

**MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
IMPACT ASSESSMENT REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Impact Assessment Review Committee
of Heritage Western Cape that was held on
Wednesday, 12 January 2010,
in the 1st Floor Boardroom Protea Assurance Building,
Green Market Square, Cape Town at 09h00**

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The acting Chairperson, Mr Steenkamp, opened the meeting at 09h00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. ATTENDANCE

Members

- Dr Stephen Townsend
- Mr Roger Joshua
- Mr Piet Louw
- Mr Magnus Steenkamp
- Dr John Almond
- Ms Sarah Winter
- Ms Sharon de Gois
- Mr Dave Halkett
- Mrs Mary Leslie

Staff

- Mr Andrew Hall
- Ms Christina Jikelo
- Mr Calvin van Wijk
- Ms Belinda Mutti
- Ms Jenna Lavin
- Ms Ntombi Nkoane
- Mr Jonathan Windvogel
- Mr Olwethu-Oz- Dlova (Sec)

Visitors

- Mr Henry Aikman
- Mr Jan Hanekom
- Mr Gerrit Coetzee

- Mr Ashley Lillie
- Mr Carel Hofmeyr

Observers

3. APOLOGIES

Mr Derrick Grootboom

Chairperson

4. MINUTES

4.1 Approval of minutes of previous meeting held on 6 October 2010

The October minutes were approved.

ACTION: none

4.2 Approval of minutes of previous meetings held on the 3 November & 2 December 2010

The draft November and December minutes presented at the meeting did not include comments made by the archaeology unit. These will be included and finalised by the officials and be circulated to the committee members for final approval via email.

ACTION: Ms Mutti & the Secretariat

5. CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS

None

6. APPOINTMENTS

Ms Jikelo welcomed Mr Andrew Hall, the new Director of Heritage who is responsible for Museums, Heritage Resources Management Services and Geographical Names. Mr Hall will also be the CEO of Heritage Western Cape.

7. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

7.1 Proposed residential development on Erven 376 & 373, Arniston

A letter was received from Cape Lowlands Environmental and circulated to members of the committee for comment. It was suggested that Mr Hall write back to the practitioner, indicating that the minutes are clear, the ROD is clear, and that the committee has dealt with the matter. It was noted that it is unclear what the committee is being asked to do. It does appear however that the writer of the letter and his/her fellow practitioners are not communicating with each other; and that the letter of complaint would have been better directed to the heritage practitioner.

7.2 NID Workshop

A NID revision workshop is to be held in February and before the next EXCO meeting (16 March). There has been a fair bit of exchange between members of Council and the Chief Director, Ms du Preez about the changes to be made to the document. It was noted that the workshop must take place soon. Mr Van Wijk indicated that no date has been set. A date for the workshop will be discussed internally and circulated to members. It is suggested that DEA&DP, professional associations (e.g. heritage practitioners, architects and planners) be invited.

7.3 Screening of matters on the IARCom Agenda

Dr Townsend raised concerns about the lack of clarity on the agenda and on a document that is received by members for review as to what the item is coming to the committee for. It was recommended that officials screen all items thoroughly before drafting the agenda to ascertain if the submissions are complete and what is being requested from HWC (i.e., comment, decision etc.) Dr Almond suggested that a checklist be drafted for use by HWC officials to streamline the process.

7.4 HWC interactions with DEA&DP

Mr Hall indicated that Ms Du Preez had suggested that he meet with DEA&DP as soon as possible to address issues of procedure and notification. Ms Leslie noted that clarity is required regarding to whom HWC's comments should be sent. It is current practice to send HWC's comments to the consultant(s) and/or applicant(s) and not to DEA&DP.

7.5 Minutes

Ms Jikelo indicated that she had communicated the problems of drafting minutes for meetings with Mr Hall; especially the IARcom meeting. There are delays in coordinating the comments of committee members. It was noted that the comments of the APM Committee are not being adequately integrated into the minutes and that the archaeology staff are not seeing the draft minutes to rectify this. The APM Committee's comments are tabulated at the end of each meeting and can be easily included in the IARcom minutes.

Dr Townsend indicated that he, Ms Winter and Dr Louw had spent a lot of time drafting and reviewing the draft minutes and did not want to revisit the minutes multiple times. He stressed the necessity for the final draft minutes to be circulated timeously within a few weeks.

Mr Hall suggested that it would be preferable for the decision taken in the meeting to be recorded "on screen". He noted logistical issues but said that these could be looked into.

A further proposal by Mr Hall was that a list of draft decisions be prepared before the meeting by HWC officials which can be amended if necessary during the meeting.

Mr Hall will attend a full cycle of meetings and suggest changes thereafter.

7.6 Moquini Beach Hotel, Mossel Bay letter from Stephen Stead *et al.*

Dr Townsend indicated that he would prepare a first draft letter in response to Mr Stead's letter. But, he indicated that he would have to be given copies of all documents received by HWC, Minutes, the ROD and Mr Stead's letter to be sent to him. It was noted that the decision made by the committee still stands, but that queries raised in the letter can be addressed. If there is indeed any information which the committee did not have access to when assessing the application, then this can be responded to. But, this needs to be ascertained.

8. MATTERS ARISING – SECTION 38: FOR DISCUSSION

8.1 MR 347 Road, George: Proposed development of an Arterial Road to connect the Plattner Boulevard development with the MR347 HM/GEORGE/PLATTNER BOULEVARD WITH MR347 ROAD

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Gaigher and Associates, dated November 2009 to be tabled.

Copies of documents have been circulated to P Louw, S de Gois, S Winter

Mr Windvogel introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed development is the construction of a road to connect Plattner Boulevard to the MR347. It is a Provincial road.
- Extends over the George Experimental Farm, a gravel road and a river.
- The case was presented to BELCom on 2 Dec 2010.
- Seven homesteads were identified on the site and identified as having historic value. No assessment criteria are presented however.
- Three family grave sites were identified. These are not older than 60 years.
- No heritage resources have been mapped in the report.
- The graphics in the report are not helpful.
- It is difficult to understand the mitigation measures proposed in the report.
- The study area is in an agricultural setting, which is part of the cultural landscape.
- Although there is reference to the agricultural patterns in the report, they are not spatialised. This makes assessment difficult and hence the report remains descriptive and at a level of opinion.
- There is a clear attempt to present a methodology, but the conclusions are not believable as there is no evidence of the spatial footprint of the elements identified in the report.
- Resources are not mapped.
- Route alternatives have not been properly identified in relation to resources. While mitigation measures may be acceptable, it is difficult to understand these within the context of the nature of heritage significance.

APM comment:

- The maps are inadequate.
- The report does not fulfil the minimum standards for archaeological impact assessments.
- Mr Gaigher is an Iron Age specialist and not a Stone Age specialist – the expertise required for this area of study.
- The report does not include any background to the archaeology and palaeontology of the area. The implication is that it is not there. However this is a rich part of the country in terms of our extensive past and especially the Stone Age, of which there is no mention. There needs to be some contextualisation of the known archaeological and palaeontological history and some explanation as to why the consultant did not see any of it or indicating that they were aware of its significance.
- It is not clear what heritage resources had been identified in the study.

COMMENT

The committee could not make a decision on this application as the report is inadequate. None of the components of Sect 38 (3) (a-g) of the NHRA are adequately satisfied by the report. The report demonstrates that the consultant is not suitably qualified to conduct this assessment.

Zwelibanzi Shiceka

9. MATTERS ARISING – SECTION 38(8): COMMENTS

9.1. Erf 3504, Upper Bosman Street, Paarl: Proposed review of Rezoning conditions, the Drakenstein Spatial Development Framework and Urban Edge and Subdivision – Section 38(8)

Additional Information compiled by Jan Hanekom Partnership dated 15 November 2010 was tabled.

Copies of documents had been circulated to S de Gois, P Louw and D Grootboom.

Mr Windvogel introduced the application.

Mr Hanekom was present at the meeting.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for six new houses on a property with an existing guesthouse and stables.
- The property falls outside of the urban edge.
- The property is zoned, Residential Zone 5 and is 2 ha in extent.
- The property was terraced vineyards in the past.
- The application was refused by BELcom (ROD 5 June 2008) previously.
- The DHF reviewed the application and refused to endorse the proposal.
- The applicant believes personal interests affected the above comment/decision proposed development.
- The application was approved by the Misdaad Verkomings Forum (ratepayers and SAP).
- The Municipality approves the development.
- A VIA was conducted and concluded that there would be no major impact. However the Committee felt that the study did not adequately show the impact of the study.
- The existing trees will be retained.
- It was unclear what new information had been supplied as the Committee members had not viewed the 2008 submission.
- The SDP is to be reviewed by the Town Planner and will include a landscape plan.

- This was not supplied to the committee and could not assess the proposal.
- In terms of the Paarl Farm Study, the heritage resource is the valley section; with transition from wild to rural to built up/urban landscape.

APM comment:

- Paarl Mountain is known to have evidence of Stillbay MSA material. Even in a disturbed context, this has value.
- A Phase 1 AIA is required.

COMMENT

- The Committee approves that development subject to the SDP review being attached and sent to DEA&P and the submission of a Phase 1 AIA.
- The AIA is to be assessed by the archaeologists and their comment confirmed by the IARCom.

Jonathan Windvogel

**9.2. N1 National Road (Section 8) between Nelspoort and Three Sisters, Central Karoo: Proposed rehabilitation of National Road – Section 38(8)
HM/N1 NATIONAL ROAD BETWEEN NELSPOORT AND THREE SISTERS**

Basic Assessment Report (BAR), Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment Report prepared by Lloyd Rossouw, dated October 2010, Heritage Assessment prepared by the Archaeological Contracts Office dated October 2010 and Environmental Management Programme for a Borrow Pit on the right hand side of the N1 prepared by Aurecon South Africa (Pty) Ltd, dated December 2010 to be tabled.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Mr Halkett declared an interest in the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed development will include widening of the road profile, minor repairs, safety improvements, resealing of the road, lengthening existing culverts and installing concrete drains.
- An existing quarry site (Renosterkop Quarry) will be used and new borrow pit (Kromrivier Borrow Pit).
- An application was submitted to HWC by Vidamemoria on 26 March 2010 and a comment was issued by Mr M Abrahams giving built environment approval for the proposed work.
- Rock engravings were identified at two localities, stone artifacts were abundant at Renosterkop 1, and some historic buildings were identified as well as an Anglo-Boer War fortification.

- The Heritage Assessment recommended that the disturbance footprint through Renosterkop 1 be kept to a minimum to avoid unnecessary destruction of the artifact scatter, the engravings at Renosterkop 6 must be analysed by a suitably experienced researcher and their future should be determined with HWC, the disturbance footprint alongside Courlands Kloof 1 should not extend beyond the fence line to avoid disturbing engravings located further from the road and steps should be taken to ensure that the historic structures close to the Kromrivier Borrow Pit are not vandalised during work at the site.

APM comment:

- Monitoring of certain sections of the road as identified in the PIA is necessary.
- The recommendations of the PIA were endorsed and must be included in the EMP.

COMMENT

The Committee endorsed the recommendations of the PIA and Heritage Assessment. The rock engravings at Renosterkop 6 must be analysed by a suitably experienced researcher and their future determined in consultation with HWC upon submission of the report.

Jenna Lavin

9.3. Farms 158, and 1167, Ongegund, and Farm 159 Portion 4, Meerendal, Durbanville – Proposed subdivision and consolidation – Section 38(8) HM/DURBANVILLE/FARM 158, 1167, 159 Portion 4

Supplementary Heritage Impact Assessment Report prepared by Aikman Associates dated November 2010 to be tabled.

Copies of documents have been circulated to S Townsend, P Louw and S Winter.

Ms Njobe presented the case.

Mr Aikman was present at the meeting.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- At the 8 September 2010 IARcom meeting, the Committee requested that an AIA be conducted and greater clarity with regard to visual impacts of the development be supplied, as well as more information on design guidelines as there were concerns about the impact the development may have on the scenic route. Written comments from the Durbanville Heritage Society were also requested.
- An AIA was submitted to the IARcom meeting on 2 December 2010, AIA submitted for comment. Comment deferred pending receipt of design guidelines and IAP comments.

- Development guidelines have been submitted.
- Mr Aikman has had difficulty in getting comment from IAPs.
- Issues of impact from the scenic route have been addressed.
- The 8m double story height is limited to 50% of the building.
- 40% of each of the erven can be developed (i.e., 800 m) i.t.o rural zoning.
- Five erven are to be consolidated into two erven.
- Mr Aikman suggested archaeological monitoring for the areas of the site not surveyed during the AIA.

APM comment:

- Only the development footprint was surveyed during the AIA.
- The Committee requires that the AIA be extended to include an adequate assessment of this development on the potentially significant area adjacent to the dam and riverine system. This should include the impact of all new access roads and services.

COMMENT

- The Committee agreed that the shape and form of the development will not be affected by any Phase II archaeological mitigation that may be required should it be necessary. Thus it was agreed that, provided an expanded AIA is submitted to HWC for review and comment, the application can be supported.

Tamar Grover

9.4 Proposed Construction of a Municipal Road (the Extension of van der Stel Street) from Bo-Dal Josafat Road to Jan van Riebeeck drive, Paarl – Section 38(8)

HMCAPE WINELANDS\DRAKENSTEIN\PAARL\ROAD EXTENSION VAN DER STEL STREET

Draft BAR, NID and Heritage Statement prepared by Jayson Orton, dated 15 November 2010, were tabled

The matter had been deferred from the December 2, 2010 meeting for further reading of the documentation by Mr P Louw.

Ms Mutti introduced the application.

Mr Halkett expressed his interest in the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for a double carriageway, 680m long and 20m wide.

- An AIA was conducted as part of the Heritage Statement and 3 ESA artifacts and 1 ceramic fragment were identified during the survey.
- All improvements will take place within an existing road reserve and there will be no impacts on heritage resources.

APM comment:

- The Committee agreed to accept the recommendations of the report.

COMMENT

- The Committee agreed to accept the recommendations of the reports and approves the proposed development.

**Ntombi Nkoane
Belinda Mutti**

**9.5. Erf 882, Portion of Erf 317 and Portion of Erf 7455, Schoonspruit, Malmesbury:
Proposed Schoonspruit Industrial Park – Section 38(8)
HM/MALMESBURY/ERF 882, Ptn ERF 317, Ptn ERF 7455/SCHOONSPRUIT**

Heritage Impact Assessments prepared by New World Associates, dated June 2007 and November 2010 to be tabled.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- VIA, AIA and NID had previously been prepared and submitted to HWC in 2007 for a different development in the same area
- The application was originally submitted as a rezoning and subdivision application for Schoonspruit on the portion containing the historic manor house known as “The Beacon”.
- The BELCom RoD indicated that no further heritage studies are required
- J. Kaplan’s AIA identified a few ESA and MSA artefacts but concluded that there would be no significant impacts to pre-colonial archaeology
- A new industrial park is proposed as the previously approved development was found to be unviable
- The proposed development covers 28.4ha and will include 322 residential units
- The proposed zoning will include: Industrial 1 on 13.7ha, Business 1 around the historic homestead, Business 3 adjacent (0.6ha), Private Open Space (5.5ha) and roads (3.3ha) (Total = 18.9ha of 24.5ha on 68 erven)
- The new proposal is an improvement on the original application
- The homestead is considered to be a Grade III building and a heritage conservation zone around it is proposed.
- Formal protection could be considered.

- The view corridor to the homestead is of concern; especially as the relationship of the homestead to the N7 is important.
- Members of the committee found the documents submitted to be confusing – diagrams are incorrectly labelled and the copying and assembly of the document was poor.

APM comment:

- The Committee agreed to uphold the recommendations of the 2006 RoD and accepted the recommendations of the AIA.
- No PIA is required

COMMENT

The Committee approves the subdivision proposal but awaits the submission of the planned development of the homestead, landscaping and architectural guidelines for comment

**Jenna Lavin
Jonathan Windvogel**

**9.6 Gouda Wind Energy Facility, Farm 94, Farm 409, Ptns 0, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 & 11 of Farm 397, Gouda
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/GOUDA - Section 38(8)**

Draft EIA and HIA submitted by Savannah Environmental and Jayson Orton to be tabled.

Ms Mutti introduced the application

Mr Halkett indicated his interest in the application

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for a WEF comprising 13 turbines with associated infrastructure over an area of 13 km²; along the R44, 1.7 km north of Gouda.
- A 132 kv powerline will be constructed to connect the facility to the existing substations at Gouda and Windmeul (Wellington).
- Scattered ESA material was identified.
- The impact of the facility on the village of Saron was of concern to the Committee but there is a small which hill would separate the WEF and the village.
- No comment from the community of Saron has been included in the documentation
- The greatest visual impact will be on the entrance to the Nuwekloof Pass which is graded 3A and has potential to be declared a PHS.
- Turbines will be placed 1km from the pass.

- The R44 is a scenic route of local significance and the WEF will impact this negatively; especially as turbines will be placed 500m from the road.
- The DEA&DP's guideline document on assessing the impacts of WEF suggests turbines should be positioned 2.5km from a scenic route.
- The VIA concluded that the proposed site is not ideally suited to a WEF. The visual absorption capacity of the landscape is low.
- The Committee noted that there was not sufficient integration between the HIA and the VIA.
- The VIA focused upon public view cones and not impacts on farmsteads.

APM comment:

- The Committee endorsed the recommendations in the HIA suggesting that the ESA sites be mapped and recorded *in situ* prior to any development.

COMMENT

- The Committee accepted the recommendations as presented in the HIA; specifically that the existing gum trees are retained and that the four identified ESA sites be mapped and recorded *in situ* prior to any development.
- Heritage Western Cape is concerned about the erosion of unique cultural landscapes and stresses the Committee's concerns about the high visual impact the Gouda WEF will have on both the Nuwekloof Pass and the R44.
- The Committee suggests that the DEA&DP consults with the community of Saron regarding the potential impacts such a development may have on their environment.

**Belinda Mutti
Ronny Nyuka**

10. SECTION 38(4): DECISIONS

NONE

11 NEW MATTERS

11. SECTION 38(2) DECISIONS ON NOTIFICATIONS OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

**11.1 Erf 54472, Werdmuller Centre, Main Road, Claremont: Proposed demolition of existing structure and redevelopment of site – Section 38(1)
HM/CLAREMONT/ERF 54472/WERDMULLER CENTRE**

Notification of Intent to Develop submitted by Ashley Lillie to be tabled.

Copies of documents were circulated to S Townsend, S Winter, R Joshua and P Louw.

The application was presented by Ms Njobe.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for demolition of the existing building and redevelopment of the site.
- An HIA has been conducted by Mssrs Henry Aikman, Andrew Berman and Peter de Tolly but not ever submitted to HWC.
- HWC received a letter from Mr Ashley Lillie indicating that the process is to begin afresh and that the past process is defunct.
- He has not completed a NID form.
- Past processes have not been collated and presented.
- The consultant requests that HWC indicates whether an impact assessment is required.
- HWC's requirements regarding experience and expertise indicate that Mr Lillie is not suitably qualified to assess the significance of this resource. He should work in collaboration with an expert.
- The assessment of significance must be done by an expert in modernist architecture with a PhD level of qualification.
- Dr Townsend indicated that he had a list of such specialists - Hannah Le Roux, Alta Steenkamp, Nicholas Clarke, Roger Fisher, Kobus du Preez and Andre Van Graan.
- Mr Lillie indicated later in the meeting that Mr Van Graan had agreed to give specialist input into the impact assessment; specifically, to draft the statement of significance.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that a HIA must be undertaken and it must include the previous process; including the considerable public discussion and debate around this matter that was part of the initial process.

Section 3 of the NHRA must be addressed. A specialist component addressing the significance of the Modernist architectural resource, that the Werdmuller Centre is, must be included.

**Tamar Grover
Shaun Dyers**

**11.2. Erf 113223, off Montreal Drive, Airport Industria, Bellville, Cape Town:
Proposed Rezoning and Subdivision – Section 38(1)
HM/BELLVILLE/ERF 113223**

Notification of Intent to Develop submitted by Ron Martin to be tabled.

Copies of documents have been circulated to D Grootboom, P Louw, S de Gois.

Ms Njobe introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for rezoning and subdivision into two 0.6 ha erven, zoned industrial.
- Mr Martin signed off Section 7 of the NID. This is not acceptable.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that no further heritage studies are required but it must be conveyed to Mr Martin that he must not sign off the archaeology section of the NID form. This must be done by a suitably qualified archaeologist.

Shaun Dyers

**11.3. N7 National Road between Melkbosch Intersection and Atlantis Intersection:
Proposed upgrade of road – Section 38(1)
HM/N7 NATIONAL ROAD**

Notification of Intent to Develop, Executive Summary of Draft BAR and Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by the Jayson Orton, dated 18 September 2010 to be tabled.

Copies of documents have been circulated to P Louw, S de Gois and S Winter.

Ms Mutti introduced the application.

Mr Halkett declared his interest in the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposal is for the construction of a two lane highway to accommodate 120 km/hr traffic, construction of interchanges (on/off ramps) as well as new farm access roads.
- A two day foot survey of archaeological resources was conducted.
- Four farms will be affected by the proposed development.
- An historic grave was identified but can be avoided and protected.
- The AIA suggests mitigation of 5 sites (DG1, DG3, DG5, DG2 & KV1). These are stone artifact scatters associated with silcrete outcrops.
- None of the historic roads will be removed despite access being closed off and re routed.
- This section of the N7 has scenic qualities in that it traverses a transition area into the Swartland cultural landscape and the agricultural setting relating to Botterberg homestead and the town of Philadelphia.
- Foreign geometries and alignments are being introduced by the proposed interventions.

- There is a concern that this will result in the erosion of the old agricultural patterns.
- The character of the adjacent land thus changes at the expense of road use efficiency.
- The new intervention changes the scale of the roads i.e. from country lane.
- Clover leaf intersections are very strong elements and lacerate the landscape.
- The road will now come closer to the 18th century Botterberg farmstead which is an important resource.
- Some form of mitigation is required at this intersection where the corner is framed by a heavy intervention.

APM comment:

- The maps are inadequate and need to clarify the location of the identified sites in relation to other known sites in the Melkbos area.
- The Melkbos area is known to have been rich archaeologically and this is quite a unique occurrence in the broader Cape Town area.
- The size/extent of the sites was not indicated.
- The silcrete outcrops may contain plant fossils.
- It is unclear whether new borrow pits will be excavated. If so, these must be inspected.
- No PIA is required.
- It was unclear as to how the consultant envisaged mitigation of the archaeological sites.

COMMENT

The concerns raised by the APM Committee require clarification.

The Committee comments as follows:

The overarching concern relates to the impact of the geometries and alignments of contemporary interventions on the broader cultural landscape and associated agricultural patterns, which are of heritage value.

A further concern includes the impact of the proposed intersection (Atlantis intersection in the form of a 'parlo' design) on the landscape setting of the Botterberg homestead.

The following additional studies need to be undertaken:

- The mitigation measures in relation to the Botterberg homestead.
- Clarification of the role and the landscape and design treatment of the 'cattle thoroughfare.'
- The layout and treatment of the existing and proposed farm access routes. These need to reflect agricultural geometries and landscape character qualities with associated treatments
- The Committee requests the conceptual design resolution of the above from an integrated technical, landscape and rural design perspective.

Belinda Mutti

11.4. Farm 485, Portion 60, Plattebosch, Still Bay: Proposed Residential Development – Section 38(1)
HM/STILL BAY/FARM 485 PORTION 60/PLATTEBOSCH

Notification of Intent to Develop and Scoping Report prepared by Sharples Environmental Services dated April 2010 to be tabled.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The property is 58.2281ha in extent.
- The application involves rezoning and subdivision – 191 Residential Zone 1, 5 Residential Zone 3, 1 Residential Zone 4, 1 Resort Zone 2, 1 Authority Zone, 2 Open Space Zone 1 and Transport Zone 3.
 - The proposed development is: 304 single units between 600m² and 3400m².
- A previous archaeological study was done by HJ Deacon in the area and archaeological deposits were noted. However it is unclear whether the study covered this property.
- The NID did not include any recommendations for further studies.
- The application included an environmental scoping report.
- The proposed development is in close proximity to the river.
- The NID form has not been completed by a heritage practitioner or signed. This would assist the assessment of the application.

APM Comment:

- The Committee agreed that an Archaeological Impact Assessment and a desktop Palaeontological Impact Assessment are required.

COMMENT

It was agreed to defer the matter until the next meeting for reading by Ms Winter & Mr Louw.

Jenna Lavin

11.5. Farm 923, Portion 8, Firland, Emoyeni, Gordon's Bay: Proposed new Dwellings: Section 38(1)
HM/GORDONS BAY/FARM 923 PORTION 8

Notification of Intent to Develop to be tabled.

Ms Njobe introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for 3 dwellings.
- The property was assessed by Ms Kathy Dumbrell who identified no heritage resources and recommends that no further specialist studies are required.
- There is no site locality plan attached.

APM Comment:

The Committee had not reviewed the application.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed to defer the matter until a site locality map is supplied and that HWC officials will assess the recommendations of the heritage practitioner once this is done. Should they not concur with Ms Dumbrell, the matter will be referred back to the Committee for their assessment of what specialist studies may be required.

Shaun Dyers

- 11.6. Farm 202 Portions 58, 59 and 61, Hansmoeskraal, Pacaltdorp, district George: Proposed Hansmoeskraal Park Development - Section 38(1) and 38(8)
HM/PACALTDORP/FARM 202 PORTIONS 58, 59 AND 61/HANSMOESKRAAL**

Notification of Intent to Develop and Final EIA Scoping Report compiled by Cape Environmental Assessment Practitioners and dated May 2009 to be tabled.

Mr Windvogel introduced the application.

COMMENT

The item was removed from the agenda by the applicant.

Jonathan Windvogel

- 11.7. Farm 202, Portion 71, Hansmoeskraal, Pacaltdorp, George: Proposed rezoning and subdivision – Section 38(1)
HM/PACALTDORP/FARM 202 PORTIONS 71/HANSMOESKRAAL**

Notification of Intent to Develop & Heritage Statement to be tabled.

Copies of the documentation were circulated to Dr S Townsend, Mr R Joshua and Mr D Grootboom.

Ms Lavin introduced the application

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed development entails rezoning of the property from “Agricultural Zone 1” to “Special Zone (Rural Residential)”
- The development site is 8.5821 ha in extent
- Property fronts directly onto the coastline, SE of George and is heavily vegetated.
- Rock art and stone artefacts have been found in the caves along this coastline.
- Some isolated archaeological occurrences were noted along existing tracks.
- The heritage practitioner recommends further cultural landscape studies.

COMMENT

- The Committee requires that an AIA be undertaken with special note taken of the increased impacts to coastal archaeology of any potential development.
- A desktop PIA must be undertaken as the De Hoop Vlei sediments and the overlying aeolianites are potentially fossiliferous.

Jenna Lavin
Zwelibanzi Shiceka

11.8. Erven 6557 and 8858, Windrush, 28 and 26 Southern Cross Drive, Constantia: Proposed Consolidation and Subdivision – Section 38(1) HM/CONSTANTIA/ERVEN 6557 AND 8858

Notification of Intent to Develop to be tabled.

Mr Windvogel introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for consolidation and subdivision of two erven into 4 portions which will be 5505m² in extent.
- Existing dwellings on the properties have been demolished.
- Existing trees will be retained.
- The Constantia Property Owners Association’s comment is included in the application. They have no objections to the application.
- Access to the property is off Southern Cross Drive which is a scenic route.
- Consideration should be given to ensuring that the boundary treatment of the property is in keeping with the rural nature of Constantia. One of the committee members pointed out that the property is a very ordinary suburban part of Constantia.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed to accept the proposed consolidation and sub division.

Jonathan Windvogel

11.9. Erf 5198 and a Portion of Erf 1, Leeubekkie Street, Swellendam: Proposed Low Cost Housing – Section 38(1)

Notification of Intent to Develop and Supporting Documents submitted by Jonathan Kaplan to be tabled

Copies of documents were circulated to Dr S Townsend and Ms S Winter.

Ms Njobe introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The application is for ±64 residential units (Erf 5198) and ±358 (Erf 1) residential units with associated roads and services.
- The heritage consultant recommended that an archival study be conducted.
- The application is an extension to an existing low cost housing area.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that an archival study is not required and that the development may proceed.

Ntombi Nkoane

11.10. Farm 436, Portion 5, Compagnies Drift, Botrivier: Proposed rezoning, subdivision and residential development – Section 38(1)

Notification of Intent to Develop and AIA to be tabled.

Copies of documentation were circulated to P Louw, S de Gois and S Townsend.

Ms Mutti introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed development is for 125 single residential and townhouse units as well as a 109 unit retirement village with associated infrastructure.
- Three alternatives have been proposed.
- Alternative 2 is the preferred option.
- The development area will cover 48.4 ha.
- Rezoning to Residential Zone 1, 11 & 111 and Public Open Space together with subdivision into three portions was applied for.
- An application was submitted to HWC in 2006.

- The development proposal was different and included a private game reserve and residential component.
- APM issued an RoD.
- It is not clear whether a NID was submitted then and what BELcom's requirements had been.
- Mr Kaplan has submitted a letter requesting that the 2006 RoD be upheld as area to be affected by the new proposal is same as in 2006.
- A VIA has been conducted by New World Associates (Bruce Eitzen) which concluded that the impact will be moderate.
- The VIA has not been included in the application.
- LUPO application approval has been received (25 January 2010) according to this application.
- Botrivier Aesthetics Committee's comment is not included.
- The proposed development will be a large addition to the area north of Botriver.
- No HIA has been submitted.
- The alternative layouts are not clearly marked in the submission.
- Impact assessments older than three years should be revised.

APM comment:

The Committee agreed to accept the request by the consultant that the 2006 RoD is still applicable to the proposed site development application.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that a Heritage Impact Assessment is required. The impact assessment must incorporate an updated AIA and the VIA as well as comment from the Botrivier Aesthetics Committee.

Belinda Mutti

11.11. Portion Farm 1684, Denneboom, Paarl: Proposed 5 New Additional Dwellings – Section 38(1)

Notification of Intent to Develop and Archaeological Impact Assessment prepared by ARC dated 22 November 2010 to be tabled.

Copies of documentation were circulated to R Joshua, D Grootboom and S de Gois.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposal is for the construction of five additional dwellings on the farm to be used as visitor accommodation.
- It was unclear as to whether this is really the intended use of the new buildings.
- The farm measures over 190 ha, including a large game area of 60 ha.
- The farm falls outside of the Voor-Paardeberg Heritage area
- Development is planned for the lowest portion of the property so that visual impact is mitigated.
- No architectural details have been submitted.
- No archaeological resources were identified and no heritage resources will be affected by the proposed development.

APM comment:

- The AIA was accepted.
- No PIA is required.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that no further studies were required (from a heritage point of view), but suggested that Mr Hall will write to the Drakenstein Municipality noting that the proposed development is inappropriate for a property zoned Agricultural.

**Jenna Lavin
Ronny Nyuka**

12. SECTION 38(8): COMMENTS

**12.1 Erf 989, Mfuleni: Proposed Mining of a portion of a sand dune – Section 38(8)
HM/MFULENI/ERF 989**

Environmental Management Plan for a mining permit to be tabled.

Copies of documentation had been circulated to Ms S de Gois and Mr P Louw.

Ms Mutti introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- A heritage practitioner has been contracted to assess the impact of the proposed activity on heritage resources.

COMMENT

The item was deferred pending the submission of heritage studies.

Belinda Mutti

**12.2 Farm 479, Portion 9, Zandam, Paarl: Relocation and upgrading of piggeries –
Section 38(8)
HM/PAARL/FARM 479, PORTION 9 / ZANDAM**

Basic Assessment report dated 10 December 2010 and prepared by Pieter Badenhorst Professional Services to be tabled.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposal is for the upgrading and development of an existing pig farm.
- The site is situated in heavily ploughed fields and is surrounded by animal farms.
- No heritage resources are to be affected by the proposed development.

COMMENT

The Committee approved the application.

Jenna Lavin

**12.3. Erven 17654 and 17669, Symphony Way, Belhar: Proposed mining permit for
borrow pit: Comment on NEMA Application
HM/BELHAR/ERVEN 17654 AND 17669**

Environmental Management Plan and Heritage Assessment prepared by Jeffares & Green (Pty) Ltd & Tim Hart dated 17 May 2010 to be tabled.

Ms Mutti introduced the application
Mr Halkett indicated an interest in the project

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- An AIA was conducted in 2007 and no archaeological resources were identified.
- The area of development will be on 6 ha of open land.

APM comment:

- The Committee accepted the recommendations of the AIA and agreed to send the applicant a copy of Mr John Pether's information and protocol guide to fossiliferous material in sand dune contexts.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed to accept the recommendations of the report and will send the applicant Mr Pether's guide document.

Belinda Mutti

12.4 Farms 70 (Rem Steenkampskraal), 72 (Kruispad), 71 (Melkbosch Vlakte), 102 (Nabeep), 69 Brandewynskraal), 68 (Bushmans Graafwater), 65 (Uilklip), 74 (Roodewal), 66 (De Put), 104 (Vlermuis Gat), 459 (Consolidated Rietkloof), 64 (Consolidated Tafelberg), Matzikama District: Proposed prospecting rights – Section 38(8)

Environmental Management Plan for Steenkampskraal Monazite Mines prospecting rights prepared by Pro-Earth Consulting dated August 2010 to be tabled.

Ms Lavin introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed mining activity will take place on an existing Monazite Mine which is at the centre of the 15 other farms proposed for prospecting.
- An AIA was conducted in 1995 by Stellenbosch University's Archaeology Department and submitted with the application.
- Three sites were found during the study - 2 MSA surface scatter sites and 1 rock shelter site.
- The report recommended that the mine at Steenkampskraal be permitted to proceed provided that the rock shelter site was not disturbed and that it be given special conservation status in the management of the mine property to ensure that disturbance was avoided; and that the MSA scatters should be sampled prior to the construction of the ponds.
- It is unclear whether this AIA covers all the relevant farms as the report does not provide a map and/or GPS co-ordinates.
- Although the archaeological study on Steenkampskraal cannot be regarded as representative of the surrounding farms on which the application is made, it does give an idea of the type of artefacts to be expected

APM comment:

- An AIA is required.
- If this development proceeds to a mining rights application, a PIA will be required.

COMMENT

The Committee agreed that an AIA is required and, that should this development proceed to a mining rights application, a PIA will be required.

Jenna Lavin

**12.5. Farm 151, Rietfontein, Vredendal: Proposed Exxaro West Coast Wind Energy Facility on the Southern Namaqualand Coast - Section 38(8)
HM/WEST COAST/MATZIKAMA/VREDENDAL/FARM 151/RIETFONTEIN**

Draft Environmental Impact Assessment, HIA and VIA report prepared by Savannah Environmental (PTY) Ltd and Jayson Orton, dated 30 November 2010 to be tabled

Copies of documents have been circulated to S de Gois, S Winter.

Ms Mutti introduced the application.

Mr Halkett declared his interest in the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- The proposed facility will include 22 turbines, underground and overhead power lines, a substation, laydown area and access roads.
- 76 archaeological sites were identified.
- The powerline route was not examined as part of the AIA.
- The impact assessment recommends that the layout be reconsidered to avoid any archaeological sites and include a 50m buffer area.
- The layout has been altered since submission of the documentation, as part of the proposed development area has been earmarked for mining.

APM Comment:

- The Committee endorsed the recommendations contained in the HIA and added that a desktop PIA be commissioned to include protocols for monitoring during the construction phase.
- The Committee stressed its concern for the archaeological sites which will need to be preserved and that it is unclear at this stage how they will be safeguarded.

INTERIM COMMENT

Whilst the Committee endorsed the recommendations contained in the HIA, given that the layout is currently unknown, and archaeological resources have been identified, the final development layout must be submitted to enable HWC to adequately assess what the impact of the development on archaeological resources will be. This will inform the Committee as to what mitigatory measures are necessary.

A desktop PIA must be commissioned and is to include protocols for monitoring during the construction phase.

Belinda Mutti

13. OTHER MATTERS

13.1 Farm 104 of Ptn 3 Edgbaston, Stellenbosch: Change of use for proposed development – Section 38(4)
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/STELLENBOSCH/FARM 104/PTN 3/EDGBASTON

Ms Njobe introduced the application.

Discussion:

It was noted that:

- A HIA was conducted by Graham Jacobs and submitted to BELCom and APM.
- HWC approved the development with conditions.
- The development is the same as the previous application, but the use will alter from a boutique hotel to a retirement village.
- The NHRA does not deal with uses.

COMMENT

The change of use is consistent with the approvals granted by HWC in 2009.

Ronny Nyuka

14. CLOSURE

The meeting adjourned at 3.15pm.

15. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the IARCom will be on Wednesday 9 February at 9am.

CHAIRPERSON



DATE 9 February 2011

SECRETARY



DATE 10 February 2011