

**MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
INVENTORIES, GRADING AND INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE**

**Approved Minutes of a meeting of the Inventories, Grading and Interpretation Committee  
of Heritage Western Cape held on 18 February 2015, at 09H30 in the 1<sup>st</sup> floor boardroom  
at the Offices of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport, Protea Assurance Building,  
Greenmarket Square, Cape Town**

**1. Opening and Welcoming**

The Chairperson, Dr Antonia Malan, opened the meeting at 09h30 and welcomed everyone present.

**2. Attendance**

**Inventories, Grading and Interpretation Committee:**

Dr Antonia Malan  
Ms Maureen Wolters  
Ms Laura Robinson  
Mr Ignatius de Swardt  
Mr Stefan de Kock  
Dr Stephen Townsend  
Mr Rowen Ruiters

**HWC Staff**

Mr Andrew Hall  
Ms Jenna Lavin  
Ms Penelope Meyer  
Ms Lithalethu Mshoti

**Visitors**

**Observers**

Mr Sadiq Toffa

**3. Apologies**

Ms Quahnita Samie

**4. Disclosure of Interest**

SDK: Item 9.3

### **5.1 Approval of Minutes dated 11 December 2014**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes dated 11 December 2014.

### **5.2 Approval of the agenda**

The agenda was approved.

## **6. Confidential matters**

### **6.1 None**

## **7. Administration Matters**

### **7.1 Updated Declaration and De-proclamation Process for approval**

The Committee resolved to endorse the document and thanked the members of committee for their assistance in this matter.

### **7.2 HWC meeting schedule**

The Committee was informed that the schedule of meetings is likely to change due to new NEMA regulations.

### **7.3 Guidelines to grading**

The Committee was informed that the Regulations have been prepared and will be advertised for comment, and the Guidelines to grading will then be advertised.

## **8. Appointments**

### **8.1 Item 11.2 when the heritage consultants arrive.**

## **9. Surveys**

### **9.1 George Survey**

It was noted that:

- The matter of whether the George survey complies with requirements and that the information is accurate has been under consideration for a long time.

- Local individuals and interest groups, including the George Heritage Trust, have expressed serious concerns about the survey.
- The proposed gradings are regarded as unreliable as they appear to be unsubstantiated by adequate research, and the information is reported in many cases to be inaccurate.
- The Committee remains unconvinced that the survey complies with the requirements as stipulated in the HWC guide surveys.

#### **DECISION**

The committee resolved that the survey does not adequately comply with HWC requirements for an assessment and inventory of heritage resources and is therefore not adopted. HWC must consult with George municipality in terms of a way forward.

As the survey is not approved, HWC remains the authority for decisions on grading and applications under S34 of the NHRA.

It is recommended that guidelines to tendering for surveys be drafted for municipalities. Among these should be emphasis on multi-disciplinary team work and close consultation with local expertise and heritage bodies.

A letter is to be sent to George Heritage Trust acknowledging its efforts and comments.

JCL

### **9.2 Swellendam Spatial Development Framework**

It was noted that:

- S9 of the draft Swellendam SDF (November 2013) was based on a preliminary heritage survey (desktop study).

#### **DECISION**

The Committee endorses the proposed way forward (S9.15) in the draft SDF. The Committee recommends that HWC advises the municipality to follow a phased scope of work, initially focusing on the significant cores of historic settlements.

JCL

### **9.3 Oudtshoorn Spatial Development Framework**

SDF recused himself.

It was noted that:

- A response was received from the lead consultant, Setplan, outlining consultation with HWC during the compilation of the Oudtshoorn SDF. The level and quality of consultation is interpreted differently by Setplan and HWC.
- JL is to meet with DEADP to discuss the SDF.
- There is now an active registered heritage group in Oudtshoorn which should be asked to comment on heritage issues.
- HWC should prepare a Protocol regarding heritage components in planning processes and development frameworks of the sort being dealt with here.

#### **DECISION**

The committee requests a presentation by the heritage consultant at its next meeting regarding the heritage component for the SDF, as well as a copy of the full draft SDF.

JCL

#### **9.4 Drakenstein Spatial Development Frameworks**

It was noted that:

- The amended SDF was received by HWC that includes the approved heritage assessment and inventory for the Drakenstein District.
- SAHRA is not responsible for the management of heritage resources (other than national heritage sites within the Western Cape) but rather HWC, and the committee requests that this is corrected in S5.4 of the Drakenstein SDF.

#### **COMMENT**

Given the extent and importance of this documentation, and if the response period allows, the committee will further consider and assess the draft SDF and will provide further comment by e-mail.

JCL

#### **9.5 Tulbagh Survey**

It was noted that:

- JCL presented a verbal report. She is meeting the municipality to discuss the declaration of a heritage area including Church Street and surrounds.
- The Committee discussed issues of protecting significant places through grading without the need to formally declare sites.

## **10. GRADING OF PREVIOUS NATIONAL MONUMENTS**

### **10.1 Mostertsdrift, Stellenbosch**

It was noted that:

- Mostertsdrift is a previous monument.
- The site is not in the current Stellenbosch historical survey but the municipality is commissioning a full heritage inventory.
- There is not enough information to make a grading proposal or decision at present.

#### **DECISION**

The grading of Mostertsdrift will be considered in terms of the full heritage inventory when it is available.

## **11. NOMINATIONS OF PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES.**

### **11.1 List of Sites to be investigated for nomination**

It was noted that:

- JCL provided a draft list of Khoesan heritage sites and asked the committee to contribute suggestions.
- JCL presented the preliminary list of sites currently being processed; this will be updated on a regular basis.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee agreed that JCL will contact Khoesan interest groups for potential site nominations. She will provide guidelines on the nomination process and information required.

### **11.2 Elandsberg Nature Reserve, together with Bosplaas and Barthlomeus Klip Homestead**

Ms Sarah Winter and Mr Ashley Lillie were present and participated in the discussions.

It was noted that:

- The nomination is accompanied by the owners support

- Further survey work is required to establish the boundaries of the buildings in relation to the nature reserve.
- If approved the matter will go the Council meeting to be held 18 March 2015.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee agreed that the Elandsberg site should be graded grade II.

### **11.3 Prince Albert Water Furrow Infrastructures**

It was noted that:

- The Prince Albert Cultural Foundation provided an analysis and comparisons of water systems in order for the committee to assess the relative significance of the Prince Albert water furrow. It included water-related infrastructure as well as the full extent of the channel from its source.
- The source of the water from the river is 10 km from the town and it passes through an underground pipe. The water source and pipe need to be maintained and protected to ensure supply of water. This portion lies beyond point A in the map.
- The Committee highly commends the foundation for this work which will form a basis for future research and protection of water systems.
- The ownership of the water system and the land it is on must be confirmed.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee agreed to grade the water furrow and infrastructure from source to re-entry to the river as grade II.

It was resolved that HWC communicate with the owner and municipality with regards to the declaration and management of the resource.

### **11.4 Elandsfontein Fossil Site**

This item was discussed in camera.

It was noted that:

- Elandsfontein is a highly significant fossil site.
- It was agreed in 2011 to nominate it as a PHS but during the process the property was bought by a mining company.

- The process of protection has been undermined by applications and approvals for prospecting and mining rights in contravention of both the heritage agreement and NHRA and a stop works order was issued by HWC.
- The property owner has requested conditions relating to the PHS declaration that relate to areas that are not envisaged for formal protection and which are designed to avoid heritage compliance in terms of the NHRA. It is not within the powers of HWC to agree to these.
- A road is being built 1.5 km away from the most significant area without adequate and approved impact assessment and controls.
- Relations between HWC and the land owner have broken down, the committee was asked to consider whether declaration should go ahead.

### **DECISION**

The Committee supports the PHS declaration and recommends that the process continues. The legal processes for declarations should again be pointed out to the property owner (see letter dated 16 February 2015). The proposed conditions are unacceptable and are contrary to provisions of the NHRA. The committee is still of the opinion that the site warrants formal protection particularly in light of threats to the site and apparent non-compliance on the part of the owner.

The Committee supports the decision of the CEO to appeal the mining right granted to EEM holdings for Ptn 2 of Farm Elandsfontein 459.

## **12. De-proclamation of existing Provincial Heritage Sites.**

### **12.1 Van Riebeeck's Hedge**

It was noted that there has been no progress on the Van Riebeeck's hedge de-proclamation as regulations around advertising and protocols are pending.

## **13. OTHER MATTERS**

### **13.1 Heerenlogement Rietmuurhuise**

It was noted that:

- HWC had received a request from Heritage South Africa enquiring as to progress on the protection of the group of rietmuurhuise on the farm Heerenlogement. Mr Raymond indicated that at a previous meeting of HWC Council (09/11/2009) it had been agreed to survey the site and prepare a report for the declaration for the group of buildings.
- Rare examples of rietmuurhuise can still be found on the West Coast and the Cedarberg area, Namaqualand and along the Orange River.
- The committee discussed possibilities of protecting these 'impermanent' structures.
  - There is a section in the NHRA (S 13(2)(c)(vi) that refers to surveying and documenting indigenous architecture and construction methods.
  - There is a system for recording these types of structures that was commissioned by SAHRA from the McGregor Museum in Kimberley in 2001.
  - It is only possible to protect the buildings by protecting cultural practices.

### **Recommendations**

The Committee recommends that Heritage South Africa approaches SAHRA with the view to initiating a survey of the rietmuurhuise.

### **13.2 Congo Caves Conservation Management Plan**

It was noted that:

- The site is graded grade II and a badge has been put up.
- There are still concerns about the site management and the responsibilities of the municipality.
- The 2007 CMP was not approved by HWC as the plan has no heritage component.
- It was proposed that the 2007 management plan should now be approved as an interim measure. The municipality has not responded to this proposal despite repeated reminders.
- HWC recommends that the 2007 management plan is adopted so that there is some management in place, especially regarding visitors to the site and appropriate use of income.
- HWC should perhaps draft a Regulation for the management of such heritage sites.

### **RECOMENDATIONS**



The committee recommends to Council that the 2007 management plan for Cango Caves is approved and the municipality is invited to attend the Council meeting.

### **13.3 Workshop with Municipalities - Update**

It was noted that:

- JCL updated the committee on progress (see previous minutes).
- An appointment is to be arranged with Stellenbosch municipality.
- TWK municipality matter is to be followed up.

### **RECOMENDATION**

The Committee encourages HWC to find the capacity to visit and liaise with municipalities as often as possible

**14. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 15 April 2015**

**16. CLOSURE 15:20**

Approved