

**MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE
FERNKLOOF NATURE RESERVE (FNR) ADVISORY BOARD (FAB)
HELD AT ELECTRICAL BOARDROOM, ONRUSRIVIER
ON FRIDAY, 10 NOVEMBER 2017 at 09:00**

1. Welcome, Attendance and Apologies

Present: Duncan Heard (DH) [in the Chair], David Beattie (DB), Penelope Aplon (PA) [Environmental Officer: Overstrand Municipality], Heloise Fortune (HF) [Environmental Secretary: Overstrand Municipality], Lee Burman (LB), Tierck Hoekstra (TH) [Cape Nature], Glynis Van Rooyen (GvR), Liezl de Villiers (LdV) [Environmental Manager: Overstrand Municipality], Anthony van Hoogstraten (AvH), Linda Griffiths (LG), Edward Fisher (EF) [Law Enforcement: Overstrand Municipality], Stephen Muller (SM) [Director: Infrastructure & Planning]

Apologies: Muthama Muasya (MM), Councillor Kari Brice (KB), Andrae Marais (AM)

Welcome: DH opened the meeting and welcomed all present. He informed all that the main purpose of the meeting is to deal with the Integrated Management Plan for FNR. He would just like to deal with the administrative points of the minutes first. Urgent points on the agenda will be discussed as well as anything that needs to be brought to the advisory board's attention.

DH stated that his appointment expired in August 2017 and that the board suggested that he remains as chairperson till the reappointment has been finalised. He noted that he had not received an appointment letter yet. PA reported that she has not gone further with the process.. She still needs to submit the letter to the Mayor's office for the reappointment of the Chair. AvH commented that the reappointment of the Chair is very important as the meeting can effectively be argued as non-voided, but he is not sure how that works. DH also questioned the status of the other vacancy. PA reported that Nicolette Lloyd was nominated. PA did contact her and is waiting on her CV. AvH wanted to know if nominations are still open. PA commented that since they are still waiting on Nicolette Lloyd more nominations can be made. DH reminded the board that the particular post on the board is for someone with cultural and heritage background. He had a meeting with PA to discuss the by-laws relating to the advisory board and in the recommendations certain positions need to cover certain areas of expertise. It is also stipulated in the Act that the cultural heritage of a nature reserve must also be attended to.

2. Confirmation of Minutes for the Meeting of the FAB held on 11 August 2017.

H.F

2.1 Confirmation of Minutes and Public Availability

HF confirmed that the minutes were made available to the public.
No comments were received on the minutes.

2.2 Comments from Council on FAB Minutes dated 11 August 2017.

K.B

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 Amendment of Bylaws relating to FNR and FAB/Re-declaration of FNR:

P.A

DH and PA have come up with recommendations to update the bylaws relating to the reserve and the FAB. It is still being scrutinized internally and will come to FAB afterwards for deliberation.

3.2 Provincial By-Pass Road

P.A

This Point will be discussed at the next meeting

4. Administration

4.1 FNR Integrated Management Plan (IMP) deliberation

DH thanked SM for making his time available to attend the meeting. DH noted that Andrae Marais from Cape Nature could not be here today because he is helping out at the De Hoop nature reserve. He welcomed Mr Tierck Hoekstra who is the regional manager and who will be representing Cape Nature today. Cape Nature has full representation on the advisory board and the ordinance says that Province can appoint up to 5 people onto the advisory board.

DH mentioned that he wanted to start from the beginning because in the last few weeks there has been a mountain of stuff written and said for and against the management plan and even some of the things that we stand for was incorrect and can be challenged. He started with the legislation.

DH noted that the Primary Act that governs the management and development of protected areas in South Africa is the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (NEM: PAA). Something that is very prominent in the Act is;

Section 7 of the Act

1) In the event of any conflict between a section of this Act and-

- (a) Other national legislation, the section of this Act prevails if the conflict specifically concerns the management or development of protected areas;
- (b) Provincial legislation, the conflict must be resolved in terms of section 146 of the Constitution; and
- (c) A municipal by-law, the section of this Act prevails.

2) In the event of any conflict between subordinate legislation issued in terms of this Act and-

- (a) An Act of Parliament, the Act of Parliament prevails;
- (b) Provincial legislation, the conflict must be resolved in terms of section 146 of the Constitution; and
- (c) A municipal by-law, the subordinate legislation issued in terms of this Act prevails.

Section 8 of the Act

This Act does not affect the implementation of provincial legislation regulating matters with regard to provincial or local protected areas to the extent that such legislation-

- (a) regulates matters not covered by this Act;
- (b) is consistent with this Act; or
- (c) Prevails over this Act in terms of section 146 of the Constitution.

This Act gives support to the ordinance. What does the ordinance say about local authority nature reserves? They must be established together with the Municipality, gives various rights to the Municipality to Manage it and it stipulates advisory boards for local nature reserves. As soon as the local nature reserve has been established the local authority concerned shall appoint an advisory board for the purpose of advising and making recommendations in connection with the management, control and development of such reserve. Many people states that the advisory board needs teeth. The advisory board is not a mandated authority it has no direct legislative teeth. Once you give it such teeth then it will become a management authority. No member of the advisory board shall be remunerated for his/her/their services unless they have expenses to do with their duties.

Very important too under section 10 of the ordinance; Responsibilities of the Minister's powers (in other provinces it's called the MEC of Environmental Affairs);

If the responsible Minister is of the opinion that any action taken or anything done or proposed to be taken or done by a local authority in course or in connection with the management, control or development of a local nature reserve established by it or will be detrimental to such reserve or to the purpose for which it has been

established he or she may after consultation with such local authority by order in writing, prohibit such action or permit such action. So ultimately in the Western Cape the Protected Areas Act gives power or authority to the Minister of the Provincial Department of Environmental Affairs under which the Department of Environmental Affairs and Cape Nature resort. Most of the time the Minister will before making any decision consult with Cape Nature and the Department of Environmental Affairs.

DH sketched the legislation hierarchy pertaining to the Protected Areas and explained the laws that apply to all.

Before NEM: PAA there was the Western Cape Nature Conservation Ordinance which proclaimed Fernkloof as a nature reserve. The advisory boards assist the Municipalities with expertise on the management of protected areas; the expertise for such management lay with the old Cape Nature department. Municipalities never had any expertise and still today have a limited amount of expertise. NEM: PAA requested a management plan for every reserve and if it is a national reserve or park it must be signed off by the Minister for approval.

NEM: PAA with the management plan and the Minister's approval becomes law, because how can you go against a management plan that has been signed off by the Minister.

If a request comes through to the Municipality for a Kiosk on top of Aasvoelskop but the management plan states no development for Aasvoelskop then the Municipality can say our management plan has been signed off by the Minister and has gone through a public participation process, it does not allow for a Kiosk on Aasvoelskop. So why go through a consent use process? He referred back to Section 7 of the Act "this Act prevails".

DH states that this is how he has worked with nature reserves before throughout the country and that is what he knows and reads in the law, if his view is wrong he would like to have a full legal opinion telling him that he is wrong. The other thing that NEM: PAA says is that all has to bear in mind in this process is its purpose of protected areas; to protect ecologically viable areas representative of South Africa's biological diversity, to preserve the ecological integrity of those areas, to conserve biodiversity in those areas, to protect areas representative of all ecosystems, to protect South Africa's threatened or rare species, to protect an area which is vulnerable or ecologically sensitive, to assist in ensuring the sustained supply of environmental good and services, to provide for the sustainable use of natural and biological resources, to create or augment destinations for nature-based tourism, to manage the interrelationship between natural environmental biodiversity, human settlement and economic development.

The objectives of this Act are to provide, within the framework of national legislation, including the National Environmental Management Act, for the declaration and management of protected areas; to provide for co-operative governance in the declaration and management of protected areas; to effect a national system of protected areas in South Africa as part of a strategy to manage and conserve its biodiversity; to provide for a representative network of protected areas on state land, private land and communal land; to promote sustainable utilisation of protected areas for the benefit of people, in a manner that would preserve the ecological character of such areas; and to promote participation of local communities in the management of protected areas, where appropriate.

DH feels that the background he gave is needed to go forward with the deliberation. There were many calls for no development on FNR that conflicts with the objectives of the Protected Areas Act. He wants to bring balance and objectivity to the table. The power of the advisory board is to advise the Municipality on a way forward where they are guaranteed that the ecological integrity of the reserve will be preserved but as far as possible allow outdoor recreation in the reserve within NEMA's precautionary principle; "if we don't know what the impact will be or if we cannot control the impact then the precautionary principle must be applied".

"If we are sure what the impact will be and can mitigate and control the impact then measures and a development node can be put in place." They want to reduce the impact but want people to enjoy the reserve too under controlled conditions. He is ashamed to say that under the watch of the FAB the management effectiveness of the reserve has fallen. In 2012 they did a management effectiveness survey which was done on national standards. The fact that the park has legislation does not protect it, what about the boundaries and security. FNR has security breaches for Africa, don't have people to management it, don't have budget to manage it, it has 60km's of pathways that are degrading, aliens are getting out of hand in some places. The officials involved cannot be blamed for this they are trying their best. The officials do not have the support system. There is not one dedicated person that works for the reserve only that can't be pulled away to some other place in the Overstrand. That is not a national standard or international standard for managing a globally important nature reserve.

What they have done with the previous plan that they have spent many hours and days on is to take everything into account, the needs of the reserve, they have debated amongst themselves, they got information from the officials, LB provided a good historic background, DB, GvR, AvH, LG, everybody here gave fantastic input. The consultants did not do that. The first day FAB went through the 1st draft it took them 3 hours to get to page 10 because of all the mistakes. They put a lot of hard work into the document. Cape Nature had no problem with the first draft and most of the people who commented had no problem except for one gentleman but with all due respect he does not have insight into protected area management. They did not try to stop the reserve from being developed they wanted to cautiously move ahead knowing constraints of finance and capacity. If you take the capacity away from Table Mountain tomorrow, what would that place look like? What would happen to that tourism node? You need people to sustain a nature reserve. All he wants to say is with the genuine believe they went forward and produced a plan which went through public participation and came off pretty well. They went to a next phase where the plan was taken and considered by different people and it was changed and some of the changes are not acceptable. He picked up that many areas in the plan were changed. If the plan goes forward now to the Minister the advisory board can't support it because they do not know the changes or the implications of the changes. The trust with the advisory board and the trust with the community at large have been broken. Everyone wants a well run nature reserve, so they all must strive and work together to achieve it. The advisory board needs to be objective; they must listen to all points of view and then make their resolution. They can lose the nature reserve at this point in time and lose the trust and support of the community for a well run nature reserve. That is his plea to the officials and advisory board. He would like to go forward now and compare the two plans paragraph by paragraph and where there is conflict for instance something taken out or added that should be deliberated because it has not been deliberated before. As authors of the plan they need to understand what the plan means.

SM made a few remarks on what DH said. He explained to all where they started and where they are now. Grant Forbes was the reserve manager at that time; he came and said that the plan is outdated. He was given the go ahead to start with the process. The idea was to create a plan that was simple and easy to implement as it was only the reserve manager and two rangers on the reserve. They did not want a thick and complicated document. They wanted a plan that fits with the organisation and also that they can implement quickly and one that can grow. They will then review it yearly, second yearly and eventually every 5 years. That was the idea to grow the budget and staff. They needed a plan to support what they have. Now 6 years later the municipality still do not have a plan to show that they are serious about moving forward. The Municipality needs something realistic on the table. When the plan came to SM 3 months ago he said it was a fantastic plan "a Rolls Royce" at international standards but it was not appropriate for Fernkloof and the Overstrand Municipality where they are now. Between LdV and himself they wanted the plan to be implemented; one reserve manager for both Fernkloof and Kleinmond and for the foreseeable future maybe still only 3 rangers. The Municipality needs something practical and affordable that they can implement now. They cannot go up and down for another 2 to 4 years. He further mentioned that he said to LdV even if it is only 70% or 80% of

what they want they must get the plan off the ground so that they can start. SM will be driving the current plan forward. They are still receiving comments which will be taken into account. FAB's comments will also be taken into account. Some of the FAB members also commented in their private capacity which will also be taken into account. He will then present the document to Council for approval. There will not be another draft or public participation process. In the last two months all the issues has come to the fore and will be taken into account when moving forward. SM stated that the Municipality did not come here today to go through the document line by line that is not an advisory council function that is more a planning function and administrative function. They need the FAB's advice and recommendation's. He does not want to go through the document line by line again. He does not think that FAB's function is to go through the document line by line. They should read through the document and make recommendations. If they feel there is a legal loophole they must just refer to the section of the law that has not been covered. SM stated that FAB is taking on the role of an oversight committee and the Municipality must come and explain their findings. The Municipality does not report to FAB in that sense. What the Municipality needs from FAB is their advice, input and comments.

DH commented that the intention or purpose of the previous draft IMP was that the document was written with their present understanding and knowledge of what must be done to improve the management effectiveness of the reserve and that sets out many actions. It is impossible to achieve everything in a 5 year plan. Under normal circumstances a conservation authority; yearly, strategically and prioritise the projects that will be selected according to the budget and that will go into the annual plan of operations. The actions sets the tone of what should be done, it does not force the organisation to undertake them.

SM commented that he agrees with that and the current plan has at least 80of those actions in it, but there were more in the previous document. It frustrates the people because there is this huge target to aim for. 80 actions is already a lot and that is not going to be achieved in the next 5 years so why list a 100, 200 or 500, what will be the use of that? He agrees that the vision must be wider but not so wide that you lose hope that you will never get there. Rather get something going with reachable targets. The staff is getting demoralised because all they hear all the time is that the reserve is going down, and that they don't know how to manage it and that they are not doing well.

DH commented that that is what he tried to explain.. When the plan is on the table and it has been signed off by the Minister the main business for the advisory board would be to sit with the officials and decide which actions should be selected for the next annual plan of operations. SM commented that he does not agree with that and that in the plan the vision must be clear on where they are heading. The actions must be clear. DH commented that if you do not see it in full context then you cannot prioritise. SM commented that there were a lot of things in the plan that he foresee will never happen in the situation they are in now. It must be appropriate for the organisation, the legal framework that they are in. If you are going to give advice that can't be used then it will be taken out again. It must be something that they can implement. That unfortunately is the nature of advice. He gives advice to Council all the time sometimes they take it, sometimes they reject it and sometimes they change some of it. DH commented that it is not more complicated by having the 80 in it is a process of selecting what is priority to take forward with the amount of resources that is available in the budget. SM commented that they are now left with 80 there were a lot more. DH commented that even if it was 500 it shows foresight and focus. SM commented that they do not want 500 that will take 100 years to get to. They need something smaller so that they can focus on getting it done. That is the plan the Municipality wants.

The Municipality cannot tell FAB what advice they should give, they can go through the two plans and compare them, but he does not want to go through that process line by line again. That is a detailed planning process. He feels the current draft is good enough to go ahead and in a year or two it can be revised again. DH commented that if there is substantive revision necessary it must go through a public participation process

again and must go to council again. If there are little changes to be made then the Minister can be informed about it but if the changes are substantive it has to go through the total process again. SM commented that they have public participation all the time. On the budget and IDP they have public participation annually. So the plan can be added to the IDP document. Every year for water services they go through a complete public participation process.

DH commented that it was not the board's fault that the plan took 6 years, their advice right from the beginning was thrown out the door. The plan was ready 2 or 3 years ago it had been through the public participation too then things were just changed without discussing it with the advisory board. In a conservation authority they sit with the planning committee and it is done that way because a lot of discussion is needed because every person on the planning committee has another knowledge frame. It is now expected of them in their own private time to sit for hours going through the document to provide comments where they could just do it in this planning milieu where everybody walks out with the same understanding. SM commented that there must be a misunderstanding because they do not see FAB as a planning committee at all. He also does not expect of them to write long comments on the plan. He does not see FAB as a planning forum, they are there to advise and make recommendations. DH commented that with the task that they have they are placed in a very difficult situation in terms of the most important document of the reserve to advise in good faith. It is not that they are a planning committee they are an advisory committee but they do fulfil the function of an expert planning committee because it is not available within the Municipality or the disciplines of environmental management. SM commented that they do not see them as fulfilling that role but if they do want to do that outside of their advisory role they can do the planning and bring it as a recommendation but he does not expect that from FAB. DH commented that the advisory board also does not want to sit as an opposition body to the municipality because then it gets thrown out and they have to fulfil the opposition role because they see things that are wrong.

TH commented that if the management plan goes to the Minister for approval, the Minister will refer it to the Department of Environmental Affairs and DEA will refer it to Cape Nature because they are suppose to be the experts to advise the Minister on whether the plan is acceptable to sign off. He foresees a hold up if an advisory board does not agree with the plan. It might be that if there are so much opposition to the plan then they have to go through it letter by letter to see if they as Cape Nature are happy with it and if the comments from the advisory board is invalid or not. That will put the onus on CapeNature to decide if the plan is something they can recommend to the Minister for approval. That will draw out the whole process. If he starts to compare it with their management plans and their zoning schemes within CapeNature then there are vast differences. He cannot say how the document will be accepted by the rest of Cape Nature but they see a lot of differences. The zoning scheme is the core issue. The zoning scheme is not based on a sensitivity analysis. At CapeNature before they start with a Management Plan, they do a sensitivity analysis and then you can decide if the area can be used for development or if the area is a no go area based on the biological and cultural sensitivity and the precautionary principle, if you haven't got the information then you must make it an action to get the information. It is crucial that there should be a development plan for a reserve. If you don't have a development plan at the moment because of various reasons then you must state that no development can take place before there is an approved and accepted development plan. At De Hoop for instance; the whale trail extension and Koppie Alleen development is all in the development plan. No other matters will be considered unless you go through the whole process again. The management plan will state what the view is and what will or will not be allowed.

AvH referred to the plan dated August 2014 and said that they did a lot of work on that document. SM commented that he only received the plan about 3 months ago it is a gap of 3 years. Can someone explain to him what happened in the 3 years? A very important issue is public opinion; you back public opinion at your peril. It has resurfaced now more and more, from the constitution down, from DA policy down even the Mayor

reiterated public opinion. They have seen a massive show in the last 3 weeks of public opinion on this issue. You ignore public opinion at your peril; an extreme example is the French Revolution.

At the moment there is a petition going around and there are approximately 8000 people on the petition. A certain ward councillor and two senior people have been rude about that; you do that at your peril to be rude about people who signs petitions, but that is not smart. The way that the new IMP was put into the public domain was perceived by the public as sneaky and it was perceived by me as being sneaky. For example the way it was advertised, the way the neighbours were ignored and the way the FAB was completely ignored. It was worse than just a simple slip up. To him that is an act of defiance and the public sees it as an act of defiance. The act of defiance has to be addressed. They believe that the reason SM has been dragging this since 2009 is the astronomy centre. He believes that is why the 3 years elapsed. He believes that if they would have said okay have your astronomy centre in 2013 there would have been a management plan. There is a fundamental issue between certain members in management and it goes back to Theo Beyleveldt who wanted the astronomy centre. The last paragraph on the last page of the plan is the cause of the public opinion. The last page was suddenly slipped in and runs parallel, to him that appears to be sneaky. That is what the public opinion does not like. He said it at a public meeting to a member of parliament who came on Tuesday night that you have to be a complete idiot to ignore this level of public opinion.

DH commented that, that is a good perception and that is what public participation is all about. It cannot be ignored and as an authority or public servant you can add a lot of strength to what you want to do if you take the public with you.

LB commented that bearing in mind the public opinion as well, what caused to put the cat amongst the pigeons was the zoning map. If you go back to the original zoning map which the board gave a lot of thought too, it was discussed and re-discussed, changed and it was specific as to where things go and what can go there. An example that occurred to her about controlled development as against uncontrolled development. The Botanical Society has developed the bottom garden and there has been no impact by the Botanical Society over 30 years on the surrounding environment they have only developed land which was already degraded. The opposite happened when TV towers was put up without an EIA, it was uncontrolled. She thinks if the zoning map is changed to what it was a lot of the problems will be solved. The other problem that has not been properly addressed is dedicated staff. Without the dedicated staff none of this can be implemented. The Botanical Society does what it can. Without the staff the plan will mean nothing. The areas that the Municipality wants to add to the reserve are areas that, when they last looked at the boundaries, were rejected as being totally without conservation merit all they will do is add a tremendous burden on existing staff in managing them and trying to rehabilitate them to the expense of the rest of the reserve. The alien vegetation has never been worse since the 70's and without written agreements the people that were doing something are now not allowed to do anything, like the Botanical Society and volunteers.

LG commented that AVH and LB had shown clearly how they feel. The mandate from the Botanical Society is to tell everybody here today that they are very disappointed in the way which this new plan has come about. They have comments coming from people who come to the nature reserve as tourists from overseas. She spent a lot of time up in the nature reserve and thanked the Municipality again for fixing the visitors centre and that is where they hear that the people are absolutely horrified at what is going on. The Botanical Society has given her the mandate to please let everybody know that they are very satisfied with the previous draft IMP but is very disappointed in the current draft. They cannot allow anybody to push through a plan just because it is taking time. The plan has got to be done according to appropriate methods even if there are 100, 200 or 300 actions, those are going to formulate priorities in the plan so that there are no excuses in the future for not doing it because of no staff, or no budget, or no expertise or capacity. It has got to be put in place and that is what they need everybody to know. They need the assurance that the plan is going to contain all of

that. Even if it takes another 2 years they want the plan to be done properly and that is her mandate from the Botanical Society to say that they are very unhappy about the plan that is currently on the table.

DH added that the shift in protected area planning is needed when it comes to finances and only when you see the broad scope of what must be done do you realise how much is actually needed and if you don't put it there you are telling a lie.

DB commented that he agrees that a plan should be as brief as possible but it has to be as relevant as possible they don't want an IMP simply for the sake of having one. It must be 100% relevant and 100% in line with the appropriate legislation. The concern and reasons why there is such a public outcry on this issue is that sections in version 2 have been eliminated and they don't know why equally sections have been added which again are the cause of the public outcry and the cause of the concern within the FAB. He is not sure how the issues can be resolved without comparing the two.

DH gave an example of the new plan. Two annexure have been removed.

Annexure 1 "consisting of all the copies of the proclamations of the reserve" and; Annexure 2 "consisting of all the information that backs the plan that has been curated by the environmental management services".

Why was that there? He has travelled the country up and down doing protected area planning. KZN wildlife could not find their records for Indumu of the original proclamation. You can't manage a place or enforce the law where you don't have the jurisdiction; you have to know where your boundary fence runs, you have to know what problems you have with the proclamation because sometimes things change and you have to update it. From the reserve manager to the municipal manager needs to know. He bets that if they ask for the information again quickly it won't be available quickly, the only place it is available quickly should be at the back of the management plan. If you have a researcher that wants to start a survey on Proteas he can look at the back and see there is already some information available and that helps a lot. Those are vital documents. In 5 years time with a new reserve manager and staff they won't know. The beacons of the reserve are not on the ground every time they spoke of the boundaries of the reserve there was total confusion. He referred to the World Bank question 1; Do you know the boundaries of your reserve? Has the reserve been proclaimed? If you say you do not know the boundaries of your reserve you get a zero score. The people that were removing things from the plan do not know the implications thereof. Here is an advisory board advising and it can be disagreed with, but should first ask why it was put in and why it was taken out of the document. That discussion was never available and he thinks it comes back to what SM said that the advisory board is not regarded as a planning committee it should not be doing what it is doing. Has all their time been wasted?

TH referred back to the ordinance where it says that Cape Nature can appoint 5 people to an advisory committee. That already gives you an implication of why and that is to get it done on a conservation basis. The ordinance is going to be replaced by a new biodiversity bill. Protected area planning and management has been taken over by NEM: PAA and NEM: PAA does not make provision for an advisory board in this sense. It does not prescribe that you must have an advisory board it says that you may have an advisory board. The new legislation guideline for management plans; the fact that the Minister has to approve the plan takes away the necessity of an advisory board because there is now legislation in place. Public participation is still a vital aspect. They are currently busy with the Rustenburg corridor planning and it is public participation right from the start.

DH commented that CapeNature is a full member of the advisory board be it one person or five. The fact that the proposed plan by the advisory board was changed and never brought back for discussion is a disregard to CapeNature as they are a member of the advisory board. TH commented that one person of CapeNature cannot say what Cape Nature's policy is. The person has to go back to CapeNature and get a mandate and that was done in the past but not yet with the current IMP. DH commented that he had discussions with certain

people at CapeNature and they were shocked as they were talking about the new legislation. So they will be looking at the ordinance the section on the advisory board into the new legislation with regards to local authority nature reserves.

DH referred to what SM had said, his regard for FAB is of such that he does not think he can change SM's opinion. He has spent a lot of time giving to the Municipality, the Environmental Department of the Municipality, the management plan and to the reserve. He is deeply disappointed in how FAB is received. He received a nomination for an environmental award from the Botanical Society because of the input on the past management plan. He would like to take the certificate and hand it back to the Municipality as it means nothing. He would like to resign from the advisory board. He feels he can't contribute, his advice is not taken. He is using his professional time to be here and that is seldom appreciated. Everybody's time is not appreciated. He thinks the meeting should be closed as SM has got other things to do. His perception is that it is not important to get a good management plan on the table just something they can use so long. He referred to what SM said "that there was nothing wrong with the previous plan it was a Rolls Royce". There was nothing wrong in putting that plan forward to the Minister. It would not have changed anything; it would've given support to the Municipality and the environmental management section. He has given a lot of his time for many years and so have all the members and they have sat for hours deliberating and what for? They are not trying to control the Municipality. They are trying to put something on the table that can benefit the community with the Municipality. He will hand in his official resignation.

AvH commented that he knows he can speak for all the members of the board with the exception of TH and a wide number of the community. He finds himself with a fairly large mouth piece at the moment. As far as they are concerned they do not except DH's resignation. With all due respect they will and do not except his resignation. He is appealing to the powers at the meeting referring to SM, LdV and HF to go back to the Mayor today to get DH's reappointment letter as soon as possible.

DH thanked all for the support he appreciates it but asked what they do about going forward. AvH commented that if DH leaves there might be no board left, it is a serious situation and the Mayor should be alerted so that he can come and address FAB. The public out there are waiting to hear what happened today. DH commented that he needs some indication that the board is taken seriously as far as their advice goes. AvH commented that public opinion will speak and that SM should do the body that he works for a favour by taking that seriously.

SM commented that he does not think that DH should resign. His years of experience are very valuable and the Municipality needs that. They are taken seriously as 90% of the document was done by FAB. The Rolls Royce, the Municipality felt is inappropriate for where they are as an organisation at the moment. They want to simplify the document and get it implemented as soon as possible. Everything they receive through this process is considered, they are close to 400 comments now. The Municipality will read through all of it and write comments next to it. All the comments received will be considered in the final draft. There are a handful of things that will change in the document most of the comments are on the similar topic. He told everyone that their advice is considered but it is considered within the context of where they are as an organisation. The draft IMP will go to the oversight committee and then to CapeNature and the Minister for approval. There is no pressure for development on or to generate income for the Reserve. Going through the plan line for line will not bring out anything new. The Municipality is already aware of the concerns. He strongly suggests that DH should reconsider his stance.

DH commented that he will take the time to reconsider but will withdraw from the board for a while. He will see how this plays out. This plan will go to council and how will council make sense of it. He has seen this type of thing before with the National Parks board and Table Mountain where they just put a whole lot of ideas on

the table “very similar to what is being done here” a hotel on Table Mountain and it took the National Parks board 4 years to recover from that before they had a plan on the table and that is with the big planning team that they have because none of the information was sifted, no sensitivity analysis was done, they just took all the ideas and put it in a document.

AvH directed his comment to LdV and SM. There was a level of disrespect caused by this process and his advice to them is a simple apology to the public. If Giorgio Lombardi hadn’t seen and started rattling the cage 3 weeks ago the plan would’ve gone through but fortunately for them it did not go unnoticed. As Councillor David Botha said even if it takes a year or 5 it should be done properly.

LG directed her comment to LdV and SM. One of the finest comments that she has read was from their Chairperson Dr Di Marais. It is something worth reading again and again. That is their mandate and that is what they stand for and they are not going to accept anything less. She asked them both to read it again.

Date of meeting – 11 November 2017

FAB Recommendation to Council – 2017 (1): Go back to the original plan as recommended by the FAB. Give the plan to SM to start from scratch then he must come back to the board with the problems he found in the plan and then those specific problems should be discussed so that it is done correctly this time around.

SM commented that he has already said that they are not going back to the previous draft IMP. They need input and advice on the current draft IMP. If FAB’s advice is to go back to the previous draft then that will not be accepted.

DH commented that there is nothing more to discuss. He thanked everyone and informed them that it was nice to work with them and that they will just have to wait and see what happens in the future. The meeting was adjourned.

4.1.1 Hermanus Astronomy Centre **P.A**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.1.2 Cableway **D.H**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.1.3 Damage done to Riparian Zone at entrance **L.d.V**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.2 FNR 2017/18 Budget **P.A**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.3 FNR Management Reports **P.A**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

4.4 World Heritage Expansion **D.H**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

5. Standing Items

5.1 Enforcement **P.A**

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

5.1.1 Encroachments

This point will be discussed at the next meeting.

- 5.2 Hoy's Koppie** **P.A**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6. Ecological Issues** **K.B**
- 6.1.1 Baboon Virtual Fence**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.1.2 Burning of Coastal Corridors** **P.A**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.1.3 Event Applications** **P.A**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.2 Research** **P.A**
- 6.2.1 Research Applications**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 6.3 Klein River Estuary Management** **P.A**
PA commented that there is nothing to report.
- 6.4 Reports from Hermanus Botanical Society (BOTSOC)** **L.G**
DH thanked the LG for the report. LG apologised for spelling Edward Fisher's name wrong in the report.
- 6.5 Reports from Cliff Path Management Group (CPMG)** **D.B**
DH thanked DB for the report. DB commented that he and PA will meet next week to finalize the co-management agreement.
- 6.6 Annual Hermanus Camp (AHC) – Lease Application** **A.v.H**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 7. General**
- 7.1 Sale of Municipal Land adjacent to Scout Camp** **A.v.H**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 7.2 Dogs in FNR** **P.A**
LG commented they are still very concerned about the dogs in FNR. The other night a car was parked and spent the night in the park. There were people in it with dogs and they were seen leaving early the next morning. She discussed this with Mr. Fisher but the Botanical Society is concerned about it as there was another car this week. She together with Geraldine and her son went to the car that has been there for a very long time but it was a respectable person doing her work, but the other car that was parked in Geraldine's glen was very closed up and had been there the entire night. That is a concern because of the robbery's and thefts. She would like Mr. Fisher to put everything in place so that people can be aware. EF requested a remote for the gate so that the late shift can do patrols to see if there are any cars parked in the reserve. LdV requested that the reports should reach the reserve management first if PA is not available then to her. Then they will coordinate with Law Enforcement. If someone sees something happening report to Law Enforcement and the control room directly.
- 7.3 Walkerbay Radio Flyers** **P.A**
This point will be discussed at the next meeting.
- 8. Date of Next Meetings:** The meeting dates for next year must still be finalized.