

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee
(IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 13 May 2020**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Mr Jason Knight, opened the meeting at 09h06 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Jason Knight (JK)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr David Gibbs (DG)
Mr Rashid Fataar (RF)
Mr Mokena Makeka (MM)

Staff

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CS)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Dr Mxolisi Dlamuka (MD)
Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)
Ms Nuraan Vallie (NV)
Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Nokubonga Dlamini (ND)
Ms Sandisiwe Matole (SM)

Observers

None

Visitors

Ms Andri Odendal
Mr Shlomi Azar
Ms Jenna Lavin

Mr Stuart Hermansen
Ms Claire Abrahamse

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 13 May 2020

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 13 May 2020, with the following amendments:

- Item 12.1 Proposed development on Erf 157 (Pacaltsdorp), George to be tabled as item 13.1 under S38(4) Record of Decision
- Item 16.3 Proposed Mixed Use Development on Erven 129123, 129124, 129125, 129126, 129127, 129128, 129129 & 172313, Tasman Road, Observatory to be tabled as item 13.2 under S38(4) Record of Decision
- Item 16.2 Proposed Development of Golf course and hotel on Hazendal Estate, Stellenbosch to be tabled as item 23.1 under S27 Provincial Heritage Sites

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 11 March 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 11 March 2020 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

5.2 Minutes dated 22 April 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 22 April 2020 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

None

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Appointments

8.1 The Committee noted appointments for items 12.1, 13.1 and 13.2

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

None

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/ Virtual Assessments

- Site inspection policy to consider virtual assessment of sites.
- Virtual Assessment guide to be formulated and forwarded to Committee for discussion.
- Thereafter be submitted to Council for approval

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

The committee queried whether all the information was available and up to date for agenda. Item 16.2 (moved to agenda item 23.1: Proposed Development of Golf course and hotel on Hazendal Estate Stellenbosch). The HWC case officer (SB) and legal advisor (PM) advised that the applicant should be given an opportunity to clarify the information previously submitted to the committee.

Andrew September (AS) was the initial case officer for the application and the latest revised Spatial Development Plan (SDP) and supporting documentation was not included with the current case file uploaded.

For consistency item previously listed as Allesverloren on the agenda, should continue being listed/indicated as such, and not as Swartland, Malmesbury.

10.4 Potential Site Inspections

None

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

Nothing to report.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

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

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(1), INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Proposed Development on Erf 157(Pacaltsdorp), George: NM
HM/EDEN/GEORGE/PACALSDORP/ERF 157**

Case No: 18082018SB0831E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Andri Odendal was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee wanted to understand the materials used for the paving area and would have preferred to see a cross-section of the site to understand the relationship between the buildings, trees, streets and open spaces.
- The revised landscape plan by Beleaf Landscape Design dated 21/02/2020 addressed the initial concerns raised previously by IACom with respect to fencing and landscaping.
- The Committee expressed that the item has been assessed multiple times and agrees that there is an improvement in the landscaping plan submitted and is therefore satisfied with the level of detail as requested previously.
- The Committee noted that the central paving should be a landscaping exercise and not an engineering proposition

- The recommendations provided by the Heritage practitioner should be included as part of the conditions of approval.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The integrated Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) submitted by Stefan de Kock dated July 2019 satisfies the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The Committee approves the revised landscape plan submitted by Beleaf Landscape Design dated 21st February 2020, as it responds to the recommendations of the integrated HIA and takes into account the planting specifications, the relationship between hard and soft landscaping as well as the soft edge and boundary treatments. The paving area must be considered as part of the landscape and sense of place of approach. The detail in the level of tree planting and positioning on the open space meets the requirements.

Given the recommendations by the heritage practitioner, the Committee resolved to approve the HIA subject to the following conditions that:

1. Archaeological monitoring of the southern triangle of Erf 157 must be undertaken during any below ground excavations on the property. If any unmarked burials are uncovered, work in that area must be stopped immediately and HWC (Tel: 021 483 9598) must be notified.
2. The southernmost portion of the property (i.e. proposed Erf 25 as shown on the proposed subdivision and zoning plan, Annexure 4) may not be developed and must be retained as open space.
3. Any earthworks on proposed Erf 25 will require permission from HWC in terms of Section 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999).
4. Linear planting along the northern and western property boundaries must be implemented with any future fencing behind (i.e. as viewed from any public road) said linear planting.
5. Any fencing to be implemented along any of the property boundaries must be visually permeable and no solid brick or concrete walling shall be permitted.
6. Signage marking the alignment of the historic “passage” and including a brief history shall be installed along the northern and southern property boundaries, details of which are to be agreed upon by local conservation bodies.
7. Existing mature trees on the property must be retained where possible.
8. Architectural design typologies should consider local vernacular architectural elements where possible and practical. Designs proposals must be refined to incorporate architectural elements and typologies more akin to local vernacular architecture where possible and practical.
9. No structures higher than single storey (max. 6m from natural ground level to roof apex) will be permitted.
10. Flat-roofed residential structures will not be permitted.
11. Revised architectural design and site layout, as meant within the context of the above, will be subject to final approval by HWC/George Municipality (whichever relevant).
12. The development is to be completed within 5 (five) years of notification of this approval, provided that HWC may extend the period on good cause shown and provided that application for extension is made to HWC at least 3 (three) months prior to the end of the five-year period.

SB

13.2 Proposed Mixed-Use Development Erven 129123, 129124, 129125, 129126, 129127, 129128, 129129 & 172313, Tasman Road, Observatory: NM HM/OBSERVATORY/TASMAN ROAD/ERF 129123, 129124

Case No: 19022806HB0307E

Mr Jason Knight recused himself from the discussion due to an emergency. The Committee nominated Mr Dave Saunders as acting chairperson for the rest of the meeting.

The Committee decided that a site inspection was not necessary.

Mr Jonathan Windvogel introduced the case and reminded the Committee of matters previously discussed with reference to concerns pertaining to the overall massing of the building in particular.

Ms Claire Abrahamse was present and took part in the discussion. Ms Abrahamse presented a revised design proposal which she believed addressed concerns that had been raised. These included concerns pertaining to the strong vertical element of the façade. Changes made include the following:

- A revision of the main façade.
- The introduction of certain roof elements informed by industrial forms found on the surrounding environment.
- The setting back of the two rear portions of the building abutting the finer grained residential buildings to the rear.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- There was general support for the scale and massing of the building.
- It was noted that the adjacent open space which is being used as a car park may be developed at some time in the future.
- The Committee concluded that the amendments made to the main façade of the building addressed the concerns previously raised.
- The setting back of the two lower portions of the building were also seen as a positive change in order to address concerns of massing.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee decided to approve the proposal subject to the following conditions:

1. Final building plans are to be endorsed by the Committee prior to their approval by the City of Cape Town.
2. The development is to be completed within 5 (five) years of notification of this approval, provided that HWC may extend the period on good cause shown and provided that application for extension is made to HWC at least 3 (three) months prior to the end of the five-year period.

JW

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

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

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

16.1 Proposed Rezoning, Subdivision and Consolidation to re-develop the site, Erven 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 23, 32, 36 and Portion 8 of Farm 64, Malmesbury: HM/ WEST COAST/ SWARTLAND/ MALMESBURY/ ERVEN 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 23, 32, 36 and Portion 8 of Farm 642

Case No: 19060710SB0607E

Mr Dave Saunders continued to act as chairperson for this item.

The revised site development plan prepared by BAU Architects dated February 2020 was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case pointing out that the Committee had raised concerns pertaining to the internal layout of the proposed retirement village. The historical 'kerkdorp' has a very strongly defined geometric layout comprised of square blocks straddling the main road, with some smaller halved blocks on the lower side of the main road. The site itself has a historical underlying plan of subdivision which dates as far back as 1911. This plan indicated the established grid pattern being extended of the site. The Committee had previously indicated that it wanted to see the proposed layout being strongly informed by the established layout. The developer, who was present at the previous meeting had agreed to undertake changes in the design to address this concern.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion. Ms Lavin presented a revised proposal with horizontal grid lines picking up on the town's street layout.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The changes to the layout.
- The internal horizontal layout did not align exactly with the historical grid.
- The retention of all the existing oaks making up the tree belt closest to the main road.
- Consider softening the parking area edge at the interface with Kerk Street.
- The four individual erven taking external access from the town grid.
- The lack of key landscape related information indicated on a landscape plan.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The submission of a revised landscape plan indicating the requested detail, including horizontal open green shafts aligned with the existing street grid. This landscape plan to be circulated via email to obtain ratification by the Committee prior to the next meeting.

WD (LB)

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 Proposed Development of Golfcourse and hotel on Hazendal Estate, Stellenbosch: NM HM/HAZENDEL/ERF 222

Case No: 18120510AS50712E

Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Stuart Hermansen and Mr Shlomi Azar were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The committee agreed the applicant could present the latest, revised SDP and supporting documents not yet seen by the committee.

- It was noted that Stellenbosch Interest Group (SIG) commented on the initial proposal and was invited to attend the previous hearing, however declined the invite to attend and requested that their written comments be taken into consideration. Regarding the revised SDP, the committee was informed that an invitation to comment was extended to SIG, they however did not take up the opportunity and referred to their previous comment.
- The Committee felt that the revised roof and “afdak” form of the cottages needed to be further broken up to address the initial concern of scaling and massing of the linear block structure which faces the dam.
- The applicant agreed to submit a consolidated, revised SDP to the case officer. This revision should respond to texture, colour and scale of the building and will be circulated to the committee for further consideration.
- The committee resolved that a decision will be made via email once the consolidated proposal was circulated.

FURTHER REQUIREMENT:

The applicant will provide an updated report and revised drawing to the Committee for approval via email.

SB

24 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. ADVICE

25.1 None

26. OTHER

26.1 None

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 14.42

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

10 June 2020

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE: _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE: _____

Approved