



**CITY OF CAPE TOWN'S PUBLIC INFORMATION PROCESS:
 THE POINT-KALK BAY REHABILITATION OF THE PARKING AND
 RECREATION AREA**

KEY NOTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

29 May 2017

VENUE: Holy Trinity Anglican Church Hall, Main Road, Kalk Bay

TIME: 17h30 – 19h00

FACILITATOR: Sadia Chand, Chand Environmental Consultants

1. ATTENDEES

PROJECT TEAM		
FULL NAME	INITIAL	ORGANISATION
Mark Doubell	MD	City of Cape Town: Transport and Urban Development Authority
Paul Booth	PB	City of Cape Town: Transport and Urban Development Authority
Andrew Rush	AR	Kayad Knight Piesold (Pty) Ltd
Ancunel Steyn	AS	City of Cape Town
Ernst Daneel Du Toit	EDT	City of Cape Town
Sadia Chand	SC	Chand Environmental Consultants (Facilitator)
Dwayne Miller	DM	Chand Environmental Consultants (Public Liaison Officer)
Mellissa Mc James	MM	Chand Environmental Consultants (Admin Assistant)
Maura Talbot	MT	Chand Environmental Consultants (Environmental Practitioner)
KEY INTERESTED & AFFECTED PARTIES		
FULL NAME	INITIAL	ORGANISATION
Barbara Bruce	BB	Resident
Alex Bassios	AB	Resident
James McDaid	JMD	Fish Hoek Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association
Jack Cullinan	JC	Kalk Bay Business Association
Audrey Rademeyer	AR	Kalk Bay Books
Selena Arendse	SA	Resident
Iris Gomez	IG	Resident
Stephen Grant	SG	Resident
M Howie	MH	Resident
D Whitfield	DW	Resident

Jody Paterson	JP	Resident
Ann Donald	AD	Resident
Revel Donald	RD	Resident
Helen O'Regan	HO'R	Fish Hoek Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association
Miranda Wannenburg	MW	Change Matters
Tony Trimmel	TT	Kalk Bay & St James Ratepayers Association
Richard Lowndes	RL	Resident
Lewis Walter	LW	Resident
Jim Russell	JR	Chairman, Kalk Bay St James SRA
Annabell Cowan	AC	Resident
Barrie Gasson	BG	Resident
Derek Stuart-Findlay	DSF	Kalk Bay Historical Association
Rae Anderson	RA	Resident

2. APOLOGIES

No apologies

3. OTHERS INVITED

The full list of registered I&APs invited to this meeting is available from Chand Environmental Consultants upon request.

4. INTRODUCTION

SC welcomed everyone to the public meeting and introduced the project team.

SC explained that her role as facilitator was to ensure that everyone had an opportunity to speak. SC noted that it is important to disseminate relevant information to the appropriate parties of interest that was not present at the meeting.

SC reminded attendees that the Public Participation Process (PPP) for a Basic Assessment is a legislated process however the team deemed it necessary to include additional interaction such as this Public Meeting to encourage community input into the design.

5. THE PRESENTATION

SC outlined the agenda as follows:

- Applicant and Project Team (Sadia Chand)
- Key Aims of the Meeting
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Legislative Requirements
- Overview of Basic Assessment Requirements
- Specialist Input
- Public Participation Process
- The Locality (Paul Booth)
- Background
- Key Considerations
- Design Options

- Aerial Photograph December 2013
- Proposed Concept Layouts
- Basic Assessment Time line (Sadia Chand)
- Discussion

6. KEY AIMS OF THE MEETING

- To share information on the conceptual design and amendments thereof.
- To give you, as the Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) , an opportunity to interact with the project team and to share your thoughts and concerns.
- To provide the project team with feedback to consider in order to amend the proposal.
- The Public Participation Process (PPP)
 - Is in accordance with the proposed Basic and Heritage processes, required for any proposal on the site.
 - Is undertaken in recognition of issues identified by the project team, and optimising the concept proposal in conjunction with local knowledge, and the surrounding community.

7. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

YOUR ROLE AS A KEY STAKEHOLDER

- Listen to the information presented.
- Ask for clarification where necessary.
- Give meaningful comment (concerns or opportunity) in a focused and succinct manner.
- Disseminate the correct information to members of your organisation.

ROLE AS FACILITATOR

- To keep discussion focused on the key aims.
- To ensure that everyone is given a fair opportunity to speak.
- To assist in clarifying issues/comments.

8. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The proposed project requires environmental authorisation from the relevant authority in terms of section 24 (5) of the National Environmental Management Act 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA), as amended. The relevant authority in this case is the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (D:EA&DP).

Activities that may have an impact on the environment are listed in various Government Notices published under NEMA. The listed activities that pertain to the proposed project will be finally determined when the official application is lodged with the D:EA&DP, however at the moment, it is understood that it will, as a minimum, trigger the following listed activities:

GN R983 Listing Notice 1, Activity 19

The **infilling** or depositing of any material of more than **5 cubic metres** into, or the dredging, excavation, removal or **moving of soil, sand, shells, shell grit, pebbles or rock** from

- (iii) the littoral active zone, an estuary or a distance of **100 metres inland of the high-water mark of the sea** or an estuary, whichever distance is the greater-
but excluding where such infilling, depositing, dredging, excavation, removal or moving
- a) will occur behind a development setback.
 - b) is for maintenance purposes undertaken in accordance with a management plan; or
 - c) falls within the ambit of activity 21 of this Notice, in which case that activity applies.

GN R985 Listing Notice 3, Activity 15

The transformation of land **bigger than 1000 square metres** in size to residential, retail, commercial, industrial or institutional use, where, such land was **zoned open space**, conservation, or had an equivalent zoning, on or after 02 August 2010

(c) in Western Cape:

i. Outside urban areas, or

ii. **Inside urban areas** in:

(aa) Areas **zoned for conservation use or equivalent zoning**, on or after 02 August 2010;

(bb) A protected area identified in terms of NEMPAA, excluding conservancies; or

(cc) Sensitive areas as identified in an environmental management framework as contemplated in chapter 5 of the Act as adopted by the competent authority.

A **Basic Assessment process** will be required to obtain the necessary environmental authorisation. Note that the possibility of a setback line application cannot be explored as only one of the listed activities provides for such an exclusion.

The proposal also requires comment from the heritage authorities in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act No. 25 of 1999. This will be undertaken by a specialist as part of the environmental process.

9. BACKGROUND

PB stated that since the start of the Main Road Upgrade Project, the Project Team has had persistent requests to solve the parking problems of the “Dust Bowl” as the Point is known. A Landscape Architect has advised on hard and soft landscaping for the rehabilitation of The Point Parking and Recreational area. The area has great scenic value and would have great potential for ad hoc community events and fairs.

Various concepts were discussed and conceptualised with 2 alternatives being provided for the proposed development namely Revision 4 and Revision 5. Once the Basic Assessment Process has been completed an estimate of costs will need to be done. Should funding be found and project approved, construction should ideally begin before the summer holiday season depending on the process it should only start in 2018.

PB informed attendees that should there be any fundamental objections to the proposals the project could be put on hold as no commitments have been made.

10. KEY CONSIDERATIONS

PB explained that the main problem that is experienced at The Point is parking and traffic congestion. The problem stems from the lack of formal parking at the “Dust Bowl” which creates queues and the queues create immense traffic congestion in the Main Road. The lack of sufficient queueing, formal parking areas and a parking entrance which limits manoeuvrability in and out of the parking lot are considered to be the main culprits to the traffic congestion in Main Road.

PB further explained the design alternatives for The Point. Both design alternatives offer a formal parking area with 20% more parking capacity along with a clear circulation which will be able to hold 111 parking bays and capacity to hold up to 35 cars in queue. Both alternatives offer a wider more formalised entrance which will allow more cars to enter and leave without specifically creating traffic congestion in Main Road.

PB stated that the only difference between the 2 alternatives is the intervention in the recreational area where revision 5 has considerably less hard paved areas. Other design options include a stop sign at the exit of the harbour along with the painting of a keep clear box at the parking entrance to allow for traffic to flow out of the harbour and avoid queueing.

11. BASIC ASSESSMENT TIMELINE

- Submission of application – beginning June 2017
- Public Review Period – 30 days from mid June and mid July 2017
- Submit final Basic Assessment Report – August 2017
- Authority Decision within 107 days
- Appeal Period follows the Environmental Authorisation

12. DISCUSSION

		COMMENTS		RESPONSE
1.	Commenting Party	At which location was the person standing that undertook the count of cars in and out of the parking lot?	PB	The count was undertaken with the total number of vehicles entering crossing the boom.
2.	Commenting Party	Will the parking lot be managed by a specific security company?	PB	It is not a decision that the City of Cape Town can make at this stage. However, proceeds need to be incorporated back into the community.
3.	Commenting Party	The general cleaning of the proposed development, will the City take care of it?	PB	No, the community will have to take care of it. The City will only construct the development.
4.	Commenting Party	The whole point of this is to improve flow and circulation of the cars in the area, the only missing link is which entity is going to control the area.	PB	Yes, we are aware that a decision will need to be taken on the operation of the area. At Jubilee Square in Simons Town the parking is run by the community and is working very well. Maybe we could implement a similar system for management of the parking lot.
5.	Commenting Party	What we need is more control of traffic and car movement at the entrance of the harbour from Main Road. Can we look at closing the queueing lane on Main Road so that there is no queueing lane? Or even a traffic sign that will notify drivers that the parking lot is full and there will be no queueing allowed on Main Road.	PB	Noted, this will be discussed with the Project Team.
6.	Commenting Party	Are you going to provide services to park bicycles?	PB	That is a good recommendation which we need to incorporate into the design.
7.	Commenting Party	How does the Harbour wall fit in with this proposal?	PB	The harbour wall will be subject to a Heritage Assessment before further decisions can be made.
8.	Commenting Party	What are the differences between Revisions 4 and 5?	PB	Revision 4 has more hard paved area which can be used as overflow parking area when required. The hard paved area could also be used for fairs, markets and events. Revision 5 has much less paved area contributing to a more natural feel. The unpaved area will be landscaped and indigenous "water wise" plants will be introduced. The green area below the parking lot will have benches and pathways.
9.	Commenting Party	Could you provide both Revisions 4 and 5 to the community, so that we can study it at our leisure?	PB	Yes, we will provide Revisions 4 and 5 to the I&APs.

10.	Commenting Party	Over the past 25 years there has been a number of Public Participation Meetings regarding The Point Kalk Bay, the discussion at that stage was that The Point would be one third green space, one third parking and the last third for economic development for the local community. Our main goal is to upgrade the area and further we want economic opportunities for the local community.	SC	Thank you, yes this will be noted and conveyed to the Project Team.
11.	Commenting Party	Is this the least development intervention at this point in time?	PB	Yes, the parking area would be able to be changed if the need arises. If one would like to put a commercial structure or development in the parking lots space, it would be possible to develop there since there are no existing structures that need removal.
12.	Commenting Party	I strongly recommend revision 5 due to the chaos that can arise at the parking lot. The development will be more manageable if you limit the amount of paved area.	SC	Noted thank you. It seems a balance will need to be struck between providing community facilities and restricting the "chaos" that might ensue from additional paved areas.
13.	Commenting Party	An idea for direct access to the harbour would be to construct a bridge over the wall into the harbour. In this way you can avoid tearing down the harbour wall. Just a piece of infrastructure that looks attractive, gives value and avoids the need for a HIA.	PB	Yes, it will be considered.
14.	Commenting Party	We do require management of the parking lot. What if a person has to pay for parking while looking for parking?	PB	Yes, it ties back to the management of the parking lot. If there is a person controlling it they will know how many parking bays are open and won't charge someone if they didn't utilise the parking.
15.	Commenting Party	The development is within the 100m high water mark, will this affect the process?	PB	Yes, that is the reason why we are doing the Basic Assessment Process because the activity triggered that specific listed activity.

13. CONCLUSION

SC thanked the team and everyone present for their attendance and valuable inputs and concluded the meeting at 19h05.