



## **TRU-Park Workshop 7: Co-design & Scenario session**

*see presentations*  
*see attendance register*

**9 June 2016**  
**18h00 – 21h00**  
**at Pinelands Methodist Church Hall**

Agenda:

- Brief explanation of Scenarios.
- Workshopping of Scenarios in 3 groups.
- Feedback of group discussions to the plenary.
- Conclusion and way forward.

Repository site available at:

<https://www.capetown.gov.za/en/mayor/CommunityServices/Pages/TRUP.aspx>

**Michael Krause:**

- Explanation of the Public participation process.
- Explanation of the way in which the evening's design workshop is run and how this process will work: There are 3 documents/brochures corresponding with the 3 scenarios. Each group will have 1 hour to discuss the Scenarios. Materials for discussion will be provided at the tables for each of the working groups. The groups will then appoint a speaker who will present the group's ideas on positive and negative aspects to the plenary.
- Explanation of the way forward after the evening's workshop.

**Scenario A: Urban Wetland**

- The scenario explores re-establishing the lost estuary.
- All stormwater will flow into the wetland. The wetland serves as a sponge.
- Berkley connects to Malta as a public transport route.
- Public facilities will be located in the park and in the area surrounding the park.
- The River Club's development follows Liesbeek parkway on both sides.
- The highest density of development takes place at Ndabeni with some additional development at Oude Molen and Alexandra Hospital site.

**Scenario B: Extended Park**

- The scenario explores pulling the green network into the urban fabric.
- Green fingers extend into the urban surrounds and this is where the stormwater drainage takes place, before the water enters the riverine system.
- The transport system is similar to that of Scenario A.
- Paarden Eiland is developed as a marina towards the bay.
- Ndabeni has the highest density of mixed use development.
- Partial development of the River Club site takes place along the new Berkley-Malta road extension.

**Mark Turok:**

**Scenario C: Preserved Park.**

- The river goes to sea along canals.
- There is a Connection to north-west.
- The Floodplain is not developed for the most part.
- Railway and storage land north of the site is put to better use and developed.
- The Observatory (SAAO) is considered sacred ground and should not be developed. Green space should also not be developed.
- We need to look for places where higher density developments can take place outside the park.
- A live-work-play environment is developed at Ndabeni.
- Alexandra road is redeveloped as an activity route.
- There is greater connectivity through to Langa, Athlone, Rondebosch and Saltriver connecting facilities around the public park. At the confluence of the two rivers is a memorial to origins of Cape Town. This area at the confluence could be larger, allowing for flooding.
- Existing facilities are retained and should continue to function.
- Some expansion of River Club is allowed with some additional facilities such as conference facilities.
- SKA is located on the Valkenberg property along Observatory Road. There should be a pedestrian and [limited] vehicular link around Valkenberg. Valkenberg could shrink a bit.
- Malta-Berkley extension should take place off the wetland on the railway-side to connect with the rail.
- The railway network should have a more circular movement and the railway storage land should be put to better use.
- The park should extend into the city with developments that will benefit from park.

**Michael Krause:**

- Explanation of the session: Stakeholders are asked to note positive and negative elements, rate elements from 1-10 and then also feel free to draw out elements of the scenarios on which they would like to comment.
- Explanation of how process will then follow through: After the workshop, the scenarios will be consolidated into one combined scenario which will be commented on by other stakeholder groups and be assessed by the technical team at the city and province for comment.

See Notes on Scenario Matrix A, B and C.

### Plenary Discussion- Feedback from the 3 Workshop Groups:

#### Scenario A discussion feedback: Lynette Munro

- We should note that although the maps are drawn to show green space, that this area is not green at all. It is currently brown.
- There were some positive aspects:  
We like the corridor concept, but are concerned that this is not a reality in our lifetime.  
The decanalisation of the river is also a good idea. We are also not sure how realistic this is. In some areas where the river is very close to the road, this might undermine the road.  
The scenario suggests more sports fields. We feel that there are many sports fields in the area and that adding more fields would be unnecessary.
- Public transport linkages are good. We endorse connectivity with additional bridges. Concerns were raised about the bridge that was taken away; this should be brought back. We also don't want a new road next to sensitive area. Malta-Berkley road extension should rather swing out towards the railway.
- We want no additional development on the green space and no hardening of green surfaces.
- We are excited about extending green space in the area.
- Space for Traditional healers. These people are very connected to Oude Molen land through ancestry. Multi-cultural space needs to be included in the plan for Oude Molen. This was in the World Design Capital proposals for Oude Molen.
- We need more details to be able to answer the rest of the questions.

---

#### Scenario B discussion feedback: Jean Ramsay

- Our group had a very polarised view on this Scenario. Some loved it and some hated it.
- The explanation of the scenarios by the professional team helped to understand it. There are some extra green fingers permeating the urban areas- No one would object to this.
- We liked the idea of the Marina at Paarden Eiland.
- Most people agreed on the following:
  - Nobody liked the idea of the Berkley extension across the wetland. We did not want a flyover, but were fine with the connection as long as the road goes around the wetland.
  - Everyone agreed that pedestrian access was important. We also agreed that Valkenberg should be more open to the public and should allow pedestrian access. There was hope that Valkenberg would dissolve altogether, but this is not realistic.
  - Everyone through that pedestrian access was necessary around and throughout the site. We also liked the idea of many more cycling routes.
  - Everybody is very happy to allow higher density development in Ndabeni. This should be where the first development starts taking place.
  - We agreed that busses should go around the edges and rail to link up. We like the idea of keeping Nieuwe Molen at the Alexandra Hospital Site.
- We did not agree with the River Club. It obstructs views from the SAAO.
- We had very varied opinions on Oude Molen. Definitely be careful about it developing anything in Oude Molen. We were concerned that it was going to be redeveloped. There were varying opinions. Some felt that it should be more open to the public and other felt that it should stay as is.
- We did not like the "finger" of development that was drawn going through the toad breeding area at Oude Molen. This should not be developed.
- We felt that the Berkley-Malta road extension should be only for pedestrians and cyclists.

### Scenario C discussion feedback: Jody Paterson

The Scenario was generally liked by everyone in the group.

- Question 1: In terms of the park, the opinion was that it was very connected to local activities and accessible.
- Berkley road extension was proposed towards the north of the site and everyone felt this was a good alignment.
- Everyone liked the idea of only low rise development at the River Club close to existing buildings.
- Everyone felt that there was a lot of potential in having a series of weirs that keep water instead of allowing it to flush through the site. This can help to deal with an ecological system and it can be designed to clean and filter silt and can be designed to allow for people to walk across them.
- Don't need to be in the park to experience it. Park is accessible from multiple points.
- Everyone felt that locating SKA across Observatory road, close to SAAO, would allow for a synergy of institutions.
- Question 2: Cleaning water is very important. Even if the water was cleaned in wetlands, it would only be clean halfway down the site, if this is even achievable. Stormwater should be looked after by communities before it is allowed to flow into river. It would also help in terms of sustainability to reuse some of the grey water.
- Question 3: Bridges for non-motorised transport are great.
- Live work units are a must. The site should not only give access for people to work off site, but should also provide opportunities for people to work on the site.
- Question 4: We felt it was important to always design with a flexible module in mind to be able to expand and contract.
- Density should be graded, starting from river edge, with 3 or 4 storeys, but later going up to 6 or 7 storeys whilst being sensitive to other residential areas such as Pinelands.
- There is a huge opportunity for development in Culemborg. Realigning the railway would allow for a new public transport interchange to be created here.
- We also saw an opportunity for the River Club as a tourism Hub along with SKA.
- It was seen as a good idea for Valkenberg to release land along its edges and rationalize their space and shrink.
- It was felt that Oude Molen should retain its identity as an eco-village.
- Question 8: Everyone felt that cultural cohesion was important.
- We liked the idea of a memorialization site at the confluence.
- We also felt that the TRUP should allow for other cultural events, community activities and ceremonies.
- Question 9: We felt that social partnerships were important and that there is are cultural and sustainability benefits to connecting communities.
- There was the sense that we need to acknowledge past communities and built for future communities.
- Question 10: We talked about possible alternative energies.
- There was the idea to pump water out of the rivers to use further away for irrigation.
- We need to think about how we can improve existing areas and their sustainability. We need to consider how to cross subsidise solar panels on for Maitland Garden Village roofs.
- We should support community systems and facilities that are currently trying to use sustainable technology and community groups.

NAME	QUESTION/STATEMENT	RESPONSE	COMMENT S/ACTIONS
Micheal Krause	Question was raised about whether we are finishing today. We will not be finishing. We need to draw this up into consolidated one. We are not closing the process. We need to reach out to people who were not here today too.		
	There was a request for site visits to specific areas.	Louise Badenhorst?: Is it not possible to do this virtually so that we do not need to go each area individually? This way we can look at 2 or 3 a night. What are we trying to get out of it? Will we try to get into more detail?	Organize next workshop at MGV with help of

		<p>We can hold off on the walkabouts.</p> <p>Some of us found it was really good to see the site on foot.</p> <p>Mark Turok: I suggested the idea to cover a broader area on vehicles and ending in an area. Can we take this plan to Oude Molen for example and identify the areas of conflict?</p> <p>Lynette Munro: can we have each meeting in a different area?</p>	Lynette Munro.
Michael Krause:	We still need to get additional inputs from other stakeholders such as Maitland Garden Village, Traditional leaders & the First Nation.		
Mark Turok:	When can we stop feeling threatened by things like the proposed development of the River Club? We would like to find happy solutions to these issues. I guess there are political issues with such groups. We are trying to work towards a consolidated plan. We need to hear the voices of people who live on the land.	<p>Michael Krause: The general area is within our mandate, but the design of the River Club is outside of influence.</p> <p>Mark Turok: We need consensus on how we can deal with RC before it is too late.</p> <p>Michael Krause: I hear your point.</p> <p>Louise Badenhorst: Why are we looking at the River Club if it is not in the mandate? Perhaps the Term of Reference were not adequate.</p> <p>Michael Krause: It is within our mandate to compose the larger vision and then go to smaller precinct plans in specific areas.</p>	
	Does The River Club need to go through Their own Public Participation Process?	<p>Michael Krause: Yes, they will have to.</p> <p>Lynette Munro: They were supposed to have their scoping report ready by May, but they are delays, but please register for their public participation.</p>	
Jean Ramsay	Can we become more specific within the scenarios so we can comment on things? What were the result?	<p>Michael Krause:</p> <p>We came up with certain elements that will be taken forward within the plans. Certain positive and negative elements were noted.</p> <p>We will present this to the Project Management Team (PMT), once we have the voices of the additional stakeholder. We will then have a technical response from the technical team.</p>	

We would like to reconvene for the next session, on **Thursday the 7<sup>th</sup> of July 2016**, between 6.00pm and 8.00pm. (Venue tbc.)

# Scenario A

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
1	How is the metropolitan urban park interpreted? [role in the City, social facilities]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why develop in front of MG. Why can the green space not stay as it is?</li> <li>• We must have eyes on the Park.</li> <li>• There is almost no Urban Park in this scenario. Limited access also to the green, only area potentially available for green is the section along the Black River.</li> <li>• Valkenberg + SAAO will not change over time; not now and not in the long term as per the presentations from VKB.</li> <li>• There is a connection presently between VKB and the Black River.</li> <li>• It will never happen that there is a public connection between and through VKB.</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corridor is good, but unlikely to happen because the development pressure is too high</li> <li>• Area outside TRU-Park becoming green</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too developed on TRU-Park site</li> </ul>	
2	How is the ecological integrity preserved and restored?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scenario is agreed in that an extended park to the sea will be wonderful.</li> <li>• But what about the River Club? It appears that different sets of principles in the manifesto work at different points in the site.</li> <li>• Restore original river course and allow river to go back to what it was.</li> <li>• Emphasize the area as green in respect of bird sanctuary and River Club.</li> <li>• Oude Molen's area must not be developed any further.</li> <li>• The Palotti wetlands are as important as the Raapenberg Wetlands.</li> <li>• Support decanalisation of the river system upstream and downstream and introduce estuaries / wetlands, where possible.</li> <li>• Golfing range will go</li> <li>• No more sports fields in floodplain</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De-canalising the river courses is lovely, not sure if it is realistic</li> <li>• Increasing the wetland</li> </ul>	
3	Does it embrace the sustainable environmental approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not know the answer to this – this is an unknown.</li> </ul>		
4	Does it promote the use of sustainable modes of transport?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkley Road and Station Road extension must have separate cycle lanes as cyclists and pedestrians must feel safe on NMT routes.</li> <li>• There is massive life and biodiversity where Berkley Road extension is proposed across the river. This must be flagged as a serious reconsideration of extending this road. Will the bridges destroy this life when the road is extended?</li> <li>• The principle of east – west connectivity is supported in this scenario but only if safety is considered and destruction of the environment is prevented.</li> <li>• Berkley bridge over the wetland, new alignment outside TRU-Park boundary</li> </ul>	Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkley bridge compromising on Raapenberg wetland</li> </ul> Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Safe bridges</li> <li>• Safe pedestrian/ cycle routes</li> </ul>	
5	Does it provide dense mixed-use and mixed tenure environment?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We cannot answer these questions as the scenario is too vague.</li> </ul>		

# Scenario A

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
6	Does it enable the development of funding and local economic opportunities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We cannot answer these questions as the scenario is too vague.</li> </ul>		
7	Does it align the development and the preservation with clear management, administrative and institutional system?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We cannot answer these questions as the scenario is too vague.</li> <li>No extra development on green space, in fact extend green space</li> </ul>	Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Extra development</li> </ul> Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preserved and extended green space</li> </ul>	
8	How does it strengthen social cohesion, celebrate and respect the different cultural narratives and heritage assets?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multi-cultural centre some where</li> <li>tourist attraction</li> <li>establishment of a kraal</li> <li>cfr. Design Capital Plan [Oude Molen OMVETA]</li> </ul>		
9	Does it enable the establishment of a social partnership?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OM definitely enables social partnerships but we do not know the answer to this question when considering the whole scenario area.</li> <li>We do not support any more sports facilities in the floodplain.</li> <li>The Peninsula Driving Range (at MGV) changes its character if developed.</li> <li>Green spaces must rather be preserved and extended than developed.</li> <li>We do not want a rates-based park but income from tourism and recreation instead.</li> <li>By 2030 / 50 where is this scenario going? All farmland is already disappearing even outside the city so why develop here. Why not develop closer to the city centre in Woodstock and Salt River?</li> <li>We do not support extending footprints in this area. Rather diversify the corridors starting from the city outward.</li> <li>The City should provide its citizens with a conceptual idea of what CT will look like in 2050; then we have something concrete to work with?</li> </ul>		
10	Does it develop alternative system of technologies?	<p>The question was asked as to whether we know cultural / historical situation of the TRUP. Yes, there was a preliminary heritage study done and presented at one of the stakeholder meetings.</p> <p>Thando described at length the rituals that take place at Oude Molen (OM) where the Chief conducts ceremonies, slaughtering occurs, dancing inside the OM hall. She said that they ideally require a kraal or a private site for rituals so that no one is offended by their ceremonies. She said that the ceremonies take place typically on 6, 7 and 8 August each year where they prepare and decorate the hall. As the traditional leaders group, the Khoi and San work together. OM is the best place for this to happen at the horse stables where it is taking place now. These rituals have been taking place for more than 10 years at OM – the site has strong ancestral connections. Ideally a dedicated ritual space, private kraal space and semi-private space for cultural activities that can be shared with outsiders or the public, are required at OM. This is already indicated in the Design Capital proposal for OM. The plan makes provision for multi-culturalism.</p>		

## Scenario B

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
<b>1</b>	<b>How is the metropolitan urban park interpreted? [role in the City, social facilities]</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserving wetland</li> <li>• Balancing the recreational park with ecological</li> <li>• MGV driving range for sports and urban agriculture [veggie garden]</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fingers allows for park, leaving the wetland near the rivers</li> <li>• Marina</li> <li>• More positive edges to the park</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No manufactured green space, preserved wetland rather.</li> </ul>	<b>5.9</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>How is the ecological integrity preserved and restored?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considering leopard toad breeding areas.</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fingers as cleaning water system and re-charging the aquifer designated areas.</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing the finger development in front of OM, it is the breeding ground of the leopard toads.</li> </ul>	<b>5.9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Does it embrace the sustainable environmental approach?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ....</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul>	<b>5.8</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Does it promote the use of sustainable modes of transport?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ....</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Berkely-Malta link as pedestrian cycle route only</li> <li>• Pedestrian and cycling route across the TRU-Park, along the rivers..</li> <li>• Bus routes around the edges of the park linking to the railway, along Liesbeek and Alexandra roads.</li> <li>• Hartley vale as MyCiti hub.</li> <li>• Valkenberg bridge open to public use</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B-M link as vehicular link including development [please explore alternative routes closer to railway line/bridge]</li> </ul>	<b>6.8</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Does it provide dense mixed-use and mixed tenure environment?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Let's consider development along Voortrekker road, on Paarden Eiland and the railway yard before entering the floodplain.</li> <li>• Absolutely no development on RC land especially around the SAAO, on the north.</li> <li>• Considering to develop the golf course</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of Ndabeni,</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• River Club development, it must take into account views from SAAO</li> <li>• Oude Molen very controversial and contested area</li> </ul>	<b>4.5</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Does it enable the development of funding and local economic opportunities?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ....</li> </ul>	Positive: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul> Negative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ...</li> </ul>	<b>1.6</b>

## Scenario B

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
<b>7</b>	<b>Does it align the development and the preservation with clear management, administrative and institutional system?</b>	• ....	Positive: • ... Negative: • ...	1.3
<b>8</b>	<b>How does it strengthen social cohesion, celebrate and respect the different cultural narratives and heritage assets?</b>	• Enlarging Neue Molen finger, open for tourism/recreation and offering space for mixed-use development on the edges	Positive: • Preserving SAAO and more open to public use • preserving Neue Molen • More permeable and open Valkenberg site, including regional social facility. • Valkenberg to be relocated mostly in the long term Negative: • ...	4.6
<b>9</b>	<b>Does it enable the establishment of a social partnership?</b>	• ...	Positive: • ... Negative: • ...	2.2
<b>10</b>	<b>Does it develop alternative system of technologies?</b>	• ....	Positive: • Fingers approach opens to sustainable solutions Negative: • ...	4

ranking 1-10 / 10 people in group B

<b>5.95</b>	10	6	3	2	8	2	6.5	7	8	7
<b>5.9</b>	2	2	7	7	7	10	7	7	7	3
<b>5.8</b>	4	8	7	5	10	7	7	6	2	2
<b>6.8</b>	3	8	3	8	10	9	6	8	8	5
<b>4.5</b>	5	0	8	6	10	3	0	4	4	5
<b>1.6</b>	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	10
<b>1.3</b>	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	1	1	1
<b>4.6</b>	9	8	2	2	7	0	5	3	0	10
<b>2.2</b>	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	0	10	0
<b>4</b>	4	0	8	0	10	7	3	3	0	5
<b>4.265</b>										

# Scenario C

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
1	How is the metropolitan urban park interpreted? [role in the City, social facilities]		<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park is connected to broader metro area allowing all communities to access it</li> <li>• Different access points allowing access from all sides</li> <li>• Natural landscape, birds and water offers uniqueness (Joy)</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of past occupation patterns and new communities</li> <li>• SKA as a destination reinforces the SAAO as place of science, learning (synergy between the two is permitted to exist due to colocation)</li> <li>• Openness and natural landscape visible from outsiders passing (off M5)</li> </ul> <p>Negative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biovac was discussed – seen as negative due to its potential to cause more of a barrier between Oude Molen and MGV. There was discussion about the fact that this could be dealt with through design</li> </ul>	9
2	How is the ecological integrity preserved and restored?		<p>Positive:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bio-retention facility along Liesbeek and Black River using set of weir's to delay water through flows</li> <li>• Infrastructure such as proposed Berkley Rd on curvy alignment frames park</li> <li>• Note: appears that ecological integrity is OK due to extent of land set aside for open space</li> <li>• Proposal is for communities on land adjacent to river corridor to handle cleaning of their storm water before it reaches river.</li> <li>• Weirs in their design could allow people to come closer to water – creative design of these elements is required – could catch silt, litter, allow flows even through dry seasons, be boat safe and allow people to cross river</li> <li>• Note: Ecological Integrity reliant on appropriate development (agreed by all)</li> </ul>	9
3	Does it embrace the sustainable environmental approach?		<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal to see water recycled – grey water reused on site. Storm water to be allowed to infiltrate ground</li> <li>• Proposal to use wind energy to pump water up and away from river for use in urban agriculture etc</li> </ul>	9
4	Does it promote the use of sustainable modes of transport?		<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct train line connection between southern suburbs line and Bellville Line</li> <li>• Localised NMT – limit bridges in particular to NMT</li> <li>• Note: Better management in the future of metro-fail is imperative and presents slight risk to achieving objectives</li> </ul>	8
5	Does it provide dense mixed-use and mixed tenure environment?		<p>Positives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Live/work – to reduce need to travel</li> <li>• Ndabeni Triangle and Culemborg present great opportunities for urban development that accommodates live/work</li> <li>• Proposal to use flexible modules in residential development to allow changes over time and a difference in need and affordability. Basic units of 44m<sup>2</sup> each – can be joined together etc.</li> <li>• Buildings can share parking</li> <li>• Note: Occupants of buildings can share common spaces – leading to integration and social cohesion</li> <li>• BUT the group were adamant that the scale of urban fabric needed to be appropriate. Group supported proposal for 3 storeys on river corridor, 3-4 storeys on Alexandra Rd and up to 7 storeys on Ndabeni Triangle. Development always to consider scale of neighbour</li> </ul>	8

## Scenario C

MANIFEST POINT	QUESTION	RESPONSE	WHAT ARE THE POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ELEMENTS?	RATING FROM 1-10
6	Does it enable the development of funding and local economic opportunities?		Positives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opportunities for development: Culemborg, River Club as Tourism node, SKa as visitor destination and part of incentive for visits from tourists, edge of Valkenberg after rationalisation of Hospital</li> <li>• Oude Molen as part Eco Village</li> </ul>	8
7	Does it align the development and the preservation with clear management, administrative and institutional system?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group felt the scenario wasn't developed far enough to guide a response although there was consensus that communities adjacent to the river should manage their own precincts and contribute at the same time to management of the the Park as single entity</li> </ul>	-
8	How does it strengthen social cohesion, celebrate and respect the different cultural narratives and heritage assets?		Positives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Park is well connected to local communities and communities further afield eg Athlone and Langa and Maitland etc – allows integration of communities</li> <li>• Proposal for places of memorialisation / cultural expression / space for cultural practises. (These are mostly related to the river landscape)</li> <li>• Note: There was a suggestion that a museum to culture and diversity should be located in the Park</li> </ul>	9
9	Does it enable the establishment of a social partnership?		Positives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connectivity between communities allowed for building of idealism through a focus on sustainability and culture etc</li> <li>• Proposal does acknowledge the past and present and future</li> <li>• Future proposals should incorporate Spaces for engagement and dialogue – spaces of memorialisation and landscape itself could allow for this</li> <li>• Acknowledgement of diverse / heterogeneous habitat and landscape types and cultures</li> <li>• Noted: Partnerships grow over time</li> </ul>	9
10	Does it develop alternative system of technologies?		Positives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wind generation to pump water from river</li> <li>• Treatment / reuse of grey water</li> <li>• Solar Power</li> <li>• Look at wetlands as way of cleaning water</li> <li>• Suggestion that poorer residents / existing buildings be subsidised / sponsored solar technology</li> </ul>	9