



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

### KEY NOTES OF FOCUS GROUP MEETING

29 May 2017

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

**TIME:** 19h30 – 20h30

**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
Aziza Davids	AD	Kalk Bay Fishing Community: Body Corp
Madnie Davids	MD	
Alison Delacruz	AD	
Zaahieda Cozyn	ZC	
May Sasman	MS	
Mymoena Poggenpoel	MP	

#### 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) is a legislated process however the team deemed it necessary to include additional interaction with registered interested and affected parties (I&APs).

### 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
- Discussion (Sadia Chand)

### 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 or to cease all further proposals.
- The Public Participation Process (PPP)
  - Is in accordance with the proposed Basic and Heritage processes, required for any proposal on the site.

2.

- 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 was 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 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 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 – end June
- Public Review Period – 30 days from end July and August 2017
- Submit final Basic Assessment Report – Mid Oct 2017

4.

- Authority Decision by end Feb 2018 (107 days)
- Appeal Period – March 2018

## 12. DISCUSSION

		COMMENTS		RESPONSE
1.	Commenting Party	Who owns that property you are proposing to develop on?	PB	City Council owns that property.
2.	Commenting Party	Best method of management for the parking lot?	PB	The community will have to manage the parking lot and proceeds will be given back to the community. The City will only construct the parking lot.
3.	Commenting Party	Is what you are proposing require a consensus from other departments and entities?	PB	No, that is City Council property and doesn't require further permissions.
4.	Commenting Party	Isn't the property split between CoCT, DAFF and Public Works?	PB	No, the proposal is all on City property.
5.	Commenting Party	Does this proposal require consensus from other Organs of State?	PB	No, Just the DEA&DP for the Environmental aspect of the proposal. A Heritage Impact Assessment would have to be conducted if we would feel the need to create an access to the harbour by breaking down a section of the harbour wall.
6.	Commenting Party	Were you planning on putting parking bays on the paved section below the parking lot on Revision 4?	PB	No, this is a recreational area where the community could host fairs, markets and events. The area is paved and could be used as an overflow parking area.
7.	Commenting Party	This proposal is just to tidy up the area and formalising the parking area and trying to make the space more visitor and tourist friendly?	PB	Yes.
8.	SC	Which alternative would you as the Muslim Community prefer?	Muslim Community	A preference for Revision 4 due to the fact that there will be paved areas where events can be hosted as well as informal trading could take place. This will give the community ample economic opportunities.
9.	Commenting Party	Who do I contact?	SC	You could contact our Public Liaison Officer Dwayne Miller, you could also take a comment sheet with all of Chand's contact details.
10.	Commenting Party	How do we make sure that our needs are addressed?	PB	We will gather all issues and concerns from our public participation process and consider the design to align with all I&APs needs and wants for the development.
11.	Commenting Party	How much time do we have in order to prepare for this development?	PB	The best case scenario is to start construction in winter 2018 and be done with the proposed development by October 2018.

### **13. CONCLUSION**

---

SC thanked the team and everyone present for their attendance and valuable inputs and concluded the meeting at 20h30.