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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The George Municipal Area

The Spatial Development Framework (SDF) for George Local Municipality presented in this report covers the municipality’s 5 238 km² jurisdictional area, inclusive of the recently incorporated Wards 24 and 25 (i.e. the former Eden District Management Area). George Municipality now administers a vast and diverse geographic area that accommodates 193 672 people and extends from the dry and climatically extreme Little Karoo in the north, to the wetter more temperate Garden Route in the south.

Role of the Municipal SDF

Informed by the strategic direction taken by a Municipality’s Integrated Development Plan, Municipal SDF’s are meant to articulate a clear spatial vision for a municipality’s urban and rural areas, and specify objectives and strategies to be implemented to realise this vision.

Previous work on the Municipal SDF

Over the period 2003 to 2009 six drafts of the George Municipal SDF were prepared. In 2009 the Built Environment Support Programme’s review of the SDF established that: the recent severe downturn in George’s economy was not factored in; important new biodiversity, infrastructure and rural development information is now available that also needs to be considered; external statutory authorities made limited input into the SDF; and documentation of the SDF in three separate volumes makes it inaccessible and difficult for users to understand the core argument on which its proposals are based.

The need for a new SDF

Accordingly the Municipality and Provincial authorities agreed that a new concise SDF Main Report is required to update and replace the three SDF volumes produced to date. This new SDF forms part of the land use planning and management system that George Municipality are introducing. Whilst the SDF provides guidelines for the development and conservation of land within the municipal area, it does not confer or take away land use rights. This is the role of the new Municipal Integrated Zoning Scheme, which standardises land use regulations across the municipal area in line with the SDF’s objectives.

Municipal Challenges

As the regional service centre of the Southern Cape and Klein Karoo, George is ranked second to Cape Town on the W Cape list of rankings of “Development Potential Index”. Despite this potential, the municipal area is faced with serious challenges:

- **Economic:** George has not escaped the ravages of the current global economic recession. Unemployment is entrenched, poverty pervasive, and the future of existing business is under threat. The challenge is to re-instil investor and consumer confidence by improving service delivery and creating an environment conducive to investment.
- **Social:** If it is to be ‘a city for all reasons’ George needs to offer all residents access to the services and facilities of city living. It also needs to ensure that those living outside George, in villages or on farms, also have access to basic services and facilities. The challenge is to ensure that social investment not only addresses basic human needs, but also develops the human capital needed for a thriving and prosperous service economy.
- **Built Environment:** The challenge is undoing the spatial legacy that apartheid left on the towns, villages and farms in
the George municipal area, and providing humane and enabling living environments for all.

- **Natural Environment:** Notwithstanding the area’s rich and varied natural capital, it remains a sensitive and vulnerable environment. The challenge is ensuring the on-going functioning of eco-system services, that climate change is taken seriously, and the Municipality’s towns and rural areas are developed sustainably. Whilst the Municipality’s natural assets and productive rural landscapes need to be safeguarded, they also need to be opened up to all – particularly those denied access in the apartheid era.

**Municipality’s Overall Strategy**

George Municipality’s IDP is clear regarding the crucial role of economic development in providing resources for the development of the poor and previously disadvantaged. With the aim of the equitable and sustainable development of the municipal area, the Municipality are pursuing the following core strategies:

- targeting the services economy - specifically the technology, tourism, and business and financial services sectors – as foundation on which to build the local economic base;

- giving priority to addressing the needs of vulnerable communities, and developing the human capital for a service economy;

- creating humane and living environments by: delivery of services to all households; upgrading of informal settlements and degraded neighbourhoods; housing delivery to the subsidy market; promotion of ‘green’ household technologies; and protection of the municipal area’s natural and cultural heritage; and

- building institutional excellence in the provision of a high standard of services to consumers, and functioning effectively as developmental local government.

- Ensure all members of public and organised business and other organisations have the opportunity to participate in the decision making process. It is of utmost importance that a culture of participation is nurtured.

**Spatial Perspective**

The SDF is the spatial manifestation of the municipal development agenda. The spatial perspective provides the development context for the SDF with a planning Vision, Mission and Guiding Principles.

**Spatial Development Objectives**

The SDF details 5 development objectives, each with a Preamble, Problem Statement & General Policy Guidelines and specific Spatial Strategies.

These 5 Spatial Objectives are as follows:

- Restructuring and integrating the Dysfunctional Urban fabric, together with a public transport system and Urban Renewal interventions.

- Strengthening the Economic Vitality by enhancing the Regional and Local Space Economy, Strategic Developments to Diversify and Strengthen the Economy, Consolidating and reinforcing nodes of economic activity, and Infrastructure Services Provision

- Creating Quality Living Environments through Sustainable Urban Growth Management, managing a hierarchy of City Activity Nodes, the use of Strategic vacant land to take up new
development demand, the densification of Urban Areas, and the provision of Housing & Public Facilities

- Safeguarding the Environmental Integrity and Assets by establishing a city-wide open space system and environmental corridors, maintaining the functionality of Critical Biodiversity Areas, applying the principles of the Spatial Planning Categories, mitigating against impacts of Climate Change, managing Visual landscapes and corridors as well as Heritage resources

- Enhance the Rural Character and Livelihood by protecting the Productive Landscape, managing the Subdivision of Land and by enhancing the Rural Livelihood and promoting integrated rural development

Implementation

The SDF sets-out the Municipality’s Human Settlements, Land Affairs and Planning Department’s action agenda to take the SDF forward, including the roll-out of the new Integrated Zoning Scheme. The SDF also highlights linkages to complementary municipal programmes (e.g. housing, community facility provision, integrated public transport, bulk services augmentation, etc), and specifies monitoring and evaluation measures.

Conclusion

The SDF gives spatial expression to the Municipality’s service delivery and development agenda. It clarifies and directs development and management activities in its urban and rural areas, and aligns with national and provincial spatial policies. As such it establishes a credible spatial framework to replace the statutory spatial plans impacting on George Municipality that were approved in the Apartheid era.
1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 LOCATION AND EXTENT

This Spatial Development Framework (SDF) for George Local Municipality covers the municipality’s jurisdictional area, inclusive of the recently incorporated Wards 24 and 25 (i.e. the former Eden District Management Area (DMA)). The municipal area straddles the Southern Cape and Little Karoo regions of the Western Cape Province, and is situated almost halfway between Cape Town and Port Elizabeth. The area administered by George Local Municipality forms part of the larger Eden District Municipality’s jurisdictional area.

With the incorporation of the DMA, George Municipality now administers a vast and diverse geographic area that extends from the dry and climatically extreme Little Karoo in the north, to the wetter more temperate Garden Route in the south. It is an area of considerable natural assets and beauty, including: expansive mountains and forests, wilderness areas, a varied coastline, and extensive lakes, rivers and estuaries. Its natural assets include parts of the Garden Route National Park and the Baviaanskloof Wilderness Area. The municipal area also includes fertile farmlands and timber plantations along the coastal plain, fruit orchards in the Langkloof and arid grazing areas in the Little Karoo.

Three important national roads – N2, N9 and N12 – traverse the area, and George regional airport serves the Southern Cape and Little Karoo, including the neighbouring towns of Mossel Bay, Oudtshoorn, Knysna and Plettenberg Bay. Prior to the incorporation of Wards 24 and 25 the municipal area was 1 068 km² in extent, but the DMA has added an additional 4 170 km². Stats SA report that 148 021 people lived in the area in 2007 (Including the previous DMA), of which approximately 80% resided in the regional service centre of George, 12% in the towns, villages and coastal enclaves of Wilderness, Herold’s Bay, Unlondale, Touwsranten, Haarlem, Hoekwil, and Victoria Bay, and 8% in rural hamlets and on farms. According to the Stats SA 2012, the total population for George is estimate at 193 672 with a 2.1% growth rate per annum since 2008.

Diagram 1: George Municipal Area, illustrates the extent, features and settlements in the area covered by the George Municipal SDF.

1.2 PURPOSE OF THE MUNICIPAL SDF

The general purpose of a municipal SDF is to set-out the local authority’s goals, strategies and supporting policies to achieve, in the medium to long term, positive changes in the spatial organisation of its jurisdictional area towards a sustainable development future.

In terms of the draft Provincial Guidelines for the Preparation of Credible Municipal Spatial Development Frameworks, SDFs should:

- Be informed by a clear understanding of the spatial performance of the municipal area, and its role in the regional space economy.
- Be consistent with national and provincial spatial policies, and interpret their local application.
- Give spatial expression to the municipality’s overarching vision, aims and strategic objectives, as contained in the municipal Integrated Development Plan (IDP).
- Articulate a clear spatial vision for the municipality’s urban and rural areas, and specify the strategies to be implemented to realise this vision.
Diagram 1: George Municipal Area
• Provide policy guidance to direct decision-making on the nature, form, scale and location of urban and rural development, land use change, infrastructure development, disaster mitigation, and environmental resource protection.

• Establish a policy framework for more detailed plans and guide the short and medium term proposals for local areas within the municipality.

• Provide a clear framework for public and private investment in infrastructure in the area.

• Be capable of implementation and monitoring.

• Be grounded in public and political consensus around the plan’s strategic framework.

The Provincial draft Guidelines stress that unlike earlier structure plans, SDFs are not rigid and prescriptive land use plans that predetermine or try to deal with all eventualities. Rather, they need to be flexible and allow for discretion while containing sufficient clarity and direction to provide guidance to investment and land use management decisions.

1.3 SDFs AND OTHER MUNICIPAL PLANS

SDFs deal with a broad range of issues, involve many stakeholders, and focus on different territorial scales – from the entire municipal area to specific towns or precincts within it. If all these considerations are included in the SDF report, it becomes a bulky technical document that is difficult to understand. The Provincial SDF Guidelines reflect on the relationship between SDFs, the municipal IDP, and sector-specific frameworks and plans (e.g. the transport plan, human settlement plan, and so on). In this regard the Guidelines advise that:

• The IDP should both inform and be informed by the SDF. While the IDP identifies overall development and management intentions for the municipal area – and associated resource allocation – the SDF directs the desired spatial direction and patterns associated with these intentions.

• The SDF should take into account sector issues and plans, while sector plans should in turn take direction from the core argument and concepts contained in the SDF with respect to the spatial location, type and integration of their proposals.

Municipal SDFs also need to be prepared in line with the national and provincial legislative and policy framework. Diagram 2: Stages of SDF, illustrates the process followed preparing a Municipal SDF, the SDF’s informants, and its relationship with other municipal plans as outlined above.

1.4 PREVIOUS WORK ON GEORGE MUNICIPAL SDF

Preparation of the George Municipal SDF to date has been a long and complex process, characterised by discontinuity, the emergence of new requirements, and shifts in focus.

In 2003 a first draft of the George Municipal SDF was prepared. When it was reviewed the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) to inform the SDF’s proposals was identified, as well as the need for the SDF to incorporate provincial policies regarding urban restructuring and social integration. The municipality then commissioned a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the municipal area, which was documented in a report titled George Spatial Development Framework: Volume II – Strategic Environmental Assessment (February 2008).
While the SEA was being undertaken further work was done on the SDF. In 2006/7 extensive public participation on draft 2 of the SDF took place, and it was referred to state departments for comment. The SDF was then amended to incorporate comments received, and submitted to the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) for review. At the same time work proceeded on the preparation of:
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Various SDPs for specific local areas, often in response to significant development pressure and the need for clear policy guidance to direct decision-making on the desirability, nature, and form of significant development proposals.

A range of sector plans, including transport, local economic development, and human settlement development (housing).

Detailed biodiversity mapping of the Garden Route Initiative (a nationally and provincially resourced project).

Subsequently further work on the SDF was undertaken and amendments to the urban edge proposals were made. In January 2008 draft 5 was produced and documented in two volumes, namely Volume I: Spatial Development Framework and Volume III: Development Perspective and Analysis. To incorporate the findings of the SEA, further input from DEA&DP, and the initial findings of the Built Environment Support Programme (BESP), in June 2009 draft 6 of the George SDF Volumes I and III was produced.

1.5 BUILT ENVIRONMENT SUPPORT PROGRAMME

Towards improving the credibility of its SDF and housing plan, in 2009 George Municipality engaged with DEA&DP and the Department of Human Settlements (DHS) in the Built Environment Support Programme (BESP). Following the BESP’s review of progress made in producing a credible SDF, the Municipality and Provincial authorities came to the following conclusions:

- Whilst valuable work has been done in preparation of the SDF over the past 7 years, the presentation of its wide-ranging findings and proposals in three separate volumes makes it inaccessible and difficult for users to understand and act on.

- External statutory authorities made limited input into the SDF, thus reducing their use of the SDF.

- The linkages between the overall municipal SDF and the more detailed SDPs that have been prepared for local areas (e.g. George CBD) and towns (e.g. Wilderness) are not explicit in the SDF.

- The SDF in its current format does not convey a clear and logical argument to substantiate a coherent municipal spatial development strategy.

- Whilst the SDF’s three volumes were prepared during a period when the George property market was buoyant, recent years have seen a severe downturn in the regional and national markets. The Municipality’s current spatial development priorities need to be informed by the new market paradigm.

- Since the SDF’s three volumes were compiled new information (e.g. biodiversity, bulk infrastructure, rural development) has become available which needs to be factored in.

The BESP assisted the Municipality improve the credibility of its SDF by: soliciting inputs from external statutory authorities; formulating a strategy for the development and management of the municipal space-economy; and identifying SDF informants emanating from newly available biodiversity, bulk infrastructure, climate change and rural development information. These BESP contributions were documented in a January 2011 Addendum to George Municipality’s SDF.

1.6 A NEW GEORGE MUNICIPAL SDF

The Municipality and Provincial authorities endorsed the BESP recommendation that the considerable work that has been done to date on the George Municipal SDF should be built upon and
taken forward. Furthermore, they agreed that a new SDF Report is required to update and replace the three SDF volumes produced over the past 8 years. In line with the provincial SDF Guidelines, the new SDF needs to be a concise document that:

- Provides a clear spatial perspective of the municipal area, and the challenges it faces.
- Articulates a logical argument for the spatial development and management of the municipal area, that is in line with the Municipality’s overall service delivery and development agenda.

To replace the overlapping, and sometimes contradictory, statutory spatial plans impacting on the George municipal area that are still in force – some emanating from the apartheid era - Province and the Municipality agreed that the new SDF should be prepared for approval in terms of the Municipal Systems Act (MSA Act 31 of 2000).

Thus this George Municipal SDF, once approved, will replace within the Municipality’s jurisdictional area all the remaining spatial plans from the previous dispensation. There are however key provisions of these historical plans which remains valuable and have been incorporated into this new SDF.

1.7 TOWARDS A NEW MUNICIPAL LAND USE PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

This SDF forms part of the new land use planning and management system that George Municipality are introducing. The previous planning framework is characterised by outdated plans of varying status, some of which have conflicting development objectives. The new system being introduced strives to give effect to the Municipality’s constitutional mandate, conform to existing planning legislation, and align with the direction of national and provincial legislative reform.

In terms of land use management, the reactive and prescriptive approach of the past is being replaced with a more responsive and flexible policy-driven approach. The intention is to create more certainty regarding decision making, thereby enhancing the investment climate.

Diagram 3 illustrates key components of the land use planning and management system being introduced for the George municipal area. Within this system the SDF provides the overarching spatial goals, principles, structuring elements, strategies and policies within which the Municipality implements its development and service delivery agenda. It provides guidelines for the development and conservation of land within the municipal area, but does not confer or take away land use rights. This is the role of new integrated zoning scheme, which standardises land use regulations across the municipal area in line with the SDF’s objectives.

Diagram 3: George Municipal Land Use Planning & Management System
The municipal SDF also gives direction to, and sets the parameters within which, the Municipality’s more detailed local area Spatial Development Plans (SDPs) have been prepared. These area specific plans translate the SDF guidelines and strategies into local area implementation plans.

The following local area SDPs have been prepared and will be formalised over time:

- George CBD SDP
- George South East SDP
- Blanco SDP
- Pacaltsdorp/Hans Moes Kraal SDP
- Thembalethu SDP
- Kraaibosch/Glenwood SDP
- Wilderness, Lakes and Hoekwil SDP
- Eden District Management Area (i.e. Wards 24 and 25, now part of George Municipality)
- Victoria Bay/Kraaibosch South SDP
- Herolds Bay SDP
- Gwaing SDP

Map 1: Local Spatial Plans, illustrates the area covered by these local area plans.

### 1.8 TIME FRAME OF THIS SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

This SDF has a planning horizon of 25 years. It must however, together with the Integrated Development Plan of the Municipality, be reviewed annually.

Specific projects, aligned to time frames and budgets which relates to the strategies, principles and guidelines in this SDF are reflected in the respective Spatial Development Plans and Sectoral Plans of the Municipality (e.g. Water Services Plans, Human Settlement Plan etc.). These plans should be consulted for more specific time frames and costs.
2. GEORGE MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT AGENDA

2.1 MUNICIPAL VISION AND MISSION

George Municipality’s vision, as encapsulated in its Integrated Development Plan (IDP), is:

“George strives to be the best medium sized city in the Country using all available resources sustainably to the benefit of the community in a growing and a thriving city.”

In fulfilling its local government service delivery mandate, the IDP commits the Municipality to apply the core values of: courtesy and putting people first; consultation; excellence in delivering services to all; information; openness and transparency; redress; and providing value for money services.

In fulfilling its mandate of promoting socio-economic development and a safe and healthy environment, the IDP commits the Municipality to pursuing a sustainable development strategy and giving priority to meeting the basic needs of the community.

Besides fulfilling its constitutional mandate and complying with applicable legislation, the IDP commits the Municipality to contribute to the development objectives of national and provincial government, as well as to Eden District Municipality’s agenda. The Municipality have prepared their SDF to comply with applicable legislation, and align with relevant policies.

2.2 MUNICIPAL CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The Garden Route, its towns, landscapes and seascapes – such as the regional centre of George, the coastal settlements of Wilderness and Victoria Bay, the “bosdorpies”, the verdant farms, timber plantations, and indigenous mountain forests, the lakes and rugged coastline – are imprinted in the minds of many people. Nationally and internationally the area is renowned for its environmental richness, history, and cultural heritage. Many have engaged with what the area offers, for a period during a visit or a lifetime as a resident. These engagements have been enormously rich in opportunity and filled with good memories.

The George municipal area still offers opportunity: it still impresses and makes inroads in agriculture, forestry, commerce, industry of different kinds, and in the tourism sector. As the regional service centre of the Southern Cape and Klein Karoo, George ranks as one of South Africa’s significant economic nodes. In the Western Cape economy it is ranked second to Cape Town on the province’s list of rankings of “Development Potential Index”.

Yet, the George municipal area is at a crossroads. The area appears to be at a point where its challenges are such that, if not addressed now, what is special about George could be lost. A point has been reached where many citizens have difficulty – in varying degrees – engaging with their place of residence, learning and work. Some struggle to survive and have no access to safety, a house or a job. Others find it difficult to get to work or get the children to school, given transport problems. Wealth, in itself, does not appear to assist – both the wealthy and poor are affected in different ways.

Much work has been done to ascertain and measure the challenges facing the Municipality. Appendix B of the separately bound George Municipal SDF: Background Information Report
presents key features of the state of the local community, economy and environment.

Whilst the Municipality has no direct control over influences emanating from outside the municipal area, its IDP highlights the need for it to be aware of and respond to external threats and opportunities. The IDP also commits the Municipality to build on the area’s strengths, and address its weaknesses. These internal and external informants to George Municipality’s development agenda are presented in Tables 1a and 1b in the format of a SWOT (i.e. strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis.

2.3 MUNICIPAL STRATEGY

George Municipality’s IDP is clear regarding the crucial role of economic development in providing resources for the development of the poor and previously disadvantaged. The core development strategies that the Municipality are pursuing are as follows:

**Strategy 1: Grow George**
The strategy is to grow the local economy by building on George’s role as a regional service centre. The service economy - specifically the technology, tourism, and business and financial services sectors - is focused on as foundation of the local economic base as it has proved to be sustainable in the past and has the best prospects for further development. To promote investment in the service economy the Municipality is committed to supply world class infrastructure and services, ensuring that suitable land is made available for related industry and commerce, and effectively administering the municipal area.

**Strategy 2: Keep George safe and Green**
One of the biggest assets which George possesses is a beautiful and safe living environment. The quality of lifestyle which is offered in the George area is a key selling factor to attract investment. It is essential that efforts are made which will ensure that George is kept clean by ensuring that on-going efforts are made to employ more unskilled labour using the EPWP programme to clean the CBD and various other areas which are of strategic importance. This also relates to environmental protection and rehabilitation of rivers and beaches etc. In order to keep George safe it is essential that security and policing staff and resources are increased which will ensure that crime rates remain low and that more efficient policing is done in all areas which includes public places such as schools and low income areas where the most vulnerable citizens reside.

**Strategy 3: Deliver Quality Services**
Towards offering residents, visitors and investors a unique lifestyle, and ensuring that all have equal access to a quality living environment, the Municipality are embarking on wide-ranging initiatives in both the built and natural environment. These encompass: delivery of services to all households; upgrading of informal settlements and degraded neighbourhoods; housing delivery to the subsidy market; promotion of ‘green’ household technologies; and protection of the municipal area’s natural and cultural heritage.

**Strategy 4: Good Governance in George**
The Municipality strive towards institutional excellence in providing a high standard of services to consumers, and functioning as developmental local government. To this end the required human resource capacity is being built up, administrative systems are being streamlined, and financial planning, control and management systems are being upgraded.

**Strategy 5: Participate in George**
Ensure all members of public and organised business and other organisations have the opportunity to participate in the decision making process. It is of utmost importance that a culture of
participation is nurtured. It is essential that the public and private sector organisations play a more active role in the decision making process and a platform has to be established whereby public participation at various levels of government is a reality. Therefore partnerships need to be fostered at all levels of government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The local economy is diversified across the primary, secondary and tertiary sectors, and well served by regional air, rail and road infrastructure, and has specialist educational and health facilities.</td>
<td>Agriculture and forestry’s contribution to the local economy is declining, in terms of both production and processing of products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George has sustained and strengthened its role as regional service centre, and the sub-sectors underpinning its service economy (i.e. finance and business services, wholesale/retail trade, catering and accommodation) have grown rapidly.</td>
<td>There are no significant mineral resources in the municipal area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area has unique natural, scenic and cultural attractions, diverse hospitality, recreational and leisure facilities, and established tourism infrastructure. The establishment of the Garden Route National Park has reinforced the area’s status as a premier tourist destination.</td>
<td>The widespread unemployment in the municipal area has been accentuated in the current economic recession, and the local construction and property sectors have been particularly severely impacted on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George has strategically located land available (e.g. west of Pacaltsdorp Industrial area and N2 intersections) that is suitable for attracting industrial and commercial investments.</td>
<td>The low skill levels of much of the local labour force limits their ability to secure work in the services economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climatic and soil conditions in the municipality’s rural areas are well suited for farming and forestry activities, and the rural area’s natural assets present opportunities for the diversification of tourism.</td>
<td>The formally developed urban economy contrasts strongly with the informal under-developed township economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local community’s diverse natural assets and mild climate provide the local community with a unique lifestyle in its towns and villages.</td>
<td>Retail activity in George CBD has declined with the development of the Garden Route Mall on the N2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The local lifestyle offering, economy and accessibility of the area have attracted migration into the George urban area by different income groups (e.g. retirees, work seekers, executives relocating from Gauteng). As a result the George urban population is a diverse community of sufficient size with the disposable income</td>
<td>Whilst agriculture and forestry’s contribution to the rural economy has declined, and tourism’s contribution has increased – there has been limited transformation of the rural economy in terms of land and agrarian reform, BBBEE, and rural development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1a: STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES OF THE GEORGE MUNICIPAL AREA
and skill levels to support high order educational, health, and commercial facilities.

- The 2004 and 2010 provincial studies into the development potential of W Cape towns reveals that social needs in George have improved recently.
- Impoverished households have limited affordability to pay for municipal services.

### The Built Environment

- George is an established urban area with well developed infrastructure and diverse facilities commensurate with that of a regional service centre. With these assets George has the foundations on which to develop into a fully-fledged city.
- There is substantial undeveloped serviced residential land (i.e. approximately 29 000 erven) within the George urban area, thereby obviating the need for expanding outwards and investing in expensive new bulk infrastructure on the urban fringe.
- The municipality has strategically located land suitable for development within the George urban area that can contribute to spatial integration.
- The municipality has provided basic services to over 3 065 households living in shacks in Thembalethu.
- The towns and villages outside of George are established human settlements with developed infrastructure and community facilities.
- The municipality has initiated roll-out of George’s integrated public transport network.
- The municipality has initiated aesthetic building guidelines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Built Environment</th>
<th>The Natural &amp; Cultural Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George urban area is spatially fragmented, reflects the legacy of Apartheid segregationist spatial planning with poor communities located furthest from facilities and employment, and lacks a legible urban structure to integrate the different parts of the town.</td>
<td>The lake systems and estuaries are under stress as a result of a reduction in the quality and quantity of water entering the lakes, in turn related to agriculture, urban encroachment and associated habitat loss, increased tourism and recreation, and the introduction of invasive, alien species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing delivery has been unable to keep up with demand, giving rise to households living in: overcrowded formal dwellings (4 423); shacks in informal settlements (6 208); and shacks in the backyard of formal dwellings (4 029).</td>
<td>Valuable agricultural and plantations land has been under pressure for urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of those living in shacks have inadequate access to basic services.</td>
<td>Increasing development on steep slopes detracts from the area’s visual quality and causes erosion and landslides.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst most of those living in vulnerable circumstances reside in George, it is logistically difficult and expensive for the municipality to deliver services and facilities to the dormitory settlements at Wilderness Heights and Kleinkranz, and dispersed rural communities.</td>
<td>The area has few beaches, limited in carrying capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current government funding for bulk infrastructure, internal services and top structures is inadequate in relation to needs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public transport in the area is largely limited to minibus taxis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Natural & Cultural Environment

- The municipal area is well endowed with rich and diverse terrestrial, marine and aquatic ecosystems, scenic attractions, and cultural landscapes – which collectively provide the attraction on which the local tourism economy is based.
- Significant progress has been made in mapping the area’s natural assets, providing sound information as a basis for informing development and land use management decision-making.
- A start has been made with recording the municipal area’s cultural and scenic assets.
- The municipal area’s fertile soils and favourable climate can

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Natural &amp; Cultural Environment</th>
<th>The Built Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lake systems and estuaries are under stress as a result of a reduction in the quality and quantity of water entering the lakes, in turn related to agriculture, urban encroachment and associated habitat loss, increased tourism and recreation, and the introduction of invasive, alien species.</td>
<td>George urban area is spatially fragmented, reflects the legacy of Apartheid segregationist spatial planning with poor communities located furthest from facilities and employment, and lacks a legible urban structure to integrate the different parts of the town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valuable agricultural and plantations land has been under pressure for urban development.</td>
<td>Housing delivery has been unable to keep up with demand, giving rise to households living in: overcrowded formal dwellings (4 423); shacks in informal settlements (6 208); and shacks in the backyard of formal dwellings (4 029).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing development on steep slopes detracts from the area’s visual quality and causes erosion and landslides.</td>
<td>70% of those living in shacks have inadequate access to basic services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The area has few beaches, limited in carrying capacity.</td>
<td>Whilst most of those living in vulnerable circumstances reside in George, it is logistically difficult and expensive for the municipality to deliver services and facilities to the dormitory settlements at Wilderness Heights and Kleinkranz, and dispersed rural communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current government funding for bulk infrastructure, internal services and top structures is inadequate in relation to needs.</td>
<td>Public transport in the area is largely limited to minibus taxis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Support increased farming and forestry activities.
- There is sufficient land to accommodate future settlement needs without damage to the environment or loss of agricultural or forestry land.
- The new Garden Route National Park has bolstered conservation.

Table 1b: EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS IMPACTING ON THE GEORGE MUNICIPAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Opportunities</th>
<th>External Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The economic recession should: | The economic recession has led to:
<p>|  - reduce the rate of migration into George, |  - Increased unemployment and reduced disposable incomes |
|  - open-up opportunities for some of the 29 000 vacant erven earmarked for the middle and higher income markets to be developed for the ‘gap’ housing market, and |  - Tightening of funding to leverage housing development. |
|  - facilitate densification of urban areas. |  - Limitations on the ability of the municipality to cross-subsidise lower income housing from its rates base. |
| The adoption of new household ‘green’ technologies for renewable energy, water savings, waste recycling, etc will, over time, reduce the municipality’s bulk infrastructure needs. |  - Pressure on the affordability of subsidised or free basic services. |
| With growth of technology globally, companies will seek locations that have infrastructure and facilities and offer quality lifestyles. |  - Decreasing property values and pressure on the municipal rates base. |
| Further growth in leisure and tourism will be attracted to established destinations. | Deepening of the economic recession leading to disinvestment. |
| Proximity to and economic linkages with the port of Mossel Bay. | Rapid increases in energy costs and petrol price, further constraining household affordability. |
| Shift to public transport usage with escalating fuel prices. | Competition from Mossel Bay for investment in the S Cape. |
| George Airport serving as a gateway to the Southern Cape for tourists and business travellers. |  |
| <strong>Social</strong> | <strong>Social</strong> |
| Growing acceptance of social integration, embracing of cultural diversity, and sense of community. | Persistent poverty, unemployment and income disparities fuelling crime, impacting negatively on lifestyles, and polarising communities. |
| Growing interest in choosing place of residence based on quality of life variables. | Political instability impacting negatively on foreign investment in South Africa. |
| Movement towards active healthy lifestyles, pursuit of outdoor recreation and sport, and self improvement. | ‘NIMBY’ attitudes, and intolerance towards change. |
| Broadening interest in ‘new urbanism’ and being part of vibrant communities living in mixed-use neighbourhoods. | Low work ethic, skills and productivity |
| Increasing popularity of non-motorised transport (e.g. cycling) |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mainstreaming of environmental awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Broad based adoption of ‘green’ technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growing interest in cultural heritage of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Voluntary adoption of conservation measures by land owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental advocacy and activism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Climate change &amp; sea level rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Invasive alien vegetation infestation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural disasters (i.e. drought, floods, wild fires, etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complacency and poor monitoring and regulation of the environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. SPATIAL PERSPECTIVE

The Spatial Development Framework needs to contextualise the spatial manifestation of the municipality’s development agenda with supporting spatial development strategies. This section provides a spatial perspective of such principles underpinning the Municipality’s spatial investment framework and spatial strategies.

3.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT FOR THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

The development context that serves as the informants for the spatial planning of the George Municipal area are summarised in Table 2.

3.2 KEY PLANNING ISSUES FOR THE GEORGE SDF

In support of the development agenda and the associated development opportunities and challenges outlined above, the George Municipal SDF’s respond to the following key planning issues:

- Redress Historic Planning practices
- Restructuring of dysfunctional urban fabric
- Development and maintaining Quality & Sustainable Living Environments
- An Integrated & Equitable City and towns with access to Social and Economic Opportunities
- Pro Poor approach
- Fast track planning processes
- Consider different geographical areas when the Municipality plans its budget

---

Table 2: SPATIAL PLANNING OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES FOR THE GEORGE MUNICIPAL AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Planning Opportunities</th>
<th>Spatial Planning Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The functional role of George in the context of the regional space economy with access to the airport.</td>
<td>• Dysfunctional urban fabric with segregated communities due to historic planning practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Garden Route Identity and trade mark with related tourism</td>
<td>• Unequal access to economic opportunities and social infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• George Municipality is a preferential settlement area for highly skilled professionals</td>
<td>• Fragile economy based on consumer market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Vacant prime coastal properties to facilitate strategic developments</td>
<td>• Protection of the rural character and environmental integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Availability of developable land and good state of infrastructure</td>
<td>• Sustainable urban vitality and supporting infrastructure and services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential of agri production</td>
<td>• Poverty with challenges for jobs &amp; housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A unique environment that attracts people to visit and live in the area</td>
<td>• Development pressure on productive agricultural land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor access to services in non-urban areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 GEORGE SPATIAL PLANNING VISION AND MISSION

The Spatial Planning Vision and Mission to guide the George SDF are the following:

Spatial Planning Vision:

“Develop George as a Destination of Opportunity”

Spatial Planning Mission:

Facilitate a sustainable and quality living environment which will:

- Support Economic growth & vitality
- Contribute to Social upliftment and wellbeing
- Protect the environmental integrity

3.4 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

George Municipality’s spatial response to the development challenges it faces is based on the application of the following interdependent principles:

i. Provide a clear spatial framework to guide the Municipality’s investment in its urban and rural areas.

ii. The SDF assist the Municipality to balance the constitutional obligation to deliver services to its rural and urban communities, with in the context of the National Development Plan / Vision 2040 (NDP).

iii. Protecting, maintaining and expanding the municipal area’s natural assets as the basis for all living, and as the foundation of the regional and local economy.

iv. Enhancing the productive capacity and livelihood opportunities associated with the municipal area’s natural assets, and attracting new higher order investment in George’s service economy.

v. Using major public infrastructure investments to leverage improved productive capacity and livelihood opportunities.

vi. Structuring and managing the municipality’s human settlements in a manner where they fulfil interdependent as opposed to competing roles.

vii. Making existing settlements better, not spatially bigger, as places of living, work, services and recreation.

viii. Improving the functioning of settlements for the poor, specifically through providing increased housing choice in well-located areas, improved access between poorer settlements and opportunity rich areas, and the upgrading of poorer areas (including the upgrade of informal settlements and location of public facilities and employment centres in these areas).
4. SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

Chapter 8 of the National Development Plan (NDP) states that all spatial development should conform to the following normative principles:

- spatial justice,
- spatial sustainability,
- spatial resilience,
- spatial quality, and
- spatial efficiency

The NDP states that spatial planning should explicitly indicate how they would meet the requirements of these principles. The Spatial Development Framework of George Municipality provides the spatial manifestation of these normative principles through 5 specific spatial objectives which in combination forms the spatial strategy for George Municipality.

SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE 4.1:
Restructuring and Integrating the Dysfunctional Urban fabric

4.1.1 Preamble

The challenge is undoing the spatial legacy that apartheid left on the towns, villages and farms in the George municipal area, and providing humane and enabling living environments for all. With the focus on George City, the existing human settlements needs to be restructured and integrated into the larger space economy of George so that they function more equitably and efficiently as a fully-fledged city that is socially integrated and has a robust economic base. The SDF needs to give direction to facilitating George’s transformation from an agglomeration of separate urban areas, into an integrated city that is underpinned by a thriving service economy and offers all residents access to the benefits of city living.

4.1.2 Problem Statement

George currently comprises disparate urban areas, as shown in Diagram 4: George Existing Spatial Structure, and has the following spatial characteristics:

- An “old” town relatively well off in terms of access to opportunity, commercial activity and public facilities.
- The space economy of George are focussed in an triangle of opportunity comprising of the existing CBD Business node, the emerging Kraaibosch/ Blue Mountain Commercial Node, and the Pacaltsdorp Industrial Node (See map 2: Existing Economic nodes).
- Less well-off areas on the periphery of the old town which mainly serves as dormant neighbourhoods with little economic opportunities, namely:
  - The older settlements of Blanco and Pacaltsdorp.
  - George South East (north of the N2).
  - The newer area of Thembalethu.
- A gradual shift of commercial development away from the old CBD focused on York Street, towards Courtney Street and “mall” type developments closer to the N2.
- The N2 forming a major barrier between poorer neighbourhoods in the south and better resourced neighbourhoods in the north.
- Increased and significant “estate” type development in the vicinity of Herold’s Bay, Kraaibosch and Kingswood.

4.1.3 General Policy Guidelines:

Guidelines in restructuring George into a fully-fledged city include:
- Restructure the George urban fabric to integrate the segregated communities south of the N2 into the larger space economy of the emerging city.
- Containing urban sprawl and the resultant loss of natural and agricultural assets, increased servicing costs, excessive movement between places of work and residence, and inadequate thresholds for smaller enterprises to develop.
- Revitalising the old CBD and strengthening the role of other urban nodes.
- Integrating opportunity rich areas of George and poorer areas through, amongst other, public transport and non-motorised transport.

Diagram 4: George’s existing spatial structure
• Improving living conditions in poorer settlements, including increased housing choice, access to community facilities, and livelihood opportunities.
• Making the most of mountain to coast river corridors to structure a "garden" city.
• Opening-up suitable nature rich areas for new productive investment and enterprises that bring broad benefits to local communities.

4.1.4 Strategies

To address these challenges and develop George into a fully-fledged city, the Municipality are pursuing the following spatial development strategies:

(a) Urban Restructuring and Integration

• Develop the vacant Hans Moes Kraal coastal properties into an economic opportunity node to reposition the segregated and dormant poor neighbourhoods into the larger space economy of George, see Map 3: New Special Investment Node.

The intention of this New Special Investment Node is not to redirect any potential investment away from the existing Pacaltsdorp or any other area in George. The intention is to attract developments that, due to its scale and uniqueness will not “fit” into any other area of George. Such development have the potential to have a positive effect on the space economy of George and will have a positive effect on George and Pacaltsdorp in particular.

• Support the development of the George open space system through maintaining the integrity of existing elements of the system and actively seek to link various elements into a continuous green web.
• Support the use of underutilised land in proximity to the intersections off the N2 and along the routes linking Pacaltsdorp and Thembalethu to the existing CBD for more intensive mixed-use development.
• Support increased densities in specifically the George CBD, secondary nodes, and along the key public transport routes that link them.
• Support development which emphasises public transport as opposed to private car use.
• Support the establishment of intense economic activities and social facilities along continuous routes which integrates the different parts of George.
• Resist the provision of further regional road infrastructure which could assist in urban sprawl or further reduce access to recreational opportunity.
• Resist gated developments/estates in scale and location that inhibits a feeling of openness and sterilise living environments.
• Ensure social equality with access to opportunities and social infrastructure.

(b) Introduce city-wide public transport and non-motorised transport networks

To make the benefits of city living accessible to all, especially the poor, the Municipality is rolling-out a mobility strategy with the assistance of the Provincial Government. It gives priority to the establishment of a bus-based public transport network along activity routes linking the nodes listed above (see Diagram 5: Integrated Public Transport Network and Map 4: Integrated Public Transport Network).
The principal routes linking the different nodal centres which will be upgraded to form the city’s public transport network are: York Street, Courtney Street, Sandkraal Road, George Road and Beach Road. In order to assist in the sustainability of public transport, higher densities and a mix of land uses will be promoted along the principal public transport routes. Principal public transport routes, together with the city-wide open space system form the basis of a system of non-motorised transport network.
(c) Renew and upgrade degraded urban areas and dysfunctional human settlements

Many of the Municipality’s urban areas are degraded, others are dysfunctional (e.g. the informal settlements). Areas prioritised for renewal and upgrading are described below.

i. Urban Renewal area 1: George CBD

Whilst the development of the Garden Route Mall and associated activities has impacted negatively on the George central business district (CBD), the area’s established public facilities and extensive property investments are significant assets that need to be used optimally.

The Municipality will maintain and strengthen the CBD as George’s primary economic activity centre. Key spatial actions related to the CBD are:

- Prevent the trend of “dispersed” business development in the CBD, specifically the spread of business development into surrounding residential areas.
- Retain office activities in the CBD.
- Use the development of a new central bus terminus as an urban regeneration project to renew the corridor from York Street to the station and between Cathedral and Market Streets.
- Investigate the development of a centralised regional office complex for the Provincial Government of the Western Cape in the CBD.
- Support residential densification along key CBD routes. The SDP for the CBD indicates that at densities of 80 units/ha an additional 4,000 households can be accommodated over the next 15 years, and over the long term, possibly up to 28,000 households. A range of housing types is foreseen, including government led social housing and private sector delivery of “gap” housing.
- Upgrade the CBD’s public spaces, parking facilities and landscaping so that the area functions as a vibrant living, working, shopping and entertainment hub during the day and in the evenings.
- Extend trading hours.
- Incentivise private investment in the upgrading and redevelopment of the CBD’s buildings.
- Investigate establishing a special purpose agency to assist with the management and development of the CBD.

Detailed directives for the development and management of the George CBD are contained in the Draft George CBD Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), May 2009.

ii. Urban Renewal area 2: Blanco

Originally Blanco developed as a distinct settlement from George, but now it is an integral part of the George urban area. Despite significant “estate” type development in the area, it has managed to retain many historic buildings and its unique pastoral village character and ways of life.

The Municipality will maintain the present environmental, rural and settlement character of Blanco. To this end it will:

- Maintain “tight” urban edges to protect the rural character of the area.
- Apply land use management guidelines to protect the human scale and pastoral character of the village (including the placement of buildings close to street boundaries).
Permit sensitive mixed use development and densification along major routes (George Street and Montagu Street), including tourism-related facilities.

 Allow infill residential development to densities of 20-30 units/ha on identified vacant land parcels.

The proposed Western By-pass affects Blanco. Four alignment options for this route were investigated as part of the EIA process associated with the project. Environmental approval was given in July 2010 for the Gwaing - Blanco alignment in the Northern Sector and quarry alignment alternative 3 for the Southern Sector. This route must be considered for all future developments taking place in this area.

Detailed directives for the development and management of Blanco are contained in the Draft Blanco Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), May 2009.

iii. Urban Renewal area 3: George South East

George South East comprises older and newer residential areas, predominantly planned in the apartheid era for the “Coloured” community south and west of the industrial area and north of the N2.

Given the background of the area, it is predominantly residential in nature (with a considerable proportion of informal dwellings), underprovided in places of work and social facilities, and poorly integrated with the rest of George.

The Municipality will promote urban renewal and integration in the area. This includes:

- Focused urban renewal through mixed use development, comprising a range of housing types at Borcherds, Rosemoor, the cemetery area, commonage south of the industrial area and a number of smaller vacant sites. At a density of 30-40 units/ha 2 000 – 3 400 housing opportunities could be provided in these areas.
- Upgrade roads for better integration with the rest of George and the industrial area.

Detailed directives for the development and management of George South East are contained in the Draft George South East Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), May 2009.

iv Urban Renewal area 4: Pacaltsdorp

Historically Pacaltsdorp developed as an independent settlement, distinct from George. Albeit part of the greater George urban area today, the area remains predominantly residential in nature.

The restructuring agenda for Pacaltsdorp is similar to that pursued for Thembalethu. Specifically:

- Limited expansion up to the urban edge of Pacaltsdorp, but in the long term spatial growth will be directed towards the Gwaing River and coast in accordance with the phasing set-out in the Pacaltsdorp/Hans Moes Kraal Local Structure Plan.
- Active support for the development of the Pacaltsdorp commercial centre as an activity centre and node. Significant opportunity exists for infill development and higher density development (approximately 70 ha of land is available and densities as high as 80 units/ha are envisaged).
• Significant new housing opportunity for a range of income
groups on the strategically located Erf 325 and Syferfontein
sites.
• Sufficient provision of public- and social infrastructure to
accommodate the future growth and development of
Pacaltsdorp should receive priority.
• Greater attention to the provision of community facilities in
association with upgrading and housing delivery projects.
• The development of Beach Road as a corridor route and
development of a “CBD” alongside the road.
• Protection of public access to the Gwaing river mouth.
• Possible location of “special attractions”, including science
and technology enterprises, and allied research and training
facilities, on the Hans Moes Kraal coast. This possibility is
currently the subject of a precinct level study.

Detailed directives for the development and management of
Pacaltsdorp are contained in the Draft Pacaltsdorp/Hans Moes
Kraal Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), February
2009.

v. Urban Renewal area 5: Thembalethu

Thembalethu was originally developed in the apartheid era as a
dormitory residential area for “African” residents.

The provision of services to areas either not serviced or
underprovided with services, and the spatial integration of
Thembalethu with the rest of George, is a municipal priority. Specific
actions being undertaken in Thembalethu are:
• The completion of the Asazani informal settlement
upgrading programme. A key objective of the programme is
to provide housing on infill sites as opposed to on the
outskirts of Thembalethu (pressure for growth southwards to
the coast is specifically resisted).
• Increasing housing choice in the area through the provision
of higher density options at commercial nodes and along
Sandkraal Road (options would include social housing).
• The development of Sandkraal Road as an activity route
and location for mixed use development, integrating
Thembalethu with the rest of George.
• Strengthening the Sandkraal Road/ Tabata Street
commercial node as the primary mixed use activity node in
Thembalethu (this would include the location of major
community facilities in association with the node).
• Establishing smaller commercial nodes at the Sandkraal
Road/ 27th Street intersection and the Sandkraal Road/ Southern
Ring Road intersection.
• Establishing light industry on the rehabilitated clay mining
area.
• Establishing the Church House complex as a cultural centre
and tourism attraction in Thembalethu.
• Support for urban agriculture, small farming and commercial
farming activities.

Detailed directives for the development and management of
Thembalethu are contained in the Draft Thembalethu Spatial
Development Plan, June 2009.
SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE 4.2:
Strengthening the Economic Vitality

4.2.1 Preamble

A central theme of the Municipal IDP is that the area’s future prospects are directly dependent on the performance of the local economy, of which the greater George urban complex is the hub of activity. The Municipality Economic Development Plan, April 2012, stipulates the Municipality’s commitment to building investor confidence in the area. The SDF should include spatial strategies to diversify and strengthen the local economy.

4.2.2 Problem Statement

The George municipal area has not escaped the ravages of the current global economic recession. Unemployment is entrenched, poverty pervasive, and the future of existing business is under threat. The Municipal Economic Development Plan recognised this and stipulates that within context of economic growth and development and given South Africa’s history it is not a viable option to leave business development and investment decisions to the market alone. For this reason it is imperative that the George Municipality intervenes strategically in the development arena as follows:

i. Improve functionality of markets;
ii. Facilitating catalytic projects, that level the playing field for entrepreneurial activity,
iii. Facilitating growth in sectors of strategic priority,
iv. Manage mechanisms that organise buying and selling, channel the flow of information but at the same time do not distort the market by creating unfair competition.

The challenge is to re-instil investor and consumer confidence by improving service delivery and creating an environment conducive to investment. The SDF recognised this and identifies economic opportunity areas where the local service economy can be strengthened, and livelihood opportunities for poor households increased.

4.2.3 General Policy Guidelines:

Guidelines for the development of the George space economy includes:

- Open-up opportunities for diversifying the local economy into the research and educational sectors in the Hans Moes Kraal precinct.
- Targeting strategic land parcels for development to diversify and strengthen the local economy.
- Actively seek to attract development sectors not strongly presented in George Municipality, specifically those that can benefit from the area’s unique environment and regional accessibility and will benefit surrounding communities.
- Seek to increase residential densities in nodes and along the public transport routes to improve thresholds required for enterprises to develop.

4.2.4 Strategies

To address these challenges and develop the economy of George to the benefit of all its inhabitants, the Municipality are pursuing the following spatial development strategies:
(a) Enhance the Regional and Local Space Economy

George Municipality forms part of the Southern Cape and Klein Karoo regions (see Diagram 6: George as part of the Broader Region). Whilst a strategy for the development and management of the regional space economy is beyond the scope of George Municipality’s SDF, it is important to align the individual strategies of key towns in the region. Developing and managing George in a manner which supports the sustainability of the broader region implies:

- Protecting and expanding natural and agricultural assets which contribute to the regional economy.
- Supporting cross-boundary land use, management and conservation initiatives.
- Maintaining and expanding the regional potential of key infrastructure and facilities (e.g. the airport).
- Maintaining and expanding services which serve in the needs of the region (e.g. the higher order industrial services and educational facilities role of George).

Diagram 6: George as part of a broader region
(b) **Strategic Developments to Diversify and Strengthen the Economy**

George’s Economic Development Strategy focuses on using established infrastructure and facilities to strengthen and expand the area’s industrial, commercial and services economic base, as well as using the area’s natural capital, unique lifestyle offering, and established tourism facilities to broaden the base of the local economy. The Municipality has identified the following sectoral opportunities to diversify and strengthen the local economy:

- Attracting science and technology enterprises, and allied research and training facilities.
- Extending the range of sport, recreation and cultural facilities offered in the greater George area.
- Establishing George as a national conference centre with associated accommodation.

In addition to the revitalisation of George CBD (see Urban Renewal proposals), the following precincts are earmarked for the realisation of these economic opportunities (see Diagram 7: Existing and proposed nodes of economic activity):

i. The **Eastern Gateway** mixed-use node, comprising the Garden Route Mall, surrounding vacant land, the Destiny Africa site and underutilised land adjacent to the N2. It is here that commercial activity can be strengthened, and new cultural and conference facilities established.

ii. The **Hans Moeis Kral precinct**, which has the locational attributes to become a 'high-tech' hub accommodating science, technology, research, training and related enterprises. The Municipality has initiated a precinct level planning study to investigate appropriate means of unlocking this special investment node’s potential.

iii. The **Western Gateway** industrial node, comprising the western expansion of the existing industrial area, which is readily accessible to both the airport and N2.

Where a business and environmental case can be made for opening-up these precincts for development, the Municipality will set in motion processes to amend the urban edge (if required) and grant the required land use rights. In addition the necessary public infrastructure and facilities will be provided.

(c) **Consolidate and reinforce nodes of economic activity**

The roles of the existing and proposed nodes of economic activity in the greater George urban areas are outlined in Table 3: Existing and proposed Nodes of Economic Activity, below, and their spatial configuration is illustrated in Diagram 7: Existing and proposed nodes of economic activity.

A network of mixed use nodal centres accessible to surrounding communities is being developed at strategic locations in the George urban area, within which higher order facilities and business activities are concentrated (see Diagram 6: George as part of a broader region).

The primary economic centre remains George CBD. The strategy is to revitalise and redevelop it into a fully-fledged city centre that contains a variety of complementary activities, as well as a substantially larger residential component than at present (see George CBD Spatial Development Plan for detailed proposals).

Thembalethu, Plett and Blanco are being developed as secondary economic activity centres (see their respective SDPs for detailed proposals). The Garden Route Mall precinct forms the nucleus of a prospective Eastern Gateway mixed-use node, and the current industrial area forms the nucleus of a prospective Western Gateway economic node.
Outside the George urban area the business centres of towns and villages are being consolidated and reinforced, and the decentralisation of economic activity curtailed.

Diagram 7: Existing and proposed nodes of economic activity
Table 3: Existing and Proposed Nodes of Economic Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NODE</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George CBD</td>
<td>Primary activity centre of the city of George, redeveloped to accommodate a vibrant mix of residential, commercial, office and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Gateway mixed-use</td>
<td>New sub-regional mixed-use node, focused on the commercial potential of the N2, but also containing a mix of conference, cultural, residential and work opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacaltsdorp CBD</td>
<td>Pacaltsdorp town centre, second order business node containing a mix of residential, commercial and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thembalethu CBD</td>
<td>Thembalethu town centre, second order business node containing a mix of residential, commercial and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco CBD</td>
<td>Blanco town centre, second order business node containing a mix of residential, commercial and public facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Moes Kraal ‘Hi-Tech’ hub</td>
<td>Future special investment node, targeted at science and technology enterprises, and allied research and training facilities as well as conferencing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Gateway Industrial</td>
<td>New sub-regional industrial node in proximity to the N2 and airport, targeted at S Cape manufacturing, freight and logistics, and service industries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(d) Infrastructure Services Provision

To ensure the efficient use of existing assets and maximise development opportunities associated with them, existing infrastructure within the urban edge of George is being used to leverage more intensive forms of urban development. For example, the local area SDPs identify vacant and underutilised land between historically separated communities for mixed-use development, specifically in proximity to the intersections off the N2 and along the routes linking Pacaltsdorp and Thembalethu to the old George CBD.

Similarly, the proposed “Eastern Gateway” development (i.e. Destiny Africa site) will be used to leverage private sector funded extensions to bulk infrastructure that will serve the greater urban area. To improve the viability of existing businesses and optimise the use of available infrastructure, the local area SDPs promote densification in suitable built-up areas, and target strategically located vacant land for infill urban development.

Furthermore bulk infrastructure is being augmented to allow for the development of vacant land inside the urban edge in Pacaltsdorp.
SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE 4.3:
Creating Quality Living Environments

4.3.1 Preamble

If it is to become ‘a city for all reasons’ George needs to offer all residents access to the services and facilities of city living. It also needs to ensure that those living in other towns or villages have access to basic services and facilities. The challenge is to ensure that social investment not only addresses basic human needs, but also develops the human capital needed for a thriving and prosperous service economy.

4.3.2 Problem Statement

The current system of human settlements in the municipal area is dominated by George as the primary regional service centre, and a number of much smaller towns, villages and hamlets which are based on the retirement market, tourism and recreation, and agricultural and forestry activity. The main challenge is to manage the development and growth of the urban and rural living environments to ensure ongoing sustainability and affordability whilst providing in the needs of the communities.

4.3.3 General Policy Guidelines:

Guidelines for the development and management of George’s human settlements are:
- Managing the direction and form of new urban growth so that it is sustainable.
- Promote responsible growth management for sustainability.
- Focus on making settlements “better”, through inward growth and development, as opposed to making them spatially bigger.
- Developing and maintaining a system of interdependent settlements, with distinct roles and a complementary mix of activities.
- Focusing productive investment in the regional centre of George, supporting its emergence as a fully-fledged city that is socially integrated and has a diversified economic base.
- Maintaining a compact settlement form to facilitate internal settlement restructuring and integration of activities for better efficiency in service delivery and better use of resources.
- Avoiding investing in “greenfields” residential developments that are detached from the existing network of human settlements.
- Opening-up suitable special coastal areas for new economic development, in proximity to poor areas and linked to other parts of George.
- Investing in improving the social inclusivity of human settlements.
- Promoting a form of urban development respectful of the environment and historic development patterns.
- Enhancing existing river corridors and open spaces to create functional open spaces connected to each other.
- Promoting development that supports public transport initiatives and non-motorised transport.
- Curtailing ‘gated’ residential developments and promoting ‘open’ developments that make use of other forms of security (e.g. CCTV cameras, security patrols).
- Intensifying existing urban centres with revitalisation programmes, densification and investment in public spaces.
- Protecting bio-diversity and heritage assets within urban areas.
- Support, in the first instance, development where existing services capacity could be utilised.
- Support "green management" strategies for all municipal services (building on existing work in water services to include, for example, compulsory green energy installations in building development, grey water reticulation, etc).
- Support the viability of public transport along proposed routes through facilitating higher density, mix use in proximity to these routes.
- Support the development of a new central bus terminus as an urban regeneration project to renew the corridor from York Street to the station and between Cathedral and Market Streets.

4.3.4 Strategies

(a) Sustainable Urban Growth Management

The Municipality’s approach to managing the direction and form of future urban growth in George is based on the approach to maintain a clear urban edge around all settlements – large and small – in the municipal area.

Based on research into the medium term requirements for new urban land, the suitability of surrounding land for urban development, and potential for inward urban growth (i.e. through infill of vacant and underutilised land and densification of existing areas) - an urban edge for George has been delineated (Map 5: The Urban Edge).

Recent studies indicate that there are in excess of 29 000 erven available for future residential development - at various stages of approvals and development. – within the confines of the proposed urban edge. This excludes significant low cost (subsidy) housing development opportunities. It is therefore sensible to maintain a relatively conservative urban edge around George. At this stage improving George does not require making it spatially bigger, but rather using existing urban areas better. When available land inside the urban edge has been developed, George’s long term spatial growth direction, beyond the current urban edge, is to the southwest up to the Gwaing River and Coast (See Map 6: Future Growth Direction).

Besides the greater George area, urban edges have also been delineated around all other human settlements in the municipal area, as detailed in the SDPs. Guidelines for urban growth management and development for the settlements Surrounding George are as follows:

i. Herold’s Bay

Herold’s Bay is a historic coastal recreation and holiday destination. Herold’s Bay Lower comprise the old seaside village, while Herold’s Bay Upper comprises more recent residential development located along the higher-lying plateau. Four residential estates have been agreed to in this area over the last number of years.

The Municipality will maintain the present environmental, rural and settlement character of the area. To this end it will:

- Permit very limited additional development in Harold’s Bay Lower, save for redevelopment and alterations sensitive to the “village-style” of the area, the amenity of adjoining properties and view-sheds.
- Support compact development in areas approved for further residential development.
- Support the development of a neighbourhood commercial centre.
- Resist any form of expansion, densification or development of the buffer zones of residential, eco and golf estates.
- No further high density developments (Flats etc.).
Detailed directives for the development and management of Herold’s Bay are contained in the Draft Herold’s Bay Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), May 2009.

ii. Victoria Bay/ Kraaibosch South

Victoria Bay is a small seaside resort and well-visited recreational area. Kraaibosch South is predominantly a rural residential area. The area’s topography, the Kaaiman’s River and built character is unique, and has contributed to its increased popularity as a place of recreation, vacation and permanent living. There are approximately 50 dwellings in the Victoria Bay rural area, 12 dwellings in the seaside settlement and four dwellings along the Kaaimans River.

The Municipality will maintain the present environmental, rural and settlement character of the area. To this end it will:

- Restrict development in Victoria Bay to existing building footprints and height.
- Manage applications for subdivision and land use in the surrounding area in a manner that maintains the rural and scenic character of the area and do not place an additional burden on service infrastructure.

Detailed directives for the development and management of Victoria Bay/ Kraaibosch South are contained in the Draft Victoria Bay/ Kraaibosch South Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), May 2009.

iii. Wilderness, Touwsranten and Hoekwil

Wilderness is one of the most popular tourism and residential destinations along the Garden Route, based on its unique terrestrial, aquatic and marine assets, outstanding rural and townscape qualities, and recreational amenity value. Threats to the area include the subdivision of smallholdings, expansion of poorly located and serviced informal areas, and insensitive building development.

The Municipality will maintain the present environmental, rural and settlement character of the area. To this end it will:

- Not permit expansion of residential areas beyond the urban edge, with the exception of Hoekwil (where a node has been identified), and Touwsranten where growth has to be accommodated.
- Prohibit significant densification of existing residential areas (except through group/ town housing and resort development on land available within the urban edge).
- Not formalise the two informal residential areas in Kleinkrantz and Wilderness Heights, and promote their residents relocating to Touwsranten where appropriate services can be delivered and community facilities provided.
- Support further tourism development in the Village to enhance its role as the primary business node in Wilderness.
- Support nodal development at Hoekwil and Touwsranten.
- No development should impact negatively on the lakes area, crest skyline and green boundaries.

Detailed directives for the development and management of Wilderness and related settlements are contained in the Draft Wilderness-Lakes-Hoekwil Local Structure Plan (Spatial Development Plan), March 2011.
v. Uniondale

Uniondale is the largest service centre in the former DMA. The Municipality will:
- Maintain the agricultural and natural surround of the town.
- Improve road infrastructure servicing the town.
- Improve basic services delivered to residents.
- Improve the provision of public facilities.

Detailed directives for the development and management of Uniondale are included in the Eden District Management Area Spatial Development Framework, March 2004 (prepared prior to the inclusion of Wards 24 and 25 as part of George Municipality).

(b) City Activity Nodes Hierarchy

The Municipality is directing public and private fixed investment to existing settlements that have economic development potential. In this way, the impact of public and private investment is maximised, the majority of residents benefit, and the Municipality’s natural and productive landscapes are protected.

To this end the Municipality are developing and managing human settlements in the municipal area in accordance with their functional role, as tabulated below and illustrated in Diagram 8: Overall environmental and rural spatial concept and Settlement Hierarchy and Map 7: Urban and Rural settlements.

Table 4: George Municipal Settlement Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETTLEMENT</th>
<th>FUNCTION / ROLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Larger urban settlements, towns and cities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Greater George</td>
<td>Significant regional commercial, service and administrative centre, industrial node, transport and logistics hub; an emerging “regional” city with well-integrated residential and higher order activity centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wilderness</td>
<td>Coastal residential, tourism, and local business node, recreation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Uniondale</td>
<td>Rural service centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Herold’s Bay</td>
<td>Coastal residential village (including self contained resorts), recreation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Touwsranten</td>
<td>Dormitory residential area with local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Hoekwil</td>
<td>Dormitory residential area with local services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Victoria Bay</td>
<td>Coastal residential village, recreation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Kleinkrantz</td>
<td>Coastal residential village, recreation area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Haarlem</td>
<td>Dormitory residential area with local services.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small rural settlements, places and areas

- Avontuur: Agricultural settlement held by one land owner.
- Barandas: Agglomeration of small holdings and houses focused on old station.
- Bergplaas: Remote forestry village.
- Collinshoek: Remote forestry village.
- De Vlug: Small settlement based on tourism and limited agriculture.
- Eseljacht: Significant rural agricultural area.
- Geelhoutboom: Significant rural agricultural area.
- Herold: Agricultural settlement located on commercial farm.
- Hoogeekraal: Significant rural agricultural area.
- Noll: Agricultural settlement consisting out of a number of small holdings.
- Rooirivier: Agglomeration of farm worker houses related to two commercial farms.
- Sinksabrug: Significant rural agricultural area
- Waboomskraal: Agricultural settlement located on commercial farm.
Diagram 8: Overall environmental and rural spatial concept and Settlement Hierarchy
(c) Strategic vacant land to take up new development demand

Through the process of preparing the detailed George SDF and local area SDPs, strategic vacant land parcels inside the urban edge that are suitable for development in the short to medium term have been identified. The local area SDPs and George HSP sets out when and how these development opportunities will be realised.

Numerous smaller parcels of land suitable for “greenfields” urban development exists inside the urban edge, as well as a number of larger scale opportunities on publicly owned land (e.g. in Pacaltsdorp, Thembalethu) and on privately owned land (e.g. Kraaibosch and the “Destiny Africa” site). Over the longer term, the Eastern Gateway site is expected to develop into a sub-regional mixed use node, and the Western Gateway site into an industrial node.

In realising these economic opportunities it is the intention not to replicate Apartheid “segregated” spatial patterns, but to promote socially integrative and sustainable city development.

Strategic land parcels inside the urban edge that are suitable for future development are indicated in the respective Spatial Development Plans and other studies conducted by the Municipality.

(d) Densification of Urban Areas

To reduce land consumption, deliver services and facilities to households more cost effectively, and to establish the thresholds for viable public transport systems - national and provincial government have set municipalities the target of increasing the density of urban areas to an average of 25 dwelling units/hectare gross.

Table 5 below summarises opportunities to increase densities in the greater George urban area and in larger settlements surrounding George, without compromising the character of these areas.

(e) Housing, Social & Public Facilities

George has a huge backlog in the provision of subsidy housing, as well as a high demand for entry level “Gap” housing opportunities. All the communities also do not have equal access to social and public infrastructure. To address these issues the following principles should be promoted and considered in future human settlement planning by the Municipality:

- Actively support the reservation and protection of municipally owned land as an asset to assist in:
  - Funding for infrastructure and public facilities associated with the municipal housing project pipeline.
  - Achieving social integration and living opportunities closer to existing facilities and/ or amenity.
  - Identify land specifically for subsidy housing projects (See Map 8: Future Residential Developments)
- Actively support inclusionary housing projects within the urban edge of all settlements in the municipal area.
- Actively support the development of GAP housing in the George CBD and other nodes identified as well as along the public transport routes which connects them.
- Rationalise the provision of facilities in line with the findings and recommendations of a public and social infrastructure study.
- Ensure that new large scale human settlement development includes the full range of public facilities required by local communities.
As far as possible locate public facilities in association with major nodes and public transport routes.

Table 5: Densification of Urban Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>DENSIFICATION PROPOSALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>George</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Densification along key CBD routes of up to 80 units/ ha.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Blanco**                            | • Sensitive mixed use development and densification along major routes (George Street and Montagu Street)  
  • Infill residential development to densities of 20-30 units/ ha on identified vacant land parcels. |
| **George South East**                 | Densities of 30-40 units/ ha for new development at Borcherds, Rosemoor, the cemetery area, and commonage south of the industrial area (and smaller vacant sites). |
| **Pacaltsdorp**                       | Densities as high as 80 units/ ha at the commercial centre.                             |
| **Thembalethu**                       | • An overall density of 25 units/ ha is proposed.                                      |
|                                       | • Higher densities of 40 units/ ha is proposed at commercial nodes and along Sandkraal Road. |
| **Herold’s Bay**                      | No significant densification given the specific rural and built character of the area.   |
| **Herold’s Bay Lower**                | No significant densification given the specific rural and built character of the area.   |
| **Herold’s Bay Upper**                | Infill within designated/ agreed settlement areas and to agreed development parameters. |
| **Victoria Bay / Kraaibosch South**   |                                                                                         |
| **Victoria Bay**                      | No significant densification given the specific built character of the area.             |
| **Kraaibosch South**                  | No significant densification given the specific rural character of the area.             |
| **Wilderness**                        |                                                                                         |
| **Wilderness**                        | No significant densification of existing residential areas (except through group/ town housing and resort development on land available within the urban edge). |


SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE 4.4:
Safeguarding the Environmental Integrity and Assets

4.4.1 Preamble

The Municipality needs to safeguard its environmental assets (i.e. biodiversity, cultural heritage and scenic resources), as these underpin the local economy and form the basis of the Garden Route brand and lifestyle offering. The Municipality’s IDP emphasises the sustainable use of its environmental assets, and the Municipal SDF needs to include this aspect into its spatial development strategy.

4.4.2 Problem Statement

Notwithstanding the area’s rich and varied natural capital, it remains a sensitive and vulnerable environment that the Municipality are the stewards of. The challenge is ensuring the ongoing functioning of eco-system services, that climate change is taken seriously, and the Municipality’s towns and rural areas are developed sustainable. This necessitates protection and strengthening of the biodiversity network, and cultural and scenic landscapes. Whilst the Municipality’s natural assets and productive rural landscapes need to be safeguarded, they also need to be opened up to all – particularly those denied access in the apartheid era.

4.4.3 General Policy Guidelines:

Guidelines for the Management of the George Environment include:
- Adopt and use the new landscape-wide Critical Biodiversity Area information and mapping emanating from the Garden Route Initiative (GRI) as primary determinant of how to develop and manage the rural component of the municipal area.
- Actively support the consolidation, extension and linkage of the Garden Route’s network of formally protected areas (through, inter-alia, the roll-out of the newly established Garden Route National Park).
- Manage urban and rural land uses in a manner that ensures that landscapes linking critical biodiversity areas can function as ecological corridors (i.e. along the coast and along the rivers that link the coast to the mountains).
- Maintain reasonable public access to nature areas for all citizens and visitors.
- Resist “new” coastal, estuarine or inland residential development which is not integrated with existing settlements.
- Protect natural and productive resources
- Protect the Garden Route Identity, which includes consideration for the new N2 alignment that crosses the lakes areas. The most suitable alignment should be determined through an environmental impact assessment (EIA) process.

4.4.4 Strategies

(a) Establish a city-wide open space system and environmental corridors

The natural assets of George are being used to “anchor” and structure the emerging city (see Diagram 9). A detailed open space study has been commissioned towards putting in place an interconnected system of urban ecological corridors, connecting the mountains to the sea. Areas for active and passive recreational facilities (e.g. sports fields, jogging and cycling trails, etc.), and land suitable for urban agriculture has been set aside along these
‘green’ corridors. A city-wide open-space system will be developed to serve all residents.

Diagram 9: City-wide Open Space Systems for George

(b) Maintaining the functionality of Critical Biodiversity Areas

Following from the GRI and a separate study of the DMA, the status and significance of biodiversity at regional landscape level was recently mapped. The Municipality have merged these two sets of Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) data to provide full coverage of the new George municipal area. The CBA map (see Map 9: Critical Biodiversity Areas) shows the spatial patterns of biological diversity in the municipal area, as well as how these patterns interrelate to support ecological processes (e.g. animal migration, pollination, etc) that extend beyond municipal boundaries.

The CBA map provides a synthesis of biodiversity information that is of use to those planning or undertaking different rural land use activities (e.g. cultivation, grazing, tourist resorts, etc). For the Municipality’s SDF the CBA map provides important indicators as to how suitable rural landscapes are for different activities.

Definitions of the different categories shown on the CBA map is summarised in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Critical Biodiversity Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Areas (PAs)</td>
<td>Terrestrial, aquatic (water) and/or marine areas that are formally protected in terms of the National Environment Management: Protected Areas Act (57 of 2003) and/or Marine Living Resources Act (107 of 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBAs)</td>
<td>Areas that need to be safeguarded in order to meet national biodiversity thresholds, or required to ensure the continued existence and functioning of species and ecosystems, including the delivery of ecosystem services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Support Areas (ESAs)</td>
<td>Areas required to prevent the degradation of Protected Areas and Critical Biodiversity Areas (although these areas are often heavily degraded or transformed, they still play an important role in supporting ecological processes). No further intensification of land-use activities should be permitted and they should be prioritized for rehabilitation, where possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Natural Areas (ONAs)</td>
<td>Areas that not currently required to meet biodiversity thresholds or to support important ecological processes. However, in the future, if there is loss of Critical Biodiversity Areas or Ecological Support Areas, such areas may eventually be reclassified as Critical Biodiversity Areas. Therefore, in all decision making, the precautionary principle needs to be applied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Natural Areas Remaining (NNAR)</td>
<td>Areas that have been irreversibly transformed through development (e.g. urban development, plantation, agriculture) and are not required as Ecological Support Areas. These areas are referred to as No Natural Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remaining. They no longer contribute to the biodiversity of the area.

(c) Spatial Planning Categories

In line with the Provincial Spatial Development Framework (PSDF), George Municipality have delineated their jurisdictional area into Spatial Planning Categories (SPCs). These SPCs are not development proposals and do not confer or take away development rights. They are based on the CBA map, and they clarify the inherent land use suitability of different landscapes. As such SPCs are a tool that the Municipality uses to assess the desirability of applications for a change in rural land use.

Map 10: Spatial Planning Categories, shows the delineation of George Municipality’s rural areas into SPCs. In addition to the SPC map, the relevant PSDF Guidelines for Rural Land Use Planning and Management are presented in Appendix A. These Guidelines assist the Municipality assess the suitability of alternative rural land uses in the different SPCs, as well as the appropriate location, form and scale of these activities.

The broad definitions of categories on the SPC map is summarised in the Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core 1</td>
<td>Pas, incl. of national parks, provincial nature reserves, designated mountain catchment areas (re: Mountain Catchments Areas Act), forestry reserves, wilderness areas, and marine reserves (in terms of the Marine Living Resources Act).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 2</td>
<td>Areas currently not yet exhibiting high levels of biodiversity loss, but which should be protected and restored in order to ensure that biodiversity pattern and ecological process targets can be met in the most efficient way possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBA aquatic buffer areas, including CBA catchment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CBA aquatic buffer areas, including CBA catchment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mountain catchment areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer 1</td>
<td>Large intact portions and remnants of natural or near natural vegetation not designated as CBAs or ESAs, especially in proximity or adjacent to CBAs and/or ESAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer 2</td>
<td>Areas designated as ONAs, with extensive and/or intensive agriculture as the dominant land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive agric. /plantation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d) Mitigating against impacts of Climate Change

As highlighted through the Garden Route Initiative (GRI), the municipal area is vulnerable to two of climate change’s most severe impacts, namely sea level rise and freshwater flooding. In response the Municipality will apply the following mitigation strategies:

i. To prevent flooding of vulnerable coastal properties, natural defences in the form of primary dune systems, estuarine mudflats and sand dunes will be safeguarded from further conversion through urban development or agricultural practices.

ii. New land use developments will be subject to ecological setbacks along the coast and around freshwater systems in order to maintain the economic and ecological functioning of marine and other aquatic ecosystems.

iii. Natural landscape corridors will be kept intact to function as ecological process areas (i.e. enable the migration of plants, animals and birds and hence to persist despite changing climatic conditions). Examples of corridors are river valleys extending from inland mountains to the sea, along parts of the escarpment (i.e. the step where the inland plateau drops to the coastal plain) and also along the coast.

(e) Visual Landscapes and Corridors

The study was concluded to determine visual sensitive areas in the George landscape and must be applied to manage visual impacts of developments. General principles include the following:

- The southern slopes of the hills north of the Wilderness Lakes areas, as viewed from the current N2, should be safeguarded against development to maintain the green backdrop and ‘wilderness’ trademark. Only dwelling houses with restricted outbuildings should be allowed in sensitively placed areas on individual properties. Guesthouses which are run from existing dwellings can also be considered.
- Avoid developing higher than the 280m contour line or on slopes steeper than 1:4.
- Employ the guidelines for managing visually sensitive landscapes set-out in the Garden Route Environmental Management Framework (EMF).
- Gateway precincts must be developed in a visually sound way that attracts visitors to towns and places in the Municipality
- Scenic landscapes and features must be safeguarded.

(f) Heritage resources

- Actively promote the use of the George Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines to ensure development which is appropriate to a “green theme”, “garden city” and the public and natural context, of appropriate architectural form and proportion, and is sensitive to heritage.
- Manage heritage places and landscapes in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the Municipality’s Heritage Management Plan.
SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE 4.5:
Enhance the Rural Character and Livelihood

4.5.1 Preamble

With the recent addition of the DMA, George Municipality’s rural area is now vast. It is an area which has rich and diverse natural landscapes, as well as a variety of farmed landscapes and plantations. The rural strategy focuses on maintaining ecologically functional and economically productive rural landscapes.

4.5.2 Problem Statement

Within the municipal area there are a number of rural villages, hamlets and places - each small settlement with its unique history, sense of place and meaning to its residents. In most cases, residents work on surrounding farms and would prefer to stay where they are, despite limited access to services and facilities, and relatively long distances to larger towns. The economic value of the rural hinterland is also important and this resource base should be managed and protected.

4.5.3 General Policy Guidelines:

Guidelines for the Management of the rural landscape include:

- The guidelines of the Spatial Planning Categories, detailed in Appendix A, must also be applied as guidelines for rural development.
- Safeguard the municipality’s farming and forestry areas as productive landscapes, equal in value to urban land.
- Promote integrated rural development as a building block of the municipal space economy, through support for new livelihood and business opportunities in the agricultural, fishing, forestry, tourism and conservation sectors as part of the roll-out of land, agrarian and marine reform programs.
- Prevent the establishment of new rural settlements, and accommodate the services, facilities or functions required by rural communities in existing rural settlements.
- Maintain a system and hierarchy of interdependent settlements, with distinct roles and a complementary mix of activities in the municipal area – See 4.3.4(c) (George remains the primary urban activity and service centre, with a number of small, specialist settlements, predominantly focused on coastal living, tourism and/ or recreation, agriculture and forestry).
- Direct public investment towards settlements that have economic development potential.
- The Municipality to supply basic services to all rural communities it is responsible for. Where rural development programmes are initiated in the municipal area, the Municipality will support the use of existing settlements as base from which to deliver basic services and facilities to rural communities, as opposed to developing new rural settlements.

4.5.4 Strategies

(a) Protect the Productive Landscape

In addition to strengthening and diversifying the main driver of the local economy, the greater George urban complex, the Municipality is also giving attention to the rural economy. The strategy is to protect productive landscapes (i.e. farming and
forestry) and safeguard the natural and scenic assets which underpin the tourism economy. This strategy entails:

- Managing all aspects of the Municipality’s rural areas in a manner which respects nature and sustains the functionality of ecosystem services.
- Areas of conservation worth (i.e. critical terrestrial and aquatic biodiversity areas, and ecological support areas) are consolidated as far as possible;
- The entire rural area is managed to sustain ecosystem services (e.g. supply of clean water);
- Adopting and using the landscape-wide biodiversity information and mapping emanating from the Garden Route Initiative (GRI) as primary determinant of how to develop and manage the rural component of the municipal area.
- Consolidating, extending and linking the Garden Route’s network of formally protected areas (through, inter-alia, the roll-out of the newly established Garden Route National Park).
- Actively supporting Cape Nature’s stewardship program to secure conservation status for critical biodiversity areas situated on private land that are not currently formally protected.
- Managing urban and rural land uses to ensure that landscapes linking critical biodiversity areas can function as ecological corridors (i.e. along the coast and along the rivers that link the coast to the mountains).
- Safeguarding the municipality’s farming and forestry areas as productive landscapes, equal in value to urban land.
- Maintaining a clear “green” edge around all settlements – large and small – in the municipal area.

- Curtailing “new” coastal, estuarine or inland residential development which is not integrated with existing settlements.
- Over time, developing “green management” strategies for all municipal services (building on existing work in water services to include, for example, compulsory green energy installations in building development, grey water reticulation, etc).

Diagram 8 under section 4.3.4(b) illustrates the overall environmental and rural spatial concept for the George municipal area.

(b) Manage the Subdivision of Land

- Subdivision of rural land into small holdings should be avoided, and no new smallholding areas shall be established.
- New sub-divisions less than 1 hectare need to abut existing urban areas, the urban edge needs to be amended to incorporate these subdivisions, and they need to be zoned as Estate Housing.
- Subdivisions of between 1 and 3 hectares may be permitted in the historical Rural Occupation areas, and be allocated a Smallholding zoning.
- Existing 1 hectare smallholdings that do not border an urban area also need to be zoned Smallholding.
- An edge should be delineated around all smallholding areas to curtail their outward growth.
- All properties greater than 3 hectares outside of existing smallholding areas are deemed as agricultural properties whose subdivision is subject to the Department of Agriculture’s regulations and desirability in terms of rural context and character.
(c) **Enhance the Rural Livelihood and promote integrated rural development**

Furthermore, the Municipality is promoting integrated rural development in order to realise the following opportunities:

- Improving food, water and energy (e.g. solar and wind powered) security, and restoring natural capital by removing alien plant infestation and adopting conservation oriented farming methods.
- Strengthening current agricultural and forestry activities, and introducing new production technologies and crops (e.g. bio-fuels) in response to climate change.
- Supporting the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRD&LR) in their initiatives to open-up new livelihood and business opportunities in the agricultural, fishing, forestry, tourism and conservation sectors as part of the roll-out of land, agrarian and marine reform programs.
- Enhancing the region’s attraction as a tourism and recreation destination by safeguarding the character of its unique natural, cultural and working landscapes, townscapes and seascapes, and opening-up new tourist attractions (e.g. introduction of game in suitable habitats) and facilities in the rural areas.
- Promoting integrated rural development as a building block of the municipal space economy.
- Maintaining reasonable public access to nature areas and the coast for all citizens and visitors.
5. IMPLEMENTATION

In addition to pursuing the spatial strategies outlined in this SDF (See Map 11: Greater George SDF), its implementation is also supported by local area Spatial Development Plans and Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Policies in support of equitable and sustainable service delivery and development. These plans and policies reflect how the Municipality’s spatial planning and land use management functions contribute to sector objectives.

5.1 PRIORITY ACTIONS

The key tasks that the Municipality’s Planning Department need to undertake as part of the implementation of the SDF are listed below. These tasks are in support of the Municipality’s overall and sector specific objectives. The focus is on spatial tasks: how the spatial planning and land use management functional area can contribute to the achievement of the Municipality’s objectives.

- Implement the recommendations of the strategic vacant land study.
- Review past plans prepared for Wards 24 and 25 (i.e. the former District Management Area), and update these so that they align with the George Municipal SDF and can be fully incorporated into the SDF.
- Finalise the George Municipality Integrated Zoning Scheme (to reflect the policy guidelines and proposals of the SDF) and the preparation of overlay zones where necessary.
- Complete the local area precinct plan for the area west of the current industrial area.
- Complete the local area SDP for the Hans Moes Kraal coast, including urban agriculture and opportunity for science, technology and research enterprises.
- Plan for managed land settlement/informal housing in Syferfontein area of Pacaltsdorp.
- Audit all municipal planning policies with a view to rationalising the current suite of policies, particularly those related to subdivision.
- Prepare an information sheet on priority opportunities for private sector assistance and development opportunity.
- Finalise the strategy for the revitalisation of George CBD. Prepare a George Municipality “Green Buildings” guide and associated regulatory directives.
- Identify land for GAP housing as part of the Municipality’s process to provide GAP housing.
- Explore the reservation and protection of municipally owned land as an asset to assist in:
  - Funding for infrastructure and public facilities associated with the municipal housing project pipeline.
  - Achieving social integration and living opportunities closer to existing facilities and/ or amenity.
- Review the SDPs undertaken for the different local areas, and finalise them.

5.2 INTEGRATED MUNICIPAL ZONING SCHEME

George’s new Integrated Zoning Scheme and SDF are both integral components of the land use planning and management system the Municipality is introducing. The draft Integrated Zoning Scheme brings together the different Zonings Schemes applicable to towns which were previously not part of the same administration.

The Integrated Zoning Scheme will:

- Support the objectives, policies and proposals of the SDF.
- Incorporate information and guidelines contained in the Critical Biodiversity Area map and Spatial Planning Category map for George Municipality.
As a means to promote the objectives of the SDF, the draft Integrated Zoning Scheme makes provision for “overlay zones”. Through the establishment of overlay zones, additional development management provisions (over and above those related to use zones) may be imposed to direct the nature and form of land use and development in a specific area.

Overlay zones could, for example, be prepared for:
- Heritage areas.
- Sensitive environmental areas.
- The urban edge.
- Activity or scenic routes.
- Specific local areas intended for restructuring or accelerated development.

5.3 HUMAN SETTLEMENT DESIGN GUIDELINES

Architectural and Urban Design Guidelines have been prepared which apply to all built up areas and new developments in the George municipal area. The Guidelines are aimed at assisting land owners, developers, built environment professionals and the Municipality’s Aesthetics Committee.

The Guidelines are based on detailed surveys of the visual and built character of different precincts in the municipal area, including larger settlements surrounding George. In general terms, the Guidelines seek development which:
- Supports a “green theme” and “garden city”.
- Respects the extent of “publicness” of its specific context (a distinction is drawn between development which is situated in primary public places, neighbourhood spaces, and residential or suburban places).
- Respects the interface between public and private space.
- Expresses appropriate architectural form and proportion.
- Respects natural context, including topography.
- Is sensitive to heritage.

A questionnaire which supports the Guidelines is a compulsory requirement of applications for building development. Further work on the Guidelines to be undertaken includes:
- Inclusion of the Guidelines as part of the Integrated Zoning Scheme.
- Development of more detailed base information related to sensitive cultural and historic buildings and places.

5.4 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

George Municipality’s Planning Department will monitor and evaluate implementation of the following aspects:
- The extent to which the main argument and proposals of the SDF are incorporated into future municipal IDPs.
- The annual review of the SDF as part of the IDP review process (i.e. a discussion on the relevance of the argument and proposals as its stands, and adaptation as and when needed).
- The extent to which the main argument and proposals of the SDF informs sector planning and resource allocation.
- The extent to which the main argument and proposals of the SDF informs land use management decision-making (all reports should include a “qualification” in relation to alignment with CBA and SPC categories and recommendations as well as restructuring).
- Alignment with and progress in implementing the Municipality’s Human Settlement Plan.
6. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

The SDF presented in this report gives spatial expression to George Municipality’s service delivery and development agenda, and clarifies and directs development and management activities in the Municipality’s urban and rural areas.

As demonstrated in Table 8 below, the George Municipal SDF also aligns with key concerns and themes contained in higher level policy frameworks, including the National Spatial Development Perspective, the PSDF, and the Eden District Municipality SDF. As such it establishes a credible spatial framework to replace the statutory spatial plans impacting on George Municipality that were approved in the Apartheid era.

6.2 ACKNOWLEDGING OTHER PROPOSED DEVELOPMENTS

Certain recent decisions to amend the old Guide Plan and some pending development applications are not fully consistent with the Municipal SDF’s spatial strategies and proposals. The Municipality will engage in dialogue with DEA&DP when these proposed developments are pursued. For the present they will not form part of the current SDF Strategy, but will be resolved between Province and the Municipality before the proposed development can be entertained.

On the agenda are the following developments (See map 12: Non-Conforming Development Proposals):

i. Proposed Lagoon Bay Lifestyle Estate: Council supported the original decision of Province to amend the Guide Plan to designate the land earmarked for development for urban use. Subsequently environmental authorisation for the proposed development was given, but the land use amended and rights refused by the Department. The applicant lodged an unsuccessful appeal against the Ministers decision. Pending the outcome of an appeal against the judgement, the SDF does not delineate an urban edge around the proposed Lagoon Bay Lifestyle Estate.

ii. Proposed Skimmelkrans Development: Council took a decision that the properties related to this proposed development should be incorporated into the urban edge, notwithstanding the fact that no formal application was lodged. The decision is inconsistent with the SDF in that the proposed development introduces into agricultural land, is not adjacent to existing development, and is far from transport, existing services, social infrastructure and job opportunities.

iii. Proposed Dutton’s Cove Development: This proposed lifestyle estate was granted Guide Plan amendment approval, and the EIA is reportedly being undertaken. Given the extensive over supply of available land inside the urban edge for this type of development, it does not form part of the SDF’s proposals.

iv. Proposed Developments at Hans Moes Kraal: Various small properties in this precinct have received Guide Plan approvals. Whilst the SDF earmarks Hans Moes Kraal as a future economic development node, it is important that the area is developed in an integrated and coherent manner if the full potential of this unique coastal precinct is to be realised. Ad hoc developments and gated lifestyle estates are not supported here, pending completion of the Hans Moes Kraal SDP.
### Table 8: SDF Policy Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY ISSUE</th>
<th>RESPONSE IN THE GEORGE SDF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedural and process issues related to SDF preparation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SDF preparation process. | - The SDF contains an overall argument for the development and management of the George Municipality.  
- SDF provides clear direction for the preparation of sector plans.  
- The SDF recognises higher level planning policy. |
| Detail of planning. | - Local area SDPs have been prepared for critical areas.  
- A vacant land survey has been completed.  
- A survey of public and social facilities is underway. |
| **Substantive issues** | |
| Promoting settlement in areas with the best prospects for development and growth. | - A hierarchy of settlements has been developed and the role of each settlement determined.  
- George is to remain as the primary centre and focus for urban activity and expansion. |
| Protecting, maintaining and expanding the area’s natural assets and identity as the basis for all living, terrestrial and aquatic, and as the foundation of the regional and local economy. | - Critical Biodiversity Area maps have been used to determine Spatial Planning Categories and guidelines for the management of environment/rural areas.  
- An overall open space network has been defined for George. |
| Enhancing the productive capacity and livelihood opportunity associated with natural assets. | - The Hans Moe’s Kraal coast has been identified for science, technology and research enterprises.  
- Urban agriculture opportunity has been identified in association with the open space network. |
| Maximising the productive capacity and livelihood opportunity associated with major public infrastructure investments. | - Major development opportunity has been identified in proximity to the airport, existing industrial area and the N2 (the area west of the industrial area and the Eastern Gateway site as new nodes).  
- The George CBD is a focus for revitalisation, mixed use and increased residential densities.  
- Focus of major development, infill and densification along key transport routes.  
- Focussing on George CBD for restructuring and balanced urban development.  
- Mixed use and increased densities are proposed in nodes and along the public transport routes which connects them in order to increase thresholds required for enterprise development. |
| Structuring human settlements in a manner where they fulfil interdependent as opposed to competing roles. | - A hierarchy of settlements has been developed and the role of each settlement determined.  
- George is to remain as the primary centre and focus for urban activity and expansion.  
- The character of rural and coastal villages and places are to be protected. |
| Making existing settlements better, not bigger, as places of living, work, services and recreation. | - Clear edges have been defined for settlements to assist in directing development inwards. |
| Respecting current settlement character and heritage. | - Architectural and urban design guidelines have been prepared to ensure that development is sensitive to its context. |
v. **Proposed Fancourt Retirement Village**: Whilst Council supported the application for the amendment of the Guide Plan for this development, the National Dept of Agriculture refused due to the loss of agricultural land. Pending a decision by province on this application, the SDF does not include it inside the urban edge.

vi. **Proposed Destiny Africa**: Guide Plan amendment approval was granted with the understanding that the original concept proposed will be implemented. Whilst the necessary approvals are in place, the development has not yet commenced, increasing the risk of the lapsing of the environmental authorisation. Whilst the area earmarked for Destiny Africa is consistent with the SDF’s medium to long term growth proposals, it is not currently included in the SDF’s proposed urban edge. Once there is certainty that the development is proceeding, the urban edge will be amended to include Destiny Africa’s development footprint. If Destiny Africa does not go ahead as originally proposed, it will be prudent to review its phasing and spatial budget in light of the surfeit of developable land available inside George’s urban edge.
## APPENDIX A: LAND USE GUIDELINES FOR SPATIAL PLANNING CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES FOR CORE SPCs</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE CORE SPC</th>
<th>CORE SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF CORE SPC</td>
<td>Purpose of Core SPC</td>
<td>Core SPC Delineation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core 1 Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core 1 Areas are those parts of the rural landscape required to meet biodiversity patterns or ecological processes (i.e. critical biodiversity areas). These include habitats classified as highly irreplaceable, critically endangered, or endangered terrestrial (land), aquatic (rivers, wetlands & estuaries) and marine habitats.

These also include areas currently not yet exhibiting high levels of biodiversity loss, but which should be protected and restored in order to ensure:

- Designate which parts of the rural landscape are of highest conservation importance, and if they are currently protected or not. Informs expansion of the protected area network.
- Delineates areas that must be maintained in, or restored to, a natural state in order to sustain biodiversity patterns and processes and the functionality of ecosystem services.
- Identify areas of land that could serve as biodiversity offset receiving areas.

In combination with:

- Essentially ‘no-go’ areas from a development perspective. Accordingly they should, as far as possible, remain undisturbed by human impact.
- Conservation management activities such as alien clearing, research and environmental education should be encouraged.
- Subject to stringent controls the following biodiversity-compatible land uses (i.e. those of very low impact) may be accommodated in Core areas:
  - Non-consumptive low impact eco-tourism activities such as:
    - No development is permissible in proclaimed Wilderness Areas.
    - Wherever possible, structures associated with activities in Core Areas should preferably be located in neighbouring Buffer areas.
    - Fine-scale environmentally sensitivity mapping should inform the placement of essential buildings or structures in Core areas (e.g. as per SANParks CDF planning process).
    - Where structures associated with biodiversity-compatible activities are located in Core areas, these should where buildings and structures in Core Areas are justifiable, “touch the earth lightly” construction principles should be applied to ensure that development is in harmony with the character of the surrounding landscape and to ensure the maintenance of its natural qualities.
    - The receiving environment and aesthetic qualities of an area must be the determinant of the scale and form of development.
    - Good management practices, with small low density footprints, appropriate technology and design concepts (e.g. Enviro-loos, etc.). In combination with:

- Include all formal Protected Areas.
- Include all land designated as Critical Biodiversity Areas (public or private) that should be protected and eventually incorporated into the Protected Areas network.
- Where possible incentivise incorporation using the following designations:
  - Private Land; Stewardship Agreements or as a Protected Environment or Nature Reserve i.t.o. NEMA or the Protected Areas.
### GUIDELINES FOR CORE SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE CORE SPC</th>
<th>CORE SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>biodiversity pattern and ecological process targets/thresholds can be met in the most efficient way possible. Also includes essential biological corridors vital to sustain their functionality. Core 1 areas comprise two components:</td>
<td>Core 2 Areas, they spatially define the 'core' of the rural landscape's ecological network.</td>
<td>recreation and tourism (e.g. hiking trails, bird and game watching, and visitor overnight accommodation). o Harvesting of natural resources (e.g. wild flowers for medicinal, culinary or commercial use), subject to EMP demonstrating the sustainability of harvesting. Where Core areas are identified on land that has no formal conservation status (e.g. private farm), no further loss of natural habitat should occur. Given the often high visual or aesthetic value of these landscapes, no large-scale eco-tourism developments to be permitted. Land consolidation should be encouraged and sub-division prohibited.</td>
<td>temporary structures, green architecture and use of natural resources). Temporary structures to be preferred (e.g. wooden structures, tents, and/or tree canopy structures, with units carefully dispersed or clustered to achieve least impact. Raised boardwalks preferred or alternatively porous materials and design concepts. Stringent management programs for resource harvesting informed by determination of carrying capacity and a management plan to ensure appropriate harvesting techniques and volumes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) All areas with formal conservation status (i.t.o. the Protected Areas Act), namely: national parks; provincial nature reserves; designated mountain catchment areas (i.t.o. the Mountain Catchments Areas Act); forestry reserves; wilderness areas; and marine reserves (i.t.o. the Marine Living Resources Act). (ii) Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA), as identified through a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act. - Municipal Land: Nature Reserve i.t.o. NEMA or Protected Areas Act. - Forest Nature Reserves through the National Forest Act and Wilderness Areas i.t.o. of the Wilderness Act. - Title deed restrictions where land has been designated under the Stewardship Program or declared a Nature Reserve or Protected Environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GUIDELINES FOR CORE SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE CORE SPC</th>
<th>CORE SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>systematic conservation planning process, that have no formal conservation status. These may comprise terrestrial or aquatic habitats, remnants or features that must be conserved to meet national biodiversity pattern or process thresholds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core 2 Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This category includes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Areas currently not yet exhibiting high levels of biodiversity loss, but which should be protected and restored in order to ensure biodiversity pattern and ecological process targets can be met in the most efficient way possible.</td>
<td>Manage to restore and sustain eco-system functioning, especially ecological processes (i.e. rivers and seep clusters and their respective buffers) in support of wetlands and rivers in Critical Biodiversity Areas.</td>
<td>Biodiversity – compatible and low impact conservation land uses as per Core 1 Areas, but allowing for a limited increase in scale of development in less sensitive areas (provided ecological processes not disrupted). To be informed by environmental sensitivity mapping, transformation thresholds and cumulative impacts. Biodiversity offsets may be necessary in this case.</td>
<td>As for Core 1 Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Ecological Support Areas (ESA) to Critical Biodiversity Areas (i.e. river reaches within</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

N.B. Delineation and inclusion of Critical Ecological Support Areas (i.e. river reaches and their buffers and significant seep clusters in support of CBA rivers and wetlands). Coastline outside the urban edge, together with coastal processes to be included.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF CORE SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE CORE SPC</th>
<th>CORE SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| priority CBA sub-catchments which prevent degradation of CBA's).  
(iii) CBA aquatic Buffer areas including CBA catchment areas.  
(iv) Coastline and coastal processes.  
(v) River and ecological corridors (those not classified essential as per Core 1 definition).  
(vi) Mountain Catchment Areas. | (e.g. livestock) in Core 1 or Core 2 Areas, need to be subject to:  
- Lower impact practices  
- Lower than standard stocking rates  
- Resting cycles (i.e. rotational grazing)  
- Wetland & river bank protection to avoid over-grazing, trampling and destabilization  
- Avoiding areas containing red data species  
- Limiting "value-adding" to nature-based tourism.  
Incentivise consolidation of the conservation estate by:  
- Introducing limited low density rural housing development rights  
- Financial incentives (i.t.o. the Property Rates Act)  
- Other incentives (e.g. resource economic approaches) | Where to locate? | Appropriate Form & Scale |

---
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**GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffer 1 Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of activities? Where to locate? Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer 1 SPC comprises large intact portions and remnants of natural or near natural vegetation not designated as CBA or ESA, especially in proximity/adjacent to CBAs and/or ESA:</td>
<td>(i) To restore &amp; maintain ecological processes.</td>
<td>(i) Conservation activities as per Core 1 and 2 Areas including sustainable consumptive or non-consumptive uses.</td>
<td>(i) All land designated as large intact portions/remnants of natural or near natural vegetation not designated as CBA or ESA, especially in proximity/adjacent to CBAs and/or ESA including: - rivers and wetlands (together with their buffers) - vulnerable and least threatened vegetation types - significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) To retain landscape scale biodiversity corridors</td>
<td>(ii) Biodiversity compatible land uses as informed by transformation thresholds, including: - Low density Rural Residential Development - Resort and holiday accommodation - Tourist and recreational facilities - Additional dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) To strengthen the conservation and extensive agricultural economies through; - incentivising the consolidation and maintenance of extensive agricultural units; and - broadening the agricultural economic base through farm diversification of use and revenue generation (e.g. farm tourism)</td>
<td>(iii) Extensive developments (e.g. caravan and camping sites) be restricted to sites of limited visual exposure and sites not prominent in the landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) To buffer Ecological Support Areas (including CBA Buffer</td>
<td>(iv) Extensive agriculture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Development to target existing farm precincts and disturbed areas, with the employment of existing structures and footprints to accommodate development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Development to reinforce farm precinct and reflect similar vernacular in terms of scale, form and design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) In the absence of existing farmsteads, development to reflect compact and unobtrusive nodes, conforming to local vernacular in terms of scale, form and design.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) All land designated as large intact portions/remnants of natural or near natural vegetation not designated as CBA or ESA, especially in proximity/adjacent to CBAs and/or ESA including: - rivers and wetlands (together with their buffers) - vulnerable and least threatened vegetation types - significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas which support Critical Biodiversity Areas.</td>
<td>(v) To enhance biodiversity through innovative agricultural practices (e.g. veld management) and rehabilitation of previously disturbed agricultural land. (vi) To buffer against the impacts of climate change.</td>
<td>What kinds of activities? Where to locate? Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</td>
<td>(iii) Development design (e.g. resort) to embrace the spatial form, movement patterns, building design and conservation and ecology of the area through: - Maintain the dominance of the natural and agricultural landscapes - Maintain and enhancing natural continuities of green spaces, riverine corridors and movement water yield areas, and significant groundwater recharge and discharge areas (ii) Corridors (river, vegetation, habitat) necessary to promote and sustain ecological processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of activities? What to locate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accommodated if accompanied with biodiversity offsets, with receiving areas for such offsets being on-site or in other Core 1 areas.</td>
<td>- Maintaining dominant landscape features and their continuity (e.g. ridge lines, valleys)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Protecting conservational worthy places and heritage areas (e.g. farmsteads)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Buffer 2 Areas

This category includes areas designated as Other Natural Areas, located in an extensive and/or intensive agriculture matrix (i.e. livestock production) as the dominant land use.

(i) Manage for sustainable development of current land use in the area.
(ii) Protect existing agricultural activity (i.e. livestock production) to ensure food security, contribution to the regional economy, maintenance and
(iii) Farm buildings & activities associated with the primary agricultural activity, including a homestead, agricultural buildings and worker accommodation
(iv) Additional dwelling units, including:
   - units approved under the
(i) Location of primary agricultural activities (e.g. livestock production) to be informed by the exclusion of steep slopes, wetlands, floodplains of rivers and streams (and associated buffers), as well as areas of
(i) Development of the primary agricultural enterprise (e.g. livestock production) to comply with existing guidelines for extensive agriculture, including:
   - Existing extensive agricultural areas
   - All areas

All other natural areas that are located in an agricultural matrix, including:

- Existing extensive agricultural areas
- All areas
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>management of rural areas and contributing to the working agricultural and cultural landscape.</td>
<td></td>
<td>remnant vegetation development in support of primary cultivation (e.g. product handling and processing) to be located within or peripheral to the farmstead precinct or as distinct clusters at farm outposts.</td>
<td>Considered suitable for current and future extensive agricultural activities as identified in the LandCare/Area-Wide Planning Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Facilitate agricultural diversification and non-agricultural opportunities (e.g. game farming, tourist facilities) and “value-adding” to the primary product (e.g. cheese-making).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Carrying capacity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Accommodate space extensive and nuisance urban uses, and extensive agricultural uses (e.g. waste water treatment plants, piggeries, mushroom growing plants, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Veld management and soil erosion control;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Enhance biodiversity through innovative agricultural practices (e.g. veld management).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agricultural setback on wetlands, rivers and streams as per CARA regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vi) Minimize fragmentation of remaining natural habitats and corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Building development to reflect the style, scale, form and the significance of the farmstead precinct or farm outpost, their buildings and setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii) Reverse lost biodiversity in order to reinstate buffer zones and corridors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- All areas of endangered vegetation that are not included in a CBA or ESA, including remnants Corridors (river, and biodiversity), wetlands natural habitats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Development in support of primary cultivation (e.g. product handling and processing) to be located within or peripheral to the farmstead precinct or as distinct clusters at farm outposts.</td>
<td>- Not result in excessive expansion and encroachment of building development and land use into the farm area; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Not be located in visually exposed areas given the extensive landscape of extensive farming areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) In the absence of existing farmsteads or outposts, development to reflect compact and unobtrusive nodes, conforming to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kinds of activities?</td>
<td>Where to locate?</td>
<td>Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agricultural-land policy equating to 1 additional non-alienable dwelling unit per 10ha to a maximum of 5 per agricultural unit</td>
<td>Remnant vegetation development in support of primary cultivation (e.g. product handling and processing) to be located within or peripheral to the farmstead precinct or as distinct clusters at farm outposts.</td>
<td>- Carrying capacity;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- units permissible in terms of Rural Residential Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Veld management and soil erosion control;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Development associated with farm diversification or “value adding” development should</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Agricultural setback on wetlands, rivers and streams as per CARA regulations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Development associated with farm diversification or “value adding” should</td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Building development to reflect the style, scale, form and the significance of the farmstead precinct or farm outpost, their buildings and setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not result in excessive expansion and encroachment of building development and land use into the farm area; and</td>
<td></td>
<td>- All areas of endangered vegetation that are not included in a CBA or ESA, including remnants Corridors (river, and biodiversity), wetlands natural habitats.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- not be located in visually exposed areas given the extensive landscape of extensive farming areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) In the absence of existing farmsteads or outposts, development to reflect compact and unobtrusive nodes, conforming to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) No fragmentation of farm cadastral unit, with spot zoning and consent uses employed to accommodate non-agricultural uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) On-farm settlement of farmworkers, using existing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs</td>
<td>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</td>
<td>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (viii) Rehabilitate degraded areas (e.g. agricultural, mining). | (vi) Buffer 2 Areas within the “fringe” of urban settlements to accommodate the following uses not suited to location within the urban edge:  
- space extensive requirements (e.g. regional sports & recreation facilities, tourist facilities)  
- nuisance and buffer requirements (e.g. waste water treatment plants, cemeteries, solid waste disposal sites, truck stops)  
- housing stock or upgraded hostels | (iv) Development design (e.g. resort) to maintain and enhance the dominance of the agricultural landscape, continuation of green spaces, riverine corridors, and dominant landscape features (e.g. ridge lines) |
<p>|                           | to be located within or peripheral to the farmstead precinct or outposts and should be accommodated in re-used, converted or replaced farm buildings (i.e. existing footprint) or to target disturbed areas. | local vernacular in terms of scale, form and design. |
|                           | Location of additional development to be informed by existing farm road access and existing on-line services network. |                                   |
|                           | Buffer 2 areas within the “fringe” of urban settlements to be determined through an integrated urban fringe study to determine their extent and suitability for accommodating space extensive and nuisance agricultural and urban uses. |                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>BUFFER SPC Delineation Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of activities?</td>
<td>Where to locate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GUIDELINES FOR INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE SPCs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SPC Delineation Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFINITION OF INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>PURPOSE OF INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN INTENSIVE AGRICULTURE SPC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of activities?</td>
<td>Where to locate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Intensive Agriculture SPC comprises a consolidation of the existing and potential intensive agricultural footprint (i.e. homogeneous farming areas made up of cultivated land and production support areas).

The Intensive Agriculture SPC includes:

(i) Irrigated crop cultivation (annual & perennial)
(ii) Dry land crop cultivation including tillage of non-irrigated crops (annual & perennial)
(iii) Timber plantations

(i) Consolidating & protecting existing & potential agricultural landscapes.
(ii) Facilitating sustainable agricultural development, land and agrarian reform, and food security.

(i) Activities and uses directly related to the primary agricultural enterprise.
(ii) Farm buildings and associated structures (e.g. homestead, barns, farm worker accommodation, etc.).
(iii) Additional dwelling units approved under the policy of 1 additional non-alienable dwelling unit per 10ha, up to a maximum of 5 per farm
(iv) Ancillary rural activities of appropriate scale that do not detract from farming production, that diversify farm income, and add

(i) The location of agricultural activities will be dictated by local on-farm agro-climatic conditions (e.g. soils, slope, etc.), but wetlands, floodplains & important vegetation remnants should be kept in a natural state.
(ii) Ancillary activities should be located within or peripheral to the farmstead precinct (preferably in re-used or replaced farm buildings and disturbed areas).
(iii) Farming to be undertaken in accordance with existing guidelines regarding slope, setbacks around wetlands and streams, etc. (as per CARA Regs).
(iv) Facilities for ancillary on-farm activities should be in scale with and reinforce the farmstead precinct, enhance the historic built fabric and

The SPC should be delineated to consolidate farming landscapes.

- Existing intensive agricultural superblocks,
- areas of High Potential and Unique Agricultural Land (HPUAL),
### GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What kinds of activities?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>value to locally produced products, e.g:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- small-scale rural holiday accommodation (e.g. farmstay, B&amp;B, guesthouse, boutique hotel);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- restaurant, rural lifestyle retail; function venue facility;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- farmstall and farmstore;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- home occupation (farm product processing);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- local product processing (e.g. winery, olive pressing); and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- rural recreational facilities (e.g. riding school)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Where to locate?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not on good or moderate soils, and linked to existing farm road access and the services network.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>respect conservation-worthy places.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) Landscaping should complement existing planting patterns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) Fragmentation of farm cadastral unit should be prevented, and consent uses and spot zoning employed for managing ancillary on-farm activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(v) Ancillary on-farm activities in an Intensive Agriculture SPC will be impacted on by surrounding farming activities (e.g. dust generation, spray drift, etc), and these impacts are not grounds for restricting farming production.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) Large scale resorts, and tourist and recreation facilities should not be accommodated within</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(v)</strong> areas in between of lower agricultural potential that are not Core or Buffer SPCs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(vi)</strong> areas identified in the Land Care/Area-Wide Planning Programs,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(vii)</strong> areas having irrigation rights or future irrigation potential, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(viii)</strong> land suitable for small-scale farming in close proximity to settlements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Buffer SPC</th>
<th>Purpose of Buffer SPC</th>
<th>Possible Land Use &amp; Activities in the Buffer SPC</th>
<th>Buffer SPC Delineation Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What kinds of activities?</strong> Where to locate? Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive Agriculture SPCs as they detract from the functionality and integrity of productive landscapes.</td>
<td>where farms have conservation-worthy natural remnants (see Appendix A for Conservation Stewardship Options).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensive-feed farming should not be accommodated in Intensive Agriculture SPCs due to their operational impacts (e.g. odour and traffic).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(viii)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nurseries in Intensive Agriculture SPCs should limit propagation to local crop types</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GUIDELINES FOR SETTLEMENT SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition of Settlement SPC</th>
<th>Purpose of Settlement SPC</th>
<th>Possible Land Use &amp; Activities in Settlement SPC</th>
<th>SPC Delineation Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What kinds of activities?</strong> Where to locate? Appropriate Form &amp; Scale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Agricultural activities of excessive scale and non-agricultural activities not suited for location in the Intensive Agricultural and Buffer 1 and 2 Areas to be</td>
<td>(i) All settlements as delineated by their interim and/or medium-term urban edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-agricultural related land uses and activities associated with rural development initiatives should,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New buildings and structures should conform with the massing, form, height and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) Where-ever possible existing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</strong></td>
<td><strong>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settlements should be used to accommodate non-agricultural rural development activities and facilities. This is for reasons of:</td>
<td>to consolidate, integrate and reinforce settlement structure;</td>
<td>located within settlements or their “fringe areas”. These activities include:</td>
<td>(ii) Urban “fringe areas” as denoted within Buffer 2 Area immediately peripheral to urban edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- local economic development; - consolidating, integrating and reinforcing settlement structure; - improving service delivery; - strengthening rural-urban linkages; - promoting socio-economic development; - increasing thresholds for service delivery and social facilities.</td>
<td>- Off-farm residential development and farm worker accommodation (e.g. in “agricultural suburbs”); - Agricultural industry (e.g. wine bottling plant) and regional product processing (e.g. fruit cannery); - Institutions (e.g. jail or rehabilitation centre); - Agricultural colleges and schools; - Large-scale tourist accommodation (e.g. hotel) and facilities (e.g. water park); - Service trades; - Footloose business, including farming co-operatives, agricultural requisites and filling stations.</td>
<td>located within settlements or their “fringe areas”. These activities include: - Off-farm residential development and farm worker accommodation (e.g. in “agricultural suburbs”); - Agricultural industry (e.g. wine bottling plant) and regional product processing (e.g. fruit cannery); - Institutions (e.g. jail or rehabilitation centre); - Agricultural colleges and schools; - Large-scale tourist accommodation (e.g. hotel) and facilities (e.g. water park); - Service trades; - Footloose business, including farming co-operatives, agricultural requisites and filling stations.</td>
<td>(ii) Urban “fringe areas” as denoted within Buffer 2 Area immediately peripheral to urban edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In line with the principles of the Prov Growth and Development Strategy, new settlements in the rural landscape should only be established in essential circumstances (e.g. power</td>
<td>located within settlements or their “fringe areas”. These activities include: - Off-farm residential development and farm worker accommodation (e.g. in “agricultural suburbs”); - Agricultural industry (e.g. wine bottling plant) and regional product processing (e.g. fruit cannery); - Institutions (e.g. jail or rehabilitation centre); - Agricultural colleges and schools; - Large-scale tourist accommodation (e.g. hotel) and facilities (e.g. water park); - Service trades; - Footloose business, including farming co-operatives, agricultural requisites and filling stations.</td>
<td>located within settlements or their “fringe areas”. These activities include: - Off-farm residential development and farm worker accommodation (e.g. in “agricultural suburbs”); - Agricultural industry (e.g. wine bottling plant) and regional product processing (e.g. fruit cannery); - Institutions (e.g. jail or rehabilitation centre); - Agricultural colleges and schools; - Large-scale tourist accommodation (e.g. hotel) and facilities (e.g. water park); - Service trades; - Footloose business, including farming co-operatives, agricultural requisites and filling stations.</td>
<td>(ii) Urban “fringe areas” as denoted within Buffer 2 Area immediately peripheral to urban edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where-ever possible, be located in existing settlements. Preference should be given to settlements along dominant routes and accessible to bulk services corridors. The SDF and its urban edge component should define areas suitable for the expansion of existing settlements. Visual impact considerations should be taken into account, especially within settlement gateways.</td>
<td>When accommodating development in existing settlements the following principles should be adhered to: - Retain the compact form of smaller settlements; - maintain and enhance public spaces; - reinforce the close relationship of settlements to the regional route structure; - integrate new development into the settlement structure; and</td>
<td>When accommodating development in existing settlements the following principles should be adhered to: - Retain the compact form of smaller settlements; - maintain and enhance public spaces; - reinforce the close relationship of settlements to the regional route structure; - integrate new development into the settlement structure; and</td>
<td>(ii) Urban “fringe areas” as denoted within Buffer 2 Area immediately peripheral to urban edges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Use CBA and HPUAL mapping to inform delineation.</td>
<td>(iii) Use CBA and HPUAL mapping to inform delineation.</td>
<td>(iii) Use CBA and HPUAL mapping to inform delineation.</td>
<td>(iii) Use CBA and HPUAL mapping to inform delineation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GUIDELINES FOR BUFFER SPCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEFINITION OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>PURPOSE OF BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>POSSIBLE LAND USE &amp; ACTIVITIES IN THE BUFFER SPC</th>
<th>BUFFER SPC DELINEATION GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What kinds of activities?</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where to locate?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>servicing rural resource exploitation (e.g. mine);</td>
<td>Visual impact, especially on the rural landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proclaiming the urban component of existing Act 9 and church settlements (e.g. Wupperthal, Genadendal), and</td>
<td>Historical settlement patterns and form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>servicing significant infrastructural developments (e.g. new power plant) situated in an isolated location.</td>
<td>Natural landscape and topographical form as design informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>station)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: SDF MAPS
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