Concerning your application, there was a number of matters that needed to be clarified. Looking at the correspondence, the issue was the existing dwelling house without building plans. There also needs to be clarification on what portion of the property will be used for the liquor shop. Additionally, based on the images, there was also a concern regarding the existing deck. The main concern was that once the temporary departure is approved, the establishment might grow into something bigger in terms of its operation, the application therefore needs to demonstrate how this will be mitigated against. Steward: concerning the deck it is clarified that the liquor store is contained within the garage and the public will not access the deck which is only accessible through the main house, and this space is mainly for the use of the permanent occupants of the property. The issue with changes on the operations will be addressed as it is a valid concern. SHM: the motivation needs to be explicit in clarifying how the operation will not be later unlawfully expanded. Parking on the property is also a concern as the garage will be used for the store, the motivation must clarify what parking provisions will be made for the use of the dwelling house, as well as for retail use (liquor store), in terms of the Zoning Scheme Bylaw.	KM Officials and Steward Mqhele

	The applicant is advised to refer to previous applications of this nature within the same area.	
3.2	<u>Erf 2187, Knysna – Application for Subdivision</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> VM: the proposal is to subdivide a property into two portions. SHM: the purpose of this meeting is for applicants to present their proposal and are advised and it is advised that the clients sources the services of a professional town planner. The application needs to be motivated for in terms of policy and desirability. The application is not merely a matter of completing an application form, the application has to be in line with the Knysna Spatial Planning and Land Use Management By-law. There seems to be a previously approved subdivision on the property, there is an SG diagram dated 1995, and another a some years ago. The client is advised to include the application history on the motivation, and the client is welcome to visit the Town Planning office to go through the file to establish and clarify on the history.	KM Officials and Vanessa Movius
3.3	<u>Erf 2352, Knysna – Application for Rezoning, Subdivision and Departure</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> CB: the subject property is located within upper old place. The property has an existing house that is placed on the upper side of the property. The property wishes to regularise the use of the property by rezoning the southern part adjoining the street to general residential one to allow for a group housing. The proposed units will be for lower income one bedroom units. There are also a few encroachments on the property that need to be addressed, as well as new encroachments resulting from the subdivision. Another aspect of the property is relating to title conditions that need to be addressed, as well as a site development plan and an administrative penalty application.	KM Officials and Camille Burger

	SHM: the owner of the property built a number of units without permission. This is a serious contravention in terms of municipal services alone. This needs to be argued extensively on the administrative penalty application. This demonstrates complete disregard for the planning bylaw. CB: the proposal is in line with the SDF and is compatible with the character of the area. SHM: the applicant's sentiments are agreed to with to some extent. However, on Milkwood Drive, there are flats and group housing developments on a number of properties on the street, it appears there is a node for higher density development, however the subject property is a bit out of that. From the local area context. However if you are going to densify in a single residential area and change zoning, the general residential category is different in terms of density. Additionally, the issue is that the proposal has to be consistent with the character of the area, regarding the subdivision, this might not be the case. The precedent has not been set. The application motivation should address this concern. CB: counter arguments will be highlighted to address these concerns. The SDF will be interrogated to give guide. The zoning schemes definition of group housing aligns with this proposal, and it ticks all the boxes. SHM: the proposal is for a subdivision to portion A and a remainder. How will portion A obtain access? CB: there is an existing right of way servitude. SHM: the servitude is not desirable, although there is a number of them in the area, there seems to be neighbourly conflicts when it comes to such, the application needs to address how this will be managed. There needs to also be a notarial agreement in this regard, considering that ownership changes over the years. CB: the proposal will be revisited and consideration will be given for a panhandle. Another consideration was that if there is a panhandle on the righthand boundary, there will be a double access, which will not be desirable.	
--	--	--

	SHM: compliance with general residential zoning requires that development be uniform, and a design guidelines is required. This needs to be demonstrated on the application, as it is a parameter for group housing. Compliance with the to both development parameters and requirements must be demonstrated. At this stage, the design manual is not to be submitted, but the motivation must speak to issues such as architectural style. CB: there are seven proposed departures, for an outbuilding, retaining wall, double car port, group housing units building lines, boundary wall height. The property is on a steep slope, hence the need for the boundary wall. SHM: why not a stepped wall, instead of a wall that high? CB: only a small section on the driveway, where there is an excavation, which makes the wall very high. SHM: the proposed departure on the height of the wall is excessive and the proposal needs to make strong arguments to that.	
3.4	<u>Erf 774, Knysna – Application for Departure</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> AV: the existing house on the property encroaches on the street building line, as well as the northern lateral building line. Therefore the application is to regularise the existing dwelling house by applying for the relation of these building lines. The proposed additions to the structure did not encroach on any building lines. Shm: the applicant states that there is no record of existing approved building plans. The building has been in existence for some time and there is evidence to that fact and proof that it is legal despite not having approved building plans. AV: it seems the building has been in existence from the 1900s, looking at the architectural style. There is a record for an application for a soakaway, but that is not applicable. Other than that there is no other record on the property. An application for heritage western cape has already been submitted and is in for consideration. SHM: this will be taken into advice from the building control department to establish its legal standing, to establish if there is a necessary	KM Officials and Andre Vercueil

	application to be submitted, as there was no applicable building line when the property was built and only the building plans for the extension would be required. The sceptic tank the applicant mentions can also be used as evidence. The applicant is advised to go through that plan again and establish when it was done.	
3.5	<u>Erf 21266, Knysna (A Portion of Erf 21001) Knysna – Application for Subdivision</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> MV: the property is a group housing property that was approved in 2015. The property was approved for 10 tiny homes in 2022, with an open space included. The owner of the property wishes to subdivide it into three properties. SHM: the issues of densification will be critical, as policy speaks to densification to address the issue of the housing crisis in the town. This also raises issues of efficient use of land. MV: the interest from the outside in the tiny homes was very low, and its intention was to provide affordable housing. SHM: how do the property sizes compare to the surrounding properties? MV: it seems to be in line with the neighbouring previously approved properties. SHM: will they be freehold properties? MV: yes SHM: there needs to be compliance with the design manual. However, the site itself, will it have compliance with group housing in terms of the zoning scheme bylaw? MV: That is one of the questions we seek to address SHM: there is a good case for a rezoning, however there is also no issue with keeping the group housing, however, compliance must be demonstrated. The refuse room is at the front of the estate. Waste management will likely require clarification on how that will work. The applicant is advised to clarify this on the motivation. SHM: if there is anything applicable or relevant from the previous approval, the applicant is advised to also address this on the motivation. The applicant is also advised to be explicit in their arguments for the proposed property sizes.	KM Officials and Marika Vreken

	MULALO: there was an environmental authorization granted with the SDP. There should've been a condition that if there is a diversion from that authorization, the competent authority be notified.	
3.6	<u>Remainder of Erf 21001, Knysna – Application for Departure</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> <u>MV:</u> this property is adjacent to the previous subject property on the agenda. It's a small holding house. In 2022, when the amended layout was approved, this property was reduced. The prescribed building line is 10m. an sdp was previously approved. The property owners wish to build a second storey on the existing approved dwelling house. There will also be a building line relaxation required. An existing tiny home will be moved to this property for a second dwelling, and a relaxation for the building line for this will be required. <u>SHM:</u> small holding allows for a dwelling house and a second dwelling provided that its small than 60m. The proposed additional floor, will require a departure. The application seems straight forward. <u>MV:</u> Is there a need for HOA consent or the neighbouring properties, or the normal advertising process will be followed? <u>SHM:</u> the normal advertising process requires all neighbouring properties to be notified. The neighbouring properties may give comments or support on the proposal.	KM Officials and Marike Vreken
3.7	<u>Erf 3926, Sedgefield – Application for Consent Use & Administrators Consent</u> <u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u> Lourens du Toit: a previous pre-application consultation was done on this property, but there are some matters of clarification from the previous minutes. The previous preconsultation was for a warehouse. The owner wishes to establish more options. The proposed options are listed as consent uses on the zoning of the subject property.	KM Officials and Lourens du Toit

	SHM: that zoning came from the subdivision of at the time of establishment of the township. A zoning certificate was recently issued and there might be a restriction on the use of the property. Business zone I, the property was limited to a nursery. In terms of the 1980 sedgefield scheme, so there is a restriction on the use of this property. For a consent use it may be acceptable, however, it seems this proposed use might not be compatible with the area, as it is within a residential area, and at the end of a residential street, and to obtain access to the property one would have to go through the whole residential area, and therefore will have impact. The nursery was probably to minimize impact. Warehousing and motor repair garage might not be desirable. These uses in terms of urban form might not be appropriate. Although it possibly wouldn't be visible from the street, it might be higher than the neighbouring single residential properties and will therefore stand out. Lourens du Toit: there is a community zone and informal housing neighbouring the property, therefore the subject property would also be a buffer between the residential area and the other two properties. Would that make a difference? SHM: the applicant is advised that they may make that argument. The access point through the panhandle would not be desirable considering the neighbouring properties. SHM: an extract from the sedgefield LSDF recognizes the area for residential purposes. The policy suggests residential development and that means the policy does not support the proposal. Lourens: the proposal is a low intensity use and is to provide garaging for trailers and boats for properties in the area who seem not to have enough space for such garaging and storage. SHM: the scale will be important in that will the use be compatible with the character of the area. The applicant is advised how the suggested low impact will work. Lourens: What's the maximum development potential? What land use would be more applicable? There is also a title deed condition on the property. SHM: condition D15, the property may not be used for any other uses other than residential properties. This is a third party condition and	
--	---	--

	would require consent from the transferer. Therefore no removal of restrictions will be required.	
4.	The Chairperson closed the meeting.	

/SS