

TRU-Park Workshop 2 : Manifesto

see presentation

see attendance register

apologies : John Kennedy, Leslie London, Lenette, Daniel, etc..

10 March 2016

18h00 – 20h00

Salt River Community Hall

Discussion on minutes from Workshop 1 [introduction]			
NO.	QUESTION / STATEMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	<p>Who are the elected steering committee members?</p> <p>What is the timeframe for the confirmation of this committee?</p>	<p>Nothing has been finalized yet. The Heads of Departments nominate members and seek possible external members at their discretion. This is still in the process of being finalized.</p> <p>Custodian of the TRU-Park site is Department of Public Works. City allocated different custodians to different parts of the land.</p> <p>The purpose of the steering committee is to play the role of advisors to the Heads of Departments when it comes to decision making, the committee cannot make final decisions.</p>	
	<p>When the responses refer to 'initiate conversations with CoCT/WCG'; what does this mean? Please provide contact persons within each area for stakeholders to initiate these conversations.</p>		CoCT and WCG
	<p>With regards to the private land within the TRU-Park area, does the public have any say on how they proceed? How do they escape public input?</p>	<p>A development framework will come out of this process where all of the land owners will have to conform to the guidelines put in place.</p>	
	<p>What is the progress on the planning/policy documents that are to be shared with the stakeholder group?</p>	<p>CoCT and WCG are in the process of setting up the online library. The stakeholder group needs to compile a list of all the policies/documents they want to put onto the library.</p> <p>In the meantime, all of these documents are available to the public on the web, they are just not collected into a consolidated library as yet.</p>	
	<p>What will happen to the 2003 contextual framework?</p>	<p>This process does not throw out the 2003 Contextual Framework, it intends to work toward a new development framework in light of new legislation, environmental issues, etc. [considering that the 2003 CF was developed 13 years ago]</p>	

Discussion on Manifesto	
MISSING ITEM RAISED :	Where do currently existing organisations and programmes within the TRU-Park area fit into the Manifesto?
	How does the Manifesto include the residents in Maitland Garden Village and other residents in the TRU-Park area?
	Urban agriculture is not mentioned in the Manifesto.

MANIFESTO ITEM NO.	STATEMENT
<p>0 The Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) and its associated landholdings offer a unique development¹ opportunity for the City of Cape Town. This centrally located site has many attributes and unique qualities that can help to heal the city and give hope to its people. As a distinctive re-generation area it affords the prospect to create a precinct that is diverse and yet socially inclusive. It offers the possibility to provide an inspiring and welcoming space within the city, for socially mixed² communities as much as for interested investors. With this envisaged development of the TRUP, the aims and objectives are:</p>	<p>¹ The term 'development' is a concern. It disregards the natural qualities.</p> <p>² The term 'socially mixed' is not ideal. Instead refer to integrated and sustainable communities.</p>
<p>1 to champion the use of sustainable modes of transport; to discourage the dependency on private vehicular movement, to endorse the use of public transport, actively encourage non-motorised transport and pedestrian movement.</p>	<p>'champion', 'endorse', 'actively encourage' – detail and define these words further, they are too vague and the stakeholders do not understand what is meant by it.</p> <p>Stakeholders need clarity on what sustainable transport is?? Needs to be defined in detail.</p> <p>Considering new developments [Valkenberg, Old power station site, Old Conradie site], the objective should be to reduce the impact on traffic and not add to the congestion. Cannot solve problems while creating more.</p>
<p>2 to provide a dense¹ mixed-use, mixed tenure urban environment associated with the Park, in which people can safely live, work and play. In particular to make provision for medium density affordable housing. To strive towards building a vibrant, safe local resident community in which cultural diversity and tolerance could flourish.</p>	<p>¹ Should be 'dense where appropriate'. Development should not sit hard onto the water's edge. To densify upwards, build higher, and less sprawl.</p> <p>Preserve existing 'natural' landscape. The client does not need to concentrate all development into this site, it can be shared into other projects elsewhere.</p> <p>Contradiction to existing green park??</p> <p>This statement in comparison with zoning regulations?</p> <p>Holistic / sustainable development, where appropriate.</p>
<p>3 to develop funding opportunities that are geared towards public and private partnerships as well as the involvement of institutional investors. To mobilise new investments, create jobs and ensure that a significant component of the business premises are affordable for small and micro enterprises.</p>	<p>Human capital is underrated.</p> <p>Stakeholders feel that this may lead to attracting large developers.</p> <p>Add value to funding opportunities.</p> <p>Park as an economic generator.</p> <p>Emphasis more on 'social entrepreneurship' and entrepreneurship models [planet, people, profit]</p> <p>Job creation within the park [like Kirstenbosch]</p>
<p>4 to embrace a progressive¹ environmentalist approach that seeks to protect the natural qualities of the site and develop the precinct in a manner that respects the Earth's resources as well as natural environments, and that is in keeping with national and international best practices.</p>	<p>¹ Progressive should be changed to sustainable.</p> <p>Urban agriculture??</p>

5	to preserve the open, green park-like¹ quality of the site as a special physical and visual amenity. To limit new building coverage and control building within the flood plain, as far as possible , in order to preserve the recreational quality and environmental value of the site.	<p>'park-like' – stakeholders do not want a park, they want to preserve the natural space.</p> <p>¹Consider using the words 'ecological integrity' instead of 'park'</p> <p>In order to ease the discussions ahead, it should be agreed upon that NOTHING is to be developed within the 100yr floodplain.</p> <p>'as far as possible' is too vague and non-descriptive, be specific.</p> <p>Urban agriculture ??</p>
6	to develop a safe metropolitan urban park¹ based on sustainable principles and responsible management practices that is founded on a partnership between local communities, different tiers of government and investors.	<p>¹ emphasis on preserving the natural environment and not creating another Green Point Park.</p> <p>To what extent do we preserve the park if we want to accommodate value for tourism?</p> <p>To consider tourism as an economic activity? To introduce shuttles from the stations to the park, bringing people into the site.</p> <p>People should be brought close to the river and the institutions should be pushed way back, further out.</p>
7	to align the development¹ with clear management, administrative and institutional systems² . To bring government and public services closer to the people, and where required, to reform legislation.	<p>¹ Using the word 'development' raises concerns with the stakeholders. It implies that the site is seen as a large development. Rather consider 'development and preservation'.</p> <p>² What systems/mechanisms? Possibility to put together a management strategy team?</p> <p>With regards to the future of the TRU-Park site; a management system should be put into place toward preserving the natural area in the future.</p> <p>90% of the problem is regarding how to preserve and conserve.</p> <p>Stakeholders were initially confused by what this statement means. [Make it clearer that it refers to the operation and maintenance of infrastructure and services.]</p>
8	to develop TRUP as an integrative space that responds to the culture, heritage and memory of the site – a place that joins together this region of the city and its local communities , rather than it continuing to serve as a 'barrier space' and in so doing assist in undoing apartheid spatial planning and attending to the needs of the current and future communities. This is to be implemented with a sensitivity to the heritage of the site and be inclusive of the diverse cultural characteristics.	<p>Who's culture ? Which heritage ?</p> <p>To what extent will heritage be considered?</p> <p>An area should allocated to experiencing and remembering the historical environment.</p> <p>Security blocks are not sustainable.</p> <p>Various cultures should be integrated in a structured way.</p>
9	to establish such a partnership – a social partnership – that can form the basis of cooperation between the various stakeholders, which can address the inequities of the past, include the marginalised sectors of society, prioritise public rather than private interest as well as help build viable enterprises.	
10	to develop, where possible, alternative systems of technology¹ - resource efficient sustainable technologies – that are viable as well as financially feasible and which could demonstrate alternative modes of urban living.	<p>¹ Phrase is too vague, should be more precise and descriptive of what kind of technologies.</p> <p>The TRU-Park area should become a showcase of technologies and an example to the rest of the city. [no cars, electric bikes, etc.] Wind turbines??</p> <p>The site should recycle and promote zero-human waste.</p>

Other issues/items raised			
	QUESTION / STATEMENT	RESPONSE	ACTION
	<p>WCDTL feel that a site visit is necessary in order for the different stakeholders to understand the different areas of the site better, as well as for the working team.</p> <p>A drone / video clip of a journey through the site would be useful.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It was discussed to have a site visit, potentially on the first Saturday of April. TBC.</p>	
	<p>Residents of Maitland Garden Village are unclear on what will happen to them and what their role is in the project.</p> <p>The residents would like to invite the CoCT and WCG to present their ideas to the community.</p>	<p>There is currently limited infrastructure within the Garden Village. WCG has ideas to retrofit the existing houses in the Village, making them a showcase of sustainable technologies. This retrofitting will hopefully influence the private owners to also upgrade their homes.</p>	

We would like to reconvene for the next session, Workshop 3: Constraints and Opportunities discussion. This will take place on the 31th of March 2016.