



Minutes of Meeting: MSCID 2nd Public Meeting

Meeting Details:

- **Meeting Type:** Public Meeting
- **Date:** 3 December 2025
- **Time:** 6:30 pm
- **Location:** The Lookout, Promenade Road, Muizenberg
- **Total Attendance:** Approximately 40 people (Committee, Observers, and Residents as per attendance register)

Attendees:

- **Committee:** Demetri Qually (Chair), Nicci Thompson Evans, Carrie Hampton, Karen Hart, Charles Whaley
- **Apologies:** Trevor Le Roux, Ulf Martz
- **Observers/Chair:** Boudje Giljam (Chairing), Peter Weir (Eastlake Island CID observer),
- **City of Cape Town:** Marsha van der Poel (Head of CIDs, City of Cape Town)
- **Residents:** 40 residents signed the attendance register

1. Welcome and Introduction

Boudje Giljam introduced himself and the committee and outlined the meeting procedure.

2. Presentation of Agenda

Demetri Qually presented the agenda and accompanying PowerPoint slides, explaining each section.

3. Questions and Comments from the Floor

Boundaries and Property Values:

- A resident from Cannon Island Way (CIW) stated local property values were significantly higher than the range mentioned in the presentation. Demetri Qually responded that a wide variety of values exist within the CID area.
- Concerns were raised by regarding the clarity and arbitrary nature of the proposed boundaries, some of which seemed to include waterways.
- There were questions as to why properties on the east side of Eastlake Drive were not included.
- **Clarification:** Boudje Giljam and Marsha van der Poel clarified that the CID only covers the terrestrial area (not the water reserve/waterways) and that boundaries must be contiguous. The other two CIDs in Marina da Gama; Park Island and Eastlake Island both showed their map boundary crossing the water and that inclusive boundaries (even across water on maps) was not disputed. The waterway is not part of the CID management. Boudje Giljam noted had not been an issue in other CIDs and is not something that should be of concern
- **Clarification:** The Eastlake Drive question was explained at the first meeting and again during today's power point presentation. The boundaries have been drawn and approved by the City. Perhaps in due course we might have one CID for the whole Marina but the boundaries that are being proposed are the ones designated for MSCID. Boudje explained how it worked on Park Island, where areas that were not part of, or had not paid for security in the past, were not included. The same has been done in Marina South by not including the east side of Eastlake Drive, whose properties are mainly commercial, with some gated streets and very few residential houses. The intention is to convert existing security groups to a CID, following the precedent of both Park Island and Eastlake Island, rather than adding additional areas that may jeopardise the process.

Security and Funding Model

- Residents (Kim Abrahams, Andrea Chishom, Kevin Briggs) expressed concerns about the effectiveness of the reactive security and camera placement, and questioned the necessity of paying extra rates when City services already exist. Mr Abrahams asserted that Demetri/the Committee have already made all the decisions.
- **Clarification:** Marsha van der Poel explained the difference between the CID and the City responsibilities. The City collects the money so that it can be spent in the CID area according to the approved Budget. The infrastructure of the City is not part of the CID. She said that the opinion of Mr Abrahams is not the sentiment of the whole of the residents of the CID and that this is not the platform for him to derail the intentions of the CID.

Peter Weir attested to the benefits of guaranteed CID funding for security over volunteer-run systems, highlighting that CIDs provide guaranteed funding for services the City of Cape Town cannot provide. He noted that the formation of a CID was future proofing the area's safety and property values by providing a sustainable funding model for security that doesn't rely on volunteer fundraising, which will "fall apart" under the current model of raising funds.

Decision Making, Voting and Rates:

- Mr Abrahams and Mr Bruk expressed the sentiment that the decision to form a CID had been pre-made by the committee. Mr Abrahams said he would like to suggest an alternative to the

proposal, i.e. a ratepayers association. There were general requests from the floor and Chair for Mr Abrahams and Mr Bruk to stop trying to take over the meeting with their agendas that they repeatedly voiced and had already been addressed.

- Ms Tutu and Kevin Briggs questioned why the contribution was based on property valuation rather than a flat rate.
- **Clarification:** Marsha van der Poel and Demetri Qually refuted that any decision has been made. Demetri said this has been a long process and we still accept comments. Nothing has been decided already, that is why there is a consent or objection process. Marsha stressed the importance of the consent and objection process and that 60% community vote was required for establishment of the CID. If the 60% is gained the CID will be formed.
- **Clarification:** Boudje Giljam stated that the City Council rules mandate contributions based on rateable value, as with all property rates. Marsha van der Poel confirmed it is one vote per property, not a proportional vote based on value. If the community votes by 60% that they want the CID, it will go forward.
- **Clarification:** Demetri Qually confirmed that people receiving rebates on City rates such as indigent persons or pensioners who have been approved for rebates, will not pay the CID levy and as per the rules set down by the City, do not have a vote in the formation of a CID.

Process and Conduct:

- Judian Bruk criticized the public participation process and the map across water boundaries, and requested an apology for perceived disregard of his comments.
- Dr. Jennifer, a resident of Uitsig, became unintelligible when she took the microphone. Her young son then stole the microphone and ran wild outside shouting into it. They completely disrupted the meeting and were asked to leave and escorted out.
- Dee van Breda made apologies and left the meeting, expressing frustration at the meeting being "derailed" by people with their own agenda.
- **Clarification:** It was pointed out that the boundary issue and public participation process had been addressed and Mr Bruk was repeating himself and making it more difficult for other people to have their say.

4. Benefits of a CID

- Cilla Lowen requested an overview of benefits in other CIDs. Boudje Giljam and Peter Weir provided examples of improved security funding, stability and enhanced relationships with the City Council.
- Peter Weir offered a personal summary of the benefits of CIDs based on his experience as a Steering Committee Member for Eastlake Island CID, pointing out some extra benefits to those already mentioned:
 - **Community Building:** CIDs help bring residents together with a sense of community. The CID can foster a productive relationship with the City Council, leading to improved area efficiency.

- **Security Effectiveness:** While cameras monitor public roads (not private properties), they serve both reactive and proactive roles. He cited an incident where prompt monitoring prevented recent aggressive incident on Eastlake Island.
- **Value Proposition:** He argued that the cost (R350-R400pcm) is reasonable compared to private security fees of someone he knows who is paying R800+per month.
- Boudje Giljam noted that while 60% consent is needed to establish a CID, only 50% is needed to cancel it, but no CID in Cape Town has ever been cancelled by its residents.

Meeting ended 20:00.
