



IMPORTANT INFORMATION TO BE READ PRIOR TO COMPLETING THIS APPEAL FORM:

1. This appeal form must be submitted –
 - a. within **20 calendar days** from the date that the decision is sent by the decision-maker, or, where applicable, by the applicant to registered interested and affected parties; or
 - b. within **30 calendar days** from the date that the decision is received, where an appeal is submitted against a Directive in terms of section 43(8) of the *National Environmental Management Act, 1998*.
2. The appellant must submit the appeal –
 - a. to the appeal administrator;
 - b. to the applicant, where the appellant is not the applicant; and
 - c. where applicable, to any registered interested and affected party where the appellant is the applicant.
3. An appeal submitted must –
 - a. be in writing;
 - b. be on this form;
 - c. include supporting documentation, which is referred to in the appeal; and
 - d. include proof of payment of a non-refundable appeal fee, if prescribed.
4. An applicant must –
 - a. notify, and make a copy of the appeal available to, registered interested and affected parties where applicable, and to affected organs of state, within 5 calendar days of the expiry of the 20-day appeal period; and
 - b. submit proof of the notification to the appeal administrator within 5 calendar days of sending the last notification.
5. The applicant, where applicable, the decision maker and the registered interested and affected party or affected organs of state may within 20 calendar days from the date of receipt of the appeal, submit, in the form obtainable from the Department’s website a statement responding to an appeal, to the appeal administrator and to the appellant/s.
6. This form is current as of **APRIL 2026**.
7. The required information must be inserted within the spaces provided in the form. The sizes of the spaces provided are not necessarily indicative of the amount of information to be provided. The spaces may be expanded where necessary.
8. Unless protected by law, all information contained in, and attached to this form, will become public information on receipt by the Department.
9. A digital copy of this form may be obtained from the Department’s website at <https://www.westerncape.gov.za/eadp/environmental-governance>, or <https://www.westerncape.gov.za/eadp/service/processing-environmental-and-planning-appeals>.
10. The Appeal Form must be duly dated and originally signed (electronic signature is also accepted) by the Appellant and must be submitted to the Appeal Administrator at the details provided below.

Decision being appealed:

1. **Reference Number of the Decision being appealed:** 16/3/3/1/A1/18/3048/25

2. Type of Decision being appealed:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Authorisation	24G Administrative Fine	Amendment of Environmental Authorisation	Amendment of Environmental Management Programme	Waste Management Licence	Variation of a Waste Management Licence	Atmospheric Emission Licence
Exemption Notice	Environmental Conservation Act: Outeniqua Sensitive Coastal Arcas Permit	Directive	Coastal Protection Notice	Coastal Removal Notice	Other	

3. **Brief description of the Decision:** Environmental Authorisation granted for the proposed Milnerton Lagoon dredging intervention, including the dredging and placement / shaping of dredged material within the lagoon system.

4. **Date of the Decision:** 15 May 2026

5. **Date of the Notification of the Decision:** 18 May 2026

Appellant's Information:

Name: [insert full name of resident submitting this appeal]

Address: [insert your Woodbridge Island / affected property address]

FREDA MYRTLE TUCKER

103 WINTON CRESCENT, WOODBRIDGE ISLAND
MILNERTON 7441

Telephone number: [insert, or write N/A] —

Cell phone number: [insert cell number]

Email address: [insert email address]

0824116549

freda.m.tucker@gmail.com

Grounds of Appeal (to be completed on this document)

TEMPLATE NOTE TO RESIDENT: Please personalise this appeal before submitting it. Replace the square-bracket sections with your own details and remove any paragraph that does not apply to you. This is not a petition. Each resident must submit their own appeal in their own name and from their own perspective.

1. Procedural Ground: Inadequate public participation and lack of meaningful direct notice to affected residents

I appeal on the basis that the public participation process did not adequately reach, inform or meaningfully engage all directly affected residents, occupiers and stakeholders living alongside the Milnerton Lagoon and Woodbridge Island lagoon edge.

I am a resident / owner / occupier / directly affected person at [insert address or area], and I am directly affected by the lagoon, its pollution, flooding behaviour, odour, visual condition and any physical intervention that changes the lagoon bed, banks, side slopes or water behaviour.

My concern is that many residents only became aware of the Environmental Authorisation and appeal deadline after a resident-led message was circulated. This suggests that the formal public participation process may not have meaningfully reached the people living closest to the affected lagoon edge.

Woodbridge Island is not an ordinary residential area. It is an island community surrounded by the ocean on one side and the lagoon on the other, with only one vehicle access road and one bridge connecting residents to the mainland. Any intervention that may alter the lagoon bed, water behaviour, flood risk or emergency access implications should therefore have been communicated directly, clearly and meaningfully to residents who live with that risk every day.

I submit that the public participation process should be re-opened or repeated with direct, targeted notification to affected residents, occupiers, owners, tenants, local businesses and community structures, using plain-language material and proper visual explanation of what is proposed.

2. Substantive Ground: The authorised intervention appears to go beyond dredging and may alter the lagoon form and water-holding behaviour in front of homes

I am not appealing because I oppose the urgent need to clean and rehabilitate the Milnerton Lagoon. The lagoon clearly needs proper remediation. My concern is that the authorised intervention appears to go beyond dredging and removal by allowing dredged material to be placed, spread or shaped within the lagoon system.

From a resident perspective, this is a material difference. Many people understood the project as dredging and removal of polluted material. If the authorised works will instead place and shape dredged material within the lagoon, this may alter the lagoon bed, side slopes, exposed banks, water-holding capacity, visual character and flood behaviour immediately in front of residential homes.

This should have been explained in clear, simple language before authorisation was granted. Affected residents should have been shown proper before-and-after visual simulations from residential viewpoints and public viewpoints so they could understand what the lagoon edge may look like after the works.

I submit that the appeal authority should require clear visual material, plain-language explanation and further public participation before any implementation takes place.

3. Substantive Ground: Flood-risk, evacuation and emergency-access implications for Woodbridge Island have not been adequately addressed

I appeal on the basis that the authorisation does not adequately address the potential flood-risk implications for Woodbridge Island and other lagoon-facing residents.

During the recent severe Cape Town storm in May 2026, residents observed the lagoon rising significantly and water approaching or affecting lawn areas and low-lying areas near homes. This demonstrated that the lagoon edge is sensitive and that flood risk is not theoretical for residents living here.

Because Woodbridge Island has only one vehicle access road and one bridge, any increase or alteration in flood risk has consequences for evacuation, emergency services, elderly residents, families, pets, visitors and general safety.

I submit that updated flood-risk modelling is required before implementation. This modelling should consider recent storm conditions, high rainfall, stormwater inflow, tidal exchange, wind conditions, sediment placement, future maintenance dredging, sea-level conditions and emergency-access implications for the island.

No physical works should commence until residents have been shown how the authorised intervention may affect flood behaviour and what recourse exists if flooding, damp, erosion, structural damage, loss of amenity or loss of property value occurs.

4. Substantive Ground: Sediment, pollution, odour, health and visual impacts require further assessment and explanation

I appeal on the basis that further sediment, pollution, odour, health-and-safety and visual-impact assessment is required before the authorised works proceed.

The material in the lagoon is experienced by residents as dark, foul-smelling and polluted sediment that has accumulated over time. If this material is disturbed, moved, placed, shaped or left exposed within the lagoon system near homes, public areas, hotels, recreational users and local businesses, residents are entitled to clear information about its content, safety and long-term management.

The appeal authority should require further sediment testing, health-and-safety assessment, odour assessment and clear handling / placement protocols. Residents should also be told whether exposed or reshaped banks may create visual degradation, odour impacts or ongoing maintenance problems.

The Milnerton Lagoon, Woodbridge Island, palm trees and Table Mountain backdrop form part of a highly visible and iconic Cape Town landscape. The visual, amenity, tourism and local economic impacts of changing this water body should be properly assessed and disclosed before implementation.

5. Relief Requested: The authorisation should be set aside, suspended or varied pending further studies and proper public participation

For the reasons above, I respectfully request that the appeal authority uphold this appeal and set aside the Environmental Authorisation, alternatively suspend or vary it so that no works commence until further public participation, updated specialist assessment and clear accountability measures are completed.

At a minimum, I request that the following be required before implementation:

- renewed direct public participation with affected residents, occupiers, owners, local businesses and community structures;
- proper plain-language explanation of what material will be removed, what material will be placed or shaped, and what the final lagoon edge will look like;
- official before-and-after visual simulations from key residential and public viewpoints;
- updated flood-risk and storm-modelling, including recent May 2026 storm conditions;
- modelling of future storm events that could rearrange, undo or materially alter the channel or sediment placement;
- updated sediment, pollution, odour and health-and-safety testing;
- assessment of Woodbridge Island evacuation and emergency-access risk;

This appeal is not an objection to proper lagoon rehabilitation. It is an appeal for a safe, transparent, evidence-based and properly explained solution that protects both the lagoon and the people who live directly beside it.

Note:

- You are also requested to submit an electronic copy (Microsoft Word format) of the appeal and any supporting documents.
- The grounds of appeal and the facts upon which they rest must be clearly set out. The grounds of appeal must be formulated as averments and not as questions about the project (refrain from material or remarks which do not contribute towards the merits of the appeal).
- Make a particular issue the subject of a separate ground of appeal, avoiding overlaps as far as possible. Issues should be grouped logically and in a chronological order to provide the Provincial Minister with clear timelines of the events or facts in dispute.
- A recommended way of arranging issues is to divide the grounds of appeal into procedural grounds, (for example inadequate public participation) and substantive grounds (why the decision is seen as wrong).
- Before submitting the appeal, it is recommended that appellants familiarise themselves with the mandate of the department to avoid raising matters falling outside the competence of the Provincial Minister on appeal.

Please include any supporting documentation which is referred to in the appeal.

Resident checklist before sending:

1. Replace all square-bracket placeholders with your own details.
2. Personalise the grounds so they reflect your own lived experience and concerns.
3. Attach any photographs, screenshots, correspondence or evidence you refer to.
4. Sign and date the form. An electronic signature is accepted by the form.
5. Submit the appeal to DEADP.Appeals@westerncape.gov.za and to the City of Cape Town as applicant / holder of the authorisation before the deadline.
6. Keep proof of sending and any acknowledgement received.

Submission address:

This appeal must be submitted to the Appeal Administrator at either of the addresses listed below:

By hand: Attention: Mr Marius Venter (Tel: 021-483 3721)

Room 809, 8th floor Utilitas Building

1 Dorp Street, Cape Town, 8000; or

By e-mail: DEADP.Appeals@westerncape.gov.za



Appellant's signature

25-05-2026

Date

www.westerncape.gov.za
Private Bag X9186, Cape Town, 8000.

