

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)  
of the Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held at the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor Boardroom, Protea  
Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town,  
at 09h00 on Wednesday 10 May 2017.**

---

**1. Opening and Welcome**

The Chairperson, Mr Chris Snelling opened the meeting at 09H05 and welcomed everyone present. The Committee welcomed a new staff member, Mr Khuluse and wished him all the best at HWC.

**2. Attendance**

**Members**

Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)  
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)  
Mr Sipiwo Mavumengwana (SM)  
Mr Guy Thomas (GT)  
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)  
Ms Natasha Higgitt (NH)  
Prof Lucien le Grange (LLG)  
Mr Andrew Hall (AH)  
Ms Joline Young (JY)

**Staff**

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)  
Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)  
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)  
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)  
Ms Katherine Robinson (KR)  
Mr Andrew September (AS)  
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)  
Ms Lithalethu Mshoti (LM)  
Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka (ZS)  
Mr Zethembe Khuluse (ZK)  
Ms Busisiwe Menzele (BM)

**Observers**

None

**Visitors**

|               |                 |                   |
|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Mr H Marais   | Mr P Stuart     | Ms M Potgieter    |
| Mr J K May    | Ms L Brauer     | Ms M Haddad       |
| Ms M Attwell  | Prof S Klopper  | Mr B de Robillard |
| Mrs L Jansen  | Mr D Leicer     | Mr F Manzo        |
| Mr M Borzsony | Ms B O'Donoghue | Mrs B Gould-Pratt |
| Dr S Townsend | Mr T Menek      | Ms A Trümpelmann  |
| Mr C de Beck  |                 |                   |

**3. Apologies**

Prof Fabio Todeschini (FT)  
Mr Steven Walker (SW)

**4. Approval of the Agenda**

4.1 The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 10 May 2017 with additions.

**5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting**

5.1 The Committee resolved to approve the minutes dated 12 April 2017 with one minor correction.

**6. Disclosure of Interest**

- 16.1. NH
- 16.2. SM

**7. Confidential Matters**

- 7.1 River Club / TRUP
- 7.2 Recordings of meetings

**8. Appointments**

None

**9 Administrative Matters**

**9.1 Outcome of the Appeals Committee, Tribunal and Court Cases**

PM reported back on the following appeal matter:

- Erf 174 Church Street, Tulbagh (HOMs).

**10 Standing Items**

**10.1 Site Inspections**

The following site inspections undertaken by Committee members and staff were noted:

- McGregor- Erf 31 and 1324
- St. Cyprian's School, Oranjezicht, Cape Town

**10.2 Report back from ExCo, Council and Other committees**

CSn gave a brief report back in respect of recording of meetings and perception of bias. In respect of the second matter legal opinion has been received which informed that Council's current policy is valid. This will be tabled at the next Committee meeting.

**10.3 Consensus amongst committee members and feedback from site inspections**

It was noted that the above matters were discussed amongst the Committee members and further discussions will be on-going in this regard.

**CSn**

**MATTERS TO BE 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 Re of Portion 12 of the Vergenoegd Farm No 653 - Proposed Development: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ SOMERSET WEST/ RE OF PORTION 12 OF THE VERGENOEGD FARM NO 653**

**Case No:** 16012507WD0210M

Revised residence design was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay did a power-point presentation

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The architect was present and made a brief presentation.
- The Committee noted that previous concerns raised had been addressed and that the heritage resource indicators had also been complied with.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the revised design on condition that future building plans are substantially in accordance with the submission dated 12/04/2017.

**WD**

#### **13.2 Development of Tourist Facilities and Accommodation on Erf 31 and 1324 – McGregor: MA HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ BREEDE RIVER WINELANDS/ MCGREGOR/ ERF 31 AND 1324**

**Case No:** 16081520WD0822M

A site visit report was tabled and is annexed to the minutes as “SI1”

Ms Waseefa Dhansay gave a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Chair read out a report in respect of the site visit which was conducted by members of the Committee on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2017, and thereafter both the applicants and objectors were given an opportunity to address the Committee.
- The Committee was generally supportive of the proposed development, which it did not believe in principle to impact either on the significance of the streetscape, the site itself, or the significance and character of the greater area.
- There were however concerns expressed in respect of the proposed intervention along Voortrekker Street, which included the proposed gable to the restaurant building and the inwardly facing spa building which is atypical of the character of the area. The stone walling motif in this particular context was also questioned.
- The Committee indicated that it could consider a double storey building along the Voortrekker Street edge and could also consider parking being taken off the street, in other words a vehicular access off Voortrekker Street and additional, landscaped parking at the centre of the site.
- This general, in-principle support of the development does not imply support for or against any town planning application which may be required under municipal jurisdiction.

## INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved not to approve the site development plan in its current layout and requested that revised drawings be submitted to the Committee that address the issues raised.

WD

### 13.3 Proposed New Enclosed Swimming Pool, Sports Hall, Performing Arts Centre and hall, additional Classrooms and vehicular thoroughfare with structured parking on Erven 333, 2281 & 2907, St Cyprian's School, Oranjezicht: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ORANJEZICHT/ERVEN 3333, 2287 & 2907

**Case No:** 16041101KR0420M

Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) by Stephen Townsend dated 25 March 2017, Comment letters from I&AP's, Tree Assessment by OVP Associates revised February 2017 and additional drawings by Meyer & Associates were tabled.

A site inspection report was tabled and is annexed as "SI 2"

Ms Katherine Robinson gave a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- It was noted that the Interested and Affected Parties (I&AP's) were informed timeously of the meeting by both HWC and the applicant.
- The comments of I&APs, the submission made to the Committee by Cullinan and Associates at the start of the previous meeting, and the response by Dr Townsend were noted.
- The report on the site visit, which was undertaken by members of the Committee on the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> of May 2017 was read out and the findings tabled.
- The applicant's representatives were present and contributed to the discussion, primarily responding to the Committee's findings in respect of the site visit
- Whilst generally supportive of the overall proposed school expansion, the Committee did express concerns:
  - The potential threat to the character (the figure-ground relationship) of the School (and its setting).
  - The proposed extension to Molteno House situated at a higher level, to approximately 2m away from Belmont House. In combination with the upper floor extension of the Nussbaum Centre, as well as the proposed covered courtyard, this creates a sense of overpowering the Grade IIIA building.
  - The extent of the covered courtyard between Haggie Hall above and the classrooms and Nussbaum Centre below. Currently Belmont Ave has a residential quality, with clear breaks between buildings and glimpses of the mountain beyond. These view corridors should be maintained with as little clutter between them as possible.
  - The proximity of the New Indoor Sports Centre to the Chapel is problematic and the scale of this new building is dominating and detracts from the significance of Chapel, which, together with the core precinct, is considered a Grade II resource. A gap of at least 7m is required between these buildings.

- West and North elevations as well as scale and height of the New Hall and New Performing Arts Centre at School in the Woods. It lacks articulation and is inappropriately scaled, especially in conjunction with the parking level underneath. Concern was expressed that the Centre, being the same scale as the New Hall will intrude on the panoramic view of Table Mountain when viewed from the hockey field.

The Committee also noted the following:

- While some trees would be sacrificed, the heritage impact of the proposed north-south link road and new entrance on Belmont Ave is considered low and is outweighed by its socio-economic benefits of improved circulation.
- The proposed swimming pool hall will be excavated and the ridge of its roof will be only 1½ storeys high. Apart from adding coverage, it was not considered to impact on heritage resources.
- No objections to the demolition of the French Block, in order to construct the New Indoor Sports Centre, but the positive space created by the existing gap between the two buildings, along with, the colonnaded link to the Chapel must be retained.
- The additional building in the row above Belmont Ave could be supported, provided that it continues the existing fine-grained 'residential' aesthetic.

Dr Townsend addressed some of the concerns raised by the Committee.

#### **DECISION**

1. The HIA report satisfies the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

That a site development plan, showing the following changes is submitted to the CEO for his approval: Resolution of the relationship between the Chapel and the Indoor Sports Centre and the north aspect of the new Performing Arts Centre.

The concerns around the extension to Molteno House must be dealt with at the time of submission of full plans for the building, to the satisfaction of HWC.

On this understanding:

2. The committee supports the development subject to the following conditions:

All future building plans must be submitted to this Committee for final approval for each phase of development.

Any earth moving must be monitored by a qualified archaeologist, who must submit a close out report to HWC at the conclusion of each phase of development.

**KR**

**13.4 HIA - Erven 117665, 9745, 4347 and 4339, Cape Town CBD, Zero2One: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CAPE TOWN CBD/ ERVEN 117665, 9745, 4347 AND 4339, CAPE TOWN CBD**

**Case No:** 16083103WD0919M

Application Documents were tabled

Ms Waseefa Dhansay made a power-point presentation

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The height of the proposed building was felt to be the primary aspect of the development that needed consideration and in this regard there was unanimous agreement that the proposed building was too high for this location.
- There was discussion amongst the Committee as to what would constitute an appropriate height, with some members being of the view that the 60 metre height limit, as per existing zoning rights, should not be exceeded. Other members of the Committee believed, in principle, that the building could exceed this 60m limit, but that it should not exceed the height of other high-rise buildings in the vicinity, in order to contribute to a more unified city skyline.
- Consideration was also given to how the building responds at street level and particularly its podium in relation to a wider streetscape; in this regard it was not felt that this was sufficiently resolved at present.
- The Committee did not support the diagonal embellishments on the building, as it drew unnecessary attention to its prominence.
- Notwithstanding the concerns tabled above, which must be taken into account in any future design revisions, the Committee was supportive of certain of the heritage resource and urban design indicators contained in the HIA, as well as certain of the recommendations which include:
  - Introduce a degree of habitable areas within the podium facing the Railway Station forecourt and the two associated corners (south and north east). These habitable areas will positively impact the immediate site precinct and especially the Heerengracht and Railway Station forecourt;
  - The proposed building's corner on the Adderley/Heerengracht and Strand Street intersection requires a different and stronger design response to the other corners due to its strategic city location. This design response should reflect the city 'higher order' route and node;
  - The corner designs and facades of St George's Mall and de Waterkant require a design response that is more pedestrian related;
  - The ground and first floor level requires a more interesting street facade in terms of relationship with the public environments and its volumes. The ground / 1st floor with its associated sheltered edge, should be raised, so the light, 'lifting up' effect is more pronounced to make the building seem less dominant at the street scale;
  - Explore wider public sidewalks by setting back the ground floor facades;
  - Consider allowing public pedestrian movement through the ground floor;
  - The height of the podium should respond to the surrounding building's context, and could not necessarily be consistent in level. A civic order response should be made on the Heerengracht and Strand Street facades with a lower order response on the St George's Mall and Waterkant Street facades i.e. the building responds to its transition zone in which it is located.

- A more continuous design style between the podium and the tower is realised so that the building's podium is an integrated part of the building. Furthermore the introduction of habitable areas on the south eastern façade will assist the animation and connection of the lower and upper portions;
- Explore the use of integrated screened balconies for the residential units as moveable screens which will animate the facade to result in the residential building expressing itself differently to a commercial building;
- Omit the diagonal steel facade element, as it can become a dominant visual element within the CBD built environment. Existing examples of diagonal elements clad onto buildings facades are assessed as a negative feature to the building and the CBD context;

#### **INTERIM COMMENT**

Based on all the comments above, the Committee resolved not to approve the design in its current form.

WD

#### **14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSE 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 construction of the Maralla East Wind Energy Facility Laingsburg Farm Aanstoot 721 Farm Annex Joseph's Kraal 84, Farm Aurora 285 Welgemoed 268: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/LAINGSBURG/FARM AANSTOOT 72/1, FARM ANNEX JOSEPH'S KRAAL 84, FARM AURORA 285 & WELGEMOED 268**

**Case No:16041211AS0418E**

HIA: Proposed construction of the Maralla East Wind Energy Facility near Laingsburg in the Western and Northern Cape Provinces

NH recused herself.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- It was noted that South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) has responsibility for the Northern Cape jurisdiction on this project and has already commented in support of it. A paleontological team under Prof Rubidge at Wits is currently conducting research in the area and may be interested in excavation associated with this project.

## FINAL COMMENT

The report is endorsed by the Committee, subject to Prof Rubidge being contacted to ascertain whether there is interest on his part and being provided with opportunity to be present during the course of excavation, as well as the recommendations set out in the consultant's report which include:

- Two highly sensitive palaeontological “no-go” areas within the proposed Maralla East WEF study area have been identified in this study and should be safeguarded by a 20 m-radius buffer zone: The tetrapod trackway site on Welgemoed 268 (Loc. 036); The uranium ore anomaly site on Schalkwyskraal 204 (Anomaly 120 of Cole & Vorster 1999).
- The following highly sensitive archaeological areas have been identified and they must be declared no-go areas during the construction:
  - A graveyard on the Komsberg River, Schalkwyskraal;
  - An historic stockpost on the Komsberg River
  - Graves and a rock art site in the Ventersrivier, Welgemoed.
- All South African fossil heritage is protected by law (NHRA) and fossils cannot be collected, damaged or disturbed without a permit from the relevant Heritage Authority (in this case SAHRA or HWC);
- The palaeontologist concerned with potential mitigation work will need a valid fossil collection permit from SAHRA / HWC and any material collected would have to be curated in an approved depository (e.g. museum or university collection);
- All palaeontological specialist work should conform to international best practice for palaeontological fieldwork and the study (e.g. data recording fossil collection and curation, final report) should adhere as far as possible to the minimum standards for Phase 2 palaeontological studies developed by Heritage Western Cape (2016) and SAHRA (2013).
- The proximity of the blue substation to significant archaeological resources may result in their destruction. It is recommended that the white substation should be used instead. Alternatively, move the blue substation at least 500m to the west to avoid sites on the Venters River (Figure 4);

If any archaeological remains, including human remains, are uncovered during construction, then work must stop in that area and the responsible heritage authorities (SAHRA/Heritage Western Cape) must be notified:

- If there are any significant changes to the layout of the wind turbines, then a walk down of sensitive areas in the proposed facility is recommended as part of the EMP;
- Since heritage resources are concentrated in the river valleys, such as the Venters River and Komsberg River valleys, it is important that access roads and underground cabling is carefully placed to avoid negative impacts. This will require a final walk down during the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) phase, of all river crossings;
- If there is any intention of future adaptive re-use of the Welgemoed house during the construction or operation of the WEF, any proposed alterations to the building, which is older than 60 years, must be submitted to Heritage Western Cape for approval;

**AS**



**16.2 Proposed 75Mw Bonnievale PVSEF on PTN 19 Farm Oudekraal 170, PTN 6 & Rem of Farm Sandfontein 232, Bonnievale: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/BREEDE RIVER WINELANDS/BONNIEVALE/ PTN 19 FARM 170, PTN 6 AND REM OF FARM 232**

**Case No:** 15072411WD0723M

NID application and HIA of proposed 75Mw Bonnievale PVSEF on Portion 19 of Oudekraal 170, and Portion 6 and remainder of Sandfontein 232, Bonnievale, Western Cape, prepared by ACO dated February 2017 were tabled

SM recused himself for this item and left the room.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay gave a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee considered the report along with the visual impact assessment very carefully. The VIA established the visual impact of the 89 ha of PV panels to be high.
- The VIA had identified the area as having high local scenic quality, but the heritage impact assessment, whilst noting the area as having some significance, i.e. III C, did not materially assess the cultural landscape in a meaningful way. Having done this would have allowed for a better understanding of the significance of the natural and cultural landscape as well as provided clear heritage resource indicators against which to measure the impact of the proposed development on the receiving environment.
- The Committee believed that the report would have benefited from the input of a heritage specialist with experience in dealing with cultural landscape issues.

**INTERIM COMMENT**

It was recommended that a more detailed cultural landscape analysis, which includes appropriate heritage resource indicators, is undertaken, and integrated into the heritage impact assessment.

**WD**

**16.3 Proposed Sand Mine on Erf 560, Schaapkraal, Philippi: NM HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ PHILIPPI/ ERF 560**

**Case No:** 17012002WD0120M

HIA and I&AP comments were tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay did a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- It was noted that in future instances where current activities, on a site or surrounds, provide the heritage context, social
- and historical studies should be more frequently required when considering a NID.
- The Committee was of the view that the site forms part of the greater Philippi Horticultural Area (PHA) landscape and contributes to the significance of the

PHA. The PHA has been previously identified as having high local and even provincial heritage significance.

- The dune proposed to be mined is one of the last remaining coastal dune systems which provide the linkages between the farmland and the coastline. The linkages between the farmland and dune system date back to the 19th century, depicting the patterns of farmland development on the Cape Flats and cannot be separated from the PHA. The sand mining operation would have a negative impact on the cultural landscape of the southern edge of the PHA.
- The dune system forms part of the ecosystem of the PHA and is a contributing factor to the functioning of the PHA ecosystem. The PHA farmlands and seasonal wetlands are the last naturally occurring recharge for the Cape Flats aquifer. The aquifer is an irreplaceable natural free source of irrigation for farmers in the PHA and also the future potable water for the CoCT – removing parts of the ecosystem which contribute to the aquifer will destroy the recharge function of the aquifer. The dune cannot be separated from what the PHA links to – food production, food prices, water crisis, urban farmland heritage, etc.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

If the sand dune, like many others, is allowed to be mined, the process is irreversible and would change the cultural landscape of the PHA, therefore the Committee does not support the application.

The Committee recommends that HWC acts upon its mandate and pursues the surveying and provisional protection of the PHA for the formal protection of this heritage resource.

**WD**

#### **16.4 Proposed borrow pit on Farm 188, Langeberg, Vredenburg: NM HM/LANGEBERG/FARM 188**

**Case No:** 16090605AS0908M

HIA and associated appendices were tabled

Mr Andrew September gave a power-point presentation.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The HOMs comments and recommendations were noted and endorsed by the Committee.
- It was further noted that HOMs can approve the palaeontologist with requisite qualifications.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

The Committee supports the consultant's recommendations that:

##### **Archaeology**

1. No mitigation is required prior to excavations commencing.
2. Excavations must be inspected for Pleistocene archaeological remains.
3. Should any human remains be disturbed, exposed or uncovered during mining operations, these must immediately be reported to Heritage Western Cape (Att: Mr Andrew September 021 483 9543), or Jonathan Kaplan (082 321 0172).

### **Palaeontology**

1. Mining must be monitored by a palaeontologist or archaeologist with appropriate palaeontological knowledge. The frequency of this to be worked out with the contractor prior to work commencing on the site, in order to minimize time spent on site.
2. Protocols for dealing with palaeontological monitoring and possible further mitigation must be included in the EMP (refer to Appendix A).
3. Any material recovered will be lodged in the Quaternary collection of Iziko South African Museum.
4. Funds must be available a priori to cover costs of fieldwork and one date should the need arise.

The Committee would like to emphasise the following:

- Paleontological monitoring must be undertaken by a professional palaeontologist approved by HWC. Monitoring must take place for all bulk earthworks and receive a comment from the West Coast Fossil Park on the appointment.
- If any palaeontological or archaeological finds are uncovered, all work must stop immediately and be reported to HWC.

**AS**

### **16.5 Proposed Photovoltaic Facility and Abalone Farm on Portion 6 of Farm Langefontein 453, Gouritzmond: NM HM/ HESSEQUA/ GOURITZMOND/ POTION 6 OF FARM 453 Case No: 16100429AS1006E**

Ratification of decision taken by e-mail, dated 20 April 2017

Mr September gave a brief presentation of the item and the HOMs recommendations were tabled. However, due time constraints it was agreed that discussion and decision in regard to the item would be circulated by email.

In e-mail correspondence that followed, the following was noted:

- The HOMs recommendations were endorsed. These include:
  - There is no evidence in the HIA that indicates the walk through for the PV Solar plant took place, even though there is a conclusion in the identification of heritage resources in this area of study. Evidence of the walkthrough must be submitted as well as site photographs of the area where the proposed photovoltaic solar energy farm is to take place.
  - There is a building in the development footprint that is possibly older than 60 years and the building has not been assessed in the HIA (i.e. history of occupation, when it was built, contextual photographs, etc.).
  - HOMs notes and commends the mitigation strategies of the VIA however would recommend that the sketch plans of the proposed interventions be submitted to HWC for approval as there are concerns with mass and scale within the rural cultural landscape.
- In respect of the last bullet above it was noted that; other than a description of the cultural landscape, which was provided for on pages 14 and 15 of the HIA, the landscape has not been assessed in terms of its significance, nor indeed was an impact of the development on this significance, if any, provided for.

It was noted by a member of Committee that there was a supplemental archaeological report done that included the P.V. facility and the house; however this has not been mentioned in the final HIA. This needs be included in a revised HIA.

**INTERIM COMMENT**

The Committee cannot at this stage endorse the HIA as having met the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

It is recommended that the items mentioned above are addressed and that a revised and updated HIA is submitted to HWC.

**AS**

**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 42 – HERITAGE AGREEMENT**

23.1 None

**24. OTHER**

**25 Adoption of decisions and resolutions**

25.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

**26. CLOSURE – 16H35**

**27. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 7 June 2017**

**CHAIRPERSON**\_\_\_\_\_ **DATE**\_\_\_\_\_

**SECRETARY**\_\_\_\_\_ **DATE**\_\_\_\_\_

## **Annexure SI1**

### **SITE INSPECTION REPORT BACK.**

**COMMITTEE: IACOM**

**DATE: 08-05-2017.**

**TIME: HWC-McGREGOR-RETURN. 07H30-14H30**

**WHERE: CORNER VOORTREKKER AND BREE ST MCGREGOR**

#### **MEMBERS ATTENDING:**

CHRIS SNELLING. CHAIR.

ANDREW HALL.

LUCIEN LE GRANGE.

SIPHIWO MAVUMENGWANA.

#### **HWC STAFF ATTENDING:**

WASEEFA DHANSAY.

JONATHAN WINDVOGEL.

ZITHEMBE KHULUSE

#### **PURPOSE OF VISIT.**

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT. NEW TOURIST FACILITIES. ERVEN 31 AND 1324 MCGREGOR

S38 (4) application received by HWC for the above project

The application was tabled at the IACom meeting of 12th April 2017.

Having considered the HIA and heard representations from both objectors and proponents of the project, the Committee resolved at the time to conduct a site visit in order to more familiarize itself with issues raised and the site itself and context in which it is located.

It was also requested at the time that intermediate drawings should be provided which locate the proposed development within a streetscape context. These were provided by the applicants, and were at hand, along with other drawings previously submitted, during the site inspection.

#### **INSPECTION:**

The Committee members who attended the site visit inspected the following:

Voortrekker Street. Bree Street, the site itself and also spent time walking around surrounding blocks in order to get an understanding of the significance of the area in respect of built form, open spaces and general character.

#### **OBSERVATIONS:**

It was noted that both street interfaces could easily accommodate additional built form, without impacting on the significance of streetscape or area.

The site itself, (consisting of 2 erven), was large and could accommodate additional built form without compromising the character of the area.

Voortrekker Street was the primary street, and is typified by single structures and the occasional double storey structure. Bree Street generally by single storey structures.

Voortrekker Street consisted of a mix of commercial and residential use.

Bree Street is generally residential in character.

*Approved IACom Minutes\_10 May 2017*

Some of the significance of the surrounding fabric and character had been marred by inwardly facing development whose relationship with the street had been lost. This was noticeable in respect of certain of the built fabric in the Voortrekker/Bree and Long Street block.

The existing high wall on the Voortrekker Road boundary of the site and neighbouring property was regarded as detrimental to the character of the area.

#### **RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL.**

The insertion of the two residential character single storey structures, of appropriate scale and character, in Bree Street is supported. Care should be taken that the outwardly facing aspect of these is maintained and that these do not turn inward into the site.

It was noted that the site is large enough to effectively absorb the proposed structures within the property, yet still maintain the open agricultural quality that is typical of much of McGregor. It was further noted that development within erven in the surrounding area is not uncommon and in this regard, the structures within the site itself would not be out of keeping.

The insertion of 2 structures into the Voortrekker Road aspect is supported in principle, however some concerns were expressed. These relate to;

- The pediment entrance feature to the restaurant was felt to be out of scale and atypical of the character of the area.
- The stone walling motif in this particular context was questioned.
- The members of the Committee present was not supportive of the inwardly facing Spa structure in this location. Structures along Voortrekker Road should be outwardly facing. In this respect the Spa building, facing inward, is considered to be out of keeping with the Voortrekker Road character.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS.**

It was suggested that the Spa building is relocated to the inside of the property and replaced with a residential unit.

Either of, (but not both), of the units along Voortrekker road could be an appropriately designed double storey structure in order to provide for accommodation.

Chris Snelling.  
Chair IACOM.  
08-05-2017.

## **Annexure SI2**

### **SITE INSPECTION REPORT**

**COMMITTEE:** IACOM

**DATE:** 03-05-2017 (CSN, SW)  
05-05-2017 (AH, LLG, SM, FV, KR)

**TIME:** 10:00 – 12:00

**VENUE:** ST CYPRIAN'S SCHOOL, ORANJEZICHT, CAPE TOWN

#### **MEMBERS ATTENDING:**

Chris Snelling (CSN)  
Andrew Hall (AH)  
Lucien le Grange (LLG)  
Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)  
Steven Walker (SW)  
Frik Vermeulen (FV)

#### **HWC STAFF ATTENDING:**

Kate Robinson (KR)

#### **PURPOSE OF VISIT:**

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ADDITIONAL FACILITIES AT ST CYPRIAN'S SCHOOL

S38(4) application received by HWC for the above project. The application was tabled at the IACom meeting of 12 April 2017, where it was resolved to conduct a site visit for members to familiarize themselves with the receiving environment and potential impacts.

At the previous meeting, 3D drawings were requested, so as to understand the volumetric and three-dimensional impacts. A 3D drawing was provided by the applicants, and, together with other drawings, was referred to at the site inspection.

#### **INSPECTION:**

The attendees met at the Main Building and walked the school campus. They identified the various development sites and observed the relationship of the site with its surrounding urban context. Views from outside the site were also considered.

#### **OBSERVATIONS:**

Campus consists of separate building complexes, dominated by mature trees. The various precincts each have a distinct character. Whilst often linked by covered walkways, the buildings currently retain their own identity and settings.

Gaps between buildings and garden spaces allow for mountain views and break up the massing.

The Belmont Ave interface has a distinct residential character, relating to the streetscape of the neighbourhood opposite the road.

Molteno House and Haggie Hall are elevated on a substantial bank, while Belmont House and Nussbaum Centre are located at a lower level.

The Chapel, as a central landmark, requires 'breathing space' around it and should not be intruded upon or dominated.

The parking area in the School in the Woods Precinct is cut into the slope, with a substantial retaining wall behind it – some capacity exists for infill buildings in the excavated space.

The hockey field allows a panoramic view of Table Mountain. The urban background has some visual absorption capacity.

### **RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL**

In general, the attendees had no objection to the notion of the school expanding, but some concerns were raised:

1. The potential threat to the character (the figure-ground relationship) of the School (and its setting).
2. The proposed extension to Molteno House to approx. 2m away from Belmont House. Sense of overpowering the Grade IIIA building.
3. The extent of the covered courtyard between Haggie Hall above and the classrooms and Nussbaum Centre below. Currently Belmont Ave has residential quality with clear breaks between buildings and glimpses of Mountains beyond. These view corridors should be maintained with as little clutter between them as possible.
4. The proximity of the New Indoor Sports Centre to the Chapel is problematic and the scale of this new building is dominating and detracts from the significance of Chapel, which, together with the core precinct, is considered a Grade II resource.
5. West elevation of the New Hall and New Performing Arts Centre at School in the Woods: Fronts onto residential area in HPOZ. Lacks articulation and is inappropriately scaled, especially in conjunction with the parking area underneath. Some also expressed concern that the Centre, being the same scale as the New Hall will intrude on the panoramic view of Table Mountain when viewed from the hockey field.

While some trees would be sacrificed, the heritage impact of the proposed north-south link road and new entrance on Belmont Ave is considered low and is outweighed by its socio-economic benefits of improved circulation.

The proposed swimming pool hall will be excavated and the ridge of its roof will be only 1½ storey high. Apart from adding coverage, it does not appear to impact on heritage resources.



No objection to the demolition of the French Block, but the gap and colonnaded link to the Chapel should be retained as far as possible.

The additional building in the row above Belmont Ave could be supported, provided that it continues the existing fine-grained 'residential' aesthetic.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

Molteno House extension should be stepped down and set back from Belmont House. More detail of this interface, including elevations, is required.

Possibly reduce the covered area to behind Nussbaum only or keep the courtyard open. Ground levels to resolved and illustrated.

The New Indoor Sports Centre to be set back from the Chapel. If the space does not meet programmatic requirements, consider the rotation of the hall by 90 degrees. Excavate/'bury' the hall as much as possible.

The New Performing Arts Centre to be stepped down from the back (the hall) towards the front, where it is situated on a substantial platform. It should be an infill building, which does not dominate the panoramic view. Additional articulation is required.

Any earth moving should be monitored. Without more detailed historic maps and with the cut and fill topography it is impossible to tell how deep the original surface is and what the likelihood of archaeological finds is. Test excavations would not be useful and monitoring is considered sufficient.