

**To:** idp@mosselbay.gov.za; 'admin'; zmpumela@mosselbay.gov.za; vbasson@mosselbay.gov.za; admin@mgev.co.za  
**Subject:** Formal Objection to the IDP and Budget Meetings of September 2025

**To:** The Municipal Manager

**Dear Mr C Puren,**

I hereby submit this formal objection to the Integrated Development Plan (IDP) and Budget Meeting held on 15 September 2025, on the grounds of non-compliance with statutory public participation requirements and fiscal prudence as prescribed by South African law and policy.

### **1. Inadequate Public Participation – Walk-In Session Not Sufficient**

The use of a walk-in session as the primary method of public engagement is inadequate and fails to meet the standards set out in the **Local Government: Municipal Systems Act 32 of 2000**, particularly:

- **Section 16(1)(a):** Municipalities must develop a culture of municipal governance that complements formal representative government with a system of participatory governance.
- **Section 17(2)(a):** Participation mechanisms must include public meetings and hearings, consultative sessions with locally recognized community organizations, and other appropriate mechanisms.

A walk-in session, without structured facilitation, prior notice, or meaningful engagement, does not satisfy the legal requirement for inclusive and effective participation.

### **2. Late Provision of Documents – Violation of Procedural Requirements**

The documents under discussion were not made available at least 14 days prior to the meeting, which contravenes the principles of transparency and informed participation. According to:

- **Section 21(1)(b) of the Municipal Finance Management Act (MFMA) 56 of 2003:** The municipality must make public the annual budget and supporting documentation at least 14 days before the council meeting at which the budget is to be considered.
- **Section 29 of the Municipal Systems Act:** The process must include mechanisms for consultation and participation, which presupposes timely access to relevant documents.

Providing documents at the start of the meeting undermines the public's ability to engage meaningfully.

### **3. Excessive Rates Increase – Disregard for Inflation and Treasury Guidelines**

The proposed rates increase for the 2025/26 financial year exceeds 2.5 times the current inflation rate and more than double the National Treasury's recommended ceiling. This is inconsistent with:

- **MFMA Circular No. 129 (December 2024):** Municipalities are advised to align tariff increases with the inflation target range of **3–6%**, with a preferred midpoint of **4.5%**.
- **Statement of the Monetary Policy Committee (July 2025):** Inflation is currently at **3%**, and Treasury has emphasized the need for fiscal restraint and affordability.

Such disproportionate increases place undue financial pressure on residents and contradict the principles of equitable service delivery.

#### **4. Lack of Capital Improvement Details – Breach of Planning Standards**

The absence of detailed capital improvement plans violates the requirement for transparency and accountability in municipal planning. According to:

- **Section 26(h) of the Municipal Systems Act:** The IDP must include a financial plan, which encompasses capital investment strategies.
- **MFMA Section 17(2)(d):** The budget must be accompanied by detailed information on capital projects, including location, cost, and implementation timelines.

Without these details, the public cannot assess the value or feasibility of proposed expenditures.

**Conclusion** I respectfully request that the Mossel Bay Municipality revisit the IDP and Budget process to ensure full compliance with legal obligations and meaningful public participation. I further request that revised documentation be made available and that a properly facilitated public hearing be scheduled.

Yours sincerely,

Annalie Clarke

2 Sekretarisvoëlstraat, Monte Christo

083 543 9689

16 September 2025