



Doc Ref: 03040
15 March 2018

BASIC ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED IRT PHASE 2A TRUNK ROUTE: PORTION E1, 3.5KM OF GOVAN MBEKI ROAD, MANENBERG & GUGULETHU: FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH LOCAL COUNCILLORS, SUB-COUNCIL 14 (PROVIDED AS AN ITEM ON THE AGENDA FOR THE SUB-COUNCIL MEETING)

PRE-APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER: 16/3/3/6/7/1/A2/19/3028/18

MINUTES- FINAL

MEETING DATE: 16 February 2018
VENUE: Sub-Council Office, Fezeka Building, Cnr NY1 and Lansdowne Road Gugulethu
TIME: 11h30 – 12h30
ARRANGED BY: Chand
FACILITATOR (FOR THIS PRESENTATION): Ms. Marielle Penwarden

1. ATTENDEES

FULL NAME	INITIAL	ORGANISATION
Cllr. Noluthando Makasi	NM	Sub-council Chairperson
Cllr. Ntombikayise Nombakuse	NN	Sub-council 11 and 14 (Acting Sub-council Manager)
Cllr. Luyanda Nyingwa	LN	Sub-council 14 Ward 37
Cllr. Luvuyo Zondani	LZ	Sub-council 14 Ward 38
Cllr. Khaya Yozi	KY	Sub-council 14 Ward 39
Cllr. Sharon Manata	SM	Sub-council 14 Ward 41
Cllr. Sonwabo Ngxumza	SN	Sub-council 14 Ward 42
Cllr. Bonita Jacobs	BJ	Sub-council 14 Ward 45
Cllr. Mlungisi Bafo	MB	Sub-council 14 PR Councillor
Cllr. Xolani Cekiso	XC	Sub-council 14 PR Councillor
Ms. Zoleka Lucia Qoba	ZQ	Sub-council 14 EPA
Ms. Khanyisa Baleke	KB	WCDH- DD
Ms. Phatiswa Papixa	PP	ASD-KMPSS
Ms. Zizipho Gxixey	ZG	Clerk- KMPSS
Mr. Eugenio Mazzarella	EM	GIBB (Pty) Ltd (Project Manager)
Ms. Marielle Penwarden	MP	Chand Environmental Consultants (Environmental Assessment Practitioner)

2. APOLOGIES

FULL NAME	INITIAL	ORGANISATION
Cllr. Mabatho Kumeke	MK	Sub-council 14
Cllr. Patrick Ngqu	PN	Sub-council 14 PR Councillor
Ms. Catherine Overmeyer	CO	Sub-council 14

3. AGENDA

- Welcome and Introduction
- Project Description
- Status of the Basic Assessment process
- Specialist Findings
- Councillors Expectations Regarding the Process

- Questions and Answers
 - a) Are there any potential issues which you can identify that the local community would want to know more about?
 - b) Are there any other stakeholders within the local community who should be contacted?
 - c) Would the Councillors be willing to serve as a conduit of information for this Basic Assessment process?
 - d) Are there any suggestions from the Councillors regarding particular methods which may be employed for the stakeholder engagement aspect of the Basic Assessment process?
 - e) Additional questions...
- Other
- Close

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Welcome and Introduction

- a) MP thanked the Chairperson for permitting the project team to speak at their meeting and thanked all attendees for their time.
- b) MP began by asserting that the intention of this meeting is to present the proposal and to hear what the Councillors have to say about it, as well as what comments they believe would come from their communities.
- c) MP also highlighted that the process is still currently underway and that, although work has been done in this regard, changes would still be made in light of additional information gained from key stakeholders (such as the attendees of this meeting) and Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs).
- d) MP also indicated that she would go through the presentation as quickly as possible, however she does not wish to glance over aspects that are important to the Councillors and therefore encouraged them to raise their comments upon conclusion of the presentation.

4.2. Project Description

Refer to the attached presentation.

- a) MP emphasised that the proposed development footprint for the preferred alternative is for the largest footprint possible, however during detailed design the footprint may be reduced in certain sections of the route in response to design requirements or constraints on the ground.
Post-meeting note: The footprint is, however, unlikely to be reduced from that applied for in the section adjacent to the Edith Stephens Wetland Park.
- b) Clarity was requested with regard to the extent of the route and MP confirmed that it starts at the corner of Govan Mbeki Road and Vibra Street and that it terminates just after the church past Sheffield Road. EM added that there is a greater route where the proposed section would tie into, but that this Basic Assessment only focuses on this particular portion.
- c) The location of bus stops was also queried and EM confirmed that the exact locations are not yet determined, but that they would be evenly spread throughout the route to ensure convenient and safe pedestrian access.
- d) With regard to the images of the proposed route in slides 10 to 12, it was queried as to whether the green or blue lines were most pertinent and MP confirmed that the green lines show the maximum extent of the proposed road widening along the route (noting that certain areas may eventually be narrower, *refer to 4.2a) above*), while the blue lines indicate the existing road reserve. She added that the importance of indicating the existing road reserve serves to clarify where the proposed expansion along the route would occur beyond the road reserve.
- e) Concern was expressed regarding the proposal of the footprint over the housing development and church near Sheffield Road and EM confirmed that the proposal and associated maps could be reduced to avoid those areas.
- f) It was asked whether some properties and existing buildings would be encroached upon and MP stated that this could be the case in certain segments of the route, but that the City of Cape Town would negotiate with the affected landowners through a separate process, as and when required. MP assured attendees that, should Environmental Authorisation be granted for the proposal, this would only be under environmental law and it does not preclude the need for any other approvals under applicable laws.

4.3. Status of the Basic Assessment process

Refer to the attached presentation.

- a) MP highlighted that it is important to obtain feedback from key stakeholders such that any significant issues may be addressed prior to the publication of the post-application draft Basic Assessment Report (BAR) for the statutory 30-day public comment period.
- b) NN added that the Councillors should consider why a Basic Assessment is being carried out and that if more information is received, the scope of the assessment may be expanded upon.

4.4. Specialist Findings

Refer to the attached presentation.

- a) MP emphasised that although specialist studies have been undertaken, it does not rule out the need for further assessment should new information come to light. She added that one of the reasons for this meeting is to receive advice from the Councillors with respect to any apparent gaps in knowledge.

4.5. Councillors Expectations Regarding the Process

4.5.1. Local Heritage Considerations

- a) With reference to slide 32 (Impacts Summary), concern was raised over the fact that no heritage impacts had been identified.
- b) It was advised that further interrogation into the cultural and historic impacts be conducted, particularly because Gugulethu is 60 years old and it holds significant cultural and heritage value which should not be overlooked.
- c) The Fezeka building, being approximately 50 years old, was provided as an example of an important structure.
- d) NN added that Heritage Western Cape (HWC) does not have all the information on the local heritage aspects of the area and that another example of an important building is the Lutheran Church on Vanguard Drive.
- e) It was suggested that the celebration of local heritage could also provide access to tourism and that these structures should be restored and well maintained. An example of such a strategy could be to locate a bus stop nearby an important building where tourists could disembark and go on a tour of the building.
- f) Overall the sentiment was that, while the proposal is welcomed, it should not be at the expense of aspects of heritage and culture valued by the community and it was strongly advised that the community would want to see more attention paid to the local heritage aspects together with the impacts thereon.
- g) MP committed to undertaking a more detailed assessment and interrogation of the heritage aspects and asked whether the Councillors could provide the project team with the contact details of a local knowledgeable party. NM agreed to provide the details of the Gugulethu Development Forum (GDF) and some Ward Councillors who would be able to provide the necessary information.

4.5.2. Treatment of the Lotus Canal

- a) NN suggested that there is an opportunity to incorporate the Lotus Canal into the IRT route proposing that this should be carefully considered. She added that the Lotus Canal should also be protected and that an EIA had been conducted for the Lotus Canal which would be provided to Chand.

4.5.3. Benefits for the Local Community

- a) NN urged Councillors to consider ways in which the Basic Assessment process could be used to achieve benefits for the community and to require that the proposal illustrates said benefits.
- b) NN stated that the community would not want most of the benefits going to external parties, for example, they would not want large external security companies being employed.
- c) NN concluded her motivation by advising that the Applicant consider other factors that could work to benefit the local community and that the Councillors and their communities should suggest such factors as part of this Basic Assessment process.

4.5.4. Stakeholder Engagement

- a) NN advised that the Councillors think holistically of the project and that they prime their communities to do this same (refer to item 4.7.2 for further detail in this regard).
- b) NN stated that benefits should accrue to the local communities as a result of the process and these benefits should be clarified. She acknowledged that, while certain recommendations and aspects of the proposal would be beyond the mandate of the consultants, the consultants and this Basic Assessment process would record all comments received and that they would address those within the mandate while providing all the feedback received to the City (i.e. TDA) making recommendations for the viability of the project as a whole.
- c) NM suggested that effective mechanisms for community engagement in these communities include loud hailing and public meetings. She emphasised the importance of not only meeting with the Councillors alone, but also having public meetings where the community has an opportunity to voice their opinions directly.
- d) NM advised that, during the public participation component of the Basic Assessment process, the project team should first communicate with the Ward Councillors who would then set up the required meetings and interactions with the local communities. LZ agreed and emphasised the importance of working with the Councillors rather than just going into the communities without their knowledge or input.
- e) LZ suggested that, prior to a public meeting, a full-day workshop should be held with parties such as Ward Committee representatives, local Non-Government Organisations (NGOs), Ward Councillors and TDA. He added that these workshops would be valuable in establishing the best approach to the local communities, possible potential public benefits which could result from the proposal together with the identification of important cultural and heritage facets. LZ confirmed that the Ward Councillors would provide the project team with all the information on the appropriate people and organisations to invite.
- f) LZ added that it would be sensible to enlist the aid of one or two local and respected up-and-coming leaders of the communities to assist not only with translation, but also to facilitate and precipitate a clear understanding of issues between the communities and the project team. MP asked whether the Councillors could suggest such individuals and NM confirmed that CVs could be provided to the project team when required and that the logistics regarding interviews in terms of how, where and by whom they are conducted as well as the possibility of including a sub-council mentor could be arranged closer to the time.
- g) It was also suggested that whenever the public is engaged in these areas a black African should be included in the team representation in order to overcome the public perception that white people get all the consulting jobs.
- h) NM also said that the wards affected by the proposed route should be re-examined as it appears as though outdated information may have been used.
- i) NM requested that the sub-council be kept abreast of the process and MP confirmed that this would be done.

4.6. Questions and Answers

The following questions and their respective responses were tabled at the meeting.

No.	Question	Answer
1	Are there any potential issues which you can identify that the local community would want to know more about?	<p>The key issues which would be important to the community can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition, protection and celebration of the local heritage and culture; • A thorough and transparent public engagement process where the entire community is afforded an opportunity to voice their concerns/issues; • Appropriate treatment of the Lotus Canal and incorporation into the proposed design; • Enhancement of the local neighbourhoods; • Benefits to the local communities (including socio-economic benefits); and • The concept designs for the entire IRT route and information on

		aspects of the IRT project that fall beyond the mandate of the current Basic Assessment process.
2	Are there any other stakeholders within the local community who should be contacted?	The Gugulethu Development Forum was highlighted as being important to the process.
3	Would the Councillors be willing to serve as a conduit of information for this Basic Assessment process?	It was agreed that the Councillors would be willing to assist with community engagement and dissemination of information, provided that they remain informed of the Basic Assessment process and involved in any meetings set up with the community and/or community organisations.
4	Are there any suggestions from the Councillors regarding particular methods which may be employed for the stakeholder engagement aspect of the Basic Assessment process?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A meeting with key heritage authorities from the local communities (e.g. the GDF) should take place to provide more detail on the local culture and heritage; • Prior to a public meeting, a workshop with the following parties (contact details to be provided by the Councillors) should be arranged (with the assistance of the Councillors) to discuss the proposal, stakeholder engagement, heritage aspects and potential benefits to the communities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ward Committee representatives; ○ TDA; ○ Local NGOs; and ○ Ward Councillors. • Hold a public meeting to present the proposal and obtain feedback from the communities. • Announcing of meetings through loud hailers and by working with the Councillors.

4.7. Other

4.7.1. Project Name

- a) It was recommended that the project name be amended to include reference to "Gugulethu" and MP agreed that this would be done.

4.7.2. Holistic Considerations of the Greater IRT Scope in the East

- a) NN highlighted that the community does not know what the overall design of the IRT route looks like and that the consultants for this Basic Assessment process cannot provide that information are only mandated to deal with a particular portion thereof.
- b) NN urged the Councillors to look holistically at the entire IRT development and push for the eastern side to become a tourist attraction, adding that the whole route and legacy should be considered. She advised Councillors to prime their communities to think this way as well and that comments should be provided with due consideration to social and economic issues.
- c) She concluded by suggesting that Councillors and communities think broadly and that they provide inputs which will make a difference to the communities residing in this space.
- d) NN advised that, when engagement occurs with the public, representatives from TDA be present in order to respond to queries which are beyond the scope of the Basic Assessment process and the mandate of the consultants.
- e) NM echoed the sentiments of NN and added that, although public engagement may have taken place in 2015, the nature of the communities with regard to their make-up and issues which are important to them, as well as the structure of the local Wards and appointed Ward Councillors have changed significantly since then and that additional engagement should be carried out. *Refer to section 4.5.4 c) for further details on appropriate mechanisms of community engagement.*

4.7.3. Demarcation of the proposed Route relative to existing Ward Boundaries as well as within the context of the Entire IRT Project

- a) NM stated that the demarcation of the route may be confusing to communities, particularly with regard to the fact that it may not cover the full extent of a particular ward (i.e. it may only extend a few hundred metres into a certain ward which would result in communities querying why one part of the ward is going to have the project while another may not). She suggested that the proposed route should terminate at a point where an entire ward is accommodated.
- b) MP explained that this particular portion of the route was selected based on the triggers in terms of environmental legislation (i.e. the National Environmental Management Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended- NEMA), given that this Basic Assessment process is being undertaken to obtain Environmental Authorisation under NEMA.
- c) EM further clarified that the entire route would still be constructed and that this portion would connect to the remainder of the route.

4.8. Close

- a) MP thanked all attendees for their time and input and closed the meeting at 11h30.

5. ACTIONS

A number of actions arose from the meeting. The details thereof are tabled below.

No.	Details	Responsible Party
1	Send attendees a copy of the presentation	MP
2	Narrow the end portion of the proposed route to avoid the church and the housing development	EM/MP
3	Send contact details of appropriate community heritage liaison (e.g. GDF) to MP	NM

General actions in terms of the additional assessment of the cultural and heritage aspects of the area, the inclusion of all affected wards as Interested and Affected Parties, as well as the stakeholder engagement activities suggested would be carried out during the Basic Assessment process and would be informed by the legislative requirements as well as feedback received from stakeholders.