

Comments and Responses Report
The Point Kalk Bay: Proposed Rehabilitation of the Parking and Recreational Area

COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT: <u>SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING PUBLIC MEETING 29 MAY, 17:30-19:00</u>			
No.	Comment:	Respondent:	Response:
1.	It is not apparent who will manage the area w.r.t security, cleaning and traffic management.	City of Cape Town (CoCT)	It is hoped that the community will take control of the management of the area. A similar community management system as implemented at the Jubilee square in Simon's town could be considered. The City will not manage it.
2.	Better traffic control is required at the Harbour entrance. How will this be managed? Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Closing the left turn lane into the Harbour from Main Road - Traffic signs indicating that the parking area is full should be erected - Constructing a bridge over the buildings on the harbour side of the wall to access the harbour from the parking area 	CoCT	<p>This has been raised before as the left turn lane has been perceived to cause the delays. The left turn lane was constructed about 25 years ago to alleviate congestion at the time when the harbour was mainly a fishing harbour with limited restaurant activity. Should the left turn lane be closed permanently this would have a hugely negative impact on traffic throughout the day and week. For example, at many times of the day especially in the early mornings and evenings during the week there is plenty of available parking in the harbour. Closing the left turn lane would mean that whenever a vehicle turning left into the harbour when a train was coming would block through traffic and this would have a significant and accumulative effect on through traffic especially in the morning and evening peaks when trains are supposed to be at their most frequent.</p> <p>The introduction of Variable Messaging Signs (VMS) would be considered however when tried before during the construction phase they were not effective. 3. A pedestrian bridge linking The Point parking area to the harbour could be physically built however it would be visually intrusive and result in the loss of parking in the harbour area. It would be</p>

			more practical to build the pedestrian access as proposed and wait for the redevelopment of the buildings to ensure that a pedestrian access can be developed in a more desirable location.
3.	What is planned for the Harbour wall?	CoCT	It is proposed that a new pedestrian access be provided through the stone wall between The Point parking area and the harbor. This proposal will be subject to a Heritage Assessment before a decision is made.
4.	Recommendations - Bicycle parking	CoCT	Bicycle racks will be provided as part of the project
5.	The design needs to better provide for economic opportunities for the local community. There have been talks over the past 25 years that at least 1/3 of the site would cater for economic development.	CoCT	The proposals do not preclude any future economic opportunities in the area. In the short term, the proposals make the possibility of community based markets and fairs more attractive than is currently the case.
6.	How will the fact that the development is 100m within the high-water mark affect the process?	CoCT	The Basic Assessment process serves to address this.
7.	Is this the least development intervention at this time?	CoCT	Yes. Future development could occur.
8.	What is the difference between Revision 4 and 5?	CoCT	Revision 4 has more paved area to be used for fairs, markets, event and overflow parking when required. Revision 5 has less paved area contributing to a more natural feel. The unpaved area will be landscaped with locally indigenous plants. The recreational area below the parking area will have benches and pathways.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT: SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING
FOCUS GROUP MEETING 29 MAY, 19:30-20:30**

No.	Comment:	Respondent:	Response:
1.	How will the parking area be managed?	City of Cape Town (CoCT)	It is hoped that the community will take charge of the management of the area. A "Friends of Kalk Bay Point" could be established to manage the parking and the proceeds could be used for example security, cleaning and community upliftment.
2.	Referring to Revision 4, will there be parking bays on the paved area below the parking lot?	CoCT	No this will be a recreational area where the community can hold fairs, markets and events. The area can be used for overflow parking.
3.	Who owns the land versus who is the decision-maker? Does the proposal require consensus from other organs of state?	CoCT	The City owns the entire property. The DEA&DP is the decision-maker. Consensus from other organs of state is not required. Input from Heritage Western Cape is required and considered by the DEA&DP.
4.	Revision 4 is preferred by the Fishing / Muslim community due to more opportunity for economic opportunities.	CoCT	Noted.
5.	How will concerns be addressed?	CoCT	All issues and concerns raised during the PPP will be gathered and considered in the design to align with all I&APs needs and wants for the development.
6.	Clarity on timeline	CoCT	If the EIA can be approved soon then there may be a possibility of construction starting this year however it must be completed before the end of November. Otherwise, the best-case scenario is for construction to start winter 2018 and to complete the project by October 2018.

COMMENTS RECEIVED PRIOR TO PUBLIC REVIEW OF DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT: ORIGINAL VIA EMAIL

No.	Name:	Comment:	Respondent:	Response:
01	<p>Glenn Ashton Ekogaia Fdn 22 May 2017</p>	<p>I note with concern the expanded footprint of the parking area, specifically the overflow area to the south of the existing and to be formalized car park. This area is one of the few remaining remnants of areas that have any degree of coastal botanical value remaining. The only other area between Simonstown and Muizenberg is St James and a small area either side of the Glencairn beach. The St James area is quite degraded and grassed.</p> <p>The increased pressure of parking on this remnant will have a serious negative impact on the viability of the site and also on any chance to enhance the sustainability of the site or to improve on the quality of the biodiversity of this area.</p> <p>In springtime, this area is notable for both a fairly wide variety of flowering plants and for the attraction of this. As such this area ought to be conserved as much as possible, restored and not relegated to parking that will stand to further degrade both the already impacted transition area but also this will lead to increased pressure on the remnant fairly intact area to the south of the proposed overflow car park.</p> <p>It is suggested that it overflow is to be enabled that it ought to only be on the railway (w) side of the site and not on the € side towards the building. Restoration of this part of the site must be engaged as part of the upgrade, which should include botanical upkeep and maintenance.</p> <p>I have found any evidence of botanical survey of this site but suggest that this is carried out and that a</p>	<p>City of Cape Town (CoCT)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a result of the public input the overflow parking has been excluded, and will no longer be constructed. The footprint of the car park will be increased by 20% in order to fit the same number of vehicles as currently use the area. 2. There is no increase in parking. The number of bays being provided is the same number as is currently possible when full. 3. Appropriate planting and seeding will

		<p>supplemental planting / seeding proposal be put forward for the area in order to enhance this valuable remnant of coastal botanical heritage. I am unsure as to exactly which variety of botanical classification this area falls under but I will lay odds it is in fact of a type under high pressure and conservation value.</p> <p>I would also suggest that additional suitable planting be considered and included over the rest of the site, to soften the hard-engineered impacts. Coloured surface asphalt would also be preferable, in grey or brown.</p>		<p>be undertaken.</p> <p>4. Appropriate planting will take place within the islands on the parking area. The pedestrian areas and islands not planted will be paved in a similar manner to what has been undertaken on Main Road. Coloured asphalt will not be used.</p>
02	<p>Alvin L Cope WCP 22 May 2017</p>	<p>1. Your e-mail of 15 May 2017 and accompanying NEMA BID.</p> <p>2. This application to improve the existing parking area and access thereto is supported.</p> <p>3. Any structural work affecting the Main Road (PMR 101) that is proposed for the improvement of the access will need to be scrutinized and accepted by the City of Cape Town, the Road Authority for PMR 101 in this area, and will be supported by this Branch.</p>	CoCT	<p>1. Noted</p> <p>2. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>3. Noted</p>
03	<p>James Ricketts 29 May 2017</p>	<p>One thing I'd like to see is formal, aesthetically pleasing and fully serviced kiosks for traders to get short & medium-term leases to sell goods and services.</p> <p>Just as discussed re Fish Hoek beach & parking.</p>	CoCT	<p>1. This is not part of the scope of this project however the provision of kiosks for informal trading has not always been successful as part of public realm upgrades and will need to be carefully considered</p>
04	<p>Jane Olive</p>	<p>On the mail I received from the SRA the link to the</p>	CoCT	<p>1. One of the objectives is to reverse the</p>

	<p>29 May 2017</p>	<p>proposal is given... this brings me directly to my gmail account?</p> <p>I am for the next few months in Greece, and so not easy for me to enquire directly where this suppose upgrade will be.?</p> <p>I have a property in Harris Road, which is directly above the traffic lights and opposite the Harbour, therefore this new upgrade does obviously interest me. I presume the upgrade is on the Southern side of the buildings housing Harbour House etc? The vacant piece of land which over the years has been sadly neglected...Half of which is being used for parking? Is this correct?</p> <p>We are desperately in need of extra parking in Kalk Bay, there is no doubt about that BUT how are the powers that be going to handle the traffic going in and out of the harbour. On every week end there is a huge problem at the traffic lights Cr of Main and Clairvaux Roads caused through the traffic trying to get into and out of the harbour... with more parking available how will it be managed.?</p> <p>Unless you live in the area 24 / 7 you have no idea how this congestion affects us all living on Harris Road. The long wait for vehicles coming down Boyse Drive, and Main Road is appalling, Shouting, hooting is the order of the day ... Sorry, i just see we will be subjected to more long and distressing roadworks.</p>		<p>deterioration of the site, and to make it more accessible for visitors, especially the recreational area south of the proposed parking area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. No additional parking will be provided. The proposed parking area will accommodate the same number of vehicles. 3. The new parking area has been designed in such a manner that access and egress will be easier and there will be proper circulation within the parking area. Currently the access to the parking area is far too narrow and circulation within the parking area is nonexistent. Parking bays will be properly demarcated to the standard widths and lengths. These improvements will contribute to a reduction in the delays caused by egress and access to the parking area. 4. Should the project proceed, construction work will be confined to the area east of the railway line.
<p>05</p>	<p>Bart van Vuuren 01 June 2017</p>	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>I am not able to attend this meeting. However, if I may:</p>	<p>CoCT</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted with thanks. 2. The railway authorities will not permit two lanes in and out. This will not solve the problem.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Confirm my support for this project. 2) Respectfully suggest that it will only be as successful as the entry/exit design include two lanes in and two lanes out. 3) The pedestrian sidewalk between the Arches and Harbour entrance be removed to widen the waiting lane into the harbour. (There is an existing catwalk that will replace that.) 4) Install electronic directional signs along Main & Clairvaux Rd to announce: Harbour Full! <p>The flow of traffic will enhance the success of this project.</p>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. The footway referred to is less than 1m wide in places and will not be wide enough to extend the two lanes. Furthermore, it will reduce pedestrian safety by doing away with a small pedestrian refuge. 4. Variable Message Signs will be considered. However, when used before at this location however during Main Road construction they were not effective.
06	Barrie Gasson 05 June 2017	<p>I oppose the parking and landscape proposals contained in Revision 4 and support those in Revision 5 for the reason that this allows a parking increase of 20% over the existing area while still retaining a satisfactory extent of 'natural' open space. The southern boundary of the parking area shall therefore be a Red Line beyond which no vehicular access should be permitted, with the exception of the small road to the house 'By the Sea', nor 'hard' landscaping introduced ie. bricked, paved or hardened surfaces.</p> <p>Re. the parking area I support the intention to connect this terrace with the harbour parking area below. I also recommend that the common boundary between Council and DAFF/PWD land should be designed as a balcony from which to view the harbour activities. Therefore, it needs to be sufficiently wide for people to walk, stand, and sit, and look over the roofs of the cubicles below. Achieving this may require raising its level (considerably?) above the level of the parking area and replacing the tatty DAFF fencing with something</p>	CoCT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revision 4 and 5 have been replaced by revision 6 and all overflow parking has been removed. 2. Although the footprint of the formal car park will be increased by ±20%, there will be no additional parking bays. 3. The paths have been significantly reduced in width. Currently the existing gravel paths with concrete edging have been eroded. Significant erosion has also been caused by pedestrian traffic where the surface has not been hardened. Exposed aggregate and natural stone will be used for the paths which will make them universally accessible. The current paths are not universally accessible. 4. The footway proposed between the parking area and the DAFF/PWD boundary will be raised to improve the visual spectacle. 5. The fence will be replaced by a more suitable hand rail / balustrade, along

		<p>that ensures cubicle security while not impeding views. The balcony concept has implications for the type of 'tree' to be planted here and at present I have no firm suggestions in that regard, except that Norfolk Pines will not be appropriate because of the height and width to which they grow. The matter of footlights along the balcony should also be factored in.</p> <p>Re. the open space - this should remain as natural as possible because it is one of the finest sites on the False Bay coast which nature has provided with natural seating slabs and panoramic all-round outlook.</p> <p>A few seats (with backs please!) could be provided at one or two places but they are not vital because people want to sit next to the sea on the slabs. The existing path could be tidied up or allowed to disappear over time. The remaining house foundations suggest that in time an indestructible information board might be set up here - or a number of info boards might be better placed on the balcony. The Historical Association has all the information about the harbour and Point e.g. plans and photos, and these can be made available when required.</p> <p>I trust these comments are helpful and look forward to seeing Revision 5 developed in greater detail.</p>		<p>most of the boundary and a low stone wall where the buildings rise above the back of the proposed footway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Footlights are a good idea but are prone to vandalism, and not supported by our Public Lighting Department. Pedestrian scale lighting will form part of the proposed rehabilitation. 7. Revision 6 excludes the use of Norfolk Pine trees. All palm trees will be retained on site, although some will have to be relocated to allow the footway to be raised. 8. It is acknowledged that the area is one of the finest sites however currently it is degraded and is not used by the general public as a consequence. 9. Interpretive boards are a good idea and can be considered at The Point.
07	<p>Jody Paterson 04 June 2017</p>	<p>I am very happy that the City of Cape Town are considering investment in this space which is currently degraded and very disconnected with the rest of Kalk Bay. I do however have a concern regarding the fact that the City are investing, what will turn out to be a significant sum, on formalizing a</p>	<p>CoCT</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The preamble is noted; however, one must acknowledge that currently the train service is far from satisfactory and many of the visitors to the area reside in the eastern suburbs for which a train service is nonexistent and an integrated

		<p>parking area when all the policy objectives currently, are focused on the promotion of public transport and NMT.</p> <p>While Kalk Bay Harbour is a major tourist destination for international visitors and a very large number of local day trippers, it is on the rail line which the City currently see as part of the major backbone of an integrated public transport network. It seems wrong therefore to be supporting parking in an area which is already accessible via public transport. In view of this, Revision 5 is preferred as it proposes less areas for use by vehicles for parking.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above concern and the concern about the future management of the area, I do believe, as I have stated above, that the area is in dire need of attention. The following comments relate to the proposals presented and focus on the spatial and material aspects due to my urban design background:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revision 5 is preferable from the point of view that less surface area is being hardened 2. The most south-eastern parking (11 bays along the open space edge) should be removed to ensure that future development of the existing building can allow for the opening up over the open space and not need to look over parked cars. This also addresses my concern that the area used currently for parking is being increased in size. 3. The edge of the parking along the south-eastern edge should be defined by means of a low wall in order to prevent creep of the parking. Only the boom should allow for vehicular movement beyond this point and this should be for the use 		<p>public transport network not yet a reality. Furthermore, the parking area is already in existence and has been for nearly 30 years.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Revision 6 is the preferred Alternative as the possible overflow parking is being eliminated, and the width of the footpaths reduced. 3. Removing the 11 bays would make the design of the parking area uneconomical in terms of road versus bays. Furthermore, the current number of bays equates with the maximum number of cars parked when the current parking area is full. 4. Noted and included in Revision 6. 5. Careful consideration regarding the location of the proposed stairs has been made. Until the buildings on the harbour side of the stone wall are demolished or revamped the proposed location of the stairwell is the only position where no building demolition is required, and coincides with the position of an old doorway which was poorly patched with stonework, and where it opens up onto the harbour parking and not in the roadway. 6. It is intended that a section of the footway will be raised as a viewing platform and seating area. 7. In view of the heritage value of the existing stone wall it is likely that a hand rail / balustrade will be constructed and the fence removed. A low wall is proposed for the portion of the footway
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

of the one residential property only.

4. I support the proposal for increased access between this upper parking and the lower parking area via a new set of stairs although I think the location of these stairs should be carefully considered.
5. I support the proposal to upgrade the edge overlooking the lower parking area into a pedestrian zone with planting and benches. It will be good to see a cross section through this edge to show the detail as its important to the performance of the harbor precinct as a whole. It also needs to be undertaken in a way that is respectful of the heritage value of the harbor precinct. This edge should be designed as a public balcony. It is currently used for sleeping as the area is outside of any main public thoroughfare (see photo). If this edge could become a major pedestrian access into the harbor from the Main Road, it would make the site safer especially at night.



where the buildings rise above the back of footway.

8. The design of the surface areas is to give a visual indication of their use.
9. Notwithstanding the above the idea of occasionally annexing this section of the parking area for a market or fair should be considered by the management of the area.
10. Noted. It was always intended to be of pedestrian scale.
11. Revision 6 includes only three clusters of trees, low walls and the use of locally indigenous low shrubs and groundcover that naturally occur in similar coastal environments and have proven to be successful along the main Road rehabilitation project.

6. The edge element on the harbor side of this pedestrianized route needs to be carefully considered – is it a low wall (similar to Jubilee square in Simonstown – see image) or a low wall with a balustrade on top? In this regard, the Landscaper did mention the proposal to replicate what has been done on the Clovelly section (low concrete stub wall with steel balustrade). I'm not sure this is appropriate given the heritage context.



7. The area to be resurfaced is large and I wonder whether the area for potential market use couldn't perhaps be the parking along the pedestrianized balcony edge and could be surfaced similarly to the pedestrian edge.
8. Any lighting in the area should be very subdued / low level and not add to light pollution for residents close by. The pedestrianized balcony edge could have more lighting.
9. The practicality of trees on the site should be considered. While they help to break the area

		<p>up into smaller sub spaces, they are unlikely to survive due to their exposure to the south-east winds and without someone watching over their health and wellbeing (i.e. without someone watering/ pruning them in their first years). Low walls rather than trees could possibly be considered to break the parking area up into smaller areas.</p>		
08	<p>Derek Stuart-Findlay 05 June 2017</p>	<p>I represent the Kalk Bay Historical Association in this public interaction. We are enthusiastic about the rehabilitation of the Point, which in our opinion is long overdue. We have no problem with the proposed plan for the parking area, the widened access to the parking and the design of the steps down to the harbor level, including the creation of a gap in the harbor access road wall through an old doorway which has been closed with poor-quality stonework.</p> <p>However, we definitely have a problem with the proposal in Revision 4 to create additional hard surfaces on the Point area beyond the parking area. In our opinion, the existing circular path and the roadway to the private residence are more than adequate, they need to be rehabilitated, but no additional hard surfaces should be built. In previous years impatient vehicle owners have broken the lock on the gate to the private residence road and parked all over the common, if additional hard surfaces are built these will encourage this type of destructive behavior. For this reason, a strong barrier for the private road and impenetrable bollards need to be installed along the edge of the parking area. Should any community activities be planned for the Point common, they should take place on the grassed area adjacent to the parking bays.</p>	<p>CoCT</p>	<p>The preamble is noted with thanks.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A revision 6 is being prepared. 2. Overflow parking has been eliminated from the recreational area. 3. The extent of the area intended for a market or fair has been reduced by more than half. 4. The width of the proposed footway has been reduced. 5. Efforts will be made to encourage the owner of the restaurants in the area to improve the visual impact of their buildings and infrastructure.

		The existing paths avoid the foundations of the historic home Patmos adjacent to the rocks at the end of the Point, any additional paths need to avoid these. We would also encourage improvements to the existing entrance and steps to the Harbour House entrance, they create a very poor first impression for visitors to the harbor. We strongly recommend that Revision 5 is adopted.		
09	Dr J P Strumpfer 25 May 2017	The problem is that even with the current volumes of traffic accessing the Kalk Bay harbour area and associated parking, it is creating a massive traffic congestion problem in Main Road, the Boyes Drive and Main Road robot, and the robot controlling harbour access. The problem is hugely exacerbated by PRASA's insistence that the exit out of the harbour area forces the robot to work on demand (prioritises the exit). This means traffic flow through is forced to a standstill. The problem is a huge problem over weekends, e.g. Sunday afternoons, but is also problematic over busy traffic times, e.g. late afternoons. Increasing parking and other attractions in the harbour area will only increase the traffic congestion, a situation that is already significantly impacting local residents and their movement. Additionally, THROUGH traffic is majorly impacted, through delays as it is virtually impossible under best of times to pass through without being caught in a hold-up at the harbour robot. Any bridge or underpass access will be very costly, difficult to implement, and will still not alleviate the problem of merging major (additional) traffic with the Boyes Drive/Man Road traffic flow. All in all, attracting more vehicles into the harbour area without relieving the already highly problematic existing traffic congestion	CoCT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No additional parking will be provided. The proposed parking area will accommodate the same number of vehicles. 2. The new parking area has been designed in such a manner that access and egress will be easier and there will be proper circulation within the parking area. Currently the access to the parking area is far too narrow and circulation within the parking area is nonexistent. Parking bays will be properly demarcated to the standard widths and lengths. These improvements will contribute to a reduction in the delays caused by egress and access to the parking area. 3. The proposed rehabilitation of the area is not seen as being a contributor to the congestion of the far south.

		<p>is not desirable.</p> <p>May I remind you that that section is a choke point on one of effectively only two access routes to the Southern Peninsula. Access is a congestion problem as it is and any development should be aimed at addressing the current issues and not adding to it. Increasing congestion here will impact traffic flows and congestion over Ou Kaapse Weg, and the "Four Ways" intersection of that and Kommetjie road, i.e. the impact will be far from the Kalk Bay harbour.</p> <p>I request that these issues be considered carefully and a concomitant solution be found for the traffic congestion problem.</p>		
10	Dale Whitfield 15 May 2017	<p>Formalising the parking area will not change the behaviour of cars waiting at the harbour entrance. It will also not change the Main Rd traffic patterns. The reason that cars back up at the entrance to the harbour is because the parking area is full and visitors queue in their vehicles, until others exit. This is a problem that will not be solved by anything other than proper traffic management.</p> <p>In addition, the impatient drivers arriving from the south, heading north on the Main Rd, regularly drive into the railway crossing area and block traffic entering, exiting and heading south.</p> <p>I'm all in favour of formalising the parking area. Improving the aesthetics and making more efficient use of the area is welcome.</p> <p>But it will have no impact on the traffic flow.</p>	CoCT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It has never been suggested that rehabilitating the parking area will change the behavior of drivers wanting to access the harbour. 2. The new parking area has been designed in such a manner that access and egress will be easier and there will be proper circulation within the parking area. Currently the access to the parking area is far too narrow and circulation within the parking area is nonexistent. Parking bays will be properly demarcated to the standard widths and lengths. These improvements will contribute to a reduction in the delays caused by egress and access to the parking area.
11	Dawid Mocke 15 May 2017	<p>We are a local Fish Hoek business and much of our clientele is regularly affected (negatively) by the</p>	CoCT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted 2. The new parking area has been

		<p>back up in traffic due to the intersection at Kalk Bay harbour. I think it is wonderful that the parking lot be upgraded with a view to managing the traffic in and outflow.</p> <p>My view is that an improvement in the parking lot would not really alleviate the traffic congestion unless the way the traffic flows in and out of the lot across the railway line is seriously changed. I would look to either changing the traffic signals to a traffic circle, or, diverting the entrance to opposite Clairvaux road and coming up to the parking lot via the existing dry dock inside the harbour. This could be a one-way system (entrance at Clairvaux, exit at the Harbour) or completely close off the railway crossing and make use of only 1 entrance/exit and traffic lights that already exist.</p>		<p>designed in such a manner that access and egress will be easier and there will be proper circulation within the parking area. Currently the access to the parking area is far too narrow and circulation within the parking area is nonexistent. Parking bays will be properly demarcated to the standard widths and lengths. These improvements will contribute to a reduction in the delays caused by egress and access to the parking area.</p> <p>3. Various bridge structure proposals have been considered over the years. However, the height that the bridge needs to be to cross the railway line is such that there is no space for the length of roadway needed to descend at a reasonable gradient into the harbour area. Furthermore, the visual impact of such a structure would be untenable, in this area</p>
12	Alex Bassios 15 May 2017	<p>Once again there were major backups on Boyes Drive and Main Rd this weekend. This is caused by cars waiting to turn into the full harbour car park. The traffic lights were green, but there was no movement South because of the harbour lane queue extending back into the main lane. We have the ridiculous situation of a green traffic light and open road to Fish Hoek, while cars back up to St. James and beyond.</p> <p>Is the City intending to do anything about this? Has anybody thought of a solution? Is there no solution using road markings, signage and cameras? If not, everybody may be better off if the harbour queue lane was closed off. That way, drivers behind a</p>	CoCT	<p>1. The new parking area has been designed in such a manner that access and egress will be easier and there will be proper circulation within the parking area. Currently the access to the parking area is far too narrow and circulation within the parking area is nonexistent. Parking bays will be properly demarcated to the standard widths and lengths. These improvements will contribute to a reduction in the delays caused by egress and access to the parking area.</p>

		<p>stationary car right at the green traffic light would make sure cars waiting to gain entrance to the harbour would move on.</p>	<p>2. This has been raised before as the left turn lane has been perceived to cause the delays. The left turn lane was constructed about 25 years ago to alleviate congestion at the time when the harbour was mainly a fishing harbour with limited restaurant activity. Should the left turn lane be closed permanently this would have a hugely negative impact on traffic throughout the day and week. For example, at many times of the day especially in the early mornings and evenings during the week there is plenty of available parking in the harbour Closing the left turn lane would mean that whenever a vehicle turning left into the harbour when a train was coming would block through traffic and this would have a significant and accumulative effect on through traffic especially in the morning and evening peaks when trains are supposed to be at their most frequent.</p> <p>3. The introduction of Variable Messaging Signs (VMS) would be considered however when tried before during the construction phase they were not effective.</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------