

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REPORT: OLD ST ANNE’S HOSPITAL (NEW KZN MUSEUM), 96 JABU NDLOVU STREET, PIETERMARITZBURG

Compiled by case officer, Ros Devereux

PROCESS FOLLOWED: a notice was placed on the website www.amafainstitute.org.za on the 28 June 2023 following an investigation through the Institute’s SEM unit that revealed problems placing an advert in the Witness newspaper. Interested and affected parties were contacted but it was not possible to identify all those who may be interested in a site such as this so only interest groups that had previously shown interest in the site and those neighbours who would be directly affected by the development were contacted. The responses are listed below.

LIONS RIVER HERITAGE SOCIETY comment received on the 17 July 2023

Dear Ros,
The Lions River Heritage Society Committee has decided not to oppose the demolition of specified parts of the old St Anne’s Hospital in the knowledge that the heritage sections of the building will be retained. Regret was expressed that the old X-Ray Department and the Chapel will be demolished as well. The former is a most interesting building and would enhance the property more than a parking area for buses, while the latter was a beautiful and meaningful part of the old hospital.
With kind regards and thank you for including us in the documentation
Jackie Kalley
Chairperson
LIONS RIVER HERITAGE SOCIETY
m: 0829245892

The Chairperson of the Lions River Heritage Society, which is based in Howick but which has a number of Pietermaritzburg or ex-Pietermaritzburg residents in its membership, gave a talk on the history of the hospital to the Society on the 25 June 2023. The talk was illustrated with plans provided by the KZN Museum and photographs taken on a visit to the site guided by Museum staff.
I attended the talk and explained the proposal in detail to the members. They were all invited to comment.
The notice was sent to the Society Chair along with the other notices after the formal posting of the notice on the website.
No other comments were received from individual members.
While the comment does not oppose the development, regret over the proposed demolition of the X-Ray building and the nuns Chapel.

| | ARCHITECT'S RESPONSE |
|--|---|
| | <p data-bbox="1144 268 1400 295">XRAY DEPARTMENT_</p> <p data-bbox="1144 304 2042 624">Although initially seen as intact and interesting, the Xray Department was noted for its social and historical significance in the context of the hospital, the architectural importance of the building was rated low. The building is located in a position that would mean it would be isolated from the rest of the development. By extending the existing driveway as the main vehicular access, it essentially disconnects the building from the rest of the museum. The integration of an isolated building presented challenges to the management of the facility, so the client favoured more efficient traffic flow at a lower cost than creating a second parking platform lower down.</p> <p data-bbox="1144 667 1256 694">CHAPEL_</p> <p data-bbox="1144 703 2042 799">This building is recognized for its beauty, but for 2 reasons, it is an extremely difficult, almost impossible building to incorporate into the new development.</p> <p data-bbox="1144 809 2042 1054">1 - The degradation state is extensive, with full trees growing out 2 of the facades. To preserve this building, it would take an almost entire rebuild. 2 - The position, although it is not disconnected, is extremely difficult to preserve in situ and maintain a connection with the new developments around it. It is a single story, freestanding building that acts as an island, separating major areas of the proposed museum to crucial connections and access points.</p> <p data-bbox="1144 1098 1272 1125">SOLUTION</p> <p data-bbox="1144 1134 2042 1230">Both buildings may be preserved in memory by incorporating certain elements from their structures in a gallery as part of permanent exhibition, or as small structural elements within the new buildings.</p> |

UPPER WEST SIDE GROUP - July 13, 2023

Thank you for the information. I think everyone on the Upper West Side would be so glad to see some positive development in contrast to all the crumbling heritage buildings that changes to the proposal will be just fine. Everyone was very positive about the development when we did the tour with Lindsay. I'll try to put your email on the UWS Facebook page. May be beyond my digital skills

Regards

Liz

Diana Milford Plans had to be revised due to financial constraints. Hence new Amafa approval but should then go ahead. Rezoning application in the Witness a few weeks ago. Seems like some new development coming to UWS - at last !

This group is run by Liz Thomson a resident of the area between West Street and the railway line that was dubbed the Upper West Side by the Friends of Macrorie House Museum and the Msunduzi Heritage Forum which brought out a self-guided tour of the area (authored by RD). The demise of Macrorie House Museum left a gap that was filled by this group, assisted by Project Gateway. The area covered by the group has been extended to Peter Kerchhoff Street and the members include the Ward Councillors.

The group organised a tour of the site and the architects explained the previous proposals to those who attended, including members of the Pietermaritzburg Heritage Society so this was regarded as more of a re-run of the previous consultation.

The leader, Liz Thomson commented positively to the proposals but did not request details of the revised proposals.

The notice was placed on the group's Face Book page.

Very few comments were received. The only one with substance was from Di Milford of Project Gateway and is in support of the project.

FRENCH PRESENCE IN PMB/KZN: ROUTES PRINCE IMPERIAL, LOUIS NAPOLEON & KING DINUZULU KACETSWHAYO – received on the 27 July 2021

Dear Ros

Proposed new KZN Museum in relation to the Allard House Chapel: a National Monument

Positives

Good to support museums. **And we are the capital city of this province.**

I just wish that the buildings had not been allowed to deteriorate to this extent and that AMAFA could actually maintain what IS in already with us.

We are sitting on treasures and they are falling apart; trees, bushes, plants growing out of venerable buildings all over our City-of-Choice, just for one small observation!

The splendid wooden gates at UNISA need VARNISH. Can AMAFA & the Department not oblige them to maintain?

Negatives - if I am reading these charts correctly

1. **The road is too close to the Allard House Chapel (and it could do with some more funding for maintenance! Our "French" project has already raised some R 98 000. 00 for the restoration of this Chapel over these years, since this project started)**

2. **the bus "drop off" (Chart C3 -Proposal, former BLOCK G), is right on top of the Allard House Chapel & its Superintendent's accommodation (what physical separation is suggested?). I suggest the bus drop off further down AWAY from the buildings (it is a CHAPEL after all. A place of worship. And with the parking RIGHT there, it will be like the MiniBus Station next to the uMsunduzi Museum ... mayhem) bottom right hand of the "park" area close to the Burger St entrance.**

The French Presence was contacted due to the impact the development may have on the Allard Chapel where the Prince Imperial was laid in state following his death in the Anglo-Zulu War. The annual mass in the Chapel forms an important part of the commemoration events that are held at the beginning of June each year.

The respondent was out of the country and only had a week to respond on her return. She was also ill on her return and was not able to discuss the matter with other members of her group.

The main concern is the positioning of the bus parking on the site of the X-Ray building and the impact of that on the Allard Chapel complex.

She did contact Allard House but the priest in charge did not submit a comment.

She also briefly comments on the impact of the design of the new building on the streetscape but does not offer any heritage basis for her comments.

3. it is a pity that not more of the original design could be kept (so elegant as compared to the broad " American" style paneling!) , but not knowing enough about costs, I would bow to informed superior advice and lament the turn of events!

Thank you for inviting our comment. And for sending through the Proposal designs. I have not had the time to discuss this issue with concerned colleagues as I was unaware of these proposals until very recently and I am presently indisposed.

My main concern is the SPACE between noisy, smelly buses and the National Monument Allard House Chapel which will inevitably be affected by more pollution from exhaust fumes and noise. This should not be allowed right next to a place of worship which happens to be a National Monument, as well. And when the "trouble" does progress, the OMI Fathers will not easily get funding from AMAFA or the KZN Department !

Kind regards

Glenn Flanagan

Project Leader: French Presence in PMB/KZN: Routes Prince Imperial, Louis Napoleon & King Dinuzulu kaCetswhayo

| | RESPONSE |
|---|--|
| | <p>PROXIMITY TO ALLARD RD CHAPEL_ The location of the driveway access, was determined by the only existing vehicular entrance onto the site, the reuse of the existing has the least impact on the rest of the site. The increase in traffic and use of the driveway may have an impact on the neighbour at certain times of the week – this analysis forms part of the town planning and traffic impact assessment. If the property were still a hospital the traffic impact would be no different, if not more.</p> <p>BUS PARKING_ The perception that the area labelled as “bus-parking” will be a “mini-bus station” is incorrect. The area is allocated for buses bringing school groups once or twice per day, leaving the buses parked there, temporarily or for the entire time the pupils are in the museum. It will not be used by public transport mini-buses and will be managed by the museum staff. Noise problems and clashes with times of worship will certainly be addressed by the management of the museum should they arise. The position is ideal for easy access and visibility of the main entrance of the museum, helping with the control of school groups and tour groups, also providing level access for wheelchair users or the elderly. If the bus parking were moved further down, this creates difficulty for them getting back up the hill to pick pupils up, or alternatively leaves hundreds of pupils having to walk down the driveway to the buses. If Block G is required to be retained, additional parking and driveway will need to be built lower down the site. This will impact the park area and add another cost to the budget through major civils work on the site.</p> |
| <p>ROBERT BRUSSE – HERITAGE PRACTITIONER AND CONVENOR OF THE HERITAGE FORUM – received on the 28 July 2023 (see full document attached)</p> | |

Public Participation Process:

Concern about the extent of the interventions on fabric that was previously destined to be retained in the development: he questions why Amafa should now consider the demolition of these structures as the value has not changed.

He notes that the KZN Museum should preserve the historic fabric as part of its mandate as a museum

Heritage issues around the demolition of buildings that have been deliberately neglected to the point where it is uneconomical to repair them are raised, along with the concern that this issue has been raised on other state owned properties.

“The consequences of demolition is that there is then a clear slate on which to design as ones wishes, except that there is a moral obligation to design a replacement that is architecturally as good and hopefully better than that which has been demolished. The tangibles and intangibles associated with history and sociological aspects of the building can, *ipso factor*, never be retained.

INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC – correspondence dated 08 November 2022 mentioned in the architect’s submission.

Structural Engineer’s Report: the report is not submitted as the engineer still needs to be appointed.

Grading: RB contends that this is open to re-assessment: he thinks the Chapel has been under graded and applies the same to Blocks A & F, which he thinks should have been graded higher.

The heritage practitioner’s submission acknowledges conservation worthiness of blocks A & C but no attempt has been made to make these buildings more visible in the development.

He raises some important points as this particular process was flawed.

The report acknowledged the importance of Block G (old X-Ray building) but the location overruled its retention – RB sees this as “a grudging acknowledgement of historic or other significance and yet a recommendation for demolition for ‘convenience’ rather than ‘conservation’.

RESPECT OF THE INTANGIBLE HERITAGE OF THE SITE AND BUILDINGS: RB contends that this has not been adequately dealt with, apart from references to proposed exhibitions to be mounted in the new museum.

ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY AND STREETScape: RB contends that the architectural quality of the old convent – Block C – will be dominated by the new buildings on either side of it as the “architectural language that has been adopted for the new build is not respectful to the heritage resources, nor is it considered indicative of the ‘Museum’.” He further contends that the use of polychromatic brickwork has not been used in this country and was typically used in railway stations and churches in Britain, not the colonies.

“The significant forms chosen – the curved walls - have little relevance to place of neighbourhood, and are at – in the area. The scale of the new buildings is considered ‘threatening’ to their historic precedents.

USE OF THE SITE: RB contends that the consolidation of the buildings on the upper side of the site is a mistake and that it would be better to spread the development throughout the site.

COLLATORAL DAMAGE FROM THIS PROPOSAL: he questions what will become of the existing museum.

He asks that consideration be given to:

1. “Requiring a clear statement of intention to apply for demolition of Heritage Resources so that the lay public is properly informed and

doesn't have to navigate the complex byways of the SAHRIS website.

2. The retention, incorporation and professional restoration of Blocks E, F and G as well as A & C and their integration into the functional planning of the new museum and support structures.
3. The new build is either respectful of the architecture and 'place' of the heritage buildings that are retained, or else it is clearly defined as a stand-alone, contemporary building of great quality.
4. The functional requirements of both the visitors viewing areas and the technical functions of the new Museum are made a pre-eminent design consideration – a campus that needs directional signs to navigate by, has not been planned optimally.
5. The creation of a new Museum should set standards of resource management commensurate with its core ethos : the preservation and conservation of the cultural heritage of the generations that have come before them, for the edification and enjoyment of those that follow – buildings, grinding stones, fish traps or handkerchiefs.”

The report acknowledged the importance of Block G (old X-Ray building) but the location overruled its retention – RB sees this as “a grudging acknowledgement of historic or other significance and yet a recommendation for demolition for ‘convenience’ rather than ‘conservation’.

RESPECT OF THE INTANGIBLE HERITAGE OF THE SITE AND BUILDINGS: RB contends that this has not been adequately dealt with, apart from references to proposed exhibitions to be mounted in the new museum.

ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY AND STREETScape: RB contends that the architectural quality of the old convent – Block C – will be dominated by the new buildings on either side of it as the “architectural language that has been adopted for the new build is not respectful to the heritage resources, nor is it considered indicative of the ‘Museum’.” He further contends that the use of polychromatic brickwork has not been used in this country and was typically used in railway stations and churches in Britain, not the colonies.

“The significant forms chosen – the curved walls - have little relevance to place of neighbourhood, and are at – in the area. The scale of the new buildings is considered ‘threatening’ to their historic precedents.

USE OF THE SITE: RB contends that the consolidation of the buildings on the upper side of the site is a mistake and that it would be better to spread the development throughout the site.

COLLATORAL DAMAGE FROM THIS PROPOSAL: he questions what will become of the existing museum.

RESPONSES:

GRADING

- In her presentation Lindsay refers to how the Grading was decided upon. The Amafa HOC is the Grading authority, so any changes to grading have to be considered by the committee.

ARCHITECTURAL QUALITY + STREETSAPES

- The architectural design and choice of materials was informed by the brief to design an “iconic” building that will be attractive and interesting. The design is the expression of the designers who have worked closely with the client over many years, understanding their brief to put tangible form to a number of concepts presented. The concept of “stratigraphy” or the analysis of the order and position of layers of archaeological remains was chosen and is expressed in the curves and horizontality of the patterning of the new facades. The natural clay colours connect with the “pink” brick characteristic of Pmb buildings. The concept goes deeper into the ethos of the Museum and Archives, expressing the history of the earth both physically, culturally and socially.
- Currently Block C is lost amongst the years of 60’s to 80’s modern facade extensions. The designers have endeavoured to improve on this. A very ugly sub-station building has been relocated and a gap between the temporary exhibitions building and Block C has been introduced, this celebrates both the old and the new buildings, allowing them to breathe. Block C will not be dominated, but celebrated by an adjacent contemporary façade, making the age of the buildings clearly recognizable and appreciated.

USE OF THE SITE

- Based on the need to achieve an international standard museum and collections facility, the buildings cannot simply be “spread” throughout

the site, as this creates issues with movement within the museum. Currently at the existing museum, they have massive difficulties with space and are required to move extremely fragile items up and down stairs and across lobbies, whereas by compacting the museum development as much as possible and building close to the Heritage Buildings, this allows for shorter connections and an overall better use of space.

DESIGN AND PLANNING :

- As indicated in the above, the designers have applied their mind to a complex brief from a group of departments within the museum, they have interpreted both the functional and conceptual briefs at various stages of engagement with the users and client. At all stages the consideration of the users and the experience of the public of the facility have been paramount. The objector is not fully aware of the intricacies of the design, having not been part of the process.

He asks that consideration be given to:

1. "Requiring a clear statement of intention to apply for demolition of Heritage Resources so that the lay public is properly informed and doesn't have to navigate the complex byways of the SAHRIS website.
2. The retention, incorporation and professional restoration of Blocks E, F and G as well as A & C and their integration into the functional planning of the new museum and support structures.
3. The new build is either respectful of the architecture and 'place' of the heritage buildings that are retained, or else it is clearly defined as a stand-alone, contemporary building of great quality.
4. The functional requirements of both the visitors viewing areas and the technical functions of the new Museum are made a pre-eminent design consideration – a campus that needs directional signs to navigate by, has not been planned optimally.
5. The creation of a new Museum should set standards of resource management commensurate with its core ethos : the preservation and conservation of the cultural heritage of the generations that have come before them, for the edification and enjoyment of those that follow – buildings, grinding stones, fish traps or handkerchiefs."

- As we have had the privilege of proposing a development that steps down the site, on our first proposal to Amafa back in 2020, due to the sheer slope of the site, this created monumental excavation work. And if you are familiar with construction costs, excavations and retaining walls is an extremely expensive affair. The latest proposal minimises the excavation as much as possible and also achieves best function of the proposed museum spaces.
- Something to add, is although RB mentions his opinion on museum design, we have been discussing and designing together with the KZN Museum for over 3 years and the most functional of buildings has and always will be our number one priority. So therefore we take great advice from the Museum when it comes to planning and we feel that their satisfaction of spaces proposed is a good benchmark for the success of the project.
- Another reason for concentrating the buildings towards the top of the site, is to enable a park environment below, amongst the trees. The original hospital site had a great amount of open park space, and we feel that the closer we can get to undisturbing the openness of the park, whilst simultaneously creating a landscaped park environment below the museum, this will enhance the approach from the public parking, as well as celebrate the original St Annes Hospital Park area.

RESPONSE TO KIRK WHITE ; Letter 28/07/2023 :

1. Conservation Ethics : there is no current change to the appointment of the Heritage Consultant, therefore there is no impact on the status of the application. The head of the Consultant team will respond in writing regarding future changes.

2A. A structural report from 2021 was submitted and a re-survey was done in June 2023. They have been advising the consultant team during the design process, the proposed recommended demolitions have been based on heritage grading, location within the development, the level

of reconstruction required and the level of suitability for reuse for the new function. The recommendations were certainly not for convenience.

A full understanding of the brief and the challenges that the site presents is necessary in order to argue if the brief can be met in a low density development. The professional team have been working since 2019 on the project and have explored all possibilities.

2B. Lindsay Napier will present the analysis of the grading of the Chapel in her response.

2C. Page 7 has been corrected to reflect the extent of Blocks A and B.

2D. The restoration of more structures on the site would be beneficial to the two structures that are being kept, but to the detriment of meeting the requirements of the brief and the possible shelving of the project all together.

2. COLLATERAL RESOURCES :

This will be responded to by the Head of Department and should not have an impact on the proposed development on the St.Annes' site.

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>ALSO CONSULTED BUT NO RESPONSE RECEIVED:</p> <p>The Pietermaritzburg Society</p> <p>The Richmond, Byrne and District Museum and Heritage Society</p> <p>St Mary's Catholic Church</p> <p>Allard House</p> <p>The owner of Over Park, 122 Jabu Ndlovu Street, a right side neighbour.</p> <p>NOT CONSULTED:</p> <p>The neighbouring house at 118 Jabu Ndlovu Street, next to the nurses home that is used by KZN DSAC</p> <p>KZN DSAC</p> <p>Green Park</p> | <p>The Pietermaritzburg Society has been semi-dormant since Covid-19 lockdowns but it did take part in the initial consultation.</p> <p>The Richmond Society has been dormant since Covid-19 lockdowns and I am not sure that my email went to the correct email address.</p> <p>The Church may not have responded as it does not directly control the Allard House and Chapel. However, it did not forward the notice to Allard House and we only learnt about the Allard House connection through consultation with Glenn Flanagan. She forwarded the details but no response was received. The time for response was limited in this case but they could have requested an extension.</p> <p>This property is a side neighbour to the site but development will not impact on the Grade II house as that area of the property is undeveloped. The owner was away and did not have coms where he was. A family member was consulted but she did not want to respond on his behalf.</p> <p>The house is closed up and it's difficult to find the owner. It used to be a business but that seems to have closed.</p> <p>It was assumed that KZN DSAC had been given notice to vacate the old nurses home and therefore was aware of the development. Should this demolition be approved in contravention of the Amafa Council appeal decision that went against DSAC previously.</p> <p>This block of flats borders on the lower part of the site and would not be affected by the development of the parking.</p> |
|---|--|

Rosewood

The properties on the opposite side of Jabu Ndlovu and Burger Streets.

This complex borders on the lower part of the site and would not be affected by the development of the parking. It would probably support the demolition of the derelict laundry buildings that it overlooks.

These properties on Jabu Ndlovu Street do not overlook any of the heritage buildings that will be demolished apart from the Nurses Home and the old Out Patients. The replacement buildings will not affect these properties. The properties on Burger Street largely turn their backs on the street and will not be affected by the development of the car park opposite. The owners' details were not easy to obtain.

Posters were not placed on the buildings or distributed within the 100m radius of the boundaries of the site as this was meant to be done for the re-zoning application.

