

GROOTE SCHUUR ESTATE

CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT

SUMMARY & RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED



**South African
National Parks**



**Cape Peninsula
National Park**



**World Wildlife Fund
(Table Mountain Fund)**

MAY 2002

GROOTE SCHUUR ESTATE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT SUMMARY & RESPONSE TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

prepared for



**South African
National Parks**



**Cape Peninsula
National Park**



**World Wildlife Fund
(Table Mountain Fund)**

prepared by



Chittenden Nicks de Villiers
urban & environmental planners & landscape architects

MAY 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION
1.1	Background
1.2	Bilateral Meetings
1.3	Open House
1.4	Comments Received / Report Format
1.5	Summary
1.6	Conclusions
	• Table 1 List of Comments Received
2.0	SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO CONCERNS AND ISSUES
3.0	SUMMARY OF CHECKLIST OF OPTIONS
3.1	Built Nodes
3.2	Landscape Precincts
4.0	ANNEXURES
A	Planning Process
B	Background Information Document
C	Invitation to Public Open House
D	List of Attendees
E	Record of Concerns
F	Comment Sheet and Checklist Distributed for Comment

THE GROOTE SCHUUR ESTATE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS COMPRISED OF THE FOLLOWING FOUR DOCUMENTS TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH EACH OTHER

PHASE 1 : ANALYSIS AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS (CNdV) (Final Draft, June 2000)

A SHORT HISTORY OF MOUNT PLEASANT (Stewart Harris) (1999)

PHASE 2 : PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

SUMMARY AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS REPORT (This Report)

PHASE 2 : DETAILED PLANNING PROPOSALS (CNdV) (Report in Progress)

Please Note: Copies of this document, including all annexures, is available for viewing at the Westlake Office of the Cape Peninsula National Park as well as at the following Libraries: Cape Town, Rondebosch, Mowbray, Claremont, Woodstock, Athlone and Observatory. Please contact Quintus Thom of CPNP at 021-7018692 for more information.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

This document contains a summary of and response to the comments received from the various key stakeholders, interested and affected parties, residents associations and individuals to the Draft Conservation and Development Proposals for the Groote Schuur Estate prepared in March 2002.

Preliminary proposals, stemming from the Phase 1 Report (prepared in 2000), were presented at meetings with specific focus groups during February 2002 and at an Open House in March where the public were invited to comment on the proposals. The response to comments stage is a specific milestone in the planning process embarked upon by the planning team. (See Annexure A: Planning Process Diagram) It is hoped that this document will provide meaningful and sufficient response to the many and varied reactions to the Draft Proposals.

The consultants wish to thank all those who have taken the time to submit comments to the Draft Proposals and look forward to their continued engagement.

The preparation of the Draft Conservation and Development Proposals for the Groote Schuur Estate has followed a comprehensive process of scoping and review with the Cape Peninsula National Park Planning Steering Committee, Local Authorities, key stakeholders, Residents Associations and other role players.

The preparation of preliminary proposals for the Estate, and subjecting these ideas to public debate, is part of the continuing planning and design process initiated by the Cape Peninsula National Park (CPNP) with the support and financial assistance of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), specifically the Table Mountain Fund.

Phase 1 comprised of a background analysis document that reviewed the historical context of the Estate, previous studies, and analysed, in bio-physical, spatial and land use terms, the various "precincts" and "nodes" on the Estate. This report was published in June 2000, and was widely distributed among key stakeholders.

Phase 2 comprises the preparation of detailed landscape management proposals as well as specific land use proposals for the identified "nodes" and ensuring that these are presented for public comment as part of the Integrated Environmental Management (IEM) process. The proposals are prepared in the context of the CPNP's Integrated Environmental Management Plan and policies and the Park's overarching "Conservation Development Framework." (CDF)

This report documents the "Comment" or "Public Scoping" stage in the process.

1.2 BILATERAL MEETINGS

A series of bilateral meetings were convened, where findings and preliminary recommendations were presented. Five focus group meetings were held with the following:

- 1. CPNP , Planning Steering Committee**
 - City of Cape Town (CMC, Cape Town and South Peninsula Administrations)
 - South African Heritage Resources Agency
 - Provincial Administration : Western Cape
 - Public Works Department
- 2. Key Interested and Affected Parties and Surrounding Organisation**
 - Ward Councillors
 - Observatory Civic Association
 - Newlands Residents Association
 - Rondebosch Rosebank Ratepayers and Business Association
 - Rosebank Mowbray Civic Association
 - Friends of Newlands Forest
 - Friends of Mostert's Mill
- 3. Professional Organisations**
 - Institute of Landscape Architecture South Africa (Cape)
 - Cape Institute of Architects (Heritage Committee, Environment and Planning Committee)
 - The Society of Architects Planners and Engineers and Surveyors
 - Association of Consulting Town and Regional Planners
 - South African Planning Institute
- 4. World Wildlife Fund and Cape Town Heritage Trust**
- 5. University of Cape Town**

Note that an ongoing bilateral forum is regularly held between SANParks and UCT, and matters of common interest are regularly discussed in this forum.

1.3 OPEN HOUSE

A document giving broad background information on the process undertaken, future proposals for the Estate and an invitation to the Open House were distributed to various registered interested and affected parties. (See Annexure B: Background Information Document).

In order to notify the broader public, invitations to the Open House were advertised in both the mainstream papers as well as the community newspapers. Notices were also posted at Groote Schuur Estate (at the entrance gate and at Rhodes Memorial) and Newlands Forest Station. Extensive coverage for the Open House was received by both the print media and by radio interviews. (See Annexure C: Invitations advertised in newspapers) An opportunity was also

given to the public to view the Phase 1 report in the following Libraries: Cape Town, Rondebosch, Mowbray, Claremont, Woodstock, Athlone and Observatory. The Open House sessions were held on the 7 March 2002 (3pm – 7pm) and 9 March 2002 (9am – 12pm) at the Newlands Forestry Station Lecture Room. The public were given adequate opportunity to view and discuss the proposals for the Grootte Schuur Estate. Information and plans were on display and members of the planning team and SANParks were available to answer questions.

A total of 52 individuals / organisations registered their attendance at the Open House Sessions (See Annexure D: List of Attendees). Through the public participation process, 31 comments to the proposals were received. (See Table 1: List of Comments Received and Annexure E: Copy of Record of Concerns)

1.4 COMMENTS RECEIVED / FORMAT OF REPORT

Interested and affected parties were invited to submit written comment regarding their general concerns and issues. In addition, a checklist containing possible management, conservation and development options were distributed to gauge the support for and comments regarding detailed proposals. (See Annexure F: Example of Comment Sheet and Checklist of Possible Options)

The consultants and SANParks have attempted to respond to each of the comments received. Naturally however, some degree of overlap exists, for example many respondents have made similar comments and these are cross referenced where applicable.

Section 2 of this report attempts to summarise the written comment received and provides the consultant's and SANPark's response where appropriate. Section 3 summarises the comments received from the "Possible Checklist of Options" and the written comments received. Section 4 contains the Annexures referred to above.

Table 1 overleaf indicates the I&AP's / organisations / individuals who have submitted comment on the Draft Conservation and Development Framework Proposals for Grootte Schuur Estate. Some comments was received by means of written submission, some simply by the completion of the checklist provided. This is indicated in Table 1.

The "Key No." column in Table 1 refers to a Numbering System which is used in Sections 2 and 3 to indicate the source of the specific comments received.

1.5 SUMMARY

Generally positive responses to the Draft Proposals have been received from key authority stakeholders, professional bodies, local residents and other organisations during this process.

The 'conservation and development principle' contained in the Draft Proposals has been broadly and widely supported as a necessary framework to ensure the long term conservation of this unique environmental and cultural asset. These responses conclude that the key essence of the brief, namely to promote sustainable conservation and enhance visitor experience on the Estate, should be supported.

An important message contained in the various responses is a "call to action". It is widely accepted that historic neglect of the Estate (by previous custodians) is imperative to redress. It is vital that the current planning process result in meaningful action and implementation in order that the Estate can fulfill its intended function as an important "Gateway" in the Cape Peninsula National Park, that the degradation of landscapes and built fabric is addressed, and that tourism and visitor experience is enhanced.

An issue that has been the subject of some conflicting opinion relates to the preservation and restoration (i.e. perpetuation) of the "cultural landscape". Although some respondents felt that the entire Estate should be restored to a "natural state", it is fair to say that this was a minority viewpoint. The position proposed in the Draft Proposals, namely to restore the cultural landscape of the "Lower Estate", in line with the CPNP Management Policy has been broadly supported.

A further issue that has been questioned is the extent of concession opportunities envisaged. Some respondents felt that the Estate may become too "touristified" or "over commercialization". This concern needs to be seen in the context of firstly, the Rhodes Will (which specifically envisages the Estate as a "park for the people"), and secondly, the CPNP Conservation Development Framework (CDF) which indeed envisages the Estate as a major "Gateway" for the Park, in recognition of its popularity and increasing visitor pressure.

1.6 CONCLUSIONS

The analysis of comment received contained in this document, forms a fundamental input to the Draft Proposals that will be contained in the "Phase 2 Report" which has two key thrusts:

- i. To make recommendations to SANParks / CPNP on landscape management strategies for the Estate in areas such as erosion control, footpath management, visitor management, and the management and replanting of suitable vegetation, etc.
- ii. To prepare detailed proposals for the various nodes and precincts that may include concession opportunities.

The "Phase 2" Report will serve to guide SANParks to manage the Estate and implement the recommendations subject to prescribed legislation and procedures (i.e. EIA, HIA, concession program etc.)

Table 1: List of Comments Received

KEY NO.	NAME	ORGANISATION	WRITTEN COMMENT RECEIVED	CHECKLIST OF OPTIONS RECEIVED
1	Atwell, Melanie	City of Cape Town Administration: City of Cape Town		↔
2	Burgess, Clare	Institute of Landscape Architects South Africa (ILASA)		↔
3	Carter, D.M	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
4	Carter, P.H	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
5	Crowley, Janet	Personal Capacity		↔
6	Dekker, Jan	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
7	Du Toit, Liezl and Lambert, Alec	Forest Knowledge	↔	
8	Esterhuysen, J	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
9	Gevers, Wieland Professor	University of Cape Town: Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor	↔	
10	Gubb, Andy	Wildlife Environmental Society of South Africa : WC (WESSA)	↔	↔
11	Goy, Jeff	Friends of the Newlands Forest	↔	↔
12	Hennessey, Kier	CMC Administration		↔
13	Hobday, Jonathan	Rosebank and Mowbray Civic Association		↔
14	Hromnik, Cyril. A. Dr.	Historian / Researcher	↔	
15	Hutton – Squire, Martin	ACTRP		↔
16	Joanna Marx	Friends of Mostert's Mill	↔	↔
17	Kinahan, Owen	Ward Councillor		↔
18	Laura Robinson	Cape Institute of Architects	request for extension	
19	Le Mesurier, N.H	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
20	Littleworth, P.E	Afro Montane Information Forum (AMIF)	↔	
21	Luger, Andrew	MLH Architects and Planners		↔
22	McConnell, Sally	Personal Capacity		↔
23	Roberts, David and Horn, Andy	Eco Design Architecture and Consulting		↔
24	Stott, E	Personal Capacity	Comment received telephonically	
25	Townsend, Steve	City of Cape Town Administration: City of Cape Town		↔
26	Van Reenen Family	Van Reenen Family	↔	↔
27	Wagener, Bernard	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
28	Weinronk, Eileen	CMC Administration Environmental Management Department		↔
29	Wheeler, Liz	Personal Capacity	↔	↔
30	Sutherland, Monica	Rondebosch, Rosebank Ratepayers and Business Association		↔
31	Oberholzer, Bernard	Personal capacity	↔	

Note:

- 1) The above I&AP's / organisations / individuals have submitted comment on the Draft Conservation and Development Framework for Groote Schuur Estate.
- 2) The "Key No." column refers to a numbering system used in Section 2 and 3 to indicate the source of the specific comments received.

2.0 SUMMARY OF AND RESPONSES TO ISSUES AND CONCERNS

COMMENT	RESPONSE
Key No. 3 Carter, D.M (Personal Capacity)	
a. Concerned that the proposals would make the development too “upmarket” and too “touristified” to the detriment of the local citizens.	CPNP’s management policy is to maintain and enhance the ecological, scenic and cultural resources of the Park, and to contribute to the financial sustainability of the Park. 80% of total Park visits takes place at only 18 sites, which include Rhodes Memorial. Given this substantial number of visitors, Park management are faced with increasing pressure for the establishment of tourism facilities, whilst still maintaining the environmental quality of the Park and recreational amenity for local users. The proposals for the Groote Schuur Estate strive to achieve that balance. The greatest challenge is meeting the costs of rehabilitating parts of the Estate, such as the Zoo site, and some form of appropriate development will be required to achieve this. The intention is certainly not to allow completely “upmarket” opportunities, to the exclusion of Capetonians.
b. Beneficial non-invasive tree species should not be excluded in future silvi-cultural endeavours.	Noted. The replanting of non-invasive trees of cultural significance is proposed below the lower jeep track.
Key No. 4 Carter, P.H (Personal Capacity)	
a. Do not turn Rhodes Memorial into a tourist park too expensive for the ordinary people of Cape Town and their families. Free entrance and parking should be given to holders of Green Cards.	Agreed. The CPNP Management Policy enshrines the current open access system. Any change will have to be approved through a process of public participation. The vision for the Park as “A Park for All”, embodies this intention. In addition, the Rhodes Devolution Act further enshrines the principle of open public access to the Estate.
b. Encourage Capetonians to picnic rather than braai. Provide picnic benches and litterbins.	Braaiing is considered an important recreational and social activity in the Peninsula and there is a very large demand for braai facilities. This use however may be perceived to be associated with anti- social behaviour, but due to an extreme lack of and an overwhelming need for braai facilities in Cape Town generally, this use should be able to be accommodated at the Zoo Site and Environs but with strict control and management.

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

Key No. 6 Dekker, J (Personal Capacity)

- a. All exotic vegetation should be removed from the Estate for it to be restored to its former natural state (re-establishing original plant species and animals)
- b. A major game viewing and tourist node should be built underground, at the bottom of the Gateway Parklands, allowing tourists to embark on a game drive.
- c. The area of natural vegetation containing wild animals should be extended South West through Newlands Forest and into the area above Kirstenbosch.

The CPNP Management Policy has been extensively workshopped and agreed upon. Objective 2(e) deals with the management of alien non-invasive plants. Policy v) explicitly states that "Park Management shall, together with relevant stakeholders, develop a strategy for managing non-invasive alien plants, in particular in the context of historical landscapes and recreational areas". The IEMS for the Park also clearly establishes the custodianship required over cultural assets and resources. It is proposed that all areas above the lower jeep track are restored to their natural state. However, the historic and cultural significance of the lower Estate is indisputable, and has been emphasized by the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA).

Suggestion noted. Game drives are considered as an appropriate use in future but will have to be tested in terms of impact. The notion of underground facilities will however be difficult to justify from an economic sustainability perspective. The appropriate departure point for game drives is seen as the Mount Pleasant Complex.

Suggestion noted. There are however significant constraints to extending the paddocks to these areas due to the impact of introducing fencing onto the mountain and the current widespread practise of walking of dogs in these parts of the mountain.

Key No. 7 Du Toit, Liezl and Lambert, Alec (Forest Knowledge)

- a. Ukuvuka is currently reviewing a proposal from Forest Knowledge to secure funding to start a indigenous 'muti' nursery on the terrace area behind Rhodes House. This will hopefully reduce the impact of illegal bark stripping occurring in Newlands Forest.

Noted. The establishment of such a nursery on the terraces is seen as an appropriate and sustainable use, but should also be reviewed in the context of other opportunities.

Key No. 8 Esterhuysen, J (Personal Capacity)

- a. Develop a hiking trail around Table Mountain with upmarket overnight facilities geared towards overseas tourists.

A Peninsula Hiking Trail has been proposed in the 'CDF' and other documentation, although detailed planning for it still has to be undertaken. The proposed route would influence the location of possible overnight facilities. The level of facilities would have to be such that they present a range of accommodation, most of which should be accessible to the broader community, and not only overseas tourists.

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| b. Propose a mountain bike ride from Grootte Schuur to slopes above Orangezicht. Charge a 'hefty fee' for a one way trip. | Noted. An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for Mountain Biking is currently being prepared. A continuous route from Oranjezicht to the Estate is proposed. The EMP also proposes that all mountain bikers be in possession of a Go-Green card. This will allow them access to all approved cycling trails. |
| c. All visitors to the Estate should have to pay in order for the development proposals to be profitable. | See response to No. 4 (a) |
-

Key No. 9 Gevers, Wieland Professor (University of Cape Town: Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor)

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. "UCT was barely consulted during the planning process", | This is incorrect. A SANParks - UCT bilateral committee is in place and has been meeting regularly for some time. At its meeting on 12 December 2001, a special workshop was held with senior representatives to present and discuss the Draft Proposals for Grootte Schuur Estate. UCT representatives were also involved in the Phase 1 Report process and were accorded every opportunity to make inputs as have been other key stakeholders. |
| b. The study area has suffered from neglect for some time, hopefully some actions will flow from the proposals prepared. | Agreed. Previous neglect has characterised previous management by City of Cape Town and the Department of Public Works. This process, initiated by SANParks, is clearly aimed at implementation. |
| c. Strongly support the proposals relating to the regeneration of <i>Pinus Pinea</i> (Stone Pines), oak and other forest canopy species in the "glades and meadows" area. | Noted. The protection of cultural landscapes underpins National Park Policy, embodied in the IEMS. |
| d. The elevation above which the Estate is to be comprised of only indigenous vegetation should be debateable. The image of UCT in its setting is important to the UCT community, Cape Town and the world. Desirable and perceived views to the Estate should be critically analysed. | Agreed. This work has largely been addressed in previous studies, including the 1992 Management Plan. The debate is part of the process underway. The distinction of the landscape domains as indicated on the draft landscape plan has generally been supported by most role players as well as park management. |
| e. The senescent Stone Pines on University Slopes should not be eradicated as proposed, rather, copses of Stone Pines should be regenerated in this area, so that they provide the necessary "backcloth" to the set piece view of the University of Cape Town. | Agreed. See No. 6 (a). The draft landscape plan does not propose "eradication", but rather a gradual removal of the <i>Pinus Pinaster</i> plantations in favour of a reinstated "Grand Landscape", consisting of appropriate indigenous and culturally significant species (including <i>Pinus Pinea</i>). |
| f. The proposals that UCT eradicate invasive alien plants on its property are supported. | Noted. An environmental management plan (EMP) for this action should be prepared as soon as possible. |

COMMENT

RESPONSE

-
- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| g. | The plan appears to be “entrepreneurially” driven | The Integrated Environmental Management System (IEMS) prepared for the Cape Peninsula National Park, specifically Goal 5, deals with “financial sustainability”, which is more accurate terminology to describe only one of many underpinning principles embodied in the approach and proposals. A fundamental objective is to enhance visitor experience and to manage visitor impacts through the concept of “Gateways”. |
| h. | It is incumbent on the proposals to ensure that the likely impacts of overall use do not detract from the qualities of the study area. We are not aware of any evidence in this regard in the material that has been made available to the public and suggest that this must be seen as an essential component of the complete proposals. | Agreed, this is an important issue that has been addressed at both the strategic level (via the CDF) and will be required as part of future EIA’s required as part of possible future concessions. The draft proposals have considered issues of capacity and demand based on visitor patterns and services capacities etc. documented in previous studies. The intent of the release of development opportunities is indeed to enhance the quality and promote the sustainable use of the Estate which has been allowed to fall into a state of neglect and disrepair. |
| i. | Due to the site being a Heritage site, HIAs are required in terms of current legislation. No such Impact Assessments have been made available as part of the consultations. | The issue of legislative compliance has been taken up with the relevant authorities, including DEAT and DECAS. It is common cause that, depending on the nature and scale of activity (as defined in the recently amended ECA Regulations) further detailed EIA’s and HIA’s may need further elaboration at the detailed level. HIA’s (and other forms of impact assessment such as visual, traffic, services, etc) are required by legislation for actual proposals. (Note that a conservation specialist, Nicholas Baumann, was appointed as part of the Phase 1 work to prepare a conservation statement and has indeed assessed potential heritage impacts at a strategic level. This work was also reviewed by senior staff within the City of Cape Town’s Environmental Management Department.) |
| j. | The detailed proposals are “sketchy”, “very questionable” and “not convincing”. | It is emphasised that the purpose of the work is to prepare a flexible framework based on solid principles and guidelines rather than detailed proposals. The terminology, “entirely unconvincing, or not at all convincing”, has unfortunately been used liberally throughout the response without elaboration or substantive argument. It is further noted that the Open House presented proposals at a conceptual level to test public reaction and will be detailed in the Draft Phase 2 Report. Experience with the concessioning process elsewhere in South Africa has demonstrated the need to remain at a “flexible” level to permit the development of design ideas which will in any event be rigorously tested via the EIA/IEM process. |

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

k. The spatial resolution of parking at Rhodes Memorial node are "poorly resolved". The proposal to curtail student parking at the Memorial is understandable, but the closure of the stile at the north-western UCT boundary is problematic.

Again, the criticism is unfortunately not substantiated by any argument. The spatial resolution of parking is constrained by existing footprints, levels and existing trees as well as the desire to remove cars from historical vistas. It is surprising that support is not expressed for the intention to restore such vistas and to remove cars from historic places in the precinct. The issue of UCT parking at the Memorial is a vexed one and is an example of where overlapping interests between SANParks and UCT need further negotiation and agreement. The visitor surveys have revealed major problems with tourist parking and busses due to the take-over of the site by UCT students. An interim arrangement to manage and control unauthorised student parking at Rhodes Memorial and on the Estate has been addressed through an agreement between SANParks and UCT as discussed at the Bi-lateral Committee. The notion of closing the existing stile is a very practical measure to discourage illegal parking but can be further discussed between the role-players. Access from UCT to the Estate could be replaced in a position where it will not encourage illegal parking behaviour.

l. Nowhere in the proposals that we are aware of, is the issue of appropriate character of new architecture for the study addressed.

This is an important issue that will be further elaborated in the Phase 2 Report and will be extended into the realm of 'sustainable buildings' to cover issues of energy efficiency and waste management etc. However, the material presented at the Open House indeed referred to this aspect, (a panel was available headed "appropriate architectural style", which the respondent probably overlooked), and made specific reference to stipulations in the "Rhodes Will" regarding architectural style. (It is interesting to note in passing that the Rhode's Will similarly applies to the UCT precinct and the lower Estate including the Groote Schuur Hospital where some highly unfortunate precedent has been set which clearly does not comply with the stipulations of the Will).

Key No. 10 Gubb, A (WESSA: WC)

a. Much of the proposals concentrate on the most transformed parts of Rhodes Memorial, what is planned for the majority of the Estate?

This comment is confusing given the extensive attention given to the Estate as a whole in both the Phase 1 and Phase 2 work. The proposals certainly go far beyond only the Memorial precinct and include the old Zoo, the Mount Pleasant node and the other landscape precincts. The proposals for the Estate generally recommend the retention of its existing open, natural character (albeit a transformed cultural landscape) as presented in the landscape plan.

b. WESSA does not support the over commercialisation of Rhodes Estate, rather a more low-level, passive, recreational / Ecotourism use. Function facilities should not be upmarket and too driven by money. Restaurant, boating, Deck bar is going overboard and requires strong motivation.

See response 3a. The proposals for recreational use of the dam are indeed aimed at low-level passive use. The draft proposals for the dam are however still subject to further investigation regarding emergency fire fighting use in particular.

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

c. Please advise on public participation and EIA process ahead.

The Phase 2 Report will now be finalised on the basis of comments received through the Open House as well as other written responses. The Phase 2 Report will be used to identify areas and other guidelines for potential concessions as well as conservation and management actions for the Estate. Where concessions are proposed, these will be dealt with according to the prescribed legislative procedures as agreed with the competent authorities. These procedures will also provide opportunity for public input through future EIA and HIA procedures as required. It is important to recognize the current work as part of a continuing process which is founded on the IEMS and CDF, which were subject to extensive participation.

Key No. 11 Goy, J (Friends of Newlands Forest)

a. Braai areas are totally out of place in a National Park due to the associated anti-social behaviour. Rather encourage strictly controlled picnic areas

Braaiing is considered an important recreational and social activity on the Peninsula. The closure of Chapmans Peak, Newlands Forest, and recently, Tokai Forest has lead to a desperate lack of such amenities in the Peninsula. See also response 4(b).

b. The introduction of tame animals (other than the game within the fenced paddocks) should not be considered. Control and management is costly and surely not justified.

Agreed. However the re-instatement of the waterfowl enclosure at the Zoo could be feasible and could be managed by a potential concession holder.

c. We are opposed to any replanting of Stone Pines. We are opposed to the replanting of Oaks except in the southern woodlands and meadows precinct. Pin oaks are a possibility. Encourage indigenous tree planting.

See No. 6 (a)

d. The fence separating Newlands Forest and Groote Schuur Estate should be retained and access paths between the two areas limited to a maximum of two with a stile / animal proof gate. (For fire fighting control purposes, there should be a jeep track running between the two areas with a locked gate)

For the time being the fence will remain due to the presence of game on parts of the Estate. However, it had been the intention to remove, where possible, internal park fences, particularly in the case of Newlands Forest, a portion of which is intended to be incorporated into the National Park / Rhodes Estate. A continuous jeep track for management purposes is planned.

Key No. 14 Hromnik, Cyril. A. Dr. (Historian / Researcher)

a. The study area incorporates both natural and culturally significant sites of the descendants of the Quena people. This heritage must be remembered and preserved.

Noted

b. The slopes of Newlands Forest contains several ancient Quena shrines, which are still visible, and could be used in the future development plans for the Forest.

Noted. The Newlands Forest is not included in this study and no development is foreseen save for conservation and forest management.

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

Key No. 16 Marx, J (Friends of Mostert's Mill)

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Historical Summary : The exhibition does not indicate the several structures in the Lower Estate dating from VOC period and after. Refer to Provisional heritage resources synthesis map (Nov 2000) Pg 38 – 39 concerning historical layering. | The lower Estate does not fall within the CPNP and was as such not included in the study area. It was however considered in the background study and was indicated on the contextual maps on display at the Open House. The lower Estate provides important information such as the architectural style of buildings. The Phase 1 Report also clearly identified the importance of the Lower Estate and recommended a serious initiative to link the Lower and Upper Estate from a conservation management and visitor experience perspective. |
| b. Mostert's Mill and Welgelegen are included in the Groote Schuur Estate, but fall outside the CPNP and CPPNE. Why then, are the servitudes for the van Reenen/ cemetery and the old dam nearby incorporated into the CPNP? A matter of principle arises from the status of the Estate properties within in the CPNP. The condition of Rhodes's Will need to be observed. | It was a decision of Parliament to only allocate land above de Waal and Rhodes Drives to National Parks, the public land below remains with Dept. of Public Works. The servitudes provide access and important links with other areas and were included for this reason. The conditions of Rhodes's Will shall be observed in the future development and management of the Estate. |
| c. How does transfer from PWD to CPNP and CPNP's proposals for concessions fit into the Will? | Legal opinions on this issue have been obtained and will be used to determine the legal framework for any possible "concessions" and the compatibility of any proposals with the Rhodes Will. The legal opinion indicates that the concession process can occur on the Estate subject to strict provisions and caveats to ensure the provisions of the Will are honoured. |
| d. Acknowledge pre-colonial, VOC and British "layers" of history that have formed the Groote Schuur Estate site. | Agreed. Refer to Phase 1 Report, as well as previous investigations (1992 Plan). It is not the purpose of this study to repeat previous work. |
| e. Restore connections between the various VOC freeburgher Welgelegen farms, especially the visual connection between Welgelegen house and the van Reenen cemetery. | The physical restoration of these links is, in some cases, not possible. However, where this can be achieved, the restoration of such linkage will certainly be considered. |
| f. Investigate relationships between CPNP and Mostert's Mill. Should they be incorporated into the CPNP? | Noted, this is however beyond the terms of reference of this study. Mostert's Mill is an access point into the Park and SANParks should take up this issue. |
| g. Consider moving farming operations (agricultural and livestock) off –site to Mostert's Mill. | It is not clear which "farming operations" are being referred to. There has been a notion of re-introducing the historic orchards that once existed on the Terraces. |
| h. Investigate and restore natural and man made water courses and vleis in the Groote Schuur Estate, and specifically Welgelegen. | Noted. |

COMMENT**RESPONSE****Key No. 19 Le Mesurier, N.H (Personal Capacity)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. The proposed pocket parking in the Southern Woodlands should be designed sensitively. | Agreed. |
| b. Do not remove oaks, elms and chestnut trees, unless absolutely necessary. | See No. 6 (a). It is proposed that no exotic trees situated below the lower jeep track, other than those which are dead, very diseased, or in watercourses are removed unless they are listed as alien invaders. |

Key No. 20 Littleworth, P. E (Afro Montane Information Forum (AMIF))

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Remove all exotic deer | All exotic fauna will be managed in accordance with the CPNP Management Policy and the National Parks Act. |
| b. Provide water for antelopes, so that they do not spill over onto Newlands Forest. | Noted. To be addressed by CPNP Management Team. |
| c. Investigate Middle Stone Age site – this should be well demarcated and not covered up. | A preliminary investigation into the site has been done and the location of the site is known. The current planning does not propose any development or disturbance of the site. Should any activity be proposed in the area, a full study will be undertaken in accordance with SAHRA requirements. |
| d. The renosterveld soil is ideal for growing a ‘muti’ garden. These need to be propagated. | Such a facility is being investigated at the terraces. (See 7a and 16j) |
| e. Stone Pines and Oaks are not needed to obliterate the dramatic landscape provided. | See no.6 (a) |
| f. The English oak is infested by termites which is associated with core fungi and renders the oaks dangerous to passers by. | Dying trees in the Newlands Forest, 10 metres either side of approved footpaths, access routes and water courses are being cut down to reduce the risk to the public. Such a program would have to be implemented on the Estate wherever such trees are becoming a danger. |
| g. Stone pines should be planted only to the north of the Memorial. | See no.6 (a) Refer to landscape plan, as well as comment from UCT regarding the “backdrop” to the university. |
| h. Strict squirrel control is required. | Objective 2 (h) of the CPNP management Policy states that resident and problem alien fauna in the Park will be managed. Squirrels fall within the ambit of this objective. In terms of priorities, however, squirrels are currently low on the list. |

COMMENT**RESPONSE****Key No. 26 Van Reenen Family**

- | | |
|---|--|
| a. No trails in Welgelegen cemetery | The management and maintenance of the Welgelegen cemetery needs to be agreed upon between the CPNP and the representatives of the Van Reenen Family. Most of the issues raised should be dealt with at this level. |
| b. CPNP to have antique gates restored at the Welgelegen cemetery | See 26(a) above |
| c. Indigenous trees to be planted around the "ringmuur" | See 26(a) above |
| d. Entry gates to Welgelegen cemetery to be kept locked at all times, access restricted to family members only and CPNP maintenance workmen. Maintenance of the graves will be done by the family, all other maintenance of the cemetery to be carried out by CPNP | See 26(a) above |
| e. List Welgelegen Cemetery as an interested and affected party | Noted. |
| f. Brownlee and deVilliers conducted a Strategic Environmental Assessment Study on behalf of the CPNP more than 15 months ago. Is there some reason why the input from the public process conducted has not been incorporated into this study? We would like some clarification on what the purpose of our previous comments were and whether they have been incorporated into this present proposal. | This involved input the preparation of a spatial framework for the CPNP – the "Conservation Development Framework" (CDF) which directly informed the proposals being put forward for the Estate and therefore have been carried through to the next level of planning. |

Key No. 27 Wagener, Bernard (Personal Capacity)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. The report describes oaks as non-invasive – they are major invaders of indigenous forests and suffer from more plagues than just mildew. | It could be argued that oaks are non-invasive in certain cases and it must be noted that the oak is a non-aggressive invader. The fact that they are disease prone is not contested. The Park's policy toward trees on the Estate will be guided by the outcome of the Cultural / Historical Management Plan. |
| b. The high steep slopes should be helped to return to native "Fynbos and forest". | Agreed. The report proposes that the areas above the lower jeep track should be rehabilitated to renosterveld and other appropriate landscape types. |
| c. Paths and jeeptracks need to be planned and stabilized, and to serve as firebreaks as well | Agreed - ongoing maintenance will ensure this. |
| d. On the lower slopes in and around the Memorial, Baker's vision should be taken into account | Agreed. The Baker vision forms a integral part of the proposals for the area around the Memorial. |

COMMENT**RESPONSE**

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| e. Keep paddocks and eland and wildebeest on the slopes of Estate. Paddock fringes could be made from scrub belt with indigenous trees growing behind it. Paddocks to be double fenced. | Noted. |
| f. The avenue to the Memorial has to be replanted with stone pines. | This is a specific proposal that was illustrated in the Open House |
| g. Oaks in the Southern Woodlands can prove to be dangerous. The following trees will do well in a similar environment: Yellowwood, Assegai, Rooiels, Wild Peach, Silvertrees. | Noted. To be investigated by specialist in future stages. |
| h. Confine the exotics to limited areas on the lower slopes. | Agreed. See no.6 (a) |
| i. Retain the fence between Newlands Forest and Groote Schuur Estate with a limited number of crossing points. | See 11 (d) |
| j. The 'Terraces' would be ideal as a nursery for young saplings. | See no. 7 (a) The opportunities for a demonstration garden will be explored during the next phase. |
| k. A policy is needed for planted South African trees that are not endemic to the peninsula. They should be left standing – but their seedlings removed. Could they be sold? | Noted. Limited opportunities exist for resale. |
-

Key No. 28 Weinronk, E (CMC Administration ; EMD)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. Require an opportunity to comment prior to briefing of concessionaires | Proposals for concessions are subject to an IEM and EIA process during which time opportunities for comment are provided. Prior to this, there will be opportunity to participate through the Planning Steering Committee on which the City is represented. |
| b. Concern regarding the re-use of the Lions Den. Would rather support a new structure behind the existing lion's enclosure. | Noted. This option is proposed as a possibility. |
| c. Overnight hikers accommodation to be provided at Mount Pleasant rather than at Zoo Site. Establish "reclusive" space to maintain a "sense of park" | Noted. However, Mount Pleasant is used as SANParks offices with potential appropriate visitor information facilities. |
-

COMMENT**RESPONSE****Key No. 29 Wheeler, L (Personal Capacity)**

- | | |
|--|--|
| a. Open house to be located near public transport and for a longer duration. | Noted. |
| b. Add Historical Society of Cape Town to I&AP list | Agreed. |
| c. Steps in paths to be small rather than big. Big steps cause people to walk on the side, causing erosion | Noted. |
| d. Paths for disabled people in wheelchairs required | The principle of 'universal access' has been accepted by the SANParks and is being implemented where possible. The maximum recommended slope for access paths for disabled, un-assisted access is 1:12. Where it is possible to construct such paths, re-development will have to consider this. |

Key No. 30 Oberholzer, B (Private Capacity)

- | | |
|---|---|
| a. Unable to make any "meaningful connection" between the 'Site Analysis' and the final precinct proposals. What role, if any, did the site analysis play in the formulation of the design? | The site analysis obviously provided an important information layer and informant to the conceptual proposals. The proposals are grouped into two categories, namely the "nodes" and the overall landscape management recommendations. Various aspects of the site analysis contribute to different design and management proposals. For example, disturbed sites with access to services, and low visual impact effects were considered for possible buildings whilst the aspects of slope, existing vegetation, soils, etc have informed the landscape proposals. It is also important to note that this study has not attempted to "re-invent the wheel". The 1992 Management Plan (of which the respondent is well aware) conducted a full site analysis, which lead to landscape recommendations. Where necessary, the previous site analysis was augmented by experts and the overall landscape directives have not shifted fundamentally from 1992. The linkages should therefore be self evident. |
|---|---|

COMMENT

RESPONSE

b. An overall concern was that the designs of the precincts were treated in isolation, as if they were islands, with little acknowledgement that a campus town of 14 000 people lies adjacent – and which is part of the same Estate! Not even simple footpath connections were shown. My concern is that the role and potential of the Estate has not been fully penetrated by the Consultants.

This is an unfair criticism. There has been no consideration of precincts as “islands”. The overall contextual and development plans (scale of 1:10 000 and 1:5000, clearly visible at the Open House, and embodied in the Phase 1 Report), dealt with linkages to Newlands Forest, the Lower Estate, UCT and the wilderness domain beyond. The landscape development plan in particular indicates linkages to UCT from two levels to the north of the Zoo Site. (These were however not indicated on the detailed plan which was an oversight). The importance and potential impacts (both positive and negative) of UCT as a neighbour is not disputed. (For example the impact of student parking and the visual impact of the large mass of building on the natural landscape). What is of concern is the growth imperatives of UCT, (the respondent in fact is the author of a previous proposal to extend parking and sports fields onto the Lower Estate), which need to be addressed in a holistic fashion.

The role and potential of the Estate goes far beyond simply "servicing" the adjacent UCT complex; however, the opportunities are recognized and lead, in part, to the suggestions of a restaurant at the Zoo.

c. An aspect that is common for all the precincts and nodes, is an absence of a clear design philosophy or structure, providing a vision for the next century. The proposals seem confined to 'fixing up' the existing run-down Estate, rather than finding a new expression

What needs to be borne in mind is the provisions and limitations of the Rhodes Will, as well as the principle of “limits of acceptable change”. The intention of the proposals are not merely a “fixing up”, but to find a balanced and appropriate response to the Estate that meets the provisions of the Will, the management responsibilities of SANParks, and the demands of financial sustainability in a climate of diminishing funds for conservation. As far as a design philosophy is concerned, this centres around the concept of appropriateness and balance, linked to acceptable change concerns. Some would argue that the proposals have made very bold statements about a future vision, in particular the recommendations for the replanting of stone pines and other appropriate species to perpetuate the visual tapestry in the landscape or the proposals around the Memorial. Or the ideas linked to the role of the Gateway Parklands. Sound environmental planning is also about respecting the past rather than imposing contemporary “visions” of current generations. The respondent seems to argue for a “new expression” in the absence of respecting the past. These aspects will be elaborated in the Phase 2 Report.

d. Far greater cognisance must be taken of the university campus, so that a symbiotic relationship is achieved, ensuring support for the proposed restaurant, as well as encouraging students to use the outdoor precincts. This would help to bring life and better surveillance to an area that is presently unsafe. The present boundary with the campus should be a lot more 'porous', with the present ugly fence possibly replaced by a low stone wall.

Agreed. The proposed restaurant at the Zoo will obviously depend greatly on the significant population at UCT for viability. The campus similarly stands to benefit from the provision of such facilities which are sorely lacking at the university. The low stone wall is a sound suggestion subject to sources of finance. There is a tendency however to assume that the concession process is a panacea for the provision of a whole host of “public add-ons” that may not be consistent with the financial viability of such business.

3.0 SUMMARY OF CHECKLIST OF OPTIONS

3.1 BUILT NODES

3.1.1 Rhodes Memorial and Environs

The proposal for the continued facilities of a restaurant and tea room at Rhodes Memorial was supported however the option of linking the restaurant to game drives was not considered to be favourable to the respondents. Respondents supported the continuation of existing activities (picnicking, parking), with control and strict management in place. Proposals for a visitor and interpretative centre were widely supported. Additional activities such as function facilities at the Rhodes Memorial Node would be considered appropriate depending on the scale of the development.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Continued restaurant use and tea room (may be linked to night game drives)	1, 2, 6, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restaurant use and tearoom to continue but no game drives to be allowed (3, 4, 5, 10, 15, 22, 26, 30) ▪ Game drives will cause noise pollution (1) ▪ Game viewing site and tourist node to be built underground, at the bottom of Gateway Parklands (6) ▪ Possible game viewing deck overlooking the Gateway Parklands (6) ▪ Upgrade restaurant facility (12) ▪ Should be careful of promoting game drives on the mountain slopes which will detract from the environment and be visible from kilometers around (15) ▪ Suggest game walks instead (5, 15)
Visitor centre	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 26, 29	22, 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A range of historical and archeological remnants should be highlighted as points on potential walkways / hiking trails (8)
An interdenominational chapel	2, 5, 6, 13, 16, 23, 29	3, 4, 10, 12, 22, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Precedent has already been set (2) ▪ Limit size of interdenominational chapel and for functions only : 50 people for weddings, funerals and christenings only (17, 25) ▪ Interdenominational chapel could lead to problems (15) ▪ Chapel should not be inter faith (19)
An interpretive centre on the history of the Estate, or the work of Sir Herbert Baker, or a landscape interpretation center	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 30	11, 22, 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rhode's Cottage in Muizenberg has the same proposal regarding a Museum (1) ▪ Not seen as a priority (4) ▪ Interpretive centre on the history of the Estate to form part of the visitor centre (10) ▪ Environmental centres are strongly supported and to be linked to low income visitors (12, 26)
Public parking	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27	17, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not for UCT Students (4) ▪ The aesthetics should be borne in mind, especially the impact from the upper slopes (8) ▪ Control parking use (12)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Picnic sites	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use wooden tables and chairs (4) ▪ No fires to be allowed (5) ▪ Accommodate in the lower slopes, near the entrance gates (10) ▪ Picnic sites to be properly controlled (30)
Function facilities	2, 5, 10, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26	3, 4, 6, 11, 17, 22, 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Function facilities are appropriate – only depending on its scale (1, 2, 5, 25) ▪ Keep development to a minimum (11) ▪ Function facilities are regarded as being too upmarket (3) ▪ Function facilities to be accommodated near the entry gates to the Estate (10) ▪ No function facilities beyond the restaurant at Rhodes Memorial (17) ▪ Conference facilities (26)
Filming	2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 13, 19, 21, 23, 25	3, 10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Filming to be introduced only if it is not too invasive (4, 30) ▪ The use is not compatible (10) ▪ All filming to be kept away from De Waal Drive (15) Filming with special permits only (26)

3.1.2 Mount Pleasant and Environs

The majority of the respondents supported the proposal for the Mount Pleasant and Environs area to be used as a utility and management office for CPNP's northern section. There was wide support for an environmental centre geared towards lower income groups. Various suggestions were received regarding alternative locations for the education centre and for merging the proposals for the visitor centre, interpretative centre and environmental educational centre. Suggestions for the future use of the terraces were varied. Most respondents agreed that some sort of farming or agricultural activity should be encouraged.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Continued utility use by SANP or dedicated Estate Management team	1, 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29	22, 23	
Seminar Rooms	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29	10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seminar rooms accommodated with "Function facilities" at the entry gates (10)
Environmental education centre	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29	10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Link this with the visitor centre at the Rhodes Memorial (10) ▪ Link this to low-income groups (12)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Restore terraces to a working farm	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 12, 17, 13, 19, 23, 25	6, 11, 15, 21, 22, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mount Pleasant terraces to be used for medicinal plants or tree nursery (4, 27) ▪ Institute this on a small scale (10) ▪ Management of the farm would be too complicated. There is also no precedent set (15) ▪ Use farm for historical and or agricultural purposes (17) ▪ Terraces to be used as an area to establish indigenous garden or muti garden (7, 20) ▪ Idea of a symbolic piece of vineyard (Ala Montmatre) (8) ▪ Consider terraces for an outdoor concert venue (21) ▪ Terraces should not deteriorate any further (29)

3.1.3 Zoo Site and Environs

General support was received for the Zoo Site and Environs to be formalised as the primary gateway to the Estate. While some respondents suggested the lion enclosure be restored and used for its original intended purpose, most agreed that the old den would be ideal to accommodate a restaurant. An even amount of responses for and against were received for the following proposals : outdoor chess sets, sculpture gardens, restored aviaries, art gallery, formalised trading opportunities and overnight accommodation for hikers / tourists. Recreation proposals for the dam area were not widely supported, mainly due to the danger it was perceived to pose. Proposals for braai areas were not supported due top the perceived problems associated with it. Tight management controls would need to be instituted, for it to operate.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Formalise as a primary gateway to Estate	2, 3, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27	4, 6, 22,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Don't waste money (4) ▪ Include function facilities at this location (10) ▪ Facilities at the Zoo site to cater for lower income visitors (12) ▪ Zoo site should not be over utilised as this may impact the locals (30)
A restaurant in and behind the old lion enclosure	2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27	4, 10, 22, 26, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restaurant structure behind the enclosure only (28) ▪ Use as a pub or beer garden (4) ▪ Restaurant to cater for a low income visitor (12) ▪ Potential for a great deal more innovative use in lion's den e.g.: art or cultural usage (2)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Overnight accommodation for hikers	5, 10, 13, 17, 19, 21, 23	2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, 15, 22, 25, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No hotel accommodation (1) Overnight facilities to be provided near the visitor centre within the Zoo Site and Environs Precinct (10) Accommodation for hikers rather at Zoo site than Mt. Pleasant. Establish a “reclusive space” – to maintain sense of park (28) Overnight accommodation facilities should be properly monitored at night, to ensure complete safety and to avoid occupation by vagrants (8)
Public parking	1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 27, 29	5, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking not to be provided to UCT (4) The aesthetics of the parking area at Rhodes Memorial should be borne in mind, especially from higher up on the slopes (19) A shuttle system would be costly and cumbersome and not practical (11, 15) Cars in the Estate to be kept to a minimum (29) Proposals relating to possible shared access and parking between the study area and UCT should be further investigated (9)
“Formalised” trading opportunities	2, 5, 6, 11, 13, 16, 17, 21, 27	1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 22, 23, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in keeping with a nature reserve (3) Is this necessary? (15) Trading opportunities to be strictly appropriate to the site. No duplication of activities or facilities available at Kirstenbosch Gardens (17) A space is required where local crafters can be exposed to visitors (20)
Outdoor Chess Set	2, 6, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 23, 26	1, 3, 4, 5, 10, 19, 21, 22, 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in keeping with a nature reserve (3)
Sculpture Gardens	2, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 17, 22, 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in keeping with a nature reserve (3) To a limited extent (16)
Restored Aviaries	3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 16, 21, 23, 26, 27	1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 19, 25, 22, 29	
Art Gallery	2, 8, 13, 19, 21, 23, 26	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 15, 22, 25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in keeping with a nature reserve (3) Don't waste money (4) Propose a Bookstore (16) Use the restaurant for this purpose (17)
Farm stall and picnicing	3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only picnicking, but no farm stall (10)
Entry Point to mountain, providing parking, and shuttle system to Rhodes Memorial	2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16	4, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't make it expensive for Capetonians (4) Restore site to near as possible to “old zoo” (5, 24) Shuttle system would be costly, cumbersome and not practical for early morning hikers (11)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Dam Area : Boat hire , Deck Bar, Pocket Parking and Braai Facilities	1, 5, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26(subject to conditions and safety requirements)	2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 22, 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No braai areas to be allowed, there are other more suitable areas (4, 8, 15, 30) ▪ Dam is too small for boating and dangerous for swimming (11) ▪ Dam to be kept open for fire fighting purposes (11) ▪ Picnic sites to be kept far away from water's edge (11) ▪ Opening up dam for public use will be very dangerous (2, 27, 26) ▪ Use dam as waterfowl space (17) ▪ Dam currently used by Egyptian geese (29) ▪ No Boat hire and Deck Bar at the dam area (15, 25, 26, 29, 1, 17,) ▪ Picnic facilities only around dam area (3, 10, 26)

3.2 LANDSCAPE PRECINCTS

3.2.1 Southern Woodlands & Meadows

General support was received for proposals regarding the landscape restoration of the old zoo site as well as the removal of invasive and disease prone trees. The responses indicate a recognition of concession contracts as a means to attract private sector finance to benefit the overall park operations. Proposals for braai opportunities **were only supported** if strict management controls are ensured and that these were only for particular areas. Further debate is required regarding the possible introduction of “tame animals”.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Restore formal landscape around zoo site	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 26, 27,	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restore valuable historical examples and paving detail, artefacts and tree specimens (2) ▪ Ambivalent (3) ▪ Keep landscape simple, don't waste money (4) ▪ Restore site to as near as possible to “old zoo” (5)
Retain avenues of tall trees & meadow landscape	2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29	6, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Add new stone pines to the Avenue only to reflect the landscape character (27)
Remove invasive trees	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ And retain non – invasive exotics (3, 4) ▪ Slowly remove invasive trees in Southern Woodlands and Meadows precinct and Waterfall Precinct. Maintain forest character of upper slopes with indigenous vegetation only (5, 10, 11, 22)
Remove trees that are disease prone	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 17, 21, 22, 23, 26	2, 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Replace these trees where appropriate, unless they have a particular design function (1, 25, 29) ▪ Only remove trees that are dangerous (2) ▪ Incorporate this into long term maintenance (4) ▪ A thorough investigation of the implied threat by oaks to other species to be undertaken prior to the removal of the “disease prone” trees (16) ▪ Retain Oaks (16) ▪ Oaks are infested by termites with associated core fungi which renders them dangerous to passers by (20) ▪ Remove trees that are disease prone only if they pose a safety hazard (10, 27) ▪ Do not remove elms, chestnut trees, oaks unless absolutely necessary (19)
Clean up area after tree felling contract	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Define clean up (10)
Urgent maintenance programme for landscape especially " Terraces"	1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 26, 27, 29	6, 10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why the urgency? (10)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Add new trees to reflect existing landscape character	3, 4, 5, 11, 13, 23, 26, 27	6, 10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate this into long term landscaping program (4) ▪ Only on the Avenues (10)
Provide discrete parking for braai areas	1, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 23, 25, 27	2, 3, 22, 26, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No braai areas, picnic spots only (4, 5)
Introduce concession opportunities for public picnic and braai areas	3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 23, 25, 27	11, 22, 26,	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No braai areas, only picnic spots (2, 3, 4, 5, 11, 27, 29, 30) ▪ Providing picnic benches and other facilities - will help control the picnic areas (4) ▪ Introduce concession opportunities for public picnic and braai areas with fool proof mechanisms to prevent overcrowding (17) ▪ Usage of braai areas must be controlled and limited (15, 17) ▪ Picnic sites to be provided in the immediate vicinity around the dam (10) ▪ Unsanitary mess will ensue from picnic sites and braai areas (26) ▪ Ensure adequate fire fighting measures on site if there are braai areas (28) ▪ Braai facilities near the Zoo site (27)
Restaurant at Zoo	3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 16, 21, 23, 27, 29	4, 22, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prefer a pub and beer garden (4)
Open up dam to public use (subject to conditions and safety requirements)	1, 2, 3, 5, 12, 13, 15, 16, 23, 25, 26	4, 6, 10, 11, 22, 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Leave the area for the use of the waterfowl (4) ▪
Mt. Pleasant for offices & visitor centre	2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29	6, 17, 22, 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use for offices only and accommodation (10)
Mt. Pleasant to be leased for special functions	5, 21, 23, 26, 29	3, 4, 6, 10, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new buildings to be erected (16)
Introduce "Tame " animals	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 15, 13, 23, 30	3, 10, 11, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Retain and introduce appropriate animals – but not a zoo (10, 26) ▪ Propose a Children's zoo (4) ▪ CPNP is not a zoo (10) ▪ Game should only be allowed within the fenced paddocks (11)

3.2.2 Memorial Ridge

All of the upgrade, management and landscaping proposals were broadly supported. Even though respondents supported the option of developing the Memorial precinct according to the proposals of Sir Herbert Baker, further debate is required on the issue of the reintroduction of stone pines and oaks as part of the landscape.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
"Perpetuate the visual tapestry "	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27		
Meadows framed by trees	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27	6, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only the Avenues to be framed by trees (10)
Protects vistas, especially to sea	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27		
Landscape to screen any new buildings	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27	22, 29	
Use stone and natural materials for buildings	1, 25, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No more new buildings to be allowed (22, 29)
Hard and soft landscape improvements	1, 2, 3, 5, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26	10, 22	
New interpretive signage (throughout Estate)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add route signage as well (4)
Protect Rhode's Bench	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 16, 22, 23, 25,		
Institute security and parking control system	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 27	22, 26, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not over charge. Allow free access to holders of Go Green Card (4) Provide stables with horses for volunteers to patrol the area in early evenings (8) Institute security and parking control before it gets to Rhodes Memorial (17)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Reintroduce stone pines and oaks in "redeveloping" landscape	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 13, 16, 23, 25	6, 10, 11, 21, 22, 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-introduce stone pines only on Ridge lines as planting oaks has little impact (2) If and where suitable only (4) Opposed to the replanting of Stone Pines and oaks (11) Suggests scenario testing. What would the area look like if other trees were planted? (12) Stone pines should only be planted to the North of the Memorial where they are not seen by those who find them offensive (20) Introduce White stinkwood and Yellow wood in redeveloping landscape (8) Consider trees like Wild Peach or Assegai (11) No replanting with Stone pines and English oaks (11) Do not need stone pines and oaks to obliterate the dramatic backdrop of provided by nature (20)
Develop Landscape as per Herbert Baker drawings such as Silver tree forest and lower terraces	1, 2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 16, 21, 23, 26	6, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Probably too expensive to implement (4) Ok, if plantings are indigenous (10)
Introduce / outsource landscape maintenance programme	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21, 23, 26	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For training gardeners / horticulturalists (4) Ok, if SANP agree (10)

3.2.3 Blockhouse slopes

Overall support for the upper slopes of the Estate to return to its natural state.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Maintain focal elements in landscape	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 23, 25, 26		
Allow vegetation succession to renosterveld above upper jeeptrack	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 26, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage vegetation succession, rather than allow (2) Incorporate into long term management (4) Allow landmark alien trees to remain in the Blockhouse Slopes Precinct (25)
Maintain tracks and fire breaks between lower slopes pathways	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add route signage and institute regular maintenance (4)

3.2.4 Gateway Parklands

There is division within the responses regarding running concession opportunities for game drives on the gateway slopes. Most respondents suggested game walks as being an appropriate alternative, which should be strictly controlled. Proposals regarding fencing, maintenance, management were met with favourably. Further division also exists with the proposal to replant Stone Pines on the Gateway Slopes.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Retain and introduce appropriate animals	5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 25, 29	2, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain and introduce appropriate animals based on Rhode's vision (1) Retain and introduce appropriate fenced animals for children's zoo (4) Re-establish animals that naturally occurred on Estate (6) No "zoo" (10) Beware of upsetting ecological balance (16) Water to be provided for antelopes, so that they do not spill over onto Newlands Forest (20) Remove all exotic deer, tahrs and sambars from the mountain (20, 22) There should be strict squirrel control (20)
Rationalise fences	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27, 25, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Double fence paddocks (27) And Maintain fences (4)
Introduce trails (historical and ecological)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 25, 27, 29,	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide suitable signage (4) Beware of upsetting ecological balance (16)
Retain and open vistas	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain existing vistas on Gateway parklands but do not open out (2, 27)
Clean up dead and fallen stone pines	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27	2, 25, 26, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The natural breakdown is good (2)
Maintain grazing to retain "paddocks"	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 27, 25, 29	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain paddocks if required for "control" (8) Please explain (10) There is a case for phasing out the pines in the paddocks (17)
Remove all invasive and disease prone trees	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not remove "all" trees. This issue requires more discussion. (10)
Replant and reseed stone pines (long term management programme)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 23, 29	6, 11, 12, 17, 22, 26, 27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only for landscaping purposes (4) Within certain areas only (10) Investigate other more appropriate species (12)
Temporary fencing of newly planted areas or individual trees	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 25, 29	22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plus suitable signage (4) This issue requires more discussion. (10)

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Concession opportunity to run tourism trails / game drives	2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 17, 21, 23, 26, 25, 27, 13	3, 4, 10, 12, 22, 29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No to vehicular game drives. Walking trails only (3) The plan must finance itself (8) Beware of upsetting ecological balance (16) Needs to be extremely controlled (17) Range of concessionaires in one area? Need to limit the cumulative impact of all operators (28)
Reinstate Fynbos / renosterveld landscape on upper slopes	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 2, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Incorporate as a long term possibility (4)
Introduce / outsource landscape maintenance programme	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21, 23, 26	4, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular maintenance by employee teams who have been trained (4)

3.2.5 University Slopes

As mentioned above, further discussion / debate is required regarding the proposal to reinstate pines along the ridge slopes. Landscape management proposals were supported.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Remove stumps	1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 27, 29	2, 22, 23, 26	
Replant to ensure landscape succession	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 25, 23	6, 12, 22	
Reinstate pines along ridge slopes	1, 2, 3, 5, 15, 16, 23, 25, 13	4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 19, 26, 21, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinstate Stone Pines only (3) Indigenous trees only (8) Along the Avenue only (10)
Phased removal of gum trees	3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 29	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outside road verge only (10) Do not necessarily remove all gums (15, 25)
New appropriate species introduced	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 13, 15, 19, 21, 23, 26		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research required as to what is both visually, aesthetically and ecologically suitable and appropriate (2) Introduce appropriate indigenous species (8, 22) Replant with indigenous trees to ensure landscape succession on University Slopes (26)
Introduce / outsource landscape maintenance programme	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 16, 21, 23, 26	4, 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular maintenance by employee teams who have been trained (4)

3.2.6 Waterfall Ravine

Landscape proposals to add indigenous tree species within this precinct is seen as being a priority, together with the restoration and maintenance of the contour paths.

OPTIONS	AGREE	DISAGREE	COMMENT
Hiking along Waterfall Ravine to Eastern Buttress and Mowbray Ridge	1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29	3, 4, 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pathway into First Waterfall Ravine should be closed off due to poor condition, or stabilize contour path (3, 11)
Remove all invasive trees	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate as a long term plan (4) ▪ Remove trees slowly (5) ▪ Remove trees outside the "formal" area (10)
Maintain forest character along upper slopes	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Indigenous trees only (10, 22)
Restore contour paths	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 26, 23, 25, 27, 29		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Restore and maintain contour paths use as fire breaks (4, 27) ▪ Current walking routes must be protected and kept free (15)
Add indigenous tree species	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 12, 19, 21, 22, 26, 25, 27,		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This issue is a priority (10) ▪ Beware of upsetting sensitive ecological balance (16)

4.0 ANNEXURES

- A Planning Process
- B Background Information Document
- C Invitation to Public Open House
- D List of Attendees
- E Record of Concerns
- F Comment Sheet and Checklist Distributed for Comment