

3. NOTULES VAN VORIGE VERGADERINGS VOORGELê VIR BEKRAGTING**3.1 NOTULE VAN ALGEMENE RAADSVERGADERING GEHOU OP:**

23 Februarie 2016

BESLUIT 41/2016

Die Notule word as korrek en volledig bekragtig.

3.2 NOTULE VAN SPESIALE RAADSVERGADERING GEHOU OP:

17 Maart 2016

BESLUIT 42/2016

- (i) Die Notule word as korrek en volledig bekragtig, **uitgesluit punt 3** ten opsigte van "Department of Finance: Draft Budget for the 2016/2017 Financail Year."
- (ii) Dat die Direkteur Finansiële Dienste die gewysigde begroting vir 2016/2017 aan Raadslede beskikbaar stel.
- (iii) Dat wysigings aan die bogenoemde dokument voorsiening moet maak vir:
 - a. R400 000 vir die wandelpad in L'Agulhas.
 - b. R400 000 vir die aanbou van toilette by sub-ekonomiese huise.
 - c. Bemarking begroting verander vanaf R690 000 na R400 000.
 - d. Sosiale ondersteuning begroting verander vanaf R50 000 na R240 000.
 - e. Veranderinge aan die kapitale begroting ten opsigte van meubels soos voorgestel deur die Uitvoerende Burgemeester.
- (iv) Dat die Bemarking sowel as die Sosiale- en Ontwikkeling en Ondersteuningsbeleide hersien word tesame met die ander begrotingsbeleide.

4. NOTULES VAN DIE UITVOERENDE BURGEMEESTERSKOMITEE VERGADERINGS OOR BESLUIE DEUR HOM GENEEM SAAM MET DIE BURGEMEESTERSKOMITEE**4.1 NOTULES VAN UBK VERGADERINGS GEHOU OP:**

16 Februarie 2016

BESLUIT 43/2016

Die Raad neem kennis van bogenoemde UBK Notule.

5. NOTULES VAN KOMITEE VERGADERINGS VOORGELê VIR KENNISNAME**5.1 WYKSKOMITEE VERGADERINGS GEHOU OP:**

- WYK 1 : 26 Januarie en 25 Februarie 2016
- WYK 2 : 25 Januarie 2016
- WYK 3 : 27 Januarie en 26 Februarie 2016
- WYK 4 : 15 Februarie 2016
- WYK 5 : 8 Februarie 2016

BESLUIT 44/2016

Die Raad neem kennis van bogenoemde Wykskomitee Notules.

5.2 **mSCOA STEERING COMMITTEE GEHOU OP:**

19 Februarie 2016

BESLUIT 45/2016

Die Raad neem kennis van bogenoemde mSCOA Steering Committee Notule.

5.3 **ICT STEERING COMMITTEE GEHOU OP:**

- 19 November 2015
- 19 Februarie 2016

BESLUIT 46/2016

Die Raad neem kennis van bogenoemde ICT Steering Committee Notules.

6. **SAKE VOORTSPRUITEND UIT NOTULES**

Geen.

7. **VERKLARINGS EN/OF MEDEDELINGS DEUR DIE VOORSITTER**

7.1 **BRIEWE VAN DANK / VIR KENNISNAME:** Vir kennisname aangeheg op bladsy 1 tot 3.

7.2 **FUNKSIES VIR DIE MAAND**

Die Speaker verwys na die skedule van die **IDP/BUDGET IMBIZO's** wat die Burgemeester se kantoor beskikbaar gestel het en versoek Raadslede om Wykskomitees dienooreenkomstig in te lig.

7.3 **AANWYS VAN AFGEVAARDIGDES**

Die volgende lede word aangewys om die Raad te verteenwoordig by SALGA se "SPECIAL NATIONAL MEMBERS ASSEMBLY" op 19/20 Mei 2016 in Port Elizabeth.

BESLUIT 47/2016

- (i) Dat Raadsheer Nieuwoudt en die Munisipale Bestuurder die Raad sal verteenwoordig by bogenoemde vergadering.
- (ii) Dat kennis geneem word dat Raadsheer Nieuwoudt ook die Overberg Distriksmunisipaliteit verteenwoordig.

7.4 **DRINGENDE SAKE DEUR DIE SPEAKER VOORGELê**

Geen.

8. **VERKLARINGS EN/OF MEDEDELINGS DEUR DIE UITVOERENDE BURGEMEESTER**

Geen.

9. **ONDERHOUDE MET AFGEVAARDIGDES EN/OF ANDER BESOEKE**

9.1 **Out The Box Productions**

Meneer C de Vries en me D Newman gee aan die Raad terugvoer ten opsigte van "The Weekender Arniston"- fees wat gedurende Desember 2015 in Arniston aangebied is. Hul terugvoer handel oor die familie-fokus, verskeidenheid van musikante, komedie, plaasmark, media bloodstelling asook die sosiale- en ekonomiese impak wat die fees op die KAM gebied gehad het. Hulle verwys ook na "lesse-geleer".

"The Weekender - Arniston" word weer beplan vir 2 tot 4 Desember 2016.

BESLUIT 48/2016

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die genoemde terugvoer.

9.2 **ArkIndustries**

Menere Rowan Rabe, Adton Domingo en A J de Wet verteenwoordig ArkIndustries tydens die inligtingsessie wat meestal 'n aanbieding van REIA (Renewable Energy Intergrators Africa) is. REIA is 'n sub-kontrakteur van Ark Industries wat verantwoordelik is vir die oprigting en die befondsing van die aanleg.

Mnr Domingo verseker die Raad dat die befondsing vir die "Green City Model" bykans gefinaliseer is om 'n "Zero-waste-aanleg" binne KAM op te rig. Hy verwys na die 3 aanlegte wat wel in die wêreld opgerig is, en fokus onderandere op (i) Fuel preparation, (ii) e-waste, (iii) Syngas cooling and cleaning systems, (iv) D4 reactor Units, asook (v) die Bio-synfuel reformer en Aquaponics- energy 3 systems. Geen suksesvolle aanleg is al in Suid-Afrika aangê nie. Hy verwys verder na die tydskedule en wys dat die aanleg die eerste water kan suiwer in September 2016 en die eerste "Syngas" sal in Mei / Junie 2017 beskikbaar kan wees.

BESLUIT 49/2016

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die genoemde terugvoer.

9.3 **Mnr Martin Kruger** het verskoning gevra aangesien die ontwikkelaar van die "Aftreeoord" van die projek onttrek het.

9.4 **Mr Ashville Riddles:** Chief Risk Officer of the ODM Shared Risk Service do a presentation on the strategic risk register (sien agenda item 10.1.1, waarin besluite soos geneem vervat is).

10. **ITEMS NA DIE RAAD VERWYS VIR OORWEGING**

Bladsy: Agenda

10.1 **MUNISIPALE BESTUURDER / MUNICIPAL MANAGER**

10.1.1 Strategic Risk Analysis: 2015/16

4

10.2 **KORPORATIEWE DIENSTE / CORPORATE SERVICES**

10.2.1 Bepaling van aantal Raadslede

5

10.2.2 Appeal: Departure erf 4818, Bredasdorp

5 - 10

10.2.3 Appeal: Departure erf 4219, Bredasdorp

10 - 15

10.2.4 Finansiële ondersteuning: Napier Kaasfabriek

15 - 16

10.2.5 Municipal Corporate Governance ICT Policies

16 - 18

- 10.3 **GEMEENSKAPSDIENSTE / COMMUNITY SERVICES**
- 10.3.1 Eksterne Beurstoekenings vir 2016 18
- 10.4 **FINANSIËLE DIENSTE / FINANCIAL SERVICES**
- 10.4.1 Oudit Aksieplan: Maandelikse vordering - Maart 2016 19
- 10.4.2 Aproval of Expenditure Virement
11. **ITEMS DEUR DIE UITVOERENDE BURGEMEESTER / -BURGEMEESTERSKOMITEE NA DIE RAAD VERWYS VIR OORWEGING**
- 11.1 Gebruik van Struisbaai Gemeenskapsaal en Sportgronde 20 - 21
- 11.2 Markdag te Struisbaai-Noord 21
- 11.3 Napier Rolbalklub: Afskrywing van Skuld.
12. **ADDISIONELE ITEMS DEUR DIE RAAD HANTEER**
- Geen.
13. **DRINGENDE SAKE DEUR DIE MUNISIPALE BESTUURDER**
- Geen.
14. **OORWEGING VAN KENNISGEWING VAN MOSIES**
- Geen mosies is ontvang nie.
15. **OORWEGING VAN KENNISGEWING VAN VRAE**
- Geen.
16. **OORWEGING VAN DRINGENDE MOSIES**
- Geen mosies is ontvang nie.
17. **VERSLAG DEUR MUNISIPALE BESTUURDER OOR DIE UITVOERING VAN RAADSBESLUIE**
Lys van onafgehandelde Raadsbesluite verskyn op **bladsy 21**.
18. **IN-KOMITEE VERSLAE**: Die In-Komitee agenda word direk na hierdie agenda ingebind.
19. **SLUITING**

10. ITEMS NA DIE RAAD VERWYS VIR OORWEGING

10.1 MUNISIPALE BESTUURDER / MUNICIPAL MANAGER

10.1.1 STRATEGIC RISK ANALYSIS: 2015/16

REPORT BY THE MANAGER STRATEGIC SERVICES

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To present the revised Strategic Risk Assessment to the Council for approval.

BACKGROUND

During January the Council considered a report on the Municipality's Strategic Risks following a risk assessment that was undertaken in house during the second half of 2015 while the establishment of the shared risk management service was being finalised.

The Council approved the following strategic risks:

1. Changes associated with Municipal Elections
2. Land invasions due to insufficient serviced land
3. Establishment of functional ward committees after elections
4. Poor clarification of roles and responsibilities in relation to the administration of personnel data.
5. Financial viability of the municipality
6. MSCOA
7. Alignment of planning and budgeting processes
8. Control of Standby / Overtime Payments

The Chief Risk Officer (CRO) of the ODM Shared Risk Service reviewed the Municipality's risk assessment during a series of workshops in February 2016. The purpose of these workshops was to evaluate and refine our risks in line with the shared service agreement and the requirements of the electronic risk management system. The following table indicates the proposed revised strategic risks.

TOP 5 STRATEGIC RISKS	RESIDUAL RISK RATING
1. Changes associated with Municipal Elections	18
2. Land invasions	15
3. Financial viability of the municipality	15
4. MSCOA	12
5. Establishment of a client service centre	10
6. Functional ward committees after elections	9

The Chief Risk Officer (Mr A Riddles) will do a presentation to Council and determine if there should be any amendments / additions to the strategic risk register.

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION

For discussion and consideration by Council.

Na die konsultasieproses met Mnr Ashville Riddles: Chief Risk Officer of the ODM Shared Risk Service word die Strategiese Top 5 risiko's van die raad soos volg gewysig:

RESOLUTION 50/2016

- (i) That Council take note of the review outcome.
- (ii) That Council take note that the review will take place monthly as well as monitor monthly.
- (iii) That risks "Illegal Buildings" and "Establishment of a client service centre" be handled within the "Operational Risk Plan".

TOP 5 STRATEGIC RISKS	RESIDUAL RISK
1. Financial viability of the municipality	Strategic Risk
2. MSCOA	Strategic Risk
3. Municipal Elections	Strategic Risk
4. Functional ward committees after elections	Strategic Risk
5. Land invasions Illegal buildings	Strategic Risk Operational Risk

10.2 **KORPORATIEWE DIENSTE / CORPORATE SERVICES**

10.2.1 **BEPALING VAN AANTAL RAADSLEDE / DETERMINATION OF NUMBER OF COUNCILLORS : BUITENGEWONE PROVINSIALE KOERANT / EXTRAORDINARY PROVINCIAL GAZETTE (DKD)**

DOEL VAN VERSLAG / PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

Om die Raad in te lig ten opsigte van die wysiging in aantal raadslede, asook aantal wyke in die munisipale regsgebied (sien bladsy 4 tot 6). / *To inform council of the new number of councillors and wards in the municipal area (see page 4 to 6).*

AGTERGROND / BACKGROUND

Section 16 of the Local Government: Municipal Structure Act, 1998 (act 117 of 1998) determines that the Provincial Minister of Local Government, Environmental Affairs and Development Planning, may amend the Establishment Notice of a Municipality.

The MEC give hereby notice (see PN 66/2016, page 8) in this Province of the Western Cape: Provincial Gazette Extraordinary (# 7574/ Wednesday 24 February 2016) that:

- (i) The Municipal Council of the Cape Agulhas Municipality (WC033) has 11 (eleven) councillors, as determined by the Provincial Minister in Provincial Notice 267/2014 published in Provincial Gazette Extraordinary No 7314 dated 6 October 2014, of which 6 (six) are ward councillors and 5 (five) are proportionally elected councillors.
- (ii) The municipality has 6 (six) wards.

Any person or organisation wishing to comment on the said Draft Section 16 Notice may comment in writing before the 28th of March 2016.

FINANSIËLE IMPLIKASIE / FINANCIAL IMPLICATION

Additional funds are budgeted in the 2016/17 financial year.

PERSONEEL IMPLIKASIE / STAFF IMPLICTION

Geen / None

BESTUURANBEVELING/ MANAGEMENT RECOMENDATION

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die wysings soos vervat in Provinsiale Koerant, Nr 7574 (PK 66/2016). / *That Council take note of the amendment in the Extraordinary Provincial Gazette, Nr 7574 (PN 66/2016).*

BESLUIT 51/2016

- (i) Dat die bestuursaanbeveling as besluit van die Raad aanvaar word.
- (ii) Dat daar in die 2016/2017 begroting voorsiening gemaak moet word vir twee addisionele raadslede asook 'n addisionele wykskomitee.
- (iii) Dat die 2016/2017 begroting voorsiening maak vir 'n addisionele lid op die Uitvoerende Burgemeesterskomitee.

10.2.2 **APPEAL: DEPARTURE ON ERF 4818, BREDASDORP (15/5/4 - MTRP) (WARD 4)****PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The evaluation of the above-mentioned appeal in terms of SPLUMA, 2013 and LUPA, 2014.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Appeal reference number	:	15/5/4
Application reference number	:	15/5/4
Application submission date	:	26 November 2015
Application decision date	:	9 February 2016
Appellant	:	Cyprian Thokozani Mjoli
Registered owner(s)	:	CT Mjoli

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Title Deed:

Erf 4818 Bredasdorp, in die Kaap Agulhas Munisipaliteit, Afdeling Bredasdorp, Provinsie Wes Kaap, GROOT, 150 (EEN HONDERD EN VYFTIG) VIERKANTE METER) SOOS AANGEDUI op Algemene Plan 1302/2012 en GEHOU kragtens Sertifikaat van Geregisteerde Titel Nr T1706/2013.

Physical address	:	5 Luzuko Street, Bredasdorp
Existing Zoning	:	Single Residential
Existing land use	:	Dwelling and houseshop
Building plan approved	:	Notice for illegal wendy house been issued on 23 July 2015.

Any unauthorised land use/building work	:	Illegal Wendy House structure erected on the property
Area of Erf	:	150m ²
Title Deed number & date	:	T49903/2013

BACKGROUND

Council received the following application: Departure on Erf 4818, Bredasdorp for the purposes to operate a house shop.

ADVERTISING

The proposal was advertised in the local newspaper and the Provincial Gazette. The following signatures of support were received:

- Patricia Makepe
- Ndumiso Mphakhathi
- Mbulelo Matyila
- Theo Mzayifani
- Luhae Drieschu
- Derick Julies
- Siseko Dolo
- A Hassiem
- Godfrey Swart
- Nomboxolo Maweni
- Sivuyile Louli

Adjoining property owners are:

- **B4819**, N F Mphakati, 7 Luzuko Hoofstraat
- **B4815**, N W Nohatala (Oorlede), 6D Ou Meulestraat
- **B4817**, P T & T Makepe, 3 Luzuko Hoofstraat
- **B4920**, D Arends, 15 Luthando Street
- **B4905**, A & E L Hassiem, Baadjiesstraat 11
- **B4941**, S Dolo, Impalastraat 2

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS DURING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**Electrical**

Geen beswaar maar indien die eienaar meer as 20 amp verlang moet hy vir 'n volle aansluiting betaal. Die staat betaal net vir 'n 20 amp aansluiting.

Director: Community Services

No objection as long as town planning regulations are met.

Director Corporate Services

No Objection

Traffic

Geen beswaar moet aan huiswinkel beleid voldoen.

Strategic Planning

No objection providing all legislative and policy prescripts are complied with.

Health (ODM)

Let op dat die aansoek n gesondheidsertifikaat in terme van artikel 12 van die Munisipale gesondheidsverordening 7389/2015 of 'n geskiktheidsertifikaat in terme van Regulasie 962/2012 bekom moet word alvorens daar begin kan word met die besigheid.

Councillor J. Nieuwoudt

Geen probleem met die aansoek, let net daarop dat die twee huiswinkels baie naby aan mekaar geleë is.

Impact on Municipal engineering services:**Director: Technical Services**

Geen Beswaar.

Waste Disposal

Vullisheffing soos in die begroting vervat sal van toepassing wees.

Water and Sewerage

Geen invloed op water- en riooldienste nie.

Streets and stormwater

In orde.

AUTHORISED OFFICIAL'S DECISION

On 2 February 2016 the Authorised Official took the following decision:

"The Director: Corporate Services on 2016-02-08 refused your application for the Departure of 4818 Bredasdorp to operate a House Shop, in terms of section 60 of the Standard By-law on Municipal Land Use Planning.

Reasons for the above decision are as follows:

The proposed shop should be operated from the main dwelling and not from an outside building"

APPEAL(S) MOTIVATION

"We finally agree to follow your rules even before we requested to be give form while we were busy collecting money to extend & excuse these rooms, one too small so I'm appealing to the Municipality to be given time and I'm going to move stuff to the room, I am unemployed there and have no income. I'm an Arc Volunteer not employed there and need your assistance appealing to this matter"

MUNICIPAL PLANNING EVALUATION ON APPEAL**(In)consistency with the Spatial Planning and Western Cape Land Use Management Act, 2013 (Act 16 of 2013)**

The proposal must be consistent with the principles of spatial justice, spatial sustainability, efficiency, spatial resilience and good administration. Public interest, constitutional transformation imperatives, facts and circumstances of the application, rights and obligations of those affected, impact on engineering services/social infrastructure/open space requirements, inter alia, were taken into account.

(In)consistency with the principles referred to in Chapter VI of the Land Use Planning Act, 2014 (Act 3 of 2014)

In terms of section 49 of LUPA considerations must be given to applicable spatial development frameworks and structure plans, and the desirability of the proposal must be determined (using guidelines on desirability). In addition, the proposal must be consistent with the land use planning principles referred to section 59 (spatial justice, spatial sustainability, efficiency and good administration).

(In)consistency with the IDP/Various levels of SDF's/Applicable policies

The proposal must be consistent with the forward planning vision for the application area. Only in exceptional circumstances (e.g. plans no longer reflect the vision for the area; the deviation is warranted due to the positive impact of the proposal on the greater area, in line with the development principles indicated in SPLUMA and LUPA) should deviation from these policies and/or plans be considered.

THE PROPOSAL IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE HOUSE SHOP BY-LAW.

Section 4 of the Cape Agulhas Municipality: House Shop By-Law (3 November 2015) reads as follows:

4. Applications for house shops

- (1) *Only the registered owner of the property (and who resides on the property) may apply to operate a house shop.*
- (2) *Only the registered owner, who resides on the property, may operate the house shop.*

Outcomes of investigations/applications in terms of other laws

Environmental authorisation is not required.

Existing and proposed zoning comparisons and considerations

A comparison between the existing zoning, and accompanying permissible land use rights and development parameters, applicable to the subject property, and a proposed new zone or land use, as well as accompanying permissible land use rights and development parameters, in order to establish the possible impacts of the proposed change on the surrounding area and its residents.

The desirability of the proposal

In determining desirability some of the considerations one could take into account are as follows:

(a) economic impact;	The departure will not have a negative economic impact on the precinct/neighbourhood/ settlement.
(b) social impact;	The proposal will cause greater social injustice and inequity of access to opportunity, in line with the settlement restructuring principles; seeing that the shop is managed by (il)legal immigrants.
(c) scale of the capital investment;	The capital investment has negative impact on the area – the wendyhouse is not approved and is a temporary structure.
(d) compatibility with surrounding uses;	The proposed development or land use change is not compatible with the surrounding uses.
(e) impact on the external engineering services;	No contribution is made towards the cost incurred / to be incurred by the municipality, to pay for this infrastructure.
(f) impact on safety, health and wellbeing of the surrounding community;	The departure has a negative impact on the safety, health and wellbeing of the surrounding community. Council decided that the property owner should manage and operate the house shop.
(g) impact on heritage;	The proposed land use change will not have a negative impact on any heritage aspects.
(h) impact on the biophysical environment;	The proposed land use change will not impacting negatively on the biophysical environment.

(i) traffic impacts, parking, access and other transport related considerations such as public transport; and	No negative impact on the traffic, parking, access or other transport related considerations.
(j) whether the imposition of conditions can mitigate an adverse impact of the proposed land use;	The proposal is not approved and the appeal is not considered favourably.
(k) adherence to universally accepted town planning principles;	All of the concerns, issues and town planning norms, standards and principles have not been addressed in this proposal.
(l) aspects which impact on quality of life (including views, sunlight, privacy, visual impact, character);	The proposed departure impacting negatively on the quality of life of the immediate and surrounding residents; through the character of the village. Neighbours privacy is compromised.
(m) timing - the need to densify or protect urban edges at that point in time;	The proposed development is within the urban edge and promoting a compact form of development.
(n) cumulative impacts;	The proposed departure will result in an unacceptable cumulative impact.
(o) alignment with the SDF;	The proposed land use change is in line with the relevant spatial planning policies which include the PSDF and the CAM SDF; but not ito the by-law.
(p) opportunity costs;	There are no missed opportunities occurring as a result of this development.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, from a Town Planning point of view it is recommended to dismiss the appeal; seeing that the owner will not operate the house shop, but immigrants. The house shop is also not from the dwelling, but from an outbuilding.

SIGNATURES

Author of this report : AC Theron
 Author signature
 SACPLAN registration number : C/7679/2014
 Date : 7 March 2016
 Registered planner name : PPA HAYWARD
 Registered planner signature
 SACPLAN registration number : 1053/1998
 Date : 8 March 2016

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION

- (i) That Council upheld the decision of the Authorised Official dated 2 February 2016.
- (ii) That the appellant be informed accordingly.

RESOLUTION 52/2016

That the item be referred to the Executive Mayor who is the appeal authority, for consideration.

10.2.3 APPEAL: DEPARTURE ON ERF 4219, BREDASDORP (15/5/4 - MTRP) (WARD 3)**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

The evaluation of the above-mentioned appeal in terms of SPLUMA, 2013 and LUPA, 2014.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Appeal reference number	:	15/5/4
Application reference number	:	15/5/4
Application submission date	:	8 December 2015
Application decision date	:	9 February 2016
Appellant	:	Petrus Dowrie
Registered owner(s)	:	P Dowrie

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Title Deed: Erf 4219, Bredasdorp, gelee in die Munisipaliteit Kaap Agulhas, Afdeling Bredasdorp, Provinsie Wes-Kaap; GROOT, TWEE HONDERD VIER EN VEERTIG (244) Vierkante Meter

Physical address	:	44 Blombos Street, Bredasdorp
Existing Zoning	:	Single Residential
Existing land use	:	Dwelling and houseshop
Building plan approved	:	Notice for illegal wendy house been issued on 26 March 2012.
Any unauthorised land use/building work	:	Illegal Wendy House structure erected on the property
Area of Erf	:	224m ²
Title Deed number & date	:	T75347/2001

BACKGROUND

Council received the following application:

Departure on Erf 4219, Bredasdorp for the purposes to operate a house shop.

ADVERTISING

The proposal was advertised in the local newspaper and the Provincial Gazette. The following signatures of support were received:

- W Mintoor
- D Windvogel
- C C Gill
- Z Y Lourens
- B J F Oostendorp
- E Lekay
- N M Pieters

Adjoining property owners are:

- B4218, W & S Mintoor & Adriaans, Blombosstraat 42
- B4221, Z Y Lourens, Randstraat 75
- B4220, C C & C Gill & Pontac, Randstraat 77
- B4329, KAM is die eienaar - Nompumelelo Creche huur daar
- B4264, A J & N M Pieters, Blombosstraat 43
- B4265, B & E Lekay, Blombosstraat 41

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS DURING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**Director: Community Services**

No Objections.

Director Corporate Services

No Objection.

Traffic

Geen Beswaar nie.

Health (ODM)

Let op dat die aansoek n gesondheidsertifikaat in terme van artikel 12 van die Munisipale gesondheidsverordening 7389/2015 of 'n geskiktheidsertifikaat in terme van Regulasie 962/2012 bekom moet word alvorens daar begin kan word met die besigheid.

Impact on Municipal engineering services:**Electrical**

Geen beswaar elektriese aansluiting kan voorsien word vanaf die bestaande kabel teen betaling van die afgekondigde tarief. Alle kostes verbonde aan die aansluiting is vir die aansoeker se rekening.

Director: Technical Services

Geen Beswaar.

Waste Disposal

Vullisheffing soos in die begroting vervat sal van toepassing wees.

Water and Sewerage

Geen invloed op water- en riooldienste nie.

Streets and stormwater

In orde.

AUTHORISED OFFICIAL'S DECISION

On 2 February 2016 the Authorised Official took the following decision:

"The Director: Corporate Services on 2016-02-08 refused your application for the Departure of 4219 Bredasdorp to operate a House Shop, in terms of section 60 of the Standard By-law on Municipal Land Use Planning.

Reasons for the above decision are as follows:

The proposed shop should be operated from the main dwelling and not from an outside building"

APPEAL MOTIVATION

- ① Ons, (mnr. mev. Douwrie) maak gebruik van huiswinkel, omdat ons pensionarise is. Dit dien as ekstra inkomste.
- ② My kinders (2 gesinne) bly ook nog by my met n (1) kleinkind. by ons. So ons gebruik die hele huis vir bewoning.
- ③ Die kinders is al vir jare op 'n waglys, hulle kry nie huise nie.
- ④ As gevolg van werkloosheid in die gemeenskap, kan hulle nie huishuur bekostig nie, so dus waarom hulle by ons woonagtig is.
- ⑤ Die erf is ook al klaar geklassifiseer as 'n besigheidserf, as gevolg van ek, kwalifiseer nie vir water subsidie of enige ^{ander} dienste nie. So die huiswinkel bied 'n inkomste.
- ⑥ Daar is ook twee waterrekening wat klaar betaal word en nie as agterstallig geïdentifiseer word nie.
- ⑦ Ons het nie 'n probleem om ons dienste te betaal nie, so aanweeg dit asb. om vir ons wel toestemming te gee om voort te gaan om 'n diens te lewer.
- ⑧ Ons trek nie alleen voordeel uit die huiswinkel nie, maar ook die gemeenskap. (a) As gevolg van die hoë syfer in werkloosheid, (b) geweld - dus voordelig vir die veiligheid van gemeenskap om nie sover die kinders te stuur of te loop nie. (c) Ons help die gemeenskap deur goedere te verskaf tot op latere tydperke tot hulle 'n inkomste het of maand tot maand basis.

MUNICIPAL PLANNING EVALUATION ON APPEAL(In)consistency with the Spatial Planning and Western Cape Land Use Management Act, 2013 (Act 16 of 2013):

The proposal must be consistent with the principles of spatial justice, spatial sustainability, efficiency, spatial resilience and good administration. Public interest, constitutional transformation imperatives, facts and circumstances of the application, rights and obligations of those affected, impact on engineering services/social infrastructure/open space requirements, inter alia, were taken into account.

(In)consistency with the principles referred to in Chapter VI of the Land Use Planning Act, 2014 (Act 3 of 2014)

In terms of section 49 of LUPA considerations must be given to applicable spatial development frameworks and structure plans, and the desirability of the proposal must be determined (using guidelines on desirability).

In addition, the proposal must be consistent with the land use planning principles referred to section 59 (spatial justice, spatial sustainability, efficiency and good administration).

(In)consistency with the IDP/Various levels of SDF's/Applicable policies

The proposal must be consistent with the forward planning vision for the application area. Only in exceptional circumstances (e.g. plans no longer reflect the vision for the area; the deviation is warranted due to the positive impact of the proposal on the greater area, in line with the development principles indicated in SPLUMA and LUPA) should deviation from these policies and/or plans be considered.

THE PROPOSAL IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE HOUSE SHOP BY-LAW.

Section 4 of the Cape Agulhas Municipality: House Shop By-Law (3 November 2015) reads as follows:

4. Applications for house shops

- (1) *Only the registered owner of the property (and who resides on the property) may apply to operate a house shop.*
- (2) *Only the registered owner, who resides on the property, may operate the house shop.*

5. Requirements for a house shop

- (1) *House shops must meet the following requirements -*
 - (a) *The house shop may only be operated from a dwelling that complies with the Scheme Regulations applicable to the specific area and the National Building Regulations;*

Outcomes of investigations/applications in terms of other laws

Environmental authorisation is not required.

Existing and proposed zoning comparisons and considerations

A comparison between the existing zoning, and accompanying permissible land use rights and development parameters, applicable to the subject property, and a proposed new zone or land use, as well as accompanying permissible land use rights and development parameters, in order to establish the possible impacts of the proposed change on the surrounding area and its residents.

The desirability of the proposal

In determining desirability some of the considerations one could take into account are as follows:

(q) economic impact;	The departure will not have a negative economic impact on the precinct/neighbourhood/ settlement.
(r) social impact;	The proposal will cause greater social injustice and inequity of access to opportunity, in line with the settlement restructuring principles; seeing that the shop is managed by (ii) legal immigrants.
(s) scale of the capital investment;	The capital investment has negative impact on the area – the wendyhouse is not approved and is a temporary structure.
(t) compatibility with surrounding uses;	The proposed development or land use change is not compatible with the surrounding uses.

(u) impact on the external engineering services;	No contribution is made towards the cost incurred / to be incurred by the municipality, to pay for this infrastructure.
(v) impact on safety, health and wellbeing of the surrounding community;	The departure has a negative impact on the safety, health and wellbeing of the surrounding community. Council decided that the property owner should manage and operate the house shop.
(w) impact on heritage;	The proposed land use change will not have a negative impact on any heritage aspects.
(x) impact on the biophysical environment;	The proposed land use change will not impacting negatively on the biophysical environment.
(y) traffic impacts, parking, access and other transport related considerations such as public transport; and	No negative impact on the traffic, parking, access or other transport related considerations.
(z) whether the imposition of conditions can mitigate an adverse impact of the proposed land use;	The proposal is not approved and the appeal is not considered favourably.
(aa) adherence to universally accepted town planning principles;	All of the concerns, issues and town planning norms, standards and principles have not been addressed in this proposal.
(bb) aspects which impact on quality of life (including views, sunlight, privacy, visual impact, character);	The proposed departure impacting negatively on the quality of life of the immediate and surrounding residents; through the character of the village. Neighbours privacy is compromised.
(cc) timing - the need to densify or protect urban edges at that point in time;	The proposed development is within the urban edge and promoting a compact form of development.
(dd) cumulative impacts;	The proposed departure will result in an unacceptable cumulative impact.
(ee) alignment with the SDF;	The proposed land use change is in line with the relevant spatial planning policies which include the PSDF and the CAM SDF; but not into the by-law.
(ff) opportunity costs;	There are no missed opportunities occurring as a result of this development.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, from a Town Planning point of view it is recommended to dismiss the appeal; seeing that the owner will not operate the house shop, but immigrants. The house shop is also not from the dwelling, but from an outbuilding.

SIGNATURES

Author of this report : A C Theron
 Author signature
 SACPLAN registration number : C/7679/2014
 Date : 7 March 2016
 Registered planner name : P P A Hayward
 Registered planner signature
 SACPLAN registration number : 1053/1998
 Date : 8 March 2016

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION

- (i) That Council upheld the decision of the Authorised Official dated 2 February 2016.
- (ii) That the appellant be informed accordingly.

RESOLUTION 53/2016

That the item be referred to the Executive Mayor who is the appeal authority, for consideration.

10.2.4 **FINANSIËLE ONDERSTEUNING VIR NAPIER KAASFABRIEK (15/5/R-BSSB) (WYK 1)****DOEL VAN VERSLAG**

Dat die Raad die versoek van Napier Protea Cheese Factory oorweeg.

AGTERGROND

Die Raad ontvang die volgende versoek gedateer 3 September 2015:

Insake Huurkontrak vir (Erf 513) Napier

Hiermee bevestig Direksie van NPCF erkenning van ontvangs van huurkontrak vir grond bewillig deur Raad vir bou van Kaasfabriek.

Graag vra ons as Direksie dat huurkontrak verander word sodoende proses vir die bou van fabriek vir befondsing.

Graag vra ons as Direksie of ons betalig van huur kan begin wanneer fabriek produksie lewer en sodra ons befondsing verkry het vir bou van fabriek.

Met gesprek met Departement Landbou was genoem dat hersonering fondse nie beskikbaar vir ons kan wees nie omrede ons die grond huur by Kaap Agulhas Munisipaliteit en nie self die erf besit nie.

Hiermee vra ons as Direksie die Munisipaliteit om ons te help met die Hersonering onkoste. Dit sal ons instaat stel dat die proses om befondsing vir die bou van die Kaasfabriek by Departement Landbou ingedien kan word.

By voorbaat dank.

Direksie: Napier Protea Cheese Factory

KOMMENTAAR: BESTUURDER - ADMINISTRATIEWE ONDERSTEUNING

- (i) Die ooreenkoms maak voorsiening vir 'n terugvallingsklousule indien ontwikkeling nie binne 'n voorgestelde tyd realiseer nie.
- (ii) Die Raad kan die ontwikkelaar tegemoet kom deur die uitstel vir die betaling van huurgeld.

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Vir oorweging deur die Raad.

AANBEVELING: KORPORATIEWE DIENSTE KOMITEE / RECOMMENDATION: CORPORATE SERVICES COMMITTEE

Dat die aangeleentheid na die Raad verwys word vir oorweging.

BESLUIT 54/2016

- (i) Dat die hersonering van toegekende erf in Napier deur die Raad gedoen word.
- (ii) Dat kwytskelding van huurgeld aan die huurder toegestaan word totdat die kaasfabriek in bedryf gestel word.
- (iii) Dat 'n amptenaar van die LED-seksie vergaderings van die Direksie moet bywoon en gereëelde verslae aan die Raad voorlê aangaande die vordering van die projek.

10.2.5 **MUNICIPAL CORPORATE GOVERNANCE OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY POLICY - POLICIES**

PURPOSE OF REPORT

To table the proposed policy for consideration by Council.

BACKGROUND

These policies are not only a legislative requirement in terms of the greater Municipal Cooperate Governance of ICT policy, but are mostly already in part, part of Cape Agulhas Municipalities current ICT Policy.

The 2 policies tabled today include the following:

- a. ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - External Service Provider
- b. ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - ICT and Municipality

These policies although different will be addressed as separate policies and therefore a short explanation of each policy are to follow:

a. ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - External Service Provider

Attached on page 7 to 13.

"This policy is regarded as crucial to the operation and security of ICT systems of the Municipality. Municipalities must develop their own Service Level Agreement Management controls and procedures by adopting the principles and practices put forward in this policy.

The policy covers the following elements of service level agreement management of external service providers/vendors:

- Agreement with service providers/vendors/vendors;
- Service management; and
- Change control."

* SCOPE - ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - External Service Provider

b. ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - ICT and Municipality

Attached on page 14 to 20.

"This ICT Service Level Agreement Policy has been developed to guide and assist municipalities to be aligned with internationally recognised best practice standards. This policy applies to the Municipal Manager and the ICT Manager involved in setting and managing service levels between ICT and the Municipality.

This policy is regarded as being crucial to the operation and security of ICT systems of the Municipality. Municipalities must develop their own Service Level Agreement Management controls and procedures by adopting the principles and practices put forward in this policy.

The policy covers the following elements of service level agreement management between ICT and the Municipality:

- Agreement between ICT and the Municipality; and
- Service management.”

* SCOPE - ICT Service Level Agreement Management Policy - ICT and Municipality

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

None.

LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

1. Municipal Corporate Governance of Information and Communication Technology Policy;
2. Constitution of the Republic of South Africa Act, Act No. 108 of 1996;
3. Copyright Act, Act No. 98 of 1978;
4. Electronic Communications and Transactions Act, Act No. 25 of 2002;
5. Minimum Information Security Standards, as approved by Cabinet in 1996;
6. Municipal Finance Management Act, Act No. 56 of 2003;
7. Municipal Structures Act, Act No. 117 of 1998;
8. Municipal Systems Act, Act No. 32, of 2000;
9. National Archives and Record Service of South Africa Act, Act No. 43 of 1996;
10. Promotion of Access to Information Act, Act No. 2 of 2000;
11. Protection of Personal Information Act, Act No. 4 of 2013;
12. Regulation of Interception of Communications Act, Act No. 70 of 2002; and
13. Treasury Regulations for departments, trading entities, constitutional institutions and public entities, Regulation 17 of 2005.

The following internationally recognised ICT standards were leveraged in the development of this policy:

1. Western Cape Municipal Information and Communication Technology Governance Policy Framework, 2014;
2. Control Objectives for Information Technology (COBIT) 5, 2012;
3. ISO 27002:2013 Information technology - Security techniques - Code of practice for information security controls; and
4. King Code of Governance Principles, 2009.

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION

- (i) That the policy be accepted as a policy of the Municipality.
- (ii) That the Password Change Request form may be edited from time to time to adapt to system changes.

ICT STEERING COMMITTEE BESLUIT - ICT 3/2016: 19 FEBRUARIE 2016

- (i) That the management's recommendation be accepted as resolution of the Committee.
- (ii) That the policies be submitted to Council for adoption.

BESLUIT 55/2016

- (i) That the ICT Steering Committee decision be accepted as resolution of Council.
- (ii) That the policies be adopted as policies of Council.

10.3 GEMEENSKAPSDIENSTE / COMMUNITY SERVICES**10.3.1 EKSTERNE BEURSTOEKENINGS VIR 2016****DOEL VAN VERSLAG**

Om die Raad in kennis te stel van eksterne studiebeurs toekennings vir 2016.

AGTERGROND

Kaap Agulhas Munisipaliteit het 'n totaal van 10 beursaansoeke ontvang. Ses applikante kwalifiseer vir beurstoekenings volgens die eksterne Beursbeleid van Kaap Agulhas Munisipaliteit.

Die applikante is soos volg:

APPLIKANT	STUDIEVELD	TERSiëRE INRIGTING	AKKEDE-MIESE JAAR	GEM %	TOEKENNING
Marceline Gafley	Menslike Hulpbronne	Boland College	2	67%	R6 500.00
Micaela Goliath	Menslike Hulpbronne	US	1	67%	R6 500.00
Danelle Joemath	Menslike Hulpbronne	North Link	1	54%	R4 500.00
Yuwinn Kraukamp	Toerisme	UWK	1	62%	R5 500.00
Sulene Spandiel	Toerisme	UWK	3	59%	R5 500.00
Bernard Afrika	Siviele Ingenieurswese	Boland College Strand	2	75%	R7 500.00

Bogenoemde studente sal toekennings volgens hul akedemiese prestasie ontvang soos bepaal deur die vermeldde beursbeleid.

Die beurskomitee het die toekennings volgens die voorgestelde glyskaal bereken:

40% - 54%	=	R4 500
55% - 64%	=	R5 500
65% - 74%	=	R6 500
75% - 84%	=	R7 500
85% - 100%	=	R9 000

FINANSIëLE IMPLIKASIES

'n Totaal van R36 000,00 word aan eksterne beurse toegeken.

PERSONEEL IMPLIKASIE

Geen.

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die bedrag wat aan eksterne beurse vir 2016 toegeken word.

BESLUIT 56/2016

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die R36 000 wat spandeer word aan eksterne beurse, soos toegeken volgens Raadsbeleid.

10.4 **FINANSIËLE DIENSTE**

10.4.1 **ODUIT AKSIEPLAN 2014/15 (OPCAR): MAANDELIKSE VORDERING - MAART 2016**

DOEL VAN VERSLAG

Oorweging van die vordering met die goedgekeurde 2014/15 Oudit Bevindinge Aksieplan (OPCAR) vir die maand Februarie 2016.

AGTERGROND

Na aanleiding van die Ouditeur-Generaal se oudit van die 2014/15 finansiële jaar is daar sekere leemtes uitgewys wat aangespreek moet word. Hierdie bevindinge is in die Oudit Bevindinge Aksieplan opgeneem en bepaalde regstellende stappe is bepaal om die bevindinge aan te spreek.

Die vordering word ook aan die Oudit- en Prestasieoudit Komitee voorgelê en word ook op 'n gereelde grondslag met die Ouditeur-Generaal bespreek. Die vordering met die plan word verder op 'n kwartaallikse grondslag aan die Wes-Kaapse Provinsiale Tesourie voorgelê. Die verslag wat hierby aangeheg is op bladsy 21 tot 35, is 'n aanduiding van die vordering wat met hierdie aksieplan gemaak is soos op einde Maart 2016.

PERSONEEL IMPLIKASIES

Geen.

FINANSIËLE IMPLIKASIES

Geen.

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Oorweging, bespreking en aanvaarding van die munisipaliteit se vordering insake die implementering van die Oudit Aksieplan voortspruitend uit die bevindinge van die Ouditeur-Generaal vir die 2014/15 finansiële jaar soos op einde Maart 2016.

BESLUIT 57/2016

- (i) Dat die munisipaliteit se vordering insake die implementering van die Oudit Aksieplan voortspruitend uit die bevindinge van die Ouditeur-Generaal vir die 2014/15 finansiële jaar soos op einde Maart 2016, aanvaar word.
- (ii) Dat die Raad kennis neem dat punte 19 en 20 in die verslag ook reeds afgehandel is.
- (iii) Dat die Direkteur: Finansiële Dienste die vordering ten opsigte van spesifiek die uitstaande aksies van toepassing op sy departement monitor.

10.4.2 **APPROVAL OF EXPENDITURE VIREMENT IN RESPECT OF THE 2015/2016 FINANCIAL YEAR (DFS)**

The Director: Finance reports as follows:

"In terms of section 29 of the MFMA, the mayor of a municipality may in emergency or other exceptional circumstances authorize unforeseen and unavoidable expenditure for which no provision was made in the approved budget".

Section 28 (2)(b) & (c) of the MFMA does allow for an adjustment budget if additional revenues become available over and above those anticipated in the annual budget as well as unforeseen / unavoidable expenditure recommended by the mayor in terms of the above mentioned section.

Furthermore Council's approved Budget & Virement policy prescribes virement limits on the amount of funds that may be moved to and from votes and sub-votes may not exceed ten (10%) per cent of the budget unless approved by council and incorporated as part of the adjustment budget.

A provincial grant allocation to the amount of R500,000 has been received on 18 March 2016 in respect of revenue enhancement and data cleansing for which no provision was made in the 2015/16 annual / adjustment budget.

Due to oversight and / or misunderstanding during the 2015/16 adjustment budget no adjustments were received from the following responsible managers in respect of overtime / standby allowance under budgeted:

•	ICT amounted to:	R 40,000
•	Traffic & Law Enforcement amounted to:	R 110,000
•	Environmental Services amounted to:	R 127,500
•	Water nett adjustment amounting to:	R 496,918
•	Sewerage adjusted to the amount:	R 559,113
•	Refuse Removal Services amounted to:	R 50,000
•	Beaches & Holiday Resorts amounted to:	<u>R 293,390</u>

Total Virement for Standby / Overtime: R1,676,921

Although the abovementioned additional expenditure to the total amount of R1,63 million will be offset against other expenditure votes with no budget implication, it is imperative to management overtime / standby in appropriate manner aligned to the long term financial plan strategy. Approval of predetermined overtime should be fully motivated for approval by the Municipal Manager in order to claim unnecessary overtime to be worked.

Other unforeseen operating expenditure not incorporated during the adjustment budget in February 2016:

•	Finance:	Commission Pre-Paid Electricity	R 80,000
•	Refuse Removal	Maintenance- Motor Vehicle Tyres	R 65,000
		Refuse Bags	R 87,000
		Maintenance - Motor Vehicle Repairs	R225,000
•	Social Development	Fuel	<u>R 4,000</u>

Total Virement for Other Expenditure: R461,000

Virement in respect of MIG capital expenditure to the following amended amounts:

•	"Ou Meule Riool Pompstasie"	R1,987,552-00
•	"Struisbaai Noord Riool Pomp Stasie"	R1,400,022-05
•	"Zwelitsha Sportvelde"	R1,420,652-72
•	Thusong Centre	R3,028,318-87
•	PMU Allocation (5% of allocation)	R 539,350-00

Additional capital expenditure not foreseen during the adjustment budget in February 2016:

Cazebo's (x2)	R7,800
---------------	--------

The Municipal Manager, in consultation with the Director: Finance, recommends as follows:

MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATION

- (i) Council considers approval of the Financial Management Support Grant (FMGSG) from Provincial Treasury to the amount of R500,000 in respect of Revenue Enhancement / Data Cleansing Projects for both revenue / expenditure.
- (ii) Council considers approval of virement in respect of standby / overtime for the relevant departments / sections to the amount of R1 676 921,00.
- (iii) Council considers the approval of virement in respect of other expenditure to the total amount of R461 000;00.
- (iv) Council considers approval in respect of the following amends relating to MIG capital expenditure:
 - Ou Meule Riool Pompstasie” R1,987,552-00
 - “Struisbaai Noord Riool Pomp Stasie” R1,400,022-05
 - “Zwelitsha Sportvelde” R1,420,652-72
 - Thusong Centre R3,028,318-87
 - PMU Allocation (5% of allocation) R 539,350-00
- (v) Council considers approval of the additional capital item for the procurement of two Cazebo's to the amount of R7,800.

BESLUIT 58/2016

That the management recommendation be accepted as resolution of Council.

11. **ITEMS DEUR DIE UITVOERENDE BURGEMEESTER / -BURGEMEESTERSKOMITEE NA DIE RAAD VERWYS VIR OORWEGING**

11.1 **AANSOEK VIR DIE GEBRUIK VAN STRUISBAAI GEMEENSKAPSAAL EN SPORTGRONDE (BM)**

DOEL VAN VERSLAG

Om 'n aansoek, soos aangeheg op bladsy 36 te oorweeg vir die gebruik van Struisbaai Gemeenskapsaal en Sportgronde.

AGTERGROND

Suidpunt Christen Gemeente vra die Raad se goedkeuring vir die gratis gebruik van Struisbaai Gemeenskapsaal en Sportgronde vir 'n "Vacation Bible School Holiday Club" gedurende die skoolvakansie (4 tot 9 Julie 2016). Die gemeenskapsaal en sportgronde word gebruik om gemeenskap kinders te vermaak gedurende skoolvakansies.

Suidpunt Christen Gemeente, in samewerking met Marantha Baptiste Kerk se verblyf uitgawes vir die chalet's beloop tussen R8 000,00 en R11 000,00 vir die week. Die kerk vra vir finansiële hulp met die huur van die chalet's.

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Vir oorweging deur die Raad.

BESLUIT 59/2016

- (i) Dat die standaard deposito's betaalbaar vir die gebruik van fasaliteite, betaalbaar sal wees.
- (ii) Dat die fasaliteite gratis aan Suidpunt Christen Gemeente beskikbaar gestel word vir die tydperk 4 tot 9 Julie 2016 vir die aanbieding van 'n "Vacation Bible School Holiday Club".
- (iii) Dat bestaande gebruikers van die fasaliteite wat reeds bespreek is voorkeur kry bo die besprekings van die aansoekers.

11.2 **AANSOEK: MARKDAG TE STRUISBAAI-NOORD****DOEL VAN VERSLAG**

Om goedkeuring te verkry vir 'n maandelikse markdag en werkswinkel om inwoners leiding te gee in verband met entrepreneurskap (sien skrywe aangeheg op bladsy 38).

AGTERGROND

Mev Jones wil 'n projek tot bekamping van armoede loots vir die inwoners van Struisbaai. Sy doen 'n versoek op die Raad om die oop perseel langs die kliniek beskikbaar te stel om die projek te begin.

Sy voer aan dat die inwoners van Struisbaai oor vaardighede beskik, maar daar nie geleentheid geskep word om dit ten toon te stel en sodoende 'n inkomste te kan genereer nie. Die gemeenskap gaan gebruik onder armoede weens werkloosheid wat ook 'n bydraende faktor is tot al die ongeruimdheid in die gemeenskap van Struisbaai.

Die projek kan van hulp wees tot bekamping van armoede en misdaad.

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Vir oorweging deur die Raad.

BESLUIT 60/2016

Dat die aangeleentheid terugverwys word vir die inwin van verdere inligting vir bespreking by die relevante komitee van die Raad.

11.3 **NAPIER ROLBALKLUB: AFSKRYWING VAN SKULD (DFD)****DOEL VAN VERSLAG**

Om oorweging te skenk daaraan om die agterstallige skulde van Napier Rolbalkklub af te skryf.

AGTERGROND

Napier Rolbalkklub is die eienaar van erwe 365 en 366 op Napier. Weens vloedskade van 'n paar jaar gelede aan die klubhuis (erf 365) sowel as die baan (erf 366), kon die bestuur van die klub net nie weer die mas opkom om die klub weer in bedryf te kry nie. Dit het ook egter tot gevolg gehad dat munisipale dienstegeelde agterstallig geraak het. Erf 365 (R8 006,04) en erf 366 (R10 832,65).

Aangesien die nuwe bestuur baie ernstig is om die klub weer aan die gang te kry het hulle onderneem om die lopende rekening op erf 365 (R4 138,91) te betaal sodat die elektrisiteit en water weer beskikbaar is. Die rekening is inderdaad op 7 Maart betaal en die dienste is heraangesluit.

Aangeheg op bladsy 78 is 'n skrywe waarin die bestuur die Raad versoek om oorweging daaraan te skenk om die uitstaande skuld van R14 699,78 af te skryf as 'n bydrae tot die projek.

FINANSIËLE IMPLIKASIE

Die bedrag vir afskrywing : R14 699,78

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Dat die Raad daaraan oorweging skenk om die uitstaande skuld van R14 699,78 ten opsigte van Napier Rolbalklub af te skryf.

BESLUIT BK35/2016: 30 MAART 2016

- (i) Dat die Uitvoerende Burgemeesterskomitee die afskrywing van die uitstaande bedrag van R14 699,78 ondersteun.
- (ii) Dat die aangeleentheid na die Raad verwys word vir oorweging.

BESLUIT 61/2016

Dat goedkeuring gegee word om die agterstallige uitstaande skuld van Napier Rolbalklub ten bedrae van R14 699,78 af te skryf.

12. **ADDISIONELE ITEMS DEUR DIE RAAD HANTEER**

Geen.

13. **ONAFGEHANDELDE RAADSBESLUIT**

Besluit Nr	Onderwerp	Verkorte Besluit	Vordering	Verantwoordelike persoon
70/2015	Market Analysis: Retirement Village, Bredasdorp	Ontwikkelingsvoorstelle vir die gedeelte weer gevra word.	<i>Konsep na Munisipale Bestuurder en R Sefoor.</i>	BSSB
105/2015	Vervreemding: Erf 5221, Bredasdorp (Waxa)	Terug verwys word vir moontlike ontwikkelingsvoorstelle.	<i>Vervreemding was geadverteer, maar geen ontwikkelingsvoorstelle is ontvang nie. 'n Opvolg verslag sal aan die Raad voorgelê word.</i>	Eiendoms-administrasie

BESTUURSAANBEVELING

Dat die Raad kennis neem van die onafgehandelde Raadsbesluite.

BESLUIT 62/2016

- (i) Dat die Bestuursaanbeveling as besluit van die Raad aanvaar word.
- (ii) Dat die Raad kennis neem dat daar twee voornemende kopers is vir erf 5221, Bredasdorp en dat vervreemding nou deur die openbare tenderproses sal plaasvind.

Hierna gaan die Raad In Komitee om sake van vertroulike aard te bespreek.

BEKRAGTIG op hierdie

dag van

2016

SPEAKER

DATUM: