

**Approved Decisions of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment
Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held on the 1st Floor in the Boardroom,
Protea Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 11 September 2019**



MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

11 SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(4), INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Proposed Demolition of Farm/Restaurant Buildings, Tree Removal and
Development of New Homestead, Stables, Indoor Horse-Riding and Winery on
Erven 9795 & 3025, Constantia Uitsig: MA
HM\CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN\CONSTANTIA\CONSTANTIA UITSIG/ERVEN
9795 & 3025**

Case No: 14102165AS1029M

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to support the amended development on condition that:

1. All final landscaping is to be substantially in accordance with the Landscape Master Plan, Drawing Number 77038.301, dated August 2019.
2. Final architectural drawings are submitted to HWC for endorsement prior to final building plan submission.

AS

**13.2 Proposed Residential Redevelopment on Erf 148055, Between Oxford and
Tennant Street, Kenilworth: MA
HM\WYNBERG/ERF 148055**

Case No: 15120915AS1214M

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorsed the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) report and the supplementary report as satisfying the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA). The revised proposal by APR Architects, dated August 2019 is approved.

AS

**13.3 Erf 5457, Imhoff Farm, Kommetjie, Cape Town: MA
HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/KOMMETJIE/ERF 5457**

Case No: 15070701WD0708M

RECORD OF DECISION.

The HIA report complies with the provisions of s38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee resolved to approve the development on condition that:

1. Final building plans must be submitted to HWC for endorsement prior to building plan submission to the City of Cape Town.
2. If any sub-surface work is required during leveling for the proposed pedestrian avenue along the length of the slave quarters/garage building, then this should be monitored by an historical archaeologist.

WD

**13.4 Proposed Residential Development on Erven 64295, 64296 And 64297, Corner
Main & Braeside Road, Kenilworth: NM
HM/KENILWORTH/ERVEN 64295, 64296 AND 64297**

Case No: 16090111AS0914M

INTERIM COMMENT:

IACom cannot consider the application until the requirements of s38(3) of the NHRA have been complied with.

AS

**13.5 Proposed mixed-use development on Portion of Farm Schoonspruit 3171,
Malmesbury: MA
HM/MALMESBURY/FARM SCHOONSPRUIT 3171**

Case No:18050909AS0510M

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the report as having met the requirements of S38(3), and broadly supported the heritage related recommendations of the consultant.

The revised development may proceed subject to:

1. The property must be protected in order to arrest further decay and vandalism as a matter of urgency.
2. An architect with the requisite expertise must inspect the building(s) and make appropriate recommendations for its restoration. This report must be submitted to HWC for endorsement.
3. A Landscape Master Plan, prepared by a landscape architect with the requisite experience in heritage work, and which takes into account the recommendations of the HIA, must be prepared for the homestead area. This must be submitted to HWC for endorsement prior to any submission of final building plans to the Municipality
4. Solid walling to the boundaries fronting onto the public roads should be avoided, and should be treated with a semi-permeable edge such as planting and palisade.

5. Landscape elements that should also be conserved include generally all the mature trees and palms around the house, other driveway trees, and other scattered mature trees with good form around the estate, particularly the large gum near the old outbuildings.
6. The pre-colonial history and the history of the family and the grounds should be accommodated in interpretive displays developed for the public or estate use.
7. The buildings on the edge of the Private Open Space and around the conserved homestead and werf area must be carefully planned to avoid over-scaling against the historic homestead.
8. With respect the restoration of the parterre gardens, it is recommended that an historical archaeologist is involved in the locating historic features of the garden.

AS

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 Mixed-Use Development, Remainder of Farm 123, Portion 4 of Farm 123, Remainder of Portion 2 of Farm 123, Portion 1 of Farm 123, Farm 1446, Portion 9 of Farm 724, Bella Riva Estate, Durbanville: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ DURBANVILLE/ REMAINDER OF FARM 123, PORTION 4 OF FARM 123, REMAINDER OF PORTION 2 OF FARM 123, PORTION 1 OF FARM 123, FARM 1446, PORTION 9 OF FARM 724**

Case No: 19032619LB0404E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The report does not comply with the requirements of s38(3) of the NHRA.

LB

**15.2 Development of a Site to include 65 Residential Units, Picardie Street, off Main Road, Paarl: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTINE/ PAARL/ RE ERF 3396**

Case No: 17112101ZK1205E

COMMENT:

The HIA should incorporate and address the concerns as noted by the Committee in discussion.

WD

**15.3 Proposed Residential Development on the Remainder of Farm Cumberland 915, Simondium, Stellenbosch: NM
HM/SIMONDIUM/FARM CUMBERLAND 915**

Case No:17021409AS0217E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the Phase 1 HIA, and its indicators, but recommended that these be expanded to include indicators for the built form of the proposed development.

AS

**15.4 Proposed new Development, Erf 1, Farm 1766 Portions 1 and 2, Vendome Bo-Plaas, Paarl: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ ERF 1, FARM 1766, PORTIONS 1 AND 2**

Case No: 18012202WD0124M

FINAL COMMENT:

The HIA complies with the provisions of s38(3) of the NHRA.

From a heritage perspective, HWC has no objection to the development.

It is recommended that the consenting authority imposes the following conditions:

1. If any human remains are uncovered or exposed during construction activities, these must immediately be cordoned off and reported to HWC.

WD

**15.5 Proposed Boulder Wind Farm, West Coast District Municipality, Western Cape: MA
HM/ VREDENBERG/ SALDANHA**

Case No: 18022002SB0314E

FINAL COMMENT:

The HIA is endorsed as having met the requirements of S38 (3) of the NHRA.

The Committee supports the Development alternative 2 and has no objection to the development proceeding.

It is recommended however that the consenting authority includes the following conditions:

Palaeontology:

1. The Heritage Western Cape Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be included in the EMPr and implemented in the case of fossil remains being encountered.

Archaeology

1. The Lombard and Pienaar cemetery (2011/329 at s32.80442800 e18.00421500) shall be a "no-go" area. As the existing farm road that passes the cemetery site will be upgraded as an access road during turbine construction, the alignment must be modified, and that the road should be shifted moderately to the west to avoid any possible impact on the cemetery;
2. Avoid and conserve significant heritage resources (buffers, no-go areas, etc) around farm buildings and graveyards, archaeological sites or complexes.
3. Accidentally discovered archaeological material must be reported to the Provincial Heritage Authority in terms of section 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act. The finds should also be reported to the appointed archaeologist for assessment and possible action;
4. Accidentally discovered human remains must immediately be reported to the Provincial Heritage Authority in terms of section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act. The finds should also be reported to the appointed archaeologist for assessment and possible action;
5. The ECO should be informed of any chance finds;

6. Monitoring of the construction activities by the archaeologist is required to determine the effectiveness of the mitigation. This will be at earthmoving stage to ensure that there are not significant buried archaeological resources being exposed.

Visual:

1. Where sensitive visual receptors are likely to be affected, the developer shall enter into negotiations regarding the potential screening of visual impacts at the receptor site. This may entail the planting of vegetation, trees or the construction of screens. Ultimately, visual screening is most effective when placed at the receptor itself.
2. The vegetation cover (i.e. either natural or cultivated) be maintained in all areas outside of the actual development footprint, both during construction and operation of the proposed facility. This will minimise the visual impact as a result of cleared areas, power line servitudes and areas denuded of vegetation.
3. Existing roads shall be utilised wherever possible. New roads should be planned taking due cognisance of the topography to limit cut and fill requirements. Construction/upgrade of roads should be undertaken properly, with adequate drainage structures in place to forego potential erosion problems.
4. In terms of on-site ancillary buildings and structures, they must be planned so that clearing of vegetation is minimised. This implies consolidating this infrastructure as much as possible and making use of already disturbed areas rather than undisturbed sites wherever possible.
5. Reduce lighting impacts through:
 - a) Limiting aircraft warning lights to the perimeter turbines;
 - b) Investigate aircraft warning lights with proximity sensors
 - c) Limit mounting heights of lighting fixtures, use footlights or bollard level lights;
 - d) Use down-lighters or shielded fixtures
 - e) Use motion sensors on security lighting
 - f) Once the facility has exhausted its life span, the main facility and all associated infrastructure not required for the post rehabilitation use of the site should be removed and all disturbed areas appropriately rehabilitated.

Once the final layout has been presented, a pre-construction survey by a suitably qualified stone age archaeologist must be undertaken of the affected area.

SB

**15.6 Farm 550/1 Kleinbosch Road, Daljosaphat, Paarl: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ FARM 550/1**

Case: 19032201WD0827E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The HIA currently does not meet the requirements of S38 (3) of the NHRA. A revised HIA must be prepared and resubmitted to HWC.

WD

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

16.1 None

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. OTHER/ ADVICE

25.1 Cloetesdal Farm, Stellenbosch: NM HM/STELLENBOSCH/CLOETESDAL FARM

Case No: N/A

ADVICE:

It is suggested that a Two Phase HIA may be the appropriate approach in this instance, with a 1st Phase report being used to identify and assess heritage significance, and provide appropriate urban design and heritage informants for a development model, which can be endorsed by HWC, prior to the development being assessed in a 2nd Phase Report.

Public Participation should also be conducted in the Phase I HIA in order to assist with the identification of heritage resources.

AS

**25.2 Erf 3, Johannesdal: NM
HM/JOHANNESDAL/ERF 3**

Case No: N/A

DISCUSSION AND ADVICE:

- Ms Malan had requested the advice of the IACom the nature of development that would be acceptable to it on this site, prior to the preparation of an HIA and development plans.
- Whilst noting that the site still retains a connection to the surrounding rural cultural landscape, it essentially falls within a block that is considered as infill development.
- The Committee noted that in this instance the primary heritage resource is Helshoogte Road, and the site's mountain backdrop.
- It was noted that given the typography of the site, development to the rear of the site would not be visible from Helshoogte Road. The Committee believed it could support a slightly denser development model than the average density, which allows for opportunities for more greening, on this portion of the site.
- It was recommended that the development team looks at the Louw & Dewar interventions along the R310, at Pniel, for examples of an appropriate model for dealing with the developments interface with Helshoogte Road.
- Ultimately the Committee would support a development model which is able to stitch together an appropriate interface along Helshoogte Road, and at the same time still retains the connections with the Mountain, and the site's overall sense of place.
- An inwardly focussed, repetitive development model, which excludes itself from its village context, would not be supported.

AS

26 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

26.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.