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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd is in the process of preparing an application for environmental authorisation for the proposed housing development entitled Mount Road Social Housing Project. This would see the rezoning of 3 erven currently zoned as Public Open Space (POS); Transportation 1; and Community 1, to Residential 3. The project is undertaken through an appointment by the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality (NMBM). The site is located in Mount Croix, Port Elizabeth, and is part of the Mandela Bay Development Agency (MBDA) mandate area. The affected erven are:

- Erf 1995, currently zoned POS and Transportation 1;
- Erf 518, currently zoned POS;
- Erf 3217, currently zoned Community 1.

A Basic Assessment will be undertaken as per Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations. This assessment will include the following four specialist studies:

- Geological Assessment;
- Traffic Impact Assessment;
- Heritage Impact Assessment; and
- Social Impact Assessment (SIA).
The Matrix...cc was appointed by Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd as an independent specialist to compile a SIA. As the proposed development is a listed activity in terms of the Government Notice No. R. 386 of 2006, a Basic Assessment will be required. This SIA forms part of the Basic Impact Assessment Report. The Arcus GIBB brief defined the following issues to be addressed in the SIA:

- The appropriateness of the location of the development in light of the social gradients of the area. The question: “Does a development of this nature fit within the social fabric of the area?” needs to be answered;
- The implications of the loss of the informal sports field on erf 518;
- The implications of the proposal in terms of the extra strain which 500 units would place on the area’s social services such as schools and healthcare facilities;
- An investigation into the availability of POS in the area.

1.1 Policy Framework

This SIA refers to relevant national legislation as well as municipal policies and guidelines.

Relevant Policy and Legislation includes:
- Land Use Planning Ordinance (15 of 1985);
- Social Housing Act (2008);

Relevant Guidelines include:
- Guidelines for Humans Settlement Planning and Design (2000) CSIR;
- Sustainable Community Planning Guide (2007) NMBM.

While the Port Elizabeth Zoning Scheme Regulations (1989) and the NMBM Integrated Zoning Scheme (Draft 3 of April 2009) are relevant background policies, they do not guide this SIA which seeks to assess the possible impact of the proposed rezoning on the Social Services in Mount Croix. The stipulations of these two policies are required to be applied specifically to the proposed development and would therefore be addressed by the developer of the scheme.

The Development Facilitation Act (67 of 1995), hereafter referred to as ‘the Act’, has also been referenced as relevant background national legislation with particular reference to the General Principles for land development as laid out in Chapter 1 of the Act.
Relevant excerpts from the Act include:

“The Principles will:
• Stimulate and promote efficient and integrated development through: ... optimal use of existing resources (land, minerals, bulk infrastructure, roads, other transport, etc before providing more); discourage urban sprawl and promote (appropriate) greater densification resulting in more compact cities and town and thus better use of existing infrastructure; rectify historically skewed/distorted infrastructural and service provision and maximise use of existing infrastructure and services.
• Provide that any and all development will be adjudged on its own merits and no preferences will be given to any particular type of development or land use.”

“The above principles apply to the following range of decision making processes in terms of Section 4 of the DFA:

• To ensure that any decision taken by a competent authority, including the Tribunal, in respect of applications to allow land development, or in respect of land development affecting the rights, obligations or freedoms of any persons or bodies, is taken in terms of the DFA and its principles;
• To ensure that correct decisions are made in respect of: ...the approval or disapproval of any proposed change to the use of land...”

Additional documents are referenced in chapter 6.
1.2 Description of project context

The proposed site for the development is located within the MBDA’s mandate area and the entire mandate area is identified as a Restructuring Zone as defined in the Social Housing Act (2008). Restructuring Areas can be defined as following:

- “Urban localities that are areas of opportunity and achieve urban regeneration, development of well-located land and higher residential densities (CBD, along transport corridors).
- Identified by Local Authority and supported by Province for targeted and focused investment.”

The erven targeted for the proposed development are located in the Mount Croix area between Turvey Street, Knowles Street, Wilkinson Street and Kent and Eastbourne Road. All three properties are owned by the NMBM. The area is sloping to the east and allowing for views over the bay and the harbour.

**Erf 518** is currently zoned Public Open Space and measures 14 750m². The area accommodates a full size soccer field and two premix tennis courts. In order to be able to develop the soccer field they area has been filled and levelled. The tennis courts are positioned on two separate platforms. The area is fenced but there is a need for maintenance on the fencing and the tennis courts.

**Erf 1995** measures 12 945m² and has a dual zoning of Public Open Space and Transportation 1. The Transportation 1 zoning is to make provision for a turning circle at the end of Hazelhurst Drive. The area is relatively steep and has no real use in its current form. There are issues with dumping and lack of maintenance in terms of grass cutting. The property has been rezoned previously as follows:

- 1969: 5 erven and a portion of Hazelhurst Drive were consolidated and rezoned from General Residential, Public Open Space and existing road to Institutional Purposes.
- 1986:  The erf was rezoned from Institution Purposes to Public Open Space.

**Erf 3217** was subdivided off erf 1995 some years ago and is zoned Community 1. The area measures 2 967m. 
1.3 Description of proposed housing development in Mount Croix

The proposed housing development offers an outline illustration of intent related to the rezoning of the specified erven. Should approval be granted, the scheme will be developed and managed by a Social Housing Association as defined in the National Social Housing Policy (2005) and the National Social Housing Act (2008).

The proposal includes 502 apartments, comprising 152 private sale units and 350 rental units. The 152 private units are envisaged to be located on the western half of erf 1995 with an entrance on the upper end of Turvey Street, with rental units on the eastern side of erf 1995, and erven 3217 and 518. Additional entrances have been planned on the lower end of Turvey Street and Knowles Street. The proposed housing development comprises three blocks separated by perimeter security. The sale price offers an indicator of intended quality for the proposed development. The private units are envisaged to range from R 500,000 to R 600,000 (1) per unit. Rental unit income is envisaged to range from R 600 per studio per month to R 2 200 per 2 bedroom unit per month.

These indicative values and figures indicate that the earning power of prospective buyers and lessees would need to be at a medium to high level. Should employment be required, income levels would need to be approximately R15 000 per month to qualify for a full bond on a private unit, based on the bank lending standards of expenditure on housing to be a maximum of 1/3 of the applicants annual earnings. Of the 350 rental units, 116 units would require a family to have an income of R 1 500 to R 3 500 per month. The remaining 234 units would require a family to have an income of R 3 500 to R 7 500 per month.

The proposed project can be considered a medium to high density housing project. The expected increase in population using the average NMBM household size of 3.79 (2) has been calculated at approximately 1900 persons. The expected increase in population according to the Social Housing Association is approximately 1331 persons. The latter calculation considers the breakdown of the proposed unit provision with 46 x studios @ 1,5p/u = 69 persons; 106 x 1 beds @ 2p/u = 212 persons; and 350 x 2 beds @ 3p/u = 1050 persons (3)

(1) Source: Imizi Housing Developer for proposed project
(2) Source: Stats SA 2007 Community Survey
(3) Source: Imizi Housing Association
1.4 Methodology

The Social Impact Assessment investigates three different aspects/elements in order to be able to draw conclusions and formulate recommendations around the proposed housing project in Mount Croix. These are the following:

Precedent Analysis - investigation of existing Social Housing Projects in South Africa

Through interviews the impact of Social Housing Projects in existing urban areas has been assessed. The interviews were conducted with three different groups for each project. These included residents of a housing development, surrounding residents and management of the Housing Association. The precedent projects include Amalinda and Emerald Sky in East London, and Lagoon View in Knysna. Telephonic interviews were held with representatives of the Johannesburg Housing Company (JHC) who developed and manage the Brickfields Project in Newtown, Johannesburg.

Social Services analysis

A comparison has been made between the available Public Open Space (POS) in Mount Croix and other neighbourhoods identified as being similar in characteristics in Port Elizabeth. A further comparison is made with national planning standards as described in ‘The Red Book’ published by CSIR. The POS in Mount Croix has also been analysed in terms of quality identifying functionality and usage.

Education: An analysis of pupil numbers and of impact of the new families on the school facilities in the area.

Health care: An analysis of available health care facilities in the area and the usage thereof.

Property Values analysis

The methodology encompasses a broad overview on the existing property values and compares findings with the value of properties proposed. In order to get reasonable indication information was sourced from NMBM Property Valuers, the Knysna Municipality and the Buffalo City Municipality ‘valueme’ website. In addition, indication of market values was sought from Estate Agents with 7 - 12 years experience in the Mount Croix area as well as the possible impact of the housing development on property values in the area.
2.0 PRECEDENT PROJECT ANALYSIS

Precedent studies of three existing housing developments have been conducted. The selection of studies has been made based on location within a city or province, contextual property values and contextual property types. The driving factors for site selection include:

1. An existing completed scheme which is fully operational, and
2. A residential context relevant to that in Mount Croix

Objectivity was a key requirement to The Matrix, as independent consultants undertaking this Social Impact Assessment (SIA). To ensure that views of relevant parties were conveyed without interpretation, a series of three questionnaires were developed aimed at:

1. Residents living in the surrounding neighbourhood,
2. Residents living within the housing development, and
3. Developer managing agents working on co-ordination and management of the completed scheme.

No demographic considerations were made in order to ensure an unbiased approach to data collation.
2.1 Amalinda Housing Development

Developed by: SOHCO
Suburb: Amalinda
City: East London

The Amalinda Main Road runs along one edge of the development, with natural bush on the Eastern side, and a suburban residential area on the other two sides.

Units vary from 1 bedroom to 3 bedrooms, and are situated around central stairwells with public garden space between them.

The development was started in 2001 and comprises 598 units, 190 of which are unsubsidised. 50% of the units are for rental use only, with the remaining 50% for rental with an option to buy.
Precedent Project Analysis

Photographs of Amalinda Housing Development

View across Amalinda of 3 and 4 storey units

3 and 4 storey walk-up units surround central staircases

Services such as postboxes and refuse removal are centralised

Photographs of neighbourhood surrounding Amalinda Housing Development
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2.2 Emerald Sky Housing Development

Developed by: SOHCO
Suburb: Amalinda
City: East London

Emerald Sky is situated on a previously undeveloped piece of land. The eastern edge of the development is bordered by a valley, with suburban residences on the other three sides.

The development began in 2008 and is currently still under construction. In August 2010 486 units had been completed, and when finished the development will consist of a total of 790 units. Currently the development is 100% occupied.

All the units are for rental purposes only and vary from 1 bedroom to 3 bedrooms, and are arranged along external walkways.
A biometric security system uses fingerprinting for security access.

Services such as postboxes and refuse removal are centralised.

Photographs of Emerald Sky Housing Development

3 and 4 storey walk-up units surround central staircases.

Photographs of neighbourhood surrounding Emerald Sky Housing Development
2.3 Lagoon View Development

Developed by: Own Haven
Suburb: Hornlee
City: Knysna

Lagoon View is situated on previously undeveloped slope overlooking the Knysna industrial area and the lagoon. To one side is a major road and the other three sides meet suburban residences.

Phase 1 of the development was opened in October 2009, with phase 2 and 3 having been completed in April 2010.

All the units are for rental purposes only and vary from 1 to 3 bedroom units, with 112 units in total. Units are arranged over three floors with access via external walkways.
The development has views over Knysna’s industrial area and lagoon.

3 storey walk-up units surround central staircases

Views across Knysna Lagoon

Common external stair cases used to access apartments

Photographs of Lagoon View Housing Development

Photographs of neighbourhood surrounding Lagoon View Housing Development
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2.4 Conclusion to precedent studies

When tabulating the responses from the three questionnaires from the three precedent projects, trends and common threads were noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Amalinda</th>
<th>Emerald Sky</th>
<th>Lagoon View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How long have you lived in your current home?</td>
<td>2yrs - 36yrs residence with majority around 20 years</td>
<td>4yrs - 16 yrs residence</td>
<td>6yrs - 37yrs residence with 55% having resided for over 20 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>were you living here prior to the housing development taking place?</td>
<td>70% of interviewees were resident in area prior to development</td>
<td>50% of interviewees were resident in area prior to development taking place</td>
<td>100% of interviewees were resident in area prior to development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Are you an owner occupier or a tenant?</td>
<td>86% of interviewees were property owners</td>
<td>50% of interviewees were property owners</td>
<td>67% of interviewees were owner occupiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What is the approximate value of your property?</td>
<td>Property values in surrounding area range from R400k to R1mil</td>
<td>Property values in surrounding area range from R800k - R855k</td>
<td>Property values in surrounding area range from R500k - R1.5mil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Have you noticed any difference in availability of social services in your area? i.e. Placement at schools, appointments with doctors or at the local hospital, availability of goods in your local supermarket, access to libraries or other civic facilities</td>
<td>70% noted no difference in availability of social services. 14% noted an improvement with an improved local supermarket.</td>
<td>No change in availability of social services noted</td>
<td>67% noted no change in availability of social services. Others cited availability as dropping, relocation of doctors surgery further away, no school nearby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do you know anyone who resides in the social housing development in your area? If so what kind of relationship do you have? (friend, family, colleague etc)</td>
<td>57% mentioned that they have developed close relationships with residents of the SH development</td>
<td>No one had close relationships with residents in the SH development</td>
<td>45% mentioned that they have friends living in the development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Are you involved in events in your neighbourhood? If so what?</td>
<td>70% stated they were not involved in the community. 20% were involved with the local church.</td>
<td>No involvement in the neighbourhood noted</td>
<td>34% are involved in the community either through hospice or church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In questionnaire one, directed towards residents living in the neighbourhood surrounding the development, most of the residents indicated no changes in the neighbourhood and day-to-day living. A small number of respondents noted that noise emanating from the development was a notable disturbance which had caused a change in the neighbourhood. The same residents noted that safety and security were improved by the transformation of a previously negative undeveloped space into a positive active space. In addition, the increase in traffic generated as a result of additional residents was noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Amalinda</th>
<th>Emerald Sky</th>
<th>Lagoon View</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Where did you used to live?</td>
<td>Most residents have moved here from surrounding areas (Mdantsane, Gonubie, Twaks City, Cradock, Cambridge). Some had previously rented in Amalinda and are now owners.</td>
<td>Residents moved from a variety of areas: Amalinda Forest, Braer Lynn, Buffalo Flats, Quigney, West Bank, Mdantsane, Gomba, and Cambridge.</td>
<td>Residents moved from a variety of areas: George, Krynina, Concordia Location, Homerville, Old Place, Mossel Bay/Nurses home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Are you an owner occupier or a tenant?</td>
<td>30% of interviewees were owners and 70% tenants/employees</td>
<td>100% of interviewees were tenants in the development.</td>
<td>100% of residents are tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Have you noticed any difference in availability of social services in your area? if so what kind of relationship do you have? [friend, family, colleague etc]</td>
<td>90% of residents noted no difficulty in accessibility to social services in the areas. 10% said no busses to Duncan Village as a problem.</td>
<td>13% noted a difficulty in access to schools, bus, Frere Hospital and Southernwood College. 67% noted not difficulties, citing easy access to taxi’s as a positive aspect.</td>
<td>30% of residents noted that access to public transport was difficult. 70% noted ease of access with either a 6 minute walk to school, 2.5km from town, or access to private transport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Do you know anyone who resides in the social housing development in your area? If so what kind of relationship do you have?</td>
<td>80% of residents mentioned numerous friendships in the surrounding neighbourhood outside of the development. Many had family in surround neighbourhood.</td>
<td>55% of interviewees have friends or relatives in the immediate neighbourhood.</td>
<td>60% of residents have friends and family living in the immediate surrounding suburb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Are you involved in events in your neighbourhood? If so what?</td>
<td>40% mentioned being involved in informal social events int he neighbourhood. 60% are not involved in events in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>89% of residents are not involved in local events. 11% cited soccer.</td>
<td>10% of residents were involved in a social children help group. 30% were not involved in any community events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Has the house to which you have moved had a positive influence on your day to day living?</td>
<td>70% of residents were emphatic about the positive influence moving to Amalinda has had on their day to day living. 10% were dissatisfied with build quality i.e. Lack of ventilation. 10% were dissatisfied by the high rental.</td>
<td>89% of interviewees were emphatic about the positive influence the move to Emerald Sky had on their lives.</td>
<td>80% of residents noted a positive influence the move to this development has had. 20% noted no change. 20% did not comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Do you feel that you have been well received by your neighbours living outside of the development?</td>
<td>90% of residents noted that they had been well received by residents outside the development in the surrounding area.</td>
<td>88% of residents noted that they had been well received by neighbours outside of the development.</td>
<td>70% of residents did not have comment about how they have been received by surrounding neighbours. 30% of residents felt they had been well received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Has the move had a positive influence on your family life?</td>
<td>40% of residents stated that the move to Amalinda had positively influenced their family life. 20% noted no change with family in Queenstown. 10% noted that the move was a financial improvement but worse for their family situation. 30% noted a negative.</td>
<td>98% noted a positive influence on their family life.</td>
<td>70% of residents noted a positive influence on family life either because they were living nearer or because they were happy to visit. Some added that they were happy to no longer live in the location. 30% noted no change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Are you happy living in the neighbourhood?</td>
<td>80% of residents noted that they were content with living in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>89% of residents noted that they were content with living in the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>100% were happy living in the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What are positive aspects of the neighbourhood?</td>
<td>General positive comments include: proximity to shops and town, security, accessibility to transport, shops, schools and hospital, serenity of neighbourhood, friendly social interactive nature of residents in area, affordability.</td>
<td>General positive comments include: safety, security, no interference, quiet, friendly environment, view.</td>
<td>General positive comments include: safety from xenophobia, not too busy/noisy, quietness, view, new home, hot water &amp; shower, modern, secure, cosmopolitan environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>What are negative aspects of the neighbourhood?</td>
<td>General negative comments include: 40% had no negative comments. 20% noted high rent as a negative. Others noted theft, loud music, damp living conditions, break-ins and drugs as negative aspects.</td>
<td>General negative comments include: cost of rent, distance from services, noise at night, density too high, noise at weekends. 56% did not have negative comments.</td>
<td>General negative comments include: rent is expensive, noise, access to shops and transport, theft of clothes off washing lines. 50% did not have negative comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Do you feel that the development is well managed?</td>
<td>50% noted that the management was good. Others noted that length of response time was poor and that maintenance took long.</td>
<td>89% of residents noted excellent management. 11% noted an inconsistency i.e. sometimes efficient, sometimes slow.</td>
<td>90% noted excellent management. 10% were not always satisfied.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In questionnaire two, directed at residents living in the housing development, access to schools and public transport were noted as primary concerns, with good security noted as a positive aspect in the development. Public Transport issues are addressed in the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) component of the composite Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Amalinda</th>
<th>Emerald Sky</th>
<th>Owen Haven</th>
<th>Brickfields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How many units are there in the development?</td>
<td>598 units on completion. 408 subsidised, 190 not subsidised. 66 x 18 (33sqm), 482 x 28 (40sqm), 50 x 38 (52sqm)</td>
<td>486 units currently. 790 units on completion.</td>
<td>112 units on completion after 3 phases in October 2009, February 2010 and April 2010. Not all are occupied yet</td>
<td>724 units in 3 phases/projects including Brickfields, Lagoa Gardens, &amp; Phumelani. All collectively know as Brickfields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Is the development secured by means of fencing?</td>
<td>Public road access with security at night. Amalinda Management are considering implementing a biometric secure access as at Emerald Sky (fingerprint scanner).</td>
<td>Fingerprint scanner (residents need to register to gain access), guards during daytime, closed booms at night</td>
<td>Electric gate and remote opening</td>
<td>Security is specific to site with single access point. In some instances the buildings from the boundary are on the building line at back edge of pavement. 24hr guard and a proximity card reader for traffic and pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>What is the tenure split of properties in the development i.e. Rental vs ownership?</td>
<td>50% rental / 50% rent-to-buy (139 bought so far)</td>
<td>100% rental</td>
<td>100% rental (middle income families)</td>
<td>100% rental. Rigorous rental retrieval system. Potential residents are vetted and then inducted to ensure they understand their responsibilities. Payment is on 1st and letter is sent on 3rd of each month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>What are the main problems you are experiencing in the development?</td>
<td>Upkeep of properties i.e. Ventilation is a problem as there are no air bricks so tenants need to be educated as to opening windows etc. Timber frames are expensive maintenance cost of around R36k/month. Subletting with approx 50-70 cases. Noise complaints are dealt with after 11pm quiet time.</td>
<td>Those that don’t qualify are getting registered persons to apply for them. Maintenance with plumbing and fencing is an issue.</td>
<td>Tenancy is the only major problem cited in the development.</td>
<td>Rent retrieval, demand for security, maintenance (levy for maintenance is part of rent and separate payment), noise and drugs are considered to be serious offences and the community gets involved, as with drinking in public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Do you receive complaints from the people in the neighbourhood? If so, how often and what kind of complaints?</td>
<td>There has only been one complaint from surrounding neighbours with one article on noise published regarding development.</td>
<td>Complaints received during construction of project re; dust and noise. Value of property was questioned.</td>
<td>No complaints received from neighbour.</td>
<td>No complaints received from neighbour. Not to the recollection of the management agent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Do your residents ever complain about the surrounding neighbourhood? If so how often and what kind of complaints?</td>
<td>No complaints as there is no class distinction as development is not perceived as Social Housing. Development is directly comparable to The Beacon which is a private development in EL.</td>
<td>No complaints by residents regarding the surrounding neighbourhood.</td>
<td>No complaints by residents regarding the surrounding neighbourhood.</td>
<td>YES! Adjacent building has been hijacked and there is sewerage running down the walls.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General comments

The demographic is 30-65yrs old. Strict rules so mostly sub-tenants that cause problems. Definite difference between owner occupier and tenant occupier. Levy is R380/mo for garden maintenance and security. "Mindset change towards SH required" Margaret Johannisen, General Manager of Amalinda and Emerald Sky for SOHCO.

Residents not always well informed. A survey revealed a need for rental properties. Municipal land therefore municipal criteria for qualifying as a tenant. Owen Haven buys land but agreement with municipality to use municipal qualification criteria.

Management is absolutely crucial for any development. It did a development in centre of an area of RDP housing. RDP residents were up in arms suggesting that their property values would decrease should the proposed development bring "hillbrow style flats" to their area. This is not the case and RDP homes have increased in value.

In questionnaire three, directed at managing agents of the developer owning and running the development, rigorous management regimes and rent retrieval methods were cited as the primary focus on which the success of the development depended. Residents not complying with strict noise abatement regulations, alcohol use in public, and timeous payment of rental were given strict warnings and eventually dismissed from the development. Management Agents noted an issue of subletting of apartments by lessees, which was an important issue to keep aware of and under control for the success of the development. It was indicated that sub-lessees often made their presence known by not adhering to the regulations of the development thus indicating a connection between the above issues and pride in ownership.

Management of housing developments in receipt of government grants are assessed, accredited and then continuously regulated according to institutional, project, and key indicators where compliance requires adherence to proven best practice.

| What are the values of the units in the development? | Initial prices: 1B = R62,399 with R18,400 subsidy, 2B = R88,395 with R18,400 subsidy. Current 2B value is in excess of R250k. | R470k per unit. 1bed rental @ R1450/mo, 2 bed rental @ R2550/mo, 3 bed rental @ R3000/mo. | Management is absolutely crucial for any development. It did a development in centre of an area of RDP housing. RDP residents were up in arms suggesting that their property values would decrease should the proposed development bring "hillbrow style flats" to their area. This is not the case and RDP homes have increased in value. |
3.0 SOCIAL SERVICES ANALYSIS

Social services analysed include Public Open Space (POS), Education Facilities and Health Facilities. The purpose of the analysis of each public amenity is to assess what the impact on the existing neighbourhood residents would be should an additional 502 households be introduced into the suburb.

3.1 Public Open Space

A regulated amount of Open Space is required to be provided on the private erf by the owner and has not been analysed within this study since this is a requirement for Municipal Building Plan Approval which falls outside the scope of this study. The extent of provision is governed by the PE Zoning Scheme.

The focus of this study is on POS within the relevant Sustainable Community Unit and Neighbourhood. Public Open Space is an integral part of the urban environment and performs a number of functions:

- Provision of identity and improvement of aesthetics for the urban areas;
- Accommodation of recreational and social activities;
- Contribution to environmental and conservation elements;
- Density transition areas; and
- Green planning infill spaces where slope would make development difficult.

When analysing Public Open Space there are three elements that play a role: **quantity; quality; and proximity.** The assessment of POS cannot therefore be confined to an assessment of the availability of POS in general. Current standards should be used as guidelines and not be applied in isolation without considering proximity as well as qualitative aspects including usage and possible future usage. Consideration for the initial intent for a particular area of POS also needs to be taken into account.
The following methodology was used to assess the POS:

3.1.1 Quality:

A tool developed in Sweden known as ‘Sociotoping’ was used as a technique to assess quality and functionality of POS in selected study areas. The tool analyses various uses and qualities of existing open spaces. In this study, results have been documented in a Sociotoping map which indicates POS locations and uses with icons. In addition to the sociotoping exercise a table was populated containing further detailed information. In the table the bright orange marks the erven subject to the study and the light orange indicates additional nearby POS. Through this analysis it can be assessed which qualities and functions are represented within neighbourhoods and what is possibly lacking.

When assessing the manner in which various POS areas are used, the following can be identified:

- Erf 518 is the only Public Open Space within a 1 - 1.3km radius where a full sized soccer field and two tennis courts are available for public use, as this is one of the few flat areas in the neighbourhood. There is continuous interest from residents requesting maintenance of the POS;
- Erf 1995 is not used intensively, has some negative uses reported and is not very well maintained. The area has a significant slope and there are issues with dumping, infill and personal safety;
- There are a number of additional POS areas within the neighbourhood accommodating various uses including erf 516, 568 and 2326/2327. The analysis shows that there is room for improvement of these spaces in terms of expanding uses as well as counteracting negative aspects currently identified in these areas.

(4) Source: City of Goteburg, Sociotoping conference document
(5) Source: NMBM Parks Department
Sociotoping map indicating Quality of Public Open Space in Mount Croix
## Sociotoping Table Indicating Quality of Public Open Space in Mount Croix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Aesthetics</th>
<th>Monument</th>
<th>Community green area</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Dog Walking</th>
<th>Walkover</th>
<th>Meeting Place</th>
<th>Negative Use</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Additional Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518</td>
<td>flat (fill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2266, 2267</td>
<td>flat (fill)</td>
<td>park</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td>workers’ lunch</td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255, 256</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2963</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>soccer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694, 695</td>
<td>flat in part</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reservior, active residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2964</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4925</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900 Donkin</td>
<td>flat in part</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3182 St Georges Park</td>
<td>sloping</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3312</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4042</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601 Hawlock</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>play equipment</td>
<td>informal sport</td>
<td>dog walking</td>
<td>walking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Sociotoping workshop was carried out during a combined session of private urban design companies including The Matrix...cc and Urban Dynamics, as well as Municipal Officials at the Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality.
3.1.2 Quantity:
The legislation for POS is regulated in the Land Use Planning Ordinance (LUPO 15 of 1985) requiring 1.8ha per 1 000 persons. The Port Elizabeth Zoning Scheme Regulations (PEZSR) indicates the following provision requirements for subdivisions:
- Erven greater than 500m², provide 72m² of open space.
- Erven smaller than 250m², provide 96m² of open space.
- Erven between 250m² and 500m², provide pro rata.

The provisions stipulated in the PEZSR are to be provided by the developer of the housing development within the proposed scheme and are therefore not relevant to this study.

For the purpose of this report the project area has been assessed and compared with the norm stipulated in the LUPO as national legislation referring to urban development. The analysed area in Mount Croix is bound by major traffic barriers being Govan Mbeki Avenue, Cape Road, Albany Road and Mount Road. In order to create a comprehensive overview of POS provision in the city, LUPO was also used to analyse POS provision in parts of alternative neighbourhoods in PE, and then cross-referenced. In every instance the analysed area was defined by major traffic barriers and therefore does not represent the whole neighbourhood. The maps on page 27 to 36 indicate the areas that were compared.

If one compares the neighbourhoods with the LUPO norm the following results can be found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated area within the following suburbs:</th>
<th>Ha Public Open Space</th>
<th>Number units within designated areas</th>
<th>m² POS per unit</th>
<th>Number residents</th>
<th>Ha POS/1000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Croix current</td>
<td>7.357</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>67.56</td>
<td>4127</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerstrand</td>
<td>9.581</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>52.27</td>
<td>6947</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Park</td>
<td>5.007</td>
<td>1184</td>
<td>42.29</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendinningvale</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorraine</td>
<td>14.982</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>107.01</td>
<td>5306</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walmer Township</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>4063</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soweto on Sea</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7516</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>28486</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwazakhele</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4726</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>17912</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>4355</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelvandale</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>1141</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>4324</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUPO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tables indicate that Mount Croix currently has an average to high supply of POS in the
neighbourhood and is in line with the provision in terms of LUPO. Most probably, the provi-
sion of POS in the area was even higher in the past though (private) subdivisions have re-
duced the POS provision.
Should the proposed scheme be approved, POS will be extracted and a significant number of
units will be added. This could be viewed as a further subdivision which would substantially
reduce the POS provision.

The following table illustrates the impact on POS should individual proposed erven be devel-
oped, or all proposed erven be developed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible development in Mount Croix</th>
<th>Ha Public Open Space</th>
<th>Number units within designated areas</th>
<th>m² POS per unit</th>
<th>Number residents</th>
<th>Ha POS/1000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erf 518, 1995 and 3217 developed, Stats SA Population Figures</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>6034</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 518, 1995 and 3217 developed IMIZI figures</td>
<td>4.588</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>5458</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 1995 and 3217 developed, Stats SA Population Figures</td>
<td>5.882</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>43.31</td>
<td>5147</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 1995 and 3217 developed, IMIZI population figures</td>
<td>5.882</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>43.31</td>
<td>4896</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1.3 Proximity:
The Guidelines for Human Settlement Planning and Design, published by the CSIR (The Red Book), identify the needs of various user groups in terms of proximity and quality. The acceptable walking distance to a POS facility has been indicated at 500m. This same radius has been adopted by the Sustainable Community Planning Guide published by the NMBM in corporation with Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). For the purpose of this report the 500m radius has been applied to the project area.

To conclude, the POS norms in the new situation are being badly affected by withdrawing POS while at the same time adding a substantial number of units. This can be counteracted by introducing improvements to the remaining adjacent open spaces which are in need of upkeep and removal of negative aspects.

This would result in a situation where residents have access to a smaller amount of good quality open space as opposed to a larger amount of medium to low quality POS. However it will be difficult to find an alternative site for the soccer field currently on erf 518 due to the slope of the remaining POS areas.

With regards to the accessibility only a limited number of households will have to walk further than 500m. Access to the available POS from these homes is up a steep hill.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The black circles indicate a 500m proximity from the centre of the proposed sites capturing four additional green areas within their extent.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The four red circles indicate a lower concentration of green areas in Glendinningvale when compared with Mount Croix.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. While there are only three red circles depicting 500m radii from green spaces, the suburb is flanked by large green accessible areas.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. An extensive amount of green spaces are made clear graphically by the large number of red circles on the map.
Map indicating Quantity and Proximity of Public Open Space in **Summerstrand**

The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The provision appears to be extensive by the number of red circles, however, Summerstrand falls below the LUPO legislation requirements when the beach front area is excluded.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The provision of green space in Kensington is comprised of a number of smaller sized areas incorporated into the street planning of the area, as opposed to being the result of leftover space which is resultanty designated as POS.
Map indicating Quantity and Proximity of Public Open Space in Gelvandale

The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The provision of green space in Gelvandale falls well below the LUPO legislative requirements.
The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. The provision of green space in Gelvandale falls well below the LUPO legislative requirements.
Map indicating Quantity and Proximity of Public Open Space in Kwazakhele

The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. Kwazakhele has a zero provision of public green open space.
Map indicating Quantity and Proximity of Public Open Space in **Soweto-on-Sea**

The extent of the study area within the neighbourhood is demarcated by the thick blue line along major traffic barriers. Soweto-on-Sea has a zero provision of public green open space.
Furthermore various Sustainable Community Units (SCU’s) were compared in ratio of POS compared to the total area. By using both techniques the effect of the immediate neighbourhood as well as the larger area is being taken into consideration. If one compares the SCU area’s the following can be found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCU Area</th>
<th>SCU Number</th>
<th>Total area of SCU (m²)</th>
<th>Total POS area in SCU (m²)</th>
<th>Total POS in SCU (%)</th>
<th>Usable POS area (m²)</th>
<th>Usable POS (%)</th>
<th>Usable POS of total SCU area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MBDA Area now</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9,080,348</td>
<td>985,730</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>560,863</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBDA Area future</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9,080,348</td>
<td>558,035</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>533,168</td>
<td>55.65</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Road</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10,808,951</td>
<td>4,359,328</td>
<td>40.33</td>
<td>2,800,032</td>
<td>64.23</td>
<td>25.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North End</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13,616,359</td>
<td>1,623,340</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>958,574</td>
<td>55.05</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon comparison between SCU areas, the MBDA area shows a lower POS provision as can be expected for a SCU area with an inner city component.
The extent of the Sustainable Community Unit is demarcated by the thick blue line. This SCU provides 25.9% open green spaces.
Map indicating total quantity of Public Open Space in **SCU 34 North End**

The extent of the Sustainable Community Unit is demarcated by the thick blue line. This SCU provides 7% open green spaces.
The extent of the Sustainable Community Unit is demarcated by the thick blue line. This SCU currently provides 6.18% green open space and would reduce to 5.87% should the development be implemented.
3.2 Education Facilities

An assessment was done in order to gauge the capacity of schools in the area and their ability to cater for the additional children in the neighbourhood should the development be implemented.

A figure of 3.79 persons per household is used as a multiplier as sourced from the Stats SA 2007 Community Survey. When multiplying the 502 units proposed in the new development by 3.79, a figure of 1902 is produced. The age distribution from the 2007 Community Survey shows that there will be approximately 280 children in the Primary School age category (5 – 13 yrs) and approximately 230 learners in the High School age category (14 – 19 yrs). If applying the Imizi population numbers the learner numbers are 200 and 160 respectively.

All schools within a 2km radius and some within a 3km radius were contacted by telephone to enquire about their capacity with regards to additional learners as well as where the current learners come from. The tables below indicate the findings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>Student number</th>
<th>Available capacity</th>
<th>Annual Fees</th>
<th>Where students travel from</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>R2970, R3630</td>
<td>Most - Motherwell, KwaZakhele. Some - North End, Korsten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morewag</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>R 2 200.00</td>
<td>approx. half - Kensington, Holland Park, half - Motherwell, Zwide, other townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons Hill</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>R 4 000.00</td>
<td>Kensington, Central, Motherwell, Gelvandale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiate</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>R 12 650.00</td>
<td>Most - surrounding suburbs, some outer suburbs + townships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excelsior</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>R 2 200.00</td>
<td>Gelvandale, Malabar, New Brighton, lower Mount Croix, Kabega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>R 7 100.00</td>
<td>Gelvandale, Malabar, New Brighton, lower Mount Croix, Kabega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R 12 400.00</td>
<td>90%+ Mill Park, Linkside, Newton Park, Walmer, plus boarders, 5 – 10% outer suburbs/townships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Augustines</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>R 3 410.00</td>
<td>80% townships – Motherwell, kwaDwesi, New Brighton, 20% Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>M + F</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>R 6 810.00</td>
<td>70% townships, 30% Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required 200-280</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5611 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Without erf S18: 150</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings show a deficit in current capacity in the Primary Schools and High Schools. If learners needed to be accommodated today, there would be a shortage of between 60 and 140 primary school places and between 52 and 122 high school places. While this study is restricted to the area indicated on the map, it is important to realise the ripple effect of education deficit issues in areas further afield.

Khumbulani High School is currently housed temporarily in the old Richmond Hill School which closed down in 1992 (5). The Khumbalani school building, a heritage building, burnt down in 2010. It is currently unclear what the permanent solution for the school is going to be and therefore capacity information is unavailable.

The percentage of the population aged 0–14 years of the total population has gradually declined since 1996 and the size of the age-group 15–64 has gradually increased. It is also evident that there is a population age shift with the percentage of people aged 65+ is increasing. (6)

These changes in demographics are not expected to have any impact on capacity need within the next few years when the housing project would be completed. The number of children in relevant age bands will not have dropped enough to accommodate them all within the schools analysed. However, all schools, with the exception of the specialist schools, indicated that preference is given to learners living in the catchment area of the school.

(5) Schalk Potgieter, Department of Housing and Land, NMBM
Map indicating proximity and availability of Education Facilities from the proposed site in Mount Croix
3.3 Health Facilities

The Central Community Health Centre (CHC) on the corner of Northwood and Eastbourne Roads offers Primary healthcare, pregnancy care, a 24 hour emergency service (Not accident and emergency but emergency illness) and 24 hour maternity service. There are plans in place to upgrade this facility in 2011. The facility currently caters for approximately 30 000 visits annually while the norm for a CHC is 144 000 visits. This means that there is ample capacity.

The Central Clinic in Rose Street is a Primary Health Centre (PHC). This area is seen by government as well resourced and there are no plans for upgrade of extension. This clinic only operates in the daytime. The clinic receives approximately 25 000 visits annually while the capacity is 24 000.

In terms of hospital care the Provincial Hospital is located directly next to the Central CHC.

New residents in Mount Croix who are employed are likely to have medical cover and will therefore also make use of private facilities. Probably not all new residents are dependant on public healthcare.
Map indicating proximity and availability of Health Facilities from the proposed site in Mount Croix
4.0 PROPERTY VALUES ANALYSIS

Property values of surrounding properties were considered pertinent in the precedent site selection process. A mapping of municipal valuations has been undertaken in order to visually present a comparison of data. These maps were created for the Mount Croix suburb as well as for each of the areas where precedent studies were undertaken. To ensure consistency in data presentation, municipal evaluations were used for all assessments. This avoids the subjectivity of market prices as opposed to sale prices of properties for the purposes of this report. When comparing valuations of erven surrounding the proposed site in Mount Croix with erven surrounding precedent housing development sites, it shows that there is a larger proportion of higher value homes.

4.1 General analysis

The Matrix...cc undertook a series of meetings with three property experts. These included Smart Properties, Adri Pretorius Properties, and Bruce McWilliams Industries. The current values show that properties located in Mount Croix closer to Westbourne Road i.e. higher up in Mount Croix, and those with a view, are the properties listed as having higher municipal values. These properties also demonstrate a trend of selling at higher prices. The areas closer to Govan Mbeki Avenue show a trend of selling at lower prices.

The meetings indicated that there were factors which could contribute to the reduction of property values in the area:

- The gap in the value of properties between the new housing development and the top end existing values. Consistent comments regarding the proposed scheme promoted a higher value development bracket ranging from R650,000 to the R1,000,000. It was suggested that this would increase the value of surrounding properties.

- The effect of the reduction of current views towards the sea and harbour. A caveat to this statement was made regarding obstruction of views suggesting that the standard of the proposed development was irrelevant when considering loss of views from properties behind the site as this would still negatively affect the values of those homes. No empirical data is available to substantiate these concerns.

- The quantum of development was also raised as a concern citing a development of 500 units as a high number for a single development, and one that would have a definite impact on the neighbourhood in terms of its dynamic and supply-and-demand which would directly affect property values.

- The loss of open space was only mentioned as a concern depending on the type and design of development and how it would affect views from surrounding homes.
Image of view from house numbers 4 & 6 Hazelhurst Road looking East

Image of view from corner of erf 518

Image indicating proposed sites, erven 1995 & 3217

Google Earth image indicating properties where views need to be considered when designs are compile for the proposed development.
Map indicating property values surrounding proposed housing development in **Mount Croix**
Map indicating property values surrounding Amalinda Housing Development
Map indicating property values surrounding *Emerald Sky Housing Development*.
Map indicating property values surrounding **Lagoon View Housing Development**
5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Precedent Study Analysis Conclusions

Precedent study findings indicate that housing development interventions into existing neighbourhoods have been well received.

The various interviews have provided the following insights:

- According to findings from the questionnaires, the majority perception is that the surrounding development has been regarded as positive when compared with the previously undeveloped area and its transformation into a managed area contributing to neighbourhood safety.
- Two major concerns of surrounding residents were related to noise and traffic.
- Strict procedures and enforcement thereof are vital to the well being of all the residents in the neighbourhood.
- Residents within and surrounding new developments have noted access to schools and public transport as primary concerns.
- Management of housing developments is noted as key to the economic success of the development and the social contentment of the residents and neighbourhood as a whole.
- Some residents recalled apprehensions prior to the development and have been surprised by the positive effect it has had on the neighbourhood.

5.2 Social Services Analysis

Public Open Space (POS)

Based on requirements within legislation and guidelines for POS, the POS in Mount Croix would be in relatively short supply should the housing development get approval and be implemented. This would continue a trend of subdivision and further reduce the supply as has been occurring over the years. There is room for improvement of the quality of the POS in Mount Croix and should the housing development be implemented, an upgrade of the remaining POS could compensate for the loss of quantity.

The soccer field on erf 518 is difficult to replace within the neighbourhood due to the steep topography of surrounding sites. Most residents in Mount Croix have access to POS within a 500m radius, as indicated in the plan on page 23.
**Education facilities**

The analysis identifies a shortage of current capacity to be able to accommodate all additional learners within a 2.5km radius. That would require learners to travel further in order to find schooling. While the issue of capacity applies equally to both high school and primary school places, the issue is more problematic for Primary School learners due to the inability to travel unsupervised. The situation around the High School capacity could improve in the future once Khumbulani High School is offered a permanent solution for its building. Khumbulani is awaiting funding for their new building.

**Health Facilities**

The health facilities in the area are more than sufficient to accommodate more residents in the neighbourhood.

**5.3 Property Valuations Analysis**

Based on the values of houses in Mount Croix currently, there appears to be a sizeable gap when comparing homes in the R1 million category and upward (Municipal valuation) and the proposed private units of around R 500,000 (Market Price). Interviews indicated a concern regarding property values and how they will be affected due to this gap as well as due to views being interrupted. Neither of these statements, however, has been substantiated by empirical data.

Views from erven surrounding the proposed development are considered to be of high value and contribute greatly to the ethos of the neighbourhood. The obstruction of such views, allowed by the presence of POS, have been available to residents at the time of purchase and should be preserved as much as possible.
5.4 Recommendations

In light of the findings from this Social Impact Assessment some concerns have been raised. These include the fact that development will affect views of properties immediately to the rear of erf 1995, that development on erf 518 will remove the only functional soccer field in the neighbourhood, and development of the scheme as a whole will drastically reduce the POS as well as place extensive pressure on educational services. In light of this, it is recommended that the quantum of the proposed development is reduced. It is suggested that an assessment of the scheme is undertaken which addresses the viability of the development, excluding erf 518 and retaining it in its current capacity as soccer field. This would mean that only erf 1995 and erf 3217 will be developed for housing purposes. This would reduce the impact on services when compared with that of the full development:

POS: All currently functional POS will remain, only unused and unmaintained POS will be removed. The POS provision will be in the region of 1.2ha per 1000 residents.

Schools: The schools in the neighbourhood would overall have sufficient capacity to accommodate the learners.

A well managed housing development would result in an improvement to the neighbourhood and remove the negative associations with the undeveloped and unmaintained erven. This being further supported by the fact that erf 1995 historically was zoned Residential.

The issue of existing views will need to be considered in the designs of the proposed housing development. As a mitigating measure for the loss of POS it is proposed to upgrade the existing open spaces to make them more attractive and usable.

However, should development continue to planning approval and final development of the full proposal, the NMBM should consider the following:

- Consolidating entrances of the housing project and thus creating the perceived orientation of the development towards the East. This would then place the development in the same economic bracket as the lower end of Mount Croix;
- Cluster access points in order to improve management of access;
- The current views towards the harbour of existing residences in the design of the housing development by reducing the height of development;
- The upgrading of adjacent POS areas to compensate for loss of POS;
- Reduction of the number of units to reduce pressure on existing facilities;
- Affording public access to the tennis courts on erf 518, an area proposed as fenced off open space incorporated into the development, thus contributing back to the POS within the neighbourhood.
- The re-opening of the Richmond Hill School.

Conclusion
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