



SUPER ESTATE UPDATE – 18 MARCH 2024

Dear Neighbours,

I'm reaching out to you not with fancy words, but heart to heart, hoping to connect with each of you as a fellow homeowner. I'm deeply involved in the ongoing Super Estate discussions, and although I'll try to keep emotions at bay, the truth is, this situation has been incredibly tough for us all.

It's hard to wrap our heads around where we currently stand, especially with VDV insisting on a "One HOA or nothing" approach. They claim to be looking out for their community's best interests, but their unwillingness to explore any middle ground is baffling.

Nico and I, on behalf of the trustees, have always been open to the One HOA idea, as long as it serves the best interest of all homeowners, both here and in VDV. Our stance has been clear from the start: the Super Estate concept is paramount. If we can't agree on One HOA terms, we must consider other options, like a Two HOA setup with optional services. However, our attempts at negotiation have felt more like facing ultimatums rather than engaging in genuine dialogue.

Let me provide some background:

Last November, we shared some initial thoughts with you, emphasising that these were proposals, not set decisions. Unfortunately, the VDV side has repeatedly presented these as if they were agreed upon, ignoring the fact that any decision requires your input. They've managed to intertwine the concepts of "One HOA" and "Super Estate," as though they're the same, which simply isn't true.

After our town hall meeting, where 64% supported further exploration of the Super Estate (and not the required 66,67% needed to get a SGM vote passed), many of you shared concerns about the financials and how decisions would affect our community in the long run. This feedback was crucial as we continued discussions, highlighting the importance of clear, transparent information. Many homeowners approached us with a very clear message: "we voted YES now because of what you've managed to get right on PVHOA so far but will change that vote to a NO at the SGM if you do not get these current T&Cs to be fair and equitable to both parties".

When we brought these concerns to the table, however, the VDV developer's dominance in the discussions was disconcerting. The refusal to consider any form of backup plan, should negotiations falter, was particularly troubling. It seemed our efforts to find a solution that benefits everyone were being dismissed out of hand.

The situation escalated when the developer insisted on "One HOA or nothing," claiming the right to block any vote. This stance caused Nico and me to seriously question the intentions and integrity of the discussions we were having with the VDV homeowner trustees.

In November, prior to our town hall, we had agreed with the VDV trustees to thoroughly investigate the financial implications, especially the R700 levy difference, so it's puzzling that VDV now views our continued due diligence as a deviation. Our only aim has been to ensure that whatever decision is made, it's one that you, the homeowners, can feel confident and comfortable with.

The frustration I feel is immense, as logic seems to have left the room. We need to understand what exactly VDV's trustees are objecting to. Their drafted resolutions suggest concerns over road and facility usage, yet there's no factual basis to the claim that we're unfairly burdening them. Moreover, their refusal to even consider charging for the use of their amenities suggests there's more at play.

Additionally, in examining our security expenses, it's clear that any argument about VDV subsidising PV falls flat. Our analysis shows that not only can we manage our security costs efficiently, but if anything, we're helping to shoulder the estate's overall security burden. A very simple illustration can be found [HERE](#).

Lastly, the claim that our community overuses VDV's facilities doesn't hold up against the actual usage data. The numbers simply don't support their narrative. We have finally managed to get the last 13 months of boom access stats, and the data paints a very different picture than the narrative that has been told.

Particularly, over the 13 months:

- VDV entering PV = 206,974 times,
- PV entering VDV = 230,505 times,
- 47% to 53%, and not exactly in alignment with the “overuse by PV on VDV roads and facilities”
- Further data can be viewed [HERE](#).

Obviously, with the way VDV have worded their resolutions for the SGM, and the fact that they've only given their members two options, we will not be surprised if they get a majority vote for Resolution 1, even without the developer using their bulk vote.

We wish to thank the Pearl Valley members for their continued support and understanding during this process. We appreciate the many messages of support received and we are confident that we enjoy a strong mandate from members in respect of the approach that we have taken.

We must now wait for VDV to hold their SGM and look forward to hearing from them further in due course.

Warm regards,
Justin Willard,
Chairman of the Pearl Valley HOA

Pearl Valley Golf & Country Estate, R301, Wemmershoek Road, Paarl, Cape Town, South Africa 7646,
South Africa, 0218678000

[Unsubscribe](#) [Manage preferences](#)