CITY OF CAPE TOWN
STAD KAAPSTAD

Final Comments on the Draft Report: VICTORIA & ALFRED WATERFRONT, DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK Submitted by the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront Company.

NOVEMBER 1989

THIS REPORT WAS ADOPTED BY COUNCIL ON 1989-12-14

ISBN 0-947439-43-0

8421H/dh/1

Civic Centre
12 Hertzog Boulevard
Cape Town
8001

Burgersentrum
Hertzogboulevard 12
Kaapstad
8001

REPORT
VERSLAG

No/Nr: 225/1989
Ref/Verw: TP 877/AJS

Date/Datum: 1989 11. 28.

To/Aan: THE TOWN PLANNING COMMITTEE

CITY OF CAPE TOWN
CITY PLANNER'S DEPARTMENT

STAD KAAPSTAD
DEPARTEMENT VAN DIE
STADSBEPLANNER

FINAL COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT ENTITLED: VICTORIA AND ALFRED WATERFRONT, DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK, SUBMITTED BY THE VICTORIA AND ALFRED WATERFRONT COMPANY

A. BACKGROUND

Council at its meeting on 1989-09-28 adopted Departmental Report No. 155/1989 entitled Preliminary Comments on the Draft Report: Victoria & Alfred Waterfront Development Framework which recommended that:

1. The Council adopts the Package of Plans approach as the basis to agreements being reached with the V & AWC and SATS on the change of use of the V & AW Area and, on future detailed planning and development, as well as the basis for recording a zoning as will be required once the Legal Succession to SA Transport Services Act of 1989 is put into force by the Minister.

2. The Council agrees in principle with the goals, objectives, policies and physical structure as summarized in the Development Framework Diagram, contained in the V & AW Draft report entitled "Victoria & Alfred Waterfront: Development Framework", September 1989, as constituting first stage planning agreement between Council and SATS as required by the SATS Transport Services Act, No. 65, 1981, subject to such revision as might be desirable as a result of further review and public consultation undertaken jointly by Council and the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront Company, and recognizing the need for separate agreements to be reached on the financial relationship and consequent provision of municipal services as part of a Master Agreement between the Council, SATS and the V & AWC.

3. Copies of the draft Contextual Framework report be forwarded to members of the Minister's Liaison Committee, the Federated Hotel Association of South Africa (FEDHASA), the Cruising Association of South Africa (CASA), and ratepayer associations adjoining the V & AW Area for their review and comment, following which a final comments report will be forwarded to Council.

4. The Corporate Management Team report further on proposed services and financial arrangements with the V & AWC and SATS.

5. The Council delegates to the Town Planning Committee the authority to reach agreement as contemplated by SA Transport Services Act, No. 65, 1981 and such approvals as may be necessary by Council, to Precinct Plans as they are submitted by the V & AWC.

B. FURTHER CONSULTATION AND REVIEW

1. Copies of Report No. 155/1989, were forwarded to the Minister's Liaison Committee and to the V & AWC for the V & AWC to circulate the report for further public comments, according to the above Recommendation 3. The groups to be contacted over and above those mentioned in Recommendation 3, were the Cape Town CBD Association, De Waterkant Civic Association, Paarden Eiland and Metro Industrial and Commercial Association, Cape Town Foreshore Property Owners' Association and the Green and Sea Point Ratepayers Association.

2. A joint meeting was held between the Minister's Liaison Committee and Departmental representatives of Cape Town City Council on 1989-11-03. The Minutes of this meeting, attached as Annexure A, confirm that the Council's Comments Report together with other publics comments were considered jointly. Further that the joint meeting resolved as follows:

> "It was resolved that the Development Framework, the comments thereon by various interested parties and the report on these comments had been duly considered by the Liaison Committee in a joint session with representatives of the Cape Town City Council. These documents have been fully discussed and the issues raised are clearly capable of being dealt with in the ongoing planning process. The joint meeting therefore resolved to support the Development Framework and the goals and objectives contained in the document."

3. Comments were received by the Ministers Liaison Committee to the Draft Development Framework. These, and the responses to them by the V & A W C are contained as part of the attached Annexure B. Annexure B also contains the V & AWC's response to Council's comments on their Draft Development Framework (Report No. 155/1989).

4. The Council's Interdepartmental Waterfront Working Group subsequently met on 1989-11-09 to consider the contents of Annexure B and the resolution of the joint meeting between the Minister's Liaison Committee and Council representatives. The Interdepartental Working Group sees a need to highlight certain elements of the response by the Waterfront Company, to the report "Comments on the draft report entitled: Victoria and Alfred Waterfront, Development Framework" see attached Annexure B, letter dated 27 October 1989:

4.1 The Working Group confirmed need to separate planning, services and finances as was resolved on by Council's adoption on 1989-09-28 of Recommendation 2 of the Preliminary Comments Report.

4.2 The Working Group considered that the further levels of planning requiring agreement, namely Precinct, Site Development and Building Plans was not at issue at this stage, which concerns agreement to goals, objectives and policies for the V & AW Area as a whole and the Development Framework Diagram, as part of the Package of Plans Approach. Further reports on procedures will be put to Council in due course.

4.3 In their letters to Council dated 1989-09-08 and 1989-10-27, the V & AWC expresses concern that the V & AW Area should not be integrated into the adjacent City in such a way as to blur the Area's "own genius and image." The Working Group response to this is found in a Sub-Area Policy for the V & AW Area which is contained in Council's Draft Policy Framework for Cape Town's Central Waterfront. This states. ".... having regard for the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront Area as a public amenity and place, which is developed in ways which take full account of its special location, conditions, environment and history."

The Council's concern has been to ensure that the V & AW Area is not separated from its surroundings by either customs or security fences, so that the V & AW Area becomes a part of the adjoining City. The Area should have its own identity and it may require protection of parts of it for security reasons, but the principle of city normalcy should obtain.

5. As a result of the joint meeting, and other meetings between the V & AWC, ratepayers and other organizations, it is considered that the process of public participation as agreed to between Council and the V & AWC has been sufficiently met for final Council agreement to the Development Framework. However, further public participation will be required as the planning proceeds to more detailed levels as required by the Package of Plans approach. For instance, when Precinct Plans are submitted for agreement. Similarly, when a "zoning" is agreed to, as will eventually be required once the Legal Succession to the SA Transport Services Act of 1989 comes into force, the extent of flexibility which is regarded as desirable could lead in time to the need for departures from the Scheme Regulations, which in turn could call for a measure of public participation. In conclusion, it is considered that no responses received call for changes to be made to the Development Framework report and there is, therefore, no reason for Council not to give its agreement to this report as constituting first stage planning agreement between Council and SATS as required by the SATS Transport Services Act No. 68, 1981.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that Council reaffirms the following recommendations previously adopted on 1989-09-28:

1.1 Council adopts the Package of Plans approach as the basis to agreements being reached with the V & AWC and SATS on the change of use of the V & AW Area and, on future detailed planning and development, as well as the basis for recording a zoning as will be required once the Legal Succession to SA Transport Services Act of 1989 is put into force by the Minister.

1.2 Council agrees with the goals, objectives, policies and physical structure as summarized in the Development Framework Diagram, contained in the V & AW Draft report entitled "Victoria & Alfred Waterfront: Development Framework", September 1989, as constituting first stage planning agreement between Council and SATS as required by the SATS Transport Services Act, No. 65, 1981, recognizing the need for separate agreements to be reached on the financial relationship and consequent provision of municipal services as part of a Master Agreement between the Council, SATS and the V & AWC.

1.3 Council delegates to the Town Planning Committee the authority to reach agreement as contemplated by SA Transport Services Act, No. 65, 1981 and such approvals as may be necessary by Council, to Precinct Plans as they are submitted by the V & AWC.

2. It is further recommended that:

2.1 Council adopts the Sub-Area policies for the Victoria and Alfred Waterfront Area contained in para. 19 of the report "Preliminary Comments on the Draft Report: Victoria & Alfred Waterfront Development Framework, submitted by the Victoria & Alfred Waterfront Company", adopted by Council on 1989-09-28.

2.2 Council's approval of the Development Framework be for a 5-year period, extending to 1994-12-31, in accordance with the V & A W C's stated intention "that the Development Framework is reviewed constantly and formally updated every five years". (Development Framework Report III page 10). And that the V & A W C be requested to submit its proposed updated Development Framework in draft form to Council by 1994-06-30, for review and approval.

CITY PLANNER
for INTERDEPARTMENTAL WATERFRONT WORKING GROUP

A

MLH

ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS

73 Strand Street Cape Town P.O. Box 15002 Vlaeberg 8018
Telex 520632 Tel. (021) 24 3210

MEETING MINUTES

Project VICTORIA AND ALFRED WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT — Project No. 89 926

Subject JOINT MEETING OF LIAISON GROUP & CCC REPRESENTATIVES — Time

Place DOCKHOUSE — Date 3/11/89

Present

Prof B Kantor	-	V&AW
Mr D Jack	-	V&AW
Mr R Basson	-	V&AW
Mr C E McCarthy	-	Chamber of Industries
Mr P le Roux	-	Dept of Environmental Affairs
Mr C Bross	-	SA Deep Sea Trawling
Dr G Haysmann	-	Simon vd Stel Foundation
Ms Z du Toit	-	Somerset Hospital Board
Ms M Kelder	-	Captour
Mr A P Roux	-	SA Cultural History Museum
Mr R Basson	-	V&AW
Ms L Townsend	-	National Monuments Council
Mr J vd Lecq	-	Kaapstadse Afrikaanse Sakekamer
Mr C Mitchell	-	SAPOA
Mr G Behrens	-	Reg Dev Advisory Committee
Mr T Brummer	-	SAITRP
Mr P Prins	-	Dept of Tourism
Mr N Riley	-	City Planner
Mr D Riley	-	City Engineer
Cllr C Keegan	-	Chairman - Town Planning Committee
Mr P de Tolly	-	Deputy City Planner
Mr K Sturgeon	-	MLH

1. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed the City's representatives to the joint meeting with the Minister's Liaison Committee.

The comments of the various interested parties and Liaison Group members had been circulated and these were to be considered jointly.

2. DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

Mr K Sturgeon reviewed the submissions and comments as set out in the attached report.

3. DISCUSSION

a) Fishing Industry

Mr Bross said that the Fishing Industry was not opposed to the V&A's development but are concerned about their future.

The Fishing Industry does not perceive itself as privileged. It assisted SATS at a time when many of its buildings were vacant and in a state of disrepair by taking up this otherwise unused space.

The Industry does not have cheaper space than other areas such as Hout Bay or other harbours. Indeed Cape Town has some of the most costly space.

SA companies are fishing in local waters whereas overseas firms are exporting and have completely different cost structures.

The Industry does not wish to be in a worse position than it was before V&AW arrived. SATS and the industry have evolved a working relationship which is mutually satisfactory. This should continue in the future aside from rentals which the industry accepts will have to rise.

The appointment of a joint committee between V&AW and the Fishing Industry will address some of the industries concerns and the move was welcomed.

Mr Basson noted that while SATS would continue to support the fishing industry, SATS itself is changing and this means of necessity that the rules of the game will change over time and agreements will have to respond to such changes.

Mr Basson also queried whether the Deep Sea Trawling Association was the representative of the whole fishing industry. Mr Bross said that not all sectors of the industry are represented because of competition, but he is seeking to gain the support of other sectors of the industry.

Prof Kantor noted that V&AW did not believe that there was a confrontational situation but the industry will have to adapt to new conditions and rationalisations as development takes place.

b) Road Links

Mr D Riley noted that no finance is presently available for the completion of the freeway system. SATS could perhaps make representations to Central Government for funding the transport system.

The freeway links would be funded 60% NTC 20% CPA and 20% CCC. This is an issue which needs to be jointly addressed by the V&AW and CCC. The CPA must respond to this issue as the current 5 year road programme has become a 19 year programme. The need for urgent joint action at Ministerial level was stressed to obtain special central government funding for the road links.

Mr Boyes noted that the question of the freeway linkages falls outside the V&AW area but is central to it in the long term. It is vital that note be taken of this longer term requirement but it should not prejudice the short term development. It was noted that the Development Framework had in fact taken account of this concern and negotiations between CCC, V&AW and PRE would continue.

c) Sewerage disposal

Mr D Riley said that the problem of sewage disposal is serious and on site disposal may have to be considered.

Ongoing discussions between V&AW and the City may resolve certain aspects of this problem.

d) Beneficiation

The question of company's goals was briefly discussed and it was agreed that the V&A's stated goals and the goals of the City Council were in close accord and therefore there should be no fears of a "profits only" approach by the Company.

e) Integration

The question of integration with the City is important. The V&A area must be a distinctive area within the City yet part of it. The V&A should not be a bland extension of the City.

Mr Jack noted that the V&A will be excluded from the customs area. It will be a mixed use area and wherever appropriate the barriers between the V&A area and its adjoining areas will be breached particularly along the Portswood Road wall and the links to the ICS site.

f) Contextual Framework

Councillor Keegan asked whether the Liaison Committee had considered the City's Contextual Framework and City's comments on the Development Framework.

Mr Jack pointed out that the City's Contextual Framework is a separate document which must be commented on not only by V&A but SATS and other bodies for it to be duly considered and processed by Council.

It is not the responsibility of the Liaison Committee to pass comment on, or give approval to, the Contextual Framework.

4. RESOLUTION

Mr Jack requested that the Liaison Committee take a formal resolution on the acceptability of the Development Framework and that the comments on this document have been adequately considered and responded to by the V&A Company.

The acceptance of the Liaison Committee that the Development Framework and issues raised by commentators have been properly dealt with then this would conclude this phase of the work.

A report could then be prepared for the Minister and forwarded to the City Council.

It was resolved that the Development Framework, the comments thereon by various interested parties and the report on these comments had been duly considered by the Liaison Committee in a joint session with representatives of the Cape Town City Council. These documents have been fully discussed and the issues raised are clearly capable of being dealt with in the ongoing planning process. The joint meeting therefore resolved to support the Development Framework and the goals and objectives contained in the document.

This meeting concludes the first phase of the planning programme for the V&AW area.

5. PIERHEAD PRECINCT PLAN

Mr Jack briefly outlined the progress made on the Precinct Plan to date. He presented a number of explanatory diagrams.

It was noted that the Pierhead Precinct Plan will be ready for consideration by the end of November, for consideration by Council in December.

The meeting ended at 16h40.

B

MLH

ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS
51 Wale Street Cape Town P.O. Box 15002 Vlaeberg 8018
Tel. (021) 24 3210 Fax (021) 24 7810

27 October 1989

90 904/KBS/scp

The City Planner
Civic Centre
18th Floor
Hertzog Boulevard
FORESHORE
8001

Attention : Mr P de Tolly

Dear Sir

RESPONSE TO THE REPORT "COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REPORT ENTITLED: Victoria and Alfred Waterfront, Development Framework".

1. PREAMBLE

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your comments report on the Development Framework tabled at an Executive committee meeting on 22/9/89 and recommended accordingly.

The V&AW is delighted that one of our major concerns, that of timeous decisionmaking, has been addressed by the recommendation to delegate powers to the Town Planning Committee.

The document also goes a long way to clarify those areas of consensus between the Company and the CCC and highlights issues that require further discussion.

The former includes the adoption of the package of plans approach as a basis for reaching agreement on the change of use of the V&AW area. The report distinguishes three purposes which the package of plans approach will serve. These are:

"As a basis for reaching agreement on:

i) Change of use;
ii) Future detailed planning and development;
iii) Future zoning once Legal Succession to SA Transport Services Act of 1989 comes into effect - (Recommendation 1)".

We are also encouraged by the way the CCC has explicitly recognised the need for flexibility. It is felt, however, that this need should be driven not only by market fluctuations, but also by a recognition that the role of planning in the present is to set up a framework which does not preclude better informed decisions being made in the future.

2. GIVING EFFECT TO THE PACKAGE OF PLANS

The question of predictability has rightly been raised. It is indeed important to create a climate of confidence that stated undertakings and intentions will be realised. We believe this will in fact be achieved as each successive section of the package of plans is unveiled. There will be increasingly rigorous definitions and statements of intent in the Precinct Plan and these will be given tangible form in the Site Plans which will present concrete proposals which embody the principles described in the Development Framework and the Precinct Plan.

MEMBER OF
MLH
ASSOCIATES

Partners: Kenneth Sturgeon TRP (SA) BA MURP (CT) MSAITRP Anton Johnson B Arch (Natal) Arch (SA) MIA Alex Robertson B Arch (CT) Arch (SA) MIA RIBA
Peter Schumann B Arch (OFS) Arch (SA) MIA Martin Hutton-Squire TRP (SA) B Soc SC (CT) MCRP (CT) MSAITRP
Associates: Eberhard Gerste B Arch (CT) Arch (SA) MIA Terence Twentyman-Jones B Arch (CT) Arch (SA) MIA Gary Martin BAS (CT) B Arch (CT) Arch (SA) MIA
Consultant: Albert Faure Cert Arch (CT) Arch (SA) MIA

The above definition or description focusses on the question of process which is contained within the five levels of the package of plans. What has to be clear to both parties is the degree of which detail suffices for each level of plan. Two realities could impact on successfully resolving possible conflicts around this issue. Firstly, the difficulty of establishing consensus on what are essentially value judgements, and secondly, that very different design solutions are possible but which achieve the same goals and objectives. We are confident however that there is a high degree of congruity regarding what both the V&AW and the City Council wish to achieve in the Waterfront. It would however be a bland solution if there was to be no debate between us on how the development should take place. We therefore look forward to lively and constructive debate on the unfolding drama of planning the Waterfront!

3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

At the two extremes, that is the Development Framework and Building Plans, there should be no conflict regarding roles, the former is clearly concerned with policy and the latter with detail.

At this stage the only issue where resolution might still be outstanding is exactly at what stage public participation can be said to be satisfactorily completed. That is at least to a level that will finalise agreement at one level of the package of plans and enable us to move on to the next.

We would like to confirm that the process of public participation will be complete for the Development Framework (for the purposes of proceeding to subsequent levels in the package of plans) when:

i) Comments have been received from the members of the Liaison Committee, adjoining ratepayers associations, Fed Nasa and CASA and;

ii) The City has met with the Ministerial Liaison Committee.

4. AGREEMENT ON THE CONTENT OF PRECINCT PLANS

It is in the middle levels of the Package of Plans especially the Precinct Plan level, that agreement regarding what is a satisfactory level of detail to enable decisions to be made must be reached. Of course it will be impossible to specify requirements in advance other than to say it should not be necessary to scrutinise building plans before agreement to the preceeding precinct plan can be achieved. Therefore there needs to be an explicit understanding between the V&AW and the CCC about two aspects:

i) The process to reach agreement will involve negotiation rather than prescription.

ii) In order to give the V&AW some predictability, dates for final decisions should be negotiated and then finalised.

PLANNING, SERVICES AND FINANCES SHOULD BE SEPARATED

In this spirit, ie. avoiding unnecessary "red herrings" in order to minimise delays on approvals, the conceptualising of Planning, Services and Finance as three "levels", (see Para 2) is seen as problematic. This is because "levels" has a notion of conformity about it, ie. the one must be completed and agreed to before the next level is commenced.

We would like to suggest that the "levels" should be referred to as issues, and that the nature of their relationship not be clearly defined at this stage. Planning is a universal concern embracing general city wide problems and issues, the V&AW's place in that context, as well as the creation of urbanity within the V&AW.

Services and finances on the other hand, as well as being closely intertwined, in that the nature of one depends on decisions about the other, are of a technical nature and will to a large extent merely take the form required by the planning. There are also a number of areas of doubt at this stage, such as the delineation and direction of sewage catchment areas which do not impinge directly on planning issues. These areas of doubt also include detailed technical concerns about the rateable value of property and its location.

Furthermore each one of these issues, planning, services and finance, are handled by a different department of the City; City Planning, City Engineering and City Treasury respectively. These departments have to first establish consensus and then negotiate that position with the V&AW. A further organisational complication is that the Interdepartmental Waterfront Working Group is structured along functional lines ie. linkages, services and approvals rather than in terms of the issues described above. A rather complicated situation of formal and informal working groups is therefore likely to arise.

We therefore would like to propose that reaching planning agreements is not dependent on agreement to services and finance being reached beforehand. This will enable architects and planners to proceed through the levels of the package of plans and keep the programme on track.

It is only at the stage of development ie. construction, that agreement to go ahead should be made subject to resolution on engineering and finance. The planning process will be continuing in parallel in the meantime.

6. THE WATERFRONT WILL BE A "WARD" OF THE CITY

Finally, we would like to reiterate our position regarding the Waterfront's physical relationship with the City. As stated in our letter to you on 8/9/89 we have no problem with the principle of integration with the City, (see para 19), however the form and character of this integration requires attention. This should be that the Waterfront is a "ward" of the City, part of it, yet retaining its own genius and image. The inevitable broad brushing that occurs when an individual becomes part of a large organisation should be actively guarded against

Other than these comments we fully endorse your "Comments on the Development Framework Report" and wish to record our appreciation of the urgency you have shown in dealing with our submissions.

Yours faithfully



K B STURGEON
MLH ARCHITECTS AND PLANNERS

COMMENTS SUMMARY REPORT

1. **Introduction**

On 28/9/89 the V&AW Company's Development Framework was agreed to in principle by Council. Final agreement was subject to a number of tasks being satisfactorily completed. Foremost amongst these was the compilation of a final report summarising the comments of the Minister's Liaison Committee, FEDNASA, CASA, and surrounding ratepayer's associations. (See para D.13, Item 3, Council Agenda D 1989-09-28).

Comments, both from the Minister's Liaison Committee and the general public, have generally been supportive.

Favourable items that were explicitly mentioned include; the conservation principles, emphasis on tourism, rapid progress to date, emphasis on Cape Town and integration into the local economy, and the "package of plans" approach.

2. **Issues Raised**

Issues identified in various comments from Liaison Committee members were, inter alia;

- the need for freehold rights, especially in residential areas;
- clarity on the Council's rating formula;
- the need to show that justice and fairplay in negotiations with developers is being achieved;
- the incomplete state of the Contextual Framework while the Development Framework is being finalised;
- unresolved jurisdictional boundaries;
- insufficient reference to the local context;
- conflict between pedestrian policy and pedestrian route proposals;
- the long term security of the fishing industry; and
- a lack of reference to the National Monuments Council and the CPIA catalogue.

The general public's comments concentrate on the practical concerns of the person in the street rather than the more overarching organisational and philosophical issues raised by the members of the Liaison Committee. They are therefore extremely valuable; points raised include:

- opening up of Granger Bay beach;
- inclusion of Robben Island;
- possibility of a retirement village;
- demolishing of eastern boulevard ramps;
- danger of overshadowing and destroying views by tower blocks depicted on urban design plan;
- danger of timeshare and seasonal residential population;
- method of disposal of development parcels;
- application of Group Areas Act;
- concern that because developers are running the project it will merely benefit the Company and not the people of Cape Town as well;
- Somerset Hospital should not be disturbed;
- should be opportunities for water activities in the basins, eg. water polo, rowing, yachting, swimming;

2.7 Long term security of the fishing industry

The root of the industry's concern is that as a result of successful development elsewhere in the Waterfront their leases will become increasingly valuable. This, in turn, will lead to pressure from more lucrative land-uses, eg. retail or office, and for their sites to be given over to these land-uses.

The V&AW wishes to state that it welcomes the presence of the fishing industry because of the life, variety and produce it offers to the general public. Furthermore, notwithstanding the Company's wanting the fishing industry to remain for these reasons anyway, the V&AW is compelled to accommodate the industry in terms of the conditions of the Burgraaff Commission.

At the same time it must be stated that in spite of the industry's belief that it should not find itself worse off as V&AW rather than SATS lessee, it is unfair to expect the V&AW to continue charging rentals that are a third below the market value for industrial rentals. This would contradict one of the prime reasons for establishing the V&AW to turn the historic harbour area into a revenue maximising asset. It should be pointed out that very few harbours in the world offer exclusive quaysides to the fishing industry. They have to take their turn with other forms of shipping.

V&AW also cannot guarantee space for the industry's expansion although it is more than willing to assist in negotiations for further space in Table Bay Harbour.

Finally, the V&AW would like to enter into negotiations regarding what the fishing industry can do to assist the Company in achieving its goals, (other than paying rent). This would include opening up fishing lease areas to allow the general public to enjoy the exciting spectacle of fishing boats loading and off loading. Obviously this would occur in ways that did not interfere with quayside operations.

2.8 Reference to the NMC and CPIA

Reference has been made several times to the NMC as well as other urban conservation bodies. Reference to the CPIA historic buildings catalogue will be strongly in evidence in the Precinct Plans.

4.0 Response to Isues raised by the general public

4.1 Granger Bay Beach

Although this beach is outside the V&AW perimeter, the V&AW is presently negotiating with the Dept of Education and Training of the House of Representatives to open the beach to the public.

4.2 Robben Island

High level discussions have been held with the Ministers of Transport and Justice in the House of Assembly regarding the future of this island. The Department of Prisons has indicated that it will retain control of the island for the foreseeable future although it is increasingly carefully controlled public access.

4.3 Retirement Village

Detailed residential land-uses have not been determined at this stage, however the V&AW will accommodate any schemes that are viable.

4.4 Eastern Boulevard Ramps

The future of the ramps is not under the control of the V&AW, however it appears that transportation studies have recommended the completion of the ramps. This will considerably ease traffic flows between the Northern and Southern Suburbs as well as the Cape Flats and the Atlantic Suburbs and will be an important link in the Metropolitan Transport Network.

4.5 Tall Buildings

Every effort will be made to ensure that building heights do not impact negatively on surrounding development. Detailed resolution of this issue will become apparent in the Precinct Planning process.

4.6 Seasonal Residential Populations

The V&AW is well aware of the dangers for the all year round viability of the area should it become seasonal. However detailed mechanisms to effectively address this possibility have not been developed yet.

4.7 Method of Disposal of Development Parcels

Other than resolving that the Company itself will develop the first phase, this issue has not yet been seriously debated and policy formulated.

4.8 Group Areas Act

It is the intention of the Company that the Waterfront shall be open to all. The particular mechanism to achieve this has not yet been identified. There also appears to be considerable flux in central government policy at this moment in time which may eventually resolve the situation.

4.9 Beneficiation of the Company at the expense of the City of Cape Town

International precedent has shown that a profit exclusive approach to Waterfront development has not yet met with success. Preconditions for success include a wide range of activity and above all access and participation from as broad a spectrum of the community as possible.

4.10 Sommerset Hospital

Extensive negotiations with hospital boards and guarantees have been given to the satisfaction of Mrs du Toit and the hospital board.

4.11 Water Activities

With the general opening up of the harbour and the staging of waterside events it is anticipated that these will become an increasing occurence in the Waterfront.

4.12 Water Quality

Water quality surveys have been conducted by the Company's hydro-dynamic consultants and a water management policy is being formulated. In general water quality was better than expected.

4.13 Sewerage

Negotiations on how and where the V&AW's sewerage should be treated are occurring between the City Engineer and the Company's civil engineering consultants. General issues relating to the treatment of sewage on the Atlantic coast are beyond the control of the Company. However it should be noted that failure to resolve the problems of the Green Point sewage outfall in a lasting manner will seriously effect the Company's Granger Bay water front.

5. Conclusion

This is the final report in a series of three, the others being the comments on the CCC's Contextual Framework and the response to the CCC's comments on the Development Framework.

The Company feels that these three reports have comprehensively addressed the many issues concerning the policy proposals of the project.

We believe that a cycle has been completed which has engaged the attention of a wide spectrum of interested parties. We now look forward to the next cycle of work which will be the Precinct Plan which will again require a wide range of inputs and agreements.