



Knysna

Municipality ♦ Munisipaliteit ♦ uMasipala
INCLUSIVE. INNOVATIVE. INSPIRED.

KNYSNA MUNICIPALITY
PRE –APPLICATION MEETING

Minutes of meeting held on the

16 July 2026

At

09:00

Microsoft Teams

MINUTES

No	Item	Presentation
1.	Opening and Welcoming	Ms L Mniki
2.	Attendance Ms L Mniki (Chairperson) – Town Planning (KM) Miss S. Sitinga- Town Planning (KM) Miss N Vonya- Town Planning (KM) Miss S Phontshi- Town Planning (KM) Ms. N Nkoane: Aesthetics Committee (KM) Mr Mulalo Maseneke: Environmental Management (KM) Delarey Ferriera Theuns Mynhardt Lundikazi Khuphiso Liezemarie Hussey	

3.	Items for consideration <i>*Please note: Meeting minutes do not reflect verbatim discussions</i>	
3.1	<p><u>Erf 6174, Knysna - Application for Departure</u></p> <p><u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Delarey: the property had approved plans from 2006, for renovations of a garage and a veranda. In 2021, under new owners who wanted to the property, it was discovered that there were deviations, and the existing gazebo and wendy house were never approved. The current owners now wish to sell the property; however, they wish to regularise these structures. Therefore, an application for a departure for the relaxation of the prescribed building lines is proposed.</p> <p>SHM: it's the as-built roof, as built gazebo and as built wendy house, and existing garage. Based on the drawings, a car port and garage are different and specifically defined in the zoning scheme, and the differentiation has different impact differences on the street building lines, which is a key consideration in terms of impact on the street.</p> <p>The application therefore is there application for the relaxation of the street building line. Additionally, because its an existing contravening structure a determination for the administrative penalty application is also required. There are no applicable restrictive title deed conditions</p> <p>SHM: The municipal approval on the 2006 plans is not very clear. Are there any changes on the carport?</p> <p>Delarey: The owners enlarged the distance of the carport; therefore, it is now a garage and no longer complies to a car port. There are no changes on the carport. There is a stamp on the application.</p>	KM Officials and Delarey Ferriera
3.2	<p><u>Amendment of the TIHOA Constitution</u></p> <p><u>Discussion and Recommendations:</u></p> <p>Theuns Mynhardt : The HOA has been working on their constitution and finalised the proposed changes and amendments and is ready for submission.</p> <p>The minor changes include changes on definitions. Secondly, about ten years ago the businesses in the estate were not doing well and there was a desire to relax a few of the rules. It was concluded that the calculations for residential levies and commercial levies be</p>	KM Officials and Theuns Mynhardt

	<p>calculated on the same rate at a special general meeting, and that was in effect. Two years ago, one of the members took the estate to cesos, in that residential levies should be less. Therefore, the TIHOA wants to go back to the original leavy rates. Residential had less levy rates.</p> <p>SHM: the applicant is advised to look at the planning bylaw, section 29 for reference to HOAs. It is interpreted that the constitution may be amended at any point and it is applicable as soon as it is approved at the AGM. The Municipality is required for endorsement, provided the changes have no impact on municipal services.</p> <p>Section 29 (3), sets out what should be included in the constitution. What we would ask for is that you include one document that highlights or tracks the proposed changes so that its easier for the department to go through. The person submitting the allocation must also obtain legal consent from the HOA to allow him to submit the application.</p> <p>The application must be sent to Nosipho Vonya or Siphosethu Phontshi Via email.</p>	
3.3.	<p><u>Remainder of Portion 16 of Farm Nr.216, Knysna – Site Development Plan</u></p> <p>LH: the application was recently approved for four additional dwelling units and five farmworkers accommodation and other agricultural activities and a main house. With one farmworkers accommodation on the high watermark. The SDP was not approved. And there is a condition that reads that “any additional farmworkers accommodation should be based on bona fide agricultural activity. An SDP application is required, and we would like to know if its necessary.</p> <p>SHM: yes an SDP is required, the approval does not give you agricultural workers accommodation, as this is a primary right. The approval is for within 1km from high watermark, in terms of the Knysna Zoning Scheme Bylaw (2020). What is suggested is that you can have more than one, but any more would be dependent on the extent of agricultural activity. Support from agricultural department must be obtained. The SDP approves with a minimum of one, the rest should be shown on the plan and specified that the additional</p>	KM Officials and Lundikazi Khuphiso

	<p>units are dependent on the support of agriculture department. The history of the application and property must be included.</p> <p>The scheme allows for as many farmworkers' accommodation as possible, but your SDP must show the extent of agricultural activity to support the need for agricultural works accommodation.</p> <p>Should any placement of buildings change, another SDP would be required.</p> <p>LH: a new SDP will be submitted with all the conditions on the plan, so that there is no need for any new application with every structure being built. There is land already under cultivation which should support the proposal.</p> <p>SHM: The environmental authorisation was already obtained and will be attached with the application documents. The application will be circulated to the internal departments, including environmental services for their support.</p>	
3.4.	<p><u>Erf 160, Sedgefield – Site Development Plan Approval</u></p> <p>LH: this is about three different applications, and our main aim is to find out what process would be best. The property was previously a business site, there is an existing approval, and the property is currently vacant.</p> <p>Two of the properties are owned by same people. They obtained a lease agreement from the municipality to use a road for access and parking. The initial SDP shows a smaller building; the new proposal shows a bigger building and is different from the initial one. The intention is to add another building and an overall reconsideration of the site plan. A servitude registration is also required. We seek to confirm if a road closure and rezoning will be required and the approval of the lease in terms of section 15.</p> <p>There is also an SP approval required, can we submit that also simultaneously with the above, or one after another.</p> <p>Neil Moolman: the proposal is for a mixed-use development, residential flats at the top and retail and commercial spaces at the bottom.</p> <p>SHM: there is an existing gap in the middle-income residential properties. Fortunately, Sedgefield already has that type of the development in that vicinity, so that will make a good connection.</p> <p>The planning bylaw does allow for the applications to go simultaneously. The zoning scheme also speaks to this on clause in terms of Clause 23(3) and (4)</p>	<p>KM Officials and Lundikazi Khuphiso/Liezemarie Hussey & Niel</p>

	<p>The lease area, this is a public road, and parking is a primary right.</p> <p>LH: road closure will be done so it will no longer a public road and will be rented and maintained privately. Advice will be obtained from a conveyancer.</p> <p>We also wish to establish if there will be a need to rezone the street? There might be a need to change to allow for private use rights (private parking).</p> <p>Looking at Section 45 of the zoning scheme bylaw must be given consideration. Without that space the requirements won't be met.</p> <p>Clause 43 is also applicable.</p> <p>In the discussions with the conveyancer, it must be established if a lease agreement will be required.</p> <p>SHM: the entire development is codependent and cannot be broken up in portions.</p> <p>Niel: On the development side of things, we would like to submit the SDP for the whole development, but if it could also be phased.</p> <p>SHM: the SDP can be considered in its entirety. The phased approach would have specific conditions that detail at what stage does the next phase start, and how is the first phase compliant, specifically with parking.</p> <p>The properties could be linked. The legal issues need to be in place first, then the phase approach would become easier and workable. It is also important to note that occupation would not be obtained without parking compliance. A phased approach would also be erf specific, to make it easier, because plans must be submitted for each a specific erf.</p> <p>LH: there was a condition (Condition 4) of approval for an SDP submission, there could also be an amendment of approval application submitted.</p> <p>SHM: the most important thing is to get the closure done and the SDP application can be done in its entirety.</p> <p>SHM: the previous approvals must be scrutinised to confirm what is required. The land legal aspect is administrative, but the closure is required from the municipality, as well as a possible rezoning to allow for registration.</p> <p>Parallel to that, and SDP application can also be submitted.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Lundi: would it be possible to separate it since the SDP will not require a full public participation?</p> <p>SHM: the applicant can make that choice.</p> <p>The parking requirements and compliance must be demonstrated for each portion. The plan as it is might not comply, and there might be a need to change the design.</p> <p>Designated delivery space must be provided on site. Services issues must also be looked. The services on the road must also be protected.</p> <p>LH: A services report was done for the commercial space, but not on the residential aspect.</p>	
4.	The Chairperson closed the meeting.	

/SS