Comments by Berta van Rooyen


Scope of comments:

Since this framework is based entirely on the heritage status of one graded building (Gazetted) and several other buildings which are recommended for gradings and not gazetted yet, as well as mentioned and not mentioned historical aspects, my comments are entirely focussed on the following

Whether the decision making process took the heritage of the Tokai Precinct into account.

Summary: A Heritage Impact Assessment is required. Approximate time line of official aspects, development implementation of different stages and end goal should be accessible and explained in simple terminology to the public as formal processes and technical language are often more confusing than explaining. Official processes should also be explained to I & A parties e.g. presentation of recommended grading to HWC and the involvement of other official bodies; when a Notification of Intend to Develop (NID) would be issued and registration of A & I parties to also register with the HWC. It was mentioned at the meeting Sept. 19th 2011 that another public consultation process would have been held.

SANParks/TMNP are very welcome in this neighbourhood converting a plantation into a Park and replacing the old forest station principle. Careful management of heritage sites, some hugely significant, taking into account public participation in determining its usage, stays a condition for commercial use by the custodian and to creating a win-win for all involved. The community of Tokai in particular would like to be involved, not only in planning but also in the future management of the Park.

The draft presented by the custodian and consultants do not entirely satisfy. On the contrary - all goals are not clearly defined and the public are left with many questions. However, this is also a recognition for work being done.

Comments:

Presenting of Material (A) Baseline Report (BR) and (B) Panels.

(A) Baseline Report:
• impressive Bibliography without source critique or preference of sources explained
• sources used in text not listed in Bibliography
• some core historical facts or disputed facts (e.g. building date of house) not correctly used
• grading process involving HWC not explained to general public
• omitting of buildings / structures / footprints (ash heap, jonkershuis or second dwelling; possible previous longhouse on Hamilton sketch; native burial site or direction to; compost room; doordrift, first vineyard etc.)
• absence of lease agreement in copy of B. at the Tokai Library.

NB: Any presentation to HWC regarding the formalisation of the recommended gradings should be accompanied by a reliable, trustworthy and verifiable source as it would become the reference for the future, e.g. Mauve's book *Under the Elephant's Eye*, is handy in size and easy to read, but totally inappropriate to use as a verifiable source due to lack of scientific report writing style.

Archival documents, some reports and publications also dispute several statements and/or conclusions of Hillary Mauve in *Under the Elephant's Eye*.

(B) Panels
- All in all strategy too wide and too vague – consequently public comments or lack thereof could be regarded as blueprint to go ahead PLUS
- Repeating and confusing information, also no cross references to other panels make many ideas confusing, suggesting too much information to absorb within two weeks and too much to address on a single sheet. Further public discussions a necessity.
- A&I's not evenly treated
- Fragmentation of site as a whole causing concern and remove tranquil and pastoral atmosphere
- Lease agreement re. Occupation of existing buildings by SANParks / TMNP very vaguely addressed

Panel 1:
Absence of explanation why Prins Kasteel got re-routed once it crosses Orpen Rd:
- danger to overflowing the road during or after heavy down pour.
- Acknowledgement of channel as a heritage site omitted.

Panel 2: Tokai Manor Precinct plan
Gate-away concept:
- concept creates idea of money making and entertainment without any sense or respect to history or heritage status ("sustainable long term commercial use")
- axis of design not entirely historically correct: first 39 morgen (to 1814) didn't include complete section east of the house; there was a walled in structure / garden at the back (west end) etc. No axis lines at the west end side after 1802 and couldn't find example of axis after 1833...
- concept raises conflict of interest between activities, commercialization vs. preservation, conservation and public interest
- "place for all": Types of activities exclude the majority of the people e.g. wedding, restaurant or selective usage, but also ...
- too many visitors at once re. multi-usage or loaded event may create detrimental effect on terrain, e.g. square inside old jail can accommodate barely 100 persons attending a market; cyclists on walking paths (Old Prince Kasteel route now Elephant's Eye was actually bridal path!!!)
- adaptation of buildings for use: without gazetted grading and consequent Notification of intent to Develop (NID) public kept in the dark. Too many suggestions ruining goodwill.
- Parking: demarcation not acceptable as too many cars detrimental to area. Rather move parking to space between CRC and road parallel with road or in south western corner of the same lot:
  - cyclists can cycle on service road to higher plantations;
  - visitors walk on promenade / transported with mule cart / old railway like something – e.g. little train in Pretoria Fountains; lift at Cape Point. Mules = educational.
  - road past the bridge become promenade – house & mountain focus point road can stay single and will save costs.
  - special arrangements for cars fitted with disabled stickers
  - more space for staff and / or service vehicles; staff parking not indicated
  - re-use of old "door drift" through Prins Kasteel; also valuable archaeological site.
  - Suggested pedestrian bridge more or less at doordrift. Good move.
  - Moving the parking out of a substantial fynbos area could create a seam of fynbos on two sides (west, south to south-east) enhancing the idea of tranquillity [ added Emile's idea with hidden picnic basket spots in between... ] Fynbos closer to house is more easily to observe than belt of fynbos at outer border. It could connect to re-established silvertree forest taking original vegetation into Mountain &...
connecting Constantiaberg Mountain to werf with lineage of fynbos & coppice

- One sided historical examples for re-use - focussing mainly on one period: post 1883. List of possible historical matter to use / exhibit on request available.
- Farming activities prior to 1883 are excluded; also land usage. Lists of activities in older documents available - at present a very imbalanced representation
- Several mistakes in identifying period structures, e.g. pergola - similarities in gable of compost house and pergola; terraces unmistakably Victorian, etc.; wine cellar can slave lodge???; stables with workshops added, etc.
- Total ignorance regarding archaeological sites, e.g. ash heap; First Longhouse, burial site for slaves / native workers Etc.
- historical equestrian (and forestry) activities have not had to compete with recent suggested activities - thus space problem and consequently interaction with other activities may lead to conflict / discomfort (flies) and historical ignorance
- increasing activities and numbers of visitors will put severe strain on traffic in Tokai neighbourhood - already severe problem at certain hours on week-ends to get into or out of Tokai Main Rd. Options for relief already minimal due to Municipal regulations
- total lack of prioritization re. Development framework: e.g. move of SANParks to premises; decay prevention management regarding dilapidated buildings; NID; gazetting of recommended gradings.
- Cultivated land: should be investigated but the first vineyards could have been the “old nursery site” and adjoining arboretum of Sir D.E. Hutchins...
- too many different food-related stalls will enhance baboon trouble.
- No plan for upgrading arboretum or missing coppice / “zuikerbosch” / kreupelhout
- Financial estimates omitted with suggested alterations.

Panel 3: Analysis / Precinct Informants

- variations in names of buildings confusing e.g Orpen House (the house, overseer’s flat and / or kitchen; convict outstation; slave lodge, wine cellar etc.) and sites / buildings omitted:
  - Historical Bosdorp?
  - Compost Room / hen hut / dove cot / ???? totally omitted in all documents
  - Garage housing “waterworks offices”?
  - Additions to Manor House
  - Workshop added to old stables

- analysis of areas west, south and south east and east of house is wrong and do not represent a historical period, though tendency to relate post 1883.
- Wrong: so called historical oak are east of house: dating post 1883. Read with the above.
- V-shaped garden EAST (now axis) developed from the house to river bank of Prins Kasteel and most probably inflow of Flagstaff spruit, need for carts / pickers to collect fruit?
  - V-shaped garden / orchards pre-1883; post 1893; orchards behind “slave bell” or time signal (Concept of a Slave bell no longer in us but time signal or ghong... not sure about correct new word or phrase)
- wind protectors / hedges also other vegetation than oak: – should be researched firstly. Post 1883 experimented with oak trees to form fire belts on plantations
  - Original oak lane was Road (b) from house to “oude tuinie” or vineyards (diagram)
- historic road (a) ran north-south past the stables to Zwaanswyk; later (post 1883) also turn off from road (b) over concrete bridge (new picnic site?) which replaced old doordrift at that crossing (map reference)
  - Cultural landscape must include silvertree forest and old burial site of slaves & labourers
  - one access road to suggested activities (Land-use) not feasible.
Grading of buildings: S-G diagram (M2411) indicates the Manor House as the only graded building together with the sites where two buildings, wine cellar and jenkershuis (image records) were demolished. Diagram also includes area before the house (quart yard).

- Slave lodge / old stables (Without workshops) seems definitely excluded! See also Records of Grading 9/2/11171 dated 8/9/1961.
- The architecture and building style of the mentioned outbuildings differ substantially from the Manor house and they were not built by Thibaut nor before 1800. See newspaper advertisements of auctions in 1800; 1802 as well as sketch by Hamilton.
- Total absence of grading process; NID; rescue maintenance on the interim; probably use as office space.
- Suggested recovery of façades to square before the house totally absent. It should be done before trees planted. REMEMBER grading status of square.
- Layered history totally ignored but at random used, mostly post 1883, e.g. layered history displayed in the slave building cum convict outstation expanding more than 100 years, but several layers of socio-economical and personal history.

Panel 4: My comments on this panel extend to several pages as I have also added historical data. Several issues brought forward in the previous panels are repeated. Summarised:

- Immediate need for ablution facilities:
  - Double sided entrance to a facility south side of workshop
  - Removal of ablution block on bank of Flagstaff river at Convict outstation
  - Arboretum: re-instate info-centre in Lister's tearoom and remove tearoom ...
  - To one kitchen facility like the old stonehouse creating an “eatery” effect on river bank between riverine vegetation; also catering for picnic baskets and bookings of sites in fynbos

- Distinguish between natural and cultural “museums” - cultural should be inside building on werf: forestry is also cultural but outside werf; natural (fauna & flora) in fynbos belt around and close to house NOT in Arboretum e.g. where wince cell footprints remains ... 

- Biodiversity and historic vegetation: omitting Afro-montane Forests.
- Visual impact of edge: remove stables to corner closest to Porter gate and recover river bank with horse & hiking trail & cycling trail. Stables on two river banks make no sense.
- Stables (eco-) will then form natural edge with view / paddocks to the river sides.
- Careful management of layered history: totally absent as no qualified personal involved.
- Eco-tourism: conflict of interest with heritage value. Take into account emotion and sensitivity of a building e.g. slave lodge / convict outstation NOT suitable for a leisure centre.

- Instead craft learning / gilds co-operation between state / private sector input in left behind communities around Tokai and the disabled (the blinds etc) – fund raising for the needy and a % rent (income) for TMNP / SANParks

- Added: suggestions from Mrs. Dillys Robinson (021- 71233566): local gilds art and crafts and classes presenting all by local artists, also to the less privileged:

  - They are eagerly waiting for an opportunity to participate and to contribute their talents to the benefit of the total Tokaiian community and TMNP. This is a great opportunity which should not be missed.

  - Hand made curios at Tokai to be sold in info-centre of shop within Precinct.

- Tourist (smart) accommodation – in conflict with guest houses in surrounding neighbourhoods, Silvermine etc.

  - Needed is backpakker accommodation re. River cottages or Bosdorp cottages.

- Orpen House: Commercial strategy of SANParks must accommodate sensitivity and intrinsic value of recommended heritage site.

- New headquarters: a new building will add to fragmentation. Instead dust, paint and
refurbish workshop but block off access to old stable. Build toilets.

- **Relocating in workshop structure** will satisfy the public as it is a mid 20th century building with no particular heritage feature apart from its age; also several examples exist.
- If a new HQ should be built the ideal place would also be on the “city side” of the werf, thus on the Flagstaff side between the old garage and the cells of the convict station. It will form a natural barrier. **NB:** a single story building...
- Gardens: layered history since 1796 not represented here. See Hamilton & other sketch & diagrams/maps covering huge timeline.
- Info boards: get community people; old pupil & / teachers from Porter etc. to do guiding in stead of impersonal and limited information board — however:
- Boards are functional to indicate heritage sites or giving direction.
- Re-introducing **leivore** ...
- but cover up Barnard’s swimming pool: contradictory to water usage, gardens and leivore: this area formed part of orchards pre 1883 and post 1893. (**see Maps**)
- **Commercial opportunities** should be managed **AFTER** cultural heritage is gazetted and restored; appropriate staff (plural) with i.e. cultural historical and museum management skills permanently involved with management of heritage. Thus postpone commercial use of werf buildings to indefinite future.

Panel 4: Conceptual Framework:

- All concepts should be considered within the framework of the lease agreement between SANParks and W.C. Province (PWD)
  - implicating official and gazetted heritage status of old buildings.
  - And required NID for public comment not indicated.
- Use of house was announced as HQ — suggested use contradictory to this.
- Hall of convict outstation ideal space for conference facility
- Or open design and leisure centre: contradictory to emotional and sensitive intrinsic value of history of the complex. Ideal place for “giving back to the community” projects
- Old stables: announced as offices. Suitable but after restoration. Adventure centre contradictory to intrinsic historical value. Heritage status is HUGLY SIGNIFICANCE.
- CSR & Bosdorp: Labour very significant to plantation; also personal history. Could be restored as back packer accommodation or staff quarters. Genealogy of Bosdorp citizens need to be done. List of names of workers on display board.
- CSR building: ideally situated as **info-centre.** Also close to suggested parking & entrance.
- HQ building and place together with suggested parking areas: fragmentation of fynbos belt on river edge not desired. Rather display natural transformation from riverine plants to fynbos on southern banks of the river. Keep clear of activities: make human consumption or footprint barely visible.
- Arboretum parking: remove and restore fynbos. Use overflow parking area for staff and disabled people.
- Tokai Manor Lane / Ave: promenade. Limited access for vehicles apart from staff and vars of disabled persons. Keep single lane.

Panel 5: Historical Synopsis

On behalf of the Friends of Tokai Park, a member of the Tokai Ratepayers Association and in my personal capacity (J&AP) and interest as an archival (freelance) researcher I insist on a Heritage Impact Assessment in terms of Section 48 of the NHRA. Reasons:

- Debatable & disputing statements, and sources
  - **Princess Kasteel legend**: Mauve lifted this from P. Kolbe via Jose Burman; Kolbe rejected by contemporary Mentzel and several historians; no trace of Portuguese
vessel or incident in legend. Historical names to area on old maps and in official documents (e.g. first deed) “Prins Kasteel”; Kolbe described by e.g. John Barrow in Travels into the Interior of Southern Africa Vol.1 p.iii (1806) as: “… although professedly sent out in the character of a naturalist, has described subjects that he never saw; retailed idle stories of the peasantry that betrayed his great credulity and imbecility of mind; and filled his book with relations that are calculated to mislead rather than inform”. (Example of opinion)

- Anglicization of names and places e.g. Prins Kasteel cave became “elephant’s eye”
- Dates, etc. concerning land registration, deeds, public sales etc. Not entirely correct!
- Objection to lunatic institution (Mauve): Objection was by citizens in Mowbray and not Constantia. Archival documentation as proof.
- Demarcation of land between Porter / Forest Station : 1892; first map 1893 (exists, drawn up by Hutchins, issued by S-G) confirmation requested in 1898 – map only presented in 1902.
- No info on vernacular buildings, see 1883, 1893 and 1902 maps. Also info in archival sources.
- Environment: Ecological: No references to natural history 1652 (and before) to 1883.
- Bibliography: sadly misplaced. I provided several pictures of the National Archives (Cape Depository) to Chris Botes. Steers in person couldn’t give you the particular pictures: he died along time ago. Kindly acknowledge National Archives. They are the custodian of South Africans unwritten history locked up in numerous documents.

NB I am willing to meet consultants at archives to verify statements / facts.

Panel 6 – 9: Comments rolling over from previous panel discussions.
- Equestrian trail: re-introduce BRIDAL PATH recent “elephant’s eye” hiking trail.
- Re-introduce old hiking trail next to river and between level 5 and area between Silvermine and waterfall: that section of the path is dating back to the 1700’s. (Suggested names could be “ou houtvester’st rail or wood inspector’s trail or houtkappers trail etc.)
- NO to restaurant in werf complex or Manor House: see suggestion for multi functional kitchen in stone house. (Also opposed by numerous Tokai residents, like Mrs. Robinson).
- Suggested use of office space in old stables and workshop:
  ○ Already addressed.

Conclusion:
Thanks for a draft suggesting what could be done to the Precinct. This draft also suggests what should not be done to the precinct.

It will be in the best interest of all parties involved if a meeting between the consultant and I & A’s could take place before a plan is finalised.

Although people often disagree and criticize, the exceptional and expertise knowledge of all involved in any project is hugely valuable to make something successful.

Mrs. Berta van Rooyen
Tokai.
# COMMENT SHEET

## TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY

7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Debbie Cusens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td>private (horse rider)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>082 566 3560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:debccs@sfe.uct.edu.za">debccs@sfe.uct.edu.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment:

I have a few concerns regarding the planning.

1. **60 stables** - additional 60 horses places great strain on available riding area & paddocks - which appear to be reduced already on the plan.

2. **traffic** - 60 stables - 60 new owners, plus craft market traffic plus cycle traffic cars & bikes - no assessment seen for this in plans.

3. **Leisure centre** - planned in a listed building - this is not allowed.

4. **Adventure grand** - this is not conservation!! Also planned to build over an old burial ground.

5. **Reduction of paddock sizes** - horses need a great deal of space & grass. Making tiny paddocks is cruel and will end up attracting flies & midges which are devastating for horses.

### Signature: [Signature]

---

Please hand in comments or submit to elavali@telkomza.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: [www.tmnp.co.za](http://www.tmnp.co.za) and at Tokai Library.
# COMMENT SHEET

## TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY

### 7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>J L Brink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Porter Stables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No</td>
<td>082 695 2751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>1cawStelkom.za.net</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comment:

- Insufficient historical research
  1. ADCAS built site on appeals building
  2. Leisure centre in listed building
  3. Unmarked graves ignored

Inappropriate development for conservation:

1. Deli Line
2. Craft & other market
3. Leisure club
4. Upmarket restaurant
5. Parking areas
6. Events
7. Increase in traffic volume

Inadequate:

1. Consultants clearly have no idea of any short/long term developments
2. Expropriating & expropriated tenancy + tenants on old land
3. Traffic assessment - impact on surrounding area
4. Non-available
5. High traffic impact on conservation, fixed + subsidised cost

Is this study funded by taxpayers money

### Signature

[Missing]
Comments on Proposed Tokai Manor Precinct Plan

Evan Rooyen, Feb 2012

Observations

This document is structured as observations, general objections, specific objections and alternate proposal/vision for the development of the precinct.

In my opinion, the proposal as displayed in the various posters (panels), do not have a clear vision of the long term future of the precinct. It reads like an ad-hoc collection of ideas, mostly about the current use patterns while ‘underutilized’ buildings are earmarked for commercial use. It fragments the area into bits so that the sense of whole, of the precinct being a single historic entity, is lost. As such it is not clear how the stated goal of developing the precinct as: “Gateway to the Table Mountain Nation Park” will be achieved.

Some additional notes and observations:

- The proposal does contain some useful ideas like rehabilitation Prinskasteel river, the using developing the “river cottages” into administration centre. Some proposals are questionable; tree top adventures through Eucalyptus trees, with branched breaking?
- I am strongly of the opinion that the historic Manor house and outbuildings should have uses, but in line with their status as, or hopefully soon to be, historic buildings. The buildings should be used daily, should not be relics of the past. The proposals do go partway towards this ideal; the builds do have uses, but as proposed, not park and/or history uses. Rather, the Manor house and surroundings are seen as available for any commercial use.
- Protecting the stables and slave lodge from the elements is an immediate priority. It needs to happen before the first winter rains.
- The Manor house should be the center from which of attention for the park, not some private restaurant competing with the restaurants at Groot Constantia, Klein Constantia and Steenberg Estates.
- There exist a garbage site on part of the equestrian area. This should be closed off for archaeological excavation without delay.
- Why remove the buildings in the equestrian area? What makes the “in appropriate”? The need for storage space, fire fighting equipment, etc. will not go away. The first forestry school was in this area; perhaps it that should be re-instated?
- The presentation does not communicate well; intent has to be guessed from small map legends and notes on the side. This makes it difficult to understand the whole.
- Given the historic nature of the area, the use of questionable historic ‘facts’, some clear errors, and closed sources, casts doubt on the quality of the information in the proposal. (A separate submission by Berta van Rooyen details some of the problems and errors.)

General Objections

- The proposals do not do justice to the historic character of the park and the precinct. The park has a rich history not reflected in the proposal. This history includes:
  - fauna (the “Big Five” roamed here),
  - flora (some Cape Flats Sand Fynbos endangered species are within walking distance),
• is a farm for 90 years and includes slave history of approximately 45 years,
• it was the starting point for commercial Forestry in South Africa with the first Forestry first nursery (though the third plantation),
• convict labour was used on the plantation, and there is record of a prison building to prove it,
• and finally, it was part of the old Porter Estate.

• The proposal fragments to old farm courtyard ("werf") into little bits, instead of restoring the Manor house and outbuildings facing the central square into a single whole as originally built.
• The focus on monetizing the area is misplaced given the history of the area and goal of the plan. It almost seems like, once the need for the park headquarters have been met, the rest of the area is available like a business park.
• There is little attention given to traffic, particularly if the precinct does become a gateway to the park. How will tour buses, people with disabilities and old people, be accommodated, with the least impact on the precinct. Having parking inside, or beyond the precinct simply aggravates the situation.
• The baseline report refers to many sources, which is not readily available to the public (and some, not at all). Thus a public discussion document becomes partially closed, not in the spirit of the process.

Specific Issues

*Hakea fence on the south side of Tokai road*

• Cultivating a Hakea hedge on the edge of a biodiversity corridor, in a park celebration the indigenous flora, by the official custodian of the park, in quite in-exusable.
• What is there to hide, surely we want the visitors to see the biodiversity corridor?
• It will be a serious problem once the biodiversity corridor needs to be burned.
• If a hedge is needed, indigenous plants would be be suitable and in line with the park mandate.

*North side fence of Tokai road*

• Again, why cultivate an exotic tree instead of indigenous plants, like large Protea species or Silvertrees?
• Again, Eucalyptus trees will complicate burning of the biodiversity corridor.
• Large tree on the northern side of the road limits sunlight to the plants at the edge of the biodiversity corridor.

*Historic avenue of Oak trees*

• There is no historic record of such an Oak avenue before 1883; the area was used for orchards, and fruit trees require sun, not shade from Oak trees.
• If the Oak trees are important enough to be re-instated, surely this implies the orchards, vineyards, and Silvertree forest needs to be re-instated!
• Propagating an invasive specie inside a National Park is definitely questionable.
• What is there to hide? Does the park not want the visitors to see the mountain.
• A short avenue would be enhance the approach to the Manor house, why not gradually
replace the Oak trees as they die off with indigenous trees, or large Protea species (Silvertrees anyone)?

Oaks around the Manor house

- Again, there is little historic justification. Certainly there never were trees at the back of the house.
- Old photographs and present day stumps show 3 trees on each of the north and south sides of the house.
- Planting more trees will aggravate moisture problems in the house itself, and the tree roots may cause structural problems later.
- As pointed out by some other commentators, large trees poses a lightning risk.

Garden to the west of the Manor house

- Why have commercial farming up the hill from a historic monument with all the irrigation and fertiliser issues?
- Vegetables need sun, not semi-shade from the remaining trees!
- It will be much larger than any historic garden.
- An extended fynbos garden seems far more appropriate. (Perhaps this can be developed into an area where people can enjoy a Tokai Fynbos picnic hamper?)

Open house complex: “Open House / Design Centre / fresh produce market”

- The Open house complex is rich in history, with various parts dating back to the farm period, the convict labour period, and the Porter Estate period.
- It must be restored, not used. The old slave lodge is ideal for a museum and information center, while the Manor house is where the park officials and visitors interact. The Manor house does not have to be a high density area.

Baboon fencing

- Fencing areas where food is consumed does make sense, and the various options for baboon fencing does this.
- None of the options makes any sense from a baboon-people interaction point of view: most people move through the precinct to the mountain itself where there is no fencing. People-baboon interaction will happen anyway.
- The fence seems more to keep people in than keeping baboons out. (It may have merit in keeping vandals out at night, though.)
- Make life to difficult for the baboons, and they will surely move to some other place with easier pickings: like bothering visitors in Silvermine or Chapmanspeak drive.

Old bridge over the Prinskasteel river

The bridge was built as part of the original access route to the plantation. It was built in the around 1883-1885. This should be noted as a historic structure.
Old 'drift', south of the Manor house

The road past the manor house going south should follow the historic route (see SG 1902 map).

An Alternative Proposal/Vision

The Tokai section of TMNP represents a link to our collective past, not just farming, but also to the Cape of Good Hope and its flora. As such, it has a major responsibility to strengthen the link by information and education. The lower Tokai area sits right in the middle of a developing city, and it is not clear to everybody why it should be there, and why it must be protected. Simply stating it is a world heritage site, is not enough!

For the park to continue, the people of the area must be proud of it, and most especially the people on the periphery of the park. They can help or hinder the park; if inspired these people living on the edges of the park, can provide a buffer zone around the edges shielding the park from much of the residential development. And to develop this civil pride, the precinct is key. It provides the focal point for the Tokai part of TMNP. The precinct must not be developed to be another Spier, Buitenverwachting, or Groot Constantia. Develop the precinct as a place people will what to visitor, not just the park head headquarters and business activities.

The history of the precinct forms a thread which links the various aspects together, and that is why the restoration of the 'werf' is so important. The story of the farm, plantation and Porter Estate provides the spine from which many other subjects flows:

- What did it look like 200 years ago?
- Explain, show, visit the endangered plants, the 600 species recorded on Tokai.
- How did they farm with baboons, elephants, and lions around?
- How did the plantation change the place? What did the slaves do, and what did the convicts do?
- How has the Orpen complex changed from a single long house to the current block?
- Show, and have a visitors path, explaining how the fynbos has returned after more than 100 years of pine cultivation, and why it is possible for the fynbos to return.
- Explain what is biodiversity, why it is important, how removing the pines contributes, and why removing the pines are important.
- etc.

Proposal

- Original outbuildings facing the central square, stables and slave lodge, must have their façade repaired to the original form. The windows and doors must be restored and the buildings made into an organic whole with the Manor house instead of just 3 separate buildings.
- A modern office building, with a period façade, can be built in the location of the wine cellar after archaeological activities have completed. This is completely in keeping with the area, will balance the structure of the farm courtyard with the Jonkershuis.
- The depot/workshop building, which was added onto the stables in the 20th century, can be used for offices and other activities so long as it does not impact the old stables building. Expansion as indicated is also possible.
- The Manor house must be an information centre, issue wild cards, a museum, an exhibition area of the history of the park, center of the TMNP's interaction with visitors.
• Develop a single isolated building for kitchen(s) for all catering activities, from which it can be distributed to various locations. This minimizes the impact on the area, one location that require major infrastructure upgrading (water, electricity, sewage, health and safety, etc.). Also associated fire risk is in one location. (The 'brick house' south of the stables perhaps?)

• Convert the road from Prinskasteel river to the Manor house into a pedestrian area, a promenade acting as a starting point of trails to the Arboretum, the fynbos, the historic buildings and the lookout 500m above the valley.

• Use the area which the current proposals make into a parking lot, into a fynbos garden or nursery, since it is an interface between the biodiversity corridor and the precinct, and is of Cape Flats Sand Fynbos geology.

• Move the main parking are to the south western corner of the picnic area. The picnic area is lightly used during the week anyway. This applies in particular to the mountain bikers, with their big 4x4 transport. It will only take them an extra 2 minutes to get to the arboretum.

• The mountain bikes can use the access road on the south of the river separating the pedestrian traffic from the cyclists.

• Provide a place for social interaction for the cyclists at the parking area; they have to end their ride at the parking lot. This expansion of service fits in with area’s use as a picnic area.

• In general, extra services may provide sources of revenue. For example
  • Tours of the fynbos for large/special groups of visitors by specialists.
  • History tours: there is so much to tell, this can only be done in person.
  • Fynbos cut flowers for local florists which service local hotels like Steenberg Estate. Species like Serruia, Sugerbushes, and Orchids perhaps. This will complement a nursery.
  • Do not try to compete with existing commercial operations (like hotels, restaurants, etc.)
  • Baboon viewing tours, as many visitors come just to see them (the baboons have become local celebrities).

Emile van Rooyen

21 Feb 2012
COMMENT SHEET

TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY

7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Cillian Howden</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>082 902 0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gillianh@redbank.co.za">gillianh@redbank.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

I wish to comment on the Equine Area Sub-Plan. I have thought a lot about this issue, and I know that what we are asking for is not feasible. The demand for space for horses is high, and we need to ensure that we provide enough space for them. This area is located in the open, and horses need space to graze and roam freely. If this area is not available, we will be left without the necessary space for our horses.

In this day and age, where we are forced to give up our horses because of economic reasons, it is important to ensure that we provide enough space for them. The proposed area is too small, and it will not be enough for the horses to graze and roam freely.

In conclusion, I urge you to reconsider the proposed area and provide enough space for our horses. Thank you for your consideration.

Signature: [Signature]

21/2/2012

Please hand in comments or submit to elavalli@telkomsa.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gillian Hansen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>082 902 0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gillian0007@web.co.za">gillian0007@web.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

With reference to other proposals, my comments are as follows:

1. Has a similar short or assessment been done on what traffic will arise from a single access route into or out of the estate? Even now, the Pilane Astra Gardens have traffic problems with cars backed up almost to the same access on weekends and public holidays.

2. The taxi rank point is more suited as the area to house the taxi rank.

3. Is it constitutional to build an adenuate ground on or over a слабье site? And can a manic building be used as a draft plan?

4. The paving master needs greater care, a thought to impact on both the community around Tokai forest and the forest itself.

**Signature:**

---

Please hand in comments or submit to elavallie@telkomsa.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.
To:

Mr Derek Chittenden
BlueGreen Planning + Design
Josephine Mill, Boundary Road,
Newlands, 7700

Mr Trevor Thorold
Viridian Consulting
P.O. Box 2416
Somerset West, 7129

Mr Michael Sluyten
SANParks
P.O. Box 37
Constantia, 7848

21 February 2012

RE: SANParks Tokai Manor Precinct Plan - submission by the Tokai District Riding Association (TDRA)

Attention: Mr Derek Chittenden, Mr Trevor Thorold and Mr Michael Sluyten

Dear Sirs,

We refer to your invitation for comments concerning the SANParks Tokai Manor Precinct Draft Plans, having attended your open day on 07 February 2012 and attach herewith our submission.

We recognise that horse riders have always enjoyed a privileged and good relationship with SANParks in having access to Table Mountain National Park for their leisure activities and we greatly appreciate the endeavours that SANParks are making to continue to look after the interests of riders.

While supportive of SANParks’ intentions to redevelop the Tokai precinct and the relocation of their head office from Westlake, the equestrian community has however expressed several concerns about some aspects of the draft redevelopment plans. For this reason a meeting was held on 16 February 2012 between concerned riders that are founding Acting Committee Members of the recently formed Tokai District Riding Association (TDRA) to determine how the proposed redevelopment might affect equestrian activities in the precinct and neighbouring areas. Attending the meeting were representatives of all the major commercial stables yards in Tokai as well as representatives of riders and affected parties in the Tokai area. These were: Rosie de Jager, Grant Chapman, Lynn Wragg, Alison Ellis-brown, Carol Poole, Annemie Daly, Elaine Harrison, Sylvia Knight and Vivienne Marais with Sarah Hetherington, Erika James and Jenny Dickerson giving their apologies for not being able to attend.

The key concerns with the draft plan for the proposed redevelopment identified at this meeting are detailed in the attached document.

Please note that the TDRA will be having an AGM on 28 February 2012 at which time any amendments or additions to this submission arising from this meeting will be communicated to the addressees. The TDRA would like to express that it is considers it of paramount importance that the planning organisations now meet with organisations such as the TDRA in drafting their plans as although this was communicated as the intention at the scoping meeting held on 20 September 2011 this doesn’t appear to have taken place yet.

Yours sincerely,
Grant Chapman
Acting Vice Chairman – TDRA (Tokai District Riding Association)
SANParks Tokai Precinct Redevelopment

Concerns and suggestions from the Tokai District Riding Association (TDRA) representing the equestrian community.

The key concerns regarding the Tokai Precinct Redevelopment draft plans from the equestrian community are as follows:

1. SANParks have identified that the equestrian heritage together with forestry are the main underlying considerations in their proposed development plans for the precinct, which is greatly appreciated by riders and other affected parties. However, the lack of sufficient consultation with equestrian bodies during the planning phase has resulted in seemingly flawed provisions for riding activities in the park. These include the following:

1.1 Building of up to 60 additional stables which will put undue stress on the precinct which cannot accommodate so many more horses. Such stabling will also be in competition with other existing stabling and livery yards that will be negatively affected by a surplus of stabling.

1.2 Additional stabling requires additional acreage for paddocks and yet the draft precinct plan indicates that paddock acreage is to be decreased. This will result in the existing paddocks turning into dustbowls, thereby substantially diminishing the appeal of the precinct to all users.

1.3 The demand and economic merit for leasing additional stabling is questionable, whereas there is a need for a communal riding arena which has far greater potential revenue opportunities for SANParks. A lack of a riding arena is also putting additional pressure on other land, such as the lower forest plantation and Porter Estate where riding usage has increased substantially.

1.4 While it is encouraging to see that SANParks is making provision for a riding and dressage arena, the proposed arenas are too small for their intended use. It would seem sensible to consider a larger area for arenas, thereby opening up the possibility of a multi-purpose space that could be utilised for a variety of income-generating events if managed correctly.

1.5 Together with the proposed additional stables, the draft proposal provides for the arenas to be located on land that is currently leased to long term tenants (both SANParks and Crysallis Academy tenants) and no prior consultation has been entered into with these tenants regarding the proposed plans.

1.6 There are various other sites in the precinct that are more suited to accommodating a riding and dressage arena, such as: (i) the historical supervisor's stables and tennis court site to the south of the manor house and (ii) the area below the Chrysallis Academy athletics track that was historically used for a riding arena but has been demarcated in draft plans as an extension to the picnic/braai area. Both of these sites are already levelled and have the advantage that riders can be routed in such a way to gain access to either of these sites without sharing the same access routes as other users such as walkers and cyclists.
2. Number of vehicles entering the arboretum part of the precinct. The TDRA would greatly appreciate obtaining a copy of the planners' traffic impact assessment report to provide to their own professional consultants as indications from the draft plans are that there will be a substantial increase in vehicular traffic in the precinct which will be severely detrimental to the area.

2.1 Increasing the number of vehicles entering the precinct will only create more hazards for walkers, cyclists and riders and parking should therefore be moved away from the congested area of the precinct. The arboretum parking area is already highly stressed at peak times and permitting more vehicles into this area will only exacerbate this problem.

2.2 SANParks has an opportunity to establish its green credentials by restricting vehicular access to the park rather than encouraging more vehicles to enter what will always be a very constricted access given that there is no intention to widen the current bridge on Tokai road.

2.3 Currently most vehicles are predominantly driven by mountain bikers that can easily cycle the short and relatively flat section from outside the precinct to the current check-in point at the arboretum, so thereby removing all these vehicles from the arboretum area park and providing parking for walkers only.

2.4 A cyclist on the relatively flat access road poses far less danger to everyone else than their vehicle does, especially considering visibility for drivers will remain poor in the confined areas of the precinct, even with proposed road re-alignments.

2.5 Providing cyclists with parking outside the precinct will encourage more cyclists to travel to the precinct by bicycle which they can safely do on the dedicated cycle paths provided for in the draft redevelopment proposal plans.

3. Mountain biking interests appear to be over-represented in the draft precinct redevelopment plan.

3.1 While mountain biking must have its fair share of access to the arboretum and Table Mountain National Park by many accounts poor management of mountain biking has largely been responsible for driving most other users of the arboretum, as evidenced by a substantial decrease in walkers and riders accessing the arboretum, presumably for fear of being knocked into by a cyclist. At current growth trends there will be a further substantial increase in mountain biking activities in the foreseeable future and unless this is properly managed the arboretum will risk becoming a no-go zone for anyone but cyclists. The Arboretum area is one of the two main access areas to the upper plantation for riders and access for cyclists, riders and walkers needs to be balanced to accommodate all of them.
4. The current precinct redevelopment draft plan, as well as the greater TMNP plan (including plantation restoration plans) will undoubtedly cut access to some of the existing riding routes. While conceding that this may be necessary, the TDRA would like to meet with SANParks and other authorities to discuss the need for:

4.1 Access points, noting that access to riding routes is currently from the arboretum entrance, properties in Swaanswyk Road and Close, the Porter Estate, neighbouring equestrian facilities such as Constantia Uitsig and from facilities below the lower forest plantation.

4.2 Bridal paths to allow the safe passage of horses and riders on routes that can be dedicated to riders to prevent conflict with other park users.

4.3 Good planning of circular routes to offer riders several options (i.e. not out and back along the same path and not only one track that is now effectively the case in the lower forest). This will help to ensure that riders do not transgress paths closed for rehabilitation and it will also ensure that riding routes are not overused and subjected to erosion.

In addition to the TDRA members, the following organisations and individuals support this submission:

Uitsig Stable
Porter Stables
Allison Ellis Brown Riding
Forest Riding Club
Elaine Harms Riding Centre
Noordhoek Riding Association
Stellenbosch Riding Club
Tokai Pony Club
South African Riding for Disabled
Lane Stables
Cape Hunt and Polo
Constantia Valley Riding Club
Western Province Horse Society
Lee-Ann Drew
**COMMENT SHEET**

**TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY**

**7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>ROSIE DE JAGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td>PRIVATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>021 715 0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosiedej@gmail.com">rosiedej@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

I find the focus on intent to “upgrade” or look after the Tokai Manor House very exciting, but am perturbed about the direction you are proposing.

You seem to have adopted a very commercial and consumerist stance: “bums on seats” so to speak. The very simple, untouched rural feel so close to the heart of our city is the very appeal of the Manor House precinct.

My suggestion: That the Manor House be clearly used for functions and events at a premium and that the surrounding precinct be untouched and unburdened by commercial aspects.

With the Stone Church down the road to the Manor House could with clever marketing become a premium sought after wedding venue and more.

Cycling activities should be monitored more carefully and pricing (entry fees) increased quite substantially to relieve the burden of so much traffic of one particular activity.

Kind regards,

Rosie de Jager

Signature: [Signature]

Please hand in comments or submit to slavalli@telkom.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.
COMMENT SHEET

TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY
7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>GEOFF VON KLEMPERER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td>NONE (LEISURE HORSEMAN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>081 715 4819 / 082 497 0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gvk@diapna.com">gvk@diapna.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

1. THE WALKING CYCLING RED EARTH TRACK AROUND THE LOWER FOREST AT ORPEN ROAD HAS BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS AND IS WELL UTILISED. A SIMILAR CIRCUIT FROM THE TRACK APPROACHING THE MANOR ZWAHNSNYK ROAD BUT GOING PAST PICNIC SITE AND BACK TO ORPEN ROAD - ALSO SHADED WOULD BE A GREAT ASSET.

2. STRONGLY ENDORSE SEPARATION OF CARS CYCLES HORSES IN APPROACH FROM ZWAHNSNYK ROAD TO ENTER TMNP FOREST AND MANOR HOUSE PRECINCTS

Signature: [Signature]

Please hand in comments or submit to glavali@telkomsa.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.
**COMMENT SHEET**

**TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY**

**7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Gordon Feliz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>082 876 9052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Why build an office complex in a national park, even if it is a "green" building? Surely conservation means less building development, not more.

Suggest use Manor house area for offices and continue where they currently are.

**Signature:**

---

Please hand in comments or submit to glavali@telkomsa.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.
**COMMENT SHEET**

**TOKAI MANOR PRECINCT PLAN: OPEN DAY**

**7 FEBRUARY 2012, TOKAI MANOR HOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>GERALDINE GONÇALVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (if any):</td>
<td>FRIENDS OF THE DOG WALKERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Tel No:</td>
<td>021 671 7451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:allweath@iafrica.com">allweath@iafrica.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:**

Friends of the Dog Walkers, an interest group that has represented Cape Town dog owners in negotiating with park authorities for over 6 years, has been asking for access to the Tokai Arboretum since the formation of the first dog ERP.

We have been given assurances since that time that access to the Arboretum would get consideration in the future.

We are angry and disappointed to see no reference to dog walking in the plan. This keeps the folk of Cape Town dogs walking areas since their removal back to Tokai.

A large body of Cape Town citizens is being ignored and those of us that against TMNP will be unimpressed.

**Signature:**

Please hand in comments or submit to glavalli@telkomsa.net by 21 February 2012. Proposals are available for viewing on TMNP website: www.tmnp.co.za and at Tokai Library.