

ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL & SPATIAL PLANNING

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEVELOPMENT

CIRCULATION INSTRUCTIONS

Card No: \_\_\_\_\_

82 Lion Street, Bo-Kaap, Erf 2977

Grade 3A (2007 Grading) / 3B (2015 Grading).	
form part of a highly intact row of three Victorians.	
Outside HPOZ but inside proposed HPOZ currently being formalised.	EAM does not support the new windows to West Elevation of the original Victorian house.
Within the SAAFA identified Grade 1 area.	They are not sympathetic to the existing.
The building is older than 60 years and will require a permit from HWC.	The proposal to add to the rear is supported in principle, however, the proposal submitted, is not sympathetic to the heritage resource nor to the <del>historic</del> context.
Site visit required to assess impact. Concern regarding the loss of interior fabric and the architectural compatibility of proposed additions to rear.	A more sympathetic design resolution is needed in this context and the addition should be set further away from the main dwelling.
Dhombor 30.09.2016	EAM awaits a revised proposal. Dhombor 19.10.2016.
Site visit has been undertaken on 10.10.2016.	
EAM is concerned with the extent of <sup>proposed</sup> internal demolition of walls and would want more of the original layout to be retained/evident eg retain passage walls + existing openings in passage + ex architraves.	

ECONOMIC, ENVIRONMENTAL & SPATIAL PLANNING

PLANNING AND BUILDING DEVELOPMENT

CIRCULATION INSTRUCTIONS

Card No:

82 Lion Street, BoKaap, Erf 2977

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Grade 3A (2007 grading) / 3B on 2015 grading.</li> </ul>	<p>26th January 2017 - I met with the owner, Heleen du Toit, and architect, Ina Otto, to discuss and clarify outstanding requirements and concerns.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inside proposed HPOZ and the identified Grade 1 area as identified by Sahara. Sahara comment thus required.</li> </ul>	<p><i>[Signature]</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HWC permit required</li> <li>The revised proposal is a far more sympathetic approach and has addressed some of our previous concerns. The new window proportions and materiality remains a concern. Aluminium would not be supported.</li> </ul>	<p>16.02.2017 - The revised proposal has responded more positively to EHM concerns and, in balance, is a more appropriate design for its context and heritage significance.</p> <p>EHM notes that the raising of the NW boundary wall will create a blank wall which does not comply with the City's Boundary Wall Policy. In this instance it is supported as the road behind is seldom used + there is a safety issue.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please provide fully coloured up plans, North elevation and indicate materiality of the new chimney.</li> </ul>	<p><i>[Signature]</i></p>
<p>It is recommended that we meet with the applicant to discuss the required changes.</p>	<p>Supported.</p>
<p><i>[Signature]</i> 12.01.2017. EHM.</p>	<p><i>[Signature]</i> 16.02.2017. (Amar Ghem-Tar)</p>