

Subcouncil - Matters Receiving Attention Report

Subcouncil 20

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 15/9/2018	1	PRESENTATION: THE FIRE SERVICE AND ITS FUNCTIONS
Author:	Ian Schnetler		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2018/09/19		
Outstanding:	230		
Directorate:	SAFETY AND SECURITY		
Department:			
Resolution Details:			
RESOLVED			
Subcouncil 20 notes the contents the feedback provided.			
Action: Richard White			
Resolution History			
Meeting Date	Resolution		
Department: Fire and Rescue Services		Responsible Officer(RO): Ian Schnetler	
Response Date	Comment from RO		
2018/10/12	Recommendation 2 - Ebor Road problem buildings require multi-agency approach which is in the process of being organized. Fire and Rescue Service intervention as a single entity entity is insufficient to address the problem. Recommendation 3 - SANParks have been informed of the matter. South area co-ordinator has been advised to engage with Cllr East to address the concerns regarding the fuel loads and management plan.		

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 42/9/2018	2	PROGRESS REPORT ON RETREAT PTI
Author:	Brigitte Francis		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2018/09/19		
Outstanding:	230		
Directorate:	TRANSPORT & URBAN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY		
Department:			

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the content of the discussion and feedback.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the request for a report on aspects discussed by members for the August Subcouncil meeting.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that the report should include Retreat PTI, Wynberg PTI and Claremont PTI and all issues pertaining thereto and raised in the meeting.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that clarity be provided on U-Turn's location and whether they will be allowed to remain there.

Action: *Richard White & Melani Ohlson*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 27/10/2018	3	ANNUAL REPORT ON HEALTH SERVICES PROVIDED AT CLINICS IN SUBCOUNCIL 20
Author:	Jacqueline Ross		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2018/10/17		
Outstanding:	210		
Directorate:	SOCIAL SERVICES		
Department:			
Resolution Details:			
Noted			
Resolution History			
Meeting Date	Resolution		
2018/10/17	<p>RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Subcouncil 20 notes the contents of the presentation. 2. Subcouncil 20 requests an annual report on the following health issues at the individual clinics in its jurisdiction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of patients using individual clinics regarding TB and HIV testing; • The number of patients on ARTs; • Chronic medication and how/where it is accessed.; • How well are the clinics being used besides screening for TB/HIV, family planning, immunisations (different milestones for immunisations), STDs and any other service that was being offered by clinics. • There was a taxi rank with lots of commuters and pedestrians, how were they being attracted to use the clinic? • Besides Wynberg and Claremont Clinics who conducted outreach programmes, what was happening at the other clinics • How were the services of the clinics advertised? 1. Subcouncil 20 requests that the first annual report be submitted in July/August 2019. 		

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 64/11/2018	4	MOTION OF EXIGENCY: PROBLEM BUILDING 37 5TH AVENUE, HEATHFIELD (ERF 80517) SUBMITTED BY: CLLR KEVIN SOUTHGATE
Author:	Kevin Southgate		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2018/11/21		
Outstanding:	185		
Directorate:	AREA-BASED SERVICE DELIVERY		
Department:			
Resolution Details: Resolved 1. Subcouncil 20 notes the feedback pertaining to this item. 1. Subcouncil 20 notes and endorses that this item be escalated to the City Manager to expedite progress. Action: Richard White			

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 27/2/2019	5	BUILDING CONTROL JUDGEMENT FROM THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT
Author:	Liz Brunette		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/02/20		
Outstanding:	120		
Directorate:	SPATIAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT		
Department:			

Preamble:

Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager advised that he received an email from Ms Fiona Ogle, Legal Services, informing him that the Department had to write to the DTI to try and obtain an amendment to Section 7 of the NBR.

The Chairperson requested that timelines be requested from her. Item to remain on the MRA Report.

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the feedback from Legal Services.
1. Subcouncil 20 **supports** that timelines be requested as to how the matter will be addressed.

Action: *Richard White*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 28/2/2019	6	PAINTING OF LINES/ROAD MARKINGS
Author:	Kevin Southgate		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/02/20		
Outstanding:	120		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:			

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the contents of the discussion.
2. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that the report that served at the Transport Portfolio Committee will be circulated to all Councillors of Subcouncil 20.

Action: *Richard White*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 29/2/2019	7	LEASES OF SPORTS CLUBS
Author:	Carol Bew		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/02/20		
Outstanding:	120		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:			
Resolution Details:			
Resolved			
1. Subcouncil 20 notes the contents of the discussion.			
1. Subcouncil 20 notes that the matter remains on the MRA Report.			
Action: Richard White			

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 25/3/2019	8	AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN MUNICIPAL PLANNING BY-LAW, 2015 (MPBL)
Author:	Schalk De Jager		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/03/20		
Outstanding:	100		
Directorate:	SPATIAL PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT		
Department:			

Preamble:

Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager reported that he was informed by Mr Richard Walton that a public meeting would not be beneficial at this stage.

He also advised that the commenting period has ended, Council still had to decide on the amendments and may approve it all or only some or may vary some.

He recommended that the public meeting be postponed until the amendments have been approved. Thereafter there will undoubtedly be media releases and an explanatory document could be produced and posted on the web site.

Mr Walton said that if there is political call for public meetings then it will be dealt with.

The Chairperson requested that the matter remain on the MRA Report.

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the feedback provided by Mr White.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that the matter to remain on the MRA Report.

Action: Richard White

Resolution History

Meeting Date	Resolution
2019/05/22	Resolved
	Subcouncil 20 notes the feedback provided.
	Action: Richard White

2019/04/25

RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

a) Subcouncil 20 notes the advertising of the proposed amendments to the City of Cape Town Municipal Planning By-law, 2015 (MPBL)

FURTHER RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

b) Subcouncil 20 endorses that the Subcouncil Manager arranges a public meeting where the amendments to the MPBL can be workshopped.

c) Subcouncil 20 notes that all documentation relative to the Amendments to the Bylaw be forwarded to all Councillors.

Action: Richard White

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 14/5/2019	9	MOTION: REVIEW OF THE CLAREMONT CBD INFORMAL TRADING PLAN
Author:	Ian Iversen		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Informal Trading		

Preamble:

Mr Paul Williamson and Ms Janice Adams from Area Economic Development was present for this item.

He explained the way forward as follows:

- There were 3 different trading plans for Claremont which now has to be consolidated and updated.
- There were trading bays outside the United Building Society which no longer existed, this meant that all the bays had to be plotted on a discussion map to establish the precise number of bays and status of the remaining bays in the area.
- Line Departments had to identify the areas where there were no trading opportunities but had now become a trading opportunity.
- This would be an internal document where engagement would be with the Ward Councillor, AED officials and then Claremont CIDs.
- Discussion will also be embarked upon with the Ward Councillor in terms of the areas/bays that must be deregistered from the old trading plans.
- Once the locations on the discussion map became clear, line departments such as Traffic, Roads Branch would be invited to participate to comment.
- The comments will then be referred to the Ward Councillor, thereafter the traders and CIDs will be consulted.
- An Open Day will be arranged, advertising will be on the City's website and in the community newspapers. Social media may also be used.
- There will also be consultation with the Subcouncil.

Mr Williamson stated that this was an onerous process but it was also consultative for business, traders and the Ward Councillor.

The Chairperson enquired about the timelines and the starting date.

Mr Williamson advised that the prescribed time for the process is 117 days. The current maps were drawn prior to the implementation of technology. The locations on the maps will therefore have to be captured by GIS.

Ms Adams further advised the meeting of the following:

- That the process had already started on 22 May 2019 when the Motion served at the Subcouncil, the Department was busy plotting the area.
- That due to the process, the trading bays has been reduced in comparison to the bays that were gazetted 19 years ago.
- According to GIS, the exact number of bays and locations are required when capturing the information. This is not possible as a public participation process needs to be embarked upon.
- She was informed by GIS that there are other areas also waiting on their information to be captured and that Subcouncil 20 will have to wait its turn.

In light of the aforementioned, she enquired whether the reduced number of bays be worked with for GIS to capture?

The Chairperson advised that he could not authorise that the reduced number of trading bays be used as there are other roleplayers who must be consulted on the issue.

Mr Williamson said that all the bays will be plotted, sites that has been decimated for any reason will be deleted, informal trading opportunities would be maximised. Claremont CIDC is a key voice in this process, once there is a proposed trading plan the Subcouncil will be informed. He stated that other departments may be aware of developments in the area which could give rise to further opportunities.

The Chairperson advised that a major development would be taking place at the Old Werdmuller Centre site. The developer will be providing space for informal trading. In response, Mr Williamson said that the development will give credence to the "dead square" adjacent to where an undercover market was envisaged.

The Chairperson thanked Mr Williamson and Ms Adams for attending the meeting and for explaining the way forward with regards to this Motion.

Resolution Details:

RESOLVED

- a. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the contents of the discussion with regards to the Motion on a Review of the Informal Trading Plan in Claremont CBD.

FURTHER RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND

- b. Subcouncil 20 requests that cognisance be taken of the issues raised by its members;

Action: *Paul Williamson & Janice Adams*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 15/5/2019	10	RECREATION AND PARKS: AREA 4 - QUARTERLY REPORT TO SUBCOUNCIL 20: JANUARY 2019 TO MARCH 2019
Author:	David Curran; Leon Swartz		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	COMMUNITY SERVICES AND HEALTH		
Department:	Recreation and Parks		

Preamble:

Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager, read an email he received from Ms Zeenat Arieff, Head: Facility Management and PMO for Area 4, containing the following information:

- The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is underway. Included in the scope on the Eastern Shore, trail including boardwalks and the Eco Centre.

The majority of the EIA is funded by the R300k allocated for 2018/2019 a minimal amount will be required to complete it in 2019/2020 financial year. The programme indicated that the submission required two rounds of public participation and the submission to the Department of Environmental Affairs by October 2019. The expectant date of decision from The Department of Environmental Affairs is a maximum 107 days from submission to DEA&DP.

- The R2m in 2019/2020 was originally earmarked for the initiation of the trail but it should be noted that the portions that will be implemented are reliant on the outcomes of the EIA.
- The project team is made up of representatives from the Recreation and Parks Department and Planning, Development and PMO Department.
- There is no single project manager allocated at this stage for the implementation of the R2m.

The email is filed in the Official Minute as Annexure C.

ClIr Southgate expressed concern about the time frames for the 2019/2020 financial year. He pointed out that 2 public participation engagements were needed, it was really pushing the boundaries. He also mentioned that with a R450 000 upgrade the officials were struggling and in light of this detailed feedback was required with regards to the timeframes in the email received from Ms Arieff.

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the feedback as per the discussion.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the request that the timeframes be elaborated on in more detail.

Action: Zeenat Arieff & Richard White

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 43/5/2019	11	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON THE DRAFT RESILIENCE STRATEGY OF THE CITY OF CAPE TOWN
Author:	Cayley Green		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	CORPORATE SERVICES		
Department:	Resilience		
Preamble:			
The Chairperson reported that he spoke to the Chief Whip and enquired why the report did not serve at Caucus. He requested that the item remain on the MRA Report.			
Resolution Details:			
The Chairperson reported that he spoke to the Chief Whip and enquired why the report did not serve at Caucus. He requested that the item remain on the MRA Report.			
Resolution History			
Meeting Date	Resolution		
2019/06/12	Resolved		
	Subcouncil 20 notes that the item to remain on the MRA Report.		
	Action: Brigitte Francis		

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 51/5/2019	12	REQUESTS RELATING TO THE UPDATING OF SUBCOUNCIL 20'S DATABASE
Author:	Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		

Preamble:

Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager, advised that the Subcouncil database has been updated.

Cllr Southgate expressed concern about the status of the database because when invitations or notices about events were sent, the turnout was very poor and based on this it appeared that the database was incomplete. A deadline needed to be set for the database to be updated. He said that the Subcouncil Manager has indicated that there have been non-responses to notices to update the information on the database.

The Chairperson said that the responsibility should also be on Councillor to check the organisations that are active or inactive.

Mr White advised that notices were sent out in February to the organisations to update their information on the database. Due to an audit the next date for updates is scheduled for 10 or 12 July 2019, deregistration will then be done in the presence of the Ward Councillor because the organisation may not be active on the database but the Ward Councillor will be aware of its status in the Ward. Thus far no responses has been received from the Education Sector and Designated Vulnerable Groups.

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the discussion about the Subcouncil database.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the request that the updating of the Subcouncil database is in progress.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that deregistration from the database will be done in the presence of the Ward Councillor.

Action: *Richard White*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 52/5/2019	13	DANGEROUS RAILWAY CROSSINGS: FAULTY BOOMS AND DANGEROUS TRAIN COMMUTING
Author:	Ian Iversen; Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	TRANSPORT		
Department:	Regulations		
Preamble:			
<p>Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager, advised that in the Chairperson's speech he referred to the dangerous railway crossings in Ward 59 and 58. He said that since 2018 there has been discussion on a political level and on an interdepartmental level about the dangers associated with faulty booms and commuting by train.</p> <p>Cllr Southgate brought it to the attention of the meeting that Prasa was busy erecting fencing in some areas but in other areas they were afraid to engage with the communities and have left open gaps at those locations.</p> <p>Recently in Heathfield there was a fatality when a man crossed the railway lines where there was no fencing and was hit by a train, therefore the discussions with Prasa should continue.</p> <p>Mr White advised that the issue was also raised at a Ward Committee meeting which was an indication that the situation was also being monitored by communities. It was important that discussion continue with Prasa.</p>			
Resolution Details:			
Resolved			
1. Subcouncil 20 notes the discussion about the dangerous railway crossings.			
1. Subcouncil 20 supports that the discussions with Prasa to continue about the dangerous railway crossings.			
Action: Richard White and Cllr Iversen			
Resolution History			
Meeting Date	Resolution		
2019/05/22	Emanating from item 20SUB8/5/2019, the Chairperson raised the issue of the danger at Kenilworth Railway Crossing. Flagmen waited until the train was practically at the crossing before alerting motorists of the danger.		
	He also spoke about the overcrowding on trains (both inside and hanging out of doorways, in front and between carriages). The Chairperson advised that he will follow-up on this matter.		

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 53/5/2019	14	LAW ENFORCEMENT: THE DESIGNATED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER FUNDED FROM WARD ALLOCATIONS AND ISSUES ARISING FROM THE PCER (APRIL)
Author:	Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		

Preamble:

Mr Rudolf Wiltshire, Chief: Law Enforcement and Safety, Traffic and Co-Ordination, was present for this item.

The Chairperson informed Mr Wiltshire that this item appeared on the MRA Report and issues such as the funding of LEOs, point duty and protective clothing, transporting of LEOs, shortage of vehicles and the replacement of designated LEOs.

The following questions/comments with the relevant responses by Mr Wiltshire are listed as follows:

- Cllr Brunette: She has funded a LEO in Ward 62 for the past 7 years. Each year the cost increased with the 2019/2020 amounting to R270 000. Was this cost the same throughout the City for all LEOs. Since the permanent appointment of the LEO, there has been no replacement but the funding continued to be spent, what happened to this funding?
- Cllr Cottle: Since December 2018 there has been no dedicated LEO in Ward 58, yet all the funding has been spent. Why was a replacement LEO never made?
- The Chairperson: Councillors were led to believe that the handover would be smooth once the dedicated LEO was permanently appointed. This has not happened. He also looked at the cost because every year when deciding on a LEO, the cost included body armour, torch, handcuffs etc for the same officer. It seemed that Councillors were being overcharged for these items as it should last for more than a year.
- Cllr Bew: She was in the same position as the other Ward Councillors, there has been no LEO in Ward 73 for the past 3 months, yet the report reflected 100 percent spend, all the good work done in the Ward by Officer Kellerman has been undone due to the absence of a LEO in the Ward.

Mr Wiltshire explained that unlike other Directorates, LE has a career path for LEOs which he elaborated on as follows:

- The Department recruited LEO as volunteers and are introduced to EPWP projects and paid a stipend. CIDs also embarked on the EPWP projects requesting 3 year contracts for the LEO they employed instead of the TCOE package. The LEOs may be paid more or a bit less. In 2008 the length of the contract was 3 months and when the contract expired, HR experienced problems where money was not in the cost centres and HR300s had to be created. This has been circumvented because the Department has a 3 year EPWP contract and LEO were appointed on a year contract, Councillors guaranteed that the funding would be in the cost centres, this sorted out the problem.
- With the migration from EPWP to fixed term contracts there is an increase in salaries. With Subcouncil LEOs it is fixed term contracts but when permanent positions became available as happened in the 2018/2019 financial year, there was a huge migration of staff which left the Wards unmanned. In the new financial year positions will also become available as officers with contract positions migrate to permanent positions. The Department was busy recruiting to fill 159 permanent positions. This also impacted on the Rail Enforcement Unit where 33 members migrated to Traffic. The instruction from the Executive Director: Safety and Security was that when a staff member moved into a permanent position, no migration should take place until the knock-on effect has been dealt with. When staff became permanent a new HR300 was completed to create positions by Council/Mayco so that a new recruitment process could be embarked upon for fixed term contracts. This has its own challenges, he reiterated that no staff to leave a Ward, CID or Subcouncil to his/her new position unless he (Mr Wiltshire) authorised the instruction. The instructions have been ignored, hence the current situation where the Wards in Subcouncil 20 were left without replacements. This was not reported to him and when it was brought to his attention he was furious. He warned staff that disciplinary action would be implemented as the Wards, CIDs, were left without LE, there were also Provincial Government and Rail Enforcement funding that had to be spent.
- In order to recover the spending on Subcouncil 20's cost centre, the Department was prepared to bring in additional staff to augment the staff in the Ward and deal with real issues of concern. The Department would

also pay overtime from its cost centre rather than lose the value of funding that had been lost in the Ward/s. This is an agreement that he is prepared to make.

- It was reiterated by Mr Wiltshire that to lose 6 months of funding was unacceptable. He stated that the Subcouncil Manager has his telephone number and should contact him and not wait for such a meeting. Issues such as this he needed to be informed about immediately, not at a Subcouncil meeting. If he had known about the situation, a permanent staff member would have been placed in the Ward to ensure that the service was not lost, there would also be no need to explain the lack of service delivery to constituents.

The Chairperson indicated that the latter offer to place a permanent staff member in the Ward while the replacements were being recruited was acceptable. He referred to the equipment that was being funded year after year for the same staff member, this needed to be looked at as well. Mr Wiltshire said that an investigation will be embarked on but if there was anything the Councillors felt aggrieved about with regards to the costing, they should contact his Financial officials. Training costs were claimed from Setas and the equipment remained with the staff member until it became unserviceable.

Cllr Brunette questioned who the responsible person for Law Enforcement is, the response was that it is Sibusiso, full details will be sent to the Subcouncil Manager. He also informed Councillors that irrespective of the magnitude of the problem/enquiry, they could contact him on his cellphone because he did not want them to worry unnecessarily about anything.

Cllr Bew requested that the Auxilliary Officer in Ward 73 be able to work flexitime because since LE operated from 8:00 to 16:00 the Ward was exposed to illegal activities after a certain time. Could the discussion take place for flexi-time?

Mr Wiltshire responded that flex-time can be discussed, that the needs of the client must be taken into consideration. Auxilliary staff are under Chief Shaun Smith, the Subcouncil Manager should have his contact details. He can also be contacted via Whatsapp.

In response to a question from Cllr Brunette, he advised that the Department was busy interviewing 400 applicants to fill 159 positions. Staff have been appointed in the vacant Wards in Subcouncil 20. He gave an undertaking to establish where the staff had been placed and why they were not reporting to the Subcouncil, feedback will be given to the Subcouncil Manager by 10:00 on Thursday, 13 June 2019.

Cllr Southgate expressed concern about the transport challenges. He advised that his LEO did point duty from 7:00 but she had to be transported which meant that 2 LEOs were involved. She also did not have white gloves which was important when directing traffic as it was still dark when her duty commenced. He enquired about the limited number of vehicles and what the Department was doing about capacitating the staff with a vehicle.

Cllr East thanked Mr Wiltshire for his positive attitude and responses, advising that she has been a proponent of the LE project for several years. She requested clarity on how the LEO/EPWP were selected and appointed to a particular Ward. She also questioned how a Councillor could be involved and whether the Councillor could head-hunt an incumbent for a particular Ward.

Mr Wiltshire responded as follows:

- The geographical location of the Ward and Subcouncil was taken into consideration. A person living in Atlantis will not be placed in Wynberg.
- With recruitment and selection, vetting, finger printing and background checks are also done. The latter involved going to the premises where the incumbent lived which included the neighbourhood to check on his/her nature and whether the person is involved in any illegal activity which was not declared. There have been dismissals in the Directorate due to gang affiliation by staff, the City was trying to circumvent this.
- The Department did not head-hunt people for positions, Corporate HR has the mandate to head-hunt. He advised Cllr East that if she knew of someone in the Law Enforcement/Auxiliary environment, to inform him thereof to consider the person.
- Another method used for recruitment was to send an SMS to all LEO in the service whether they are on active duty, at home or on the EPWP database, there is a SMS number they can apply to. If the person is at home and unemployed, they may apply via the SMS number. They will be placed on voluntary duty, receive the necessary training and will be placed on the EPWP database. Thereafter they will be appointed on a fixed term contract and then permanent staff.

Cllr East thanked Mr Wiltshire for the in-depth information he shared. She explained that she had someone who was very experienced, very effective and were highly respected by the community where he lived. She has been informed that this person had been head-hunted by another Subcouncil and she was not happy about this. He lived in Ward 71. She said that influence could have been used but she was not comfortable with the person working

in another Subcouncil.

Mr Wiltshire advised that he would look into the matter, he also had the final say into the deployment of incumbents. He suggested that the discussion be conducted outside of the meeting.

Cllr Cottle advised that she has funded a LEO in Ward 58 for the 2019/2020 financial year, however, with the Mayor's announcement that each Ward will be assigned a LEO, how would this impact on the appointment of the new recruit to Ward 58.

Mr Wiltshire explained that the LEO will be a permanent appointment. If Councillors still needed the Ward Allocations funded LEO, the two could work together on a "buddy system" and a vehicle could be provided for them to monitor the activities in the Ward. This can only have a positive effect on Ward 58 because by working as a collective with the Subcouncil Manager, focus can be placed on the problems in the Subcouncil and Ward.

Cllr Cottle enquired about the reporting lines of the permanent member of staff because with the Ward Allocations funded LEO, the Councillor had control over the latter, would it change with the permanent LEO.

Mr Wiltshire advised that the LEOs could clock in at the Subcouncils, have meetings with the Councillors and Subcouncil Managers regarding the needs. The supervising staff would be there to assist them. The mandate is to serve the community and it did not matter who issued an instruction as long as the task was carried out.

Cllr Brunette enquired about the difference in salary between a permanent LEO and a fixed term contract EPWP LEO and training.

Mr Wiltshire explained that the EPWP LEO was paid a stipend of R308 per day, no overtime was worked and they worked 40 hours a week. The officer could only act on By-Laws being transgressed because should the City have to defend itself in Labour Relations, it can be said that the EPWP LEO only did a fraction of the work. The permanent LEO earned a salary which cannot be disclosed and is responsible for more duties.

The Chairperson thanked Mr Wiltshire for the in-depth explanation and that he looked forward to the report back at 10:00 on 13 June 2019. The matter to remain on the MRA Report pending the feedback the Subcouncil received.

Resolution Details:

Resolved

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the feedback provided by Mr Rudolf Wiltshire on aspects relating to Law Enforcement.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the undertaking of Mr Wiltshire to provide further feedback by 13 June 2019 at 10:00.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** that the item to remain on the MRA Report, pending the feedback the Subcouncil receives.

Action: *Richard White & Rudolf Wiltshire*

Resolution History

Meeting Date	Resolution
2019/05/22	RESOLVED

Subcouncil 20 notes that a meeting be convened with the Ward Councillors and relevant Officials with regards to the issues linked to Law Enforcement Officers.

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 54/5/2019	15	WORKSHOP WITH THE PUBLIC: DISTRICT SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
Author:	Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/05/22		
Outstanding:	55		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		
Preamble:			
Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager, advised that he has not been able to arrange a workshop yet. The Workshop will be set up after recess.			
Resolution Details:			
Resolved			
Subcouncil 20 notes that the workshop on the District Spatial Development Framework will be set up after recess.			
Action: <i>Richard White</i>			
Resolution History			
Meeting Date	Resolution		
2019/05/22	RESOLVED		
Subcouncil 20 supports that a workshop with the public be arranged to discuss the District Spatial Development Framework.			

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 14/6/2019	16	SUBJECT QUARTERLY REPORTS: DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT CENTRE: 1 JANUARY TO 31 MARCH 2019
Author:	Greg Pillay		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/06/12		
Outstanding:	40		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Urban Management		

Preamble:

Mr Dominic Daniels from Disaster Risk Management was present for this item.

Cllr East stated that she was impressed with the Department's engagements across all sectors of the community and the great initiatives that were being driven by DRM. She enquired whether the initiatives could benefit Westlake and the broader community of Subcouncil 20.

The Chairperson said that there was a number of vulnerable groups, schools etc in Subcouncil 20, how could these institutions benefit from the initiatives. Could a school be referred to the Department for awareness programmes.

Mr Daniels advised that there were awareness programmes being conducted in Westlake and in informal settlements. He said that if a request was forwarded by the Subcouncil Manager to the Head of the Department, a programme will be prepared for the school or organisation. Summer and winter programmes were being conducted in Westlake.

Cllr Southgate expressed concern as there seemed to be a lack of engagement between the Department and the informal settlement, Die Gatjie in Ward 72. Reblocking between structures should be done and the area to be monitored to prevent densification. He visited the area 3 weeks ago and observed that the residents had built onto their structures. This should not have happened because it obstructed the access of emergency vehicles between structures and to different locations in the informal settlement. It would also hamper the work of DRM, they should communicate this irresponsibility to the community.

Mr Daniels concurred with Cllr Southgate, undertaking to pass on this concern to Mr Kippie. He was unable to advise when an inspection had been done of the area. Enforcement agencies played a part and would be called on to assist.

Cllr Southgate requested that the Subcouncil Manager arrange a site inspection and that DRM be present.

Cllr Brunette referred to the report, page 84 and enquired what the functional plan at Normal Henshilwood was that DRM would be assisting with. Mr Daniels advised that it was an emergency plan that will be created for evacuation in times of a crisis.

Resolution Details:

RESOLVED

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the contents of the report under consideration.
1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the request for a site inspection at Die Gatjie to be attended by the Ward Councillor, DRM and the Subcouncil Manager.

Action: *Richard White*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 15/6/2019	17	UPDATE ON CCTV CAMERAS IN SUBCOUNCIL 20
Author:	Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/06/12		
Outstanding:	40		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		

Preamble:

Senior Supt Jean Hesqua of Metro Police was present for this item.

She reported on the status of CCTV cameras in Subcouncil 20 as follows:

Ward 58: The project was partially completed; the Department was waiting on BP Garage to grant permission for a camera on their premises. The pole will be planted.

Sen Supt Hesqua advised that the Department was able to accept the project for the additional Ward Allocations funding for 2019/2020 for 3 LPR cameras in Ward 58.

She cautioned that the need for CCTV Cameras was increasing and that the Department was hesitant in taking on more projects especially for the 2020/2021 financial year. The neighbourhood watches are also erecting LPR cameras resulting in an increase in demand.

Ward 59: The pole was planted last week, the contractor is not on site everyday. There was a problem in running the cable through the manhole. There was still three weeks left before the end of the financial year, the City's IT connection to the cameras may also cause a possible delay.

Ward 62: A camera has been installed opposite Maynard Mall, the contractor was also waiting on permission as the location is a building.

Cllr Brunette pointed out that the buildings at that intersection are Heritage buildings. Sen Supt Hesqua to follow-up on this location.

Ward 71: The camera has been installed at Tyremart. Another camera installation was outstanding

Cllr East advised that she was only recently informed that the second camera could not be installed and she identified an alternate. All funding had been spent but the project was incomplete.

Sen Supt Hesqua advised that the second site is also problematic because there was already a camera at Ou Kaapseweg, Cllr East was requested to identify another location. With regards to the funding, she advised that all cameras were purchased before installation, therefore the zero balance.

Cllr East advised that she will meet with the Department externally.

Ward 72: Cllr Southgate reported that the outstanding camera has now been replaced.

Cllr Southgate expressed concern because he received a telephone call from Mr Barry Schuller who was very concerned that the service provider had been approached by a member of the neighbourhood watch giving direction where the cameras should be monitored from. He stated that he informed Mr Schuller that the cameras should be monitored and linked up to Constantia Watch. He requested that his concern be recorded and noted that it was being permitted by community organisations to give instructions to where the cameras should be linked to. This matter to be attended to. A LPR camera still had to be mounted/installed and the organisation who requested that the first camera be linked to them did not have the capacity or infrastructure to deal with LPR cameras.

During an engagement with the Department last week, it was very disconcerting to be informed that the Department did not have the capacity to install all the cameras that are being requested. Indirectly Councillors were told not to allocate funding for cameras in the 2020/2021 financial year. There was also only one contractor who installed the cameras throughout the City, this was a major concern.

The Chairperson enquired if there were more companies in the Metro who could do the job.

Sen Supt Hesqua explained that the project was advertised via Tender. This particular company was "one of a

kind", the company also outsourced the work or a portion thereof. Through a process of adjudication, it caused a big delay with their appointment, thus delaying the 2018/2019 projects further. The Tender for this contractor was valid until 2021 and it was the only company that had been appointed.

Cllr Southgate thanked Sen Supt Hesqua for the explanation, stating that this posed a concern as the communities put pressure on Councillors to deliver. He also enquired whether the status had changed with regard to the Electricity Department not allowing cameras to be mounted on its poles.

Sen Inspector Hesqua responded that she attended a meeting where all departments involved were present, an agreement was being formulated, the roleplayers would be meeting on a monthly basis. The issue of way leaves would be addressed during this process.

Cllr Southgate thanked her for the fact that a meeting of this nature had been set-up. He said that the request for cameras was normally made prior to a financial year. During this period the ground work should have been done and the cameras should have been installed during the first six months of any new financial year.

The Chairperson said that the request for cameras were made 18 months ago, the communities are questioning why in the final month of the current financial year the cameras had not been installed.

Mr Richard White, Subcouncil Manager, stated that in an earlier meeting in the past week, Mr Barry Schuller: Director: Metro Police – CCTV Cameras, alluded to the fact that the Department would not be accepting projects for CCTV cameras for the 2020/2021 financial year. He enquired whether this was the situation.

Sen Supt Hesqua was of the view that Mr Schuller was trying to minimize the projects. She said that the 2018/2019 financial year started off with 18 projects and ended with 40 projects. She was further of the view that she could not comment on this issue and that the Director should comment as he took the final decision regarding the installation of cameras. She was responsible for the installation of the cameras.

Resolution Details:

RESOLVED

1. Subcouncil 20 **notes** the content of the discussion relating to CCTV Cameras.

FURTHER RESOLVED

1. Subcouncil 20 to convene a meeting with the Director: Metro Police CCTV camera about CCTV cameras for the 2019/2020 financial year.

Action: *Richard White & Barry Schuller*

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 24/6/2019	18	SUMMARY MINUTE: WYNBERG ACT MEETING HELD AT SUBCOUNCIL 20, OLD COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CONSTANTIA, ON 30 APRIL 2019 AT 10:00
Author:	Jody Timothy Okkers		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/06/12		
Outstanding:	40		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		
Preamble: Cllr Brunette advised that Mr Neil Arendse to action the recommendation regarding Transport Enforcement officers and the area cleaning plan from Transport, Cleansing and WID linked to the responsible person be identified.			
Resolution Details: RESOLVED 1. Subcouncil 20 adopts the Summary Minute for the Wynberg ACT meeting held on 30 April 2019. 1. Subcouncil 20 notes that Transport Enforcement Officers to be employed for Wynberg PTI. 1. Subcouncil 20 notes that the area cleaning plan from Transport, Cleansing and WID as well as the responsible person be identified. Action: Richard White & Neil Arendse			

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 25/6/2019	19	SUMMARY MINUTE OF SITE MEETING HELD IN MONTY ROAD, SOUTHFIELD AND 10 AVENUE, FAIRWAYS ON 14 JUNE 2018
Author:	Richard White		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/06/12		
Outstanding:	40		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		
Preamble:			
<p>By the time this item was considered, Cllr Southgate had already left the meeting, he was given permission to leave early due to another engagement.</p> <p>The Subcouncil advised that his guidance was required for the item and that the Subcouncil Manager discuss the matter with him outside the meeting.</p> <p>The Subcouncil to note the report.</p>			
Resolution Details:			
RESOLVED			
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Subcouncil 20 notes the contents of the report in the absence of Cllr Southgate.1. Subcouncil 20 endorses that the guidance of Cllr Southgate, the Ward Councillor be obtained outside the meeting.			
Action: Richard White & Cllr Southgate			

Agenda Item No:	20SUB 28/6/2019	20	MOTION: REMOVAL OF CLAREMONT ROAD SCHEMES - HARFIELD & THOMAS ROADS, WILDERNESS ROAD AND NEW ROAD
Author:	Ian Iversen		
How Resolved:	Consensus		
Meeting Date:	2019/06/12		
Outstanding:	40		
Directorate:	URBAN MANAGEMENT		
Department:	Sub-councils		
Preamble:			
The Chairperson spoke to the Motion. He requested that the Schemes be deproclaimed, it negatively impacted on certain homes and was no longer required.			
Resolution Details:			
RESOLVED TO RECOMMEND			
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Subcouncil 20 supports the Motion for the Transport Directorate to deproclaim the Claremont Road Scheme consisting of Harfield and Thomas Roads, Wilderness Road and New Road.2. Subcouncil 20 supports that the Claremont Road Scheme as mention in Recommendation A be placed on the prioritised list for the formal process for deproclamation to be implemented.			