

**TRUP Workshop 1  
Held at Pinelands Town Hall – 25 Feb 2016 | 18:00 – 20:30**

**Present:** See attendance register

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome and introduction
2. Purpose of meeting
3. Presentation
4. Discussion
5. Way forward

**NOTES OF THE MEETING**

**1. Opening and Welcome**

- 1.1. Melikaya Ntshingwa (SUN) opened the meeting, welcoming attendees and stakeholders
- 1.2. An over view of the agenda and background to the workshop was done

**2. Introduction Presentation**

Michael Krause (SUN) presented the following topics:

- 2.1.1. TRUP development tender process
- 2.1.2. Consortium team responsible for the tender
- 2.1.3. The team brief by client (WCG and CoCT)
- 2.1.4. Key objectives of the brief
- 2.1.5. Public participation process
- 2.1.6. TRU-Park process and visioning (broad perspective)
- 2.1.7. Vision alignment and manifesto

Presentation is attached and available on request.

QUESTION / STATEMENT	RESPONSE	PROPOSED ACTION
<p>Does the WCG and/CoCT have a policy guideline and plan that guides the Development of the TRU-Park area?</p> <p>Are there documents in their possession that support such development? Is that information available for sharing?</p> <p>Policy guidelines, spatial plans and development proposals should be shared with the stakeholder members / should be made available on a forum or website / links to the various policies to be sent via email.</p> <p>The plans for Woodstock, Salt river and Observatory need to be available for one to make sustainable plans for the TRUP area. We need to know what is going to happen in those areas</p> <p>Documents or plans of the previous Oude Molen proposal should also be added to the library of reference materials for the stakeholders.</p>	<p>Stakeholders are free to suggest specific documents they would like to see.</p> <p>The City is looking at the broader development and is aware of other plans.</p>	<p>Share policies, vision alignment documents and spatial plans via email with the stakeholder group</p> <p>Create an online library of references that the stakeholders can access.</p>

<p>Whose idea was this whole project?</p> <p>Where has it initiated from? Why this site?</p> <p>The project will need large capital expenditure. Where is the money going to come from?</p>	<p>Idea originated in the provincial government; based around the idea of creating a 'Live, Work, Play' environment.</p> <p>The land is owned largely by the provincial government, Local government that's why it has been chosen.</p>	
<p>What frustrates us is that the WCG and CoCT seems to want to start at the green lung (TRUP area) instead of starting from the CBD/Town and link CBD development with Woodstock, Salt-river, Observatory and TRUP area.</p> <p>Why is the Client not focusing on development in other areas of the City? [E.g. Woodstock, Salt River]. There are many other sites/areas where they can develop; so why 'our' site – leave our green lung alone.</p> <p>Emphasis on the value of the TRUP site; especially as it is the only park connection up to the peninsula and provides necessary ecosystem services.</p>	<p>The client and team are considering the city at large and other development projects throughout the city.</p> <p>This is noted and agreed on.</p>	
<p>What is the role of the TRUP Association in this process? Are they bystanders?</p> <p>The TRUP Association should be a part of the full participation process. They would like to be present at all meetings.</p> <p>We are aware that there are steering committee nominations that are taking place. Why is the TRUP Association not involved?</p>	<p>The stakeholders are not bystanders, the intention is to have them as part of the process.</p> <p>A conversation about the role of the TRUP Association can be initiated with the CoCT; where the relationship between the TRUP Association and CoCT can be addressed.</p> <p>Willingness to participate in round table discussions is appreciated. SUN does not have the authority to include the TRUP Association in all the meetings with the client; this conversation needs to be initiated with the CoCT &amp; WCG.</p>	
<p>The Client steering committee; who are the members?</p>	<p>The committee is to be elected through a nomination process; the deadline was 24 February, but the members have not yet been confirmed.</p>	
<p>What are the timelines of this process? Why is the timeline so short?</p> <p>What is the rush? Why 4 meetings in March?</p> <p>Where are the representatives from the CoCT and the WCG? If they are here they should be given mandate to speak.</p>	<p>See Workshop timeline. The short timeline is due to the fact that we are required to give feedback to the WCG and CoCT at the beginning of April.</p> <p>Tamsyn [CoCT] is present.</p>	<p>Stakeholders would like CoCT and WCG officials to be actively involved in workshops and also give comments.</p>

<p>What is 'no go area' within the precinct?  'No-go' areas should be made clear and resolved upfront for ease of the process.</p>	<p>Workshop 3: Constraints and Opportunities will encourage a discussion that can address and identify the 'no-go' areas</p>	
<p>Government presents itself as owners of land, whereas we know that they are custodians of the land. We believe that the owners of the land are the people/communities</p> <p>Government need to first consult people before formulating ideas about what need to take place on any land.</p> <p>No design work should take place before participation. A round-table discussion needs to take place around some maps and with the CoCT and WCG</p>	<p>Workshop 3: Constraints and Opportunities of the site will be discussed</p>	<p>Before the plans are published to a wider audience, they need to run through public participation processes</p> <p>A round-table discussion needs to take place around some maps and with the CoCT and WCG</p>
<p>Do you have a sense of what kind of buildings to be erected on this site? How much space is available for development?</p> <p>What percentages of commercial, residential, industrial etc. development types is intended for TRU-Park site, as well as how much [floor area] of development is intended?</p> <p>We wish any views of CoCT and WCG on the development will not be hidden to us (stakeholders), instead, those views will be presented to us before adoption.</p>	<p>These figures have not yet been finalized . The figures are to be debated between the WCG and CoCT and the stakeholders during the workshop on various scenarios (Workshops 3 &amp; 4) and throughout the design process.</p> <p>Workshop 3: Constraints and Opportunities</p> <p>Workshop 4: Scenarios</p>	
<p>We went through the painstaking process previously, in trying to come up with a conceptual framework for development in the TRUP area. Nothing came back to us as stakeholders. We are concerned about this new process.</p> <p>There was money allocated to the previous process. Is that money still available?</p>	<p>Initiate this conversation with the WCG and CoCT.</p>	
<p>Concern that what happened to the Oude Molen plans from the Mokena Makeka process will reoccur in this process. A lot of effort and time went into that process.</p>	<p>The team is aware of the previous processes.</p>	
<p>What is the current status or plans for rezoning applications? Why have they not been made available to the stakeholders?</p>	<p>We do not currently have any rezoning applications under way, this process hasn't started yet.</p> <p>We cannot speak for other privately owned development sites in the area.</p>	

<p>What were the CoCT and WCG comments on the Manifesto?</p> <p>Would like to see the conclusive Manifesto before it goes to the WCG and CoCT for approval.</p> <p>More detail and further clarity needs to be applied to the Manifesto where 'as far as possible', etc. is mentioned. For example, to limit development in flood plain as far as possible – define/clarify</p>	<p>The WCG and CoCT have commented on the manifesto. The next workshop session, Workshop 2, will focus on the Manifesto and there will be all received comments available as well.</p>	<p>Stakeholder group would like access to the WCG and CoCT comments to the Manifesto.</p> <p>Further clarify and detail certain aspects in the Manifesto.</p>
<p>We are concerned about the manifesto. It is too general and vague. The stakeholders would like to be able to give input and would like to see more extensive explanations before signing.</p> <p>What legal weight will the manifesto carry?</p>	<p>Workshop 2 will provide space for stakeholder input into the manifesto.</p> <p>The manifesto will be signed off by the stakeholders as well as the WCG and CoCT and then used to assess the various scenarios against.</p>	
<p>Make clear the WCG and CoCT intentions and objectives for the site – in order for stakeholders to feel confident in the fact that the park is secure.</p> <p>When is the WCG and CoCT being taken on the site to be made aware of the actual, physical space? They need to experience the site.</p> <p>The mandate of the CoCT and the WCG needs to be clearly showed.</p>	<p>Initiate this conversation with the WCG and CoCT .</p>	
<p>What is the intention of the Dutch?</p> <p>Why are the Dutch coming to assist in this project, what is in it for them</p>	<p>As far as we are aware, there was a media release last year, a memorandum of agreement has been signed between the CoCT and the Dutch. The Dutch Government will be assisting in providing technical expertise for the team.</p>	
<p>Where are the private land owners on the site?</p> <p>What is happening at the River Club? The River Club site is supposed to be part of TRUP.</p> <p>What about rumors that the River Club is going to develop into a waterfront?</p> <p>River Club is public land owned by PRASA?</p> <p>Construction activity has been spotted on the River Club site, what is going on? People have not been informed about what is happening on the River Club site.</p> <p>Stakeholders feel it is unacceptable that</p>	<p>River Club site has been sold by PRASA and is now private land.</p> <p>We are currently working at a very high level, not on the ground. We are not privy to what is taking place on the ground.</p>	

public land has been sold with such ease.		
SKA, national health institutions, BIOVAC : Where does the money for this come from?  Oude Molen land was given to BIOVAC by provincial government?		
Who are the engineers on the team? Where are they based?  Who is looking at the water system?	RHDHV is an engineering firm based in Cape Town and Johannesburg.  The representative in Johannesburg will be doing the flood modelling in collaboration with the team of engineers and the environmental consultant in Cape Town.	
Is a traffic impact assessment being done?	Yes. This is part of our mandate and will take place at a later stage in the project.	
Ancestral tie to the site need to be acknowledged. A museum or cultural village site needs to be included.  Acknowledge people that were forcibly removed from the site and relocated.  Historically, Nguni people are part of the area. They want to be part of giving input on the development of the area. Suggestion: The facilitators of this process need to assist in convening a wider group of traditional leaders so that all traditional leaders may feel part of the engagements in this process.  The work of SUN and the process thus far is appreciated.	Statement for a cultural site has been mentioned in the presentation. The Manifesto has incorporated the historical and cultural significance of the site.	
How will the stakeholder inputs be recorded?  Who is recording the minutes of the meeting? How will it be shared with the stakeholder group as well as the broader interested public?  Simple written notes are not enough of a record.  Stakeholders suggested a press release about the Public Participation Process which is taking place.	Minutes/questions and responses will be shared as well as made available at the next meeting so they can be commented on.  Recordings will be used for future meetings.	Forward minutes and any other relevant material to the larger stakeholder group.  Stakeholders can then comment on the minutes taken and those members who were not present can be made aware of what was discussed.
How soon can the notes and minutes be made available?  Meeting minutes should be transcribed and be made publically available.	In a week's time, the notes will be distributed to the stakeholder groups.	The participation process needs to include a broader range of stakeholders/interested parties. Everyone should be able to access information and

		ask questions on an open site, where the Client can respond to concerns.
--	--	--

The meeting was closed by facilitators informing the stakeholders that SUN would like to welcome suggestions from all the stakeholders, on how we can best include the broader stakeholder groups and how we can reach everyone that is interested.

**We would like to reconvene for the next session - Workshop 2: Manifesto discussion. This will take place on Thursday, 10<sup>th</sup> of March 2016. Venue still to be confirmed.**

A date will thereafter be finalized for Workshop 3: constraints/opportunities.