

Good day Michael

Comments from Land Use and Spatial Planning on the proposed development:

1. The intended use can be considered in the rural area as an urban rural transition as the area is earmarked as a tourist precinct. The development impact must however, still reflect the rural quality of the area. In this instance the view from the N2 is not illustrated adequately.
2. The Preferred alternative site plan shows a near continuous building façade along the N2. This will detract from the scenic value when travelling along the N2. The Visual Impact Assessment fails to illustrate the view from the N2 across the proposed buildings and structures towards the mountain. The “N2 Elevations” should be modelled into views from the highway to the mountain, with the walls/buildings imposed onto the actual view-illustrating the line of sight when traveling in a car. The statement “Vehicles travelling along the N2 highway will only have brief glimpses (short viewing time) of the development (Figure 13 - 17) seems misleading, given the plans provided. The impact should be illustrated correctly. The sketches included in Figure 2 of the VIA shows continuous building-scape, but not the visual impact.
3. Consideration should be given to:
 - i. Finer grain buildings (separated with green spaces of sight) to mitigate visual impact (like alternative layout 2, safeguarding visibility corridors);
 - ii. The height impact on the scenic views from the N2 should be illustrated;
 - iii. Setback of buildings to mitigate the visual impact;
 - iv. Natural/green berm along the N2 to mitigate visual impact. The parking adjacent to the N2 is not desirable and should be placed behind a natural/green berm.
 - v. If a perimeter fence/wall be erected, it must be 60% permeable.

Trust the above comments will be considered.

Regards.

Jeanne Muller

Senior Town Planner

Directorate Human Settlements, Planning and Development

Office: 044 801 1290

Internal ext: 9138

Email: jmuller@george.gov.za