

**Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment
Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H05 on Wednesday, 23 June 2021**



MATTERS DISCUSSED

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

11.1 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

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

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

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The revised Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by Dr Nicolas Baumann as dated June 2021 is endorsed as meeting the requirements of Section 38(3) with the following recommendations:

1. The conditions underpinning the agreement were endorsed by the Ministerial Tribunal related to the Beach Road/Granger Bay HIA in 2015. The sole purpose of this assessment is to ensure adherence to the conditions stipulated.
2. It is concluded that the revised proposal, Revision 6, has addressed the primary heritage indicator, the retention of the view cone from Ford Wynyard to Robben Island.
3. By maintaining the horizon line, the primary concerns raised at the IACOM meeting of 13 January 2021 have been addressed.
4. It is further recommended that should any archaeological resources (shipwrecks) be encountered during the excavation process the work should be suspended and HWC notified to advise on any further requirements.
5. in addition, final building plans to be submitted to HWC for final endorsement incorporating the recommendations as per the HIA.

Final building plans are to be submitted to HWC for final endorsement incorporating the recommendations as per the HIA.

SB

**13.2 Proposed Redevelopment Erf 46732, RE 22 Rouwkoop Road, Rondebosch: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46732**

Case No: 19112802LB0129E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolve to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Ms Claire Abrahamse dated 11 June 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee resolved to support the landscape plan prepared by Viridian, dated 9 June 2021 as submitted with the following recommendations:

- 1 Given the large extent of the site and its established landscaping, it is recommended that the building retain a landscaped area between the proposed buildings and the site boundaries, including the retention of all mature trees
- 2 In addition, final building plans and SDP to be submitted to HWC for final endorsement incorporating the recommendations as per the HIA.

Final building plans and Spatial Development Plan (SDP) must be submitted to HWC for final endorsement incorporating the recommendations as per the HIA.

SB

**13.4 Proposed redevelopment on Erven 10892-10869, 21 Albert Road, Woodstock: NM
HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/WOODSTOCK/ERVEN 10892-10869**

Case No: 20121401KB0113E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Ms Louise van Riet dated 01 June 2021 (with corrections as stated above) as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, noting that the development as assessed therein may proceed, subject to the following conditions:

1. Incorporates the mitigation measures as noted in the heritage-related design indicators, and
2. HWC request detail drawings for the renovation of the existing Albert Road terrace building including the extension and new corner building.
3. Final building plans demonstrating the incorporation of the recommendations as per the HIA are to be submitted to HWC for final endorsement.
4. Any further demolition to parts of the structures, as per the drawings to be supplied, only to proceed once construction of said development commences.

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 Wind Farm along with associated Infrastructure on Farm 18 REM_181_182, Beaufort West: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / 18REM_181_182**

Case No: 19090607SB1017E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the APM comments and resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting dated May 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, noting that the development as assessed therein may proceed, subject to the following conditions:

1. The final layout of the wind farm and bypass road must be subjected to a pre-construction archaeological survey. This would be to determine whether any micrositing of infrastructure is required to ensure in situ protection of heritage resources or, if this is not possible, whether any mitigation should be implemented;
2. Where required, sensitive portions of the final layout of the wind farm must be subjected to a pre-construction palaeontological survey. This must determine whether:
 - a. Any recording and/or collection of fossils might be required;
 - b. Certain areas may require monitoring;
 - c. Any areas should be avoided and protected;
3. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
4. Care must be taken to minimise landscape scarring during construction and undertake rehabilitation of areas not required during operation, to the satisfaction of the Environmental Control Officer (ECO);
5. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
6. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 35 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping outlier turbines that extend the zone of visual influence, and detract from the visual cohesion of the wind farm (from a heritage point of view turbines 001 & 002 which overlook the R381 and to a lesser degree turbines 092 & 101 which appear somewhat isolated are candidates); and
7. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.
8. The Committee emphasizes the importance of the pre-construction survey by the archaeologist and palaeontologist.

SB

15.2 Proposed Vortum Solar Park Project of The Remainder of Portion 4, Portion 9 And Portion 11 of the Farm Langeberg 187 and the Remainder of Portion 1 of the Farm Uyekraal: NM HM/WEST COAST/SWARTLAND/VREDENBURG/RE OF PTN 7 OF FARM 187

Case No: 20092301SB1215E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Heritage Impact Assessment as submitted (date / author) does not fulfill the requirements of Section 38 (3) of the NHRA.

A revised HIA is to be submitted to comply with Section 38(3) and to address the Committee's concerns, including the following:

1. A cultural landscape assessment, including the built environs but not limited to the Kleinberg farmhouse.
2. A paleontological assessment.

SB

15.3 Proposed Wind Farm along with associated infrastructure on Farm 13_ 21REM_43, Beaufort West: NM HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / FARM 13 21 REM 43

Case No: 19090609SB1017E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the APM comments and resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting dated May 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, and therefore the development as assessed therein may proceed subject to the following conditions:

1. The final layout of the wind farm and bypass road must be subjected to a pre-construction archaeological survey. This would be to determine whether any micrositing of infrastructure is required to ensure in situ protection of heritage resources or, if this is not possible, whether any mitigation should be implemented;
2. Where required, sensitive portions of the final layout of the wind farm must be subjected to a pre-construction palaeontological survey. This must determine whether any recording and/or collection of fossils might be required or if any areas should be avoided
3. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
4. South-eastern edge of the archaeological site between turbines 178 and 179 must be demarcated as a no-go area during construction;
5. Care must be taken to minimise landscape scarring during construction and rehabilitation of areas not required during operation, to the satisfaction of the ECO;
6. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
7. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 35 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas (from a heritage point of view turbines 147 & 149 which overlook

- the R381 and turbine 168 which overlooks an important archaeological site with engravings and graves are candidates); and
8. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.
 9. The Committee emphasizes the importance of the pre-construction survey by the archaeologist and palaeontologist

SB

**15.4 Proposed Consolidation for a Proposed Hotel Boutique Hotel, Erven 19324, 19325 AND 19326
Pinnacle Point: NM
HM/ EDEN/ MOSSEL BAY / PINNACLE POINT / ERVEN 19324, 19325 AND 19326**

Case No: 19060606AS0726E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee supports the principle of a Boutique Hotel within these environs, however, given the significant landscape context, a far more site-specific and nuanced design needs to be developed (*in response to cultural and natural landscape parameters*).

The Heritage Impact Assessment as submitted does not fulfill the requirements of Section 38 (3) of the NHRA.

A revised HIA addressing the Committee's concerns and complying with Section 38(3), is to be submitted, specifically addressing the following:

1. Further design development in response to a set of parameters which draw reference from the overall cultural and natural landscape context. These parameters are to be developed by suitably qualified professional(s) with experience in cultural landscape heritage assessments.

SB

**15.5 Proposed Wind Farm along with associated infrastructure on Farm 12_13_14, Beaufort West:
NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / FARM 12 13 14**

Case No: 19090608SB1017E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the APM comments and resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting dated May 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, the development as assessed therein may proceed subject to the following conditions:

1. The final layout of the wind farm and bypass road must be subjected to a pre-construction archaeological survey. This would be to determine whether any micro-siting of infrastructure

- is required to ensure in situ protection of heritage resources or, if this is not possible, whether any mitigation should be implemented;
2. Where required, sensitive portions of the final layout of the wind farm must be subjected to a pre-construction palaeontological survey. This must determine whether:
 - a. Any recording and/or collection of fossils might be required;
 - b. Certain areas may require monitoring;
 - c. Any areas should be avoided and protected;
 3. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
 4. Care must be taken to minimise landscape scarring during construction and undertake rehabilitation of areas not required during operation, to the satisfaction of the Environmental Control Officer (ECO);
 5. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
 6. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 35 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas; and
 7. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.
 8. The Committee emphasizes the importance of the pre-construction survey by the archaeologist and palaeontologist.

SB

**15.6 Proposed residential development on a 23d/ha land, consisting of a variety of residential Typologies of varying heights within a gated precinct with single access on Ptn 8 of Farm Ronwe 851 Paarl: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL / PTN 8 OF FARM 851**

Case No: 17062709HB0804E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on 16 July 2021 at 10:30 (DG, SW and MS) and report back will be provided at the meeting of the IACom on 21 July 2021.

AM

**15.7 Proposed 120km Long Powerline for the Nuweveld Wind Farms Grid: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ BEAUFORT WEST / POWERLINE NUWEVELD WEF**

Case No: 19090610SB1017E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the APM comments and resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting dated May 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section

38(3) of the NHRA, the development as assessed therein may proceed subject to the following conditions:

1. The final alignment of the gridline must be subjected to a pre-construction archaeological survey. This would be to determine whether any micrositing of infrastructure is required to ensure in situ protection of heritage resources or, if this is not possible, whether any mitigation should be implemented;
2. In areas where palaeontological sensitivity is inferred to be high, the final alignment of the powerline must be subjected to a pre-construction palaeontological survey. This must determine whether any recording and/or collection of fossils might be required or if any areas should be avoided;
3. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
4. The final alignment must be determined in consultation with a visual specialist to ensure that:
 - a. the final escarpment crossing minimises visual impacts, especially as seen from De Jager's Pass; and
 - b. visual impact to scenic valleys and ridgelines along the final route are minimised as far as practical;
5. Pre-construction planning must allow for buffers around archaeological and palaeontological sites and graves of at least 30 m and of 200 m for Grade IIIB and up structures and 100 m for Grade IIIC structures. Alternatively, the implementation of mitigation measures may be required, and these would be determined as part of the pre-construction survey;
6. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.
7. The Committee emphasizes the importance of the pre-construction survey by the archaeologist and palaeontologist.

SB

**15.8 Proposed Residential Development on Portion 175 (A Portion of Portion 168) of the Farm Vyf Brakke Fonteinen 220 (Erf 21244) In Mossel Bay: NM
HM/ EDEN / MOSSEL BAY / PTN 220/178**

Case No: 20081209SB0818E

INTERIM COMMENT:

(Notwithstanding the above) the Committee concurred with the APM concerns and noted that the HIA does not comply with the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA. A revised HIA to be submitted clarifying the heritage resources, if any, and addressing all other requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.9 Proposed Development of a Fuel Station on Ptn 14, Farm 786, Phillipi: NM
HM /CITY OF CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ PHILLIPI / PTN 14 OF FARM 786**

Case No: 19022708AS0305E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolve to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting dated 25 May 2021 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, the development as assessed therein may proceed, with the following conditions:

1. Should the development proposal as contained within the HIA change, the revised proposal is to be submitted for review and endorsement - which would entail a new application process.
2. A palaeontologist to monitor excavations.
3. It is recommended that the project be authorised in full, but subject to the following mitigation measures¹⁰:
4. Lighting should be designed to avoid light spillage and minimise light pollution; • Neon/flashing lights and signs may not be used;
5. The detailed design for lighting and signage must be submitted to HWC for approval prior to the commencement of construction (it is recommended that guidance be sought from a visual specialist prior to this submission);
6. Once the full depth of the fuel tanks has been excavated in part of the tank farm area, a palaeontologist should be contracted to examine and log the sand profile. Sampling of any significant deposits may then be required;
7. All trees within the road reserve along Weltevreden Road are to be retained and protected from harm during the implementation of the project; and
8. If any archaeological material, palaeontological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist or palaeontologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**15.10 Proposed Blouville Development on Erf 4722, Wellington: MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ WELLINGTON/ERF 4722**

Case No: 17080109ZK0122M

FINAL COMMENT:

The previous concerns expressed by the Committee have been addressed.

The Committee resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ARCON dated January 2019 as meeting the provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, and further endorses Option 2 (plan 6) of the SDP prepared by Urban Dynamics Western Cape, dated 17 June 2021 (including the split-zoning on portion 56), and therefore the development as assessed therein may proceed.

KB

**15.11 Proposed Subdivision for Prospective Residential Units on Erf 177476, Main Road, St. James:
MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ ST JAMES/ERF 177476**

Case No: 17090415AS0914M

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee is unable to make an assessment of the heritage impact of the development as heritage indicators have not been articulated sufficiently enough to identify the nature of the development or the appropriate mitigation measures to be applied to the development. Therefore, the HIA does not comply with Section 38(3) (c) of the NHRA.

SB

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. ADVICE

24.1 None

25 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

25.1 None

26. OTHER

**26.1 Bloemendal Spillway Draft Maintenance Management Plan (MMP): NM
HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/ DURBANVILLE / PTN 1 OF FARM 1471**

Case No: N/A

COMMENT:

The proposed spillway contained within the MMP prepared by ug Jeffery Environmental Consultants as dated 19 May 2021 has no impacts to heritage resources and therefore no further action in terms of the NHRA is required.

SB

**26.2 Draft Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for Bains Kloof, Wellington: MA
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTIEN/ WELLINGTON/ BAINS KLOOF PASS**

Case No: 19050303SB0619E

COMMENT:

A revised draft CMP is to be submitted, including documentation related to the previous Section 27 application and any other submissions, to the Committee. Thereafter the Committee will conduct a site inspection.

SB

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above. SM moved to endorse and adopt the resolutions and decisions and SW seconded.