



**CITY OF CAPE TOWN
ISIXEKO SASEKAPA
STAD KAAPSTAD**

Case ID 1500154509

Erf 18303, 23 Glanville Road, Tijgerhof

Development Management

This cover page is added by the City of Cape Town as part of our standard branding and document-management process. It does not indicate that the City authored, verified or endorses the submission. All application documents remain the responsibility of the applicant and the City assesses them as submitted. Any errors or discrepancies will be addressed through the normal land use assessment process.

All rights reserved. No part of this data may be reproduced or transmitted without written permission from the Development Management Department of the City of Cape Town. This document is available on the City of Cape Town website (www.capetown.gov.za/LandUseNotices) for a limited time. Please do not host the document independently; you may link to it from the City's site. Documents downloaded from any other website cannot be verified for authenticity.

MOTIVATION REPORT

(03 JUNE 2025)

LIST OF APPLICATIONS TRIGGERED BY ROR, REZONING AND CONSOLIDATION APPLICATION:

- 1. CONSOLIDATION APPLICATION: ERVEN 18303, 18304, 18306, 18308, 18309, CAPE TOWN TO BE CONSOLIDATED**
- 2. ROR AND REZONING OF ERF 18303, CAPE TOWN FROM RESIDENTIAL R1 TO GENERAL BUSINESS GB1 – PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**
- 3. ROR AND REZONING OF ERF 18304, CAPE TOWN FROM RESIDENTIAL R1 TO GENERAL BUSINESS GB1 – PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**

•

**FEES FROM PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS NO's
1500123596 & 1500145077 TO BE CARRIED OVER TO
THIS FRESH/NEW APPLICATION**

**PRE-CONSULTATION MEETING MINUTES RE ROR
APPLICATION RE ERVEN 18303 AND 18304, UPLOADED
ONTO PORTAL**

**NOTE: ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FROM PREVIOUS
APPLICATION NO. 1500123596, AS RAISED BY MS.
ALICIA VISAGIE ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS:**

- ☐ Applicant is requested to upload copies of approved building plans for all existing structures on all of the applicable properties to the case:

PLANS UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Applicant is requested to upload copies of all LUM approvals to the case:

COPIES OF ALL LUM APPROVALS UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Conveyancer's certificate is required indicating the extent of advertising:

CONVEYANCER'S CERTIFICATE UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Consolidation plan is required:

CONSOLIDATION PLAN UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Updated site plan is required that indicate all of the existing structures. Not all of the existing structures are indicated on the subject plan:

UPDATED SITE PLAN UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Fees outstanding for Removal of Restrictive title conditions. Applicant is requested to contact Janine Vermaak for an updated invoice and upload proof of payment with the submission of the outstanding information:

WILL BE DONE ONCE APPLICATION IS CONFIRMED IN ORDER BY LUM's

- ☐ Updated power of attorney is required:

UPDATED POWER OF ATTORNEY UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Motivation submitted is inadequate. A more detailed motivation is required addressing the full impact of the subject proposal on the adjoining properties. See sections in the MPB-Law (amended 2015) that is specific applicable to consolidations (item 99.2.f.i-ii.). Please address in detail:

MORE DETAILED MOTIVATION UPLOADED TO THE CASE

- ☐ Dimensions of parking bays and carriageway crossings need to be indicated on plans.

Applicant is requested to indicate the stacking and reversing distances on plan.

SDP AMENDED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ All DMS building parameters and title building parameters need to be indicated accurately on the submitted site plan.

SDP AMENDED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ All the restrictive title conditions that prohibit the subject proposal must be indicated accurately and must be motivated in more detail.

ADJUSTMENTS MADE ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ Applicant is requested to upload a copy of the Notice of Intent to Develop that was submitted to Heritage Western Cape.

**HWC APPLICATION REFERENCE NO.: HWC24112812
UPLOADED ACCORDINGLY**

- ☐ Applicant is requested to submit a draft landscaping plan.

UPLOADED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ Applicant is requested to upload a lines and signs plan that addresses the parking circulation and movement on site.

UPLOADED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ See attached comments received from City internal departments. The applicant is requested to address all of the comments in detail.

UPLOADED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ All outstanding information must be uploaded to the case.

UPLOADED ACCORDINGLY

- ☐ The applicant is requested to notify the case officer via email on the submission of the above requested information.
- ☐ On the submission of the above requested information, more comment will follow.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

The reason for the consolidation is to take the five erven which are used by EcoWise for administrative purposes and to create one consolidated erf, which will make the use of the respective buildings for office use, much easier, in the sense that the landowner has been able to remove all the fences, in between the respective erven, to facilitate the internal movement of vehicles and personnel.

This has freed up a lot of usable space because of the removal of the fences.

This has certainly allowed for the optimization of space, without impacting on neighbours, especially as the two existing houses on Glanville Road are to be retained as is, which have been used for offices, without having any negative impact on neighbours.

The proposed consolidation will therefore have a positive impact on neighbours as well as improve the combined functionality of the five individual erven.

What we have also done is to apply for the most basic business zoning, GB.1, in respect of the two properties, Erven 18303 and 18304, abutting Glanville Road.

With the consolidation of the two Glanville Road properties and the retention of the residential facade thereof and with access being taken off Koeberg Road, instead of Glanville Road, the GB.1 rezoning of the two Glanville properties, will not detract from the spatial objectives of the local district plan or the Koeberg Road management strategy.

Application has been made for the determination of an admin penalty in respect of the office conversion of the two Glanville houses on Erven 18303 and 18304, which has been appealed and paid for.

Neither site has any heritage value – A Section 38 NID Application has been made to HWC in this regard.

Application is accordingly also made herewith for a deviation from the Koeberg Road management strategy.

It is to be noted that a landscaping plan has been submitted by the landscape architect to Morne Theron, for perusal and to iron out any issues.

•

1. CONSOLIDATION APPLICATION: ERVEN 18303, 18304, 18306, 18308, 18309, CAPE TOWN TO BE CONSOLIDATED:

SECTION 42(f) OF THE MPBL APPLIES

CONSOLIDATION PLAN IS ENCLOSED.

ITEM 99.2.f.i-ii:

- (f) in an application for the consolidation of land unit –
- (i) the scale and design of the development – No new buildings to be erected – Buildings on property to be retained as is
- (ii) the impact of the building massing – No new buildings to be erected – Buildings on property to be retained as is
- (iii) the impact on surrounding properties – No new buildings to be erected – Buildings on property to be retained as is – Residential massing and character of buildings have been retained

1.1 ERF 18303, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 21 GLANVILLE ROAD

ZONED SR.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 1031 SQ M'S

EXISTING SINGLE STOREY HOUSE WHICH HAS BEEN RENOVATED INTO OFFICE USE (ADMIN)

TO BE REZONED FROM R.1 TO GB.1 TO ALLOW FOR A DWELLING AND OFFICES/STORAGE

GB.1 ZONING WILL PERMIT A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0

CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR ECO-WIZE OFFICES

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND
APPEALED AND PAID FOR

TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS:

DEED OF TRANSFER:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE CONDITION
NO. B3(b) TO ALLOW FOR PROPERTY TO BE USED FOR
OFFICES/STORAGE PURPOSES**

THE EXISTING HOUSE HAS BEEN CONVERTED INTO ECO-WIZE
OFFICES – TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED
FOR AND APPEALED AND PAID FOR

PROPERTY RESTRICTED TO 50% COVERAGE [TITLE CONDITION
B3(c)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS IN TITLE
DEED

PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TITLE DEED 4.72 METER STREET
BUILDING LINE AND 1.57 METER SIDE AND 3.15 METER REAR
BUILDING LINES [TITLE CONDITION B3(d)] – TITLE DEED
RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS IN TITLE DEED

1.2 ERF 18304, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 23 GLANVILLE ROAD

ZONED SR.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 990 M2

EXISTING SINGLE STOREY HOUSE IN PROCESS OF BEING
CONVERTED FOR STORAGE PURPOSES

TO BE REZONED FROM R.1 TO GB.1 (HOUSE AND
OFFICES/STORAGE)

GB.1 ZONING WILL PERMIT A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0

EXISTING SINGLE STOREY HOUSE CURRENTLY BEING
CONVERTED FOR STORAGE/OFFICES

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND
APPEALED AND PAID FOR

TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS:

DEED OF TRANSFER:

**RESTRICTIVE CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO BE AMENDED/REMOVED
TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND
APPEALED AND PAID FOR

PROPERTY RESTRICTED TO 50% COVERAGE [TITLE CONDITION
B(3)(c)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS

PROPERTY SUBJECT TO 4.72 METER STREET BUILDING LINE AND
1.57 METER SIDE AND 3.15 METER REAR BUILDING LINES [TITLE
CONDITION B(3)(d)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS
IS IN TITLE DEED

1.3 ERF 18306, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 3 TIJGERHOF STREET
ZONED GB.1 (OFFICE USE)

OWNER:

SIZE: 872 M2

ZONED GB.1 – PERMITS A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0
STREET BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

RENOVATED SINGLE STOREY HOUSE CURRENTLY BEING USED
FOR OFFICES (PERMITTED USE)

REZONED BY COCT ON 20 APRIL 2016 – CASE ID 70074124

USE RESTRICTED TO OFFICES

ZONING COMPLIANT – NO CHANGES TO BUILDING(S) PROPOSED

MAXIMUM DMS PERMISSIBLE BULK 1308 SQ M'S

TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS – DEED OF TRANSFER

FOOTPRINT OF TOTAL BUILDING AREA (COVERAGE) MAY NOT EXCEED 436 SQ. M'S IN TERMS OF TITLE CONDITION B.3(C) – 50% COVERAGE RESTRICTION

SUBJECT TO TITLE DEED BUILDING LINE RESTRICTIONS – TITLE CONDITION B.3(D) – PROPERTY SUBJECT TO 4.72 METER STREET BUILDING LINE AND 1.57 METER SIDE AND 3.15 METER REAR BUILDING LINES.

1.4 ERF 18308, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 322 KOEBERG ROAD

ZONED GB.1 (OFFICE USE)

OWNER:

ZONED GB.1 – PERMITS A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0

STREET BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

RENOVATED SINGLE STOREY HOUSE CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR OFFICES (PERMITTED USE)

REZONED BY COCT ON 14 DECEMBER 2001 REFERENCE LC 18308 TH TO GENERAL BUSINESS FOR OFFICE AND STORAGE PURPOSES

ZONING COMPLIANT – NO CHANGES TO BUILDING(S) PROPOSED

PROPERTY TO BE TRANSFERRED INTO THE NAME OF MOVE-ON-UP (PTY) LTD TO FACILITATE CONSOLIDATION

CURRENT DMS PERMISSIBLE FLOOR AREA IS 1544 SQ M'S.

ALL RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITIONS WERE REMOVED DURING 2001.

1.4 ERF 18309, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 324 KOEBERG ROAD

ZONED GB.1 (OFFICE USE)

OWNER:

SIZE: 1018 M2

ZONED GB.1 – PERMITS A BULK OF 1.5

STREET BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: 0.0 METERS

RENOVATED SINGLE STOREY HOUSE CURRENTLY BEING USED
FOR OFFICES (PERMITTED USE)

REZONED BY COCT ON 15 FEBRUARY 2012 APPLICATION NO.:
125037 FOR GENERAL BUSINESS GB.1 FOR RESIDENTIAL AND
OFFICE PURPOSES WITH A MAXIMUM COVERAGE OF 60%, WITH A
REAR BUILDING LINE RESTRICTION OF 3.0 METERS, INCLUDING 7
ONSITE PARKING BAYS

ZONING COMPLIANT – NO CHANGES TO BUILDING(S) PROPOSED

MAY ONLY BE USED FOR OFFICES AND RESIDENTIAL IN TERMS OF
ORIGINAL REZONING APPROVAL, PRECEDING DMS DEVELOPMENT
RULES.

MAXIMUM DMS PERMISSIBLE BULK 1507 SQ M'S.

TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS – DEED OF TRANSFER NO.

FOOTPRINT OF TOTAL BUILDING AREA MAY NOT EXCEED 509 SQ.
M'S IN TERMS OF TITLE CONDITION 2.3(C) – 50% COVERAGE
RESTRICTION.

TITLE DEED BUILDING LINE RESTRICTIONS HAVE BEEN REMOVED.

2. REZONING APPLICATION: ERVEN 18303 AND 18304, CAPE TOWN TO BE REZONED FROM SR.1 TO GB.1:

SECTION 42(a) OF THE MPBL APPLIES

2.1 ERF 18303, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 21 GLANVILLE ROAD
ZONED SR.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 1031 SQ M'S

TO BE REZONED GB.1 (HOUSE AND OFFICES)

GB.1 PERMITS A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0

STREET BLDG LINES: NIL

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: NIL

CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR OFFICES/STORAGE

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND
APPEALED AND PAID

DEED OF TRANSFER:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE
CONDITION NO. B3(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**

PROPERTY RESTRICTED TO 50% COVERAGE [TITLE CONDITION
B3(c)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS

PROPERTY SUBJECT TO 4.72 METER STREET BUILDING LINE AND
1.57 METER SIDE AND 3.15 METER REAR BUILDING LINES [TITLE
CONDITION B3(d)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS

2.2 ERF 18304, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 23 GLANVILLE ROAD

ZONED SR.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 990 M2

TO BE REZONED GB.1 (HOUSE AND OFFICES)

GB.1 PERMITS A BULK OF 1.5 AND A COVERAGE OF 1.0

STREET BLDG LINES: NIL

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: NIL

CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR OFFICES/STORAGE

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND
APPEALED AND PAID.

DEED OF TRANSFER:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE
CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**

PROPERTY RESTRICTED TO 50% COVERAGE [TITLE CONDITION
B(3)(c)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS IS IN TITLE
DEED

PROPERTY SUBJECT TO 4.72 METER STREET BUILDING LINE AND
1.57 METER SIDE AND 3.15 METER REAR BUILDING LINES [TITLE
CONDITION B(3)(d)] – TITLE DEED RESTRICTION(S) TO REMAIN AS
IS IN TITLE DEED

3. APPLICATION FOR AMENDMENT OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITIONS IN RESPECT OF ERVEN 18303 AND 18304, CAPE TOWN TO ALLOW FOR HOUSE, OFFICES & STORAGE:

SECTIONS 42(g) & 42(j) OF THE MPBL APPLY

3.1 ERF 18303, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 21 GLANVILLE ROAD

ZONED R.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 1031 SQ M'S

TO BE REZONED GB.1 (HOUSE, OFFICES AND STORAGE)

STREET BLDG LINES: NIL

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: NIL

CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR OFFICES/STORAGE

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND PAID FOR.

DEED OF TRANSFER:

RESTRICTIVE CONDITION NO. B3(b) TO BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS TO ALLOW FOR ONE DWELLING AND OFFICES/STORAGE:

“It shall be used only for the purpose of erecting thereon one dwelling, offices and storage facilities, together with such outbuildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith”.

ADVERTISING: IT IS REQUESTED THAT COUNCIL SERVES NOTICES ON THE NEIGHBOURS.

3.2 ERF 18304, CAPE TOWN

ADDRESS: 23 GLANVILLE ROAD

ZONED R.1

OWNER:

SIZE: 990 M2

TO BE REZONED GB.1 (HOUSE AND OFFICES/STORAGE)

STREET BLDG LINES: NIL

COMMON BOUNDARY BLDG LINES: NIL

CURRENTLY BEING USED FOR OFFICES/STORAGE

TRIGGERS ADMIN PENALTY APPLICATION – APPLIED FOR AND APPEALED AND PAID FOR.

DEED OF TRANSFER:

RESTRICTIVE CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO BE AMENDED TO READ AS FOLLOWS TO ALLOW FOR ONE DWELLING AND OFFICES/STORAGE:

“It shall be used only for the purpose of erecting thereon one dwelling, offices and storage facilities, together with such outbuildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith”.

ADVERTISING: IT IS REQUESTED THAT COUNCIL SERVES NOTICES ON THE NEIGHBOURS.

4. SPATIAL PLANNING POLICY:

The site is located within an old and established part of Cape Town, with a distinctive mixed-use character.

The site is located within a built-up residential area, designated spatially for urban development (STRUCTURING URBAN INNER CORE) and is therefore construed to be consistent with the MSDF as read with the applicable Local District Plan, in terms of which ‘inward growth’ is promoted.

The proposed rezoning and consolidation would by definition constitute ‘inward growth’ and thereby contribute towards the already existing organic transformation of the area.

The site is located within an area designated for urban development (mixed use intensification), in terms of the applicable local District Spatial Development Framework, which allows for land use intensification and residential densification in the area, in keeping with the spatial planning objectives of the Local District Plan.

The Local District Plan allows for residential densification and land use intensification, in a manner that will not detract from the mixed-use urban character of the area.

The proposed consolidated office use site is therefore deemed to be consistent with the ‘inward growth’ spatial planning policy of the MSDF and the local District Plan, with specific reference to the nature of the

land use activity, which is viewed as an associated nonintrusive land use activity.

5. KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT STRATEGY:

A DEVIATION IS REQUIRED FROM THE KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN, TO ALLOW FOR GB.1 REZONING OF ERVEN 18303 AND 18304, IN KEEPING WITH THE GB.1-ZONING OF THE THREE ADJACENT BUSINESS SITES, TO FORM ONE CONSOLIDATED GB.1 (OFFICES) SITE.

The proposed consolidated property is located along Koeberg Road and is designated for 'NEW COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT' in terms of the KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, which means that the proposed consolidation of the erven abutting Koeberg Road, is consistent with abovementioned policy plan.

It is to be noted that the two single residential properties situated along Glanville Road, will upon consolidation, no longer be able to take access directly from Glanville Road, with its new access being a shared access along Koeberg Road.

There is more than sufficient space on the proposed consolidated site to meet the DMS-GB.1 parking requirements.

Three of the five properties to be consolidated are currently zoned GB.1 and have been used for offices for a good many years.

The three existing business zoned properties abut Koeberg Road and Tijgerhof Street, with access currently being taken off both roads.

Application is accordingly hereby made for a DEVIATION from the KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT STRATEGY, to allow for the rezoning of the two Glanville Properties, Erven 18303 and 18304, from SR.1 to GB.1 to be included within the proposed consolidation and to allow for the use thereof for a combination of residential and offices/storage purposes.

6. HERITAGE PROTECTION OVERLAY ZONE:

HWC APPLICATION REFERENCE NO.: HWC24112812 – HERITAGE APPLICATION TO HWC CURRENTLY UNDERWAY

7. TITLE DEED CONDITIONS:

Yes, applicable as elaborated upon herein – ROR application only applies to Erven 18303 and 18304.

8. ZONING APPROPRIATENESS:

The proposed consolidated property is partially zoned GB.1, with the two properties, being Erven 18303 and 18304, also to be rezoned GB.1, so that all 5 properties are zoned GB.1.

9. COMPARISON BETWEEN EXISTING LAND USE RIGHTS AND LAND USE RIGHTS APPLIED FOR:

The proposed consolidated property is partially zoned GB.1, with the two properties, being Erven 18303 and 18304, also to be rezoned GB.1, so that all 5 properties are zoned GB.1.

The current R.1 zoning of Erven 18303 and 18304 LIMITS THE USE OF THESE TWO ERVEN TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF THREE HOUSES, whereas the proposed GB.1 zone only allows two houses on each property.

What the GB.1 ZONING will do, however, is to free up the use of Erven 18303 and 18304 for offices which cannot be achieved in terms of a R.1-Zoning.

The residential fascade of Erven 18303 and 18304 are to be retained.

10. IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS:

As COCT deems appropriate.

11. IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS:

NO IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS.

THREE OF THE PROPERTIES ARE ALREADY ZONED GB.1, WITH THE TWO NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTIAL ERVEN 18303 AND 18304 TO BE INCORPORATED INTO THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION AS GB.1 ZONED PROPERTIES, WITH THE EXTERNAL FASCADES OF THE TWO HOUSES LOCATED ON ERVEN 18303 AND 18304, TO BE RETAINED AS IS.

THE TWO HOUSES ON ERVEN 18303 AND 18304 WILL BE RETAINED AS IS, STRUCTURALLY, WITH THE INSIDE OF THE TWO HOUSES HAVING BEEN CONVERTED INTO OFFICES/STORAGE, WITH NO IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS.

THE MAIN ACCESS POINT IS LOCATED ALONG KOEBERG ROAD, WITH NO ACCESS TO BE ALLOWED ONTO GLANVILLE ROAD.

ERVEN 18303 AND 18304 ARE GOING TO BE REZONED GB.1, AS AN APPROPRIATE INTERFACE WITH GLANVILLE ROAD.

THE GB.1 ZONING IS CAPABLE OF ACCOMMODATING BOTH RESIDENTIAL AND OFFICES/STORAGE, DEEMED SUITABLE FOR PROPERTIES INTERFACING WITH GLANVILLE ROAD.

THE GB.1 ZONING WILL ALLOW FOR A MARGINAL INCREASE IN DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS IN THE FORM OF OFFICES/STORAGE.

IT IS REQUESTED THAT COUNCIL SERVES NOTICES ON THE NEIGHBOURS.

12. S.99 (1, 2 & 3) DESIRABILITY:

12.1 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF APPLICATION PREMISES AND SURROUNDING AREA:

The proposed business rezoning/consolidation is consistent with existing commercial developments in the area.

The property is located within an area with a predominantly medium density residential character, with a number of properties located along Koeberg Road, which have been rezoned for office purposes.

12.2 SOCIO-ECONOMIC IMPACT:

Currently provides much needed jobs in various fields of expertise, relating to pest control and hygiene.

12.3 COMPATIBILITY WITH SURROUNDING USES:

No additional impact on surrounding land use.

Constitutes a rezoning and consolidation of 5 existing serviced properties to create one consolidated GB.1-ZONED ERF, of which three properties have already been zoned business GB.1, which have been used for office use for a good many years.

The proposed consolidated property is located within an area with a predominantly medium density mixed-use character, with a number of adjacent properties, which have been rezoned for office purposes.

The proposed consolidation will strengthen the Koeberg Road Business Corridor.

The reason for the consolidation is to take the five erven which are used by EcoWise for office purposes and to create one consolidated GB.1-ZONED ERF, which will make the use of the respective buildings on the site, for office use, much easier, in the sense that the landowner has been able to remove all the fences in between the respective erven, to facilitate the internal movement of vehicles and personnel.

This has freed up a lot of usable space, because of the removal of the fences.

This has certainly allowed for the optimization of space, without impacting on neighbours, especially as the two existing houses on Glanville Road are to be retained, which have been used for offices, without having any negative impact on neighbours.

The proposed consolidation will therefore have a positive impact on neighbours as well as improve the combined functionality of the five individual erven.

What the removal of the internal common boundary fences have done is to create an island of private open space. This has certainly allowed for the optimization of space, without impacting negatively on neighbours.

12.4 IMPACT ON EXTERNAL ENGINEERING SERVICES:

No additional impact on existing engineering services.

Constitutes a rezoning and consolidation of 5 existing serviced properties to create one consolidated erf, of which three properties have already been zoned business GB.1 and have been used for offices for a good many years.

12.5 SURROUNDING COMMUNITY (HEALTH AND SAFETY):

No safety or health concerns.

Constitutes a rezoning and consolidation of 5 existing serviced properties to create one consolidated erf, of which three properties have already been zoned business and have been used for office use for a good many years.

12.6 IMPACT ON HERITAGE:

HWC APPLICATION REFERENCE NO.: HWC24112812 – HERITAGE APPLICATION TO HWC currently underway.

12.7 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT:

No environmental implications. Constitutes a rezoning and consolidation of 5 existing serviced business and residential zoned properties to create one consolidated erf, of which three properties have already been zoned business and have been used for office use for a good many years.

12.8 IMPACT ON BIOPHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT:

None. Constitutes a rezoning and consolidation of 5 existing serviced properties to create one consolidated erf, of which three properties have already been zoned business and have been used for office use for a good many years.

12.9 TRAFFIC IMPACTS, PARKING, ACCESS AND OTHER TRANSPORT RELATED CONSIDERATIONS:

DMS parking compliant – See SDP.

12.10 WHETHER THE IMPOSITION OF CONDITIONS CAN MITIGATE AN ADVERSE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED LAND USE:

As deemed appropriate by Council.

13. SPLUMA:

- **SPATIAL JUSTICE**

Has no relevance in this particular instance.

- **SPATIAL SUSTAINABILITY**

The proposal addresses this principle with respect to proposing a spatial compact development, in a location that is sustainable and limits urban sprawl.

- **PRINCIPLES OF EFFICIENCY**

The proposal addresses efficiency as it promotes the optimization of resources and discouraging urban sprawl.

- **PRINCIPLES OF GOOD ADMINISTRATION**

N/A – Has no relevance in this instance.

14. SECTION 25 OF NATIONAL CONSTITUTION:

No party's constitutional property rights will be infringed upon by virtue of the application submitted herewith.

15. SECTION 99 (1, 2 & 3) OF PLANNING BYLAW:

99. Criteria for deciding application:

(1) An application must be refused if the decision-maker is satisfied that it fails to comply with the following minimum threshold requirements –

(a) the application must comply with the requirements of this By-Law;

THIS APPLICATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MPBL.

(b) the proposed land use must comply with or be consistent with the municipal spatial development framework, or if not, a deviation from the municipal spatial development framework must be permissible;

THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MSDF AS READ WITH THE APPLICABLE DISTRICT PLAN, INCLUDING THE KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN.

NO DEVIATIONS ARE REQUIRED FROM LOCAL DISTRICT PLAN

TRIGGERS DEVIATION FROM KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN IN RESPECT OF GB.1 REZONING OF TWO GLANVILLE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

(c) the proposed land use must be desirable as contemplated in subsection (3); and

THIS APPLICATION IS DESIRABLE AS CONTEMPLATED IN TERMS OF 99 (3)

*APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA
ADDRESSED HEREIN*

- (d)** in the case of an application for a departure to alter the development rules relating to permitted floor space or height, approval of the application would not have the effect of granting the property the development rules of the next subzone within a zone.

NOT APPLICABLE IN THIS INSTANCE

- (2)** If an application is not refused under subsection (1), when deciding whether or not to approve the application, the decision maker must consider all relevant considerations including, where relevant, the following –

- (a)** any applicable spatial development framework;

THIS APPLICATION IS CONSISTENT WITH THE MSDF AS READ WITH THE APPLICABLE DISTRICT PLAN, INCLUDING THE KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN.

NO DEVIATIONS ARE REQUIRED FROM APPLICABLE DISTRICT PLAN

TRIGGERS DEVIATION FROM KOEBERG ROAD MANAGEMENT PLAN IN RESPECT OF GB.1 REZONING OF TWO GLANVILLE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

- (b)** relevant criteria contemplated in the development management scheme;

THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED HERewith IS CONSISTENT WITH RELEVANT CRITERIA CONTEMPLATED IN THE DMS

- (c)** any applicable policy or strategy approved by the City to guide decision making, which includes the Social Development Strategy and the Economic Growth Strategy;

THE PROPOSAL IS CONSISTENT WITH THE CITY'S SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY IN THAT IT ASSISTS WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND THE PROVISION OF MUCH NEEDED JOBS FOR SKILLED PROFESSIONAL PERSONS AND OTHER WORKERS.

- (d) **the extent of desirability of the proposed land use as contemplated in subsection (3);**

THE PROPOSAL IS DESIRABLE AS CONTEMPLATED IN SECTION 99(3) OF BYLAW – APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

- (e) **impact on existing rights (other than the right to be protected against trade competition);**

PROPOSAL DOES NOT IMPACT NEGATIVELY ON EXISTING RIGHTS, AS NO THIRD PARTY HAS ANY REGISTERED RIGHTS OR SERVITUDES IN PLACE, WHICH MAY BE COMPROMISED BY THE PROPOSAL HEREIN.

- (f) **in an application for the consolidation of land unit –**

THE REASON FOR THE CONSOLIDATION IS TO TAKE THE FIVE ERVEN WHICH ARE CURRENTLY USED BY ECOWISE FOR OFFICE PURPOSES, AND TO CREATE ONE CONSOLIDATED GB.1-ZONED ERF, WHICH WILL MAKE THE USE OF THE RESPECTIVE BUILDINGS FOR OFFICE USE, MUCH EASIER, IN THE SENSE THAT THE LANDOWNER HAS BEEN ABLE TO REMOVE ALL THE FENCES TO FACILITATE THE INTERNAL MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES AND PERSONNEL.

WHICH OF COURSE HAS ALSO FREED UP A LOT OF SPACE BECAUSE OF THE

REMOVAL OF THE FENCES WHICH WERE CREATING UNNECESSARY BARRIERS IN BETWEEN ERVEN.

THIS HAS CERTAINLY ALLOWED FOR THE OPTIMIZATION OF SPACE, WITHOUT IMPACTING NEGATIVELY ON NEIGHBOURS, ESPECIALLY AS THE EXISTING GLANVILLE HOUSES ARE TO BE RETAINED, WHICH HAVE BEEN USED FOR OFFICES, WITHOUT HAVING ANY NEGATIVE IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS.

THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION WILL THEREFORE HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS, AS WELL AS IMPROVE THE COMBINED FUNCTIONALITY OF THE FIVE INDIVIDUAL ERVEN.

- (g) other considerations prescribed in relevant national or provincial legislation, which includes the development principles as contained in section 7 of the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act, 2013 (Act no. 16 of 2013).**

APPLICABLE SPLUMA CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

- (3) The following considerations are relevant to the assessment under subsection (1)(c) of whether, and under subsection (2)(d) of the extent to which, the proposed land use would be desirable –**

- (a) socio-economic impact;**

APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

- (b) ...**

- (c) ...**

- (d) compatibility with surrounding uses;**

APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

THE REASON FOR THE CONSOLIDATION IS TO TAKE THE FIVE ERVEN WHICH ARE USED BY ECOWISE FOR OFFICE/ADMINISTRATIVE PURPOSES AND TO CREATE ONE CONSOLIDATED GB.1-ZONED ERF, WHICH WILL MAKE THE USE OF THE RESPECTIVE BUILDINGS FOR OFFICE USE, MUCH EASIER, IN THE SENSE THAT THE LANDOWNER HAS BEEN ABLE TO REMOVE ALL THE FENCES TO FACILITATE THE INTERNAL MOVEMENT OF VEHICLES AND PERSONNEL.

WHICH OF COURSE HAS ALSO FREED UP A LOT OF SPACE BECAUSE OF THE REMOVAL OF THE FENCES WHICH WERE CREATING UNNECESSARY BARRIERS IN BETWEEN ERVEN.

THIS HAS CERTAINLY ALLOWED FOR THE OPTIMIZATION OF SPACE, WITHOUT IMPACTING ON NEIGHBOURS, ESPECIALLY AS THE EXISTING HOUSES ARE TO BE RETAINED, WHICH HAVE BEEN USED FOR OFFICES, WITHOUT HAVING ANY NEGATIVE IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS.

THE PROPOSED CONSOLIDATION WILL THEREFORE HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS AS WELL AS IMPROVE THE COMBINED FUNCTIONALITY OF THE FIVE INDIVIDUAL ERVEN.

(e) impact on the external engineering services;

APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

(f) impact on safety, health and wellbeing of the surrounding community;

APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA ADDRESSED HEREIN.

(g) impact on heritage;

NOT APPLICABLE.

(h) impact on the biophysical environment.

*APPLICABLE SECTION 99(3) CRITERIA
ADDRESSED HEREIN.*

**(i) traffic impacts, parking, access and other
transport related considerations; and**

DMS PARKING COMPLIANT – SEE SDP.

**(j) whether the imposition of conditions can
mitigate an adverse impact of the proposed
land use.**

AS COUNCIL DEEMS APPROPRIATE.

LUPA IMPLICATIONS:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITION
NO. B(3)(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE**

S.39(5)(a) OF LUPA:

In our opinion the title condition(s) to be amended/removed is of and has no financial value to any landowner or any other party, as the title deed restriction concerned merely serves to restrict the extent to which the land can be used for residential purposes, for the purpose of facilitating land use control, which rights are to be expanded to accommodate the additional land use activities of offices/storage.

S.39(5)(b) OF LUPA:

In our opinion the title condition(s) to be amended/removed does not result in any personal benefit to any of the neighbouring property owners or any other party, as the title deed restriction(s) merely serves to restrict the extent to which the land can be used for residential purposes, for the purpose of facilitating land use control, which rights are to be expanded to accommodate the additional land use activities of offices/storage.

S.39(5)(c) OF LUPA:

The amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) will free up the property to enable the landowner to utilize the said premises optimally for office/storage use.

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) will allow for the more efficient use of the property in question.

This in turn will have a positive impact on the value of the surrounding properties.

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) is therefore in the interest of the community concerned, in the sense that it will create a precedent to free up and to facilitate the processing of similar land use applications in the area.

S.39(5)(d) OF LUPA:

There will be no social benefits should the amendment/removal of the applicable restrictive title condition(s) not be granted.

The applicable restrictive title condition(s) is onerous and severely limits the development potential of the subject property.

If not amended/removed, the area will be deprived of the opportunity of being able to expand its amenities, in keeping with current development trends in the area.

Also, the refusal of the application for the amendment/removal of the applicable restrictive title restriction(s) will set an undesirable precedent, which will thus cause COCT to have to refuse all other similar development applications in the area.

The social benefits to be derived from the improvements as reflected on the attached consolidated plan, will create additional job opportunities, which will boost the local economy.

S.39(5)(e) OF LUPA:

The proposal will have a positive social impact on the area, as it will allow for the area to evolve spontaneously into being able to accommodate other similar improvements/related activities in the area, which will be good for the development of the area and boost the local economy.

S.39(5)(f) OF LUPA:

Application is made for the amendment/removal of the applicable restrictive title condition(s).

The development of the site will continue to be subject to the development controls of the DMS, which is deemed adequate to safeguard the interests and welfare of the surrounding neighbours and that of the local community.

S.99(2) OF LUPA:

The subject property is designated for 'urban development' in terms of the applicable structure/spatial development frameworks.

The proposed land use activities are consistent with the MSDF as read with the local District Plan.

The application is desirable as contemplated, in terms of subsection (3).

There will be no negative impact on existing rights.

The reason for the consolidation is to take the five erven which are used by EcoWise for office purposes and to create one consolidated erf, which will make the use of the respective buildings for office use, much easier, in the sense that the landowner has been able to remove all the fences to facilitate the internal movement of vehicles and personnel.

Which of course has also freed up a lot of space because of the removal of the fences which were creating unnecessary barriers in between erven.

This has certainly allowed for the optimization of space, without impacting on neighbours, especially as the existing houses are to be retained, which have been used for offices, without having any negative impact on neighbours.

The proposed consolidation will therefore have a positive impact on neighbours as well as improve the combined functionality of the five individual erven.

S.99(3) OF LUPA:

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable restrictive title condition(s) and DMS building line departure(s) in respect of the land will allow for the more efficient utilization of the land, where land is a scarce resource.

From an engineering services point of view, the services implications re the usage of the site as shown on the enclosed plan, will remain unchanged.

The property is not situated in a heritage protection area – The residential character of the house is to remain the same.

There will be no negative impact on the bio-physical environment.

The parking and access arrangements will comply with the development controls of the DMS and there will be no negative impact on the area from a parking and traffic point of view.

With regard to the imposition of conditions, COCT may impose any such approval conditions as it deems appropriate.

SPLUMA IMPLICATIONS:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT/REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITION NO. B(3)(b) TO ALLOW FOR OFFICES/STORAGE

S. 47(2) of SPLUMA:

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) will not result in any person being deprived of property, in that the applicable restrictive title condition does not grant land use rights or servitude rights in favour of third parties, but endeavours to facilitate the control of land use, emanating from a time when the only means of land use control was via the imposition of title conditions.

S.47(2)(a) of SPLUMA:

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) does not affect the property rights of any party, in that the applicable restrictive title condition does not grant land use rights or servitudes in favour of third parties, but endeavours to facilitate the control of land use, emanating from a time when the only means of land use control was via the imposition of title conditions.

S. 47(2)(b) of SPLUMA:

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) does not impact negatively on the rights of any party and the public has no interest in the land use activities as it relates to the subject property, in that the applicable restrictive title condition(s) does not grant land use rights or servitudes in favour of third parties, but endeavours to facilitate the control of land use, emanating from a time when the only means of land use control was via the imposition of title conditions.

The only interest that the public has in the subject property is in terms of how the use may affect them with regard to traffic/parking, noise and other possible nuisances which can easily be controlled by means of the imposition of suitable conditions and/or existing relevant municipal by-laws.

S.47(2)(c) of SPLUMA:

The proposed amendment/removal of the applicable title condition(s) is being affected in the pre-scribed manner.

The restrictive title condition(s) currently deemed to still be effective has been identified and it is this/these title condition(s) that we have applied for to be amended/removed.

COMPILED BY ADRIAAN VAN DER MERWE – 06 NOVEMBER 2025

NOTE:
ALL BUILDING STRUCTURES ARE EXISTING

Parking Bays - PT1 areas	
Offices:	2.5 bays per 100m ² GLA 507.8m ² GLA/100 x 2.5 = 13 bays
Warehousing:	1.0 bays per 100m ² GLA 449.4m ² GLA/100 x 1.0 = 5 bays containers (temporary) 7 x 13.7m ² = 95.9m ² = 1 bay
Total Parking provided = 30 bays	
Parking bay dimensions: 5 000mm x 2 500mm	



FOR
INFORMATION
2024-03-14



ECOWIZE			
SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN			
TOTAL BULK: 879.2 m2			
TOTAL PARKING BAYS: 86,438			
ERF 18303	1001 SQM		
ERF 18304	880 SQM		
ERF 18306	870 SQM		
ERF 18308	1008 SQM		
ERF 18309	1010 SQM		
TOTAL EXISTING OF CONSOLIDATED AREA: 4991 SQM			
DATE	DATE	BY	CHKD
12/01	2024-03-14	ME	ME
DRAWING NUMBER		DESCRIPTION	
D022/005K02			

FOR
INFORMATION
2024-03-14



ECOWIZE			
SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN			
TOTAL BULK: 879.2 m2			
TOTAL PARKING BAYS: 86,438			
ERF 18303	1001 SQM		
ERF 18304	880 SQM		
ERF 18306	870 SQM		
ERF 18308	1038 SQM		
ERF 18309	1018 SQM		
TOTAL EXTENT OF CONSOLIDATED AREA: 4939 SQM			
DATE	DATE	BY	CHKD
12041	2024-02-05	ME	ME
DRAWING NUMBER		DESCRIPTION	
D0222/06SK02			