

**MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC MEETING OF THE
AFFECTED RESIDENTS OF ERF 2643, 09 NOVEMBER 2023, HELD AT THE PINELANDS LIBRARY AT 18H30.**

PRESENT: See attached attendance register.

Item	Portfolio	Notes
1	WELCOME	Councillor Riad Davids welcomed all present and introduced Brian Watkyns, Shaun Adendorff, Desray Britz and Emily Bolton. Mark Job, a town planner who is contracted by the owners, represented Communicare. The property owners of ERF 2643 offered their apologies.
2	PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION AND QUESTIONS ON 2 CEDAR AVENUE, ERF 2643	<p>BRIEF EXPLANATION OF TITLE DEED REMOVAL REQUEST: Job explained that Communicare wants to create housing that talks to the rental market, expanding social housing to residents that are not only the elderly. Operational property costs increase, but not necessarily their income increases with the operational costs.</p> <p>Renting will be open to individuals who earn between R3 500 and R22 500 per month – of which there will need to be equal earning distribution of such individuals. The owners can only charge up to a third of rental income of the residents income.</p> <p>Job stated that the erf currently holds 52 units. There are currently between 6-9 residents staying at SAWAS (this was later allegedly rejected). The request is for the removal of their restrictive condition that will then allow for non-seniors to reside in SAWAS. It was mentioned that if the restrictive title deed is lifted, Communicare can change this building into social housing without involving the public.</p> <p>RESIDENT CONCERNS: Residents raised various stressing concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintaining of the frontage of the property - Parking - The fact that the proposal mentioned that "it is ideal for multifloor development". In response to this concern, Job stated that there are certain types of criteria given by the City, and these are not always relevant. In this case it is not relevant but an argument made to the City. - There was the concern of what the intention is to develop there. The response was that if there are departures then there will be public participation. Residents were still concerned after the given response.

- Residents bought property with the knowledge of this being an old aged home, not low quintile social housing.
- Whatever is being developed or changed will impact residents.
- Residents questioned as to why SAWAS was not economically viable and why then must it be removed.

RATEPAYERS CONCERNS: Adendorff discussed concerns from the ratepayers, which included: zoning and that the City can override zoning. Once there is the removal of the old aged home, the apartments are small. There is a habitual space minimum of 30 squared metres, therefore making these rooms not habitable. We need to consider the green belt, habitable housing and parking and the concern is that there is not much hold once the title deed is revoked. Therefore we are requesting a **site development plan** of what is coming. This then sets the rules and becomes the guide of what can be developed. This application will be opposed until there is a site development plan.

BRIEF HISTORY OF SAWAS: Ald Brian Watkyns presented a brief history of SAWAS. It is important to note why it was built (he quoted various newspaper articles from the time), and it was to give **preference** to SAWAS. Owners ran into problems making it viable and sold. In 2016 members of Communicare discussed demolishing and rebuilding SAWAS. In the next few months they allegedly put students in SAWAS who were then removed (minutes of a meeting were presented mentioning the students). They closed the SAWAS kitchen in March 2017 and for almost two years the residents were fed and food was supplied by community members, churches, and mosques. People were applying for rooms and weren't getting in with the assumption that they wanted to show that the old aged home was empty. In 2020, residents were suddenly moved out. Only a day and night security guard is in the building. It is important to note that the back area belongs to the river reserve.

The **WAY FORWARD** was discussed. Job will address his client and revert back to the ratepayers and community. If there is no dialogue then ratepayers will compile objections that will be circulated to residents. Job was asked what a reasonable time frame to present the proposal to the community is and it was requested in two weeks from this meeting. Residents were told to also send in their own letter from the City (complete the form) and write the objections in their own words. They will receive the list of objections from ratepayers.

There was the indication that affected members of the community were not informed from the City. Ald Watkyns noted who received the forms.

Residents are encouraged to think of ideas of what the community can agree upon.

3

CLOSING

The meeting closed at 19:50.