

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee  
of Heritage Western Cape held on Wednesday, 7 December 2016, at the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Boardroom, Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town,  
at 09h00**

---

**1. Opening and Welcome**

The Chairperson, Mr Chris Snelling opened the meeting at 09H00 and welcomed everyone present.

**2. Attendance**

**Members**

Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)  
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)  
Mr Andrew Hall (AH)  
Mr Guy Thomas (GT)  
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)  
Ms Natasha Higgitt (NH)  
Prof Fabio Todeschini (FT)  
Ms Joline Young (JY)

**Staff**

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)  
Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka (ZS)  
Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)  
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)  
Ms Katherine Robinson (KR)  
Mr Andrew September (AS)  
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)  
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)  
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)  
Ms Lithalethu Mshoti (LM)

**Observers**

None

**Visitors**

Dr Stephen Townsend (ST)  
Mr Tiaan Meyer (TM)  
Ms Jade Budd (JB)  
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)

Ms Tessa Toerien (TT)  
Mr Armand Botes (AB)  
Mr Henry Aikman (HA)  
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

**3. Apologies**

Mr Steven Walker (SW)  
Prof Lucien le Grange (LLG)  
Mr Siphwiwo Mavumengwana (SM)

**4. Approval of the Agenda**

**4.1 Dated 7 December 2016**

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 7 December 2016 with additional items.

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

**5.1 Dated 9 November 2016**

The Committee agreed to adopt the minutes with no amendments.

## **6 Disclosure of Interest**

- FV: 13.1
- CS: 13.1
- FT: 13.2.

## **7. Confidential Matters**

7.1 None

## **8. Appointments**

8.1 No appointments

## **9 Administrative Matters**

AH was nominated and elected as Vice Chair.

New Committee Members were informed of the Ground rules for Committee Meetings and related procedures

### **9.1 Outcome of the Appeals, Tribunal Committees and Court Cases**

PM reported back on the outcomes following appeal matters:

- Proposed Remedial Work, Erf 11306, Klein Constantia Street, Paarl: Section 27
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 26939, 6 Roman Road, Observatory: Section 34
- Proposed Redevelopment of Erf 19506, Paardevlei, Somerset West: Section 38 (4)
- Proposed Additions to Existing Structure, Restoration & Alteration to Erf 785, 19 Hasting Street, Tamboerskloof: Section 34
- Proposed Redevelopment of the Warwick, Erven 333, 334 and 335, Main Road, Green Point: Section 38 (4)
- Proposed Total Demolition, Erven 177651 (5044, 5046, 5047, 5048, 5050, 5052 & 5053), 44, 46 & 48 Commercial Street, Cape Town CBD: Section: Section 38(4)
- Proposed Total Demolition - Erf 1186 - 19 A Cumming Street – Wellington: Section 34
- Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 48363, 49 Dean Street, Newlands: Section 34

**PM/JW**

### **9.2 HWC HIA Guidelines**

The Committee noted the new guidelines and asked that in line with previous procedure it be numbered in accordance with numbering and dated procedures for policies.

Any heritage impact assessments that do not comply with these guidelines will not be considered by IACom.

The Committee resolved that recommendation is made to HWC Council that the guidelines be formally adopted as policy.

**WD**

## **10 Standing Items**

### **10.1 Site Inspections**

Nothing to report.

**PM**

### **10.2 Report back from ExCo, Council and any Other Committees**

Matters were discussed and noted.

## **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 Proposal to Upgrade an Existing Sports Ground - NID application: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ERF 2601**

**Case no:** 16102103KR1031E

NID Application with supporting documentation prepared by Dr. Stephen Townsend and letters of objection from CIBRA and ENS Africa were tabled.

Ms Katherine Robinson made a power-point presentation.

Dr Stephen Townsend, Ms Tessa Toerien and Mr Tiaan Meyer were present and took part in the discussion.

In discussion it was noted that:

- The use of the sports field will not change and although the existing fields could be described as contributing to the overall character of the Upper Table Valley HPOZ, the upgrade of the sports field will not impact negatively on this significance.
- The proposed upgrade does not include flood lighting and the playing surface will be green.

#### **RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved that as there is no reason to believe that heritage resources will be impacted on, in terms of S 38(2)(b) of the NHRA, HWC notifies the applicant that Section 38 does not apply.

**KR**

### **13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION**

#### **13.1 Erf 19506, Paardevlei, Somerset West: NM HM/SOMERSET WEST/PAARDEVLEI/ERF 19506**

**Case No:** 161002106JW1026M

Statements and Plans were tabled

CSn and FV recused themselves and left the room.

AH Assumed the Chair.

Mr Jonathan Windvogel made a power-point presentation.

Mr Armand Botes, Ms Jade Budd and Mr Henry Aikman were present and took part in the discussions.

In discussion it was noted that:

- The incline of the roofs of the proposed new development seemed to have little impact on the way that it would be perceived when seen from the existing houses.
- The fact that the proposed design incorporated an additional floor is also a fact that is not material to heritage perceptions of the development.
- Approved landscaping will screen the new development from the old.

#### **RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee has no objections to the proposals as presented and it may proceed in accordance with the plans presented.

**JW**

#### **13.2 Proposed Inner City Transportation Hub: Projects A and B, Replacement Pedestrian Bridge and Vehicular Downramp of Erven RE 14888, RE 4651 and 148638, Strand Street, Cape Town CBD: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CAPE TOWN CBD/Erven RE 14888, RE 4651 & 148638**

**Case no:** 16102520KR1026M

Proposed Inner City Transportation Hub: Projects A and B, Replacement Pedestrian Bridge and Vehicular Downramp of Erven RE 14888, RE 4651 and 148638, Strand Street, Cape Town Heritage Impact Assessment dated 8th January 2016 amended 20th September 2016 by Melanie Attwell, Sarah Winter, Graham Jacobs in Association were tabled.

FT recused himself and left the room.

Ms Katherine Robinson made a power-point presentation

Ms Sarah Winter, Mr Graham Jacobs and Mr Tiaan Meyer were present and took part in the discussions.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The report and supporting specialist studies are comprehensive.
- The comments and I&APs are noted.
- The Committee was in accord with the location of the bridge and the ramp.
- The Committee had concerns regarding the design of the pedestrian bridge being over-elaborate and the termination element on the Parade being intrusive and impacting on the significance of the Parade.
- Concern was also raised in regard to the removal of the existing breeze block screen and its reconstruction as an isolated element, as this was felt to be contrived. It was felt that it should be tied to the building in a meaningful way.
- The Committee recognizes that the pedestrian bridge has social significance in the context of apartheid when commuters were segregated.

### **RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved to endorse the HIA as having met the requirements of S 38 (3) of the NHRA and approves the development, subject to the following conditions:

- Detailed design of the proposed new bridge, vehicular ramp and the reconstructed breeze block screen wall, addressing the above concerns raised by Committee, must be submitted to HWC for approval.
- The feature wall of the proposed new bridge must be considerably reduced in scale and revised plans must be submitted to HWC for approval.
- The relocation of the decorative screen wall of the Station Concourse building must be supervised by an appropriately qualified and experienced architectural heritage specialist approved by HWC.
- Ground disturbance and excavations associated with the construction proposed new bridge and the vehicular bridge must be monitored by a suitably qualified and experienced archaeologist to be approved by HWC. The archaeologist appointed to do the monitoring work must submit a monitoring programme including provisions for reporting to HWC for approval.
- The social history must be appropriately incorporated into the project and in a manner that commemorates it in a significant fashion. This must be approved by HWC before construction proceeds.'

**KR**

**13.3 Phase 1 - Proposed Tourist Facility/Service Station Farm 41 Boterberg Philadelphia Road Cape Town HM/CAPE TOWN/FARM 41 BOTERBERG PHILADELPHIA**

**Case No:** 15062211WD0624E

Phase 1 Heritage Impact Assessment to be tabled.

Matter removed from the agenda

**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 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF HOLIDAY HOMES ON REMAINDER OF THE FARM ZEVEN PUTS 434 VAN RHYNSDORP:NM**

**Case no:** 16031113GT0318M

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ACRM was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay made a power-point presentation

In discussion it was noted that:

- This is part of a pre application being made to DEADP.
- Whilst the archaeological component of the HIA is adequate the Committee did not regard the HIA as having complied with provisions of S 38 (3) of the NHRA. In this regard it is noted that there was no assessment of the wider cultural landscape, its significance, nor any impact of development on such significance.
- The references on page 4 to the necessity for permits are not appropriate in terms of an S 38 application.

**INTERIM RESPONSE**

The HIA does not comply with the requirements of S 38(3) of the NHRA.

A revised impact assessment must be submitted to HWC, which includes an assessment of the significance of the broader heritage context, appropriate heritage resource indicators for development and an assessment of the impact of the proposals on it.

**WD**

**16.2 Proposed Mixed-Use Development on Portion 7 and 10 of Farm 1674, Boschendal, Stellenbosch: MA  
HM/STELLENBOSCH/PTN 7 AND 10 OF FARM BOSCHENDAL**

**Case No:** 16050523AS0802M

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

Ms Sarah Winter was present and took part in the discussion.

Committee members made informal, initial comments on the proposal.

In discussion it was noted that:

- The social significance pertaining to the site must be integrated into, and addressed in the HIA.
- Public consultation has not been concluded, and the applicant had therefore requested that no decision be taken at this point.

## **INTERIM COMMENT**

The Committee resolved to defer the matter and undertake a site visit.

**AS**

### **16.3 Proposed Expansion of Citrus Orchards on Remainder of Farm Vogelfontein 321, Clanwilliam, Western Cape: NM HM/CLANWILLIAM/REM OF FARM VOGELFONTEIN 321**

**Case no:** 16060104AS0609M

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ACRM, dated September 2016 was tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

The Committee resolved to support the application, subject to the following conditions:

- A buffer of 10m for the possible grave (Site 696) in Orchard 2 must be provided and the possible grave must be fenced off.
- The pipeline route must be re-located higher upslope and eastwards lying within the main orchard development area, above the base of the Gamkwa Formation that is marked by a prominent sandstone ridge (in an area that is not palaeontologically sensitive).

**AS**

### **16.4 Proposed Extension of a car park at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, Cape Farm Duynefontein 1552: NM HM/CAPE FARM DUYNEFONTEIN/KOEBERG NUCLEAR POWER STATION**

**Case no:** 16052406AS0711E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA consulting, dated 4 November 2016 was tabled.

Mr Andrew September made a power-point presentation.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

The Committee supports the findings and the consultant's recommendations, contained in the final HIA report (Nov 2016) and has no objection to the proposed development.

**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**

24.1 None

**25 Adoption of decisions and resolutions**

25.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

**26. CLOSURE – 13H15**

**27. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 18<sup>th</sup> January 2017**

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

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