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A. STATE OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
1 LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

This section of the analysis starts with a Heritage section that leads into the Land Use and Development Trends, which deals with the residential, retail and office, mixed use development, industrial, noxious industry, smallholdings, agricultural land, and coastal resorts. The section unpacks the land use and development trends by focusing individually on each Sub-district in the District and then conclude with a summary of the key trends.

This methodology is used to help group land use and development trends into physical areas to help with synthesising the information, to move towards the next phase in the DSDF Review process.

1.1 Built environment: Heritage

**Brief historic overview of the development of the district.**

1.1.1 Heritage management and compliance

“The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA, Act 25 of 1999) introduces an integrated and interactive system for the management of the national heritage resources; to promote good government at all levels; and to empower civil society to nurture and conserve their heritage resources so that they may be bequeathed to future generations…to provide for the protection and management of conservation-worthy places and areas by local authorities…”

The National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA) identifies a three tier system for the management of heritage resources and prescribes the criteria for assessing heritage resources. SAHRA, in consultation with the Minister and MEC of every province must publish regulations distinguishing between at least three grading categories.

- South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) is responsible for the identification and management of Grade I heritage resources and the co-ordination and monitoring of the management of the national estate in the Republic.
- The provincial heritage resources authority, Heritage Western Cape (HWC), is responsible for the identification and management of Grade II heritage resources.
- The local authorities: The City of Cape Town, is responsible for the identification and management of Grade III heritage resources and heritage resources which are deemed to fall within their competence in terms of the NHRA.

Heritage resources within the City of Cape Town are managed under both the MPBL and the NHRA. While currently the NHRA protections are largely management by the HWC, it is prescribed in the NHRA that the management of Grade III heritage resources must be carried out by the local authority. In 2013, the City of Cape Town was the first local authority in South Africa to have its competence in terms of the NHRA approved.

HPOZ is the tool within the MPBL for the protection of heritage places and spaces. The Urban Conservation Areas, S108 of the old town planning scheme, where converted to HPOZ when the Cape Town Zoning Scheme Regulations was replaced by the
Development Management Scheme of the MPBL. The HPOZ is designed to align with the requirements in the NHRA for managing sites listed in the Heritage Register (S30 NHRA) or protected as a Heritage Area (S31 NHRA).

The City must ensure that decision making within the City is informed and compliant with the requirements of heritage legislation.

1.1.1.1 Heritage management: national legislative requirement into the NHRA

The heritage resources within the Helderberg District include not only buildings older than 60 years, but also palaeontological sites and archaeological sites. The sections which the NRHA that decision makers within the local authority must comply with are detailed below:

1.1.1.1 Section 27: Formally protected heritage sites

Heritage sites have been formally protected in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA. While many were declared under the previous National Monuments Act (1969) they are Provincial Heritage Sites under the NHRA and are managed by HWC. Listed in Table x, are places that are of exceptional heritage significance and are relevant across the Western Cape region.

Table x: List of Provincial Heritage Sites in the Helderberg District.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provincial Heritage site</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vergenoegd farm</td>
<td>Off Kramat Rod, Somerset West</td>
<td>This property was originally granted to Pieter de Vos in 1696. The earliest section of this H-shape dwelling house with its impressive gables probably dates from the middle of the 18th century. The farmyard is bounded by a ring-wall and an interesting complex of outbuildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groot Paardevlei</td>
<td>Magnolia Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>The farm was granted to Frans van der Stel, youngest son of Governor Simon van der Stel, shortly after 1700. The farm was the property of Martin Melck when he died in 1781, and it was probably his widow who gave the house its H-shape. It retains many of its original architectural features. It was recently acquired by Historical Homes Limited for preservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parel Valleu</td>
<td>Aberdeen Road, Somerset West</td>
<td>The farm was granted to Frans van der Stel, youngest son of Governor Simon van der Stel, in 1699. The back and front gables were added to the house in 1800. It was damaged by fire early in this century and thereafter restored. It has recently been purchased for preservation by Historical Homes Limited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset House Preparatory School</td>
<td>Off St Georges Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>This property originally formed part of the farm Cloeteborg which was bought in 1709 by Catharina Cloete. The oldest section of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Type</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Office</td>
<td>126 Main Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>This building was erected in 1898. It originally housed the post office, as well as the magistrate’s court, after Somerset West was proclaimed an Assistant Magistracy in 1892.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Station</td>
<td>124 Main Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>This building dates from approximately 1835 to 1840 and was originally used as a dwelling-house, and thereafter as a school, post office and library. It is now being used as a police station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coachmans House</td>
<td>23 Andries Pretorius Street, Somerset West; 20 Church Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>This cottage, designed in a simple vernacular style, is one of several built by freed slaves in the eighteen thirties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Village cottages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voorbrug</td>
<td>41 Victoria Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>Originally built by Morkel as a ‘tuishuis’ - house in town for when the family came to church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch Reformed Church</td>
<td>Off Church Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>The building was first inaugurated in 1819 but was altered in 1860 to its current form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predikants Plein</td>
<td>Off Church Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>Square associated with the DRChurch and the establishment of the village of Somerset West. Significant public space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old parsonage</td>
<td>41 Lourens Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>Mid-19th century parsonage associated with the establishment of Somerset West as a church town. Visual linke retained with the Church across Predikant Plein.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land-en-Zeezicht</td>
<td>15 Verster Ave, Somerset West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgenster</td>
<td></td>
<td>Originally part of the Vergelegen estate granted to WA vd Stel in 1700. Subsequent subdivision and redevelopment. Well preserved historic werf and forming part of a well preserved cultural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camphor Trees</td>
<td>Vergelegen, off Lourensford Road, Somerset West</td>
<td>Remnants of the 18th century camphor trees allegedly planted at Vergelegen. Also listed as Champion Trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onverwacht dovecote</td>
<td>Off Asrin Drive, Somerset Road</td>
<td>This dovecote is a particularly good example of the dovecots often built on old farms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lwandle Museum Hostel 33</td>
<td>Noxolo Road, Lwandle</td>
<td>Hostel 33 forms part of the Lwandle Migrant Labour Museum and illustrates how people lived within the migrant labour system. It represents an extraordinary spatial and social expression of resilience and oppression, which dominated the South African settlement morphology as part of an “apartheid” city. The heritage significance of Hostel 33 is both historical and social on a broad provincial level. Its architecture nonetheless speaks volumes about its origins in the late</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nineteenth century and its role later in a repressive apartheid system in South Africa. Hostel 33 is both part of a spatial expression of a wider system of oppression as well as a representation of a system of managed oppression at a local level. The value of Hostel 33 lies in its representative and symbolic nature. Hostel 33 is of outstanding significance for the memorialisation and acknowledgement of migrant workers, their role and contribution to society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Safran</td>
<td>Sir Lowrys Pass Village</td>
<td>The original portion of this victorianised dwelling-house probably dates from the beginning of the nineteenth century. The house is situated on property which was originally granted to G. F. Prenger in 1779.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railway Station</td>
<td>Sir Lowrys Pass Village</td>
<td>The old Railway Station Building at Sir Lowry's Pass Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knorrhoek</td>
<td></td>
<td>This imposing Cape Dutch manor-house together with the adjacent watermill forms a unique architectural complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Lourens River Bridge</td>
<td>Main Street, Somerset West</td>
<td>The original bridge over the Lourens River forming part of the newly established hard road network driven by the Central Road Board. Similar bridge of the Eerste Rivier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinan House</td>
<td>Paardevali</td>
<td>The so-called Quinan house and a piece of surrounding land at Somerset West. This gracious homestead was designed and built by the firm Baker and Masey in 1901 as residence for the factory manager of De Beers Cape Explosive Works. The first two general managers were William Quinan and Kenneth Quinan, after whom the house was named after its restoration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1.1.1.2 Section 30: Provincial Heritage Register

The Provincial Heritage Register is the formal protection in terms of the NHRA for individual local heritage resources. HWC maintains the Heritage Register, which is a list of all the formally protected (Grade II) heritage sites as well as any other Grade III heritage resources. Sites are only placed on the Heritage Register once they have been gazetted in the Provincial Gazette. The City of Cape Town manages places that are listed on the Heritage Register through the MPBL (HPOZ).
1.1.1.1.3 Section 31: Heritage Areas

The Heritage Area is the protection mechanism for geographical areas or places of environmental or cultural interest. HWC or The City (provided it has retained heritage competency) may, by notice in the Provincial Gazette, designate any area or land to be a Heritage Area on the grounds of its environmental or cultural interest, or the presence of heritage resources. Heritage Areas are managed through the MPBL (HPOZ).

The intention is that all Heritage Protection Overlay zone areas are gazetted as Heritage Areas. This would allow for the lifting of the provisions of S34 in these areas, but is conditional to HWC being satisfied that the protection and decision making mechanism under the MPBL (HPOZ) are adequate and robust.

1.1.1.1.4 Section 34: Buildings/structures older than 60 years

In terms of Section 34 of the NHRA a permit is required from HWC for alterations or demolition of any structure or part of a structure that is older than 60 years.

Not all buildings that are older than 60 years are conservation worthy. The NHRA makes provision for lifting the requirements for S34 approvals within a defined geographical area on condition that the relevant heritage authority (HWC) is satisfied that heritage resources within that defined geographical area have been adequately provided for in terms of the formal protections of the Act. The formal protections for Grade III heritage resources are the Heritage Register (S30) and Heritage Areas (S31).

The City maintains an inventory of its heritage buildings and places and this inventory is continuously being updated. The City’s Heritage inventory is published on the City’s internal as well as external website and the information is accessible to all city officials and members of the public.

1.1.1.1.5 Section 35: Archaeological resources

In terms of Section 35 of the NHRA all archaeological objects are the property of the State and a permit is required (from HWC) to destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological site.

1.1.1.1.6 Section 38: Management of Impact on Heritage Resources

---

1 S36 of the NHRA deals with burials and the graves of victims of conflict. This section rarely comes into play in the Western Cape as these deal with burials and graves less than 100 years old.
This section outlines the triggers in terms of the NHRA to identify activities that may have a negative impact on heritage or on the heritage character of a place and are applicable across the City Metro.

1.1.1.2 Heritage management: Municipal Planning Bylaw

The City of Cape makes provision for the consideration of heritage in its general process and criteria for deciding applications under S99 of the MPBL. In addition to this, it provides for the further protection of heritage through its Heritage Protection Overlay zoning in the Development Management Scheme.

1.1.1.2.1 Heritage Protection Overlay zoning

The Heritage Protection Overlay zoning, is the tool within the MPBL for managing heritage places and spaces. It is consistent with and meets the requirements of S30 and S31 of the NHRA which instructs local authorities at the time of the compilation or review of a town or regional planning scheme or a spatial development plan, or at any other time of its choosing, to compile and inventory of its heritage for submission to the PHRA for placement on the Provincial Heritage Register; and to identify the need for the designation of heritage areas to protect any place of environmental or cultural interest.

1.1.1.2.2 Existing HPOZ and areas identified for investigation for conservation

There are potential areas for the investigation for conservation in Strand, Somerset West, Gordon’s Bay and Sir Lowry’s Pass village.

The most urgent of these areas to be formalized for conservation would be the Somerset Mission Village. It represents a well preserved mid19th century mission village. It is very vulnerable to neglect.

Sir Lowry’s Pass and BoPass villages have been negatively impacted in the last decade, but the potential does remain for the enhancement of the heritage qualities and opportunities in the village for the benefit of the communities living there.

1.1.2 Heritage conservation vs Densification

There is a commonly held misconception that heritage conservation and protection is in competition and conflict with the City’s Densification Policy. The Densification policy aims to contribute to the creation of good quality, efficient and sustainable urban environments.

Areas identified for heritage conservation and protection can help to indicate where higher densities are appropriate and desirable in terms of their impact on heritage and the environment.
1.2 Residential

1.2.1 Sub-district 1:

Sub-district 1 includes the areas of Vergenoegd farm, Faure, Croyden, Firgrove, Macassar and Sandvlei smallholding, and is bounded by Baden Powell Drive to the west, the municipal boundary to the north, the Somchem cadastral boundary to the east and the coastline and Macassar Dunes conservation area to the south.

Sub-district 1 has experienced the highest growth rate in terms of land uptake in the last 5 years. There has been an increase in largely Single Residential land use, entrenched in gated private residential estates i.e. Sitari Country Estate, Kelderhof Country Estate, Croydon Vineyard Estate, Croydon Olive Estate, The Huntsman, Vergenoegd Village, Kelderhof Country Village, and Acorn Creek.

Croydon has experienced larger erven to be consolidated, sub-divided and rezoned to SR1 to densify the area.

Very little development can be seen South of the N2 in Macassar during the last 5 years. However, City Department: Human Settlements has recently reserved Erf 3993 (circa 35 Ha), Macassar for future Human Settlement development. This portion of land, should be investigated for cemetery purposes if the Eerste River has been canalized and the water table is sufficient for cemetery purposes. There is a pressing need for cemetery land due to the loss of the Vaalfontein cemetery site which is not suitable for this purpose due to its high water table.

Sub-district 1 can be divided into two income categories: north of the N2 and south of the N2. North of the N2 is middle to high income property owners, and south of the N2 is low to middle income residential areas. Firgrove was previously a lower income neighbourhood, but due to its location and recent demand for development in the area, the area has shown a positive growth in property value. This may be due to Sitari Country Estate, The Huntsman, and mixed use development around the Firgrove Station.

Smallholdings wedged between Macassar Road (M9) and the Eerste River has shown very little interest in subdivision and rezoning.

1.2.2 Sub-district 2:

Sub-district 2 is located on the seaward side of the T2 and forms part of the western environs of the developed area of Somerset West and Strand. It includes the major land holdings of Denel (Pty) Ltd (i.e. Somchem noxious industry) and Heartland landholdings (previously known as the AECI site, and currently owned by the City).

Rapid growth is seen in the Heartland Beach Road Precinct and Heartland Historical Precinct, with Single Residential and Group Housing development positively integrating with a mixed of other land uses.

Somerset Links – residential group housing infill consist of x amount of units.
De Velde Group Housing Estate – 4 stories residential group housing.

Sub-district 2 has shown the highest growth in business, office space and residential development.

1.2.3 **Sub-district 3:**

Sub-district 3 is bounded by the T2 development route to the north; Broadlands Road to the east, the Lourens River and De Beers Avenue to the west and the False Bay coastline to the south. The area is largely urban in character with economic opportunities in the form of light industrial and retail development. Further mixed use intensification opportunities exist along the section of the T2 and Strand Main Road. Residential areas found in this sub-district include: Strand northern areas, Victoria Park, Greenways, Rustehof and the low income areas of Asanda Village, Nomzamo and Lwandle. The main attraction is the five kilometers of white sandy beach found along False Bay coast.

Lourensia park assisted Governmental housing is the most recent residential development in Sub-district 3.

Lwandle and Nomzamo are extremely dense areas. There has been a rise in illegal building work; often onto public road reserves or public open spaces. Similarly, the construction of unauthorized boarding houses has increased. The aforementioned is considered a direct response to the dire need for housing in close proximity to employment opportunities. Both these areas are located in close proximity to industrial / mixed use areas which are employment generators. It will be critical for the City to address the form and manner of densification to ensure the safety and wellbeing of residents.

1.2.4 **Sub-district 4:**

Sub-district 4 is bounded by the T2; a development and scenic route to the north; the City of Cape Town jurisdictional boundary to the south-east; Broadlands Street to the west and the False Bay coastline to the south-west.

Residential development in this district has been slow, with very little new residential development in the last 5 years. During the last year some interest has been shown for the subdivision of land along Sir Lowry’s Pass road, and the rezoning of land from Agriculture or Rural to Single Residential i.e. residential estates. This low interest to develop land might be due to the lack of public transport and economic/employment opportunities in the area, forcing people to travel far distances to work.

There has been rather a successful trend in Group Housing (General Residential 2) development along the Sir Lowry’s Pass road, closer to Gordon’s Bay. This may be due to the mixed of land uses forming a local node in the Sub-district, with Commercial, Industrial, General Residential 2, and Single Residential clustering together (refer to Figure x).
It is important to note that Sir Lowry’s Pass road will become the first turn off from the N2, after it has been constructed and will form the gateway to Gordon’s Bay. Sir Lowry’s Pass road is currently intended in the 2012 District Plan to become intensified with tourism related activities, and therefore new development along this road should be guided i.e. urban design guidelines.

1.2.5 **Sub-district 5:**

The sub-district is bounded by the slopes of the Helderberg Mountain to the north, the CoCT’s jurisdictional boundary to the north-west and the T2 to the south. Somerset West is one of the upmarket residential suburbs in the Helderberg district.

Parel Vallei, Land en Zeezicht, Nature’s Valley, Morningside, Golden Acre, Highveld, Laconcorde, Spanish Farms, Helena Heights are some of the oldest suburbs in the district. These areas play a critical role in the provision of residential accommodation for a higher income groups close to employment and public transport. The interest in these areas for increased densification and alternative land uses are growing. The future of the areas must
be carefully considered to avoid gentrification whilst still allowing for densification and land use intensification along Koeberg Road.

1.2.6 Sub-district 6:

Sir Lowry’s Pass sub-district is located north of the T2 on the north-eastern boundary of the district. It includes the smallholding areas (referred to in the 2012 DSDP as peripheral residential), agricultural land with vineyards estates and the Sir Lowry’s Pass Village. The Sir Lowry’s Pass Village has become a dormitory village and is regarded as one of the poorest communities in the Helderberg district with an increase in crime activity, and a lack of employment opportunities. A range of these socio economic factors has also led to and contributed to a large number of people living in informal structures in poor living conditions.

The Sir Lowry’s Pass environs as a whole represent a unique rural character, which is under considerable development pressure to subdivide properties and establish additional urban development around the village. Predominant challenges experienced in this area include the need to manage the interface between the existing urban area and the land that was previously outside the urban edge, now pro to development subject to infrastructure capacity, while maintaining the rural character and simultaneously accommodating residential uses and creating employment opportunities.

The area previously indicated in the DSDP 2012 as Urban Peripheral development has experienced a large amount of development applications, but few has succeeded in the intended development guidelines that were envisioned for the area.

1.2.7 Second dwellings

With the inclusion of second dwellings in the single residential zone as an additional use right, the process for obtaining such rights were thus streamlined. The take-up of such rights are however still subject to title deed restrictions in some of the older areas. In respect of the latter, the additional use right has to be tested in the Traffic Evacuation Model (TEM) to ensure that sufficient infrastructure exist for evacuation in case of emergency.

1.3 Mixed Use

The Mall Triangle and Paardevlei is the best example of mixed use development in the district. During the last 5 years the idea of a mixed use, or mixed of land uses has slowly become a way to develop land in well located areas in the district.

As mentioned, the areas around Somerset Mall has seen the highest degree of mixed use development in the last 5 years. Other areas, such as, Gordon’s Bay beach front, and Somerset West CBD has shown very little development in terms of diversification and densification over the last few years.
The high unemployment rate and limited opportunities within Nomzamo & Lwandle has forced residents to find alternative sources of income. It is prevalent through the number of illegal house shops, liquor shops and ECDs.

There has been a slow uptake in what could be considered genuine mixed use developments. Two factors are considered to play a role:

- The models for financing, residential versus commercial developments differ;
- Existing legislation does not force a mix of uses but rather allows developers to pick financially viable uses from a list of primary rights within a particular zone.

Unless incentives are provided or legislation is changed, the vision of creating developments that provides a rich variety of uses is considered out of reach.

1.4 Industrial

The district boasts a significant amount of developed industrial land, with a rapid uptake of undeveloped portions of Industrial land in existing Industrial nodes. Areas with the highest agglomeration of Industrial land is: Somerset Mall Interchange, Deep Freeze (Macassar), Strand Industria, Gants Park (Strand), Asla Park, Strand Onverwacht, George Park, Helderberg Industrial Park and Mansfield Industria. The latest interest in uptake of Industrial development is around the Firgrove Station, Faure Station, and Firlands (for storage facilities).

- Jubilee Vineyard Estates (Erf 5541, Eersteriver) is situated north of the M49 road extension, and is bounded northwest by the R310, and north east by the R102. General Business 1 and General Industrial (storage) land.
- Faure Industrial Park (GI1) (Corurseal Group; Erf 49 Faure, Croydon) situated south east of the Faure Train Station.

1.5 Noxious Industry

Somchem is the most prominent area that falls within Noxious Industry in the Helderberg District. This area should be reserves for noxious trade, and risk activity. Consent for uses outside of this zoning should take into account potential negative impacts. With the development of Paardevlei East of this site, consideration should be given to the social, health and safety impacts of proposed industries.

1.6 Retail and Office

1.6.1 Sub-district 1:

Sitari Village Mall
Croydon local node
1.6.2 Sub-district 2:
The Sanctuary Shopping Centre
Somerset mall Triangle
Heartland Historic Precinct
Heartland Beach Road Precinct

1.6.3 Sub-district 3:
Strand CBD has seen a decline in commercial and office space. This can be due to the lack of safe private vehicle parking for business. There has been a trend in businesses relocating to newer office space in Paardevlei that is more accessible and a larger agglomeration of economic activity. Action from the public to improve the safety and activity in the Strand CBD has shown an increase in cleanliness and safety.

1.6.4 Sub-district 4:
This District showed very little growth in economic activity.

1.6.5 Sub-district 5:

1.6.6 Sub-district 6:

1.7 Smallholdings
Extensive land units ranging in size and character were previously located outside the Urban Edge. Since the 2018 MSDF, these areas are now indicated as either, developable areas subject to infrastructure capacity, or as areas that should be protected due to their high value as agricultural value.

Smallholding areas in the district include the following:

- Firlands (forming the gateway from the N2 into Gordon’s Bay);
- Macassar (Sandvlei) smallholding areas situated next to the Eerste river;
- Parel Valley Smallholdings.

1.8 Agricultural land
Large portions of land in the Helderberg district is classified as high potential and unique agricultural land and, agricultural areas of significant value. Most of these areas are actively cultivated. The most significant areas include: Lourensford Wine Estate, Vergelegen Wine Estate, Morgenster Wine Estate, Sir Lowry’s Pass environs, areas North of Sir Lowry’s Pass road (M9), and the Eastern portion of the Vergenoegd Farm.

There is, however, a tendency in the last 5 years to rezone agricultural land for the development of urban use due several reasons, such as its great location in terms of access to public transport e.g. Agricultural land around Firgrove Train Station).

It is important to note that these portions of land should be preserved and utilised for food security and urban intrusion should be prevented. Further sub-division of agricultural land should also not be permitted.

1.9 Coastal Resorts & Tourism Attractions

The district has a number of coastal resorts (Voortrekker Park Resort, Harmony Park, Fleur Park is City owned land which has been long termed lease (lease expires in 23 years?) Hendon Park, and the Kogel Bay Resort) with a variety of accommodation options, which includes self-catering accommodation, camping and caravan stands. The Macassar beach resort has discontinued its use of the facilities constructed due to the dune system moving across the facility’s amenities.

1.10 Development Pressures

There has been a rapid increase in the private sector to develop land in the Helderberg district over the last 5 years. Private residential gated estates on Agricultural land has been an ongoing battle in the District in terms of protecting valuable agricultural land and finding appropriate land for urban development.

Areas currently experiencing the greatest amount of development pressure linked to limited infrastructure, land and/or services capacity are listed below:

1.10.1 Sub-district 1:
- Macassar – severe lack of Stormwater capacity & Electricity capacity
- Croydon, Sitari Country Estate, Deep Freeze, Firgrove, Somchem.

1.10.2 Sub-district 2:

1.10.3 Sub-district 3:
Strand along the railway – slight lack of water capacity.

1.10.4 Sub-district 4:
Broadlands Park, Sercor park, Fairview Golf Estate – slight lack of water capacity.

Gordon’s Bay – severe lack of sanitation infrastructure capacity

1.10.5 **Sub-district 5:**

Jonkers Hoogte – slight lack of water capacity.

Erf 228 RE, Erf 234, Erf 226– severe lack of electricity

1.10.6 **Sub-district 6:**

1.11 **Vacant Land**

Figure x depicts all the vacant land opportunities in Helderberg. The vacant land has been grouped into four categories using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Underutilised vacant land: | Vacant Land **without any** of the following attributes:  
- reservations,  
- public projects (human settlements; social facilities etc.)  
- building plan approvals  
- rezoning land use approvals. |
| 2    | Potentially-utilised vacant land: | Vacant Land **with any** of the following attributes:  
- reservations,  
- pending building plan approvals,  
- any public projects in pipeline stage, |
| 3    | Utilised Vacant Land: (vacant land under development or a registered intent to be developed) | Vacant Land **with any** of the following attributes:  
- any public projects in planning or construction stage,  
- existing building plan approvals,  
- rezoning land use approvals |
| 4    | Vacant Land Reserved and/or Zoned for Community or Recreational use: | This will include vacant land currently zoned OS1, OS2, OS3, CO1, CO2.  
[Only applicable layers that did not fall within the utilised (3) of potentially-utilised (2) categories] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vacant Land Zoned for Transport Use:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This will include vacant land currently zoned TR1, TR2 and Utility. [Only applicable layers that did not fall within the utilised (3) of potentially-utilised (2) categories]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Properties shaded in blue and grey are land zoned for community or recreational use, and should ideally be reserved as such in order to accommodate existing communities and anticipated growth/intensification in residential development. However, there are some larger-scaled properties which can potentially accommodate additional mixed use development (non-residential and residential land uses), other than only community or recreation.
1.12 Key Challenges and Opportunities

1.12.1 Opportunities

- Protect natural resources to attract more tourism and investment.
- Enhance heritage qualities of unique precincts (e.g. Macassar/Zandvliet and Sir Lowry’s pass village) with the aim of encouraging economic opportunities for the benefit of local (vulnerable) communities.
- Identify areas that are not conducive for residential development (e.g. coastal zone along AECI site) and create biodiversity corridors along the false bay coast.
- Redevelopment of City Resorts along False Bay coast to enhance tourism opportunities and activity.
- Appropriate interventions to enhance tourism attraction and the use as a City amenity of Macassar Beach resort.
- Underdeveloped land with existing latent rights should be encouraged for development (or expansion in the case of existing developments with latent rights) without having to undergo lengthy land use applications.
- Creating incentives for consolidation of erven to promote cohesive developments instead of fragmented developments along activity corridors.
- Investigate the appropriate use for development and disposal of Vaalfontein cemetery site (this site can no longer be developed as a cemetery due to its high water table which makes it not feasible for its intended purpose).
- Establish Firgrove Station Precinct as a mixed use development with higher density development due to its TOD potential.

1.12.2 Challenges

- Loss of heritage character of precincts where densification policy has been implemented as a “one size fits all” without taking into consideration the unique qualities of the receiving environment.
- Firgrove Station Area – there is a need for higher density mixed use development to the north of the Station, however this land is currently outside the City’s jurisdiction. A need for readjustment of municipal boundaries is required to allow the Transport Accessible Precinct to reach its suitable development ability.
- Infrastructure capacity
- Service delivery performance is low in Lwandle and Nomzamo (canals are blocked due to solidwaste).
- Slow development of industrial land in Deep Freeze limiting employment opportunities for the Macassar residence.
- Lack of NMT routes due to gated residential estates.
- Transversal co-operation to provide key supportive land uses (e.g. magistrates courts, hospitals, clinics, libraries, functional safe open space, public schools) for the district remains a challenge due to planning and financing for such not being coordinated between the different spheres of government.
- Public resistance to development, regardless of approved city policy.
- Legislation currently does not enforce the provision of a range of land uses within the relevant mixed use zones.
Financial models of developers are not accommodating mixed use type developments, furthermore there are no incentives or legislative mechanisms to support this type of development.

Fragmented developments due to single-erf ownership.

2 TRANSPORT AND ACCESSIBILITY

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a status quo analysis of the mobility and accessibility networks within the Helderberg District.

There is a strong focus on transport as an informant of the CTMSDF, using the TOD Strategic Framework (2016), in line with international planning trend which recognizes the need for spatial planning tools to support public transport and non-motorised transport options, as well as reducing the need to travel. The CTMSDF now needs to be translated “down” in scale to a district level. This section therefore focuses on the application of TOD to a district/corridor level.

The diagram below is useful in this regard, showing TOD at various scales.

Figure x: Transit Oriented Development Concept at Various Scales (Source: TOD SF, 2016: 24)

At a metro scale, there is a need to balance and shorten trips through:
At a corridor scale, TOD requires the generation of bi-directional flow (to replace the current "tidal" commuter patterns), reduced travel distances to public transport, and higher seat renewal (multiple origins and destinations along the route). The district plan will identify which corridors in the district should be reinforced with land use proposals.

2.2 Strategic Parameters & Informants

The City of Cape Town developed a host of strategies which aim to provide various strategic intents and objectives to guide the delivery of an efficient transport system and outline the primary framework within which the system develops. Further strategies address other transport needs such as non-motorised transport, universal accessibility, parking, operations, etc.

1.2.1 District Specific Transport Strategies

There are no transport-specific strategies relating to this region.

2.3 State of Public Transport

2.3.1 Existing Infrastructure and Services

2.3.1.1 High Order Public Transport

Rail

There is a passenger railway line running from Strand through the south-west part of the district, to Bellville and on to the CBD. It includes a Business Express service, on the Northern line. The need has been identified for a new railway station between Van der Stel and Strand stations.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

The rail line, which is well-located to serve the district, is seen as the trunk service in an integrated public transport system, as it serves the CBD, and Bellville. Hence this district is not targeted for any BRT trunk services in the near future. No feeder services exist in the district.
2.3.1.2 **Low Order Public Transport**

Minibus Taxis and GABS, and related PTIs

The main activity is centred on the Somerset West public transport interchange, and to a lesser extent at Macassar, Nomzamo and Strand station. There are no clear public transport “routes”, apart from the dominant service along the N2, taking commuters in and out of the district.

The district is served by the following public transport facilities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Formal/ Informal</th>
<th>Any plan for upgrading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gordons Bay Minibus-taxi Rank</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lwandle</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Macassar Minibus-taxi Terminus</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Scoping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Somerset Mall Public Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Somerset West Public Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Procurement phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Somerset West Station Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Strand Station Transport Interchange</td>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Firgrove</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-motorised transport (NMT)**

Most NMT (cycling) facilities are still in planning, except for existing routes in Macassar and Broadway Boulevard.

There is a strong presence of commuter cyclists around Nomzamo, which should be supported in the roll-out of the NMT plans, and as roads in the area are maintained and upgraded.
Figure x: Existing and Future Cycle Routes
2.3.2 Planned Infrastructure and Services

2.3.2.1 BRT feeders and trunks

In the long term, a trunk BRT route is planned for Phase 3, from Gordon’s Bay to Retreat.

2.3.2.2 Rail

A double track with 3-minute headway multiple-aspect signalling between Eerste River and Strand are planned by PRASA. While this project is within the Western Cape Regional Plan, dates have not been set for their implementation.

2.3.3 Level of Public Transport Accessibility

As part of the TODC model a scoring of the various Transport Accessible Precincts (TAPs) around stations and stops in the city was conducted. The overall score provides a measure of the level of accessibility of the City’s current public transport network using the following indicators:

C1. Status of station: Existing or Proposed
C2. Status of network: Existing or Proposed
C3. Connectivity: Accumulative Travel time to the City’s top 10 employment destinations
C4. Capacity: Capacity of stations to accommodate passenger volumes
C5. Modal Integration: Level of integration between modes of public transport (Rail/BRT/PTI/Feeder)
C6. Intensity: Number of people within 500m of a station/core feeder stop

Note that this scoring methodology does not take into account the functionality of the public transport services. The measure is purely a locational score. Based on these scorings, the following patterns are highlighted for the district:

iv. Few TAPS in the district have high accessibility – these are linked to the railway system.
v. The planned MyCiTi routes will extend the TAPS corridors significantly.
vi. Some areas are not served by public transport (or minimally served), resulting in no overall accessibility score, largely as a result of topographical factors, and limited habitation.
Figure x: TAPS Accessibility Scoring
2.4 State of Road Infrastructure

2.4.1 Overview of the district road network

The road network reflects the intensity of development – so is far denser in the central part of the district. Generally, south of the N2 the network is more connected and areas are more permeable. However, north of the N2, Somerset West is dominated by topographical barriers and modern estates which create limited access points and even more limited through-routes, concentrating traffic onto the main arterials.

See map below showing recently completed roads.

2.4.1.1 Historic Road Schemes to be reviewed

There are no historic road schemes which need to be removed or amended.

2.4.2 Parking

A popular park-and-ride facility exists for GABS users at Somerset West police station, initiated as part of the FIFA 2010 World Cup transport plan, which continues to meet a need.

Parking pressure exists in the Strand CBD area.

2.4.3 Planned Road Infrastructure

2.4.3.1 N2 Upgrade

Saun Dyers to update the 2012 wording: The N2 Freeway realignment upgrading and construction is planned to start in the next 2 to 3 years, with new interchanges planned in the Victoria Street and Onverwacht Road, according to latest feedback from SANRAL. The impact it may have on the existing network is still questioned with regard to accessibility (Main Road and Fabriek Street as examples). The upgrade of the T2 is almost complete, and will address congestion problems in the area. This upgrade is believed to also accommodate the upgrade of Main Road 108 (Gordon’s Bay/ Sir Lowry’s Pass Rd.).

2.4.3.2 Other Planned Road Upgrades and New builds

There has been significant road construction in the district in recent years. Recently completed roads, as well as possible new or upgraded connections can be seen on the plan below, and are not listed separately. However, due to budget constraints, construction is usually dependent on the development contributions from new developments. Where this is not possible, or insufficient, construction will be in accordance with city priorities (for example the congestion management strategy).

The completion of Broadway through Strand/ Gordon’s Bay remains a priority, as well as the dueling of Broadway from Strand Golf course to Main Road, Strand.

A number of road proposals have been made to strengthen connectivity and general mobility in the District.
Figure x: Planned Public Right of Way Upgrades or New Links
2.5 The State of Freight

The freight sector is critical to the efficient movement of goods in support of the economy and the provision of services. On the other hand, it can be a hindrance to traffic flow, and trucks place a disproportionate maintenance burden on road infrastructure (and the impact of accidents are great).

Freight movement in the district can be seen on the map below: clearly the largest volumes are on the national roads, and related to the Port. Cape Town’s deep water port processes ±15 million tons of freight per annum, with around 95% of freight movement on the land-side being road-based. The port together with over 30 industrial areas located in various parts of the City, contribute to a high number of trucks on the municipal road network.

The City’s Freight Management Strategy addresses the planning and management of freight operations within the city’s functional region. It recognises the need to shift the modal split back towards rail where possible.
The map shows that the district experiences the greatest freight movement through it, along the N2. This links the fruit-growing hinterland to the port (Fruit being a significant export commodity); and goods from the port and city are exported to the southern Cape along this route. The largest industrial area is also located in this district, having easy access to inland markets.
2.6 Travel Patterns

2.6.1 Current (EMME Demand – Base year 2015)

The following features for the district as whole can be observed:

- Development is thinly spread, with much of the district inaccessible due to the Hottentots Holland mountain range to the south and east, and the Tygerberg Hills to the north. Much of the central part of the district is under farmlands. This undermines the viability of a public transport system in these areas.
- There is a good mix of trip generators and trip attractors, resulting in not only internal trips, but also a flow both in and out of the district.

![Figure x: Base Year Trip Attractors and Generators (2013)](image)

**2.6.2 2013 Origin Destination Movements for the District**

The metropolitan origin-destination maps show the following patterns:

- There is little movement out of the area, but less movement into the area.
The greatest movement pattern is inbound, from the Khayelitsha/Mitchell’s Plain/Blue Downs district, using public transport.

The greatest destination districts are Table Bay, and Tygerberg, for both public and private transport.

Private transport trips were previously mainly to the Table Bay district, but now equally to the Tygerberg district.

Despite its peripheral location, there are a significant number of commuter trips to the northern and southern periphery of the city.
Figure x: Origin-Destination Patterns for Private and Public Transport (2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>NMT</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>BRT</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Table Bay</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>3302</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4233</td>
<td>9313</td>
<td>9602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Blaauwberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>2189</td>
<td>3066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>3317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Tygerberg</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>5151</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>2322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>12705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Khayelitsha / Mitchells Plain</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1312</td>
<td>3082</td>
<td>4310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Cape Flats</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>2522</td>
<td>3385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>3720</td>
<td>4120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>NMT</th>
<th>Car</th>
<th>Taxi</th>
<th>Bus</th>
<th>BRT</th>
<th>Train</th>
<th>Public Transport</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>5477</td>
<td>6975</td>
<td>6914</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>11067</td>
<td>23519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Bay</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaauwberg</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>1841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tygerberg</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>3011</td>
<td>5075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayelitsha / Mitchells Plain</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>2538</td>
<td>4611</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2741</td>
<td>9890</td>
<td>12086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Flats</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>2665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>1045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.6.2.1 Cost of Travel

This nature of tidal movement across the city results in an inefficient use of public transport and of the road-space: people traveling into the CBD in the morning, and out in the afternoon. This has a significant cost.

2.6.2.2 User costs

The newly-developed Urban Development Index (UDI) measured the cost of travel for different income groups, different travel modes, and to their top 5 destinations\(^2\) in terms of travel time, travel distance, and direct costs.

Modal choice is influenced by a range of factors: not simply direct costs, but indirect costs such as safety (of the service itself), security (on the service, as well as accessing it), level of flexibility (of the service), reliability (of the service), and the impact of congestion on the service. The high rate of NMT as the primary mode of transport as evidenced in poorer areas has less to do with short travel distances, and more to do with affordability.

This district is quite distinct from all the others in that there is a high modal split in favour of private transport: more than 70%, up to 90% on the northern part of Somerset West. Thus the majority of transport users enjoy short travel distances (as low as 5km in the Strand and Somerset West areas); low travel times (11-12mins in the Heldervue, Strand and the southern part of Somerset West), and relatively low direct costs as a percentage of income (31-32% in the Heldervue, Strand and Somerset West areas for the low income group).

Even public transport users fare well, with low direct costs as a percentage of income for the low income group in the Gordons Bay and Strand areas (8% and 10% respectively), and generally low travel times on all modes.

2.6.2.3 Operational costs

There is a high cost to operate public transport in a sprawling urban environment. If the travel demand patterns of the city remains at current variables this will translate into a deterioration of the recurrent annual operating deficit for the whole MyCiTi system by approximately R1 billion (IPTN Business Plan, 2017).

\(^2\) The top 5 commuting destinations were identified for each area based on employment and education patterns
2.6.2.4 Environmental and Economic costs

- Serious constraints on economic growth and development - Congestion currently costs Cape Town R2.8 billion per year.
- Increasing negative environmental impacts
- CO₂ emissions and energy consumption.

2.6.2.5 Future Ideal Distribution of Trip Generators and Attractors (2032)

In modelling the future land use patterns which would generate the demand for trips to be served by the IPTN, an “ideal” scenario, namely “Comprehensive Transit Oriented Development”, or CTOD, was run for 2032. The CTOD response is to try to balance trip attractors and trip producers in all areas, to theoretically eliminate/minimise the need to travel by having jobs and residences in the same area. The map below shows this ideal future state to work towards, with growth in the right locations to minimise travel time.

From a transport optimisation perspective, the current and anticipated residential units (trip producers) far from existing trip attractors needs to be countered/matched by new non-residential land uses (trip attractors) in order to achieve this goal.

From a spatial planning perspective, this means mixing land use (diversifying land use). This DSP must determine how this is achievable.

The following features for the district as whole should be pursued:

- A fairly balanced growth in both trip generators and trip attractors, except on the Paardevlei site, where potential exists for a significant number of new trip attractors (job opportunities). The nature of the land use development on Paardevlei will significantly alter the travel patterns, for better or worse
- Apart from that, the greatest growth will be along the N2, with the farms and mountainous areas remaining undeveloped. Continued residential expansion into these areas will exacerbate travel patterns
- Development should result in reduced travel through keeping employment for the district, within the district.
Figure x: Future Trip Attractors and Generators (2032)
2.7 Key Transport Challenges and Opportunities

2.7.1 Constraints

The uncertainty around the future of the N2 upgrade puts a dampener on development, and means that SANRAL is unlikely to invest in any upgrades, pending the long term future being resolved.

The decline in the rail service has impacted the district severely, as road-based public transport suffers the most acutely from the resultant congestion within the city.

The challenge is that the urban form is characterized by insular townships with low density development. This leads to low transport densities which cannot support quality public transport because of long commuting distances, low seat renewal (through multiple destinations along the route), and little bi-directional flow. The plan will attempt to address these challenges, which are land use issues.

2.7.2 Opportunities

This district is the “gateway” to the hinterland, with strong connections to neighbouring Stellenbosch, Grabouw, and the coastal parts of the province, and beyond. Certainty around the N2 alignment, and the nature of its access to the surrounding land uses, will influence development decisions in the future.

The relatively isolated nature of the eastern part of the district from the rest of the metropolitan area does create an opportunity for greater self-reliance. Trip attractors should be encouraged in the district: there seems to be potential for this in the areas north of the N2.

The City is moving towards incrementalism in the provision of public transport. This should benefit the district whose residents are largely dependent on public transport.

New generation technologies are evolving rapidly in the transport sector, and may benefit the district, for example cashless payment for public transport.

2.7.3 Spatial Implications

The need to balance the number of trip generators and attractors within this district is critical to reduce the number of long distance commutes into the CT CBD (a distance of 50km from Gordon’s Bay) and other opportunity areas.

The expansion of new developments to the north of the N2 is hindered by lack of adequate road access. From a transport perspective, this expansion is less preferable to intensification of development within the existing urban development footprint. This “dampening” of lateral expansion should be seen as an opportunity for making the existing urban area more attractive for development.
Throughout the district, it may well be worthwhile aligning with the Resilience Strategy process: some of its related pathfinding questions have relevance:

- How can we improve the design and co-location of public facilities to achieve multiple resilience dividends?
- How can we incentivise city residents to become more involved in resilient place making?
- How can partnerships in society be leveraged to contribute to reducing the stress of traffic congestion?

### 3 INFRASTRUCTURE

**Medium Term Infrastructure Investment Framework (MTIIF)**

Figures x and x current level of supply of water, sanitation, electricity and stormwater infrastructure in the Helderberg district as identified in the 2015 Medium Term Infrastructure Investment Framework.

#### 3.1 Electricity

The information used for the assessment of bulk electrical infrastructure capacity is from 2018 peak loads at distribution substations. The information was processed and each substation supply area classifies according to its level of existing capacity. There are 114 substation supply areas in the metropolitan: 82 of these are within the City of Cape Town’s distribution area, while 38 are within Eskom’s area of distribution. The table below gives the definitions used to classify the capacity of a substation area. The assessment was done using Transport Analysis Zones (TAZ’s) indicated in blue in Figures x and y, which have different geographical delineations when compared to the substation supply areas.

Bulk electrical infrastructure includes:

- Existing main transmission substations (MTSs)
- New MTSs
- Existing 132/11 kV distribution substations
- New 132/11 kV distribution substations
- Existing 132 and 66 kV underground (UG) cables and overhead lines (OHLs)
- New 132 kV UG cables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe lack of capacity</td>
<td>Over 100% of firm substation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight lack of capacity</td>
<td>90% to 100% of firm substation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate capacity</td>
<td>70% to 90% of firm substation capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare capacity</td>
<td>Less than 70% of firm substation capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table showing Definition of electrical system capacity (MTIIF, 2017 Draft: 68)
In the Helderberg District, the following areas have a \textbf{severe lack of capacity} in terms of bulk electrical infrastructure:

- Macassar – residential and undeveloped fynbos and dune systems
- The western rural portions of Paardevlei
- Built-up Gordon’s Bay – residential

There are currently no areas that experience a \textbf{slight lack of capacity}.

The following areas have an \textbf{adequate capacity}:

- The eastern rural portions of Paardevlei
- Strand – residential and commercial, with minor industrial activity in Strand Industria

The following areas have \textbf{spare capacity}:

- The eastern, built-up edge of Paardevlei – predominantly residential
- The Mall Triangle – commercial
- The suburbs of Greater Somerset West – residential
- Asanda and Nomzamo – informal residential
- Rural Gordon’s Bay
- Sir Lowry’s Pass – rural and residential
In Eastern district, no areas have a severe lack of capacity and the District has adequate or spare capacity.

A project has commenced which will consolidate the Eskom intake points in the area and supply the future Paardevlei development.

### 3.2 Water

For the purposes of this project bulk water infrastructure included the following:

- Bulk supply system from the water sources to the water treatment works (WTW)
- WTWs
- Supply pipelines from the WTW to reservoirs
- Reservoirs
Pump stations and rising mains
Distribution pipes ≥250 mm diameter (nominal)

The information used for this baseline assessment relies on 2011 and 2015 data which was processed for MTIIF. The impacts of the drought in terms of water infrastructure and capacity status are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe lack of capacity</td>
<td>0 - 15 m residual pressure in the reticulation networks &lt; 36 hours x AADD reservoir storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight lack of capacity</td>
<td>15 - 24 m residual pressure in the reticulation networks 36 - 48 hours x AADD reservoir storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate capacity</td>
<td>25 - 60 m residual pressure in the reticulation networks 48 - 72 hours x AADD reservoir storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare capacity</td>
<td>&gt; 60 m residual pressure in the reticulation networks &gt; 72 hours x AADD reservoir storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table showing definition of water system capacity

In the Helderberg District, one area is subject to a **severe lack of capacity** in terms of bulk water infrastructure:
- The Mountainside Reservoir supply zone in the Firlands, Gordons Bay and Strand areas – rural in nature

Only the following three areas experience a **slight lack of capacity**:
- Fairview Golf Estate – residential
- The southeastern edge of Strand – primarily residential, with commercial activity along Main Road
- The suburbs of Fraaigelegen and Lynn’s View – residential

The vast majority of the district has **adequate capacity**, including:
- Macassar – residential and undeveloped fynbos and dune systems
- The remainder of Strand and Gordon’s Bay – predominantly residential, with some commercial
- Sir Lowry’s Pass Village – predominantly residential
- Rural Somerset West
- Suburban areas west of the Somerset West Nature Reserve

The following areas have **spare capacity**:
- Paardevlei – predominantly rural, with residential areas on its eastern edge
- Suburban residential areas along the north-eastern edge of the N2
- Helderberg Village, Vredenberg, Vredenzicht, La Montagne, Bel’Aire, Helderberg Estate, Helena Heights and Die Wingerd – suburban residential
- Helderberg Rural, adjacent to Sir Lowry’s Pass Village

[Awaiting further information, and a list of current and planned projects, from the line department]
3.3 Sanitation (Waste Water and Solid Waste)

3.3.1 Waste Water

Waste Water infrastructure includes the following components:

- All wastewater treatment works (WWTWs)
- Pump stations (≥50 l/s duty flow)
- Rising mains (≥250 mm diameter (nominal))
- Gravity pipelines (≥250 mm diameter (nominal))

The information used for this baseline assessment relies on 2011 and 2015 data which was processed for MTIIF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity status</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe lack of capacity</td>
<td>WWTW: Capacity exceeded (major drainage areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravity mains: &lt; 15 % relative spare capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slight lack of capacity</td>
<td>WWTW: Capacity exceeded (minor drainage areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS: Required pump flow 105% - 115% of current capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravity mains: 15% - 30% relative spare capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate capacity</td>
<td>WWTW: 95% - 100% of treatment capacity required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravity mains: 30% to 50% relative spare capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS: Required pump flow 95% - 105% of current capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spare capacity</td>
<td>WWTW: &lt; 95% of treatment capacity required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PS: Required pump flow &lt; 95% of current capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Helderberg District, the following area is experiencing a severe lack of capacity in terms of bulk waste water infrastructure:

- Gordon’s Bay – predominantly residential

There are no areas with a slight lack of capacity.

The following areas have adequate capacity:

- Strand – residential and commercial
- The eastern (populated) portions of Paardevlei – residential
- The suburbs of Greater Somerset West, between the N2 and the Somerset West Nature Reserve – residential
- Sir Lowry’s Pass – predominantly residential

Lastly, the following areas have spare capacity:

- Macassar – residential
- Suburbs of Greater Somerset West, west of the Somerset West Nature Reserve – residential
3.3.2 Bulk solid waste

Bulk solid waste infrastructure considered for the purpose of this project consists of the infrastructure required to provide current waste management services to existing and future developments and new infrastructure associated with evolving legislative requirements. This includes:

- Landfills and associated mechanical plant
- Refuse transfer stations
- Drop-off facilities (garage waste, greens, builders’ rubble, recyclables, household hazardous waste)
- Buy-back centers
- Fleet (Workshop, Collection vehicles, Cleansing vehicles)
- Material recovery facilities
- Alternative treatment technologies

The information is based on data from 2019.

Table showing existing bulk solid waste management infrastructure capacity status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure type</th>
<th>Capacity status</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfills and mechanical plant</td>
<td>The total banked airspace is &gt;10 years in the city, but less than the international benchmark of 15 years.</td>
<td>Landfill sites are not area bound. The city only has 3 operational landfills. Due to Limited capacity at landfills, based on license conditions. Excludes regional landfill site of which the authority is under consideration. All landfills have a limited life, per their specific license, and hence will close as the said conditions are met. Infrastructure, plant and equipment at all landfill sites are sustainable managed and compliant with License Authority regulated audits. The Regional landfill will receive most household/business waste via RTSs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RTSs

The total transfer capacity available currently meets the demand capacity. Additional RTSs are being planned and included in the SWM IWM Plan. RTSs are primarily designed for the waste compactor fleet servicing household/businesses.

RTSs are strategically located throughout the city and hence do not necessarily coincide with the city area model. TRSs service large catchments, structured in terms of resource economic models.

Due to the sensitivity of obtaining land/authority of these type of activities closer to high demand areas, they are in most instances built at landfill sites or on main roads to improve accessibility.

More RTSs are however required as existing centralized landfills are closing. At an RTS the waste collected by refuse compactors are downloaded, re-compact, containerized and then hauled to landfill sites. These new required additional RTSs will where practically possible be developed on landfill sites (operational or closed) or be strategically located on city owned land.

### Drop-off facilities

Currently the city has adequate capacity in terms of drop-off floor area. The actual number of drop-offs are significantly less than what is required to improve accessibility.

The need for drop-offs closer to communities is a major challenge. The current spread is a drop-off within 7km of each household.

Due to many economic and social factors communities find it difficult to effectively utilize these facilities. To improve accessibility and to decrease illegal dumping the planned spread of drop-offs should not be one within 3km of each household, with even a
It is extremely difficult to find suitable land that is compliant with city policies and by-laws, additional to the resistance from adjacent or close-by property owners. Pressure is on SWM to close existing facilities as development is allowed closer to the same.

**Buy-back centers/ recycling facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a huge desire to develop buy-back centers or recycling facilities, to be operated by SMME’s, CBO’s, NGO’s or the city in poorer communities throughout the city.

Whilst the land requirement is <1000m², it is difficult to secure city land within communities that are compliant with city policies and bylaws.

Support for these type of facilities is increasingly provided by Councilors and lately also from City Urban Renewal and Sub Councils.

**Fleet - Collection vehicles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate number of collection compactors</td>
<td>Replace and supplement Collection fleet in accordance with city growth and service requirements (different communities, local conditions, different vehicle types). Ensure collection fleet has an average replacement age of &lt; 7 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fleet - Workshop**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate capacity</td>
<td>City operates own dedicated workshop for servicing at Hillstar. Emergency repairs &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance, tyre services and overhauls are outsourced.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleansing vehicles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack in capacity of the correct vehicles, heavy plant and equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace and supplement Cleansing fleet in accordance with city growth and service requirements (different communities, local conditions, different vehicle types). Ensure cleansing fleet has an average replacement age of less than the 5 years, 7 years and 12 years respectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of vehicles need to increase significantly, also the type of vehicles in use, such as mechanical cleaning equipment, loaders and tippers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRFs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of capacity in the city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth in recycling is hampered due to the unavailability of MRFs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city has developed a MRF in Kraaifontein and 2 more are planned for development, at Coastal Park and at ARTS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city will supplement these larger MRFs with mini-MRFs to increase capacity, to improve accessibility by all and to create SMME opportunities. Current larger drop-offs are earmarked for this added function.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alternative treatment technologies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of legislative requirements, the city is obliged to meet stringent diversion targets for several waste types. Organic and food waste diversion is a major challenge that falls in this category for alternative treatment technologies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best technologies, required infrastructure and business requirements are being investigated in an effort to identify the basic requirements.

Where practically possible existing land at landfills or RTSs will be used to host the new integrated waste infrastructure.

3.4 Stormwater

The stormwater system of the CCT consists of a wide range of infrastructure components. The CCT’s Management of Urban Stormwater Impacts Policy (CCT, 2009) defines the stormwater system as “both the constructed and natural facilities, including pipes, culverts and watercourses, whether over or under public or privately owned land, used or required for the management, collection, conveyance, temporary storage, control, monitoring, treatment, use and disposal of stormwater”.

The stormwater infrastructure applicable to this study therefore includes the following:

- Piped networks (excluding provision for minor drainage system associated with road provision)
- Culverts
- Open channels, lined and unlined, including watercourses
- Detention and retention facilities
- Energy dissipation structures
- Water quality management facilities
- Outfalls to watercourses or the sea
- Storm surge and flood protection infrastructure

In the Helderberg District, the following areas have major stormwater capacity constraints:

- Macassar (both urbanised and rural), primarily between the N2 and Macassar Road, straddling the Eerste River
- Suburbs straddling the Lourens River
- The coastal edge of Strand between the Lourens and Soete Rivers
- Northern, rural areas of Gordon’s Bay
• Sir Lowry’s Pass Village and adjacent rural land stretching along the northern boundary of the N2

3.5 Key Opportunities and Constraints

In terms of the assessment above, areas that have spare capacity signify opportunities, while those with a severe lack of capacity are the most constrained areas.

The MTIF information needs to be updated and verified by line departments, which should include new projects to address the existing backlogs in the district.
4 HUMAN SETTLEMENTS

The concept of integrated human settlements goes beyond providing housing, but rather speaks to creating environments that support the social, physical, and economic integration of housing developments into the existing urban fabric and establishing quality living environments that are sustainable. This means that housing is merely one of the basic infrastructure components required to build integrated and resilient communities (see Figure x below). Housing must be integrated within areas through housing mix, typologies, design and income, and be close to transport routes supporting transit-oriented development.

**Figure x: Overview of the integrated communities concept in terms of TOD**

### 4.1 Housing Typologies

As of 2011, 84.90% of Helderberg’s 68,738 households reside in formal dwellings, comparable to most other districts, save for Khayelitsha, Mitchells Plain & Greater Blue Downs at only 60.10%.

Combined, informal dwellings account for 13.92% of households, sitting below the metropolitan average of 16.39%. This is the third highest proportion among the city’s eight districts, followed by the Cape Flats at 19.30% and, far more significantly, Khayelitsha, Mitchells Plain & Greater Blue Downs at 39.00%. Due to the small number of households in the district, however, it only accounts for 10.73% of all informal dwellings in the city. At 4.53%, the district is home to the second lowest percentage of...
freestanding informal households in the city behind Tygerberg at 3.00%. In contrast, the district contains the second largest percentage of informal backyard dwellings among all districts at 9.39% – only marginally smaller a percentage than Khayelitsha, Mitchells Plain & Greater Blue Downs at 10.10%.

The remaining 86.06% of households reside in formal dwellings. These comprise overwhelmingly of freestanding houses (60.06%), followed by apartments (9.37%), semi-detached houses (7.75%) and a smaller mix of cluster houses (2.73%), townhouses (2.61%) and formal backyard dwellings (1.68%). Other housing typologies make up only a negligible percentage of total district households.

![Helderberg District housing typology distribution (Census, 2011)](image)

In addition to their large share of dwelling typologies, freestanding houses are also the most widely spread form of housing, constituting the majority of households in most sub-places. Apart from a significant presence in Weltevreden in the Strand Sub-District, semi-detached houses are concentrated most intensely in Nomzamo and Macassar SP. Apartments contribute greatest to the mix of dwelling typologies within the Strand Sub-District, particularly the sub-places of Lwandle (9.50%), Strand SP (28.49%), Rome (51.46%), Guldenland (61.38%) and Van Rynевeld (67.32%). They are also present to similar degrees in several sub-places in Gordon’s Bay and the southernmost sub-places of Greater Somerset West. Lastly, cluster houses and townhouses in complexes are most prevalent in sub-places within Greater Somerset
West (and to a smaller extent in south-eastern Gordon’s Bay), reflecting the ubiquity of gated community developments in the area. Overall, the widest diversity of housing typologies is present in Strand, including sub-places such as Nomzamo and Lwandle. These are joined by several isolated sub-places in other sub-districts, such as Macassar SP and Sir Lowry’s Pass.
Figure x: Helderberg District major formal dwelling typologies distribution by sub-place (Census, 2011)
Figure x: Helderberg District informal dwelling distribution by sub-place (Census, 2011)
Informal backyard dwellings make up a significant proportion of households in Nomzamo (28.29%), Lwandele (20.12%) and Sir Lowry’s Pass (11.69%), while also present in smaller measures (5%–10%) in several other sub-places such as Macassar SP (8.70%). Freestanding informal dwellings are less widespread, but present in large proportions in a three sub-places, most notably Onverwacht (59.26%), Lwandle (21.39%) and Sir Lowry’s Pass (27.63%).

4.2 Tenure Status

At 52.11% (as measured in 2011), the Helderberg District has a rate of home ownership slightly below the metropolitan average of 54.14%. This is the third lowest rate, behind the Cape Flats at 50.26% and Table Bay at 42.18%. In effect, approximately half of the households in the district are owned by their inhabitants. This is made up primarily of owned and fully paid off homes, accounting for 35.51% of all households – the second largest percentage out of any district behind Khayelitsha, Mitchells Plain & Greater Blue Downs at 42.26%. The remaining 16.43% of owned homes are secured with bonds, sitting below the metropolitan average of 20.91%.

Of the remaining 47.89% of homes, which are not owned by their occupants, the significant majority (37.00%) is rented. This is the third highest rate of rented homes in the city, behind Blaauwberg at 38.23% and Table Bay at 47.11%. In contrast, only 8.69% of homes, the third lowest percentage among districts, are occupied rent-free. This speaks to a relatively healthy rental market in the area.
Figure x: Helderberg District distribution of household tenure status by sub-place (Census, 2011)
The spatial distribution of household tenure status across the district is more varied than that of dwelling typology. Still, there emerge certain trends. Sub-places with high rates of owned and paid off homes primarily consist of freestanding houses. These sub-places are concentrated most strongly in the south-eastern portion of Greater Somerset West, where the rate of owned and paid off homes sits primarily in the range of 40%–50%, but reaches as high as 86.35% in Helderberg Village. A similar proportion is observed in Macassar SP, where about half (49.08%) of homes are fully owned and paid off. Generally lower percentages are observed in Strand and Gordon’s Bay, where paid off home ownership primarily ranges from 30%–40% and 20%–30%, respectively. The highest percentage of homes that are owned, but in the process of being paid off are found in the Onverwacht Sub-Place in Strand, at 70.83%. However, overall, the majority of bond-secured home ownership in the district occurs in Greater Somerset West, accounting for 30%–40% of households in the majority of sub-places. As with paid off home ownership, this corresponded very closely with freestanding houses and also reflects the higher incomes of households in this area.

Rental shows the opposite distribution. Rented homes are primarily concentrated in Strand and Gordon’s Bay, with the highest percentage occurring in the Fairview Golf Estate in Gordon’s Bay at 90.49%. Furthermore, over half (55.04%) of the homes in Firgrove Rural, making up the bulk of the Paardevlei Sub-District, are rented. Significant numbers of rented homes are also found in the southernmost sub-places of Greater Somerset West. There is an almost direct correlation between apartment housing typologies and rented homes, along with a smaller overlap between rental and freestanding houses. Rental tenure status is associated with an especially wide variety of housing typologies (including freestanding, semi-detached and informal backyard) in the Nomzamo Sub-Place, where almost half (49.60%) of the households rent their homes.

Lastly, rent-free occupation is by far the least widely distributed tenure type. It is found primarily in the rural areas of Greater Somerset West, Sir Lowry’s Pass and Gordon’s Bay, making up approximately a quarter (27.56%) of all households. Apart from these areas, it is highly present in sub-places of high informality, namely Nomzamo, Lwandle and Sir Lowry’s Pass. Within these sub-places, a respective 15.38%, 23.50% and 32.37% of households do not pay any rent.

4.3 Housing Demand

4.4 Housing Supply
Limitation within Housing Demand and Supply data:

Needs Summary:

- Records marked as “Assisted” – this is not a true reflection on supply per financial year as records are not regularly updated. For this reason, there is a difference between the figures (per financial year) for “Assisted” records and “Total Supply”.
- Furthermore, “Assisted” records primarily refer to the supply of BNG, PHP and CRU housing opportunities as not all housing products supplied are currently captured on the Housing Needs Register.
- Records marked as “Waiting” – this only refers to persons who came forward to express their housing need and not necessarily person who will qualify for a state subsidized housing opportunity. The qualification verification process will only occur once a person is selected for a housing opportunity.

Supply Summary:

- UISP – persons who are beneficiaries within an Upgrading of Informal Settlements Project are not necessarily registered on the City’s Housing Needs Register as this is not a mandatory provision as per the prescripts of the National Human Settlements Policy. The idea is to upgrade the identified Informal Settlements regardless of a person’s eligibility criteria. A person’s eligibility criteria is however taken into account during the transfer of ownership of a services site and/or top-structure.
• GAP – person who are beneficiaries within the GAP market are not necessarily registered on the City’s Housing Needs Register. Eligible persons apply directly to the developer to purchase the property and will apply directly to the Western Cape Department of Human Settlement for the Financed Linked Individual Subsidy Programme (FLISP) subsidy.

• Land Restitution/ Institutional - persons who are beneficiaries within this housing programme are not necessarily registered on the City’s Housing Needs Register.

• Social and rent to buy - persons who are beneficiaries within this housing programme are not necessarily registered on the City’s Housing Needs Register as this housing programme caters for households with an income up to R15 000 per month. Prospective tenants apply directly to the respective Social Housing Institutions for rental vacancies.
• Social housing: Social housing refers to affordable rental housing. Prior to September 2017 the income band for this housing programme was R1500 – R7500. After September 2017 the income band was changed to R1500 – R15 000.

• Community Residential Units (CRU): Affordable rental targeting the R0 – R3500 income group, but the City will allow households to access this programme if they earn up to R10 000 – however households above R3500 must pay additional rental amounts according to what they earn.

• Land Restitution and Institutional: There is one example of land restitution in the Cape Flats District – Erf 3053 Lotus River. There has only been one institutional housing programme (a rent to buy option) and this was in Harmony Village in Mitchells Plain/Khayelitsha District – the target income group for this programme is R3500 and below.

• Upgrading of Informal Settlements Programme (UISP): Upgrading of informal settlements by means of in situ upgrading, or relocation to greenfields site. This programme gives households access to municipal services, or the incremental development of a top structure.

4.5 Key Opportunities and Constraints
5 PUBLIC FACILITIES

5.1 State of Supply and Demand

The following section provides a list of the current supply of public facilities in the area, and the demand of new facilities in the district accounting for the anticipated growth in population and required densification and intensification of land use in line with city policy.

5.1.1 Education

The figures provided in this section only relate to state schools and exclude any private schools or Early Childhood Development centres (ECDs). This information also does not include the current status of school infrastructure or the level of utilisation of the facilities (i.e. capacity considerations), which could also impact on the level of education services that can be provided. The information is based on 2011 figures obtained from the City of Cape Town’s Department of Community Services and Health extracted from the revised 2011 Census.

In total there are approximately 37 public education facilities in the Helderberg District: 26 primary and 11 secondary schools (Figure X). All operational Grade R (pre-primary) facilities are assumed to be within existing state primary schools. The assumed standard capacity ratio for each category of schooling is as follows:

- Grade R: 30 learners per class;
- Primary Schools: 40 learners per class; and
- Secondary Schools: 40 learners per class.

5.1.1.1 Estimated number of pupils served by the schools

Table X below indicates the current number of pupils served and unserved based on capacity constraints within 5km of the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of schooling</th>
<th># of schools</th>
<th>Unserved children</th>
<th>Served children</th>
<th>% served children</th>
<th>Metro average % served</th>
<th>Total potential pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade R</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 663</td>
<td>1 034</td>
<td>27.98</td>
<td>58.46%</td>
<td>3 697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>1 028</td>
<td>21 055</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.34%</td>
<td>96.23%</td>
<td>22 083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2 836</td>
<td>12 331</td>
<td>81.30%</td>
<td>81.71%</td>
<td>15 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6 527</td>
<td>34 420</td>
<td>88.12%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40 947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure x: Spatial distribution of existing education facilities across the Helderberg District
From Table X above, it is concluded that, based on the number of school-going-aged children in 2011, the Helderberg District was performing significantly worse in Grade R education than the rest of the city. In 2011, approximately 28% of children in the District had access to Grade R education, compared to the metropolitan average of 58%. By contrast, the District and metropolitan statistics for primary schools are more similar at approximately 96%. The same holds true for secondary schools, which served approximately 81% of pupils in the District – equivalent to the metropolitan average.

Overall, the District serves approximately 88% of the total estimated school-going-aged population of approximately 40,947.

### 5.1.1.2 Estimated travel distance to schools

Table X below expresses the distances travelled to school by pupils of different categories, based on 2011 Census figures. It provides an overview of the accessibility of schools in relation to the number of pupils that they serve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of schooling</th>
<th>Number of pupils</th>
<th>Percentage of pupils</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1km</td>
<td>&lt;2km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade R</td>
<td>1 633</td>
<td>1 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>11 834</td>
<td>7 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Schools</td>
<td>5 113</td>
<td>4 865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 580</td>
<td>13 482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be concluded from the above table that in 2011, 45% of pupils had access to a school within 1km, 33% between 1km and 2km and 18% between 2km and 5km from their homes. In total, approximately 78% of school-going-aged children in the District lived within 2km of a school.

Increasing the percentage of pupils within 1km of a school requires higher-density development around existing schools, with an increased capacity where needed and/or more schools dispersed within the area. The former may be a more affordable option, requiring less land, but will likely lead to management and capacity challenges in individual schools.

At approximately 12%, there is still a high number of pupils who are unserved by school facilities. However, this does not appear to be related to the accessibility of these facilities and is more likely subject to available capacity of existing schools, the preference of schools (relating to subject choice), family movement patterns and networks, among other factors.

Although the age distribution of the population has remained fairly consistent between 2001 and 2011, the overall District population has been growing at the second largest average rate among the 8 metropolitan planning districts (5.49% per
This rapidly increasing population will likely lead to an increase in the requirement for educational facilities. It should be noted, however, that there are various private schools within the District that also service pupils, who are in most cases not constrained by physical proximity, and that a number of pupils travel outside of their residential area for education.

The following are gaps in information relating to educational facilities within the District:

1. Building programme since 2012
2. Capacity of the schools i.e. number of learners vis-à-vis number of class rooms;
3. Current programmes for upgrades / enlargement of existing schools or new schools;
4. Original of learners per school – is it possible to determine how many learners are actually from outside an area or travel to schools outside, i.e. should all areas provide the standard ratio or are more learner moving outside their residential area;
5. MOD (Mass Opportunity Development) centre schools – and the interrelationship between schools for say joint use of facilities;
6. Underutilized land:
   a. What schools are not optimally using their land and could dispose of them
   b. Can schools use city facilities and then potentially dispose of their underutilized and under-maintained facilities.

5.1.2 Medical

Medical facilities encompass all public clinics, district and regional hospitals and private hospitals in the city. In 2011, the Helderberg District had approximately 8 operational Primary Health Care (PHC) facilities (Figure X below).

Table X below provides an overview of the number of people served and unserved per Health District in Cape Town, based on Health District. There is a clear indication that facilities are very well distributed across the city and that service problems are more likely related to issues of service capacity than travel distance. Without any change to the capacity of current facilities, 76% of the dependent population can be accommodated by PHC facilities within 2.5 km of their places of residence, while 87% can be served within 4 km. In terms of specific areas, however, the Metro South-East, growth areas and periphery of city did experience limited capacity in 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health District</th>
<th>Served within 1 km</th>
<th>Served within 2.5 km</th>
<th>Total pop. served &lt; 4km</th>
<th>Unserved at 2.5km</th>
<th>Unserved at 4km</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>124 591</td>
<td>293 590</td>
<td>340 318</td>
<td>123 921</td>
<td>77 193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khayelitsha</td>
<td>137 005</td>
<td>365 782</td>
<td>380 892</td>
<td>23 584</td>
<td>8 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klipfontein</td>
<td>141 920</td>
<td>254 875</td>
<td>304 550</td>
<td>53 421</td>
<td>3 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchells Plain</td>
<td>176 769</td>
<td>355 486</td>
<td>408 558</td>
<td>111 255</td>
<td>58 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>Western</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>77 501</td>
<td>131 893</td>
<td>164 707</td>
<td>86 074</td>
<td>53 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>104 918</td>
<td>233 113</td>
<td>298 098</td>
<td>122 325</td>
<td>57 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>157 084</td>
<td>414 251</td>
<td>450 234</td>
<td>45 512</td>
<td>9 529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>96 657</td>
<td>192 573</td>
<td>218 930</td>
<td>143 207</td>
<td>116 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>1 016 444</td>
<td>2 241 562</td>
<td>2 566 286</td>
<td>709 299</td>
<td>384 574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure x: Spatial distribution of existing health care facilities across the Helderberg District
5.1.3 Community/Social Facilities

These encompass all public and communal facilities in the city including: libraries, halls, community centres, post offices, magistrate courts, fire stations, police stations, municipal offices and cemeteries. Specific attention will be given to the distribution of community halls, libraries and fire stations.

Gaps in information relating to the above facilities are as follows:

- Table X: Fire stations service statistics for 2011 at a metropolitan level and need to be disaggregated per district.
- Spatial representation of the facilities.

5.1.3.1 Municipal halls

In 2011, the Helderberg District had approximately 10 municipal halls, which included both civic centres and multi-purpose centres (Figure X below). The following key assumptions relating to this section were made:

- Demand: Entire population.
- Access distance: 5km.

The service capacity of each hall is related to hall grading as follows:

- Grade A = 60 000 people;
- Grade B = 30 000 people;
- Grade C = 20 000 people;
- Grade D = 15 000 people; and
- Grade E = 10 000 people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>Unserved</th>
<th>% Served</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>195 069</td>
<td>22 261</td>
<td>89.76%</td>
<td>217 329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X above illustrates that the Helderberg District has sufficient supply of municipal halls across, with nearly 90% of its population being served by municipal halls within 5km of their places of residence.

5.1.3.2 Libraries

In 2011, there were 7 community libraries and 1 regional library within the Helderberg District. Key assumptions regarding libraries include:

- The entire population of Cape Town was deemed to be users of public library services;
- Larger facilities preferred up to a maximum of 120 000 thresholds per facility;
- Accessible distance limits were set at 5km for community and 10km for regional libraries; and
• All regional facilities also serve as community facilities, but not vice versa.

Table X: Number of people served and unserved by community and regional libraries within a 5km distance across the Helderberg District, 2011 (Updated Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unserved</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>% served</th>
<th>% served metro</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>36 512</td>
<td>180 528</td>
<td>77.55%</td>
<td>76.50%</td>
<td>217 039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>97 322</td>
<td>12 000</td>
<td>55.22%</td>
<td>63.04%</td>
<td>217 322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X above provides an overview of the proportions of the District population served and unserved by community and regional libraries. In 2011, the community libraries in the District served 77.50% of its population. This is marginally higher than the metropolitan average population served by community libraries (76.50%). In terms of the population served by regional libraries, the Helderberg District seems to be underperforming when compared to the city as a whole, as it served slightly over 55% of its population, compared to the metropolitan average of 63%.

5.1.3.3 Fire stations

Table X below indicates fire stations service statistics for 2011 at a metropolitan level; this needs to be disaggregated per district. According to these statistics, 89% of the metropolitan area, representing 95% of the population, was served by fire stations.

Table X: Metropolitan fire station service statistics, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk category</th>
<th>Area served (ha)</th>
<th>% Area served</th>
<th>Population served (ha)</th>
<th>% Population served</th>
<th>Area unserved (ha)</th>
<th>Population unserved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A- High</td>
<td>3800</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>22709</td>
<td>53.35</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>19858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- Moderate</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>5566</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C- Low</td>
<td>91460</td>
<td>93.96</td>
<td>3352266</td>
<td>98.09</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>65274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D- Rural</td>
<td>111500</td>
<td>88.89</td>
<td>72427</td>
<td>98.52</td>
<td>13940</td>
<td>1088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Special</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>29834</td>
<td>24.45</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>92196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208320</td>
<td>88.66</td>
<td>3482803</td>
<td>95.13</td>
<td>26640</td>
<td>178417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of 2011, there were 3 fire stations serving the entire Helderberg District, namely Somerset West, Strand and Macassar. Table X below indicates the area and population served per fire station. Collectively, the 3 fire stations cover 18 640 ha and serve a population of 206 983 out of a total District population of 217 329. This means that approximately 95% of the Helderberg population is served by a fire station.

Table X: Number of people served per fire station within the Helderberg District, 2011 (Updated Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station name</th>
<th>Station #</th>
<th>Area served (ha)</th>
<th>Population served</th>
<th>% Population served</th>
<th>% metro population served</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somerset West</td>
<td>4751</td>
<td>12 980</td>
<td>87 018</td>
<td>40.04%</td>
<td>2.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strand</td>
<td>4334</td>
<td>2 620</td>
<td>85 794</td>
<td>39.48%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macassar</td>
<td>5200</td>
<td>3 040</td>
<td>34 171</td>
<td>15.72%</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18 640</td>
<td>206 983</td>
<td>95.24%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure x: Spatial distribution of community facilities across the Helderberg District
5.1.4 Parks and Recreational Facilities

Parks and recreational facilities effectively consist of sports facilities and parks, which are discussed below in greater detail.

5.1.4.1 Sports facilities

Sports facilities are categorized into municipal multi-code sports grounds (MMSGs) and school sports grounds. As of 2011, the Helderberg District has approximately 34 sports facilities, consisting of 10 municipal sports grounds and 24 School sports grounds.

The following assumptions have been made in this section:

- A maximum threshold of 10km was used as an acceptable distance between place of residence and sports grounds in the analysis.
- School sports fields were also considered as additional supply.
- Only outdoor ball sports facilities were analysed.
- A capacity threshold of 0.2ha/1 000 people for formal ball sports facilities to provide sufficient facilities to meet the needs of residents was used in the final analysis.
- Excluded facilities include: Pools, single-code facilities (e.g. tennis courts and bowling greens), even though these form part of the 0.2ha/ 1 000 people provision standard.

Table X below provides an indication of the number of sports grounds that is located within the Helderberg District in comparison to the metropolitan total. It should be noted that the population figures used was as per the Census 2011 data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Municipal Multi-Code Sports Grounds</th>
<th>School Sports Fields</th>
<th>Municipal + Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of grounds</td>
<td>Total size (ha)</td>
<td>No. of fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helderberg</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table X below provides an overview of the size of sports grounds in the Helderberg District in relation to the number of people that are being served by them. From this, it can be concluded that the Helderberg District is adequately served with sports facilities in terms of the number of facilities provide for its current population. It can also be noted that approximately 34% of the total area used for sport facilities are located at schools.
The following Table X provides an overview of the accessibility of Sports facilities as reflected in relation to the number of people they serve. It can be seen that approximately 83% of the population is located within 2km of a municipal sports ground and approximately 89% of the population is located within 2km of a school sports ground. Therefore, the majority of Helderberg’s population lives within close proximity (2km radius) of sport grounds. Consequently, it can be inferred that the Helderberg District is well-served by sports grounds both in terms of capacity and accessibility.

Table X: Travel distance to sports facilities and the number of people served by them, based on capacity and distance constraints, 2011 (Updated Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>0-1km</th>
<th>1-2km</th>
<th>2-5km</th>
<th>5-10km</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population served by MMSG</td>
<td>67 377</td>
<td>88 467</td>
<td>50 974</td>
<td>10 616</td>
<td>218 005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population served by school sports fields</td>
<td>162 328</td>
<td>7 201</td>
<td>37 849</td>
<td>10 627</td>
<td>218 005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.4.2 Parks

In analysing the state of the current supply of parks, the following key assumptions were made:

- Parks include developed open space (hard and soft spaces).
- Any facilities with entrance fees were excluded.
- Nature reserves were excluded, although specific picnic areas within reserves could be.
- The following provision standards applied:
  - 0.35ha / 1 000 people for Community Parks at 1.5km access distance; and
  - 0.15ha / 1 000 people for District Parks at 20km access distance.
Figure X (left) illustrates that, at a metropolitan level, there was good access to parks in 2011, with 90% of the city’s population living within 1.5km of a Community Park. However, when taking into consideration the provision ratio of Community Parks, the service coverage stood only at 61% of the total metropolitan population. Areas of unserved population are thus evidence of a lack of park capacity to serve local demand, as opposed to poor accessibility.
As with Community Parks, Figure X (left) illustrates that there is a relatively good spatial distribution of District Parks across the city. The vast majority of residents (90%) live within the travel distance standard of 20km.

Despite overall sufficient developed District Park space at a city-wide level, on a district level, the population of Atlantis and the majority of the Helderberg District lives further than 20km away from a District Park. Furthermore, the service coverage statistics at a district level have shown that the populations of the Khayelitsha, Mitchells Plain & Greater Blue Downs District are poorly served when considering the provision ratio of District Parks (12% in 2011 and 10% in 2032).

This means that, although the city has sufficient developed District Park space, there is a spatial mismatch of supply and demand, rather than an actual undersupply of District Park space; i.e. the spatial provision of District Parks does not align with density patterns.

In light of the metropolitan information above, Table X below further breaks down the service coverage statistics of parks in the Helderberg District. In 2011, the Helderberg District had approximately 239 Community Parks and no District Parks. It can be seen that Community Parks served approximately 62% of the population. In light of the complete lack of District Parks in the District, 0% of the population is served by a District Park.

The rapidly increasing population of and number of housing developments in the District will necessitate the development of new or optimisation of existing facilities. However, there is currently a significant gap in in qualitative information available on the quality and management of parks.
Table X: Number of people served and unserved by parks in the Helderberg District, 2011 (Updated Census, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park type</th>
<th>Unserved</th>
<th>Served</th>
<th>% Served</th>
<th>Total population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>84 646</td>
<td>135 684</td>
<td>62.43%</td>
<td>217 331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District parks</td>
<td>217 331</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>217 331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Required Facilities

5.3 Key Observations

5.4 Key Opportunities and Constraints

5.4.1 Opportunities

- 90% of the Helderberg District population lives within 5km of a municipal hall. These can form the centres of civic nodes, integrating other, mutually supporting social facilities to contribute to social development in the District.

- The vast majority of Helderberg’s population lives within 2km of either a municipal or school sports facility. The abundance of sports facilities can be integrated with the development of new parks to create more varied, active and safer recreational nodes.

5.4.2 Constraints

- There is a poor level of access to Grade R education.

- A relatively large proportion (12%) of the school-going-aged population is not served by schools. This appears to most likely be an issue of school capacity, rather than physical proximity of schools.

- The existing lack of educational capacity (see above) will likely be exacerbated by the District’s rapidly growing population (5.49% per annum).

- There is poor access to passive recreation. Only 62% of the Helderberg District population is served by community parks and the majority of the population lives more than 20km away from a district park.

- Between 2001 and 2016, the Helderberg District population has experienced rapid population growth at 5.49% per annum. If this trend continues, it will put significant additional pressure on the provision of new and optimisation of existing social facilities.