



2024-2025 DRAFT AMENDED INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND 2024/2025 DRAFT BUDGET

STAKEHOLDER INQUIRIES, COMMENTS,
INPUTS, AND REPRESENTATIONS

OVERVIEW:

The 2024-2025 Draft Amended Integrated Development Plan and 2024/2025 Draft Budget served before a Special Council meeting held on Thursday, 28 March 2024. Council unanimously adopted the documentation following a Working Session held on Tuesday, 2 April 2024.

Following the adoption process, the Municipality embarked on full-scale public participation engagements throughout the Greater Municipal Area. The engagements are deemed fruitful based on the input and deliberations at these engagements by community members and community organisations.

The meetings were held in the various wards as follows:

WARD	TOWN	DATE	METHOD
WARD 2	Klaarstroom	Tuesday, 16 April 2024.	Contact session.
WARD 1	Leeu-Gamka	Wednesday, 17 April 2024.	
WARD 2, 3, & 4	Prince Albert	Thursday, 8 April 2024.	
		Tuesday, 23 April 2024.	

Due to the amendment of the 2022-2027 Fifth Generation Integrated Development Plan for the 2024/2025 financial year the document was advertised for a period of twenty-one (21) days. The due date for submitting comments was Tuesday, 30 April 2024.

All the inquiries, comments, inputs, and representations in respect of the 2024-2025 Draft Amended Integrated Development Plan and 2024/2025 Draft Budget are listed in the table below for Council review and consideration.

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
1	Monday, 8 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Max Hoppe	Inquiry	<p>RATES QUERY: I am in the process of reviewing the budget. I am unable to reconcile the:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Valuation for 20230701 (property roll) property categories, with the 2. Property categories set out in the table "Property Rates for the period 01 July 2024 until 30 June 2025. New General Valuation" on page 2 of the document – "2024/25 TO 2026 MAJOR CONSUMER TARIFFS" <p>Please provide the required clarification.</p>	<p>FINANCIAL SERVICES: Mr. D. Plaatjies responded to the query on Wednesday, 24 April 2024.</p>
2	Tuesday, 9 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Max Hoppe	Input	<p>ELECTRICITY TARIFFS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am submitting these comments to obtain clarity as it appears there are some errors regarding the proposed electricity tariff increases. 2. My comments only concern the prepaid "Domestic" tariffs at this stage. 3. See the two tables below for full details. 4. Electricity tariff increases set out in the 2024/ 2025 draft budget ("draft") (Table 1): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percentage increases: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Draft budget – 11% ii. Message from the Mayor on 9 April 2024 – 11.11% <p>Which percentage is correct?</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>2. Draft prepaid electricity (Table 1):</p> <p>i. The draft shows the NERSA tariff increases for 2023/2024 (Table 1) as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 16%, when in fact they were 15.1%, and 2. The unit cost for electricity excl VAT as R3.74 which in fact it is R3.34 (see Table 2) <p><i>This shows that the starting base is wrong.</i></p> <p>ii. The draft shows the increased rate (at 11%) for 2024/2025 (Table 1) as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. R3.74 excl VAT, whereas it should be R3.71, when calculated on R3.34 per unit. 2. This means the increase in the draft is effect 11.98%, though the draft shows it as 11%. <p>What is the correct position and can the other calculations also be checked.</p>	

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
3	Monday, 29 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Albert Terblanche	Input and Comment	<p>BUDGET: Presentation</p> <p>I always found a budget to be one of the highest priority items to get right in the year. Firstly, to make sure all numbers had substance behind them (and that I was able to explain every single driver to the numbers) and then secondly that I included in the presentation enough ammunition to defend the numbers. That being said, a presentation should always allow for different audiences i.e. you will need granular information for financial orientated attendees, but you will need summarised information for those that are not. Generally, a budget that is not met with acceptance is not necessarily because the numbers are not right but because the story is not told right and that is unfortunately where last Tuesday's presentation sits in part. I thought the following items required attention:</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>1. The operating budget for 2024/25 is compared to the 2023/24 budget.</p> <p>Last year's budget is irrelevant here – you should compare to the actual numbers or at least a forecast that is updated with actuals up to where possible (like a rolling forecast). The problem is you may very well have missed last year's budget completely for whatever reason and now you compare next year's budget effectively to a fictional number and thereby your year-on-year growth % could be completely off the mark. It could be right, but it could be wrong so rather just don't do it – compare the right data.</p> <p>Action – PAMUN to provide appropriate number comparative context for 2025 budget.</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>2. Profit and Loss.</p> <p>The context of the various numbers to shape the profit and loss is important. The presentation slide 12 (please number slides in future for ease of reference) shows income of R97m, but nowhere do we actually see a complete list of expenses or even income and expense together on a profit and loss. Slide 10 and 11 lists expenses but not in table format with subtotals so it is not clear / easy to see what the total expenses are. When I add up slide 11 I get to R96.3m – with income of R97m and expenses of R96.3m I would say this is a little tight. If you run short on income or overspend you have a real problem because you will run out of money. Also, I am not sure if there are any expenses not shown such as financing (which there should not be but nonetheless, I don't know because there is no full profit and loss).</p> <p>Action – PAMUN to include P&L for 2025 budget with relevant comparative number, i.e. 2024 vs 2025 plus 2023 vs 2024 so that annual growth / increases can be reviewed.</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>3. Income items</p> <p>Sewerage</p> <p>The Guesthouse monthly bill is R3-R3.5k per month. I do understand the users that do not do monthly suction feel like they are subsidising but to be honest our bill is not small either. A rate decrease will likely not help your overall numbers, but it is very clear this will need fixing as this will remain a contentious point. We should look at alternatives so that neither the users nor the municipality have this cost. We will be very interested in seeing the implementation of the septic tank conversion to a treatment tank (Neptunus plumbers are working on this option) and thought this should be looked at as a municipality financed option.</p> <p>This way you could avoid the capital cost of a waterborne conversion (which would be likely be expensive considering the amount of rock) but you could also deal with the outliers first – the properties with very few suction and the ones with many suction thus making the complainants less. We do believe this to be a priority in everyone’s interest and believe we need a public meeting to evaluate the options. Is this something you can place on the meeting calendar for the next six months?</p> <p>Action – Is it possible for PAMUN to set up a meeting to get input from residents on the options?</p>	<p>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO: The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>Valuation rolls and rates</p> <p>I apologise as I have found the valuation included in the January bill – it is clear if you know what you are looking for but given the importance of it, it might help to notify property owners that you are distributing the valuation roll. We are fine with our valuation, but if I can add a suggestion would be to print the valuation on the rates bill and adjust once the valuation is accepted / adjusted so that it is clear which base you are applying the % increase on.</p> <p>I do feel we have seen inordinately high increases since owning the property. In May 2021 our basic charges were R3 400, now it is R5 600 – an increase of 65%. Usage is up 5 X what it was which is a mix of more volume and a price - more visitors and rate increases. Combined we see an overall utility bill that has doubled in 3 years, which in part I would expect as we have higher occupancy than before, but the level of change is still too high. No business has been able to double its rates and there has not been a marked change in services –the end result is that rapidly increasing municipal bills affected the sustainability of many businesses in town.</p>	<p>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO: The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>Action - I call to limit increases on rates, sanitation and water to a maximum of CPI (electricity can be in line with national measures). In addition, we need a separate numbers analysis and benchmarking to other municipalities on why we had such cost increases. No business can double fees in three years without any improvement in services, without seeing a loss of customers / revenue. The cost base has a problem that needs to be understood and addressed.</p> <p>I trust my questions and suggestions are clear but am available to meet and discuss where needed to clarify.</p>	

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
4	Monday, 22 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Max Hoppe	Comments	<p>BUDGET:</p> <p>1. Communication with residents</p> <p>The municipality needs to confirm the communication process to ensure that the proposals are received by all residents.</p> <p>Facebook and WhatsApp are not sufficient.</p> <p>2. Public participation process</p> <p>2.1. Firm deadline date to be provided for the submission of proposals.</p> <p>2.2. All budget proposals submitted by residents must be acknowledged and appropriate feedback provided.</p> <p>2.3. Residents to be provided with the final approved budget figures after the final approval by council.</p> <p>3. Cost cutting and productivity improvement measures.</p> <p>What consideration has been given to cost cutting measures to mitigate against sharp increases?</p>	<p><u>OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER / CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES</u></p> <p>1. Communication with residents Municipality utilises FaceBook, WhatsApp, notice boards, hand-delivered notices, and loudhailing to communicate matters of importance to the residents.</p> <p>2.Public Participation Process</p> <p>2.1 The deadlines are advertised on the notices as well as the presentations disseminated at the public meetings.</p> <p>2.2 Correspondences are acknowledged and feedback was provided.</p> <p>2.3 The final budget is available:</p> <p>2.3.1 The Municipal Website.</p> <p>2.3.2 Municipal offices and libraries.</p> <p>2.3.3 Financial Services Directorate at the Thusong Centre.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>4. Debtors</p> <p>4.1. The debt levels have increased significant and have to be addressed URGENTLY.</p> <p>4.2. Debtors' action plan to be implemented to achieve the 95% collection target.</p> <p>4.3. The target must be set to keep the debtors' collection levels at a minimum of 95%.</p> <p>4.4. The PAM to improve its debtor's collection.</p> <p>4.4.1. Can it be explained how this percentage was arrived at? and</p> <p>Is it intended that the 2023 valuation will be retained without any or few adjustments?</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>5. Property valuations</p> <p>5.1. Rates to be decided after the objections to the valuations have been considered.</p> <p>5.2. Notwithstanding the fact that some properties were undervalued to start with, this analysis shows that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the new valuation is certainly not equitable and highlights many inconsistencies, and • the valuation needs to be reviewed in its entirety, to ensure that properties showing a negative rates increase are in fact correctly valued and that those. <p>6. Tariff increases:</p> <p>6.1. Increases to be kept below the CPI (5.8%), and</p> <p>6.2. The PAM introduces a comprehensive cost cutting and improvement efficiency programme in all departments.</p> <p>7. Sewerage suction:</p> <p>The two-tier fee system be reinstated with:</p> <p>7.1. Availability charge, and A fee for service for suction.</p>	

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>8. Timing of the FY 2024/2025 increases:</p> <p>The municipality must ensure that residents:</p> <p>8.1. are only charged at the FY 2024/ 2025 rates for service provided/ rendered from 1 July 2024, and</p> <p>8.2. are charged the FY2023/ 2024 rates for water and electricity used in June 2024. The practice is to charge for these services at the new rates, which is unacceptable.</p> <p>9. Permanent speed cameras</p> <p>9.1. Targets to be set to achieve the projected traffic fine income.</p> <p>9.2. Proposed that two permanent speed cameras be purchased and placed at the northern and southern entrances to town.</p> <p>10. Salary and councillors' fees</p> <p>Salaries and council fees must not exceed the CPI.</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p> <p><u>CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>9. Permanent speed cameras: Provision will be made in the 2025/2026 financial year subject to Councils' approval.</p> <p>10. Salary and Councillors' Fees: The comment is noted.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
5	Saturday, 27 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Max Hoppe	Comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional comments arising from meeting on 23 April 2024 2. Comments on the budget presentation by Mr K van Niekerk <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Average accounts – presented by the previous Acting CFO 1.2 Max Hoppe average account <hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Percentage increases 3. Further comments/ suggestions – Municipal obligations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1 Sewerage 3.2 Refuse removal <p>Operating budget income</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
6	Saturday, 27 April 2024	E-mail	Mr. Max Hoppe	Comments	<p>2024-2025 DRAFT AMENDED INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN</p> <p>1. Tourism</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Much is said about tourism in the IDP. b. An objective for all Wards states: "Improved utilisation of the Tourism InformationOffice": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This objective appears to be a non-starter as the municipality summarily cut the tourism funding at the end of 2023. • Surely for tourism to become more effective there should be sufficient funding for the tourism office to operate effectively. c. Given the amount of reliance that the PAM is placing on tourism in the IDP the withdrawal or lack of funding will be very short sighted. d. I have searched the draft budget for tourism funding but have turned up nothing. e. Please advise what the budgeted funding is for tourism and community development. 	<p><u>OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER AND CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>1.Tourism</p> <p>The Municipality has advertised a tender for professional services relating to Social, Tourism, Local Economic and Small-Scale Farmer Development for a contract period of three (3) years. The amount available for Toursim equates to R500, 000.00</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>2. Municipal offices – capital expenditure plans The proposed spending of R20 million on a new building cannot be justified in the present economic environment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. There are too many issues to fix and other priorities such as road repairs and articulated sewerage system. b. Projects of this nature can only be considered when debt levels are drastically reduced and when residents are no longer “bled” with excessive tariff increases. 	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>
					<p>3. Traffic law enforcement Stronger focus needs to be placed on traffic enforcement ito:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Increased speed trapping, b. Greater visible patrolling, c. Installation of permanent speed cameras d. Reduction of speed limits to 40 kph through town for heavy vehicles, e. Installation of a weighbridge for heavy trucks, which are damaging the roads. 	<p><u>CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>3. Traffic and Law Enforcement We take note of the response, however the comments and inputs regarding traffic and law enforcement will be taken into consideration in the upcoming financial years due to the heavy financial implications.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>4. PAIA Manual and Information Officer</p> <p>Promotion of Access to Information Manual to be implemented without further delay, as well as the appointment of an information officer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The PAM is in fact in breach of the PAI Act as it became a legal requirement to have a manual in 2021. b. This was pointed out in May 2023. It should not take this long to put a manual in place. 	<p><u>CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>4. PAIA Manual and Information Officer</p> <p>The PAIA Manual has been drafted and is accompanied by a report contextualising the nature and extend of the manual. The manual will be tabled before Council prior to the end of the current financial year.</p>
					<p>5. Communication with residents</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The PAM officials and councillors to adhere to the communication code of practice. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ongoing lack of response to communications is frustrating for residents, and • Gives the impression that officials and councillors are not interested. b. With certain communications Facebook has to my knowledge been the only source of communication. Many residents do not have Facebook accounts, so this needs to be broadened. 	<p><u>CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>5. Communication with residents</p> <p>Please see previous response under reference 4.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>6. Audit Committee</p> <p>In the interests of transparency, the credentials of the Audit Committee members should be made available to residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. It is not sufficient to state that the PAM complies with the minimum statutory requirements. b. Residents need the assurance that the right appointments have been made. c. Full disclosure is a fundamental of good governance. 	<p><u>OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL MANAGER AND CORPORATE AND COMMUNITY SERVICES:</u></p> <p>6. Audit Committee</p> <p>The appointment of Audit Committee members was conducted in terms of the relevant legislative and policy provision.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>SEWER MASTER PLAN OF PRINCE ALBERT LOCAL MUNICIPALITY Report Ref: AFR3108/01 - Date: 17 April 2023</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is noted that Erf 528 and 2812 are not included in the 'urban edge': <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. J J SENEKAL FAMILY TRUST, 1 Christina de Wit Street b. Max and Sue Hoppe, 35 Christina de Wit Street <p>Figure 3.1a: Prince Albert Potential Future Developments – map page 87</p> 2. Further noted that these properties are included in the numbers for "Flush toilet (with septic tank/conservancy)" on page 26. 3. Both properties are billed monthly for "Flush toilet (with septic tank/conservancy) - Residential. 	<p><u>TECHNICAL SERVICES:</u></p> <p>Sewer Master Plan of Prince Albert Local Municipality:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The urban edge is merely a guideline indicating approximately where an alternative Land Use commences and residential ends- and not a marker for the extent of the Proposed Sewer Reticulation Network. 2) Access to the proposed Sewer Reticulation Network and expansion of the existing system will depend on a number of Factors and costs is certainly one of the foremost, this being said there might be exclusions of even those properties located within the Urban Edge because of Topography and other factors. 3) The properties are billed in accordance with the level service they have access to.

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>4. These properties must be included in the “urban edge” as envisaged in the Figure 3.1a of thereport, so that they are included in the plans for the reticulated sewerage.</p> <p>5. At the public meeting on 23 April 2024, I got the impression that these two properties would notbe included in the plans, because of costs. Please confirm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is it the PAMs intention to exclude erfs 2812 and 538 from the sewer plans, if so b. Is it intended to retain the suction service and at what will be cost of this be, and c. In the event of the response to the above two questions being in the affirmative, please provide the all the relevant details needed for me to install a septic tank. 	<p>4) See bullet 2 above – Council Reserves the right to further expand the Urban Edge through the Spatial Development Framework</p> <p>5) (a) – No, the plans for expansion or upgrading of the Sewer Reticulation Service does not have a finalised footprint or layout and the concept is yet to be developed</p> <p>b) It is too early to in the proposed project inception to confirm this – a layout and concept design will provide much better insight into what is feasible</p> <p>c) Refer to SANS specifications</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
7	Tuesday, 30 April 2024	Hand-Delivered	Mrs. Vivienne Mennell	Input and Comment	<p>INPUT AND COMMENT ON THE LANDFILL SITES, AS RECORDED IN THE DRAFT AMENDED INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND DRAFT 2024/2025 BUDGET</p> <p>The below are highlights of the comment received. Kindly advise the document, hereby attached as an annexure for a detailed view.</p> <p>1. The Acting Chief Financial Officer, Mr. Kobus van Niekerk, advised us at the Public Meeting on 23 April 2024, that there have been no additional:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provisions made, and • Reserves set aside. <p>For the rehabilitation and closure of the Prince Albert Municipality (PAMun) landfill sites. These issues are raised in the 2025 budget document.</p> <p>How can this be?</p>	<p><u>TECHNICAL SERVICES:</u></p> <p>The issues that are raised on the letter are well noted. It should be born in mind than the issue of provision for rehabilitation of landfill site, was indeed covered for an amount of R10 000 000 on the 2023/24 budget. This provision was indeed allocated for the rehabilitation of the landfill site. With the purchase of the Front - End - Loader, the municipality has been able to extend the life expectancy of the landfill site by doing monthly compaction of the landfill site. This type of operation helps with prolonging the life expectancy and also create more airspace that is required for the landfill site.</p> <p>Again, on the 2023/24 Budget, there was a provision made for the operational activities on the landfill site. Those operations include, hauling of suitable material such as sand or top-soil in order to cover the compacted waste with 150mm of top-soil. This is done for the two sole purpose: 1) Prevent any gas that is generated from the landfill sites and prevention of fire. 2) The cover also prevents any wind blow litter that may take place in the landfill site.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK										
					<p>2. Financial Responsibility: The landfill sites are significant obligations for the municipality which should be reviewed annually.</p>	<p>Financial Responsibility:</p> <p>- The provisions calculated is determined by the Consultants appointed to conduct the airspace determination which gives an indication of the life expectancy of the site and forward projections for construction costs based on the Permit/License Capping Requirements. -Jan Palm, Landfill Closure Provisions Report June 2023.</p> <p>-The provisions set aside and fund management, the CFO and/or Expenditure Depart can provide comment on the proposals.</p>										
					<p>3. Capital Expenditure: It is both surprising and alarming that, apart from the R260K in the budget for the current financial year (Table 55, page 22), there is not capital expenditure whatsoever included in the budget for waste management for the financial years 2025 to 2027. Is this right?</p> <p>Aside from anything else, given the nature of the landfill sites, not only the closure and rehabilitation costs looming, but also the replacement expenses, particularly for Prince Albert.</p>	<p>2) Capital Expenditure: The capital expenditure for the current FY is not R260 000 only but must include the following:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>CRR: Tractor-Loader-Backhoe (TLB)</td> <td>1 000 000,00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CRR: Landfill Fire Control</td> <td>250 000,00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CRR: Landfill Site Fencing and Access Control measures</td> <td>100 000,00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CRR: Co-funding (Waste Vehicle)</td> <td>385 000,00</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MIG: Specialised Waste Vehicles (Yellowfleet)</td> <td>2 538 004,00</td> </tr> </table> <p>An additional budget of R2,173 m is planned for implementation during the FY23-24 to procure a Dumptruck as part of the Yellow Fleet.</p> <p>-The procurement of additional Yellow Fleet will be implemented during the MTREF (2024/25-2026/27) this is to improve Landfill Operations and Extend the Lifespan of the Waste Disposal Facilities (WDF's) - D8 Bulldozer to be procured.</p>	CRR: Tractor-Loader-Backhoe (TLB)	1 000 000,00	CRR: Landfill Fire Control	250 000,00	CRR: Landfill Site Fencing and Access Control measures	100 000,00	CRR: Co-funding (Waste Vehicle)	385 000,00	MIG: Specialised Waste Vehicles (Yellowfleet)	2 538 004,00
CRR: Tractor-Loader-Backhoe (TLB)	1 000 000,00															
CRR: Landfill Fire Control	250 000,00															
CRR: Landfill Site Fencing and Access Control measures	100 000,00															
CRR: Co-funding (Waste Vehicle)	385 000,00															
MIG: Specialised Waste Vehicles (Yellowfleet)	2 538 004,00															

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
						<p>The impacts of the above will extend the lifespan beyond 2025 and as a 2nd Option the funding for Consultants Fee's set aside will also consider the feasibility of increasing of the existing berm height at Prince Albert WDF to reclaim additional airspace.</p> <p>Also to note is the financial provisions made does not necessarily have to align with inflation indexes as the Municipality has 5 Years to complete the rehabilitation from the date of issue of the closure licenses and this must be accounted for in the annual increase for provisions which is usually based on CIDB Rates for the type and nature of construction activities.</p> <p>The recent Landfill Fire was a critical environmental risk and concern and council has made provision to the tune of R250 000 to address this and mitigate some of the risk also additional sand was procured from a local supplier for extra cover to try to extinguish the fire- our efforts have been on-going.</p>
					<p>4. Fire, Air Pollution and Health Hazards: Then, of course, we have the issue of the current fire still burning at the Prince Albert site. So far efforts to contain and extinguish it have clearly been unsuccessful. We were advised at the meeting that there are loans afoot to deal with the menace, hopefully it will triumph. There intentions obviously should be implemented sooner rather than later as the situation is critical. Despite the IDP (page 211) document asserting that the landfill fire has been contained, it's not the case and the reference should be suitable amended.</p>	<p>Indeed, this issue its a health risk matter. Hence, the municipality has issued a purchase order to one of the local suppliers for delivery of cover material at the landfill site. Due to some other operations of the PSP they have not yet delivered the material as per the purchase order. For any economic sense, its difficult for the municipality to cancel the current order and source other service providers that are within CKDM or close-by due to the fact that costs such as traveling and establishment will be very much higher.</p> <p>Other Concerns:</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>Other Concerns: There are other worrying concerns about the waste management process in town:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The transfer refuse sites, which were described as “a mess” at the meeting, require appropriate supervision. • In addition, there should be a concerted drive to encourage residents to reduce waste (1) through recycling (bottles, plastics, paper) and (2) by separating (a) organic waste (for composting), (b) garden refuse (for chipping and composting) and (c) building material (for fill for building sites), so encouraging reuse as well. Heartingly we were advised at the meeting that an initial plan to utilise the EPWP Workers to commence recycling was being put in place. • Finally, efforts need to be made to keep wind-blown plastic from the solid waste disposal site out of the water treatment plant, 	<p>1) A dedicated team has been established to service the Transfer Sites equipped with a tipper truck and TLB to clear bulky waste and dumping sites daily since Aug 2023.</p> <p>2) The review and updating of our 3rd Generation IWMP is underway and will aim to address the need for recycling - pro's and con's</p> <p>3) The procurement of the Yellow Fleet will aid in improving the efficiency of Wind-Blown Litter Control and Disposal Practices.</p> <p>Currently an Environmental Forum exist at District Level and Local Landfill Committee ultimately needs to be a subsidiary of this committee and the Terms of Reference developed at this level and included in the DRAFT 3rd Generation IWMP.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>Landfill Committee: As a matter of some urgency, set up a Landfill Committee. Involve the experts in the community together with the relevant municipal and provincial government officials and the recommended, trusted experts with a track record to show.</p>	<p>On the 15 May 2024, we had a meeting which was a follow-up of the 23 April 2024 public meeting. The meeting was mainly called for the detailed discussions around the ways and means to better manage the waste in our area. The writer was part of the meeting whereby the following issues were discussed:</p> <p>1) There is a company called Polyco which is willing to set up the NGO or NPO that can run the day-to-day recycling operations, and the company will assist with all the funding and required machinery. (It was resolved that most of the local personal that has expertise in waste management and background should form part of the NPO or NGO instead of establishing the Committee, this can then be operated as the business.</p> <p>2) The follow -up meeting will be called soon, in order to look at final details as well as pros and cons of establishing such NPO or NGO.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
				Input and comment	<p>INPUT AND COMMENT ON THE ERRORS CONTAINED IN THE DRAFT 2024/2025 BUDGET</p> <p>The below are highlights of the comment received. Kindly advise the document, hereby attached as an annexure for a detailed view.</p> <p>Comparison AFS 2022/23 and Budget 2024/25: It is somewhat alarming that an unchecked paper of the importance of the draft 2024/25 budget should be circulated without verification. It certainly does not foster confidence in the information presented and casts the responsible officials in a poor light. The situation should be avoided at all costs, particularly when the document contains many references about what makes a "credible budget" and how the budget circulated conforms to the principles articulated.</p> <p>Best practice: Aside from the stringent reviews to check for accuracy and completeness of reported data and information, this incorporates comparisons of expectations for (1) the current financial year to the previous audited one and (2) the budget for the year ahead to the current fiscal period, with explanations of the main causes, trends and variations identified and any exceptional items.</p>	<p>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO: The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
				Inquiries	<p>SOME QUESTIONS ON THE DRAFT 2024/25 BUDGET</p> <p>A short table of questions are attached.</p>	<p>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO: The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>
8	Thursday, 2 May 2024	E-mail	Mr. Donal Searle	Comment	<p>BUDGET 2024/2025</p> <p>1. The point of concern, that I want to raise (there are others, but not now), is the Sewerage Extraction Costs, that we are being now charged and obviously going into Infinity at this moment in time?</p> <p>These are increasing at a phenomenal yearly rate and will do so, way into the future?</p>	<p>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO: The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>2. Every year we hear the ' Same old Song. 'We are doing our best in looking at different processes to connect South End to the Waterborne Sewerage Pipeline, spending small fortunes on hiring Experienced Consultants with expertise in these matters etc, and then follows ' the Full Stop! ' But, the Blou Klip Slab in upper South End!</p> <p>So, roll on another Financial Year with increased rates. Not nice for the SE residents who just have to keep paying.</p> <p>What will we be paying in 5 years' time, the elderly, 10 years etc. we are all getting old!</p> <p>On the other hand, why should there be a rush to alleviate this Big Problem, it has become a very convenient Windfall for the Municipality? Sad!</p>	

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>3. At this Budget Meeting, a new idea was presented, which could be the solution that would be the way out of this Predicament, which was drawn up by an experienced Resident Plumber.</p> <p>Hopefully, the Powers to be, will Endeavour to follow up on this Solution as soon as possible, as it seems a very workable one. Now is the time, not in 5 years, or 10 years' time?</p> <p>They, the Municipality and Others, must be bear in mind, that there is a big down turn in the Economy which is getting worse, the rising cost of Inflation, which is never going to improve.</p> <p>So yes, many people are going to struggle with these issues as time progresses! Unless, you are super wealthy?</p>	
					<p>4. What was totally uncalled for, was the comment made by the stand in Accountant, Kobus van Niekerk, about people not being able to afford these rates in years to come; ' They must then apply for the Indigent Subsidy ' no mention at all on any solution being worked on by the Municipality for them!</p> <p>Certainly not much empathy for situations they, the Residents are not responsible for?</p>	<p><u>2024/2025 FINAL BUDGET PUBLIC INPUT AND RESPONSES THERETO:</u> The consumers highlighted and or made comments with regards to the sewerage tariff, especially the basic tariff on the sewerage suction services. All tariffs must be cost reflective as per National and Provincial Treasury Circulars issued and were submitted to all relevant stakeholders for consultation. Prince Albert municipality however decided to decrease the sewerage suction basic tariff from 12% to 8% in its Final MTREF Budget. The municipality also addressed all the</p>

REFERENCE	SUBMISSION DATE	FORMAT	STAKEHOLDER	TYPE	INPUT/INQUIRY/REQUEST	PROGRESS/FEEDBACK
					<p>5. Lastly, There are many, many single and just only couples living in PA. Who I feel are unfairly being discriminated against, by having to pay the rate, soon to be +/- R720 a month irrespective of whether they have a monthly Extraction or not. Most use this service every 2 or months! This seems unjust, charge them for a Withdrawal only, at that time! Another convenient Windfall!</p> <p>6. Residents on the Waterborne Pipeline method on pay a very small monthly rate, how nice! When we moved here to live and purchased our houses, we certainly did not have a choice regarding a Sewerage Extraction Method, we had to make do with what came with the House.</p> <p>Your comments will be appreciated, and especially what arrangements are going to be made regarding this Rate Payment?</p>	<p>inputs made by the public on the Draft Budget, and correct in the Final MTREF Budget for 2024/2025 financial year.</p>