

PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING OF STELLENBOSCH MOBILITY FORUM MEETING OF 2018-11-21

HC EGGERS

Sent out by email on 2018-11-22

NOTE: This transcript is not an official document. It represents as much of the conversation and statements made at the MF meeting as possible but necessarily contains gaps, eg where I myself was speaking and in parts which proceeded too rapidly. They are not official minutes or even draft minutes. As we saw in the process of correcting the draft minutes of the September meeting, however, they do help with the drafting of accurate and complete minutes.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Welcoming of Clr Quintin Smit (QS)

Start and end meeting on time

Apologies for director Esau

2. ATTENDEES

3. INTRODUCTION

DL (Louw): Constitution circulated. What this forum is all about. Four legs in directorate: water+sanitation, mobility, etc Meet with main stakeholders. Mobility forum was created. Chance for everyone to tell us what they think. We try to achieve ito national constitution: mun public tpt, roads, traffic + parking, stormwater. Also added NMT, TOD, bulk parking universal access, railways, public transport. Ito SA Constitution we have to deal with the public. This forum has no decisionmaking powers, but will provide input into mun.

So-called master plans: the reason is that for engineers we need to know what's going to happen to this town. SDF will give us the direction. Ensure that we have roads in the right places. Very reliant on the SDF. Auditor requires a 5-year master plan of budgets. Assets live a long time, decades. From eng point of view we need a horizon that long.

IUDG: Integrated Urban Development Grant is the new way. We must ito this prepare a 10-year budget. Must live by it, but a master plan is not cast in stone. Can be altered.

HE (Eggers): minutes of meeting 18-09-13 were sent out, but no agenda item for correction and/or confirmation of minutes. Need additional agenda item. Minutes are incomplete.

QS: will do so in future.

DBotha: Besluitnemingsfunksie is belangrik en die nuwe MF konstitusie moet dit in ag neem.

QS: Put the Minutes of the meeting of 180913 to the meeting. If items to be placed, please send them beforehand to the director.

HE proposed specific corrections and insertions of missing points as set out in the augmented draft minutes. Items proposed for insertion by HE based on transcript of the 180913 meeting will be circulated after the meeting for comment.

PvBlerk: correction: 13 percent does not refer to TPark as a whole but only to Capitec.

QS: Put the minutes up for acceptance. The minutes of previous meeting of 180913 are adopted on condition of the proposed additions/insertions as per HE and feedback on them.

Dates for next meeting: January

Meetings to be held bimonthly.

4. SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (SDF) PRESENTATION

B de la Bat: we were asked to provide MSDF as guideline. Asked S Boshoff to do the presentation. Vast amount of experience, head of planning Cape Town. Assisted by Brandon Koopman. MSDF is in process, must be completed and approved by end of financial year in June next year.

S BOSHOFF PRESENTATION:

Lize Malan, Janine Loubser, also Richard Gordge present

Task to prepare MSDF. Guided by SPLUMA, which spells out procedural and substantive matters. Spatial framework quite specific, quite voluminous. They should focus how specific areas should develop in what form, what conditions. In broad terms, process comprises

1. Status quo phases, from biophysical to infrastructure, institutional context.
2. Concept driving the work forward (where we are now) focus on the implementation framework. Advocacy; need to consider how to use these tools.
3. Specifics based on the concept

We have completed the status quo and synthesis/concept.

Lot of work done in past on environment and heritage. Currently busy with workshops with public, discussions with different officials.

HIGHLIGHT A FEW THINGS FROM STATUS QUO:

Degradation of assets, agricultural land. Poverty deepened. Unskilled workers. Infrastructure backlogs. Ongoing maintenance v important. Not kept up with demand for housing. Stellenbosch very expensive, has impact, locks out poor and lower income group. Key movement modes. Large proportion of population moves on foot. Inadequate attention so far.

Current funds allocated to infrastructure. Mun do not have adequate resources to address needs and negative trends. Not enough partnering. Sector planning fragmented between spatial and transport planning.

Previous planning initiatives have not acknowledged potential of Klapmuts.

Diagram on spatial distribution of expenditure.

Slide: Housing demand. 15,000 or more required. Just existing demand. Backlog is just one issue, Stb part of metropolitan area, so what backlog is it? CapeT must deliver 30,000 per annum for the next 20 years. Need to look at Stb differently. How many can we accommodate sustainably. Stb must provide more.

In context of prov policy: Stb is high growth area. Best potential to accommodate human need. Wealthy area.

Slide on current housing need: we need 380ha to accommodate need! Either Stb closes its doors or we actively seek opportunity for dignified living.

Slide: Collation of development pressure areas in response to previous development initiatives. Private land owners express requests to urban edge and urban development: 2000ha !! Have a serious problem: many landowners have desire and intent to develop for other purposes in future.

Slide on Four Investment needs: Service backlogs, maintenance, crisis, vs productive. Private sector mostly in the productive sector, public sector in all four. Stb Mun focus on maintenance, crisis, very little on productive investment. Private view concerned only on their view of productive investment. This is another predicament.

Finally on Status Quo: Particular worrisome point in history. Svc backlogs remain, meeting current residents. Inordinate new pressure from corporate and from poor. People not only migrating in, but also from CT to Stb. Corporate sectors are looking at urban periphery, lifestyle, need larger land parcels, less congestion. Poor from CT also looking at Stb/Drakenstein/Malmesbury for better livelihoods. They are new frontier of settlement. Land invasions in Paarl and Stb, will become a pattern.

CONCEPT PART

Look at big concepts, the detail will come naturally.

Concept 1: Maintain and grow our natural assets.

All of life depends on it. Critical. Global recognition of the problems which we are in. Fortunately Stb have identified nature areas and agric land. We know what is of most valuable, most vulnerable, not be built upon.

Critical biodiversity areas, valuable land areas (incl agric land)

Concept 2: Respect and grow our cultural heritage

Nature and culture need to be preserved, but not only preserved but expanded. Culture forever emerging. Bergkelder can be used to extend cultural offering further. Need to accommodate new culture, an emerging concept.

Concept 3: Direct growth to areas of lesser natural and cultural significance. Movement is critical, because that is how people gain access to livelihood and opportunity. Two corridors: Baden Powell corridor, also where rail and road come together, opportunities for livelihoods. Future growth generally to be directed towards that corridor as a collection of settlements. Contained villages where people can walk. Corridor to N1.

Concept 4: Clarify and respect the different roles and functions of settlements

Concept 5:

Look at specific settlements. If not on the corridor, it should have a different role and function from those on the corridor. So the new settlement hierarchy we should respect where they are located in space. Eg Franschoek cannot accommodate significant growth. Should of course provide basic services. Major growth should be on the corridors.

We have not clarified the different corridor roles. Baden Powell different from R44. Must clarify what the role of each are before we do interventions. Configuration of road should first be clarified.

Concept 6: Ensure balanced, sustainable communities. Balanced: full set of housing types, open to all. Every settlement have full set of social facilities. Balanced relationship with nature. Clearly defined edges of urban structure. Balance of movement choice: beyond private vehicle cannot dominate, but people cannot just walk.

Concept 7: Focus collective energy on critical lead projects

Three focus areas: a. Klapmuts. Major industrial interest (Distell) to move to Klapmuts. We see this as a positive. Releases significant land in Stb town for restructuring. 300ha, can almost build a new town. accommodate students, lower income group, in highly diverse, dense, intense rich environment.

5-10 years future: these must be done with private sector. Billions of Rands involved. Supporting movement system.

CRITICAL PARALLEL ACTIVITIES: Integrated transport planning, MSDF and tpt planning need to talk to each other. Talking Remgro, Distell, Mun as land owners. Partnering with univ and large employers. Shift culture around vehicular use. Stb will not change if every student can use car as they like. Univ must be convinced to contain activities within town. Does not make sense to move half of campus to Klapmuts.

Next Steps: Dec-Feb Compile Draft SDF and implementation Framework Feb-Mar PPP presenting draft SDF Mar-Jun Finalise SDF for approval.

QS: No questions at this point.

5. ROAD MASTER PLAN / COMPREHENSIVE INTEGRATED TRANSPORT PLAN (CITP)

J Fullard

Presentation will be brief, where we stand.

CITP: reviewed in 2016, next review 2021. The CITP updated every year. This year is the public tpt and public planning sector with focus on public tpt. Next CITP will take into account developments in the SDF.

Roads Master Plan: lots of discussion on its relation to acts and other legislation. Important to provide clarity on definition: RMP stands on its own, compiled gathering roads, evaluating alternatives, making recommendations. RMP makes recommendations. Not the master plan of all plans.

RMP is required by law: Dept of Tpt White Paper of Tpt policy. A KPI for Mun required by National and Provincial Government. It is correct that these national acts promote public tpt and nmt. Mun has made good progress in implementing these. National acts and frameworks promote tpt and nmt without ignoring any plans. For example the RMP, NMT, etc all feed into the CITP, all feed into the IDP. Gives us direction.

6. CYCLE PLAN / NON-MOTORISED TRANSPORT (NMT) / PROVINCIAL SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT PROGRAMME (PSTP)

R Gordge

Reference to PSTP and how it fits in.

Cycle Plan for town. High level of interest, need to harness this. Must incorporate into the IDP and SDF.

2015 Cycle development for the town. Stb one of the first to have it prepared. But the challenge is to make them happen. If not funding and institutional structures in place, then cannot make it happen.

Cycle not just for origin-destination but also for linking different forms of transport. Faster by cycle than motorised vehicle. Ticks all the sustainability boxes.

Mun not resourced. Needs funding partners.

Current status: get into second gear, need PSTP. Cycle plan still relevant but is not implemented at speed we want to see. Potential.

Potential funding sources: National Govt, Province, business, donor funding (intl and local), Municipality, special levies.

Capitec would not bring in people by car if it had a choice.

B. NMT. Cycle plan not in isolation. Within funding limits, Stb has made effort to connect poorer people, make a walkable town. Critical missing links along provincial roads remain essential urgent projects. Coordination needed with province: link to JTown, Cloetesville to Welgevonden. Along R44 between station and Die Boord.

PROV SUST TRANSPORT PROGRAMME (PSTP)

Has largely been ignored, not well understood. Opportunity to partner with province. There has been dialogue, complex getting off the ground. To support development of sustainable tpt mechanisms. Try to ensure that strategic tpt plan is put in place. Goes beyond institutional capability of local govt. Must always get back to the principles, not just debate around.

RG's Ten point plan for transport in Stellenbosch. Much has been drafted but not approved its statutory processes. Opportunity to get it right.

PSTP Targets: Travel demand management must be implemented

Key issues:

Aligning PSTP with CIPT, SDF, IDP Integrating with national initiatives Alignment with provincial DTPW Partnerships

7. MELLOW CABS PRESENTATION

80% of trips shorter than 4km.

23% of carbon from urban transport

28% of tpt costs incurred in the last mile

Ride sharing is big. Uber. Will grow in future. 3-wheel rickshaws make 229million taxi trips / day in India. Future is smaller vehicles.

Mellow cabs: light electric vehicles that enable good mobility.

3-wheeled low-cost vehicle, fully electric. Developed locally in Devon Valley. 2 versions: a passenger vehicle for on-demand tpt. Focus on tourism. Cargo version. Available with custom options. Job opportunities for drivers.

One mellowcab can save 10.2 tonnes per year.

Confirmed contract with DHL. Takealot in Woodstock, and agreement with Uber.
Geofencing; can see where any vehicle is and can address that immediately.

QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

HE: I repeat: Dispute the status of RMP again. The RMP does NOT stand on its own and may not. The White Paper held up as motivation is 10 years old and not promulgated. KPIs are low-level and cannot compete with explicit prioritisation of tpt and nmt by legislation. Available funds to be used for roads can and should be allocated to sustainable tpt projects. Aligning the RMP with the SDF would imply that three quarters of it would have to be removed.

8. GENERAL MATTERS

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

10.CLOSURE