

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 9 December 2020**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Mr David Gibbs, opened the meeting at 09h00 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr David Gibbs (DG)
Mr Gaarith Williams (GW)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Mr Jason Knight (JK)
Mr Rashiq Fataar (RF)

Observers

None

Visitors

Mr Anthony Stricker
Mr Chris Snelling
Ms Berta Hayes
Ms Quahnita Samie
Mr Darryn Botha
Mr Gregory Hoedemaker
Ms Sally Titlestad
Mr Adam Snitcher
Ms Sandra van der Merwe
Dr Stephen Townsend
Mr John May
Mr Henning van As
Ms Jenna Lavin
Mr Peter Mons
Mr Jasper Bruinsma
Mr John Gribble
Ms Nadiema Safter
Mr Dave Peerutin
Ms Berendine Irrgang
Mr Charles Norman
Mr Luca Lattanzio

Staff

Ms Nuraan Vallie (NV)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Ms Patricia Botha
Ms Bettina Woodward
Ms Katherine Dumbrell
Ms Makale Ngwenya
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Mr Gordon Bradley
Ms Elize Mendelsohn
Mr Bruce Eitzen
Mr Henry Aikman
Dr Nicolas Baumann
Mr Veronique Fyfe
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Mr Renske Haller
Ms Adel Groenwald
Mr Tim Hart
Mr Andrew Nimmo
Ms Ute Kuhlmann
Mr Anton Chait
Mr Tiaan Meyer

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 9 December 2020

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 9 December 2020.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 11 November 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 11 November 2020 and resolved to approve them with minor amendments.

5.2 Minutes dated 17 November 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 17 November 2020 and resolved to approve them with minor amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- MS: item 13.3 and 13.4
- SW: item 13.7

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the outcomes of the following Appeals matters:

- Proposed Total demolition on Erf 164592, 48 Riverside Road, Fernwood, Newlands

9.2 Kudusberg WEF EA Amendment

Noted

10.1 Site Inspections/ Virtual Assessments undertaken:

- Proposed redevelopment of Molen Erf 14601, Stellenbosch
- Proposed tourism Re-development of the werf on Farm 956, Donkerhoek, Simondium, Paarl

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

- The chair reported that he had been in discussion with the APM chair regarding the integration of APM and IACOM matters.

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

For noting.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed Siting of Employee Housing, Deli and 3 New Dwellings on Jonkersdrift Farm, Housing Development on Jonkersdrift Farm (Farm 1440, 1441, 334/17 & 334/9), Stellenbosch Magisterial District) (item 13.5)
- Proposed Nautica Development on Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point, Cape Town (item 15.8)

10.5 HWC and DEA&DP Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

Nothing to report.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

1. SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP (NID)

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(1), INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 Proposed Tourist Facility on Portion 1 of Farm Simonsvlei 791, Paarl: NM HM/PAARL/FARM SIMONSVLEI 791

Case No: 20110910SB1109E

Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) and amended Spatial Development Plan (SDP) prepared by Anthony Stricker to be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Anthony Stricker (Applicant/ Architect) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The revised footprint of Cellar Building, eaves line and roof apex
- Improved parking layout
- The cellar building alone is the subject of this application. The homestead and cottages will be subject to future applications.

FINAL COMMENT:

With respect to the cellar building, the revised scheme is substantially in accordance with the approved plans and therefore, the impact on heritage resources is the same. Confirmation letter will be issued by HWC. No further heritage studies required with respect to the cellar building.

SB

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

13.1 Proposed redevelopment of Molen Erf 14601, Stellenbosch: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/ERF 14601

Case No: 20101911KB1020E

IACom reported back on the site visit undertaken on 24 November 2020. The site visit report submitted by DS was tabled as per the attached Annexure SI1.

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage Consultant), Mr Chris Snelling (Heritage Consultant), Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) and Ms Berta Hayes (Stellenbosch Interest Group) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Site inspection report was noted.
- The Committee broadly supports the development on the site in principle; however noted specific concerns to be addressed.
- Block 6: scale, form, relationship and orientation to be informed by its particular context
- Industrial entrance building: retention of front portion.
- Landscape of forecourt to homestead to mitigate against alienation/isolation of the building by surrounding parking
- Relationship of the site to the broader precinct
- Based on anecdotal evidence the possibility of human remains was discussed. Although this is unlikely, the usual archaeological protocols will be put in place.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

Revised proposal to be submitted addressing the concerns with respect to:

1. Block 6 scale, form, relationship and orientation to be informed by particular context
2. Industrial entrance building retention of front portion.
3. Landscape of forecourt to homestead

KB

13.2 Proposed Tourism Development on Farm 956, Donkerhoek, Simondium, Paarl: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/FARM 956

Case No: 20030508SB1020E

IACom reported back on the site visit undertaken on 24 November 2020. The site visit report submitted by SW was tabled as per the attached Annexure SI2.

Ms Bettina Woodward (Architect) and Mr Henry Aikman (Heritage Consultant) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Archaeology Palaeontology and Meteorites Committee (APM) comments were noted.

- The farmstead is considered to have Grade II heritage significance within the context of a Grade I Cultural Landscape, whereas Agterbos is considered to have Grade III heritage significance.
- Significance of the farmstead is due to its relationship with its setting including a discrete valley setting on the lower slopes of the Simonsberg, a distinctive approach road off the R44 lined with bluegums and the sense of scale and modesty of the farmstead relative to the grander set pieces in the area.
- The modest character of the farmstead is reflected in the built environment and the landscape character.
- The considerable intactness and authenticity of the farmstead being of increasing rarity value in terms of the absence of being over-restored and its unembellished and ungentrified condition.
- The homestead in particular being of heritage value in terms of its intactness and authenticity with distinctive features including inter alia the relatively smaller width of the façade, gable and fanlight details, the use of colour and patina.
- The concern around the 1896 date as a key informant to the conservation approach to the werf and the need for caution not to fix upon a moment in time, but to consider the layering of historical periods.
- Notwithstanding an initial concern around the siting of the new outbuildings and the impact that this would have on the modest character of the werf, their siting was regarded as the preferred option. However, careful attention would need to be given to the architectural treatment of the new buildings in the relationship between old and new and being recessive. Similarly, carefully attention would need to be given to the landscaping treatment for the forecourt space and the approach to ensure that it is not over formalised.
- The Committee supports the submission of a Conservation Management Plan (CMP).
- The concept of developing the werf as a tourism destination and investing in its heritage value is supported.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The adaptive re-use of the farmstead together with the conceptual framework is supported in principle. However certain concerns were noted, and issues raised with respect to detailing of alterations to the historic buildings, insertion of new buildings, landscape elements and landscape treatment. The Committee emphasised the need to retain the unique, nuanced character of the werf in terms of its informality and modesty. Particular attention to be given to the retention of historical layering and the absence of formal landscape elements e.g. werf walling and entrances, which are not supported, as their insertion would enclose and embellish the werf in a manner which is out of character. The proposed treatment of the new buildings must be informed by a carefully considered and convincing heritage management approach as not to distract from the authenticity and modesty of the exiting werf buildings. The interventions to the homestead must be accompanied by the method statement. The above-mentioned requirements must be included in the Phase II HIA and must be accompanied by a landscape plan to be prepared by a landscape architect with relevant heritage experience. Similarly, the architectural interventions must involve the input of an architect with appropriate heritage expertise.

SB

13.3 Proposed Re Development of the Site on Erf 8019, Sir Lowry Square: MA HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/WOODSTOCK/ERF 8019

Case No: 20091008KB0921E

MS and DS recused themselves and logged-off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment (interim comment) was tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Quahnita Samie (Heritage Consultant), Mr Darryn Botha (Project Architect) and Ms Katherine Dumbrell (Heritage Practitioner), Ms Nadiema Safter (Residents), Mr Andrew Nimmo (Residents) and Ms Berendine Irrgang (CoCT) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- (in response to previous IACom comments) Revised proposals were tabled.
- I&APs concerns were noted.
- The additional opinion of the independent architectural heritage specialist was tabled

RECORD OF DECISION:

On balance, the heritage concerns previously raised have been sufficiently addressed as far as possible. The Committee therefore resolved to approve the application as compliant with S38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The Committee re-iterated their support for the setback façade option and therefore the relaxation of the street set back.

KB

13.4 Proposed Re-Development for West Block of Rex Trueform Factory Complex, Erf 175934, Victoria Road, Salt River: MA HM/SALT RIVER/ERF 175934

Case No: 15011421AS0203M

MS recused himself and logged-off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment was tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Makale Ngwenya (SCTWU), Ms Claire Abrahamse (Heritage Consultant), Ms Sally Titlestad (Heritage Consultant), Mr Gordon Bradley (Queens Park), Mr Adam Snitcher (Representing Owner), Ms Elize Mendelsohn (CoCT), Ms Berendine Irrgang (CoCT) and Ms Sandra van der Merwe (DOCOMOMO SA) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The thorough work undertaken including pioneering research
- The importance of the building including its- Grade II significance worthy of being included as a PHS.
- The various components of the proposals including adaptive re-use, memorialization, partial demolition and architectural insertions.
- I&APs comments were noted as well as heritage consultant team responses.
- Within a private building, the question of public accessibility linked to memorialization

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the recommendation within the HIA.

Key considerations from the foregoing assessments and studies that will be used to assess the revisions include:

1. The new extension must not introduce visual confusion or clutter or mimic the Modern building at its core.
2. The new extension must be responsive to the old, but clearly new.
3. The architectural expression and elements of the extension must sit comfortably into the ensemble of the 20th century factory complex.
4. The architectural expression and elements of the extension must form a cohesive whole.
5. The extension must define its role as a restrained background building or as a dynamic intervention.
6. The use of curved corners and similar elements borrowed from the Policansky design must be carefully considered to avoid seeming “applied” in mimicry. The overall architectural conceptual approach should provide the framework within which decisions about where to incorporate elements and forms from the Modernist structure (if at all) are made.
7. Consideration could instead be given to referencing more elemental aspects of the existing Modernist structure, rather than mimicry of forms and elements.
8. A subtle Modernist reference in the roof form of the new structure could also assist with scaling.
9. The upper floors above the gabled Cavalla structure currently distract from the “found object” of the building façade and streetscape, and either need to be further visually calmed, or set back.
10. The insertion requires a higher level of architectural resolution than is currently evident, and it cannot solely be thought of as a planning exercise.

The overall response to the design of the new insertion has been to retain the “base” of the building with its encircling ramp, and strip out all other elements and aspects. The two upper levels - the “top” - are treated in glass only, which is also used between the horizontal banding of the “base”.

Curved corners are retained on two corners only: the corner of Factory and Brickfield road, and at the “gasket” between the new insertion and the Cavalla Administration Building (which is physically separated by an approximately 2m gap). Some of the pedestrian ramps are curved at their corners.

The ramps are then tilted across the facade to respond to the changes in floor level, and broken completely in areas where points of access exist - be it car or pedestrian access

The Committee endorsed the requirement for further involvement of I&APs in the memorialization process.

KB

**13.5 Proposed Siting of Employee Housing, Deli and 3 New Dwellings on Jonkersdrift Farm, Housing Development on Jonkersdrift Farm (Farm 1440, 1441, 334/17 & 334/9), Stellenbosch Magisterial District): MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH/ JONKERSDRIFT FARM 1440,1441, 334/17 & 334/9**

Case No: 20041707SB0603E

Revised Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by New World Associates were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection, noting that the I&APs should be invited to attend the site inspection.

SB

**13.6 Proposed rearrangement and development of St Cyprian's school: MA
HM/ST CYPRIANNS SCHOOL**

Case No: 20101209KB1120E

For endorsement.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Dr Stephen Townsend (Heritage Consultant), Mr Tiaan Meyer (Architect) and Mr John May (School Representative) were present and took part in the discussion.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the application as substantially in accordance with the approved plans.

KB

**13.7 Proposed Re-Development and Rezoning of the Site, Portion 9 Farm 653, Port Beaufort Square, Woolshed, Witsand: MA
HM/HESSEQUA/WITSAND/9/653**

Case No: 19090301SB0905E

SW recused herself and logged-off from MS Teams.

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Nicolas Baumann were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Nicolas Baumann (Heritage Consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee took note of the distance between the two buildings in defining the view corridor.
- The Committee noted that their previous concerns have been addressed and that the revision has improved upon the previous submission.
- The Committee noted that archaeological monitoring of excavations within the vicinity of the historic woolshed will be required.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application on condition that final building plans are to be submitted to HWC IACom for endorsement.

SB

13.8 Proposed Business Park on Portion 1 Farm 1279, Paarl: NM HM/PAARL/PTN 1 FARM 1279

Case No: 20101209KB1120E

Heritage Impact Assessment was tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- N1 corridor possible scenic qualities.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the heritage impact assessment as having satisfied the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA. The development may therefore proceed.

KB

13.9 Proposed Residential Development on Erf 178677,220A Albert Road & Essex Road, Woodstock: NM HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/WOODSTOCK/ERF 178677

Case No: 2003304JW0318

Heritage Impact Assessment was tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (Heritage Consultant) and Mr Dave Peerutin (Architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The design indicators and architectural response
- Active Street interfaces
- The positive benefits of not having a parking podium
- The question around stepping down the building at the residential interface

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the heritage impact assessment and recommendations as meeting the requirements of S38(3) and further endorsed the architectural interpretation as per annexure D presented dated 30 September 2020.as having met the indicators adequately.

KB

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 **Proposed 132kV Oya Powerline on Portion 2 of the Farm Bakovens Kloof No 152 Remainder of the Farm Bakovens Kloof No 152 Portion 3 of the Farm Baakens Rivier No 155 Remainder of the Farm Baakens Rivier No 155 Portion 1 of the Farm Gats Rivier No 156 Remain: NM HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ MAATJIESFONTEIN / PORTION 2 OF THE FARM BAKOVENS KLOOF NO 152 REMAINDER OF THE FARM BAKOVENS**

Case No: 20103006SB1105E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Veronique Fyfe (EAP) and Ms Jenna Lavin (Archaeologist) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed
- The river flood plain has potential archaeological sensitivities

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee endorsed the HIA and recommendations as having met the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.2 Proposed Boutique Hotel Development, Franschhoek Pass Winery, Farm No 1545 Paarl, Franschhoek: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / FRANSCHHOEK / FARM NO 1545 PAARL**

Case No: 20012313AS0225E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (Heritage Consultant), Mr Peter Mons (Planner), Mr Renske Haller (Architect), Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group), Ms Berta Hayes (Stellenbosch Interest Group), Mr Jasper Bruinsma (Applicant), Ms Adel Groenwald (EAP) were present and took part in the discussions.

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over. The applicant is requested to circulate HIA to I&APs for comment.

SB

**15.3 Proposed Vineyard Development on Rem Ptn 10 of Farm 502, Stellenbosch, Cape Winelands: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / REM PTN 10 OF FARM 502**

Case No: 19012505SB0201E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin (Archaeologist), Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) and Ms Berta Hayes (Stellenbosch Interest Group) were present and took part in the discussions.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee resolved to endorse the HIA and supports the recommendations as having met the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.4 Proposed Development of three 175 MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Facilities (Grootfontein PV 1 - PV 3): NM
HM/ BREEDE VALLEY / TOUWSRIVIER / GROOTFONTEIN PV 1 - PV 3**

Case No: 20081908SB0821E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments and recommendations were noted and endorsed.
- The proposal is located within the “Red zone” identified as appropriate for the installation of green energy infrastructure
- Remnant karoo buildings to be protected and grave sites to be protected.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee resolved to endorse the heritage impact assessment and recommendation as meeting with requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

15.5 Proposed Development of Four 175 MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Facilities (Hoek Doornen PV 1 - PV 4) and associated Electrical Grid Infrastructure, near Touws River: NM HM/ BREEDE VALLEY / TOUWSRIVIER / HOEK DOORNEN PV 1 - PV 4

Case No: 20081909SB0825E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments and recommendations were noted and endorsed.
- The proposal is located within the “Red zone” identified as appropriate for the installation of green energy infrastructure
- Remnant karoo buildings to be protected and grave sites to be protected.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee resolved to endorse the heritage impact assessment and recommendation as meeting with requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

15.6 Proposed Development of two 175 MW Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Facilities (Witte Wall PV 1 & PV 2) and associated Electrical Grid Infrastructure, near Touws River: NM HM /BREEDE VALLEY/ TOUWSRIVIER / (WITTE WALL PV 1 & PV 2)

Case No: 20081910SB0825E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ASHA was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments and recommendations were noted and endorsed.
- The proposal is located within the “Red zone” identified as appropriate for the installation of green energy infrastructure

- Remnant karoo buildings to be protected and grave sites to be protected.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee resolved to endorse the heritage impact assessment and recommendation as meeting with requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.7 Proposed Emoyeni Wind Energy Facilities: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/MURRARYSBURG/UMSINDE EMOYENI WEF**

Case No: 14120410GT0119E

Amended Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ACO Associated and associated documentation to be tabled

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Tim Hart (Archaeologist), Mr John Gribble (Archaeologist) and Mr Charles Norman (Observer) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The history of the case was outlined.
- Earlier HIA and associated reports were noted.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee resolved to endorse the EA amendment report and recommendations on condition that a pre-construction walk down is conducted by professional archaeologist; all rock engravings potentially disturbed by the development are identified, recorded and cataloged and that a work plan is produced as part of EMPR and submitted to HWC.

SB

**15.8 Proposed Nautica Development on Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point, Cape Town: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ MOUILLE POINT/ ERF 1942**

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Nicolas Baumann Heritage Consultant were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Nicolas Baumann (Heritage Consultant) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Earlier planning and rezoning reports and documentation

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection.

SB

**15.9 Proposed Mixed Residential Development on Erven 252 & 298 Raithby: NM
CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ STELLENBOSCH/ RAITHBY/ ERVEN 252 & 298**

Case No: 17110208WD1103E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by Cindy Postlethway were tabled.

HELD OVER:

The item has been removed from the agenda, the case officer will be in further communication with the parties.

SB

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**16.1 Proposed Redevelopment of Site, Remainder 4722, Blouvillei, Wellington: MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/WELLINGTON/REMAINDER FARM 4722**

Case No: 17080109ZK0122M

HELD OVER:

The matter was withdrawn from the agenda.

TZ

**16.2 Proposed Mixed Use Urban Node Re 1/697, Farm 1/1113, Ptn of Erf Re 353, Erf 1449 and
1450, De Hoop Farm, Malmesbury: MA
HM/SWARTLAND/MALMESBURY/ RE OF PTN 1 OF FARM 697, PORTION 1 OF FARM 113, RE
OF FARM 1113, RE OF FRAM 301, RE OF FARM 353**

Case No: 19110103SB1106E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by New World Associates were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Bruce Eitzen (New World Associates, Landscape Architects) and Mr Anton Chait (Project Manager) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Extent of development
- 20-year phased implementation
- APM comments noted

- Lack of clarity in terms of significance of heritage resources translated into indicators for planning and design response

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection to determine whether S38(3) of the NHRA has been satisfied.

SB

**16.3 Proposed CNC Aquaculture Facility on Portion 8 of the Farm Bottelfontein 11, Near Elands Bay: MA
HM/ WEST COAST/ SWARTLAND/ BERGRIVER / PIKETBERG / FARM BOTTLEFONTEIN**

Case No: 19040313SB0331E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by New World Associates were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Bruce Eitzen (New World Associates, Landscape Architects) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted
- Coastal landscape environment
- Question around the visual impact of wind turbines

FINAL COMMENTS:

The Committee endorsed the APM recommendations and further endorsed the heritage impact assessment as meeting the heritage requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA

SB

17 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

17.1 None

18 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT

18.1 None

19 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT

19.1 None

20 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

20.1 None

21 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT

21.1 None

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23. SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES

23.1 None

24 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. ADVICE

**25.1 Cape Town Station Proposed Deviations: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CAPE TOWN CBD/ ERF 148368**

Case No: 121219ZS19M

JK recused himself and logged-off from MS Teams.

Revised proposal prepared by Claire Abrahamse was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (Heritage Consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Move the item to section 13 of the agenda.

RECORD OF DECISION:

With respect to portion A and B the Committee agreed that the proposed deviation from the approved plan is too minor to require a further application.

WD

**25.2 Proposed Minor Deviations from Approved Building Envelope, Erf 31990 Mowbray Cape
Town: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ MOWBRAY/ERF 31990**

Case No: 120418JW08

Letter to HWC prepared by Aikman Associates was tabled.

HELD OVER:

The item has been removed from the agenda, the case officer will be in further communication with the parties.

SB

26. OTHER

26.1 None

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as minutes above. CM adopted and DS supported the adoption.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 17:30

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

13 January 2020

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON

DATE:

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____

Annexure SI 1

IACom Site Inspection Report for OUDE MOLEN – ERF 14601 STELLENBOSCH

Submitted by Dave Saunders on 8th December 2020

Case Number: 15012102GT0127E

Erf/Farm No.: ERF 14601 Stellenbosch

Registered Owner: Catwalk Investments 385 (Pty) Ltd.

Grading: III A

Nature of Application: It is proposed to rezone erf 14601 in order to accommodate a mixed-use development comprising general residential apartments and some associated commercial space. A warehouse older than 60 years, the reconstructed mill and the historic manor house are to be retained within the new development.

Type of application: Section 38(4) of the NHRA.

Date of Site Visit: 24 November 2020

HWC Representatives: Olwethu Dlova (Staff)

IACOM Committee Members: Mike Scurr, Sarah Winter, Dave Saunders.

Reasons for Site Inspection: IACOM resolution to assess the proposal.

Area Inspected: The property, the interior of certain buildings on the site, and the surrounds .

Findings:

- The property is quite isolated in terms of vehicular and pedestrian access.
- There is a lot of recently approved mixed use development either, completed, under construction or in an advertising phase to the south of the property.
- The manor house is of high significance and is strategically positioned on the property with an ornate forecourt. The geometry of the manor house and this forecourt are significant indicators.
- The mill while having little value in term of authenticity, does however celebrate the site's historical role accommodating one of the four original Stellenbosch water mills.
- The site itself has heritage significance as an industrial site as one of the first commercial brandy distilleries in South Africa.
- This history is depicted in plaster embellishments on two of the remaining industrial buildings.
- One of these buildings is strategically positioned at the entry point to the property.
- There are strong sight lines lining this building with the mill, and the manor house beyond.
- Other large industrial buildings have no heritage significance.
- Archaeology may well be a consideration given the fact that the site may have human remains.

Recommended Action: Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next Committee meeting.

Which committee should this report be submitted to: IACom – 9th December 2020.

PHOTOGRAPHS:







APPROVED

Annexure SI 2

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for: **PHASE 1 HIA**

Erf/Farm No.: **FARM 956, DONKERHOEK**

Street Address: **Off the R44, Simondium, Paarl**

Registered Owner: **Robert Steven Meihuizen**

Grading: **Grade II**

Nature of Application: **SECTION 38(8)**

Date of Site Visit: **24.11.2020**

HWC Representatives: **Dave Saunders, Mike Scurr, Sarah Winter (IACOM); Olwethu Dlova**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM RESOLUTION TO ASSESS THE SITE AND CONTEXT IN ORDER TO PROVIDE COMMENT ON THE PHASE 1 HIA**

Report submitted by **SARAH WINTER on 09.12.2020 with photographs by Mike Scurr**

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Tuesday 24 November 2020 by 3 IACom members. The heritage consultant, Henry Aikmann and the applicant's representative from Babylonstoren were present to provide access to the site.

Area Inspected: The werf as whole including the approach road and immediate setting, the exterior and interior homestead and the exterior and interior of the wine cellar. The other outbuildings were viewed from the exterior.

Items Noted:

- The discrete valley setting of the farm werf, the gum tree lined approach road and its sense of scale in the landscape relative to other grander farmsteads in the area;
- The intactness of the homestead in particular with the absence of any heavy restoration, major alterations, or over gentrification distracting from heritage significance and thus being a relatively rare example of a historical farm werf in the Cape Winelands landscape context;
- The presence of distinctive period features and detailing on the homestead (e.g. fanlight, use of colour on pilasters and front gable);
- The importance of the historical layering of the werf as whole and the homestead in particular;
- The landmark presence of the Norfolk pine and other distinctive landscape features.
- The importance of developing a clear approach to alterations and new additions to ensure that the above- mentioned qualities are retained.
- The intended linkage of the farm werf with the Babylonstoren visitor experience.

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting (09/12/2020).

Which committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom at the meeting held on the 9 December 2020.

Photographs by Mike Scurr:

A selection of key informing images taken on site are included below.







