Guillaume Nel environmental consultants

Durbanville Gardens Meeting

13 March 2019

ATTENDING:

NAME & SURNAME	ORGANISATION	EMAIL
Guillaume Nel (GN)	GNEC	gn@gec.co.za
Pat Titmus (PT)	CoCT: EMD	pat.titmuss@capetown.gov.za
Johann Terblanche (JT)	CoCT: CSRM	johannn terblanche@capetown.gov.za
Bronwyn Jillings (BJ)	CoCT	bronwyn.jillings@capetown.gov.za
George Goodie (GG)	Aurecon	george.goodey@aurecongroup.com
Dean Ollis (DO)	Freshwater Consulting	dean.ollis@gmail.com
Rene Brett (RB)	Landscaping	rene@veridian.co.za
Phillip du Toit (PDT)	Architect	phillipdt@o-l.co.za

DISCUSSION

NO.	DESCRIPTION.

1.	Environmental
	• GN states that it was requested that they move the boundary out of the 1:100 year flood line and also that the wall must be permeable water to seep through into the wetland and also for fauna to move freely. • GN states the reason for the meeting is not to get final comments but just to find out if there is any additional studies that must be done.

	• GN states that the comment from CoCT was for the sewerage connection must be relocated to avoid impacting the seep wetland. • Asked PDT to explain the layout changes with regards to the road and parking out of the flood line as far as possible. • GN stated that the applicant agreed to further rehabilitate the part of the wetland offsite, which will be included in the rehabilitation plan. With regards to maintenance a trust will be set up which must be before construction starts. • The applicant did a lot to cater for all the comments received. It will be costly for the applicant to develop further away from the fence wall. • The ecological net gain will be fantastic and will also a good way of looking after the environment without the city having to pay for anything. • GN states that if the CoCT is willing to look at the plan, it can be put on paper.
2.	**Landscaping**
	• RB explained that it will be a fence and not a wall and will be positioned on a solid sill at the bottom the sill in some places will have penetrations bigger than the actual fence mesh penetrations that will permit fauna to go through. • RB states that the fence is completely permeable so that the water can flow through. • The height of the sill will not be higher than what the natural ground level would have been so there will be some digging down to install the sill and where they have dug, pipes can also be placed under through the sill to allow for fauna movement of different sizes. • The fence mesh will allow for smaller rodents to come through. Water will be able to push through. • RB explains that it is possible to insert panels along the bottom that has a bigger mesh size. • RB states that the fence will be located on the actual boundary in certain places it will be below the 1:100 year flood line. • RB explains that there are many trees on the site and most of them are exotic and some of them are invasive and states that their approach have been to identify the trees that actually have very special character. • RB states that there are some enormous English Oak trees. • RB states that the trees that they would have like to keep has been identified before the building footprint was developed. Each individual tree

has been assessed in terms of design to understand what its natural existing ground level is, how that will relate to the levels that are going to be cut because there are going to be big platform cuts to construct basements and if it is feasible to keep the tree or not.

- RB mentions that there has been a discussion about the actual final levels of the basements.
- All the trees on site will be impacted by earthworks.
- The construction of the basements will interfere with the natural groundwater flow.
- There will be drains to prevent the water from damming up behind the basements.
- The drains will be around the buildings or underneath the basements where it will be emptying out on the edge to the wetland to try and reinstate the actual groundwater flow as closely as possible as it has been before.
- RB states that there will be an impact on the trees, and the trees that will be kept are considered to be very special with special requirements in terms of how to deal with their root zones and their canopies.
- From the first day of construction their root zone portions will go on life support and will have to be specially irrigated, fed and nurtured to ensure that they actually remain.
- RB states that the developer considers the trees to be a very valuable asset to the landscape and to the character of the development.
- Fewer trees would rather be kept and invest more to ensure that they survive.
- The trees that will remain have been marked and their canopy sizes are shown accurately there's a table which gives you the information about them.
- RB explained that it is generally because of the levels and the shaping that would permit a specific tree to stay on the site. The development site does not have large opens spaces which makes it difficult to retain all the trees
- The open spaces that is on the site are all reshaped which makes it difficult to actually retain the trees.
- RB feels strongly that they should not plant trees just for the sake of putting back trees because it is not necessarily appropriate to plant more trees at the wetland edge.
- RB explains that the plan has been slightly modified and a green section has been inserted as discussed with BJ.

	• RB sates that the paving in the parking area will have permeable paving which can drain sideways as it is going to be elevated by half a meter. • RB states that they want as much water as possible to flow sideways at as many points as possible rather than concentrating it. • RB states the reason for the sideways drain is to allow the water to drain into the wetland and not only into the retention pond. • RB explains the principle is to basically have a series of little ponds or rainwater gardens that can fill up to certain level and just seep in and beyond a certain point it will just fill up more but has a smaller outlet that runs into the next, and ultimately runs into the retention pond. • RB states that this is a form of detention as well as a form of quality improvement because it will be vegetated with wetland species and not only with grass.
3.	**CoCT**
	• PT raises her concern about the yellowwood tree that will be removed as it is a protected tree. • PT states that the Tree Management Plan must state which trees are going to be removed and which are going to be retained through colour- coding. • The reasoning behind why some of the indigenous trees are being removed and not retained must be indicated. • PT states that it is encouraging to hear that there are alternatives. • JT asked if there will be a need for additional sewer lines. • BJ requested for some relief on the wetland edge and just having 1 extra meter on the other edge for people to not step right onto a parking for an older person to have a bit of a bench and not taking anything away from PT's needs on the wetland side. • JT asked where the water for the seep is coming from DO states that it is subsurface water flow coming down from the slope.
4.	**Sewerage**
	• GG explains that the only other alternative is that the existing houses has a connection to the sewer line which runs in the wetland. • GG states it is a matter of dividing the sewer lines on each erf to the existing sewer connection that is already on the erf. • GG will assess for any new connections.
5.	**Architect**
	• PDT states that there was an investigation to go underneath the building but that it was not feasible from a construction point of view.

	• PDT explains that the main change was to remove the all the parking on the one side of the road which created a barrier. • PDT states that previously the road had a bit of a curve to stay away from the flood line. • PDT explains that finding a balance between spatial experience and staying away from the wetland as far as possible which is how the current layout was created.
6.	**Freshwater**
	• DO explains that they have mapped different kinds of wetlands. • The one is the edge of the valley bottom wetland which sits in the valley floor and sits fairly close to the 1:100 year flood line. • On the slope coming into the site and into the valley floor, is where the seepage wetland was mapped and historically there would have been a lot more seepage wetland and along the whole slope but through urban development and water movement the whole area has changed radically so they are not where they used to be. • DO states that the amount of wetland gain in terms of habitat and function far exceed the amount of wetland loss. • DO states that if the development is done properly and all measures are implemented and managed properly there will be a positive gain in terms of wetland. There will be much better and more functional wetland than what there is currently.