EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

It is the intention of the Applicant to consolidate, rezone and redevelop Erf 46 and Erf 47 with a signature lifestyle apartment building known as Azalea Signature Residences. The to-be consolidated erf constitutes "the site", but excludes 59m^2 along Victoria Road, which is zoned Transport Zoning 2 and will remain undeveloped to accommodate the future widening of Victoria Road. The site is located on the mountain side of Victoria Road in the coastal suburb of Clifton, approximately 90 m from the beachfront.

Erf 46 housed a residential dwelling which, since withdrawal of the previous application, has been demolished in accordance with permits from HWC (dated June 2023) and CCT (dated August 2023). Erf 47 is a vacant stand which is densely vegetated and slopes steeply upwards from Victoria Road towards Kloof Road.

The proposal comprises a signature apartment building with up to ten terraced levels, providing for up to ten apartments as follows:

Storey	**Description**
Basement Storey 3	At Victoria Road street-level, this basement would comprise of entry security and drive-through port cochere, two vehicle parking lifts; a pedestrian shuttle lift and 2 private internal lifts (1 of which is a fireman's lift).
Basement Storeys 2 & 1	Contain parking areas of 18 bays and service/plant rooms.
Ground Floor – 1st Storey	This level comprises the main pedestrian entry lobby as well as a common swimming pool area with gardens, storage and back of house facilities. The secure residents lift lobby point is accessed by non-residents on this level.
Second Storey	would hold 2 x apartments with terraces.
Third Storey	would hold 2 x apartments with terraces.
Fourth Storey	would hold 2 x apartments with terraces.
Fifth Storey	would hold 2 x apartments with terraces.
Sixth and Seventh Storeys	would hold 2 x duplex penthouse apartments with terraces, swimming pools and garden areas.

The development footprint will be approximately 1127 m² in extent. The set of Site Development Plans are included as Appendix B1 to the DBAR.

The development would require significant excavation, particularly to construct the lower levels. The design is such that lateral support is only required in the Open Space areas to the back of the site. No lateral supports are required into the drainage passages or any residential properties beyond.

The proposal therefore also necessitates the realignment of a highly eroded stormwater drainage feature which cuts through Erf 47. The proposal is to reroute the channel to its original course on Erf 48 and remainder street parcel RE/145. This course of action was determined in consultation with City of Cape Town catchment management. The realigned portion of the stormwater channel will be approximately 20 m long and comprise three stormwater stilling chambers connected by an open gabion channel constructed with gabion baskets and reno mattress placed on Bidim. Each chamber will feature a deep recess and a headwall. Stormwater will exit the chambers through a wide opening into the gabion channel. The final stilling chamber will discharge to the existing watercourse southeast of the site.

The development demands the following services:

- Potable water (approximately 5 kl/day), to be supplied from the 100mm diameter municipal bulk main in Kloof Street. Two existing 50mm polycop pipes connect the site to the bulk supply in Kloof Street, however only one of these will be utilised for the consolidation erf and the other will be blanked off. The CCT confirmed capacity in the Kloof Nek distribution zone to service the development but noted low pressure in the Kloof Street bulk main line. On-site booster pumps may be necessary (dependent on on-site pressure tests at detailed design phase).
- Reticulation and treatment of domestic sewage. The existing 150mm diameter sewer pipe which connects the site to the 150mm sewer main in Victoria Road will be utilised. The CCT confirmed capacity in the bulk pipelines and at the Wastewater Treatment Works to accommodate the proposed development.
- Solid waste removal and disposal, which will be undertaken by the CCT, who confirmed capacity in this regard.
- Electricity supply of 350A at 400V. The CCT confirm that the Clifton Terraces substation has spare capacity to service the development. A solar system is also proposed to reduce development's grid reliance.

Stormwater flows are such that onsite attenuation is not required in terms of the CCT's 2009 Management of Urban Stormwater and Impact Policy. Stormwater management on site will include collection from roofs and balconies for use in landscaping on the ground floor and terraces. Runoff from the landscaped areas will be piped, routed through silt traps and discharge to the kerb face into the existing road channel along Victoria Road. This stormwater management proposal was supported by the CoCT. Groundwater (subsoil drainage) will also be collected and pumped to a tank to be utilised for landscape irrigation and for non-potable uses within the development.

Extensive landscaping is proposed on the natural ground level, terraces and the roof. A concept landscaping plan is included in the SDP set.

This executive summary accompanies the Final BAR submission to DEA&DP. Changes to the DBAR to compile the Final BAR are shown orange text for ease of reference. This formatting is echoed in this executive summary.

SITE SENSITIVITY STATEMENT:

Except for the footprint of the now demolished structure, the site is densely covered with vegetation and slopes steeply upwards from Victoria Road towards Kloof Road. It is bounded by stormwater servitudes to the north and south, Victoria Road to the west and undeveloped 'Public Open Space' erven to the east, immediately upslope of the site towards Kloof Road. The neighbouring area in the vicinity of the site comprises a number of apartment blocks and a few remaining single residential dwellings.

From a terrestrial biodiversity perspective, the site has 'Low' sensitivity being small, fragmented and completed transformed by consistent negative impacts and removal of positive vegetation and eco-system drivers. The site plays no current or future role in conservation and does not provide vital broader support services for any terrestrial biodiversity on site or at a local scale. Avifaunal species that may utilise the large exotic trees for perching would relocate unharmed during any construction process.

In terms of aquatic biodiversity, the stormwater channel that crosses Erf 47 is not deemed a natural watercourse and relocation of this channel is supported. The stream immediately southeast of the site (within the drainage passage) is considered a watercourse, but this aquatic feature has lost most of the sensitive elements due to modifications. As such this watercourse holds 'Low' ecological importance and sensitivity.

The granite underlying the site is jointed, with fractures and weathered zones that could result in significant amount of groundwater flow downgradient towards the ocean. Redevelopment of the site would most likely result in subsurface water build-up along the structures/wall in contact with the granite. It is expected that especially during times of good rainfall there will be subsurface flow that will need to be concentrated and removed to retain foundation integrity.
From a visual sensitivity perspective, the immediate environment of the site is of medium scenic, cultural and historical significance i.e., having valued characteristics, reasonably tolerant of some changes of the type proposed. This is due to the scenic drives of Victoria Road and Kloof Road, and the special character of Clifton within the urban cultural landscape of the Atlantic seaboard. Although the site is associated with areas of visual / scenic amenity, the landscape character of the regional setting is considered to have low sensitivity to the visual impact associated with the development proposal, given the small scale of the site. The landscape character of the local context is considered moderately sensitive, as the residential properties immediately adjacent to the site will be exposed to the most direct visual impacts of construction and operational phases of the development.

The Atlantic seaboard is considered the 'cultural landscape' which constitutes a meaningful visual (spatial, scenic and aesthetic) resource to communities of people. The Atlantic seaboard is characterized by the sharp juxtaposition of highly 'urbanized' townscape foreground against a dramatic coastal mountain 'wilderness' background. The visual nature of the site is open, unbuilt and vegetated nature that provides a moment of 'green relief' within the street scape. It is not of significant scale to constitute a major feature though.

Nevertheless, given the scenic drives of Victoria Road as well as Kloof Road, and the special character of Clifton within the urban cultural landscape of the Atlantic seaboard, the immediate environment of the site is considered to be of medium scenic, cultural and historical significance, i.e. having valued characteristics, reasonably tolerant of some changes of the type proposed.

The Traffic Impact Assessment found that Victoria Road has capacity to accommodate the development.

The DBAR was informed by inputs from terrestrial and aquatic ecologists, groundwater and visual specialists, as well as a team of geotechnical, transport, structural, civil and electrical engineers.

ALTERNATIVES:

No reasonable or feasible location, activity, operational and technology alternatives exist.

The evolution of design on the site is detailed in the DBAR. The preferred alternative comprises the development as detailed in the project description above. The preferred alternative is favoured for the following reasons:

- Allows for efficient dual use of the site.
- Constitutes a renewable energy project with no impact on terrestrial or aquatic biodiversity, and no impact on heritage, archaeology and palaeontology aspects.
- Will benefit agriculture as it provides shade and some shielding against the prevailing winds in the area. This results in improved crop yields.
- Will result in water use efficiencies and water use reduction of approximately 20%.
- Contributes to the City's aim to stop loadshedding.
- Contributes to the economy in the construction phase and operational phase.
- Provides a second income stream for the landowners.

- Contributes to the City's climate change resilience.

Single residential zoning on the site is not desirable for the landowner, however, if SR1 is to remain under the No-Go alternative, it could result in implementation of the existing rights. The SR1 zoning of the erven currently permits two dwelling units per erf. The No-Go alternative therefore equates to 4 single residences on the site (2 dwellings on Erf46 + 2 dwellings on Erf 47). Compared to the development alternative, the no-go option is not desirable.

IMPACT SUMMARY:

The summary of impacts is tabled below.

Potential Impact and Risk	**ALTERNATIVES**			
	Development Alternative		**No-Go Alternative**	
	Significance prior to Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation	Significance before Mitigation	Significance after Mitigation
CONSTRUCTION PHASE				
Aquatic habitat modification and potential for some flow and water quality modification	Medium to Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Displacement of faunal community due to habitat loss, disturbance and/or direct mortalities.	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Change in groundwater flows paths and impact to neighbouring properties.	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Increased stormwater discharge resulting in coastal erosion and wetting of beaches	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Traffic entering and exiting the access poses risk of vehicle crashes.	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Medium (-)	Low (-)
Traffic Congestion/ Disruptions to Traffic flow	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Restricted pedestrian passage alongside site boundary exposes pedestrians to risk of being struck be a vehicle	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Obstruction or loose materials in the roadway creating risk of crashes during	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Workers using public transport / taxis arriving at / or leaving the site will cross Victoria Road and will be exposed to risk of being struck by a motor vehicle.	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Site access difficult for heavy vehicles leading to possible crashes	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential impact on the visual/ heritage resources and cultural landscape character effected by site clearance, removal of existing vegetation, earthworks, site camp establishment etc.	Low (-)	Low (Neutral)	Not applicable	Not applicable

Noise and dust nuisance and disruption	Medium (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Use of natural resources	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Job creation and contribution to the economy	Low (+)	Low (+)	Not applicable	Not applicable
OPERATIONAL PHASE				
Freshwater flow and water quality modification	Low (-)	Very Low (-)	Low (-)	Very Low (-)
Continued displacement and fragmentation of the faunal community due to ongoing anthropogenic disturbances (noise, traffic, dust and vibrations) and habitat degradation (litter, road mortalities and/or dumping of rubble).	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Traffic entering and exiting the access poses risk of vehicle crashes.	Medium (-)	Low (-)	Medium (-)	Medium (-)
Traffic Congestion/ Disruptions to Traffic flow where vehicles park in the roadway - during Operations	Low (-)	Low (-)	Not applicable	Not applicable
Potential impact on the visual / heritage resources and cultural landscape character: Contemporary layer added to the cultural landscape, responding to important patterns.	Low (Neutral)	Low (+)	Low (+)	Not applicable
Job creation and overall impact on economy.	Low (+)	Low (+)	Not Applicable	Not Applicable

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The decision for the authorisation ultimately lies with the Competent Authority and should be taken based on the information provided in the BAR and supporting documents. The EAP and specialist team are confident that all significant impacts of the proposal have been identified and assessed, and appropriate mitigation and management measures to not cause undue harm to the environment recommended.

The biophysical context of the site is not considered particularly sensitive due to its partly transformed nature, urban setting and proximity to the coastline which is already densely developed. Nevertheless, consideration has been made for natural features particularly related to a stream which flows along the southeastern extent of the site and the undeveloped Open Space/" Other Natural Area" upslope of the site. While the stream has been highly modified and of low ecological importance and sensitivity, it would be protected through a carefully designed stormwater management system and management plan which would also address the current erosion issues visible on site. Some restoration of the stream would also be realised through the planting of indigenous riparian vegetation.

Given the unique character of the area and location of the site between two scenic routes, visual aspects were thoroughly investigated and assessed. This assessment concluded that the recommended mitigation measures should be sufficient to ensure that the visual impact of the proposed development remains within acceptable levels.

Overall, the proposal has responded to the development intention of the Applicant, the cultural landscape, built environment and natural environment which would be enhanced through careful planning and design considerations. The development of the site is not constrained by traffic or the infrastructure required to deliver municipal services.

Anticipated negative impacts of the proposed development can be mitigated to acceptable levels, all of which are anticipated to be of 'Low' or 'Vey Low' significance. Mitigation measures recommended by specialists are aligned and practicable.

The environmental process thus far, has not highlighted any environmental constraints or reasons why the preferred development alternative should not be implemented. The proposal aligns with the immediate built environment and is congruent with wider planning and development objectives for the area. For these reasons, the No-Go alternatives is not considered reasonable.

Further to the circulation of the DBAR, there were no comments or issues raised that warrant further investigation or shift the above sentiments of the EAP. Issues raised in the circulation of the BAR have been directly and thoroughly addressed through responses from the EAP, specialists with inputs from other professional team members, as required.

Considering the above, it is the opinion of the EAP that the preferred alternative could be authorised, however, public participation is still required in this process. Should the DEA&DP agree with the EAP and grant authorisation, it should be subject to the following conditions:

- Ensure that the proposed development is developed as per the intention and design philosophy as described in this report.
- All mitigation measures recommended by the specialists (including groundwater monitoring) must be implemented.
- That groundwater seepage must be used for irrigation of landscaping and for non-drinking purposes.
- The impact management outcomes of the EMPr must be upheld as conditions of authorisation.
- The EMPr should be incorporated into all contract documentation and it is the Applicant's responsibility to ensure that the Contractor/s is made aware of the requirements thereof when preparing a quote for the work.
- The Stormwater Management Plan must take into account the recommendations made by the aquatic and groundwater assessments and should be approved by the CoCT prior to implementation.
- The Landscaping Plan and associated planting list must be compiled by a registered landscape architect, according to the City's standard requirements for Landscape Plans, and be approved by the CoCT prior to commencement of the construction phase.
- The Traffic Management Plan must be compiled and submitted to the City's Roads Infrastructure and Management branch for comment prior to building plan approval.
- The ECO must be provided with a copy of the final approved Stormwater Management Plan.
- The ECO must be provided with a copy of the final approved Landscape Master Plan.