

District Six
Final Draft
Development
Framework:
Public
Participation
Report

March 30
2012

The purpose of this report is to record the comments received from all non-government stakeholders including the District Six claimants and the broader public and respond to these comments.

Bergstan SA assisted by:
District Six Beneficiary & Redevelopment Trust
Lucien le Grange Architects and Urban Planners
NM & Associates Planners and Designers
Target Projects



Compiled by:
Bergstan SA

For: **The Department of
Rural Development & Land
Reform**

1. Introduction

This report records the public engagement process on the:

- a) The Final Draft Development Framework for District Six dated November 2011 (also known as the District Six spatial plan); and
- b) The Business Plan principles to give effect to the Final Draft Development Framework for District Six.

Both the Final Draft Development Framework and Business Plan were participated, displayed and explained to the claimant community and more broadly the interested and affected parties of Cape Town in an Open House held between Monday, 05 and Friday, 09 December 2011 from 10h00 to 19h30 (Monday to Thursday) and 09h00 to 12h00 on Friday at Trafalgar High School located in District Six. Since 2005, there were many previous engagements with the claimant Community which were recorded at the time of taking place.

This report deals only with the participation process that commenced with the Open House on 05 December 2011 and continued in the form of a review of the Final Draft Development Framework material at the offices of Bergstan SA from Monday, 23 January 2012 until Monday, 20 February 2012. The purpose of this report is to record the comments received from all non-government stakeholders including: the District Six claimants and the broader public and respond to these comments as far as possible. The initial closing date for comment was 27 January 2012, however given the substantial interest in the redevelopment of District Six, this closing date was extended to 20 February 2012.

2. Public Participation Method

Various ways and means were employed to inform and invite stakeholders to the Open House / Exhibition and view the material throughout the participation process conducted between 05 December 2011 and 20 February 2012.

2.1 Invitations:

The stakeholders were invited to attend the open house public participation process by various communication methods.

- The first, a letter of invitation to attend the launch of the Draft District Six Development Framework and Business Plan was transmitted by post, facsimile and email to all claimants by the appointed Public Participation Consultant, Bergstan SA.

- The second was a letter of invitation directly delivered / mailed by means of mail drops, emails and facsimile or regular mail postage to the attached list of interested and affected parties as defined by the City of Cape Town (Annexure A) by the appointed Public Participation Consultant, Bergstan SA.
- The third was by means of public notices placed in the local media: The Cape Argus, Die Burger, Cape Times and Cape Towner during the week of 05 to 09 December 2011 (Please refer to Annexure B).
- The fourth method of invitation was by means of mail drops to claimants that had already been resettled in District Six.
- The fifth means of communicating the public participation event was through the website: www.districtsix.za.org.
- Lastly all interested and affected parties listed in Annexure A were notified in writing of the extension of time granted for the closing date for comments from 27 January 2012 to 20 February 2012 (refer to Annexure C). This was also announced on the website: www.districtsix.za.org

2.2 Format of Participation

The participation took the form of an Open House and public exhibition. This included a scaled model of the redevelopment proposals, 13 exhibition boards (displayed on two separate walls to accommodate 'mass' perusal) and a running power point presentation. In addition two hard copies of the Draft Development Framework were available to view. All professional consultants were available between 10h00 and 13h00 and again from 17h00 to 20h00 in the course of the week to provide explanation and answer questions directly. However, throughout the day representatives from the professional team were available to address questions. On at least two days the exhibition only closed at 21h00 due to members of the public arriving late but still needing to engage the material and the consultants.

All participants who attended the event were requested to sign an attendance register. In addition the website (districtsix.za.org) was launched where all the exhibition material, including the exhibition boards, the Final Draft Development Framework document and other materials could be accessed and

downloaded. Also available on the website were all the previous documents and reports which helped inform the Final Draft Development Framework.

Comment sheets were made available for attendees to provide their comment and input into the process. Attendees were also invited to submit written comment to an email and/or postal address so that they could be considered as part of the Development Framework Review process. Alternatively, claimants and members of the public could submit comments via the website. The deadline for comments on the Final Draft Development Framework and Business Plan principles was initially 27 January 2012. However, given that school and Christmas holidays commenced soon after the closing of the exhibition and there was great interest in the project, a number of participants requested that the closing date for comment be extended. The comment period was therefore extended to 20 February 2012 with the permission of the DRD&LR and the District Six Task Team to afford the participants more time to state their views. The same material presented at the Open House / Exhibition was made available for perusal between 10h00 and 14h00 at the offices of Bergstan SA between 20 January 2012 and 20 February 2012.

3. Summary of Comments

The general response to the Draft Development Framework and Business Plan was positive with a large number of respondents communicating their support for the project. Specific concerns were raised in respect of the Business Plan which concerns were to be addressed at more intimate sessions held with the claimants in the week of 12 December 2011 and in the second half of January through to February 2012.

Comments received from the claimant community, Interested and Affected Parties (I&AP's) and the general public were collected, recorded, numbered and filtered into appropriate categories to allow for meaningful assessment and response (See Annexure D) for the full list of respondents who submitted written comment). As was expected the comments submitted at the consultation touched on a number of diverse and interrelated issues, not all of which related specifically to the Development Framework or the Business Plan. The comments were filtered into the following categories:

- Responses conveying support for the project;
- Responses conveying objection to the project;

- Responses related to the content of the Development Framework touching on issues such as density, house types, parking, tenure etc.;
- Responses related to communication - a lack of information, claimants not receiving invitations, the late change of venue without adequate forewarning and requests for access to information;
- Responses and comments related to the business plan which have to do with issues of housing allocation, affordability, accessing finance and contributions; and
- Responses related to claimants and others either wanting to confirm their contact details with the DRD&LR or wanting to enquire where their names were on the list.

The general response to the project was positive with 37 respondents communicating their direct support for the project. Only 2 of respondents objected strongly to the project and process. The main issues identified by participants included:

- Concerns about density;
- Concerns about a lack of open space;
- Concerns from claimants about their choices and housing options;
- The availability of car parking and garages;
- Frustrations with the slow progress of the project; and
- Poor communication.

It is noted that a distinct grouping of comments came from residents of Justice Walk / Canterbury Square. For ease of reference and given the detail of this group's inputs, a separate section has been allowed for to record their comments. Claimant and public comments were reviewed and categorised in the Table below to enable an appropriate response. The number of respondents recorded in the right hand side column of the Table below provides an indication of how many respondents expressed the comment / issue / concern.

Even though only 155 comments including those of Justice Walk and Canterbury Square (who were counted as one but 160 households were party to the collective comment), it is estimated that between 200 and 300 persons visited the exhibition per day in the week of 05 to 09 December 2011. However, only 657 people signed the attendance register during the participation period held between 05 December 2011 and 20 February 2012.

Table: Comments by claimant community and broader public stakeholders and responses on the Final Draft Development Framework and Business Plan Principles

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
Public Comments			
General Support	Respondents are supportive of the project and proposals and are eager for the project to go ahead. Responses vary from “delight “to “extremely impressed” to “keep it up”. In some cases names of particular individuals are mentioned but most are more generally supportive. Many respondents express a desire for the process to move forward more quickly as they are old and want to return to District Six while still able to appreciate it. Some respondents were impressed by the website and requested to be informed on how the process develops (Also see communication section below).	Noted	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,16,17,18, 19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,31, 36,40,77, 92,101,104,107,143,146
Objections	Respondents express anger and disillusionment about the process. Comments largely relate to claimants wanting their land back and these individuals are not interested in being part of the planning process. Some respondents are critical of the process and express suspicion with regards to the individuals involved in the process. Some respondents form part of the advocacy group resisting the development for various reasons.	Noted	28,29
Development Framework related Comments			
Density	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many respondents and particularly claimants expressed concerns about the density of the proposed development and the proposed heights of buildings. • Many noted the high percentage of flats relative to houses within the development and responded negatively to this. • Many respondents complained that their concerns with density had been raised during previous consultation events and had not been addressed. • Some respondents associated density with crime and are concerned that if the densities are high that the area will degenerate into a slum and become a haven for gangsters. These included both claimants as well as non-claimants. 	<p>While the issue of density features high on the respondents list of concerns, these comments are the result of perceptions of density rather than the nature of urban / city centre environments which are by nature dense.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons why a higher density in District Six is desirable and in fact necessary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. District Six is an inner city area where land values are high and low rise, low density development is inappropriate, particularly on portions located closer to the City centre. 2. Densities in the old District Six were historically high ranging from 85 to 100 du/ha gross and an average of 168du/Ha net 3. The Draft CoCT Densification Strategy (2009) and the Table Bay Spatial Development Plan suggest that gross densities within District Six should be between 25 and 180du/Ha. The proposed average Gross Density of 60du/Ha (162du/Ha net) for District Six is therefore in the lower end of this range and appropriate for an inner city neighbourhood. 4. The brief to the consultants from the DRD&LR and D6BT, which as agreed with the claimant community at previous consultations, was to accommodate between 4500 and 5500 homes within District Six. The Final Draft Development Framework plans for 5000 units and includes a mix of claimant units, Market units and other forms of housing. This mix is necessary to ensure that more development can cross-subsidise the cost of construction of the homes for returning claimants. 5. The division of the available land into individual plots for claimants would yield approximately 210m². This option was discounted by claimants and the D6BT a number of years ago as; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i) the costs of servicing these plots would be high and this alone makes the project unviable. ii) A single plot/house form of development is inappropriate for the 	30,31,32,33,34,38,40,41,42 44,45,46, 47,49,50,52,61,62,85,87,138

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
		<p>inner city.</p> <p>iii) There would be no land available for non residential development which could cross subsidise the construction of the claimant housing.</p> <p>iv) This approach to the project undermines the spirit of restitution on which the project was founded as many more people were removed from District Six than those who are verified claimants, and can potentially move back to the area.</p>	
House Types and Design	Claimants requested that their homes be designed to their specification and that they be involved in the design process.	Claimants will be engaged in the next Precinct Planning stage of the project and will be directly involved in the design of their homes, as was the case for Pilot Projects 1 and 2.	30,33,35,36, 152
	Many respondents are unhappy about the high proportion of flats relative to houses. A number of claimants requested double storey / duplex units. Some argue that most of the claimants were elderly and would have problems negotiating stairs and therefore single storey development is more appropriate. A number of claimants complained the units which were built as part of the pilot project were too small and requested gardens.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Claimants will all be accommodated in the low-rise duplexes. They may, however, opt for units in the higher density and high rise clusters. • As set out in Section 4.5.8 and 4.5.9 the Final Draft Development Framework does not support a “one-size-fits-all” approach to the provision of housing. It must be acknowledged that claimants have different needs and requirement and therefore a mix of different types of houses is appropriate. • All claimants are entitled to a dignified home of a minimum of 90m². • It must also be acknowledged that due to the slope of the site different typologies are more appropriate than others. • The high percentage of flats relative to houses is necessary to achieve the required densities. A failure to deliver the total number of units suggested in the Development Framework could potentially make the development unviable and put the Business Plan in jeopardy. • The development of flats and sectional title schemes also make it easier to provide secure car parking on site in an affordable and attractive manner. • All the above factors will be considered in detail during the Precinct Planning stage of development. 	30,33,34,35,36,41,42,46,47,48,49,61,146
	Some respondents expressed concerns about steps and disabled access to homes as well as other public facilities (Aspeling Street Mosque).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a matter of principle all the units developed for claimants will have a bedroom on the ground floor for elderly or disabled people. • Depending on the design and scale of a building lifts will be provided to give access to the upper storeys (this applies to multi-storey buildings above 4 to 5 storeys only). • Section 4.6.2 of the Final Draft Development Framework makes explicit reference to the need to plan for people with disabilities. These concerns will be dealt with at detail and building design level. • Future planning will take greater heed of issues faced by the disabled. 	53,56,
	A number of respondents requested that provision be made specifically for the elderly in the form of “pensioners’ cottages” and other related amenities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Final Draft Development Framework is a high level planning document and does not make specific provision for the elderly. The aspiration is that all the facilities required by the elderly will be easily accessible, as it should be in any good urban environment. It is anticipated that in most cases the elderly will either live with their families or independently in smaller units. • Opportunities for care homes for the aged can be explored during precinct planning stage. 	27,51,53, 88,89
Garages and parking	Many claimants requested garages to be provided within their property. While some respondents were unhappy about how the garages are currently being allocated, others are willing to pay an additional contribution for a private	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of car parking is informed by the desire and need for car parking, planning policy and regulations, the availability (or lack thereof) of land, the cost of providing car parking and the value of car 	21,30,42,47,48,49,50,111,112

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
	garage.	<p>parking within the inner city.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The principle of reduced car parking provision which is promoted in the Development Framework is in keeping with international development trends and is appropriate for a site such as District Six which enjoys good access to public transport. • Garages create dead facades at ground level and lead to unattractive and less safe streets due to decreased passive surveillance (eyes on the street). • Garages and on site parking within urban environments require crossovers, dropped kerbs and breaks in the front boundary wall which detract from the quality of the urban environment and streetscape. • Not all units will have garages or on site car parking. People who own cars and do not have garages will need to park their cars on the street or in a common parking court. • It is easier to provide structured car parking for flats or sectional title type developments. • Those units where garaging/off-street is available are allocated through a democratic process involving all the claimants eligible for a unit at the time that it becomes available. 	
Tenure options and management	<p>Respondents raised questions around the tenure options which would be available within the development and how the development would be managed. Other respondents expressed concerns about private ownership and wanted to know where the social housing elements would be located. Questions were also raised with regards to what mechanisms would be put in place to prevent overcrowding and backyard rentals.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 4.5.12 of the Final Draft Development Framework presents a range of tenure options which will be available within the development. Only validated claimants and land reform beneficiaries will own their dwellings. The remainder will be rental stock managed by a company with the capacity to do so. • Social housing will be interspersed amongst other units thereby adhering to the principle of integration. This integration is there precisely to maintain the quality of the environment. The vast majority of poor people are decent families looking for a quality residential environment, just like anyone else. Living amongst the wealthy in dwellings of no lesser quality will go a long way to encouraging the aspirations of the poor. • The upkeep and maintenance of individual properties will be the responsibility of the property owner. • As required by law Sectional title properties will be required to form body corporate/s that will be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the buildings. • It is anticipated that the Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) will provide additional assistance and support to body corporate/s in the interest of ensuring that the whole development is properly maintained according to a set of guidelines and rules that will ensure good standards. 	27, 31, 44, 86, 87, 89, 138
Development Quality	<p>Respondents expressed concerns with regard to the quality of the proposed development given limited resources. Some respondents point out that a number of the pilot project houses are not being adequately maintained and are degrading. A number of questions relate to how the built quality will be guaranteed and monitored, who is accountable for maintenance?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is in the interest of all parties to ensure that the development is built to an acceptable standard. Section 4.5.10 and 4.5.11 of the Final Draft Development Framework sets out broad development guidelines which will be developed in greater detail during later stages. • All proposals will be assessed by the CoCT and SAHRA to ensure that building regulations are complied with and the development is befitting of a (proposed) National Heritage Site. • The SPV will establish a Design Review Committee consisting of a range of professionals and other relevant members to review proposals and 	41, 59, 60, 89

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
		design and monitor construction as the scheme's development progresses.	
Open Space	Respondents expressed concerns around the perceived lack of open space within the development. There is also concern over the loss of some existing parks and open spaces including Fawley and Mckenzie Parks. A number of respondents requested detailed proposals for the new open spaces.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implicit in the Landscape Strategy is a principle of no net loss of open space. • The development will also comply with current planning policy with regards to the provision of public open space. • A review of the historic plans of District Six indicates that many of the existing public open spaces in District Six (Fawley and Mckenzie Parks in particular) never existed. They were not planned as public parks but rather resulted from the left over space following the demolition of the historic fabric and the forced removal of the community. Most of them are not overlooked, have blank frontages fronting onto them and are not landscaped in a meaningful way. They have also been identified from early on as sites for restitution. The opportunity has therefore arisen through the Development Framework process to interrogate the location, purpose and design of open space across the entire District Six site with the intention of developing land efficiently and creating a network of integrated and quality open spaces. These proposals will need to be developed further and assessed during precinct planning and will involve claimants as well as local residents. • Existing trees and play equipment will either be integrated into the new design or relocated appropriately. • Detail plans and proposals of open spaces will only be developed during the Precinct Planning stages. 	32, 46, 54,58,60, 70,85,87,88, 138, 145
	There were a number of positive responses with regards to the proposed open spaces, with support for the Memorial Park and the idea of water being reintroduced into the development. A number of requests were made for more trees to be planted within the development.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detailed landscape interventions and proposals for open spaces and proposed streams will be developed during the Precinct Planning stages. • Section 4.4.4 of the Final Draft Development Framework outlines an approach to tree planting and a structured green landscape within the development. 	88,138,
Cultural and community facilities	Some respondents requested that more attention be paid to cultural facilities (arts, performance, music, etc.). A number of these respondents offer their personal services with regards to the running of facilities (childcare) and cultural facilities (amphitheatre and entertainment venues). Suggestions were also made for shared spaces for meeting, congregation and celebration. A specific proposal was suggested for a shared faith meeting area where interaction between people of different faiths and religions could be facilitated.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While section 4.1 of the Final Draft Development Framework provides a broad approach to aspects of culture and memory, these aspects of the site and community can only be developed meaningfully through community participation and engagement. It is not the place or purpose of the Development Framework to plan these facilities but the intention is that the guidelines and framework remains flexible enough for these ideas to emerge and be driven by the various parts of the community and individuals / companies with a special interest. • Respondents are encouraged to make contact with the SPV, once it is established, to present and investigate cultural opportunities and should target existing community halls for this purpose. 	21,55,57,59, 60,88
Businesses / commercial development.	Some claimants and respondents enquired as to how they could secure commercial premises within the development to open a business.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respondents are encouraged to make contact with the SPV, once it is established, to investigate commercial opportunities. • The letting of commercial space will follow a procurement protocol similar to that envisaged for the redevelopment programme where community members are given first preference. 	30, 50, 61, 111
	One comment related to the disproportion between housing and employment and questioned where residents would be employed.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While there is a mix of uses proposed in District Six it will remain predominantly a residential area. • The proximity of the CBD and other employment areas such as 	46

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
		<p>Woodstock and Salt River, together with good access to public transport will make it easy and convenient for residents to access employment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relocation of claimants to District Six is not intended to uproot them from their existing employment. • A proposed component of the SPV is a Not for Profit Company (NPC). The NPC will drive community programmes including training in skills and entrepreneurship. 	
Sustainability	A number of respondents expressed support for a sustainable development and used terminology such as “Eco friendly hub”. One respondent requested that the development be “off-grid”. There was also general support expressed for alternative energy and developing a green economy.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support is noted and welcomed. • All proposals will need to be investigated further during Precinct Planning and detailed design stage in compliance with the guidelines outlined in the Final Draft Development Framework and relevant National and Municipal requirements in respect of sustainable development. 	40, 61, 89
Access	One respondent requested that measures be put in place to ensure that those with disabilities are able to access public transport.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is the intention of the CoCT to improve access to public transport for the disabled. • Further consideration will need to be made at detail design level. 	53, 56
	A number of comments questioned whether the existing road infrastructure can cope with increased traffic from the proposed new development. There were particular concerns about the proposals to narrow Keizersgracht. One respondent identifies a contradiction between the narrowing of the road reserve and the provision of bus lanes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Development Framework will be subject to a full Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) during the forthcoming planning processes. The Transport Impact Assessment will in turn inform future plans for Keizersgracht. • Preliminary investigations suggest that the Road reserve of Keizersgracht could be reduced while still being able to accommodate bus lanes. Further investigations will be undertaken during Precinct Planning and once the Transport Impact Assessment has been completed. 	60, 87,89, 138
	Some respondents expressed support for cycle and pedestrian friendly environments with dedicated cycle lanes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For more information see Section 4.6 of the Final Draft Development Framework. Detailed proposals for cycle lanes are to be investigated during Precinct Planning stages. 	89, 138
	There were concerns about narrow lanes and the safety and securing aspects related to these.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian lanes play an important role in increasing levels of permeability for residents making access more convenient and potentially safe. A careful balance will need to be struck during Precinct Planning and detailed design stages to ensure that these lanes are sufficiently surveyed with eyes onto the spaces. 	89, 138
Questions related to statutory processes and the legal status of the exhibition.	One respondent questioned the intention of the consultation and its relationship with an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process. They were particularly critical of the lack of technical material available at the exhibition, questioned the legality of the process and wondered whether the project was just being “pushed through” for political reasons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of this consultation process was to present the Final Draft Development Framework to the claimants, Interested and Affected Parties and general public for comment. Once comment has been received and revisions made to the Final Draft Development Framework it will be submitted to the City of Cape Town as a high level planning guideline document for District Six. • Some of the land that needs to be rezoned will to go through an Environmental Impact Assessment process in as far as their use and development trigger an Environmental Impact Assessment in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA). Claimants, Interested and Affected Parties and the general public will be informed as to when this process begins and will have an opportunity to comment on the proposals again during the Environmental Impact Assessment process. • It must be noted that a large portion of the District Six land has existing 	88

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
Other development opportunities	Claimant identifies land behind the schools which needs to be developed	development rights in place and can therefore be constructed on 'as of right'. Refer to Figure 5.1 in the Final Draft Development Framework. • Figures 4.8 and 5.4 In the Development Framework clearly indicate that this land will be developed. Parcel K2 has been identified as one of the Fast Track Development Parcels.	42
Justice Walk and Canterbury Square			
Justice Walk and Canterbury Square (Comments received during Open House period)	A large number of comments came from residents of Justice Walk who complained that they should have been consulted before this late stage of the project. These related predominantly to the impact of the proposed development on their properties and concerns that they would potentially lose their views of the harbour. These respondents also expressed concern over the proposed density, the heights of buildings, particularly in parcels N1 and N2, heritage constraints, lack and loss of open space. Many respondents requested to be engaged during the detailed planning process for parcels N1 and N2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that we establish points of departure when engaging with these residents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They occupy dwellings from which some of the community were forcibly removed ○ They will now be participants in a scheme that is a model of restorative justice. ○ While the returning community will not demand that existing residents be evicted because that would be a repeat of the injustice visited on South African society, they have an expectation that existing residents also embrace the concept of restorative justice. • Many of the issues raised by these respondents are addressed in the above responses. • Sites N1 and N2 form part of the land claim, are appropriately zoned and will be redeveloped. Buildings within these parcels will range from 2-4 storeys. • The issues of building heights and loss of views will be addressed at the precinct planning and site development plan stages. • Residents will be consulted when this happens. 	32, 58,59,60,69,70,84,85,87,89,138, 145, 147
Views	<p>Losing our views; exactly how high in meters will the buildings in front of Justice Walk be? Can you be specific?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept plans speak of protecting views, but it sounds like the views of the double story flats, not the views of Justice Walk • How deep will you excavate to sustain views for Justice Walk? • How sure are you that 2, 3-4 storeys will not impair the views from existing buildings in Justice Walk? [And just being able to see over their roof tops is not a view] • We do not believe the grading of 9 meters is sufficient for a 4 story building to not obliterate our views. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reason that they have views is because the dwellings that once stood in front of their homes were razed to the ground when the community was forcibly removed. • Having regard to what is said above about restorative justice, maintenance of their views is a secondary concern. • The issue of 'views' is a complex one – within recent developments in SA, the preservation of views are increasingly seen as a 'privilege' rather than a 'right'. It is important for Justice Walk/ Canterbury Square residents to remember that the former District Six residents who occupied the existing houses along the southern edge of Old Constitution Street, now 'Justice Walk', did not enjoy an un-interrupted view of Table Bay/the City. Housing and commercial developments (i.e. the Tafelberg Hotel) blocked that view. It was only with the forced removals and the destruction of buildings that these houses along the southern edge of Justice Walk came to have a 'view' – a view privileged by the acts/actions of apartheid. • With the redevelopment of District Six it is impossible – as elsewhere in the city and internationally – to guarantee that every residential unit will/must have a view. Where possible views will be protected but not at the expense of denying the redevelopment of District Six for returning claimants, nor at the expense of achieving reasonable residential densities. 	148 (160 respondents) Note: Comments that follow from Justice Walk / Canterbury Square residents were received during extended comment period to 20 February 2012
	Losing our views; exactly how high in meters will the buildings in Keizersgracht	• Proposed as a primary of 'high street' New Hanover Street will be a	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
	<p>Street in front of Canterbury Square and alongside Canterbury Square in Vogelgezang Street be? Can you be specific?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> You speak of protecting views but it seems that the views of Canterbury Square are not being considered at all. Canterbury Square was designed and built with urban balconies to ensure each property has a view, very much in line with your proposals for the new development. Hanover Street to the front of us is proposed to be a Primary Street with buildings of 4 to 6 storeys. Vogelgezang Street adjacent to us is to be a Low Order Street with buildings of 3 – 4 storeys. We were verbally assured at the Presentation at Trafalgar School the buildings in front and adjacent to us would be 2 storeys maximum. On the Vogelgezang side of our complex will you be excavating to sustain our views? Can you be specific 	<p>mixed land –use corridor that will include medium density housing provision. As the different precincts along this arterial route are developed and as further design occurs at the precinct level, the question of building heights, views and light will be discussed further with stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The commercial developments along New Hanover Street are critical to making the redevelopment as a whole sustainable. Shall the dispossessed community be denied their right lest we offend against those who stand to lose views? And more, these views that they claim ownership were gained off the back of the destruction of the homes of the dispossessed who now seek to return. 	
Light/shadowing and wind effects/tunnelling	<p>Losing light/shadowing and wind effects/tunnelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It appears to us any that multi story buildings built between Canterbury Square and Keizersgracht would result in loss of light to us. Can you be specific as regard to shadow lines? Will the effects on wind/tunnelling be established and will we be consulted about the findings. 	<p>As the different precincts along this arterial route are developed and as further design occurs at the precinct level, the question of building heights, views and light will be discussed further with stakeholders. Detailed light and shadow projection studies will then have to be done.</p>	148
Building plans	<p>We would like all the ‘concrete’ proposed development and building plans to be open for inspection and discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have only seen a concept of the proposed development We have no guarantees that our views over the harbour & city will not be obstructed. The values of our Justice Walk and Canterbury Square properties are directly linked to having a view. We would like to see a proposed 'virtual plan' of the draft final outcome of the proposed development. 	<p>The Final Draft Development Framework discusses the urban design of District Six at a broad conceptual level and in terms of design and development principles. These general design strategies and principles have to be applied/ tested at Precinct level and detailed design stages. With precinct designs there will be the opportunity for stakeholders to understand the proposals in greater detail.</p>	148
Services	<p>We need the police, welfare, fire and road planning departments to be involved for their comments (the Summer Greens development near Canal Walk was so badly planned fire engines or rubbish collection vehicles could not drive on narrow streets)</p>	<p>Various departments of the City of Cape Town are and will be making comments.</p>	148
Access	<p>How can the Kuyper Road entrance to Justice Walk be used as road with direct access garages backing onto road (as shown on development plans in Trafalgar School</p>	<p>With the development of Block N1/N2 vehicular access to Justice Walk needs to be reviewed by the CoCT's Roads Department. In doing so the status of Kuyper Road will have to be re-appraised.</p>	148
	<p>Canterbury Square only has two access points, the driveway gate onto Vogelgezang Street & the pedestrian gate leading out onto the Public Open Space between Canterbury Square & Keizersgracht. Confirmation is required that should the Public Open Space be rezoned and or developed our pedestrian access will be preserved.</p>	<p>With the further design development of precincts that surround Canterbury Square, these concerns of access and open space provision will have to be addressed.</p>	148
Planned Development	<p>It should be strongly stated that a badly planned development will turn into the City of Cape Town's biggest problem in a few years' time. It is better to think it through properly now</p>	<p>Agreed!</p>	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
De Waal Drive Flats	<p>De Waal Drive Flats: We have a huge problem with the De Waal Drive flats. We don't want a duplication of that problem in front of and around us.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justice Walk concern is being sandwiched between the problem De Waal Drive Flats and potentially problem development in front. Canterbury Square and Blinde Street already experience high levels of crime and have the same concerns. <p>De Waal Drive Flats, the problems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drug taking and dealing Unemployed youth have nothing to do A criminal element has moved into some of the flats, some of the other flat owners live in fear. This has been reported in the local newspapers. Vandalism to all of our properties Vandalism to the De Waal Drive flats and garages People living in the De Waal Drive Flat's garages Dumping of rubbish from the De Waal Drive flats above into the car parking bays in Lymington Close. This is an on-going monthly problem. It's like living in a rubbish dump. It's difficult to get the dumped rubbish removed. Shoddy maintenance of the De Waal Drive Flats and Garage buildings (Buildings are not timeously maintained by Human Settlements) it can take years to get things fixed. Graffiti is an on-going problem No proper tenant rules Back yard dwellers, would this be allowed elsewhere in CPT? De Waal Drive Flats in 3 words, shocking, disgusting, unacceptable The De Waal Drive flats are a problem which will only be exacerbated if it is not fixed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These are issues that have to be taken up by Civic, Residents as well as Neighbourhood organizations and by the appropriate departments of the City of Cape Town. There is an unfortunate assumption here that the people who will be returning are rabble and miscreants. Part of the contribution that these beneficiaries of apartheid, and now of restorative justice can make, is on community driven strategies to limit criminality and poor neighbourliness. Drawing up a list is a good start. Making a plan that is inclusive and subscribes to our model of integration is the next step. 	148
Allocation of Homes	<p>How will all the 4,500 – 5,500 new homes be allocated? As per DRAFT DISTRICT SIX DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK 2011 Page 7 of Chapters 5 & 6 and TABLE 5.1: SUMMARY OF FAST TRACK DEVELOPMENT Phase 1A homes are allocated as: claimants as 840, social 0, gap 40, market 40 Phase 1B shows claimants 228 social 165, gap 66, market 211. So as we understand it, the majority of the claimants will be allocated homes in Phase 1A. Will the majority of any other group be homed in any other one phase? We are concerned that a majority of another phase may be allocated as rental properties instead of the homes in the phases being split between the various groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The danger of accelerating the return of claimants was that we would sacrifice the principle of an integrated development. We have managed to limit that as the breakdown of categories demonstrates. With less time pressure in the remaining redevelopment, we should achieve a better mix and distribution of land reform beneficiaries, gap, social and market-related housing. 	148
Commencement of building process	<p>When will this first phase of building start and how long do they think it would take for completion?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March/April 2012 All claimants will return by February 11, 2014. The total redevelopment will take approximately 7 years to complete. 	148
Security	<p>Will security become an issue?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The builders will have workers around 24/7? Will building sites be enclosed, patrolled & monitored? 	<p>The builders will by contractual agreements deal with issues of health, safety and security.</p>	148
Noise and Dust and Construction hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What steps will be taken to minimise noise and dust and inconvenience to current residents? Will buildings construction hours be strictly controlled? 	<p>These are real and valid concerns that must be addressed with each precinct development. In terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act the various building sites will have to have proper hoarding, security</p>	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
Site laws	<p>If we (the existing residents) are restricted to Heritage site laws in terms of adding onto and changing our homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surely the sensitivity of preservation needs to be taken into account when erecting large buildings around & in front of the Zonnebloem belt. • You speak of enhancing the setting of the remaining historic buildings as unique and distinctive places within the urban fabric. Can you be specific? 	<p>fencing, signage, etc.</p> <p>Yes the 'sensitivity of preservation' needs to be considered, while still making it possible for the re-development of District Six to occur. In principle there should be a balance of conservation and development. In this regard the remaining historic buildings (of Churches, Mosques and Schools) should not be dwarfed by inappropriately tall/high buildings – they should retain their status as landmark buildings.</p>	148
Public Open Space	<p>Not enough Public Open green spaces within the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the Concept/Spatial plan it looks as though they are even building on the little park at the end of Justice Walk and Lymington. Fawley Park as well as the Public Open Space between Canterbury Square and Keizersgracht Street. • Fawley Park, at the end of Justice and Lymington roads, is probably the only aspect of community that still exists in this strip. Children are seen playing soccer, cricket & walking dogs every day, morning & evening, why is this being ignored? • • Open spaces? Concept plans mention Trafalgar Park, It's not close, it's unsafe, and Zonnebloem Estate as open space, are we allowed access to Zonnebloem estate? Point is, these are not here, you need to get into your car and drive there. • As safety is an issue at Trafalgar Park, you wouldn't want to go there anyway. • There is no Open space within the proposed development big enough for outdoor recreation. • The Public Open Space between Canterbury Square and Keizersgracht is a narrow strip of land on which a large chunk of the original Hanover Street remains and is clearly visible. • It would be a good idea to establish a memorial park there so that there is at least some green space on the New Hanover Street. We have written to the city and various officials over the years offering to help where we can to establish such a park but no response has been received to date. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As part of an inner-city quarter the re-developed District Six will contribute to, and share, amenities within the city bowl area. The provision of public open space in the re-developed District Six cannot therefore be thought of in terms of typical 'suburban' open space norms. Thus places such as Trafalgar Park would have to be made safe to be used by surrounding communities. • The public use of open spaces such as the Zonnebloem Estate needs to be integrated into the Business Plan and be negotiated with the Zonnebloem Trust. In addition the full and open public use of the CoCT owned playing fields (known as the 'Greens') needs to be negotiated. Together these expansive open spaces can serve as outdoor recreation areas to be used by residents and Schools alike. • As and when this precinct gets developed design issues of heritage, massing, heights, etc. will need to be considered with stakeholder input. • Refer to discussion on Open Space on page 5-6. 	148
Memorial Park	<p>The proposed memorial park, it should be positioned in front of existing houses in Justice Walk to ensure that at least some of the houses keep their existing views.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will the Memorial park be constructed? At the moment its slopes are so steep it is not suitable for use as a park. It is not remotely conducive to any recreational use. It's also exposed to the full blast of the South Easter. It needs to be a park that residents can use and enjoy as an outdoor space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Memorial Park is to commemorate the forced removal of a community and to symbolize the wasted windswept landscape caused by the destruction of District Six. The intention is that it serves as a reminder to all of the destruction of a community. This is its primary purpose. • The primary purpose of the park is not to protect views. The site where the park is proposed is at Horstley Street (which still exists) where the first and last forced removals in the modern era happened. Justice Walk does not carry the same historical significance. 	148
Narrow streets	<p>Rabbit warren streets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They are planning to narrow Keizersgracht from 30 to 17 meters. They don't want motorists using it as a detour to bypass traffic jams; a rat run was the term. Yet they want to use it for the My City buses and Taxis. • This needs a re-look, once the buildings are built it's hard to change the roads, what about in 50 years' time? What about imposing a strict, low, speed limit? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • District Six is part of the inner city bowl area – it is not a suburb as understood in the conventional sense. It is urban in character rather than sub-urban. The reconstruction of District Six also involves building on a historic site, where the historic grid of streets remains in places and where these traces of history will be made tangible again. • Keizersgracht is therefore not envisaged as a transportation hub. The vision for this road is a place where community can celebrate, walk, 	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You can plant trees in the middle of a wide street We need road engineering, the police, welfare and fire departments to be involved for their comments (the Summer Greens development near Canal Walk was so badly planned fire engines and rubbish collection vehicles could not drive on the narrow streets) 	<p>shop, socialise and encounter. The detail design of the road has not been completed at this stage and is dependant on a transportation impact assessment being undertaken.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Cape Town, their Roads, Fire and Waste Disposal Departments will all make comments. 	
Crime, Policing & Traffic in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> They are considering laneways between the buildings, the original street grid. What about crime prevention? Narrow streets that you cannot get a car down make the area difficult to police? A perfect escape route for criminals? Surely input from the police would help. Each section (should/must) be fenced off like the Mill and Canterbury Square with security access; criminals would then at least have to negotiate a fence in order to get away. How will the City be able to do rubbish collection if we have narrow streets trucks cannot drive down? This kind of development will need a lot of security features to prevent it from turning into the slum it once was. Will the city or province allocate additional police, Metro police, CCID security or traffic officers for the maintenance of proper law and order in the area? Will CCV cameras be installed as in the city? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of narrower streets does not preclude policing, rubbish collection and crime prevention – this has been proved all over the world. While streets may be narrow they will still allow vehicular access. Yes policing must occur – the extent and scale of such crime prevention measures should be taken up with SAPS, Neighbourhood Watch organizations, etc. Gated communities will not be allowed. The whole area is designed so that a community can establish itself. The process of community building itself involves tackling issues such as crime. 	148
Ownership and maintenance	<p>Types of ownership & Maintenance of the buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Full Title pilot phase buildings are not being maintained at all, not even a lick of paint. If you want photos, we have photos taken in December 2011. Many of the buildings to be erected will be Sectional Title Ownership. What guarantees can be made that the Body Corporate/s will produce a long term budget correctly for the maintenance and repair of the common property and raise sufficient levies to cover these costs and build an appropriate reserve for contingencies? Management Rules and Conduct rules are as automatically as prescribed but Conduct Rules need to be tailored and registered/filed to suit their application. Will Sectional Title experts such as Prof Graham Paddock and Tertius Maree be consulted to ensure that this is set up correctly and a professional managing agency be appointed? The balance of buildings could either be Full Title or Home Owners Associations. Full Title leaves everything related to the building up to the individual owning it and Home Owners Associations would in our opinion be more desirable as in this way the maintenance and repair of the buildings can be ‘governed’ the roads and sidewalks maintained as well as security if necessary. It is mentioned that the area should be divided into eight smaller sub precincts rather than one single urban precinct. This provides a good basis for home owners associations to be established. Please could you be specific as to how ownership is envisaged. Again, strict rules and guidelines will need to be put in place to prevent the area from becoming a slum. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All claimants and land reform beneficiaries will own their homes either through freehold or sectional title. The remainder will be let. The rental units will be managed by a properly qualified property management company. The basic rules of good neighbourliness are captured in the Social Compact that every returnee is required to sign and recorded in the title deeds. Apart from the fact that the returning community is very house-proud, as evidenced by the fact that previously dilapidated white areas such as Crawford and Rondebosch East now boast mansions with sky-rocketing property values, it must be remembered that the people living in the first pilot project live next a construction site. There is no point in painting now when there is a chance that the effort will be a wasted exercise. 	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
Returning claimants	<p>Will the returnees live in the houses or will they be absentee landlords as appears to be the case with some of the houses down at the pilot phase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since most claimants are relatively old by now would we soon have a retirement village? Since they will soon pass on but have to keep their property for 15 years what would happen to it then. Does this mean their kids inherit it? What claim do they have to these properties as they are not returnees? • The pilot project below seems to have many absent landlords. Is the same going to happen here? • Are claimants permitted to rent their properties out? • If the claimant passes away are the heirs still restricted from selling it until the prescribed number years have elapsed? • Will heirs also pay zero rates & will they be allowed to rent the properties out? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While we are doing everything possible to get the original evictees to return to guide the establishment of the new community, many have died or are too old to return. • They often give the houses to their children or rent it out to a family member. • In any event, and regardless to whom they rent, the Social Compact prohibits exploitative rentals. Poorer people must return to the City as a matter of priority. 	148
	<p>We've heard the returnees would not be required to pay rates and taxes for a number of years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We are concerned about the economic, social and aesthetic impact this arrangement could have on the neighbourhood 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not paying rates and taxes does not absolve the City of its responsibilities as the local authority. • The moneys saved from not paying rates will mean that there will be spare cash available to maintain their homes 	148
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where is the extra parking available for Mosque days? • You say that reduced car parking ratios will be negotiated with the city on the basis of the site's high level of access to work opportunities and public transport, that on street parking is promoted and walking to the shops will be encouraged & the intention is to make it less convenient to use a car & that a ratio of .7 parking per Household is aimed for. • As stated: paying, hiring and buying parking in the city is not affordable so what will car owners do? • In our opinion trying to minimising parking is extremely short-sighted, 1.25 parkings per household in the surrounding areas has already often proved to be inadequate. • What a about visitors parking? • Using on street parking as ones primary parking increases ones insurance premiums substantially. • In our opinion lack of adequate parking facilities at the shops will discourage people from shopping in the area and the shops will lose trade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provision of Parking in inner city areas such as District Six is a complex issue that needs to be addressed on an on-going basis and re-evaluated as transport trends change and as more sustainable public transport is provided. To provide parking in conventional terms and standards would drastically reduce the land area available for residential development. Thus parking provision needs to be made in a range of different ways, including, limited on-site parking, on-street parking, multi-use parking courts and where feasible parking garages. • In the case of the development of Block N1/N2 all four of these options are being considered as the Precinct level Urban Design progresses. 	148
Levies	<p>Levies for the administration, maintenance & repair and upkeep of common Property</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of sectional title properties and Home Owners Associations levies for the administration, maintenance & repair of the common property, insurance and so on would need to commence from day one at a realistic figure. [In Sectional Title it could probably be estimated to be approximately R10 per square metre per month to ensure that sufficient reserves are built up to cover all future expenses] • How will these levies be covered in the case of the returnees, will they be liable for these? Or is this another item they will not be required to pay and if so how will they be subsidized? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an unfortunate assumption here that the people who will be returning are rabble and miscreants. • It is neither the place of existing residents / owners nor a Development Framework to address the question of levies. It is the responsibility of the proposed Management Vehicle to attend to such matters. 	148

Theme / Issue	Comment	Response	Comment Record Number
Liaising with existing property owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> You mention consulting the claimants, but not existing owners? Canterbury Square has been here for more than two decades and some existing residents have been here for 40 years and more. We believe we have a right to be heard. We seem to be an afterthought in the consultation process despite requesting to be included over the years. 	The claimants, their representatives and proponents of the scheme are aware and mindful of the fact that Canterbury Square has been in existence for many years. However, Canterbury Square was developed on land from which returning claimants were forcibly removed. The participation of the Draft Development Framework is the beginning of an unfolding process where all stakeholders will be engaged.	148
Environmental Impact Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would like to see the environmental impact studies. 	This will be considered if deemed necessary in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA).	148
Construction materials	<p>We are very concerned about the quality of the construction of the housing development. If it is based on the flats close to the Nelson Mandela Boulevard handed over in 2003, which now look like a sub- economic housing scheme, we are very worried.</p> <p>We have recent pictures taken in December 2011.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the builder's track record? Will the tender/s process be open for public scrutiny? 	While the upkeep and maintenance of some houses have been neglected, the overall process should not be misjudged. The Pilot Project built in 2003 and the Second Pilot Project currently under construction has been carried out with integrity. Sound building techniques and materials were/are being employed. An open tender process of building procurement has been followed.	148
Further concerns of current local residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is current ownership respected? Who is the Architect Lucien La Grange? There is little information on him on the web. Which prestigious developments did he work on? Is a CV of his work available? Where are the plans as we have not seen anything? Which architectural design is to be used and is it in keeping with the current style and heritage yet with consideration of modern requirements? What overcrowding laws (automatically laws apply) will apply to the housing and what overcrowding rules will apply to the occupation of sectional title units. Will allotments be available to current residents as well? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lucien le Grange Architects & Urban Planners will certainly have to improve their information on the web! As precincts are designed and developed so will participation of stakeholders' increase. Detailed plans, models and other three dimensional representations will be made available for public comment/input. 	148

Communication			
Lack of / poor communication (Claimants)	Many Claimants complained that they were not informed about the consultation event and only heard about the event on the radio or through word of mouth. Many respondents expressed frustration with regards to the change of venue and requested better notification in future. [Note also see last section for DRD&LR to follow up on.]	This is being addressed.	20,23,42, 68,74 91, 92,96 97,99,110, 131, 132, 136, 146, 147
No communication (Stakeholders)	Some stakeholders, particularly residents of Justice Walk, Canterbury Square and other adjacent land owners, questioned why they had not been engaged during the DF process. They request to be involved and informed of developments in the future. Some respondents queried how Interested and Affected Parties who were unable to attend the exhibition would provide their comment into the process.	The public participation period (05 December 2011 and 20 February 2012) was the official engagement process with all stakeholders.	59,60, 72, 83,89,138, 151
Short consultation period	Some respondents complained about the short consultation period and notification period. They also recommend that in future consultants attending the exhibition wear name tags so that they can be identified. One respondent complained that no consultants were available to answer when the exhibition was visited.	The public participation comment and viewing (of materials) was extended from 27 January to 20 February 2012. Consultants were present at the times stipulated in the notification letters / public notices.	47, 59,94
Request for additional information	Some respondents requested copies (hard copies as well as high resolution digital copies) of the material on display. One respondent requested access to the running presentation which was not on the website. Others had problems accessing the material on the website and complained about the time it took to download the material.	Low resolution version of all the material which was on display at the exhibition, including the full Final Draft Development Framework, is available on the website. This includes the Final Draft Development Framework and Business Plan presentations. Higher resolution digital copies were available on CD's on request from Bergstan during the public participation process. All information on the website has been divided into 4MB files which are considered acceptable for downloading. Reducing file size further would have required reducing the quality of the images further making them illegible.	22, 47,78,92, 95,98, 142
	One respondent expressed dissatisfaction around the lack of information presented on the business plan.	Noted. The Claimants were intimately engaged in smaller workshops between the week of 12 December 2011 and February 2012.	110
Greater Transparency	Some respondents criticized the apparent opacity of the process and suggest foul play. They complain that there is no clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders for undertaking the project. They argue that it is therefore difficult to know who is accountable and who is in a position to make decisions.	The Restitution of Land Rights Act makes provision for the process of restoring land rights lost. Stakeholders are encouraged to read the provisions of the act.	28, 30, 85, 86, 151
Communicating progress	One respondent suggested that a database for District Six be made public. This should include a list of claimants and a record showing how the project is progressing and a count to monitor the handover of homes to claimants.	Noted.	104
Public meetings	Respondents did not appreciate the format of the exhibition and requested a public meeting to be held for all claimants.	After consultation with the D6BT and other stakeholders it was decided that a more informal form of consultation in the form of a manned exhibition was more appropriate. A manned exhibition allows for people to come at a time that suits them, allows the material to be presented and explained to small groups of people and afford an opportunity for people to ask questions one-to-one. Public meeting have also proved problematic in the past with dissidents disrupting proceedings and not allowing others to express their views. Many of those who attended the exhibition commented that they preferred this format. This format has proved to be very successful.	66, 93
District Six Community Health Centre Comments	A number of local residents questioned why they were not asked to comment on the proposals for the demolition of the Old Maternity Hospital.	In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999) a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was completed by Dr Nicolas	85,86

		Baumann and submitted to Heritage Western Cape who identified the D6BT as a key stakeholder to be consulted in the Heritage Impact Assessment process for the new D6 CHC. The survey of claimants was a requirement of the D6BT being uncomfortable to make a decision on behalf of the entire claimant community of District Six in respect of the demolition of the Old Peninsula Maternity Hospital (PMH). A report on the findings of the survey can be accessed on www.districtsix.za.org	
Business Plan			
Slow progress	Many respondents communicated frustration with the slow progress of the project, political interference, un-kept promises and felt that claimants were being used as “political footballs”. Some respondents lament that their parents and partners were unable to see the areas redevelopment and are disillusioned with the process.	Noted. However, with the buy-in of all tiers of government, this should no longer pose a problem. Government support together with the Business Plan will unlock the Acceleration of the Development	17, 24, 25, 26, 34, 37, 42, 48, 52, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 86, 113, 133, 142, 144, 153, 155
Meaningful engagement and participation	Claimants requested that their homes are designed to their specifications and that this should form part of the process.	They are already part of the process. Claimants will be engaged in the next Precinct Planning stage of the project and will be directly involved in the design of their homes, as was the case for Pilot Projects 1 and 2 (within an Architectural Guideline	30,35
Allocation	Concern was expressed over the allocation of the houses. Many objected to a “take a number out of a hat approach” which is perceived to be happening at present. There was also dissatisfaction with having to draw lots for a garage	When the allocation gets done, eligible claimants are called into a meeting where the best way to approach the issue is first discussed. The process decided upon at the outcome is then implemented. Allocation based purely on the date of lodgement of the Claim as previously agreed by the majority of claimants as a fair basis for allocation.	30, 39, 50,107, 113, 149
Claimants and locations of choice	Many Claimants expressed a desire to live close to where they used to stay within District Six before they were relocated. Some claimants ask what the implication would be if they are offered a house and turn it down as they prefer another location (and are prepared to wait).	This is possible provided that they understand that it is unlikely that they will be allocated a unit in exactly the place where they lost their home Claimants have a choice, but may need to wait a longer period of time before preferred locations are developed.	35, 39,43, 107, 111, 141, 142
Priority for the elderly	Respondents questioned whether the policy was still to house the elderly claimants first.	While a number of the older claimants were given houses in the pilot project the policy is now that allocations are done on a first come first served basis. This was at the instance of the community in a meeting of the community held in 2008.	
Claimants and their choice of house types	Claimants requested more information with regards to their choice of housing type, the size of units and their location. Related questions included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the cost / contribution vary according to the size? • If a claimant is able to contribute more can they get a bigger house? 	This issue is addressed when designs for a particular part of the development are workshopped with claimants who are eligible in terms of the selection process) for the houses built to be built. Yes, the contribution will vary from R 200 000 to R 250 000 depending on the size of the unit. The figure stated on the website is the average cost. Yes, however there is a limit to the number of larger units.	107,113, 114
Restitution in relation to previous property occupied.	These respondents questioned whether the size of the property that Claimants would receive had any relationship to what they may have owned or lived in previously. This applies generally and specifically to people who ran businesses from their properties.	No. The size of landholding of previous landowners will be a factor in the allocation of the number of units that landowner claimants will be entitled to.	29,109,113, 128
Date of occupancy	Respondents expressed concerns and had questions around costs, affordability, the extent of the subsidies and financial implications for Claimants.	These are being workshopped with the claimants presently This was communicated during the Focus Groups. The Claimant Contribution will remain the same until the end of 2014 at which stage all of the Claimants will have been settled.	31, 42, 49, 66,80,101,102, 105,112
Funding and subsidies	Many claimants enquired for more information of the potential dates when they would be able move back. Some are tired of waiting and concerned that	We will publish a list in order of date of lodgement. By comparing this list to an indicative construction programme, claimants will be able to	37, 73, 74, 100, 106, 105, 112, 142,

	they are getting old, others want to know so that adequate financial arrangements plans can be made. Some Claimants have homes which they are willing to sell so that they can move and want to know when the contribution needs to be made.	determine when, more or less, they will be eligible for a unit. Currently Government has committed to returning all Claimants by 2014.	
	Some Claimants are ready to pay but want a guarantee of a house.	Each claimant will get a house. Guaranteed. Payment will ONLY be due at transfer at which stage FULL title will be given. All validated Claimants are guaranteed a house.	101, 114
	Some claimants query whether they will be able to access credit from financial institutions based on the value of the house.	Yes. The District Six Company to be formed (of which the Claimants will be shareholders) will underwrite the bonds.	113
	Claimant requests information on the costs of the house / house price and how this relates to unit size.	In the current market it is estimated that costs will be in the order of R 1 million+ to build residences of this nature.	35
Timescales	Respondents expressed doubt over the proposed 3 year time frame for delivery.	This is based on a commitment by Government.	40
Land	This respondent expressed support for the process but requests his portion of land back.	This is not possible given that much of the original land has been developed.	45
SPV	Some respondents requested more information on the SPV and how it is intended to be run. Others are excited about the opportunity of investing in the Trust and think that this should be advertised more aggressively	The SPV will be workshopped with the Claimants during the next round of workshops with Claimants starting in March 2012.	20,24, 47, 100
Purchasing property in District Six	A number of respondents enquire as to how it will be possible to purchase property within District Six. This related to both claimants and the general public.	It is not possible to purchase property in District Six. All additional residential and commercial stock will be held by the District Six SPV as rental stock.	71,82,119,139
Pilot / Next 100 Houses projects	A number of Claimants raised questions regarding the completed but still empty / unoccupied houses in the Next 100 Houses. Some requested to be moved into these houses.	We have to respect the process and the community's demand that date of lodgement be the deciding criteria for prioritising. We have put people who have not taken occupation of their houses to terms. Should they not take occupation within a stipulated period of time, the get shifted down the list and the next eligible family gets an opportunity to take the unit. These are being dealt with and will soon be occupied.	73,101,103, 108, 141
Appointments	Respondents enquired who is responsible for appointing and paying consultants and contractors during the development process. Respondents again make reference to a lack of transparency (see point on transparency above).	This is done by public tender managed by national DRDLR and overseen by the Task Team. You could not have a more open process. Currently the Government appoints consultants. Future appointments will be made by the District Six SPV in compliance with the tenets of the Public Finance Management Act.	20, 30, 86
Professional services	Some respondents offer their professional services (valuation, palisade fencing and waste pickup services) to the SPV. Other respondents expressed an interest in providing social services – soup kitchens, crèches and provide their contact details.	Procurement will be done with emphasis on the fact that a large pool of resources reside within the returning community. There will be a Procurement Process for all goods and services with preference given to Claimants and Land Reform Beneficiaries and in compliance with the provisions of the BBBEE Act.	70,76,81,111
Local / Community Contractors	One respondent suggested that artisans from the community be employed in the construction process.	This is a principle that will be incorporated into procurement requirements and all companies will need to comply with such conditions	140
Purchasing or renting in District Six	Some Claimants liked the idea that they or their children could buy or rent in District Six and wanted to know what the process for this would be for securing property.	They will own their houses. Claimant Families will have first preference.	50, 119
Questions related to the transfer of claims to other	Respondents make enquiries regarding what happens to a claim if a claimant has passed away without leaving a will.	The claim goes to their heirs in terms of the Intestate Succession Act. The Claim will revert to the dependants and should there be no	65

beneficiaries		dependants then the Claim will revert to the SPV.	
Comments for DRD&LR to address			
Queries regarding claim numbers and verification	A number of respondents are awaiting claim numbers and correspondence from DRD&LR. Most have left contact details and request a response from the DRD&LR.	All claimants have been assigned a claim number. Land Reform Beneficiaries do not qualify for claim numbers.	65, 75,79, 91, 99, 115, 117, 118, 120, 122, 123, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 141
	Respondents wanting to be added to claimant list	The closing date for claims was December 1998.	71, 82, 90, 119, 124
	Claims that staff members at land affairs are uncooperative.	Noted. The DRD&LR is happy to investigate any specific complaints made against members of the department's staff.	132, 134
Institutional Claims	St. Marks Church Query on the status of their institutional claim	All religious institutions who have lodged claims will be directly engaged by the DRD&LR by June 2012.	88
Update contact details	A number of claimants complained that their contact details are incorrect and should be updated with the information provided on the comments sheets for future correspondence.	The information recorded on the comments sheets has been submitted to the DRD&LR to enable the department to correct and update their claimant database.	16, 68, 72, 74, 99, 116, 121, 125, 126, 127,137, 146, 150, 154