

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY - SDZ - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public Participation Methodology

The public participation consisted of a presentation and an accompanied by a week exhibition of the proposal.

Because of the complexity of the proposal it was very important for the participants to be able to communicate with the professional team one on one to get a better understanding of the proposal. It is important that this process should not be seen as a rubber stamp approach to public participation.

Protocol with regards to the communication of the participation session was published on the cities Corridors of Freedom website as well as in the star newspaper. Emails and flyers were also distributed throughout the community.

The public participation and exhibition focused on the SDZ mechanism on how to densify and how densification could be expected to roll out.

ORANGE GROVE

There were approximately 137 people (74 signed the Attendance Register, 95 from the comment cards) who attended the Orange Grove Public participation sessions from 13 Feb 2017 – 18 Feb 2017 at Spark Gallery, Orange Grove

Out of a total of 142 cards 74 were red cards, 42 were yellow cards and 26 were green cards. Out of a total of 211 comments 112 were red comment **52%**, 70 were yellow comments **30%** and 29 were green comments **18%**

Dislikes 52%

The complaints can be categorized within 3 categories, being *Densification 34%*, *Transport 17%* and *Amenities 26%*.

1. Most of the comments centered around complete objection with the SDZ's proposal. This was followed by concerns of noise pollution as well as building heights was a predominate concern. A majority of the the complains around densification was with particular reference to the obligation to develop.
2. Many of the participants expressed a fear of increased crime and noise within the increased population proposed.
3. The second major theme to be discussed by residents was the lack of public participation with regards to the planning and the input of the implementation of the Louis Botha corridor. Many are concerned about the congestion that will arise when the BRT is operation.
4. The third major point raised was centered around the capacity of the existing infrastructure within the study zone, as participants feared that the existing capacity would not be able to cope with the proposed population densities.

Not Considered 30%

Comments that residents felt were not considered were: *Densification 17%*, *Transport 19%*, *Amenities 11%*, *Economics 20%* and *Management 11%*.

1. Two issues were raised with specific reference to Densification. The first was why was Orange Grove chosen for development. The second was the question of what will happen to a resident's property if they choose not to develop.
2. Participants highlighted two concerns regarding transport with reference to the development of the Louis Botha Corridor mainly concerned with the management and policing of the BRT area as well management of the increase in traffic flow.
3. Similar concerns with the constraints on existing infrastructure and how it affects the current system with the new allocation of the bulk was raised.
4. Most residents were concerned about the economic implications with regards to how the development would affect their current property values as well as the influence on rates and taxes in the area.
5. Lastly concerns were raised by the about who would manage the development as to insure implementation up to the intended standards as to prevent slum lording

Likes 18%

Positive comments raised were focused around *Transport 12%, Social 9%, Typologies 9% and Development 41%*

1. Some participants were optimistic that the development of the Louis Botha corridor would create a better quality of space.
2. Some participants believed that the densification will allow for a more inclusionary development of the area, as well as alter apartheid style spatial planning.
3. Some participants liked the design of the typologies as well as its incorporation of the existing housing for heritage preservation.
4. Lastly some participants felt with that new development taking place within the area, it will allow for better management of the area.

Through the Orange Grove process, it became clear that Participants felt that the previous round of public participation conducted for the SAF was lacking. Most participants were bombarded by the complexity of the proposal and the possible immediate impact it could pose to their neighborhoods and communities.

A lot of reassurance by the professional team centered around the required quality of developments which seemed to make participants more receptive to the presented proposal.

The question around the future of existing gated communities within the study area posed a big potential obstacle for both the SDZ roll out and the affected residents.

Several Residents Associations submitted documentation raising very specific issues which aren't covered in this summary and will require Council to answer directly.

BRIXTON AND EMPIRE PERTH

There were approximately 124 people (80 signed the Attendance Register, 44 from the comment cards) who attended the Brixton/Empire Perth Public Participation sessions from 20 Feb 2017 – 24 Feb 2017 at Marks Park, and 25 Feb 2017 at Brixton Recreational Center.

Out of a total of 102 cards, 42 were on red cards, 43 were on yellow cards and 17 were green cards. A total of 264 comments were made of which 120 red comments (45%), 93 yellow comments (35%) and 51 green comments (19%) were received.

Dislikes 45%

The bulk of the comments on the red cards were generally focused on *Densification 21%*, *Management 28%* and *Typologies 15%*. The main comments raised included:

1. The heights of the proposed buildings as an invasion of privacy.
2. A request for some areas in the 'grey/white' area to be included in one of the zone categories.
3. Resistance against making Ripley Road a major pedestrian movement route.
4. Traffic problems and congestion.
5. By-law and traffic control enforcement and policing by JPMD as well as SAPS.
6. Noise and party disturbances in the area.
7. Crime increase once more people move into the area.

Not Considered 35%

Most of the comments received on yellow cards were mainly focused on *Densification 26%*, *Management 26%* and *Development 14%*. The main comments raised included:

1. A large amount of comments discuss that the property owners in the 'grey/white' area would like to be part of a zoning area.
2. Noise disturbance and party issues, and a lack of better law enforcement on this matter.
3. An issue with lack of green space.
4. Residents don't get the opportunity to object/comment on proposed developments, at concept level.
5. An issue with a 'container' development in Collins Road that is infringing on their privacy due to its height.

Likes 19%

The Green cards mainly referred to *Densification 39%*, *Typologies 12%* and *Public Participation 12%*. The main comments raised included:

1. It is a great opportunity to provide housing for range of income brackets.
2. It could regenerate the area.
3. It could possibly become a 'University town'.
4. That the High density areas are limited to 6 to 8 storeys.
5. Heritage is an important consideration.
6. If a SDP for a ERF has been submitted which matched the originally proposed density category, but not the current proposed density, what will happen to the SDP?
7. Good feedback about the Public Participation.

With 45% of the comments falling into the red card category the Public Participation highlighted a lot of frustration with current and past conditions and the fear that if the SDZ process itself doesn't allow for neighbours to comment and influence the developments that might be erected next to them – the current and past conditions will continue to worsen along with property values.

Several Residents Associations submitted documentation raising very specific issues which aren't covered in this summary and will require Council to answer directly.