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Section 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background, Study Area and Brief

Significant work has been commissioned by the South African National Parks (SANParks) for the Cape Peninsula National Park (CPNP) during the past few years, including the CPNP IEMS Management Policy (2000) and the Strategic Management Plan (2000 – 2004). Specifically, the Conservation Development Framework for the Cape Peninsula National Park (March 2001) has identified certain sites as important ‘gateways’ and ‘visitor nodes’. The Signal Hill lookout site in particular, is identified an important visitor node. However, despite the high visitor numbers, this site is in dire need of attention due to the lack of facilities, and crime and “grime”. Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road are identified as a strategic gateway into the Cape Peninsula National Park. However, visitor facilities in this area, other than those at the Lower Cableway, are poor or virtually non-existent, while some of the area is degraded. Hence, this very accessible, and significant recreation and tourism component of the CPNP is not fulfilling its vast potential.

To address these problems, and realise the potentials inherent in the area, SANParks has appointed a consortium “Orion Planning” to compile a Development Framework for the entire study area, as well as more detailed precinct plans for specific nodes. The study area consists of Signal Hill, Lion’s Head, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road, down to the urban edge. It includes the Lion battery, Magazine site, Kloof Nek, the lower cableway station, and van Riebeeck Park (See Figure 1).

The SANParks brief outlined the purpose of the study as follows:

‘The overall purpose of the Development Framework and Precinct Plans is to determine the most suitable way to upgrade the facilities within the planning area, to provide for improved access to and within it, and to safeguard and enhance the key conservation values. The Framework will guide the future conservation and development of the area, provide the basis for precinct plans for each of the development nodes and provide guidelines on the proposals for the movement and transport of visitors to and between the various sites. It will also provide the information to enable SANParks to release opportunities for private concerns to obtain concessions in the area.’

1.2 Orion Planning Consortium

The Orion Planning Consortium was appointed by SANParks on the 31st January 2002 for the compilation of the Signal Hill, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road Development Framework and Precinct Plans.

Orion Planning consists of a ‘core team’ of: Chittenden Nicks de Villiers, MLH Architects and Planners, and OvP Landscape Architects. The core team will be responsible for the project co-ordination and management, town planning, urban design and landscaping component of the project.

The core team is supported by a ‘specialist team’ of consultants, who will provide the following input: traffic, transport and civils (Ninham Shand), public participation (Chand Environmental and Ninham Shand), viability assessments (LDV), cultural and historical (Aikman and Associates), tourism and marketing (KPMG) and environmental management input (Ninham Shand).
The Orion Planning Consortium has a wealth of experience in compiling development frameworks, detailed precinct plans, and implementing them in sensitive environments. The team also has a close working relationship and understanding of each other, having previously worked together on numerous occasions.

1.3 Product, Process & Public Participation

The Consortium is required to compile a ‘development framework’ for the study area and precinct-level development plans for each visitor site, based on existing documentation and available knowledge, and to test the proposals through a process of public participation.

The ‘development framework’ is to formulate policies, principles and proposals dealing with the following aspects: the environmental system; the economic and social development system; the services and infrastructure system; the spatial system; and the institutional system. The linkage of the area with the city is vitally important, and transport and access to various visitor nodes and linkages between them is to be studied.

Precinct plans will be compiled for significant nodes or collections of nodes. The precinct plans are to contain broad proposals for the upgrading and rehabilitation of facilities, providing guidelines for potential uses, and to the treatment of historical and landscape aspects.

The product is to be informed primary by the CPNP’s IEM Management Policy (2000), Strategic Management Plan (2000-2004), and the Conservation Development Framework (2001), as well as by the numerous studies that have been undertaken in the recent past (See section 3.0, below).

The Orion Planning Consortium’s methodology is outlined in Figure 2. The process has been designed with the draft development framework being prepared within the first few months of the programme. This will in turn allow for the precinct plan areas to be identified, and work to commence on visitor node proposals.

The public participation process, in the form of focus group, public meetings and open days, is indicated on the methodology diagram. It should however be recognised that the public participation process is flexible, and subject to the nature of the public response to the project, may need to be amended or extended as planning progresses.
Section 2. LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

A Review of the Legal Framework Applicable to the Development of an Integrated Environmental Management System for the Cape Peninsula National Park and Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment has been prepared by Cliffe Dekker Fuller Moore Inc. (February 2000).

The report reviewed the range of legislation that pertains to the Park, including: international law, conventions and treaties; the National Parks Act; the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa; National, Provincial and Local legislation, ordinances and by-laws.

A number of pieces of legislation are very briefly summarized, below, (from Cliffe, Dekker Fuller Moore Inc., February 2000), and especially their implications for SANParks and the current study:

2.1 National Parks Act 57 of 1976 (as amended by the National Parks Act Amendment Act 106 of 1999)

The Cape Peninsula National Park was declared by notice of the Minister of DEAT in GC18916 GN739 of 29 May 1998.

In terms of section 12(1) of the Act, SANP is charged to ‘control, manage and maintain the parks’.

Cliffe Dekker Fuller Moore Inc. (February 2000) conclude that ‘Provincial legislation and local authority by-laws will generally be applicable within a proclaimed national park. There may be specific instances where, as a result of the provisions of the Constitution, National Parks Act or other statute, the application of provincial legislation and local authority by-laws is expressly or by necessary implication excluded. In particular, this would apply to measures that relate to nature conservation.’

2.2 National Environmental Management Act 107 of 1998

The National Environmental management Act 107 of 1998 (NEMA) states that its purpose is ‘To provide for co-operative environmental governance by establishing principles for decision-making on matters affecting the environment, institutions that will promote co-operative governance and procedures for co-ordinating environmental functions exercised by organs of state; and to provide for matters connected therewith.’

The principles articulated in section 2 include:

(1) Environmental management must place people and their needs at the forefront of its concern and serve their physical, psychological, developmental, cultural and social interests equitably.

(2) Development must be ‘socially, environmentally and economically sustainable’.

For activities ‘that may significantly affect’ the environment, it will be necessary for SANP to comply with the minimum procedural requirements for investigation and assessment set out in the act. These procedures will be binding on SANP regardless of whether or not the activity is one to which the environmental impact assessment regulations promulgated in terms of the Environment Conservation Act apply.
2.3 Environment Conservation Act 73 of 1989

The act has been largely repealed by NEMA.

Until such time as regulations are published in terms of NEMA, the regulation GN R1183 GG18261 of 5 September 1997, remains applicable.

As these regulations are part of national legislation they are binding on SANParks. However, in terms of s28A a government institution may in writing apply to the Minister or a competent authority, with the furnishing of reasons, for exemption from the application of any provision of any regulation or directive that has been promulgated in terms of the act.

2.4 National Heritage Resources Act 25 of 1999

The Natural Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) has repealed the National Monuments Act (Act 28 of 1969) as well as a section of the ECA.

Table Mountain was declared a national monument in 1958 under the Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act 4 of 1934.

The NHRA is expressly binding on the State and local authorities and, it would appear by implication, on organs of state including SANP. It provides for the replacement of the NMC by a heritage resource authority and for a provincial equivalent which may exercise certain powers over areas of the Park. The Act identifies objects and places of historical and cultural significance for present and future generations as part of the ‘national estate’. These include landscapes and the protection of rare or endangered aspects of South Africa’s natural heritage.

SANP is obliged to maintain the resource under its control according to standards and procedures that will be set out in regulations prepared by the national heritage resources authority, to submit to it an annual report on the maintenance and development of those resources and to otherwise comply with prescribed procedures, particularly with regarding to planning, ie. s9(3)(e) ‘not take any action that adversely affects such a resource unless the authority concerned is satisfied that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the taking of that action and that all measures that can reasonably be taken to minimise the adverse effect will be taken; and s9(3)(f) ‘at the initiation of the planning process of the project, or at least 90 days before taking any action that could adversely affect such heritage resource, whichever is the greater, inform SAHRA of the proposed action and give them a reasonable opportunity to consider and comment on it’.

The Act also provides for a heritage resource authority to enter into an agreement with a conservation body to provide for the conservation, improvement or presentation of a heritage resource. Such an agreement with the SANP may be contemplated in order to achieve a level of unified management of the area.

2.5 Heads of Agreement in Respect of the Allocation of Local Authority Land in the Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment for the Purpose of Establishing a National Park (April 1998)

The Heads of Agreement is a legal document, entered into between the Cape Metropolitan Council, the Cape Town Municipality, the South Peninsula Municipality, and South African National Parks.
In May 1998, following negotiations between SANParks and public authorities with land holdings in the CPPNE, the CPNP was formally established as one of 19 national parks in South Africa. In accordance with a Heads of Agreement with the Cape Metropolitan Council (CMC), South Peninsula Municipality (SPM) and the Cape Town City Council (CCC), SANParks undertook to manage large portions of local authority land within the CPPNE as a National Park while ensuring ongoing access by local authorities to essential services provided through the Park.

The Heads of Agreement also promotes co-operative governance between SANParks and local authorities towards meeting their respective management objectives. The recent establishment of the unicity, the City of Cape Town, should facilitate co-operative governance as the CPNP now only has one surrounding local authority.

Section 14. concerns Integrated Environmental Management. ‘All proposed future infrastructural development within the park, including buildings and roads, by any of the parties to this agreement shall be subjected to integrated environmental management processes and shall be effected in accordance with sound environmental management practices...’.

Section 15. concerns future infrastructure. 15.1 states that ‘The South African National Parks shall obtain the prior written consent of the relevant local authority, which consent shall not be unreasonably withheld, for the erection upon any land within the park, including the land forming the subject matter of this agreement, of any building or ancillary infrastructure or facility.’ 15.3 states that ‘In order to ensure that future buildings comply with the provisions of the National Building Regulations,: (i). The relevant local authority shall, as agent of the South African National Parks, scrutinise all plans for buildings to be erected within the park for compliance with the National Building Regulations and advise the South African National Parks accordingly;’. 15.4 states ‘it is recorded that the provisions of this clause shall not apply to land within the park, other than land forming the subject matter of this agreement, insofar as it may be ultra vires the Act to proclaim that other land to be a national park and include it in the land defined in Schedule 1 to the Act whilst the provisions of this clause apply.’

Section 16. concerns roads. 16.1 states that SANParks ‘shall be responsible for the management and maintenance of existing and future private roads and closed roads upon the land’. 16.2 states that ‘unless otherwise agreed in regard to specific parts thereof, the relevant local authority or other organ of state shall be responsible for the maintenance of public roads and statutory roads reserves within the future national park’.

Section 17. deals with access charges. 17.1 states that ‘the South African National Parks shall obtain the prior written consent of the relevant local authority to the levying of charges by the South African National Parks for access by members of the public to those areas of the land where access is currently allowed by the relevant local authority at no charge.'
Section 3. REVIEW OF RELATED REPORTS AND STUDIES

Numerous planning, design and engineering studies have been commissioned by SANParks and the previous custodians of the study area in the recent past.

These studies have resulted in the compilation of a vast amount of knowledge, ideas, guidelines and policy. The more significant of these reports, from the perspective of the Signal Hill, Kloof Nek and Lion’s Head Development Framework and Precinct Plan study, are reviewed below, with the view to informing the preparation of the draft Development Framework and subsequent Precinct Plans.

3.1 Conservation Development Framework for the Cape Peninsula National Park (March 2001)

Client : SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park
Consultant : Settlement Planning Services
Date and Ref. : March 2001, 1298/R3.3
Study area : Terrestrial environment of the Cape Peninsula.
Status : Approved by the SANParks Board

Rationale and summary of findings:

The CPNP is world renowned for its unique flora and fauna, spectacular scenery, diverse recreational activities and deep cultural heritage. The Park is situated within a populous metropolitan area, and attracts millions of visitors each year. Managing the Park on a sustainable basis poses special challenges.

The CDF seeks to address these challenges by setting out a clear spatial framework to guide and co-ordinate conservation and development activities in and around the Park. The CDF builds on previous studies that addressed the issue of how to reconcile the multi-purpose use of the Park. The CDF takes the CPNP Management Policy as its point of departure and makes proposals for an overall spatial framework for the Park.

Following the proclamation of the Park in 1998, CPNP officials consulted widely with the community of Cape Town to put in place a Management Policy and Strategic Management Plan. The need to prepare an overarching spatial framework for the Park was identified and prioritised in this consultation process. The resultant CDF takes the Management Policy as its point of departure and makes proposals for an overall spatial framework for the Park.

In accordance with Strategic Environmental Assessment guidelines, opportunities and constraints that the environment places on prospective tourism and recreation development have been assessed – allowing the cumulative effects of tourism and recreation pressure.

The CDF incorporates proposals with respect to: planning principles; the demarcation of use zones; the rationalisation of visitor sites; and guidelines for the sustainable management of the Park / City interface.

Planning principles include: spatial continuity of ecological systems; containment of urban encroachment into nature or heritage areas; protection of sensitive habitats from intrusive impacts; celebration of heritage sites, places and areas as a community resource; integrated conservation management of natural, cultural and scenic resources; visitor facility provision in line with needs and preferences of visitors; clustering of visitor facilities at accessible sites; channeling visitor access through hierarchy of entry points; differentiating level of facility provision according to scale of patronage; scale and form of visitor facility provision in harmony with
‘sense of place’ and environmental and social carrying capacities; precaution in facility provision where uncertainty over impacts; monitoring of cumulative impacts; and maintaining ecological corridors from Park through urban areas.

The CDF’s Use Zones serve the following purposes: reflect the range of activities and experiences which should be accommodated within different functional areas; provide specifications to management on what are the desired resource and social conditions; provide a means of ensuring overall land use compatibility between the natural and built environment; and provides a point of departure for a co-ordinated approach to management of the Peninsula’s built and natural environments.

The CDF utilises the Use Zones as proposed in 1994 (See 3.2, above). The use zones relate to the quality of human experience, as follows:

*Remote Zones:* make up the core natural areas of the Cape Peninsula, where the impact and presence of people should remain subservient to that of nature. Management should protect and rehabilitate these pristine areas, and provide appropriate recreational and educational opportunities.

*Quite Zones:* is the buffer between the built and natural environments. Management should accommodate a range of recreation activities, focussing on managing impacts.

*Low Intensity Leisure Zones:* are accessible, safe, natural areas, where leisure and recreation activities occur. These areas, which comprise modified landscapes, are foci for a range of activities, so as to reduce pressure on more sensitive Quite and Remote zones.

*High Intensity Leisure Zones:* are similar to the Low Intensity Leisure Zone, but accommodate concentrated human activity. These zones are accessible by motor vehicle, and provide access into other zones. A range of infrastructure and facilities could be provided in this zone (eg. braai facilities, restaurants). Higher order and large scale tourist facilities should preferably be accommodated within urban areas.

The CDF classifies the Park’s visitor sites in terms of:

*Scale of Patronage:* High volume (>100000 visits per annum), medium volume (35000 – 100000 visits) and low volume (<35000 visits).

*Role of the Site:* Destinations (tourist sites), transit (points of embarkation), leisure (places of relaxation), and mixed use (serve a variety of purposes).

*Entry Point:* For visitor management purposes, entry points have been identified.

*Ecological and Cultural characteristics:* Ecological sensitivity and cultural significance was rated.

*Patrons:* Sites were assessed wrt usage be tourists versus locals.

Based on the above criteria, the CDF makes specific proposals for all visitor sites in terms of their current and potential role. Development of new visitor sites is not seen to be appropriate. The CDF proposes that existing sites be rationalised.
The CDF formulated proposals for extending the Use Zones from the CPPNE into the urban area. Whilst the Park has no jurisdiction over surrounding land, this is intended to stimulate debate on how the Park / City interface should be managed. The CDF delineates the following Use Zones:

**Agriculture:** Are landscapes of economic, scenic and cultural/historical significance. The management objective is to protect and retain these areas as productive green spaces along the urban fringe.

**Peri-Urban:** Are mixed use areas, ie. small holdings and institutional facilities of a rural character that fall inside the Urban Edge. The primary management function is to retain their rural qualities in the face of intense urban development pressures.

**Urban:** The primary management objective is to ensure an equitable, efficient and environmentally sustainable urban form.

The CDF incorporates specific management guidelines for these zones aimed at the sustainable management of the Park / City interface.

The CDF is a framework for planning, not a plan for implementation. Implementation will be achieved through: local area plans; environmental management plans; the Heritage Resources Management Plan; environmental management programmes and Codes of Conduct for different recreation activities; and ongoing environmenatl and visitor management.

The Lower Cable Station, Kloof Nek and Signal Hill Lookout sites are classified as ‘high volume’ visitor sites, with more than 100 000 visits per annum. The Lion Battery, Magazine site, Lion’s Head Summit and Van Riebeeck Park sites are classified as ‘medium volume’ visitor sites, with between 35 000 and 100 000 visits per annum.

The ‘management action’ and ‘priority’ of the sites are defined as follows:

- **Lower Cable Station:** Manage as per EMP; Priority low.
- **Kloof Nek:** Rehabilitate existing facilities with possible new facilities/uses; Priority high.
- **Signal Hill Lookout:** Upgrade facilities, parking and security; Priority high.
- **Lion Battery:** Rehabilitate existing facilities with possible new facilities/uses; Priority medium.
- **Magazine Site:** Rehabilitate existing facilities with possible new facilities/uses; Priority medium.
- **Lion’s Head Summit:** Compile EMPR and manage from base to summit; Priority medium.
- **Van Riebeeck Park:** Rehabilitate existing facilities with possible new facilities/uses; Priority high.


**Client:** SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park  
**Consultant:** Common Ground Consulting  
**Date and Ref.:** 2000  
**Study area:** Cape Peninsula National Park  
**Status:** Approved by the SANParks Board

Rationale and summary of findings:
An Integrated Environmental Management Plan (IEMS) has been developed for the CPNP. The Strategic Management Plan (SMP) is an integral part of the overarching IEMS. The SMP indicates where the Park Management Team intends to focus its efforts over the next five years. It does not identify every operation required in terms of the Policy or by crises that may arise, but prioritises proactive strategies. The SMP, together with the Management Policy, provide a framework for action.

A set of Key Result Areas has been prioritised. Each Key Result Area is directed by a strategic objective for which strategies have been developed. Each strategy will be implemented through a set of actions and will result in a number of deliverables. The implementation of the strategies by those tasked with responsibilities for implementation will be monitored using indicators within a set timeframe. Each of these elements of the Key Result Areas are dealt with in detail in the report.

Key Action Areas are: Park establishment; proactive conservation planning and development; research and monitoring; invasive and non-invasive alien plant and animal management; fire management; cultural heritage resources management; community partnerships and benefits; cooperative governance; financial sustainability; visitor management and services; commercial operations management; and institutional development.


Client : SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park
Consultant : Common Ground Consulting
Date and Ref. : 2000
Study area : Cape Peninsula National Park
Status : Approved by the SANParks Board

Rationale and summary of findings:

The Management Policy for the CPNP was prepared as part of the process of developing an Integrated Environmental Management System, underwent a comprehensive public participation process.

The Management Policy, together with relevant national policies and legislation, provide the overarching framework for managing the Park and guide the development of the Strategic Management Plan, Annual Plans and Implementation and Operation.

Regular review of the Management Policy will enable the Park Management to respond to changing contexts and responsibilities.

Guiding principles include: custodianship, common heritage, transparency in management, duty of care, sustainability, holism, intrinsic value, participation and partnerships, equitable access, precaution, empowerment and transformation, co-operative governance, and excellence in management and service.

Eleven policy themes are outlined, together with goals, objectives and policy statements: Park establishment and sustainability; biodiversity; the park community, cultural heritage; conservation planning and development; visitor management; park-metropolitan area interface; awareness, education and training; research, monitoring and information management; legal and institutional requirements; and managing operational impacts.
The overarching goal of each of the themes are as follows (for detailed objectives and policy statements, see the report):

**Goal 1.** To establish and consolidate the CPNP and ensure its long-term ecological, economic and social sustainability.

**Goal 2.** To ensure the long-term conservation and rehabilitation of the biodiversity of the Park.

**Goal 3.** To build a Park Community, including the staff of the CPNP, users and stakeholders, local, provincial and national government, that works together for, and benefits equitably from, the long-term sustainability of the Park.

**Goal 4.** To facilitate the conservation of cultural heritage through the expression of diverse cultural identities in the Park.

**Goal 5.** To ensure that physical conservation planning and development of the Park maintains and enhances the integrity of ecological, cultural and scenic resources, enables the financial sustainability of the Park, and is integrated and co-ordinated with the development and planning of the surrounding Cape Metropolitan Area.

**Goal 6.** To provide a unique experience and world-class service and facilities to all users and visitors by developing a visitor management strategy that ensures the conservation of the natural and cultural resources of the Park.

**Goal 7.** To manage the interface between the Park and the Cape Metropolitan Area.

**Goal 8.** To provide staff, stakeholders, visitors and users with sufficient information and capacity in order that they can undertake their activities within the framework of the policies and plans for the Park.

**Goal 9.** To ensure that the management of the Park is guided by the application of relevant research and monitoring, resulting in information that is readily accessible to managers and relevant stakeholders.

**Goal 10.** To enable compliance with legal and policy pertaining to the Park.

**Goal 11.** To ensure that operational impacts on the environment are avoided or minimised.

### 3.4 Cape Peninsula National Park: Signal Hill, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road – Phase One Baseline Study, Synthesis Report (October 2000)

**Client**: SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park  
**Consultant**: Bernard Oberholzer Landscape Architect + Environmental Planner  
**Date and Ref.**: October 2000, Draft 3  
**Study area**: Covers mainly the CPPNE areas of Signal Hill, Lion’s Head, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road, down to the urban edge. It includes the Lion Battery, Magazine Site, Kloof Nek, and Lower Cable Way Station, but excludes the Camps Bay Glen and van Riebeek Park.  
**Status**: No official status  
**Rationale and summary of findings:**
SANParks identified Signal Hill, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road as requiring urgent planning attention, as this area experiences the most intense and complex activity in the CPNP. Specific issues to be addressed included: uncoordinated access, traffic congestion, parking problems, inadequate services / facilities, criminal activity, degraded historical buildings, infrastructure and landscape, invasive vegetation, linkage between access / destination points, interface between city and mountain. The brief included the following: identification of appropriate study area; base mapping in digital form; summary of relevant plans and policies; review and update of the 1993 Signal Hill and Lion’s Head Report; detailed site analysis of infrastructure, biophysical features, user patterns, land uses and activities; analysis of the history, archaeology and architecture of the area; identification of the need for further specialist studies; evaluation of the unique character and significance of the area; initial constraints and opportunities analysis to identify implications and guidelines for planning.

Planning guidelines: issues that need to be addressed in future planning:

Geology and Hydrology: Development should avoid areas susceptible to landslides and rockfalls. Paths, roads and development should fit in with the ‘grain’ of the land. Roads along contours should be avoided where they intercept groundwater flow and require large cuts and fill. Preference should be given to utilizing already disturbed areas, so as not to disturb pristine areas. Generally avoid areas with poor founding conditions. Quarries could be used for clean fill, followed by rehabilitation and landscaping.

Climate: Cooler east and south-facing slopes are more sheltered and less fire-prone, and are more comfortable for trails. Ridgelines are more wind-exposed and less suitable for development of facilities. Where facilities are provided, they should include measures to improve human comfort, such as shade, wind protection and rain shelter.

Vegetation: All natural vegetation should be accorded high priority conservation status. Invasive species should be eradicated / controlled (eg. Kikuyu). Development should be avoided on drier renosterveld slopes which are considered highly sensitive and subject to erosion, because of their lower plant cover and slow ability to recover after disturbance or fire. Granite outcrops with unique plant species and plant assemblages, which are sensitive to trampling, should be avoided in the design of trails, viewpoints and other facilities. Development should generally be confined to the perimeter of natural areas to avoid fragmentation of ecosystems. Riparian vegetation and indigenous forests are sensitive and should be conserved. Development should be avoided within 15m of intermittent streams and within 25m of perennial streams. Heavily disturbed sites such as the dump site above the Bo-Kaap, and the Lion Battery are less sensitive to development. Natural areas could be used for low-impact recreation and tourism, as well as environmental education, and appropriate facilities provided for visitors in areas of low sensitivity. Gums, which are an erosion hazard, should be phased out and preferably replaced with indigenous species common to the region. Vegetation along the urban edge should ideally offer amenity, and protection from the frequent fires in the area. The stone pines in the Glen, below Kloof Nek, above the Bo-Kaap and at the start of Tafelberg Road, should not be removed as these have visual, historical and recreational value. Rehabilitation of eroded and degraded slopes and eradication of alien vegetation should be linked to the education of the public. The area could be used as an educational resource by universities and technikons, to provide the necessary research for the park managers.

Visual and Scenic: Because of the scenic importance of the area, and new development, roads or structures within the study area should be subject to a visual impact assessment. Areas of high visibility, particularly those where structures would intrude on the skyline, such as the Signal Hill summit, should be avoided, unless satisfactory mitigatory measures are introduced. Development should generally be confined to the periphery of
the nature area, such as the Magazine Site, to retain the wilderness integrity of the Park on the upper slopes as far as possible. Existing nodes with buildings, and available infrastructure, should be used for development where possible, such as the Kloof Nek Forest Station. Gateway locations should be reinforced and upgraded to improve the visual image and amenity level of the Park, such as Kloof Nek. Historical sites should be restored, and structures recycled, where appropriate, for new uses to optimize the attraction value of these sites, such as the Lion Battery.

_Cultural Landscape:_ Any future development should be preceded by a detailed archaeological field study. Ephemeral sites should be protected in terms of the Heritage Resources Act. Ruined farm buildings, old military installations, religious sites, water reservoirs and associated `rural’ sites and works within the study area, which are of significance, should be protected, and upgraded, where appropriate. The signalling stations established on the summit of Lion’ Head and Signal Hill have historical interest, and should be conserved. A landscape framework for the urban-wilderness interface, with strategic gateways and pivotal recreational/tourist places, should be included in future planning for the Park. Targeted research on themes / sites about which little is known, should be undertaken.

_Traffic and Transportation:_ Effective management and control of traffic and parking operations should be implemented, to address parking congestion during peak times on Tafelberg Road and at the Signal Hill parking area. Controlled access and management of vehicles, especially during special events, should be used to provide emergency vehicles swift access to the whole precinct. Rationalisation of lay-bys for viewing should be considered, and the surface treatment of parking areas improved, particularly on Signal Hill.

_Existing Services:_ Except for Kloof Nek, most of Signal Hill has little or no services, and consideration should be given to provide basic services, as an essential part of the visitor infrastructure. Where new facilities and services are provided, these should serve as a model in terms of appropriate technology and environmental sustainability.

_Visitor Facilities:_ Given the large numbers of visitors, together with the national and international importance of the area, the upgrading of facilities, management and security should be accorded a high priority. The study area should be seen as the front door of the entire Cape Peninsula National Park. Kloof Nek, as the main gateway, and Signal Hill Lookout as the main destination, should both be seen as priority sites.

3.5 Peninsula Urban Edge Study (2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>City of Cape Town: CMC Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>VKE Engineers and Planners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Ref.</td>
<td>June 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>The entire Cape Peninsula, from Cape Point in the south to Signal Hill in the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Adopted as a policy document by the City of Cape Town, and has been submitted to the Provincial Government: Western Cape for approval as a 4(6) structure plan in terms of the LUPO.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale and summary of findings:

In view of the ever increasing development pressures and the associated low gross urban density in the CMA, the MSDF identifies the need for the establishment of a detailed metropolitan-wide urban edge. The objectives of this edge are to protect the valuable agricultural, natural and cultural/historic resources and promote appropriate densification.
The terms of reference required: the definition of the 20 year, cadastrally defined, outer edge of urban development; the identification of management zones; and the formulation of appropriate policies and guidelines for the management of land use on both sides of the urban edge line.

Urban edge informants included: the geophysical environment; biophysical ecological environment; river & wetland systems; infrastructure location & capacity; land use & related patterns; demographic & population profiles & trends; legal, planning & land ownership situation; socio-cultural & historic environment; and visual resource analysis.

Management policies: The sustainability of the urban edge is dependent on the control and management of the transition areas, ie. the Urban Transition Zone and the Non-Urban Zone.

Urban Transition Zone (UTZ): Refers to an area inside the Urban Edge within which all development is to be controlled by a set of policies. Ideally this area should be managed as a Special Area Zoning into the relevant Zoning Scheme. Policy proposals are recommended for this zone with respect to: densification; open space linkages; development on steep slopes; landscaping and architecture; provision of services and infrastructure; stormwater management; public land; fire protection; scenic quality; natural systems and historical areas; small holdings; incentives; and scenic routes. Specific policies for the UTZ component of the study area are:

- **Policy 2**: The average planned gross density of urban development that exists or is committed in the UTZ must not be increased. Lower gross densities are recommended where enhanced development rights are granted. Higher densities can be considered subject to approved studies to the satisfaction of the Local Authority.
- **Policy 4(a)**: No urban development to take place on slopes steeper than 1:4.
- **Policy 5**: Special attention must be given in the processing of architectural and landscaping proposals in the UTZ to create an attractive zone as a transition between urban and rural areas.
- **Policy 9**: Appropriate fire protection measures against veld fires must be compiled and applied to all new structures in the UTZ. Owners of existing structures should also be encouraged to install fire protection measures.
- **Policy 10(a)**: Developments, which would have an adverse effect on the scenic quality of this zone, should not be approved.
- **Policy 11(b)**: All invasive vegetation that is threatening indigenous plant communities should be eradicated.
- **Policy 13**: So as to achieve a desirable land use density and distribution and to reserve land for conservation, land development incentives should be negotiated with owners/developers.

Non-Urban Zone (NUZ): Refers to an area beyond the Urban Edge. Policy proposals are recommended for this zone with respect to the following: tradeoffs; rehabilitation; development; public access; agriculture; forestry areas; and integration. Specific policies for the NUZ component of the study area are:

- **Policy 17**: Disturbed natural habitats must be rehabilitated and may not be accepted as motivation to permit urban development. Requirements pertaining to the eradication of invasive vegetation and the rehabilitation of disturbed areas must be imposed on the owner.
• **Policy 19:** Opportunity for access to natural areas should remain and access routes should be managed to be in harmony with their carrying capacity. The provision of adequate public facilities are acceptable and must be appropriately located, designed and maintained.

### 3.6 Draft Scenic Drive Network (November 2001)

**Client** : City of Cape Town  
**Consultant** : MCA Urban and Environmental Planners  
**Date and Ref.** : November 2001, Volume 3  
**Study area** : Scenic Drives routes within the CMA  
**Status** : No official status

**Rationale and summary of findings:**

The Scenic Drive Network study consists of three volumes. Volume 1: Study Report proposed that scenic routes be assessed and designated in terms of intrinsic qualities such as: views and experiences of natural and cultural landscapes, traverse areas of scenic quality, or provide linkages between major scenic, historical and recreational points or areas of interest. Strategies to protect and enhance scenic drives were proposed.

Volume 2: Route Description and Analysis included a description, analysis and assessment of each scenic route in terms of the following criteria of significance: degree of significance; visual quality; historical/socio-political/archaeological qualities; botanical and geological qualities; range of experience; intermodal qualities; points of attraction; network completion; level of convenience; and grade.

The brief for Volume 3: Assessment and Evaluation of S1 and S2 Routes Identification of Projects, Programmes and Management Policies was to: focus on an assessment of the key issues and concerns and the identification of routes requiring priority intervention, and the identification of programmes, projects, remedial measures and relevant management guidelines.

Tafelberg Road, Signal Hill Road and Kloof Road and Kloof Nek Road are assessed in some detail according to: intrinsic qualities; policy/land use/control issues; environmental issues; economic issues; transportation issues; and existing policy. Projects and programmes are proposed, along with management policies/plans. The management policies/plans for each road are outlined below:

- **Tafelberg Road (Kloofnek to end Tafelberg Road)**
  ‘Prepare Tafelberg Road Site Development Framework. The under-utilised parking at the foot of Tafelberg Road needs to be examined to determine how this can be integrated more efficiently to reduce parking pressure at the Lower Cableway Station. A traffic management plan for this route with an emphasis on the parking issue needs to be formulated. Investigate the feasibility of a viewing station where this route terminates. Large shade trees should be re-established along this route to recreate previously enjoyed visual and shade amenity. Particular emphasis should be on the sidings/stop-over points. All mature exotic trees along this route, or visible from the road, require protection. Management of this route as well as Signal Hill in terms of an overall development framework.’

- **Signal Hill Road (Kloof Nek to major viewing site)**
  ‘Signal Hill Site Development Framework. Improve tourist facilities at the Signal Hill Lookout Point. This should include the provision of ablution facilities and determining the feasibility of commercial facilities such as a restaurant. Consider establishing a secondary major view site along this route. Upgrade picnic facilities
and paths. The scenic significance of this route requires that urgent attention be given to develop and improve the tourist amenities and facilities along this route within the context of the CDF. The development framework for the area should address aspects relating to safety, ablution facilities, minor access roads and formalisation/improvement of parking facilities, picnic facilities and paths. Environmental interpretative signage is also required.’

- **Kloof Road (Kloof Nek to Queens and Victoria Roads)**
  ‘Departure applications that could result in reducing views from this route should not be approved. Opportunities for locating additional view points/stop-over sites need to be investigated.’

- **Kloof Nek Road (Kloof Nek to Burnside Road)**
  ‘Height of buildings above street level in the upper section of Kloof Nek Road should be managed with a view to maintaining views, i.e no departures for height or setbacks from lateral common boundaries should be granted (in order to maintain views between and over the houses).’

### 3.7 Table Mountain, Signal Hill and Lion’s Head: Baseline Study: Existing Services (May 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Bernard Oberholzer Landscape Architects / SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Ninham Shand (South) (Pty) Ltd Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Ref.</td>
<td>May 2000, 3072/9084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>Kloof Nek, Lower Cableway, Battery Site, Magazine Site, Signal Hill Lookout / Appleton Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>No official status, prepared as input to the Phase One Baseline Study Synthesis Report (October 2000) – See 3.4, above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rationale and summary of findings:

The report forms the existing services component of the CPNP’s Conservation Development Framework’s baseline investigation. The brief was to provide information of the existing services (water, sewers, stormwater, electricity and Telkom) within and abutting the study area.

The findings of the report are as follows: The Lower Cable Way, Kloof Nek, Magazine and battery Sites have services readily available, although these may be limited in some instances. The Signal Hill Lookout Site only has electricity services available.

It is concluded that once new developments are known, the service requirements can be determined and the suitability of existing services verified.

### 3.8 Table Mountain, Signal Hill and Lion’s Head: Traffic and Parking Study (May 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Bernard Oberholzer Landscape Architects / SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>Ninham Shand (South) (Pty) Ltd Consulting Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Ref.</td>
<td>May 2000, 3070/9084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area</td>
<td>Kloof Nek, Lower Cableway, Tafelberg Road, Lion’s Head, Signal Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>No official status, prepared as input to the Phase One Baseline Study Synthesis Report (October 2000) – See 3.4, above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rationale and summary of findings:

The report forms the traffic component of the CPNP’s Conservation Development Framework’s baseline investigation. The brief was to provide a status quo assessment of the study area, including a review of the most recent existing studies. The report assesses existing infrastructure, demands and capacity constraints, and existing operation and conformity with management plans by means of visual evaluation during critical peak periods.

Kloof Nek parking area is underutilized, with sufficient capacity for present demand. The Lower Cableway functions effectively, with congestion on either side, and conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. Parking facilities along Tafelberg Road are placed under stress during peak times. Capacity exceeds demand along Signal Hill Drive. At the Signal Hill parking area, capacity exceeds demand during the peak season. The Kloof Nek intersection operates satisfactorily, with a number of points of conflict. The Lion Battery, Magazine Site and Deer Park have poor access conditions - any potential tourist development would require further investigation regarding the feasibility of improvements to infrastructure.

3.9 Cape Peninsula National Park Visitor and User Survey – Summary Results (Phases 1 and 2)(2000)

Client : SANParks – Cape Peninsula National / City of Cape Town, funded by the WWF-SA
Consultant : City of Cape Town
Date and Ref. : 2000
Study area : CPNP
Status : No official status

Rationale and summary of findings:

‘In order to plan and manage its assets effectively, the Park needs accurate, up-to-date information on the number of visitors to the area, as well as their needs and perceptions in relation to the Park. The CPNP visitor survey was conducted with the aim of providing some of this necessary information on the Park’s visitors and users, as a base against which future progress and projections can be measured.

‘A comprehensive, representative survey of visitors to the Cape Peninsula National Park, was undertaken in two parts: Part 1 included a daily visitor count over a period of 12 months (captured on ‘count sheets’, recording weather, time of day, group sizes, means of transport, gender, age group, and accompaniment by dogs), at a total of 70 entry points to the Park. Further written field observation records, as well as informal discussions with visitors, were also carried out over the 12 month period (1 September 1999 – 31 August 2000);
Part 2, carried out over six months (summer to winter), included structured 15-minute interviews with 2 100 visitors on exit from their visit to the Park.

‘The survey findings indicate a conservative total of 4,1 million visits to the CPNP over the year-long period (=excluding visitors to Kirstenbosch Gardens, who can access Park areas from the Gardens). Besides the pay points, there were 1,3 million visits per year at 10 high usage sites, 525 000 visits at 11 medium usage sites, and 350 000 visits at 41 selected low usage sites.

‘The visitor interviews provided useful and accurate information on visitor preferences and patterns for future management of the Park. Capetonians were responsible for most visits (61%), while the most popular international tourist sites were Table Mountain via the cableway, Cape Point, and Boulders beach. Most visitors were accompanied by family (51%) or friends (36%), and most used private cars as a means of transport to the Park site visited (87%).

‘Sightseeing, walking or hiking, and picnicking were the main reasons for visiting. As expected, most visitor suggestions for improvements related to basic facilities catering for these popular outdoor activities. Visitors
were deeply appreciative of the natural environment, and also recognised the value of environmental education facilities and services, and the need for enhancement of sites of historical and cultural value.

‘More than 90% of visitors rated their overall experience in the Park positively, as “good” or “excellent”. Ratings of particular facilities and services are valuable indicators of priorities to be addressed by the Park management, such as signage, parking, and footpath maintenance. The most common complaint related to the lack of basic necessities such as toilets and taps at many of the sites, and the need for cleaning and maintenance. Visitors were not in favour of large-scale “commercial” developments in the Park, their priority being to retain the natural settings and tranquillity of the Park environment that they currently enjoy.

‘These findings correspond with other research in the field, indicating great potential for the constructive growth and development of the nature-based and cultural tourism industry. The location of the Park within the Cape’s largest city offers unique opportunities in this regard, with visitors and Cape Town residents being the ‘lifeblood’ of the reserve. The survey has provided valuable baseline information for the Park, and has led to further co-operative initiatives among partners with an interest in the nature-based tourism industry, to gather accurate data to inform decision-making for the development of appropriate facilities and activities.’

3.10 The Cultural Landscape: Signal Hill and the Lower Slopes of Table Mountain & Devil’s Peak in the Table Valley Amphitheatre (Report & Appendix) (March – May 2000)

Client : Bernard Oberholzer Landscape Architects / SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park
Consultant : Fabio Todeschini
Date and Ref. : March – May 2000
Study area : Covers mainly the CPPNE areas of Signal Hill, Lion's Head, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road, down to the urban edge. It includes the Lion Battery, Magazine Site, Kloof Nek, and Lower Cable Way Station, but excludes the Camps Bay Glen and van Riebeek Park.
Status : No official status; prepared as input to the Phase One Baseline Study Synthesis Report (October 2000) – See 3.4, above.

Rationale and summary of findings:

The brief was to provide a ‘historical / cultural’ component to the Signal Hill, Kloof Nek and Tafelberg Road Phase One Baseline Study. The purpose of the study was to: identify surviving significant elements of the cultural landscape; and to isolate the primary concerns and issues that require attention in the preparation of a policy and landscape management plan for the area, from the perspective of considerations of the cultural landscape.

Issues and implications for planning include:

The original pristine environment of the study area has been affected by many layers of cultural adaptation, elements of which have historical and cultural significance and are worthy of conservation. The cultural landscape does not simply comprise a few sites, it invests in much of the study area with cultural meaning.

The pre-colonial archaeology of the area is largely unknown – any future development needs to be preceded by a detailed archaeological field study.

Themes of cultural landscape include: Cape Wilderness, agriculture, defense, water, slavery, forestry and recreation, mining, and sub-urbanization.
• There are ruined farm buildings, boundary walls, water reservoirs and associated ‘rural’ sites and works which are of significance and need protection.
• Military installations and routes are important, given the increasing interest in military history.
• Important sites of religious activity and significance exist, particularly those associated with resistance politics from the early colonial period.
• There are important sites, routes and paths of heritage value associated with recreation – some characterized by the presence of particular exotic botanical species which have great cultural value and provide shade.
• The signalling stations established on the summit of Lion’s Head and Signal Hill have historical interest.
• The conservation, enhancement and, where appropriate, the recycling of specific historical sites need to be considered, eg. Tamboers Kloof Magazine, the Lion Battery, the Appleton Camp, two quarries on Signal Hill, Kloof Nek, the Glen, Van Riebeeck Park, the Old Tin Mine, the King’s, Queen’s and Prince of Wales’s Blockhouses and related military sites and access roads.
• The need for a broad landscape framework for the edges between the domains of the urban and the wilderness.
• The need for a development framework for the urban-wilderness joint.
• The need to be strategic about gateways and pivotal recreational / tourist places of significance.
• The need to safeguard specific cultural sites and define appropriate re-use.
• The need to undertake targeted research on themes / sites about which insufficient is known.

3.11 Van Riebeeck Park Planning Study Phase 1: Analysis (February 2000)

Client : SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park
Consultant : Lucien le Grange and Nicolas Baumann
Date and Ref. : February 2000
Study area :
Status : No official status

Rationale and summary of findings:

The brief required the: identification of an appropriate study area; a review and evaluation of existing policies, plans, proposals, agreements; the preparation of a detailed digital base maps; the preparation of baseline studies and detailed site and environmental analysis (land uses, zoning, infrastructure, buildings, biophysical features, access, site history, visual analysis, etc.); the identification and evaluation of physical and non-physical attributes, elements and qualities that give character; identifying the need for additional specialist information required to undertake detailed planning; the identification of an initial set of issues/problems; the undertaking of a constraints/opportunities analysis; and the identification of stakeholders and a possible public participation process for future phases.

Elements of significance that were identified include: the Platteklip Stream, Platteklip Route, De Grendel van de Platteklip, Oranjezicht Boundary Wall, Wash Houses, Platteklip Mill (now Cottages), Upper and Lower reservoirs, Filter Beds, Kramats, Van Riebeeck Park Picnic Area, the ‘Crowsnest’. These elements are discussed in some detail in the report.

Broad principles that should influence the conservation and development of the area include: a strategy of Multiple use of the amenity area; sustainable development; selective rehabilitation/upgrading; appropriate linkages; the practice of a strategy of Minimal Intervention; authenticity for the fabric of the place.

Client : SANParks – Cape Peninsula National Park
Consultant : Eco-Africa Environmental Consultants
Date and Ref. : January 2000
Study area : Groote Schuur Estate, Constantia Nek, Apostle Battery, The Glen and Van Riebeeck Park
Status : No official status

Rationale and summary of findings:

The aim of the study was to assess the visitor market of the CPNP, with specific reference to the market opportunity surrounding the improvement of the five degraded sites within the northern sector of the Park (ie. Groote Schuur Estate, Constantia Nek, Apostle Battery, The Glen, and Van Riebeeck Park).

The findings of the study indicate that SANParks has an ideal opportunity to assume a pioneering role in the development of responsible tourism within the CMA. Phenomenal growth in the foreign tourism industry is expected and to cope with the increasing numbers of visitors, the regional tourism industry will need to become more cohesive and inclusive. The emergence of ecotourism and adventure tourism, and more recently cultural and heritage tourism provides local citizens with good opportunity to access the tourism market. The obstacle that remains is simply access to the opportunities to develop capacity among local people for tourism. The SANP can provide a diversity of such opportunities to previously disadvantaged citizens within the CMA, thus fulfilling their role of a Park for the people.

The five sites provide opportunity to improve the visitor experience through provision of products that cater for the needs of arts and culture, education and tourism sectors. These needs define ideal opportunities to forge strong linkages between the needs of local people and visitors to the city.

Possible rehabilitation and development of the five sites through forming joint ventures could include the maintenance of trails and existing facilities, development of guided walks, interpretation centres, arts and crafts centres, eateries, accommodation, conference and environmental education facilities.

Specific recommendations are made for Van Riebeeck Park: improve the popular circular trail through the use of interpretative signage; explore linkages onto the mountain; contact mountain biking fraternity regarding trails and maintenance; explore possibilities of developing ‘Crows Nest’ for accommodation; explore the links between MADESA Trust (a capacity-building and product orientated design initiative) and the historical buildings for the possible development of an artist’s retreat / craft market / tea-room; explore links with museums in developing the wash houses into a museum/interpretation centre; the Kramats have strong spiritual significance – links with the Muslin community should be strengthened.

3.13 The Tamboerskloof Magazine Site – Preliminary Planning Study: Understanding the Site (September 1999)

Client : The Cape Town Highlanders Trust
Consultant : Nicolas Baumann
Date and Ref. : September 1999
Study area : Tamboerskloof Magazine Site (Erf 81)
Status : No official status
Rationale and summary of findings:

The rationale for the study was to ascertain how the Tamboerskloof Magazine might best be used and conserved, in conjunction with the Cape Peninsula National Park and Table Mountain’s status as a World Heritage Site.

The Tamboerskloof military magazine site, 8.2ha in extent, is strategically located at the interface between the Cape Peninsula National Park (CPNP) and the central city area and between the residential communities of the Bokaap and Tamboerskloof. It is endowment land, granted to the South African National Defence Force in terms of the Defense Endowment Property and Account Act of 1922. The buildings date from 1895 and are of considerable cultural/historical interest. The main magazine building is a declared National Monument. The SANDF have no further use for the site and it is underutilized in terms of its scale and strategic location.

This report seeks to establish the potential future role of the site in its metropolitan and local contexts and to identify the policy framework which should guide future development. It analyses the existing policy context and the particular physical constraints and opportunities on the site.

The report concludes that the site is highly significant in terms of its: military historical role in the fortification of the Cape at the end of the last century; late nineteenth century military architecture and building technology; linkage opportunities to the Lion Battery and noon day gun site; strategic location as a gateway to the CPNP with good access from the central city; opportunity to function as an urban park and means of urban integration.

It recommends that consideration be given to the transfer of land, via the NMC, to the National Parks Board (NPB) and that it function as a “gateway” and urban park, directly linking the central city to the network of trails across the Park, and that the military presence on the site be continued in the form of a military heritage trail. It is further recommended that the whole site be declared a Heritage Area in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).

3.14 Survey of Visitors on Table Mountain, Devils Peak and Lion’s Head: 28 September 1997

Client : National Parks Board (Funded by the Table Mountain Fund and the WWF-SA)
Consultant : GIBB Africa
Date and Ref. : October 1997, J19918A
Study area : Back Table, Eastern Table, Western Table, Apostles, Lions Head
Status : No official status
Rationale and summary of findings:

In order that the National Park be managed appropriately, the negative impacts of visitors on the mountain must be understood and quantified so that resources to manage these impacts can be allocated wisely. The main aim of the study was to provide information on: the number of people using the mountain; the movement patterns of people on the mountain; and the different user groups on the mountain.

The survey was the first of its kind to be conducted on Table Mountain. No information regarding trends can be deduced.
Details concerning usage of the mountain are provided for the survey date, i.e. 27 September 1997. A total of 256 people were counted walking up Lions Head, and 63 and 31 respectively for Platteklip Gorge and India Venster.

3.15 Table Mountain National Park – Use-Zone Map (June 1996)

Client : National Parks Board  
Consultant : MLH Architects and Planners  
Date and Ref. : June 1996, 96 949  
Study area : The Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment (CPPNE).  
Status : No official status  

Rationale and summary of findings (cited from the report):

The lack of co-ordinated management in the Peninsula has been recognised as a problem in ensuring its continued well-being and protection. After widespread consultation, the Huntley Committee recommended the appointment of the National Parks Board (NPB) as the body most able to ensure effective management of the Peninsula. In December 1995, the Provincial Government of the Western Cape accepted this recommendation, on condition that the NPB makes "significant progress" towards stewardship of the area by July 1996.

Recognising the uniqueness of the Peninsula and its setting within an urban context, the National Parks Board immediately initiated the preparation of a Use-Zone Map. The aim of the Map is to reconcile and accommodate the different (and sometimes conflicting) uses that occur in the Peninsula. This report reflects the Consultants' (MLH Architects and Planners) recommendations to the National Parks Board as to how and where activities should occur and what the most appropriate uses are for different parts of the Peninsula from a human experience perspective.

The Use-Zone Map focuses specifically on human use of the mountain. It recognises that the human use should not jeopardise: the long-term ecological sustainability of the National Park; the high quality recreational and tourist experiences offered by the National Park, now and for future generations; and that the Park should be managed so as: to accommodate all activities where possible, subject to the above requirements being met, and so as to reduce conflict between activities by demarcating where specific uses can occur; to ensure that all have access to the facilities and experiences offered; to ensure that the public is involved and consulted in the planning and development of the Park; and to constantly improve the way activities are managed through monitoring and evaluation.

The Use-Zone Map consists of:

- a Use-Zone Map, based on human use and experience of the Peninsula;
- an Activities Map that indicates where selected activities can take place in the National Park; and
- an Ecological Sensitivity Map, based on data and research by the CSIR and other specialists, that indicates especially fragile or valuable natural resources and systems on the mountain.

The Use-Zone Map includes, at a general level, the different activities and experiences which should be accommodated and provided for in the Park. This will enable the NPB to manage the areas so that the quality and range of the human experiences are maintained.
The primary objectives of each zone are as follows:

(a) **Special Preservation**: To ensure the preservation of unique flora and fauna habitats and/or features within the Park. This is the only zone where the criteria for determining the area are based purely on ecological factors and not the type of human experience/activity to be accommodated.

(b) **Remote**: To ensure that large parts of the Park are managed in order to retain their sense of remoteness. These areas will ensure that future generations will experience areas which are in relatively pristine condition.

(c) **Quiet**: To act as a buffer to Remote Areas and to take some of the pressure off Remote Areas in terms of uses and activities, whilst still retaining their natural and relatively undisturbed feel.

(d) **Low Intensity Leisure**: To provide a focus for human recreational activities and to accommodate them by supplying appropriate infrastructure where required.

(e) **High Intensity Leisure**: To provide formal and built recreational facilities which can be easily accessed via motor vehicle, or which are within easy walking distance.

(f) **Utility Sites**: To contain services and infrastructure necessary for the Park and the metropolitan area.

(g) **Sites of Special Interest**: To recognise sites which are of specific cultural or historical interest.

The Use-Zone Map is the first attempt to clearly state where and how the Peninsula should be used. As such it will guide the NPB in their initial planning for the Park and will be reviewed, should implementation prove the need for such revision.

### 3.16 Policy for the Multi-Purpose Use of the Cape Peninsula (1994)

**Client**: Administrator of the Cape  
**Consultant**: Environmental Evaluation Unit at the University of Cape Town  
**Date and Ref.**: 1994  
**Study area**: n/a  
**Status**: n/a  

Rationale and summary of findings (cited from the CDF, March 2001):

In February 1993 the Administrator of the Cape appointed the Environmental Evaluation Unit at the University of Cape Town (UCT) to “provide policy and management options for the future planning, development and management of the mountain chain, constituent nature reserves, forests, monuments and other land included in the Cape Peninsula Protected Natural Environment (CPPNE)”.

The resultant policy document released in 1994 encompassed statements of desired future actions relating to the management of the CPPNE. The study concluded that “the Cape Peninsula has a variety of physical, ecological and social carrying capacities, ranging from areas which can tolerate and should be developed for intensive use, to those which cannot tolerate as much disturbance and should be managed as wild nature protection areas.”

The study recommended that “human use of the Cape Peninsula should take place according to the management objectives of different functional areas, permitted uses varying from area to area.” Different categories of functional areas were recommended in the study with different intensities of prescribed use, ranging from low levels of human use to areas where intensive use would be desirable and acceptable.
Furthermore the UCT study recommended that South African National Parks (SANParks) should manage the Peninsula's conservation areas. Subsequently the Huntley Committee (chaired by Prof. Brian Huntley of the National Botanical Institute), which was appointed to implement the recommendations of the 1994 UCT study, endorsed the recommendation that SANParks be appointed to take over managerial custody of the area.

The 1994 UCT report is an important point of departure for the CDF. It provided the broad policy framework within which the Park was established and within which the Park subsequently formulated its own Management Policy. Moreover it established principles and a conceptual approach to the multi-purpose use of the Cape Peninsula that this CDF takes forward.


Client : City Planner's Department, City of Cape Town
Consultant : Bernard Oberholzer Landscape Architects
Date and Ref. : March 1993
Study area : Includes Signal Hill and Lion’s Head, extending from the SW limits of the Glen to the NE slopes of Signal Hill. The boundary roughly follows the proclaimed Nature Area, as well as the National Monument, and includes most of the area above the existing line of development.
Status : Unknown. However the report has been largely superceded by the May 2000 Baseline Study – See 3.4, below.

Rationale and summary of findings:

The brief required: a report on a possible future policy for the use of Signal Hill; the need, if any, for its development; and the desirability or otherwise of a linkage to the peak (of Signal Hill) from any point in the City.

Problems, concerns, assets and opportunities are identified in the report, and are summarized into ‘environmental issues’, ‘historical-cultural issues’, ‘land use issues’, ‘management issues’, and ‘funding issues’.

Environmental issues include: The regional scarcity of West Coast Renosterveld, and that the importance of fire in regeneration of species is not widely appreciated. The sensitivity of the vegetation to urbanization, and the hazard of fires are in direct conflict with residential and recreational uses. The invasion of alien vegetation, and the loss of habitats and endemic species is a threat, aggravated by the shortage of funds and labour. The role that Signal Hill can play as an area of special botanical interest, providing opportunities for research, education, and nature-related recreation and tourism.

Historical – Cultural issues include: Signal Hill was seen by the Khoi as a holy place, and more recently by the Moslem community as a religious site. This century it has been used for utilitarian purposes including defense installations, timber plantations, quarries and dumping. Little or no investigation has been made into archaeological or other historical remains. The role that Signal Hill can play as a place of natural, religious and historical interest has not been adequately cultivated. The cultural landscaping in the form of the mature stone pines will be lost in the absence of a future planting strategy.

Land use issues include: The natural setting contributes to its importance as a recreation and tourist destination – while few facilities cater for visitors. Inappropriate use, or over-use of the natural resources, and a lack of controls and funding has led to degradation of the landscape in certain places. The lack of information,
signage, shade, water and continuous circular paths, means that the potential of the natural and scenic resources is not optimized. Derelict structures and inadequate patrols are a security concern. The intrusion of unsympathetic development and building forms in certain areas has detracted from the natural and scenic quality of the mountain. Development of private property on the upper slopes of Fresnaye, Tamboerskloof and Bo-Kaap could lead to further intrusion unless carefully controlled.

**Management issues include:** The overlapping of management authorities, and legislation, often leads to duplication and confusion. Difficulties in up-dating management programmes, as well as funding and labour shortages, have led to a decline in the maintenance of the mountain in recent years. ‘Ad hoc’ actions, the absence of an overall concept plan and lack of funds could eventually result in further deterioration of the mountain.

**Funding issues include:** Grants and subsidies for conservation are being cut back, leading to a reduced budget and resulting staff cuts. Little or no revenue is generated by Signal Hill.

Nine policies (ie. statement of intent) are put forward, together with proposals (ie. implementation measures). The policies and detailed proposals were reviewed and refined in the October 2000 Phase One Baseline Study Synthesis Report – See Section 3.4, below.
Section 4. CONCLUSION AND THE WAY FORWARD

In summary, Orion Consortium has been appointed by SANParks to compile a ‘development framework’ for the entire study area, as well as more detailed ‘precinct plans’ for identified visitor nodes. The purpose of the study is to determine the most suitable way to upgrade the facilities and visitor experience within the study area.

The development framework will guide the future conservation and development of the area, provide the basis for precinct plans for each of the development nodes, and provide guidelines on the proposals for the movement and transport of visitors to and between the various sites. It will also provide the information to enable SANParks to release opportunities for private concerns to obtain concessions in the area.

As can be seen from the review of related reports and studies in Section 3, above, a vast amount of effort and thought has already been expended on the study area. Three studies commissioned by the South African National Parks (SANParks) for the Cape Peninsula National Park (CPNP) are especially significant; i.e. the CPNP IEMS Management Policy (2000), the Strategic Management Plan (2000 – 2004), and the Conservation Development Framework for the Cape Peninsula National Park (March 2001).

Orion Consortium is currently in the process of preparing the development framework, which includes the formulation of policies, principles and proposals dealing with the following aspects: the environmental system; the economic and social development system; the services and infrastructure system; the spatial system; and the institutional system. The linkage of the area with the city is vitally important, and transport and access to various visitor nodes and linkages between them is to be studied.

As part of this process, a number of ‘focus group workshops’ are being held with the following sectors: officials and professional organisations; ratepayers and councillors; and interest & user groups.

The development framework will direct the compilation of precinct plans for visitor nodes, which will contain broad proposals for the upgrading and rehabilitation of facilities, provide guidelines for potential uses, and for the treatment of historical and landscape aspects. The precinct planning process will also involve a further round of public participation in the form of focus group workshops, public meetings and open days. It should however be recognised that the public participation process is flexible, and subject to the nature of the public response to the project, may need to be amended or extended as planning progresses.