

What are the five main objectives of this proposed plan?

- The development of a co-produced vision for precinct
- Status quo analysis of the current situation to assist in setting the spatial vision for the study area
- To facilitate the optimal delivery of municipal and any other urban management services;
- To activate the public places and facilities created through the development by introducing place-making strategies; and
- To deepen the neighbourhood identity, assist in creating encouraging conditions for long-term private investment, as well as the establishment of social and economic programmes that benefit the local community

In the Corridors of Freedom plan, Melville was declared a Heritage Area and exempted from densification – why has this changed?

The Heritage assessment declares certain properties that are residential, institutional, commercial, and religious as having heritage significance, it did not declare all of Melville as a heritage area.

Are there similar plans for other areas such as Parkview, Greenside and Parkhurst?

Yes, they have existing Precinct plans.

What is the rationale behind defining a precinct area?

This is informed by Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act which sets out the various planning frameworks within municipal planning.

1. The City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality has the following strategic frameworks guiding development planning:

2. City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality Growth and Development Strategy 2040
3. City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality Spatial Development Framework
4. The Strategic Area Framework for Empire Perth Corridor
5. Regional B Spatial Development Framework 2010/11

A Precinct Plan becomes the lowest order of plan that focuses key proposals to achieve the development vision of an earmarked area.

Areas within Region B with Precinct Plans are Millpark and Westbury.

How was a decision reached on the currently defined precinct area?

The study area has been framed using major routes of movement and nodes of activity.

Although the Jhb City official present at the meeting said there is no plan(iii), if 7th and 4th are pedestrianized, two of the outcomes will be increased traffic and parking along streets other than 4th Avenue and 7th Street? Surely the restaurants and businesses on these streets need to be primarily responsible for their customers' parking?

There is no plan to pedestrianize 7th Street and 4th Avenue or any other interventions. The project is meant to facilitate a process where stakeholders determine desired yet feasible development solutions for the precinct.

Do they see more communes and business premises in Melville as being part of the inevitable outcome of this proposed plan?

Please refer to above answer

What is the purpose of consulting so widely?

We are legally obliged to facilitate a public participation process that is just; it has to be open to all interested and affected stakeholders.

It negates or minimises the investment property owners have made and the contribution we continue to make as rate payers and financial contributors to the suburb's restaurants and shops.

The purpose of the project is not to disadvantage stakeholders but ensure that all interested and affected stakeholders become empowered by the project.

Are they aware of previous traffic studies for example?

There have not been any other traffic studies other than the Household Travel Survey for the City of Johannesburg (2013)

Are they aware of previous plans to pedestrianise 7th Street?

No

There is nothing new in proposing closure of 7th Street, an idea previously rejected for the load and traffic jams the arterial roads suffer as a result.

There are no development proposals at this point of the project; the project aims to solicit these from consensus building from local stakeholders.

Already 27 Boxes has increased traffic and refuse for everyone who lives in 3rd Avenue and 4th Avenue, and 6th Street, which used to be a quiet street.

I would suggest workshops with property owners only as a first step before increasing the stakeholder representation. (How to make friends and influence them?)

We are open and willing to engage with the MRA and would be pleased to have it as a key and active stakeholder in the project.

How does the PP fit in with the Corridors? Corridors documents sent to me by Denver, not sure if it

was done by mistake but I thought Melville was supposed to be excluded;

Melville is one of the precincts within the Empire Perth Corridor. The Empire Perth Corridor covers a much broader geographic area defined along the BRT trunk route which starts on Victoria Avenue and Empire Road and ends Commando Road and Main Reef Road.

How do we as residents ensure that we are being listened to? It is said in the tender docs that public participation is vital - what does that mean?

The project depends on a robust public engagement process in order to achieve outcomes accepted by engaged stakeholders. There will be public meetings as well as workshop sessions held and other forms of engagement or communication outside of the meetings can be arranged with the project team.

Has the desk-top analysis been done?

The status quo analysis has been carried out; the first draft was presented at the public meeting held on 02 May 2017. Further inputs from stakeholders on the analysis are still welcome; a revised version will be presented at the next public meeting.

Widening and resurfacing of pavements and reducing parking in some area and increasing it in others - arrangements with schools and churches suggested - any contact made with them to date? What are their attitudes?

Yes, all organisations affected and interested will be engaged.

Informal traders to be accommodated - can this be done at 27 boxes? Necessary to widen pavements to have them on the pavements?

Proposals coming from stakeholders can be presented and deliberated in workshops.

Can we as residents have direct contact with the project leader, Charlotte van der Merwe?

The project manager from the JDA is Xolisile Sithole. The consultant team's project manager is Tobie Pretorius - 082 738 6800. Denver Hendriks from UrbanSoup is the project technical leader. Charlotte van der Merwe is the project reviewer.

Undertaking to protect Melville's existing character or portrait - how?

Proposals coming from stakeholders can be presented and deliberated in workshops.

Has the 3D model been handed over to client and may we see it?

This is a deliverable at the end of the project based on the vision set and agreed to by stakeholders.

Can we see the documents referred to on page 8/15?

Please clarify which documents you are referring to.

If you are referring to the reports on page 8 of 15 of the UrbanSoup section of the technical proposal; these are project deliverables and have therefore not been completed other than the Status Quo

Analysis which is still a draft. The dates were initial dates on which the consultant was expected to provide the documents as part of the project.

What exactly is the vision?

The vision has to be defined and set by stakeholders as part of the project.

Am I right that a PP plan has to be developed by the team and submitted to council who will then decide if they want to implement it or not? It is therefore not a given that the team's plan will be implemented (although likely)?

The Plan will be presented to and approved by Council.

Am I correct that the PP needs to be developed in line with the City's commitment to the SDF? As someone who has no idea of urban development - am I correct that the team needs to act as experts to give info and advice to council to set up a possible plan for future development that is in line with the city's vision for how development should take place?

Yes, all City policies need to be aligned.

How did we get to where we are – what is the history of this exercise? Please give us a timeline of city requests/RFP/EOI etc and the process that led to you being appointed?

A Request For Proposals was advertised on 02 September 2016 and closed on 16 September 2016, where submissions were opened in attendance of the public. A tender briefing was held on 09 September 2017 which was also open to interested consultants. The recommendation to have the team appointed was approved on 03 February 2017.

What is the overall objective/vision – e.g. is it transport access, densification, city improvement, new infrastructure, mixed residential/business development etc. We would like to see the guiding philosophy for this project.

The overall objective is to facilitate the development of a co-produced vision set by engaged stakeholders; the project team will only facilitate the process ensuring that it is not adverse to existing City policies outlined above as existing legislative and policy frameworks of the City and planning principles.

What research/studies have been done or are being used to guide the project?

As part of the project the project team is required to produce the following reports as the project develops through engagement:

1. Status Quo Analysis including
 - Spatial Study
 - Socio Economic Study
 - Transport and Traffic Study
 - Bulk Infrastructure analysis
2. Urban Design Guidelines
3. Urban Management Plan including

- Activation Plan
 - Socio – Economic Plan
4. Implementation plan

The project is being guided by existing City policies and research on best cases is being used to inform the process. This is only the second time (first was Grant Avenue Precinct Plan) that such an approach is being applied in the City, there aren't many similar contextual cases.

How have the capacity of municipal services such as water supply, sewage, refuse removal and power been taken account of. Will existing capacity be sufficient for the new project or is new capacity proposed. Has this been discussed with the relevant utilities and how are they on board with the project?

This will be addressed in the status quo as part of the Bulk Infrastructure analysis.

What have you actually proposed to the city. Please break this down by:

- Residential development
- Business development
- Restoration/rehabilitation of existing infrastructure
- Other land use
- Transport
- Green economy and environmental protection
- Green space and recreational facilities

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

What provision has been made for public transport?

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

What provision has been made for cycling?

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

What provision has been made for pedestrian access?

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

How will different transport modes be integrated with each other?

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

Are you planning to pedestrianize any parts of the suburb or surrounding areas? What models do you have for the impact this will have on other roads/routes/infrastructure?

There are no proposals; these are discussions that stakeholders need to present at workshops and meetings for further deliberation.

Please provide a detailed timeline for the whole project including immediate next steps

The precinct plan is programmed to be completed in September 2017, however there are variables that could change this date. The immediate steps are to engage with stakeholders. These engagements have been very fruitful to date, but the process requires more as we are following a participatory methodology suitable for broad discussions which will inform the development of the plan.

Please provide details of the consultation process. Who will be consulted and when, what is the nature of these consultations, and how will input from residents and other interested parties be taken account of?

These engagements have been very fruitful to date, but the process requires more as we are following a participatory methodology suitable for broad discussions which will inform the development of the plan. The following dates are key:

- Status quo presentation – done
- Brainstorming session – 27th of May 2017 – please join us
- Workshop of proposals out of Urban Design Guidelines – 24th of June 2017 (tentative)
- Public Meeting – 15th of July 2017 (tentative)
- Public Meeting – 21st of August 2017 (tentative)
- Public Meeting – 23rd of September 2017 (tentative)

The project team will endeavour to ensure that the MRA and other stakeholders are thoroughly and constantly informed of all processes of the project.

What is the approval and decision making process guiding the project?

Stakeholders will be responsible for approving components of the Plan through a guided and facilitated process by the project team. Upon completion of the Precinct Plan, the plan will be approved by the JDA and a report will be compiled presenting the Plan for approval to Council.

Is there a proper community participation strategy, and how has meaningful participation been conceived?

Please see dates provided above. Participation and engagement is not limited to the above listed platforms, the MRA is welcome to engage with the project team at any point reasonable.

The access routes for Main, 4th Avenue, 7th Street and 1st Avenue. How and for what reasons these streets has been identified. Is this due to the increased density planning or expectation.

No, it is not based on density planning. This was based on identifying major nodes of movement and activity in Melville.

This Precinct Plan initiative has been given the name "Melville UJ precinct plan". Why is UJ's name associated with this? The campus is not even included in the study area. We require details of all communications and discussions with UJ and the developers who purport to bring solutions in the form of residential developments. Letters, minutes of all meetings and all proposals made by UJ and all developers privy to such discussions, are required. We would also appreciate a list of every entity whom the committee has identified as a stakeholder in this process. UJ has for many years taken the view that its students are entitled to be housed in communes in the surrounding suburbs, and this has led to an uncontrollable and devastating influx of students and non-students into Brixton, Crosby, Auckland Park, Westdene and Rossmore. Residents have had to shoulder the burden of noise, trash, increased criminal activity, illegal land use and overcrowding as a result of such attitudes.

The name of the plan will be Melville Precinct Plan.

It is alarming to hear that discussions have been held with UJ, who should be dealing with the increase in its student numbers itself, instead of expecting surrounding suburbs to sacrifice their peace, quiet and safety.

They have been engaged as one of the many stakeholders of the project as the process/project needs to be as open and transparent as possible.

The **Corridors of Freedom** engagements, which took place over an extended period of time, included Melville. The final blueprint for developments, including densification housing, were published at Marks Park about 2 months ago. Certain parts of South Western Melville were affected, while it was deemed unnecessary to intervene in the remaining parts of the suburb.

In light of the above final determinations, upon what basis do you now consider it necessary to facilitate further changes in our suburb relating to, among other things, "strategic densification" when, upon your own admission, there have been no studies performed in respect of the need and desirability of further interventions in our suburb?

The project has not presented densification proposals.

Only the central and western parts of Melville are included in the study area. We record the fact that we were advised at our meeting with the precinct plan committee last week, that this does not mean that the remainder of the suburb will be the subject of further precinct plan initiatives.

At present we have only been in communication with the precinct plan committee and the JDA. Which other City departments and officials are meant to be involved in, and privy to this project? We think of the JRA, Land Use, City Parks, the Ward Councillor, Environmental Health, JMPD, Development Planning and Graham De Kock as well as the Section 79 committee and Herman Pienaar of City Transformation as examples.

City Transformation is involved in the project as well as all other City departments and Entities and Ward governance through the Region B Citizen Relationship and Urban Management office.

We were also advised that the residents of Melville are but one of many "focus groups" to be involved in this project. It was specifically asked of you whether the residents had any more say than

any other group or individual. Your answer was vague. Melville is primarily a residential suburb, and the residents are by far the most numerous group, with the most to lose if there is irresponsible intervention in the suburb. We require unequivocal confirmation that our sentiments and suggestions will enjoy the benefit of proportional preeminence in this process. Any approach to the contrary would not be a true reflection of the needs and desires of the majority of the community.

Can residents veto your final recommendations?

The residents are requested to be actively engaged in the entire project where they can make their inputs and be part of co-producing the plan to reflect their best intentions and solutions.

Why is there so much emphasis on pedestrianizing parts of the suburb? The vast majority of Melville residents need to get to their various work destinations by using their cars. That fact will not change unless you intend to reconstitute the profile of Melville residents to those who do not use cars. The Raa vaa route into the CBD has been remodeled so that it creates severe inconvenience to car users.

There are no proposals for the precinct.

Is it possible to proceed with this project without it leaving at least some casualties behind in the form of ruined property values, artificially altered suburban character, disruptive densified developments, etc? If not, who are the individuals most likely to have to compromise?

The project does not aim to compromise any sector of the community; hence the involvement of all stakeholders, interested and affected, is required in order to ensure that everyone is well represented.