

Business Plan Comments

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
1	House is trust-owned; she holds a usufruct, pays the rates and maintains the property. Pensioner with a R6.7m valuation says she cannot contribute further and does not qualify for a rebate because the house is trust-owned. Asks whether similar residents have been considered, and how many resident-owned properties in the area are valued at around R1m.	Financial Impact	Yes		[S. 5 and 15] Added affordability/rebate explanation, noting that the CID cannot create its own exemptions and that City rates rebates determine CID exemption. Added property valuation distribution charts.	Sections 5 and 15
2	Supports the initiative; cites broken-window theory and does not want Vredehoek to decline in the same way; thanks steering committee for professionalism and volunteer effort.	other	No	No impact to business plan.		
3	Pensioner with fixed income asks what answer exists for people who do not have extra income.	Financial Impact	No	The CID cannot create its own exemptions and that City rates rebates determine CID exemption. However the City does offer Pensioners rebate and can be applied for under the criteria.		
4	Pensioner with fixed income asks what answer exists for people who do not have extra income.	Boundary of the CID	Yes		[S. 5] Amended boundary section to explain that proposed CID boundaries are selected in the application, subject to City approval, must be contiguous and may not dissect properties, and must be justified by public-space benefit, feasibility and support.	Section 5
5	Says personal experience of another CID in Lower Kenilworth suggests CIDs do not work; electric fencing and cameras have not prevented burglaries or car theft. Questions value of proposed CID services.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 11.1] Business plan updated to include crime statistics from other CIDs.	Section 11.1
6	Objects to cost for high-valued properties around Rocklands/Deer Park/Clairwood; pensioner living off savings says R600-R650/month is unaffordable and unfair; says arithmetic is flawed because many upper-area properties are far above average valuation.	Financial Impact	Yes		[S. 15] Added recognition that value-based contributions can be difficult for some owners, including pensioners, and that the CID is an attempt to strike a balance. Noted that the CID is unable to levy a flat fee.	Section 15
7	Questions whether recent Western Cape High Court judgment affects legality of charges for services based on property values and says by-law may need to change.	Other	No	No impact to business plan.		
8	Asks whether VAT is charged on the displayed rates and whether a legal opinion has been obtained on the recent full bench Western Cape High Court judgment; asks whether the legal opinion can be seen; says he supports CID idea but thinks charges may be unlawful.	Financial Impact	No	No impact to business plan. Business plan already indicates VAT status of additional rate. The City has advised that the judgment does not affect CIDs.		
9	Objects to a R10m house and R3m apartment paying different amounts for the same CID service; says a flat rate per ratepayer would make him more accommodating; recognises merit in CID but objects to unequal payment burden and impact on retired owners.	Financial Impact	Yes		[S. 15] Added explanation of legally required rate-in-the-rand basis, note that a flat fee is not possible.	Section 15
10	Asks whether Highlands Estate, including Rocklands and Deer Park Avenue, could be excluded from the business plan because many residents are pensioners, have lived there for decades, face high valuations, have off-street parking/security/cameras/armed response, and do not use some parks proposed for fencing. Finds that the safety issues in the area such as break-ins and drug paraphernalia have been ongoing for decades and they cannot afford the CID.	boundary of the CID	Yes		[S. 5] Explained boundary rationale, including public-space benefit, contiguity, service coverage, affordability and vote feasibility.	Section 5
11	Supports security budget and says he lacks private security/armed response. Also concerned about security on bin days. Proposes armed guard or armed response at night because City law enforcement officer is only during normal hours.	public safety	Yes		[S 11.1] Business plan updated to reflect that Law Enforcement Officer is available when upon request outside of business hours. Recommendation from other CIDs is not to have armed patrollers, but to rely on the LEO being armed, and armed backup.	Section 11.1

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
12	Supports proposal; asks how steering committee plans to get 60% support and how supporters can help. Asks whether new developments and Nazareth development are included in the rates base and will contribute.	implementation plan	No	No plan change required. New rateable developments inside the CID boundary will be liable; exempt properties such as religious institutions, schools and retirement homes do not pay, while commercial development on such land would not be exempt.		
13	Supports CID based on Mowbray experience. Asks whether Upper Mill/Upper Orange/freeway boundary near Stroompie will be patrolled. Also asks about integration of existing street cameras and cost split/extra expenses.	Public Safety	No	No change to plan required. Patrols will include all roads within the CID, including boundary roads. However, the CID cannot offer services outside of the boundaries. So, Stroompie itself will not be patrolled. The business plan already explains that suitable existing cameras may be integrated, with the CID taking over monitoring costs while owners retain electricity/internet costs.		
14	Supports concept based on Observatory CID experience but says plan feels binary. Requests upper/lower budget options, such as R75 or R45 per million, to understand what changes in service levels and to gauge resident support. Mentions bikes/foot patrols as possible alternative response modes.	Budget	No	The formal vote must be on one final business plan.		
15	Supports proposal and has seen the improvement in the CCID asks what happens to neighbourhood watches in other CIDs and how DPVWatch might evolve if a CID is established.	Other	Yes		[S 11.1] Added note that DPVWatch remains independent and may continue or adapt based on community need.	Section 11.1
16	Suggests including Disa Park, High Cape and other developments to broaden the rates base and bring budget down.	Boundary of the CID	Yes		[S. 5] Explained boundary rationale, including public-space benefit, contiguity, service coverage, affordability and vote feasibility.	Section 5
17	Concerned that the initial budget may escalate; asks whether annual increases are for inflation or added services and whether the five-year budget is being committed upfront. Asks how many new cameras are included.	Budget	No	Business plan already includes annual increases, additional increases are not permitted. Business plan also includes details on camera coverage (revised based on other feedback).		
18	Supports CID and asks how blocks of flats are counted and charged: individual flats, all blocks, or body corporate.	Financial Impact	Yes		[S. 16] Clarified that each rateable sectional title unit/property with its own municipal valuation and rates account will pay the additional rate, not the body corporate as a single payer unless the property is rated that way.	Section 16
19	Supports proposal based on Lower Gardens CID experience. Recommends using testimony and before/after evidence from other CIDs to sell the proposal and get votes; frames CID as standardising costs and investing in community/property value.	Other	Yes		[S. 11.1] Business plan updated to include crime statistics from other CIDs.	Section 11.1
20	Supports concept and notes fairness issue of current volunteer/free-rider system. Suggests two proposal levels or an approval method where residents could support both lower and higher service levels, or at least a broader survey to determine support at different cost levels before vote.	Budget	No	The formal vote must be on one final business plan. A broader survey or informal preference testing can be considered before finalising the plan, but the City process requires one proposal for written consent.		
21	Supports CID; wants parks cleaner and safer; mentions personal experience of being stabbed/phone theft attempt. Supports not including towers/High Cape because it may reduce 60% support. Offers to help with getting word out through the Spar; frames CID as investment in clean safe area and property value.	Public Safety	No	No impact to business plan.		
22	Strongly supports CID and warns against complacency. Says DPVWatch reliance is not sustainable, volunteers are limited, and costs should be seen in context. Argues property values may decline if Vredehoek lacks a CID while surrounding suburbs have one.	Other	No	No impact to business plan.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
23	Supports CID strongly and says he would be willing to pay more to help a neighbour if legally possible. Practical question: asks how the cleaning team sourced through a homelessness support organisation will be safe and win-win, and whether it risks deliberately bringing homeless people into the neighbourhood.	Social Responsibility	No	The business plan explains that the cleaning programme would be managed through an experienced social development partner, with supervision, support and accountability. Feedback from other CIDs indicates that structured social-development programmes do not attract additional rough sleeper into an area.		
24	Supports people investing in community but asks for expanded privacy plan because business plan depends heavily on centralised cameras and monitoring. Wants to know how privacy will be maintained as monitoring develops.	Public Safety	Yes		[S 11.2] Added camera privacy and data governance subsection including service-provider obligations and board oversight.	Section 11.2
25	Says Pin Oak Road already has many cameras and a night guard. Requests fencing at the end of Pin Oak where it connects to Philip Kgosana due to walking in/out and escape route. Also supports evidence from other CIDs and recommends presenting residents with options rather than a yes/no frame.	Public Safety	Yes		[S 13.1] Business plan updated to include fencing of end of Pin Oak.	Section 13.1
26	Recommends obtaining information on impact of existing CIDs, including crime reduction and cleaning/public-space outcomes, to persuade ratepayers.	other	Yes		[S. 11.1] Business plan updated to include crime statistics from other CIDs.	Section 11.1
27	I hereby lodge a formal objection regarding the manner in which the steering committee conducted the urban management survey required in terms of Section 8.1.2 of the Policy and the corresponding provisions of the By-law. Section 8.1.2 expressly requires that the survey be administered to a randomised sample of at least 20% of the proposed ARPs, with owners of multiple CID properties counted only once, and that the form and content of the survey be pre approved by your office. This requirement is not optional; it is a mandatory procedural safeguard designed to ensure retrospectivity, statistical integrity, and compliance with the By-law. Despite this, the survey was distributed as an open-access link, available to any individual who received or forwarded it. No verification of eligibility occurred, no randomised sampling was undertaken, and no mechanism existed to prevent multiple submissions or participation by individuals outside the defined ARP group. This approach is fundamentally incompatible with the Policy and renders the resulting data unreliable and procedurally defective. On this basis, I submit that the survey does not comply with Section 8.1.2 and cannot lawfully be used to inform or support the business plan. I request that the municipality formally require the steering committee to redo the survey in strict accordance with the Policy and the By-law.	Other	No	The objection does not relate to the business plan.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
28	I hereby lodge a formal objection to the public participation process currently being undertaken in respect of the proposed Vredehoek City Improvement District (CID). My objection specifically concerns the decision to hold the prescribed public meeting outside the boundaries of the proposed district, in direct conflict with the applicable by law requirements. The Public Participation provisions of the Western Cape CID By law (Provincial Gazette Extraordinary 8743, 13 April 2023) set out mandatory criteria for a valid public participation process. Section 6(2)(e) explicitly requires that: “Venues for prescribed public meetings [must be] located within the proposed district, or as otherwise approved by the Executive Director.” The current arrangement does not comply with this requirement for the following reasons: The meeting venue is not located within the proposed district, contrary to section 6(2)(e). There is no indication that the Executive Director has granted approval for an alternative venue outside the district, as required by the by law. Holding the meeting outside the district creates barriers to participation, particularly for residents, property owners, and businesses who are directly affected and who may not have the means or ability to travel to an external venue. This approach is inconsistent with the by law’s requirement that the public participation plan must be “cognizant of the needs and characteristics of the local community” (section 6(2)). The deviation undermines the integrity and accessibility of the public participation process, which is a mandatory prerequisite for the determination of a CID. Request for Remedial Action In light of the above, I request that: The current meeting arrangements be declared non compliant, and A new meeting be scheduled at a neutral venue located within the proposed district, as required by section 6(2)(e), unless a lawful exemption has been granted and published. The applicant be required to amend and resubmit the public participation plan to ensure full compliance with section 6 of the by law. Until these defects are remedied, the public participation process cannot be considered valid, fair, or compliant with the governing legislation.	Other	No	The objection does not relate to the business plan.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
29	This is a wonderful idea, but I have some qualms about my own position. The house is valued at 6.7 m. or thereabouts. I am the usufructuary of the property in terms of the trust. I am retired and a pensioner with a relatively small pension, and considering my medical expenses, I am not able to pay more for the property than I do already - the rates account is generally between R8 000 and R 9 000, and to pay this, I am having to eat into my ever-decreasing savings. I understand that a trust cannot request a rebate from the City Council. There must be others in the suburb who are in the same situation as I, and I wonder if any consideration could be offered to to me and any others. Best wishes and many thanks	Financial Impact	No	The CID is not legally allowed to exclude individuals from the additional rate.		
30	1. Shift change staggering — patrol vehicles I'd suggest considering two different shift-end times for the two patrol vehicles (e.g. Vehicle 1 changes at 17:00, Vehicle 2 at 18:00). The goal is not to control how other services manage their own rosters, but to ensure that the CID's patrol shift changes do not coincide with the existing shift change times of Armed Response, Law Enforcement, or SAPS. A brief gap in all services simultaneously is worth avoiding where it's within our control. The business plan notes that shift structures will be managed by the patrol service provider in compliance with employment regulations, but the CID should specify in the service-level agreement that shift handovers are staggered and do not create coverage gaps. 2. Law Enforcement Officer — weekend and after-hours coverage The business plan confirms that the Law Enforcement Officer is deployed on weekdays during standard working hours, but that the City can be requested to deploy them outside of these hours. A 9-to-5 weekday schedule leaves the area with significantly reduced formal enforcement support over weekends and evenings, which is precisely when many incidents occur. I'd recommend engaging the City early to explore whether a weekend shift — late or early — is feasible, even on a rotational basis. The limited availability of Metro Police resources during non-business hours makes this more important, not less. 3. Radio communications The business plan notes that CID staff will have a radio to communicate with patrol vehicles. I'd suggest we explore whether the DPVWatch radio channel can be used for CID communications or alternatively, approach Werner (DPVWatch Chair and the person managing radio frequencies in the area) about securing a dedicated frequency for the CID. Seamless communication between the control room, patrol vehicles, and DPVWatch is operationally essential. 4. Patrol vehicles — prisoner transport capability Both patrol vehicles should ideally be bakkies fitted with a secure compartment for the lawful transport of suspects. The current absence of this capability is a genuine operational constraint — without it, arrests cannot be followed through effectively. This should be included as a specification in the patrol service provider tender.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 11.1] Business plan updated to require that patrol shift changes must not overlap; LEO will be available outside of usual daytime business hours on an as-needed basis. Radio communications will include DPVWatch to support coordination. Patrol vehicles must have capability to lawfully transport suspects.	Section 11.1

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
31	5. Plantation Park fencing — Speed Classic timing The business plan identifies the Speed Classic as a co-funder for the Plantation Park fence, based on their multi-year agreement with the City. Based on feedback from a resident who was involved in organising last year's event, the Speed Classic is unlikely to go ahead this year but is expected to return next year. The fencing timeline and budget should account for this, as the expected co-funding contribution may be delayed - or not, if CID starts in 2027	Environmental Development	No	Fencing budget is spread across the budget period for cashflow and coordination purposes.		
32	I would be interested in supporting the CID, but only the model which focuses on safety and not the other non-essential "soft" issues, which take up over 40% of the current proposed budget. Please provide an option for the community to support a model which only address the safety issues, as the rest can either be done via a volunteer basis, or eg management of park is actually an existing CoCT task and they should be held responsible for these services.	Budget	No	The CID cannot legally only provide public safety services, it must spend funds in all four areas. About 18% of the budget goes towards cleaning, environmental components and social development. The majority (over 52%) goes towards public safety. Additionally, the proposed services in the cleaning and social development categories work hand-in-hand to help reduce the negative impacts of homelessness, which is a significant aspect of the public safety concerns raised by residents.		
33	Thank you for hosting the public meeting. I want to begin by saying that I strongly support the broader CID initiative and appreciate the work being done to improve the neighbourhood. That said, I left the meeting strongly opposed to the proposal to fence the three parks at the entrance to Vredehoek, particularly at Aandbloem. For me, this is a visual representation of my only lingering concern about a CID: that it could default to making the neighbourhood feel more fortified/garrison rather than working toward a positive vision of safety, greening, beautification, and creative problem-solving, which is what I believe a CID is empowered and legislated to be. Aandbloem is quite literally the gateway to our neighbourhood, so the visual and symbolic impact matters. Vredehoek already feels overly fenced and lacking in greenery compared with neighbouring suburbs. By contrast, areas such as Lower Gardens and other nearby neighbourhoods seem to be moving in the opposite direction: greening public spaces, softening boundaries, and removing fencing where possible. That feels much more aligned with the promise of urban renewal and neighbourhood improvement. I would like to ask whether the committee is flexible on this issue. Would you be open to exploring alternatives, such as a planted or “green” boundary, landscaping interventions, improved lighting, cameras, or other solutions that address safety concerns without making the entrance to Vredehoek feel like a barrier? More directly, is the committee prepared to abandon the fencing proposal altogether if there is strong community concern? I am personally prepared to contribute funding toward beautification and native planting in this area, and I am not opposed to safety interventions such as cameras or security presence in this important entry point. However, I feel strongly that fencing is fundamentally the wrong approach for this location. I raise this because I genuinely want to support the CID, but the fencing proposal gives me pause. I would love to see the committee take a more creative approach here, one that reflects shared values of greening, openness, beautification, safety, and care for the public realm. I do hope you will reply in order to win my support, and to take me up on the offer to contribute to an alternative solution.	Environmental Development	Yes		[S. 13.1] The Steering Committee consulted with a landscaper and DPVWatch patrollers to consider a green barrier rather than a fence along Jutland Ave. The guidance from the landscaper was that a fence will meet the priority requirement of security faster and more cheaply (in the long term) than a green barrier solution. They recommended that a clear fence, together with greening, would balance security with visibility and greenification. The business plan has been updated to reflect this.	Section 13.1

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
34	I was initially against the CID but have come round to seeing it as a necessary addition to enhancing firstly the safety of our neighbourhood and secondly the cleanliness. Opportunistic crime has become a regular occurrence either stealing items off parked vehicles or actually breaking in to them and as well as actually stealing the vehicle! ☹ Our neighbourhood watch, as important as it is, is lurching along as best as they can with vacancies on their committee And way too much apathy shown by owners with little or no support. Patrollers are always the same couple of die hard owners who assist at all times and have grown weary at having to constantly bare the load when others sit in their glass houses and throw stones. Costs - Although the amount proposed is R61 per million of your municipal valuation. If we had to increase it to say R75 I would not be opposed as it may well give us 2 vehicles instead of the one team. Is that 24 hours a day coverage? For an additional R15 a month instead of R61 up it R75 the difference could really bring additional efforts. Especially as this is fixed for 5 years? Correct? I think it should be put to all attendees at the meeting by show of hands who would be willing to pay R75 per million instead of the proposed R61 for even better security coverage either by way of 24 hour patrols in 2 vehicles or additional security patrollers? I appreciate a lot of work has gone into this by the committee but it's just a suggestion. Another question I'm interested in is as Herzlia junior and High schools have a significant footprint in upper Vredehoek are they going to contribute towards this initiative? I appreciate they have their own private armed security team at the school with their own cameras however they tend not to interact with surrounding owners especially regarding the huge traffic congestion around various times of the day and I believe that access to their private camera feed is difficult to obtain by surrounding residents if the need arises. They form a huge part of our community and some community spirit may well be appreciated by residents in upper Vredehoek.	Public Safety	No	The business plan already includes two patrol vehicles with 24 hours per day coverage.		
35	1. If the proposal is about space outside private property: Then the following properties must be included in the area as they use the parks, cleanliness, security as much as the any of the residents who are currently expected to contribute: Diss park High Cape If Lamanier is excluded - which is not an old age old home but a retirement village where each property is individually charged rates and taxes as in the case of other dwellings- then any retired persons should be treated the same. Finally the dirtiest area outside property is Larmanier	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary was drawn by balancing public-space benefit with existing services, service feasibility, community alignment and the ability to achieve the required support threshold. High Cape and Disa Park were excluded because they already have substantial private/shared services and controlled access, and because including them without clear support from those communities would add many properties to the consent process and could put the establishment of the CID at risk. Nazareth House is exempt by the City from the additional rate as it is classed as an old age home.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
36	I live in a block of flats, Stellenhof, Escombe Road, Vredehoek, since 2021. Prior to that I lived in firstly a flat then bought a house in Davenport Road. I have been a resident of Vredehoek since 1967. While at this time, I am not for or against a CID in the area and will make up my mind when it is time to vote. 1. My main concern is the cost. My flat's value at this time is R2,250,000 therefore I would be paying approximately R152 a month if the CID were to be established. 2. I am presently employed part time but am almost 79 years of age (yes, and still working!) but the firm I work for is winding down and I will probably be unemployed in a year's time. Then I will be living off interest on savings. I will not be able to afford R152+ a month then . I will apply for a Rates rebate as my income will be drastically reduced. I sold my house and bought this flat in order to downsize so that I would have money for my retirement years. However with the rate of galloping inflation I will be no better off once I cease working. 3. I STRENUOUSLY OBJECT to people saying it is a small amount comparable to eating out, a week's groceries, "money is nothing when you are dead" (one woman's comment). The money I have saved/invested for my old age is what I have to LIVE ON, while I am ALIVE! 4. I NEVER eat out, I NEVER entertain since years ago, I hardly ever GO OUT, I don't sit at cafes in the evenings. I object STRONGLY to people commenting on other people's income. I agree with the comments of older people who say they cannot afford it. I do not see why we have to do the job the City Council should be doing, i.e.. cleaning streets, fixing damaged pavements, weeds, public spaces etc. I find that if one logs a service with the City, the problem gets sorted quite quickly. Our block has a caretaker who cleans the area outside around our block and the block next to us I have even seen their caretaker mowing the grass outside adjacent to the pavement, which is the job of the City. Our block has high fencing, electric fencing and I am fortunate to have off-street parking. In 4 years of living in this apartment block I have only once seen a car (actually it was a pick up truck) broken into. Most times cars are broken into due to negligence of owners leaving items visible inside.	Financial Impact	No	The CID is not legally allowed to exclude individuals from the additional rate, and pensioners qualifying for a rates rebate are fully exempt from paying the additional rate.		
37	I note that Gardens Centre is not included. That means if I want to walk down to the Gardens Centre, I can get mugged on the way down and that area is not monitored? The Gardens Centre area is the most place where people are accosted by the homeless and / or mugged.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary focuses on the Vredehoek and Devil's Peak suburbs, and touches up against Gardens Centre, including crime hotspots just east and south of the Centre.		
38	Thank you for your presentation and time spent putting it together. I believe this to be an excellent initiative and there is overwhelming evidence that CIDs are fantastic for an area. I fully support the idea. I would suggest that the budget be increased as R60.38 per R1m seems very reasonable and we can probably do a lot more with a higher contribution. In addition to the 2 patrol vehicles proposed, I would ideally like to see additional officers on bikes (perhaps 3 per shift) to help get around quicker and provide a better street presence.	Budget	Yes		Walking patrols added to public safety plan.	

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
39	I would also suggest that a budget is allocated for tree planting and beautification as the suburb could do with a load more trees and greenery.	Environmental Development	No	The CID's proposed services are prioritised based on the issues raised in the Urban Management Survey, of which public safety is by far the greatest concern. The CID does have some discretionary budget for public space improvements, which can be used towards greening if required, once the higher priority public safety considerations are being managed effectively.		
40	Lastly, I would suggest that the area around and including Garden's Centre is included as this area carries a high level of foot traffic and a substantial amount could be raised from the contributions of the Garden's Centre.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary focuses on the Vredehoek and Devil's Peak suburbs, and touches up against Gardens Centre, including crime hotspots just east and south of the Centre.		
41	The suggestion of submitting a proposal which looks at the minimum requirements as the first proposal ipo the one presented on Wednesday makes a lot of sense. Once the CID is has run and worked for a year the 2nd year commitment can be expanded to cover a greater security option. Are the Air BNBs going to be charged at the business rate. If one keeps to the proposal I believe they should be.	Budget	No	The legal process requires a 5 year business plan that must be coherent from the start. If the budget is too small in the beginning, it has the risk of not showing the expected benefits, which could undermine confidence before the model has had a fair chance to work.		
42	Thank you for an informative workshop and good business plan. I agree wholeheartedly with the comment by another resident tonight that I believe that people would be more keen to vote for a menu of options, not a straight yes/no. Could you please provide a simple table with a per million rand charge for each of the four included services? You can then ask people to vote for one to four of the service menu options, as they are able and can afford to pay. I personally am not interested in cleaning, environmental development and social/economic development. I'm interested in security and willing to pay for it.	Budget	No	The CID cannot legally only provide public safety services, it must spend funds in all four areas. About 18% of the budget goes towards cleaning, environmental components and social development. The majority (over 52%) goes towards public safety. Additionally, the proposed services in the cleaning and social development categories work hand-in-hand to help reduce the negative impacts of homelessness, which is a significant aspect of the public safety concerns raised by residents.		
43	I have read the business plan and am hoping that you can provide feedback on how the budget will be evenly distributed across Vredehoek? Currently the plan seems to prioritise lower Vredehoek with 65% of cameras covering access to lower Vredehoek and access points at the top of Vredehoek left exposed. This means that these residents will need to continue to fund private monitoring of cameras while contributing to the CID. I also could not find park improvements or other advantages for residents above Noordelik Avenue. If a street funds private security and monitoring, can they request to be excluded from the CID like Disa Park and High Cape? Was also wondering if you have segmented the survey results by areas within Vredehoek? For example, are the same concerns and needs evenly distributed across Vredehoek and how does this correlate with the income expected to be generated from each area?	Implementation Plan	No	Services operate across the entire CID. The public safety strategy includes the monitoring of entry/exit points, hotspots and key routes through the community, and must be managed as an area-wide programme and not street-by-street. Camera locations are indicative and will be finalised by the CID's CCTV deployment plan (once the CID is in place). Streets can not opt out of the CID individually.		
44	Good day - please be advised that I'm not in favour and do not support the notion of a proposed vredehoek CID and its suggested cost/fees. The Vredehoek community must rather focus on pressurising the City and the relevant ward councillor to deliver the upkeep, security and cleaning necessary in the area which they are obligated to do and for which the residents are already paying for through a very expensive multilayered rates, tax and services charge structure.	Other	No	No changes suggested.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
45	1. I suggest that 2 different CID should be operated/implemented in vredehoek and devils peak – i.e. separate. Not practical am sure but may be better. The need of the 2 areas are the same but the residents very different. One - Vredehoek - with mostly flats and the other – devils peak - almost only houses. Meaning a lot of renters in one and mostly all home owners in the other with properties costing a lot more and therefore interests and needs are similar but different.	Boundary of the CID	No	The CID boundary was drawn based on a number of factors, including the boundary of Vredehoek (including Devil's Peak Estate) as defined by the City, and is very similar to the area covered by DPVWatch. As noted, the needs of the area are sufficiently similar to warrant a single CID. Two CIDs would duplicate overhead costs and services, and require additional coordination between them. The Steering Committee believes that a single CID can reasonably and cost effectively service the concerns of the area.		
46	2. Guards who will not be armed will not have the same deterrent factor. 3. A very very important point: in your meeting you mentioned that having CID will not diminish police presence. ????? in our street, since establishing a security guard at night between 7 pm and 7 am, we have no more police patrols. Not even in the day! They used to patrol 3 times a day (am, lunchtime and pm). How do we know this? We saw them everyday as they turn around in our circle and our garden is situated in a way that we saw and heard them every time. No more.	Public Safety	No	The Law Enforcement Officer will be armed. The proposed services are not intended to replace City-provided services, but supplement them. The City is not allowed to reduce services in an area just because there is a CID in place.		
47	4. We are situated at 34 pinoak road right at the end of the street in the circle, with our north and east side perimeter facing the mountain buffer land. It is literally a motorway off vagrancy and a litany of misdemeanours happening in front of our very eyes on a daily basis, leading to attempted or realised crimes varying from theft from gardens even when dogs are there sometimes!, break-ins of cars (twice for my neighbour at no 36 in one month or so in April /may 2026) or houses, epic poaching of proteas and other protected flora. I once even chased and successfully stopped 3 guys from taking a tortoise from the slope. 5. Whilst we have now the Sugarbird NGO cutting down aliens, my husband spent years cutting down thousands of aliens on the slopes to have more visibility against vagrants trying to sleep amongst the trees. We contacted TMNP for authorisation to poison aliens after cutting but were refused. We were left with aliens growing rapidly again and still no help. On top of this there is the unbelievable littering of the slope between dewaal drive (PK) and our houses/mountain path, the littering and occupation of the Murray and Stewart quarry. I have spent 22 years cleaning the litter from the mountain slope, even one memorable 1st January! Every Wednesday after Bin collection it is the same: Vagrants come and pick bins and leave our street mostly through the mountain slope downwards. They often seat on the grass, out of the view of most residents(but we can see them due to our position) and start selecting what they took out of bins and want to keep and leaving behind what they don't want.	Public Safety	No	The CID cannot provide services on Table Mountain, but will coordinate with TMNP to monitor entry/exit, including for poaching.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	They also eat stuff and leave the containers etc. All this leading to us clearing the litter every week with no help from the municipality or TMNP. The grassy ridges by the entrance of Murray and Stewart quarry are sometimes overloaded with litter, excrements and condoms etc as it is a popular place for sleeping and living in summer. My husband and I have cleaned the quarry and its slopes and ridges for 20 years, sometimes collecting 2 rolley bins at a time and we feel that nothing will ever change as we are not protected from what is happening on the slope and mountain. Which leads me to my last point: 6. If you are going to erect a fence to protect lower gardens but this project does not include for a fence from the end of the High Cape 2 Complex along PK drive to - say – pass the shooting quarry, you will not be protecting Devils peak from anything. Multiple fires have been started because people have no restriction whatsoever to their destructive behaviour. Let me give you a last example: On Christmas day, i.e. December 2025 a fire was started. My husband and I were walking down the slope coming back from a dog walk as the smoke became obvious. We passed a man with suspicious behaviour and immediately felt that he was suspect but also that surely we should not jumped to conclusion. However, houses along the slopes had actually filmed him starting the fire and less than 2 hours later when we consulted our street group, we found out that it was the right man. He came from PK drive and escaped toward Deer park if I remember well. With no certitude that a fence will be erected at PK drive limits, by the high cape 2 complex, I can guarantee that we will not vote for CID even though I am in favour of it. I can also confirm that nobody in our street will vote for it as we have a Security Guard scheme and as people see it during our discussions on group, is that it will bring us no added advantages. Please also note the situation that we are in. A bit like a ‘no man’s land’ – a hot potato between municipal area and TMNP land where no one takes responsibility.					
48	Supportive resident raised a specific safety concern involving a person sleeping rough around Derry Street, Wexford Park, the library and the quarry. Resident described alleged theft of a baby bag, erratic/incoherent behaviour, unwanted engagement with their child, and reports of aggression toward women. Resident asked how the CID would address recurring public-space safety threats of this nature, requested camera coverage at Derry/Exner and Wexford/Exner, and asked to remain anonymous.	Public Safety	No	The proposed CID services are relevant to to this concern: visible patrols, camera monitoring, coordinated incident response, City Law Enforcement escalation, SAPS coordination, and structured social outreach. The specific camera locations and patrol focus areas would be dealt with during implementation through the CCTV deployment plan and operational planning, informed by identified hotspots and recurring incidents. Wexford/Exner is marked as a key point on the proposed camera map.		
49	1. Fee Structure The fee structure being based on property value is grossly unfair. It should either be based per person or on some other metric like income. It is grossly unfair to penalise people who already pay much higher rates and water, etc... I understand that this is the city's by-law but it is still not fair to those who happen to live in properties with higher value - however they got to live in those properties.	Budget	No	The additional rate as a funding mechanism for the CID is supported by law, and the SC is not allowed to choose a different mechanism.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
50	2. Inclusivity The decision to include and exclude certain areas is questionable at best. The reason given for excluding high cape and disc park was most people there are renters so it's harder to get them to agree. BAD REASON! I would say if you can exclude those areas then you can also exclude Highlands Estate and other parts of the neighbourhood. 3. Areas The entire steering committee for the CID seems to live in Devil's Peak. Maybe that's where the CID is needed. Why get the whole of Vredehoek to do the CID just because you feel you need it in Devil's Peak? Otherwise you have to get all the areas. You can't pick and choose depending on whether or not the people there will agree. 4. Existing Benefits I'd like to know if anyone in the steering committee or otherwise has ever used Van Riebeeck Park? If so, have you ever paid for it? Have you ever contributed towards upkeep there? If not, perhaps pause to consider that some people around that area contributed huge sums to get that fence built so we could all enjoy it. I was one of them. By my calculations, you should deduct around 10 years of CID fees for what I paid for that fence out of my own pocket, without going to the rest of Vredehoek and asking for them to contribute. Strangely enough, that act of mine has led to greater property value which in turn has led to the city and the CID wanting more money from me!	Boundary of the CID	No	No business plan amendment is proposed. The boundary rationale is already based on serviceability, existing shared services, controlled access, community alignment and consent feasibility; High Cape and Disa Park are distinct from individual streets or areas within the proposed CID because they have substantial shared arrangements and different operating conditions. The business plan is not limited to Devil's Peak and proposes area-wide services across the full CID boundary, informed by the Urban Management Survey. Prior voluntary contributions to public-space improvements are acknowledged, but the CID cannot legally offset individual historic contributions against future additional rates.		
51	In general I think you have a solid plan, some things that I think need adjusting are as follows: 10.1 Public Safety Instead of having 2 x 24/7 vehicle and two "officers each" I would suggest 1 vehicle 24/7 1 vehicle 18h00 and 06h00 Only 1 officer for the day shift 1 officer AND 1 LE officer for the night shift (NSO should be available during the day), focus for LE should be Unlawful Occupation By-Law Streets, Public Places and Prevention of Noise Nuisance By-law Traffic By-Law (moving violations and red line parking in particular) Public Parks By-law BUT each vehicle needs at least ONE firearm	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 3.11.1] Patrol vehicles adjust to one patroller each, foot patrols added. LEO can be available outside of business hours if requested. LEO is armed, patrollers will not be armed based on feedback from other CIDs.	Section 11.1
52	10.3 Environmental development All fencing ideas are good Plantation Park needs to be completely to ensure residents safety (so that kids and dogs don't run onto Phillip Kgosana) and public safety (preventing easy ingress and egress for criminal elements) Fence at the end of Pinoak Road needs to be considered to prevent access from Phillip Kgosana and direct access to the Quarry Apart from the points above everything else looks spot-on.	Environmental Development	Yes		[S. 13.1] Business plan updated to include fencing of end of Pin Oak.	Section 13.1

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
53	When we purchased our property in Rocklands Avenue in 1990 it was valued around R200 000 and our rates bill was modest and affordable. Since then, the property valuation has increased 50-fold to R10.75m – with the monthly rates correspondingly increasing to R6 271. Unfortunately, our monthly income has not grown close to the same rate and has been capped since we’ve become pensioners, with the result that we barely break even each month. The additional R650 monthly Vredehoek CID levy (based on the valuation of our property) will push us beyond our budget limit and we will have to sell our house if this is enforced. In addition, this is more than 3 times higher than the R189 average monthly levy envisaged for the CID.	Financial Impact	No	The CID is not legally allowed to exclude individuals from the additional rate.		
54	The proposed boundaries of the CID enclose properties with very diverse profiles and different needs and concerns. It covers a large area – about 4sqkm - with properties against Table Mountain about 2km away from properties on Philip Kgosana Drive. I would please like to request the Steering committee to reconsider the boundaries to exclude the area previously identified as Highlands Estate - above Highlands Avenue, between Van Riebeeck Park and Disa Park. In the CID Business Plan the area is described as follows: “Vredehoek is not a suburban community of large properties and high fences. Most properties are modest, face directly onto the street, and have limited off-street parking.” This description is completely the opposite of our properties bordering on Table Mountain, namely: Large properties with high fences (many electrified) and off-street parking. Most residents here struggle to meet the rising cost of rates based on soaring valuations of the modest properties they bought many decades ago, which are now valued around R10m. Many of the owners are pensioners on fixed incomes – not eligible for rebates, as has been suggested. Most have armed response and alarms because our main safety concern is home invasions and armed burglaries by organised gangs coming across the mountain - which many experienced. We do not experience Vredehoek as having a “a strong community feel” as described in the Business Plan. It was clearly demonstrated that we inhabit two different worlds at the public meeting at Gardens High School:	Boundary of the CID	No	The proposed boundary needs to support an area-wide public-space safety and management system, and the Rocklands / Highlands Estate mountain-edge area is part of the broader movement network into and out of Vredehoek. Excluding that area would create a gap in patrol coverage, camera planning and coordinated response, making the CID less coherent and potentially less effective for both that area and the wider neighbourhood.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	I was repeatedly told to “get out of Vredehoek” by a gentleman who added that he does not want to inhabit the same planet as me, never mind the same suburb, because I said we will be paying three times the average CID rate based on our house valuation of more than R10m (missing the point I made about unaffordability) for services with little benefit to us. Another lady called me “entitled” because I said I didn’t know where the parks were that will be fenced by CID – On Google Maps Plantation Park is about 2km from where we live – but Van Riebeeck Park, which we border on, had been excluded from the CID. I was labelled selfish because we have armed response and “not know the fear of being confronted by criminals on the street”. Not true, we got armed response because: During a home invasion our family was held at gun point for about 1½ hours while the so-called “mountain gang” (because they invade from Table Mountain and escape over the mountain) ransacked our house; our front door and security gate was kicked in by another organised gang who was luckily interrupted; burglars entered our house at night and were scared off by our dog; two more attempted burglaries were foiled and intruders were chased from our property on more than one occasion. These perpetrators arrived from, and escaped via, Table Mountain, avoiding roads that can be patrolled by CID vehicles, which made armed response an absolute necessity. We therefore do not experience Vredehoek as particularly “walkable” as described in the Business Plan, especially not at night when we lock ourselves in our houses and switch on alarms. I would therefore like to request that you have another look at the boundaries and consider excluding our area (mentioned above) that does not fit your CID profile.					
55	The budget allocation and Business Plan emphasis does not align with the needs and wishes expressed by respondents to the Urban Management Survey. We do not believe that enough thought – and budget planning – have gone into addressing the issues that concern residents. The main concerns, homelessness and dire poverty, are extremely complex issues faced by authorities worldwide, which cannot be solved by vehicle patrols or one or two social workers. The responses to the Urban Management Survey showed that only 26% of the respondents felt unsafe (37% feel safe, 37% are neutral, and 26% feel unsafe). Could this relative low concern be because 85% of houses (43% of apartments) have armed response, plus 19% are considering getting it in the next year? Despite the fact that only about a quarter of the respondents feel unsafe, the CID Business Plan claims that “very few respondents feel completely safe, or not safe at all” and more than 50% (R3 710 450) of the CID budget for the first year will be allocated to address “Public Safety” concerns. The next highest budget allocation will be for CID Management admin (salaries, office, repairs etc.) namely 31% (R2 211 122). On the other hand, “Addressing Homelessness” - and resultant issues like begging, people going through trash, etc. - that have been flagged as major concerns in the Urban Management Survey - will only receive 5% of the proposed budget (R336 960). “Maintenance and cleaning” and “Environmental development” of public spaces, including fencing – identified as other major concerns for residents – will respectively receive R408 244 (6%) and R396 000 (6%).	Budget	Yes		[S. 10] Business plan updated to explain that it is weighted toward public safety because it is the strongest survey theme, and non-safety items such as cleaning/social/environmental work contribute towards public safety through public-space management.	Section 10

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	The 219 respondents who identified community projects that they felt were important, indicated that safety issues were third on the list with 34 mentions (15%). The main community projects they highlighted related to environmental development and public spaces at 29% (63 mentions of which 8 were about Plantation Park specifically), followed by homelessness issues at 26% (56 mentions of which 8 were about the Stroompie informal settlement specifically.) By specifically mentioning the Stroompie informal settlement and the fencing of Plantation Park, shows that these problems are important to a very specific area. This is supported by the budget allocated to improving and fencing parks in the same area, which will not benefit the broader community. There is only scant reference to “illegal fires” (linked to homelessness). Yet, one of the greatest dangers us homeowners bordering on Table Mountain face are regular mountain fires started naturally (sun on glass), accidentally by picnickers, deliberately by arsonists, and irresponsibly by illegal sleepers on the mountain. Once again, not a danger that a CID can protect us from. We do not oppose the formation of a CID, as we acknowledge that many property owners will benefit from it. We have sympathy for their concerns, which we experienced about 50 years ago in the 1970s when we moved into a semi-detached house in Upper Mill Street – e.g. theft from cars, muggings on the street, mess by bin pickers, homeless people and drug users in Deer Park, etc. and we would never have dreamt of walking the streets at night. But, we also believe that to be fair, resources and benefits should be shared equally throughout the community that will be paying for them.					
56	Thank you for your presentation and all the time spent putting it together. I think this is an excellent initiative and there is overwhelming evidence that CIDs are fantastic for an area. I fully support the idea. I would suggest that the budget be increased as R60.38 per R1m seems very reasonable and we can probably do a lot more with a higher contribution.	Budget	No	The budget will not be raised due to general affordability concerns and support considerations.		
57	In addition to the 2 patrol vehicles proposed, I would ideally like to see additional officers on bikes (perhaps 3 per shift) to help get around quicker and provide a better street presence.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 10.1] The business plan has been updated to include walking patrol officers.	Section 10.1
58	I would also suggest that a budget is allocated for tree planting and beautification as the suburb could do with a load more trees and greenery. Like Oranjezicht and Higgovale where all the streets have beautiful greenery.	Environmental Development	No	The CID's proposed services are prioritised based on the issues raised in the Urban Management Survey, of which public safety is by far the greatest concern. The CID does have some discretionary budget for public space improvements, which can be used towards greening if required, once the higher priority public safety considerations are being managed effectively.		
59	Lastly, I would suggest that the area around and including Garden's Centre is included as this area carries a high level of foot traffic and a substantial amount could be raised from the contributions of the Garden's Centre.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary focuses on the Vredehoek and Devil's Peak suburbs, and touches up against Gardens Centre, including crime hotspots just east and south of the Centre.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
60	The following objections were negotiated among several residents over many hours of discussions and summarized as follows: The proposal states that many residents already have private security while only a minority believe the police are effective, and it uses those survey results to justify the CID. However, only about 25% of ratepayers responded to the Urban Management Survey. It is reasonable to ask whether that survey is sufficiently representative of the whole neighbourhood before using it as the basis for a multi-year funding commitment. (Objector 1 and Objector 2) The City should provide these services already. 1. We pay the COCT for cleaning services, we clean our own bins, we separate recycling and we keep our own pavements clean. 2. We pay for own security to CBAR, ADT, own cameras, own alarm systems, dogs. Comment: We do understand concerns for people living in Devils Peak, near Stroompies, near Philip Kgosana, but why should we be responsible for those areas? For those areas it makes sense to have a CID or rather improved security. 3. What would make sense is to improve security on the mountain walks and not shift the responsibility solely for that to TMNP. This would allow everyone to use the mountain safely. There should be a much larger and intense collaboration between city managers and Parks Board, THAT is where heightened security urgently is needed (see recent robberies and muggings). (Objector 1, Objector 2, Objector 3, Objector 4) The additional levy may become unaffordable. Pensioners, fixed-income households and owners who are "asset rich but cash poor" may struggle to afford another mandatory charge. We do not agree to the fee structure in GENERAL for an extra payment (even if the By-Law stipulates that!) for houses bought years ago, and now are of higher value . On top of that the CID fees would also be calculated on the property value (We know! It's the By-Law, but it's terribly unfair - we challenge the validity of the By-Law). Many residents in Highlands Est are pensioners. (Objector 1, Objector 2, Objector 3, Objector 4, Objector 5, Objector 6) Benefits may not be shared equally. Some streets or sections of the CID may (and need) receive more security patrols, cleaning or landscaping than others, even though everyone pays The business plan may not justify the costs. One can question whether the proposed budget, staffing, security contracts and expected outcomes represent value for money. "For this purpose please find attached an analysis of your budget (AB) with my concerns" (Objector 3)	Budget	No	The comments raise affordability, value-for-money and fairness concerns, but they do not identify a specific budget error or viable alternative service model that would meet the CID's legal requirements and provide the proposed area-wide services. The Urban Management Survey exceeded the City's required response threshold, the fee structure is prescribed by the City's CID framework, and the draft plan already explains that CID services are supplementary to City services and are intended to operate across the full CID area.		
61	The boundaries may be inappropriate. We argue that some of our properties have little connection with the rest of the proposed CID or receive limited benefit from inclusion. Suggestion: Separate Highlands Estate from the Vredehoek area, which we do understand should invest in a CID	Boundary of the CID	No	The proposed boundary needs to support an area-wide public-space safety and management system, and the Rocklands / Highlands Estate mountain-edge area is part of the broader movement network into and out of Vredehoek. Excluding that area would create a gap in patrol coverage, camera planning and coordinated response, making the CID less coherent and potentially less effective for both that area and the wider neighbourhood.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
62	The governance structure may not be representative. Since CIDs are managed by a non-profit company, we wish to question how directors are appointed, how conflicts of interest are managed and how ordinary property owners can hold the board accountable. (SEE (AB)) The municipality could reduce its own service levels. Although CIDs are supposed to provide only supplementary services, some residents worry that the City may come to rely on the CID and provide fewer municipal services over time..(SEE AB)) COMMENT : As crippling as homelessness is for societies and communities, it is not the responsibility of residents to solve, and part of the high rates and taxes could be assigned for low cost housing and social services for those people. And besides that, it's a national problem.	Implementation Plan	No	The draft plan and CID framework already provide for a non-profit company with ratepayer membership, an elected board, annual budgets, audited financial statements, public reporting and City oversight. CID services are legally supplementary and do not remove the City's municipal responsibilities. The social development component is not intended to solve homelessness generally, but to manage its direct public-space impacts through outreach, referral, supervision and coordination with relevant service providers and authorities.		
63	Good afternoon steering committee. Thanks for your reply. We have great difficulty in understanding your justification in excluding the above areas [Disa Park and High Cape]. By excluding them(because they will be charged for services they already have) , you have already decided to take away the residents rights to decide for themselves if they want to be part of the CID. What about Larmenier, Fairview and other complexes that ARE included? We pay extra just like those you have excluded. Armed response, gardening service, on site CCTV. Same We outright reject the CID process and business model going forward until the High Cape and Disa Park are included. Stop the process and get back onto a fair and transparent path. This email is to be recorded as formal input / objection to the CID process.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary was drawn by balancing public-space benefit with existing services, service feasibility, community alignment and the ability to achieve the required support threshold. High Cape and Disa Park were excluded because they already have substantial private/shared services and controlled access, and because including them without clear support from those communities would add many properties to the consent process and could put the establishment of the CID at risk.		
64	Objects to property-value-based additional rate, VAT treatment, and validity of funding model; relies on SAPOA/AfriForum High Court tariff judgment and argues the model vulnerable to legal challenge. Objects that higher-value properties pay more for allegedly equal services, raises asset-rich/cash-poor and pensioner displacement concerns, sectional-title cost concerns, and argues residents already pay rates/private security/maintenance.	Budget	No	The CID business plan and budget are determined based on the City's CID legal framework.		
65	Objects to social and economic development as political/social policy, argues homelessness is not residents' responsibility, questions vehicle patrol effectiveness, armed response overlap, displacement of crime risk, and failure to recognise existing grassroots maintenance.	Social Responsibility	No	The City's CID legal framework requires that the CID spends at least some of its funds on social development. The social development and public space improvements respond directly to the concerns of ratepayers raised in the urban management survey, and work together to help to create safe public spaces that are used legally and safely.		
66	Questions democratic mandate, representation, board accountability, conflicts of interest, administrative overheads, inflationary increases, and requests publication of a signed register of interests of the Steering Committee and halting/rewrite of the business plan.	Management	No	The CID business plan and budget are determined based on the City's CID legal framework. The Steering Committee acts under the guidance and review of the City's CID processes.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
67	I have reviewed the CID business plan and would like to express my strong support for the proposed border security measures, including the installation of fencing along our border areas. As a resident of The Signal and an active DPV Neighbourhood Watch patroller, I have spent the past year regularly patrolling our border areas and green spaces. During this time, I have personally witnessed ongoing drug use, illegal fires, violent behavior, illegal camping and sleeping, littering, as well as criminal activity along our borders and within the surrounding green spaces. Based on these firsthand observations, I fully support the proposed fencing opposite Jutland Park and extending along the entire border from Plantation Park, past the Jutland area, and through to Gardens. Restricting access by requiring people to enter and exit the Devil's Peak and Vredehoek area through monitored street access points, supported by strategically placed fencing, would, in my view, significantly improve public safety. It would reduce opportunities for criminal activity, help curb by-law infringements, and make it considerably easier for law enforcement and neighbourhood security teams to identify, monitor, and apprehend offenders entering or leaving the area. I believe these measures would contribute meaningfully to creating a safer environment for residents while protecting our public greenspaces from ongoing abuse and unlawful activities. Having patrolled these areas extensively over the past year, I believe the proposed fencing is a practical and effective measure that will improve safety, enhance the protection of our natural environment, and support the efforts of law enforcement, the City, private security and volunteer neighbourhood watch members in maintaining a secure and welcoming community.	Environmental Development	Yes		[S. 13.1] The business plan has been updated to include more details about the fencing of Jutland Ave.	Section 13.1
68	Please find attached my written comment on the Vredehoek CID draft Business Plan, together with a proposed CCTV and Camera Data Governance Addendum for consideration. I am submitting this as a constructive comment within the public participation period. I support the overall objective of improving safety, cleanliness, social support and public-space management in Vredehoek, but would like the final Business Plan to include clearer privacy-by-design commitments for the proposed camera-monitoring arrangements. My main request is that the future CID board be required to adopt and publish a clear CCTV and camera data governance policy before expanded monitoring is procured or implemented, especially covering retention, deletion, access controls, audit logs, third-party disclosure, contractor obligations, automated monitoring and future analytics. I have also seen and broadly support separate comments made by Dawie Bosch on broader issues of service standards, public access, fair treatment, social intervention and accountability, while this submission remains focused on CCTV and camera data governance.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 11.2] Business plan has been updated to require that camera monitoring be limited to public-safety and incident-response purposes, governed by POPIA-compliant service agreements, and supported by an appropriate CCTV and camera data governance policy before expanded monitoring is implemented.	Section 11.2

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
69	Requested clear measurable service standards and outcome reporting, including response times, patrol/camera/control-room availability, incident records, referrals to SAPS/City, complaints and resolution rates. Also requested clear coordination between CID patrols, control room, SAPS, City Law Enforcement, DPVWatch and private armed-response providers, and clarity that CID services do not necessarily replace private armed response. Resident also identified minor drafting/cross-reference issues in the plan.	Implementation Plan	Yes		[S. 17] Business plan has been updated to make clear that operational service standards, reporting and coordination protocols will be developed and reviewed during implementation. Part B (Implementation plan) already includes many of these aspects, which must be put in place when the CID launches.	Section 17
70	Requested fencing proposals remain subject to site-specific design, operating arrangements and appropriate consultation, including gates, opening hours, pedestrian access, emergency access, maintenance and displacement risk. Resident also requested clear commitments to lawful public access, fair treatment and non-discriminatory public-space management.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 13.1] Business plan updated to clarify that fencing projects require appropriate design, approvals and operating arrangements before implementation, and that public safety/public-space management must be lawful, proportionate and non-discriminatory.	Section 13.1
71	Resident requested commitments around procurement transparency, conflict management, service-provider performance reporting, complaints/escalation procedures.	Management	Yes		[S. 18.3] Business plan updated with new S. 18.3 which includes a governance/procurement transparency statement. Part B already includes fair, equitable, transparent and competitive procurement, board oversight, annual reporting, audited financial statements, service-provider appointment and review, and communication requirements.	Section 18.3
72	Resident supported the social programme but suggested stronger social-intervention capacity, measurable social outcomes and a better balance between security and social spending.	Social Responsibility	No	No concrete proposals to the proposed social development services were provided. The SC has chosen not to increase the budget further, due to affordability concerns and service-level balance.		
73	Resident formally objects to the proposed CID on affordability, funding-model fairness, boundary fairness and consultation-process grounds. Resident argues that municipal valuation does not reflect disposable income, especially for long-term and older Highlands Estate residents, and says affordability concerns at the public meeting were not constructively engaged with. Resident objects to excluding High Cape and Disa Park while including other residents who also pay privately for security/maintenance, arguing that excluded developments will benefit from the CID without contributing and that this affects both the financial burden and voting constituency. Resident requests clear objective boundary criteria and formal recording of the objection.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary was drawn by balancing public-space benefit with existing services, service feasibility, community alignment and the ability to achieve the required support threshold. High Cape and Disa Park were excluded because they already have substantial private/shared services and controlled access, and because including them without clear support from those communities would add many properties to the consent process and could put the establishment of the CID at risk.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
74	I hereby submit this formal objection to the establishment of the proposed Vredehoek City Improvement District (CID). This submission is made in terms of: The Municipal Systems Act (MSA) The Municipal Property Rates Act (MPRA), The Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (PAJA), and The constitutional principles of legality, rationality, and fairness. The recent Western Cape High Court judgment declaring the City's value based service charges unlawful has direct implications for the CID model, which relies on the same impermissible charging mechanism. Summary of Core Objection The proposed Vredehoek CID is legally defective, financially irrational, and administratively unsound because: CID levies are calculated using property values, which the High Court has ruled cannot be used to determine service charges. CIDs fund service functions (cleaning, security, maintenance), not general municipal governance. Therefore, CID levies are service tariffs, not property rates. Service tariffs may not be based on property value. The CID levy structure is therefore unlawful, unconstitutional, and invalid under the Court's reasoning. The CID proposal fails to meet statutory requirements for transparency, necessity, proportionality, and public participation. Legal Grounds for Objection The High Court's Judgment Applies Directly to CIDs The Court held that: Service charges must be based on usage or availability, not property value. Value based service charges become unlawful disguised property taxes. Municipalities may not create hybrid charges ("part tariff, part tax"). VAT may not be charged on property rates. Any charge based on property value must strictly comply with the MPRA. CID levies suffer from the same defects identified by the Court. CIDs Fund Services, Not Rates-Based Governance The Vredehoek CID proposal states that the CID will provide: Additional cleaning Security patrols Urban maintenance Social upliftment Public space management These are service functions, not general municipal governance. Under the High Court's reasoning: Service charges may not be based on property value. Because CID levies are calculated using property value, they are unlawful disguised service tariffs.	Other	No	The objection does not include changes to the business plan.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	The CID Levy Does Not Comply with the MPRA If the CID levy is intended to be a property rate, it must comply with the MPRA. However: CID levies are not included in the City's Rates Policy. They are not reflected in the Valuation Roll. They are not imposed through the MPRA budget process. VAT is charged on CID levies, which is prohibited for property rates. Therefore, CID levies are not lawful property rates. Constitutional Defects Legality The City lacks legal authority to impose value based service charges. Rationality There is no rational connection between: The value of a property, and The cost of cleaning or securing Vredehoek. The Court has already rejected this logic. Equality and Non Discrimination Two properties receiving identical CID services pay different levies solely because of differing property values. This is arbitrary and irrational. Procedural Fairness (PAJA) The CID proposal process lacks: Clear service-level baselines, Independent oversight. Financial and Practical Grounds for Objection Double Charging for Services Already Funded by Rates Residents already pay for: Cleaning, Security, Urban management, Social services, Infrastructure maintenance. The CID duplicates these services, effectively creating a second layer of taxation. Disproportionate Financial Burden CID Levies disproportionately burden: Pensioners, Low income households, Long term residents, Owners of modest properties. The levy is regressive and inequitable.					

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	Procedural Defects in the Vredehoek CID Proposal The proposal suffers from multiple procedural flaws: No evidence of competitive procurement. No baseline service assessment The City has not shown what services are currently provided. Without a baseline, "improvement" cannot be measured. Private board control without democratic oversight CIDs are controlled by private boards. Residents have limited influence. This creates governance risks. Relief Requested I hereby request that the City: Reject the proposed Vredehoek CID in its current form. Suspend all CID processes pending a full legal review of CID levy structures in light of the High Court judgment. Provide written reasons (in terms of PAJA) explaining the legal authority under which CID levies are imposed. Conduct a proper baseline service assessment for Vredehoek.					
75	Good day I am a resident of Ludlow Road, a busy thoroughfare in Vredehoek. The main cause of the deterioration of my and my family's quality of life over the past two years or so is the unchecked increase in the noise produced by cars (many illegally 'enhanced ') and motorcycles that drive up and down our road at all hours. The problematic vehicles produce decibels that way exceed the allowable limit in terms of the city's by-laws. The driving of off-road motorcycles on municipal roads, which is against the law, is a particular source of noise and aggravation. I cannot understand why residents should be expected to put up with the pure selfishness displayed by these drivers, who show no regard for the impact of their actions on those around them, let alone consider that they are breaking the law. I have taken up this matter with the DVP Neighbourhood Watch but received no support. The only reason that I would support a CID in Vredehoek is if this disregard of the laws of our roads are actively addressed. However, I see no mention of this particular issue anywhere in the business plan. Until I do, I will not support a CID in Vredehoek because there would be no significant increase in my quality of life as a result. No homeless person in my area has had the same negative impact on my life as these drivers and the lack of law enforcement on our roads have had. I therefore request that this problem, which is increasing by the day, be addressed in the planning of a future CID. I look forward to your feedback	Roads and Infrastructure	No	Traffic noise is a low priority for the CID because it is the second lowest concern in the urban management survey (reported as a concern by 24% of respondents). However, the Law Enforcement Officer included in the business plan can assist with enforcing the City's by-laws, and the CID can assist with identifying traffic noise hotspots and raising them with the City.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
76	My comments are that the night hours are the most important for combatting crime. I would suggest a Law enforcement officer covers that shift. I also don't think residents will like the fact that they are paying extra to get ticketed in their own area during the day (although some may be in favour of this). Also, do we need two guards per vehicle or would one suffice? If the law enforcement officer is armed, there is no need for the security guard to be armed. I feel one vehicle in the day is enough , but two at night would be good at least to start.	Public Safety	Yes		[S. 10.1] The business plan has been revised to note that the LEO will be available upon request outside of business hours, reduce vehicle officers from 2 to 1, and include walking patrols.	Section 10.1
77	At present I am paying rates and I feel it is the responsibility of the municipality for the cleaning of parks and public spaces improvements. The law enforcement is responsible to keep the public safe. It is of paramount importance that the citizens of the area are kept safe and that the areas are maintained and thus I object to paying for a CID when I am already paying for the same in my rates bill. I also object to the amount being based on property values. Not fair to force us into a situation that we do not want to be part of. Please acknowledge that you have lodged my objection on the site and have taken cognisance of my objection. It is imperative for the community that the city of Cape Town and the law enforcement must be held accountable to ensure that the community feels safe and well as international visitors. We do not need a top up for services that the City of Cape Town is responsible for and Saps. We rather need them to be held accountable and to do their services as promises are made by them. Calls can be logged and Francine could become more involved. Also noted as another service with vat added is unfair.	Other	No	No changes to the business plan are proposed.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
78	I hereby object to the Vredehoek CID for the following reasons: The CID tariff is yet another tax based on pre capital gains property value. As you are well aware - property value is determined by COCT and to have yet another punitive "wealth tax" added to a municipal bill is not fair and just. The CID Steering Committee has stated that the CID is a top service. Services should be charged based on usage and not on property value. Every property in the area targeted by the CID Steering Committee will most definitely not benefit the save value. Some will benefit more than others and the benefit will not be in proportion to the CID tariff paid per property. Our municipal rates and taxes are supposed to cover cleansing, servicing of public parks and spaces and already go towards social improvements for the homeless. One should not have to pay yet another fee to ensure that the above-mentioned services are delivered. The COCT should be taken to task to ensure that residents get the services that they pay for. Law enforcement that COCT keeps advertising is already paid for by our rates and taxes and should go towards ensuring that the safety and security of our neighbourhood is kept in check. I have spent after tax capital on securing my property without financial assistance from the state or the municipality. I contribute to our street camera monitoring project and 2 of my cameras facing the street are used to monitor for suspicious activity with CBAR as a response vehicle. Only 100 cameras will have their monitoring fees taken over by the CID. This will benefit only certain residents and opens the plan up to favouring only certain residents. Furthermore, excluding certain properties in Vredehoek (like Disa Park and High Cape) in order to skew votes in favour of a CID is not an approach that instils trust in the agents of the CID. There are many apartments in Vredehoek vs free standing properties. Clearly those with lower value properties won't pay a hefty fee at the current proposed rate. But higher value properties, who don't even qualify for a rates rebate and pay huge rates and taxes merely because of inflated property value stand to pay a hefty fee. The concern is looking forward to the future - with big increases in CID budgets as well as the compound effects of Valuations every few years - the increases are seriously concerning! The fact that those pushing for the CID are happy to enforce yet another tariff based on property value onto their very neighbours, just because "it's the only way", does not instil much faith and trust in the CID. The CID policies and bylaws are designed to be unfair. Clearly the "top up" services we end up paying for will free up our rates and taxes for the COCT to use elsewhere. They are already doing this - why make it easier for them to renage on their duties? As you know -	Other	No	The boundary was drawn by balancing public-space benefit with existing services, service feasibility, community alignment and the ability to achieve the required support threshold. High Cape and Disa Park were excluded because they already have substantial private/shared services and controlled access, and because including them without clear support from those communities would add many properties to the consent process and could put the establishment of the CID at risk.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
	the COCT bylaws and policies can change at any time and often do not favour residents financially. I have the following questions: 1) Has the CID Steering Committee considered whether they will be happy to have funds go towards a COCT pot if another party other than the DA was in charge of Cape Town? Would you trust another in coming party to be the custodians of the CID funds? 2) What does the CID Steering Committee expect those living against the mountain to do if they find themselves having to finance another security initiative from off the mountain in the future? Would the CID free those residents from having to pay the existing CID fee and allow them to finance their own or create a CID for their own area? 3) Different areas of Vredehoek have different issues: those against PK drive and near lower mill have different issues to those up against the mountain. Those in Rocklands and backing onto Van Riebeeck Park have different issues to those living near Lazari and Villa Portuguese. It is clear that not all the various issues can be solved by one CID. At the very least, it seems to me it would make sense to have smaller areas for a CID where those residents facing similar issues would possibly feel that their needs would be met and their CID levy would actually be used in their immediate area. 4) I have asked this question before and I would like a detailed response please. In a case of a 5 year CID budget where there is say a 15% increase in property valuation in year 3. How will this affect the residents CID levy? Likewise - in a case where a property have been over valued and an objection to property valuation has been won by the resident after say 1 year of paying based on the higher value. How will the CID reimburse that over charged levy to the resident?					
79	Resident disagreed that the whole area faces heightened crime, believes issues are concentrated in specific lower Devil's Peak roads. Considers the proposed 2 patrol vehicles and ~200-camera network excessive and unnecessary, and suggests budget should prioritise social development/outreach capacity over security infrastructure. Also wanted to clarify that the DPV Outreach was established with the DPV Watch and has been operating as a separate entity since 2021.	Budget	No	The SC agrees with the importance of a holistic approach but the SC has chosen not to increase the budget further due to affordability concerns, and maintains that social development have been considered in the service offering - through the social worker support and cleaning initiatives.		
80	1. A CID should reflect the whole community The proposed exclusion of High Cape and Disa Park appears inconsistent with the principle that a City Improvement District exists to improve shared public spaces and neighbourhood-wide safety. The benefits of enhanced public safety, cleaner streets and improved public environments extend beyond individual properties and are enjoyed by everyone living in and moving through the neighbourhood. The fact that certain developments already fund private security should not, in itself, justify exclusion from contributing to services that benefit the broader community. Many individual property owners similarly invest in private security while continuing to contribute towards collective neighbourhood initiatives. Excluding two substantial residential developments, on a questionable rationale, establishes a principle that is difficult to apply consistently and creates an inequitable distinction between different residential property owners. Including these areas would strengthen both the equity and affordability of the CID by ensuring that all beneficiaries contribute to the shared investment in Vredehoek.	Boundary of the CID	No	The boundary was drawn by balancing public-space benefit with existing services, service feasibility, community alignment and the ability to achieve the required support threshold. High Cape and Disa Park were excluded because they already have substantial private/shared services and controlled access, and because including them without clear support from those communities would add many properties to the consent process and could put the establishment of the CID at risk.		

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
81	2. Governance and accountability The plan explains what the CID will do, but says relatively little about how residents will influence priorities once it is established. It sets out the Board structure and statutory reporting requirements, but there is little detail on how residents who are paying the levy will have meaningful input between AGMs. I would suggest requesting: Annual review of priorities with community input. Publication of measurable outcomes and regular performance reporting Independent resident satisfaction surveys every year or two. that any significant change in strategic priorities or allocation of budget between core functions should require consultation with members (The business plan gives the CID considerable flexibility to amend its operations without further consent where changes are considered "non-material.") Also important issue under this point is representation The proposed Board is elected from members, but there is no indication that different parts of the neighbourhood or different property types should be represented. One could encourage consideration of ensuring representation from: apartment owners / free-standing homes / commercial properties different areas of DP / Vredehoek DPVWatch 3. Build on existing community capacity One of Vredehoek's greatest strengths is its active and committed community, particularly the contribution made over many years by DPVWatch. The success of the CID should not be measured by its ability to replace existing community structures, but rather by its ability to strengthen and coordinate them. DPVWatch represents significant institutional knowledge, established community trust and a volunteer capacity that cannot easily be replicated through contracted services alone. Formal mechanisms should therefore be established to ensure that the neighbourhood watch remains an integral strategic partner in the governance and ongoing development of the CID's public safety programme. Furthermore, the CID should formally develop a Community Partnership Framework with organisations such as: DPVWatch 'Friends of ' Park groups resident associations schools / churches / community organisations (DPV Outreach) /volunteer groups Professional services work best when they amplify community capacity rather than replace it. The strongest community safety model will combine professional resources with informed and engaged community participation.	Management	Yes		[S. 1] Business plan updated to indicate that the CID must strengthen, not replace existing community structures, and it must include feedback from the community when changes are made. DPVWatch and volunteer patrollers were consulted during the creation of the business plan for their experience and expertise. The CID by-law already supports the need that ratepayers are the members of the CID and supports their participation in CID processes.	Section 1

No	Comment / Inputs received	Category (Select from the List)	Will this comment / input lead to an amendment in	If no, provide reasons	If yes, provide detail	Any additional information
82	4. Affordability and financial guardrails for the future For the CID to be supported by individual households varying significantly in financial means, affordability must remain a central design principle. Given the wide variation in property values across Vredehoek, consideration should be given to mechanisms that provide greater protection for lower-value residential properties, such as a rateable-value rebate or other progressive levy structure. This would improve equity without undermining the financial viability of the CID. Similarly, property owners would benefit from greater certainty regarding future levy increases. Incorporating clear guardrails that limit annual levy increases to inflation, where any increase above inflation requires a specific consultation and approval process. Such measures would provide confidence in the long-term affordability of the CID. 5. Review after initial term Suggest that before the initial five-year term the CID commission an (independent) review covering: financial performance operational effectiveness resident satisfaction priorities for the next term That allows the CID to adapt if circumstances change.	Financial Impact	No	The CID use of an additional rate is required by law. The CID cannot create exemptions or use a flat rate. The Business Plan notes that the budget and annual increases for the 5 year period are fixed. The CID cannot		
83	We are happy with the draft business plan. It seems like a very reasonable budget.	Other	No	No changes suggested.		