

LANGEBAAN

Ratepayers and Residents Association
Belastingbetalers- en Inwonersvereniging

14 March 2019

The Municipal Manager
Saldanha Bay Municipality
Private Bag X12
VREDENBURG

Att. Doreen.dunn@sbm.org.za

Dear Sir,

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIVE TITLE CONDITION: ERF 5947, LANGEBAAN TO ALLOW A FREESTANDING BASE TELECOMMUNICATION STATION.

The above application has reference.

The Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above application and wish to state as follows:

It is correct that Langebaan requires additional mobile data and voice coverage. The installation of a 25m base station/tower (equal to an 8-storey building in height) surrounded by medium to high density residential areas (located directly adjacent to the very small industrial node) is not acceptable. There are most certainly alternative options (apart from those mentioned in the application) for the installation of additional mobile data and voice coverage for Langebaan.

The application cannot be supported. It is the opinion that a 12m tower will suffice.

There are factual errors in the application. See detail below.

Below are extracts from the application, comments thereto and some questions:

Page 5; the following is stated:

"The subject area of the proposed development is specifically located within Langebaan Industrial area."

"All the surrounding properties in close proximity to the subject area are utilised for industrial related uses."

These two sentences are very misleading. The industrial area is very small and directly adjacent to medium to high density residential areas; specifically, Benguella Street, Saffier street, Lelie street and Minetoka street. In reality, the proposed site is surrounded by residential areas.

Page 6 & 7; Height restriction relaxation:

"A mast of 12m will not be able to provide effective voice- and data coverage to the surrounding area."

"A freestanding base telecommunication station lower than 25m will not be able to provide sufficient space for potentially four mobile network operators."

These two sentences contradict each other. Firstly, it is stated that a 12m tower will not provide effective coverage.... Then it is stated that a tower lower than 25m cannot accommodate potentially four mobile operators.

A bit of research indicates that the only reason for the 25m mast is to accommodate four mobile operators on the single mono pole. The 25m height is not required for effective coverage.

Page 7; Height restriction relaxation:

"..deployed in order to minimize the visual impact on the surrounding environment."

The following impacts are not mentioned:

Wind generates significant noise around a 25m pole. With the significant southerly winds in Langebaan, wind noise from the tower will impact on the very close surrounding residential areas.

Nothing is said about lights on the tower. If aviation warning lights are required by the Civil Aviation Authority these will have a significant negative effect on surrounding residential areas.

With the problematic electricity supply, generators will be required from time to time. Will a single generator be used with noise suppression or will each of the four network operators supply their own mobile generators when required? This could have a significant noise impact.

Page 10; 5. Motivation a. Background

"The new LTE base stations have a maximum coverage of 500m depending on the number of users."

This statement together with the rest of the motivation implies that a multitude of (more than 10) 25m towers will be required to provide Langebaan with effective coverage. See figures 3, 4 and 5 on pages 16 and 17. This cannot be correct.

The 900, 1800 and 2400 frequencies are normally used in combination to provide far wider coverage than the stated 500m.

Pages 18 & 19; Current coverage

The red star on each of Fig 6, 7 & 8 claims to indicate the present location of Vodacom, MTN and Cell-C sites. This cannot be correct as all three indicate the same site; where the proposed new tower will be located.

Fig 8 also refers to "the area of Vanrhynsdorp".

Page 19; Existing telecommunications infrastructure.

Just two sites are listed; Roode Vos crescent and Laguna Mall.

This is incorrect. There are at least two more sites; at Flamingos and the Telkom site at the Post Office.

Is this error the result of poor and incomplete work or manipulation to achieve a goal?
What else in the application is incorrect?

Page 21; h. Visual Impact

".. has elected to erect a monopole design in order to reduce the visual impact and be in fitting with the surrounding environment due to its perceived transparency."

What a rubbish statement; a 25m (the height of an 8-storey building) fitted with 9 triband antennae and four transmission dishes will not have a reduced visual impact and will not have perceived transparency.

"The area identifies as an industrial area – a telecommunication mast will not have an out-of-place impact on the character."

As stated previously, the impact will be on the surrounding residential areas as the location is in a very small industrial area node. This is also a rubbish statement.

Page 24: Conclusion

"This proposed minor development.."

From a visual impact point of view the proposed development is a major development.

".. 3 x Transmission dishes,.."

Page 6 states 4 transmission dishes. Is it 3 or 4?

Yours faithfully.

Signed

F S PALM

CHAIRPERSON/SECRETARY