

**APPROVED DECISIONS OF THE MEETING OF
HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE PERMIT COMMITTEE (BELCom)
Held on Wednesday, 28 February 2018 in the 1st Floor Boardroom at the Offices
of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport,
Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town at 09:00**

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**11.1 Proposed Additions, Alterations and Landscaping, Re of Portion 12 of the Vergenoegd Farm No 653, Somerset West: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ SOMERSET WEST/ RE OF PORTION 12 OF THE VERGENOEGD FARM NO 653**

Case No: 16112213WD1123M

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application with the following suspensive conditions:

1. Detailed integrated services drawings (including electrical, data, water supply, HVAC and fire, etc.) showing the minimal nature and extent of historic fabric impacted to be provided.
2. That the wall nibs in the meeting rooms be configured as sloping buttresses to ensure adequate lateral support to the long walls without the introduction of concrete columns and/or new foundations.
3. When construction commences, a monthly progress report is to be submitted to Heritage Western Cape by an architect with suitable heritage experience.
4. A close-out report must be submitted by the architect with suitable heritage experience within 30 days of practical completion.
5. A structural engineer is to work under direction of the architect with suitable heritage experience.

WD

**11.2 Proposed Restoration and Alteration on Farm 579, Farm Druk My Niet, Bodal Road, Paarl: MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/FARM 579**

Case No: 17050204HB0503M

The matter was removed from agenda.

HB

**11.3 Erf 1113, 20 Brownlow Road, Tamboerskloof: MA
HM/CAPE METROPOLITAN/TAMBOERSKLOOF**

Case No: 18020710HB0207E; 17070305HB0818E; 15062408HB0625E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

1. The Committee endorses the proposal to transplant the tree *Phoenix canariensis* and has no objections to the landscape plan. However, the case officer noted that alterations to the approved building plan have been included on landscape drawings.

2. A revised landscape drawing, excluding alterations to the buildings, needs to be submitted for permitting. The proposed building alterations need to be the subject of a new application. (To clarify – a final building plan and a final landscape plan are to be submitted, and these plans should be properly coordinated so that they both reflect the most updated design intention).

HB

**11.4 Proposed Guest Cottages and Spa - RE of Farm 1319 Morgenster, Somerset West: MN
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ SOMERSET WEST/ RE OF FARM 1319**

Case No: 17102704WD0206M

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to undertake a site visit once the following further heritage investigation work has been undertaken and provided to the Committee for consideration.

1. In order to assess the broader heritage context, sections which carry through the entire site/locale are required; these to include the cellar, stretches up to the trees, the proposed sites themselves, as well as the slopes above.
2. The 1990's Ian Ford and Associates landscape studies to be included in submission pack, and to be consulted by design team with regards to the site selection.
3. The VIA has provided an idea of the visibility of the proposal from certain vantage points. However, this needs to be expanded to give an impression of the impact from within the Vergelegen Estate.
4. Groupings of building within this cultural landscape are typically orthogonally clustered; this typical arrangement to be considered as a design indicator.
5. Alternative building arrangements, taking into account traditional settlement patterns and place-making, should be provided for consideration.
6. The scale of the buildings needs to be considered in terms of an impact on the cultural environment. The extent and sizes of the internal spaces are to be reviewed and possibly reduced to take the above into account,
7. The work of the heritage consultants and VIA consultants needs to be integrated.

WD

**11.5 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 10780; Groot Constantia Estate, Constantia: MN
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CONSTANTIA / ERF 10780**

Case No: 17102007WD0124E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

Manor House (Homestead) Entrance: glass wind lobby:

The Committee supports the glass wind lobby concept, subject to the following suspensive conditions:

1. Integrated services drawings (including electrical and data, or anything that may impact on heritage fabric visually or physically) showing the minimal nature and extent of historic fabric impacted must be submitted to the Committee.
2. The glass structure must be self-supporting i.e. not intervening with any heritage fabric, or any intervention to be the barest minimal. The floor is one of the oldest intact remaining features of the building, and therefore the installation should not be allowed to impact upon the floor negatively.

3. Revised detailed drawings, including 3D's, to be submitted to the Committee.

Bus Shelters:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection. (KDS, MS and DG), as visual impacts of the bus shelter are a potential concern.

RECORD OF DECISION

Cellar:

The Committee resolved to approve the application, as the heritage resources in question are of lower significance within the broader context, and impacts on heritage are minimal.

WD

**11.6 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Farm 1777, Owloon, Paarl: MN
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/ FARM 1777**

Case No: 16111706HB1123M

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Friday, 16 March 2018. (MS, MN, PB, JdW and DG).

HB

**12 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR TOTAL
DEMOLITION**

**12.1 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1079, 28 Vredehoek Avenue, Vredehoek: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN/ VREDEHOEK/ERF 1079**

Case No: 15071004HB0715E

RECORD OF DECISION

1. The Committee resolved not to approve the application, as the proposed replacement building does not respond to its context and the impact on the heritage environment of the proposal will be negative.
2. The consultant to confirm ownership to ensure the correct application process.
3. A new application must be submitted to satisfy the Committee's requirements.

HB

**12.2 Proposed total demolition at Erf 28565, 47 Mount Street, Mowbray: MA
HM / CAPE METROPOLITAN/ MOWBRAY/ERF 28565**

Case No: 17051603HB0519M

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

Revised designs to be submitted addressing the following issues:

1. The results of the analysis in *document 04-Erf 28565* must be implemented more rigorously in the design. Elements noted included colonnaded walkways, cantilevered balconies etc. The design responses in to this heritage context must be augmented.

2. Buildings in the immediate surroundings of Erf 28565 are visually and spatially broken up into horizontal sections: base, middle and roof.
3. The buildings located along this portion of Main Road (within the declared HPO) create a successful, varied pedestrian zone, with no vehicular access to any of the buildings off Main Road. In keeping with this pedestrian realm, this building's design is to emphasise and encourage more pedestrian oriented aspects, minimising and downplaying the vehicle access to the building. Vehicle access is to be minimised.
4. The projecting wall cutting the pedestrian access off from the neighbouring property is to be removed. Continuous pedestrian access along the street facades are to be facilitated.

HB

12.3 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 2969, 38 Lion Street, Bo-Kaap: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ BO-KAAP/ ERF 2969

Case No: 17111521WD1117

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

1. An architect with suitable heritage experience is to be appointed to the consultant team to further consider and report on heritage significance of the buildings and spaces on site, and to produce heritage design indicators related to this, taking into account the points raised below, as well as any possible further impacts on all varieties of heritage significance as identified by the consultant team in terms of the NHRA.
2. The original architects and/or architectural teams responsible for the design of all buildings on the site must be established, along with a fully developed chronology of how building and site development happened over time. This is to inform an integrated set of decisions regarding of the heritage significances of all elements of the site, including the chapel and nursery components of the existing building complex, along with grading suggestions for exterior spaces and landscape elements of the complex.
3. The proposals in their current form cannot be assessed without the above. Revised design proposals are required. The following points at least need to be taken into account in the development of design indicators and subsequent design work:
 - i. The rocky outcrop is an important feature of the site which contributes enormously to its character – and thus the proposals for the site should integrate the rocky outcrop in a creative and innovating way, celebrating it as an opportunity (it should not be obliterated to make way for a new building parallel to the street – as this would reduce the special 'anomaly' in urban morphology that the site has, as a result of the rocky outcrop).
 - ii. The site sits on the edge of the mountain slope – and therefore needs to respond to the natural environment as much as it responds to the urban. The scale therefore has to be very carefully considered, and the design indicators, and any resulting design, must apply the greatest design sensitivity possible in this transition zone. Impacts on the environs of the site, and surrounding locale, to be checked with a range of visual graphics on a city and Table Valley scale to ensure the proposed development sits comfortably along the edge of the city and the mountain slopes behind.
 - iii. The site and its complexities (including the existing structures) need to inform the programme of the proposal, not the other way round.

- iv. The extent of demolitions indicated in the proposal tabled needs to be reconsidered: heritage design indicators may well establish “no go” areas for development on the site.
- v. If/ where demolitions are suggested, the established design morphology of the site as a whole has to inform guidelines for possible replacement structures, buildings and hard/soft landscaping.

WD

12.4 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 1418, 16 Bradwell Road, Vredehoek: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/VREDEHOEK/ ERF 1418

Case No: 17042812WD0503M

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve demolition of the existing house with the following suspensive conditions:

1. EHRM have called for EMP for protecting mature trees. The Committee supports this and requires this to be taken into account as a design indicator.
2. Design indicators need to take into account; amongst other issues pertinent to the NHRA:
 - i) All aspects of the immediate surrounding streetscape and townscape.
 - ii) Reconsideration of building directly onto side boundary, including pockets of greenery, as these elements are a long-established pattern in the townscape
 - iii) Pitch roof are more common in the immediate environs than any other roof form in this townscape.
 - iv) Street interface.
 - v) Providing space to the sides of the building taking particular account of the highly significant building No.18 Bradwell Road.
 - vi) The Committee supports a maximum double storey height.

WD

12.5 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 1489, 12 Bradwell Road, Vredehoek: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/VREDEHOEK/ ERF 1489

Case No: 17042814WD0503M

RECORD OF DECISION

The committee resolved not to approve the total demolition with one member dissenting. The total demolition of the buildings will impact negatively on heritage resources, both on the site itself, and in the broader context. The layering of the house is somewhat unusual, adding special interest to this unusual house which displays architectural elements of both its “Cape Revival” and “Art Deco” past. The street frontage, including the façade and verandah are of particular interest and must be retained, not only for their intrinsic heritage significance, but for their contribution to the heritage environs of the streetscape.

WD

**12.6 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 60, 4 Bellwood Road, Fresnaye: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ FRESNAYE/ ERF 60**

Case No: 17102512WD1101E

HELD OVER

The Committee resolved to defer the decision to the meeting of 8th March 2018.

WD

**12.7 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 102, 3 Princess Road, Fresnaye: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ FRESNAYE/ ERF 102**

Case No: 17061509WD0829

HELD OVER

The Committee resolved to defer the decision to the meeting of 8th March 2018.

WD

**12.8 Proposed Total Demolition at Erf 8736, 60-62 Hyde Street, Zonnebloem: MA
HM/ CAPE METROPOLITAN/ ZONNEBLOEM/ ERF 8736**

Case No: 17031701HB0411E

Report Back from Site Inspection.

HELD OVER

The Committee resolved to defer the decision to the meeting of 8th March 2018.

HB

**12.9 Proposed Total Demolition - Erf 551, 4 Oliver Road, Sea Point: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ SEA POINT/ ERF 551**

Case No: 17103016WD1201E

RECORD OF DECISION

The Committee resolved (with one dissenting) to approve the proposed total demolition on condition that the replacement building not be more than three storeys in height.

WD

12.10 Proposed Total Demolition - 72 Barnet Street, ERF 95451, Gardens: MA

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee noted that the 3Ds taken from a “drone view” do not satisfy the Committee’s previous requirement for drawings that allow the proposal to be assessed “spatialized in context”.

- The Committee requires that the previous requested requirements are properly addressed. The proposed new building is illustrated in 3D’s showing the building at pedestrian level. This is a requirement to inform the heritage practitioner, and in turn the Committee, of the nature of impacts on significant heritage resources within the local area.

ZK

13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS

13.1 None

14 HERITAGE AREAS: SECTION 31 CONSENT APPLICATIONS

14.1 None

15 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 29 PERMIT

15.1 None

16 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 28 REFUSAL

16.1 None

17 HERITAGE REGISTER: SECTION 30 PROCESS

17.1 None

18 PUBLIC MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS: SECTION 37 PROCESS

18.1 None

19 REQUESTS FOR OPINION/ADVICE

19.1 None

20 OTHER MATTERS

20.1 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee adopted the resolution and decisions.