

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee
(IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held on the 1st Floor in the Boardroom,
Protea Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 6 November 2019**



Note: Due to the Chairperson, Mr Chris Snelling having declined the extension of his term of office, the CEO asked members to elect the Acting Chairperson in terms of the rule 12(5) of the Rules of Order and Conduct at Meetings of HWC. The Committee elected Mr Frik Vermeulen to chair the meeting.

1. Opening and Welcome

The Acting Chairperson, Mr Frik Vermeulen, opened the meeting at 09H15 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)

Staff

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Mr Andrew September (AS)
Ms Stephanie-Anne Barnardt (SB)
Dr Mxolisi Dlamuka (MD) (left at 9:30)

Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)

Observers

Ms Berendine Irrgang

Ms Adelaide Combrink

Visitors

Mr Gordon Bradley
Ms Makale Ngwenya
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Ms Brogan Bradfield
Mr Istvan Gosztola
Mr Graham Jacobs
Mr Jed Kritzing
Mr Jandre Pieters

Mr Adam Snitcher
Ms Sally Titlestad
Mr Gregory Hoedemaker
Mr Guy Briggs
Ms Helen Seaman
Mr Henry Aikman
Ms Laura Milandri

3. Apologies

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)

3.1. Absent

Mr Mokena Makeka (MM)

4. Approval of the Agenda

- 4.1** The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 6 November 2019, with one minor correction. It was noted that approximate time slots have been allocated for each item.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 9 October 2019

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 9 October 2019 and resolved to approve the minutes without amendments.

5.2 Confidential minutes dated 9 October 2019

The Committee reviewed the confidential minutes dated 9 October 2019 and resolved to approve the minutes without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- MS: items 13.5 and 25.1
- DS: item 13.3

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals Committee, Tribunal and Court Cases

The following appeal matters were noted:

- Proposed demolition and replacement structure on Erf 55148, 16 Osborne Road, Claremont – Section 34
- Proposed Development and Consolidation of Erven 28900-28902, 1, 3 and 5 Strubens Road, Mowbray - Section 38(4)
- Proposed Redevelopment of Erven 143, 144, 145, 155, 156, 157, 158, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, Rem 185, 4683 & 5957, Dennesig & Paul Kruger Streets, Stellenbosch - Section 38(4)
- Proposed Alterations and Additions to Existing Structure on Erf 183, 5 Crown Crescent, Camps Bay – Section 34
- Proposed Total demolition - Erf 2146, 2 Deer Park, Vredehoek - Section 34
- Proposed addition & alteration at Erf 830, 17 Ravenscraig Road, Green Point - Section 34

9.2 Proposed Consolidation of Erven 3370, 3381 & 3382, 16, 18 & 20 Main Road, Paarl: MA

HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/ERVEN 3370, 3381 & 3382

Case No: 16110809KR1116E

Decision via e-mail was tabled. The Committee noted that the revised elevations adequately addressed the concerns previously raised.

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee ratified the e-mail decision, which approved the revised elevations (Drawings P-3416/C/301 and P-3416 /C /302, Rev.B, dated 25 September 2019 by TV3 Architects and Town Planners).

SB

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections

The following site inspection was conducted by Committee members:

- Rex Trueform 2 Factory Complex, Victoria Road, Salt River on 22 October 2019

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

Noted.

10.4 Potential Site Inspections

Boschendal Farm, Dwarsriver Valley, Stellenbosch

- It was noted that the Heritage Input into the Boschendal Conceptual Framework report was being updated. The Committee will await the updated report before undertaking the site inspection.

10.5 HWC and DEA&DP Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

Nothing to report.

MATTERS 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 Proposed re-development of West Block of Rex Trueform Factory Complex, Erf 175934, Victoria Road, Salt River: MA HM/SALT RIVER/ERF 175934

Case No: 15011421AS0203M

Phase 1 HIA, comments and responses were tabled.

FV reported back on the site inspection undertaken on 22 October 2019. Site inspection report dated 5 November 2019 is attached (annexure SI1).

Mr Gordon Bradley, Mr Adam Snitcher, Ms Makale Ngwenya, Ms Sally Titlestad, Ms Claire Abrahamse and Mr Gregory Hoedemaker were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The report identifies and assesses heritage significance of the buildings and proposes to establish heritage indicators to guide the form, scale and possible interventions of proposed development, as indicated in the HIA.
- The Committee noted that in addition to the high architectural significance of the building, the site also has high socio-political significance.
- The Committee endorsed SACTWU's comment that:
 - *"Rex Trueform holds enormous significance for a host of reasons related to the social, racial, gendered, economic, labour and political dimensions of its history and the lives of Cape Town's working-class communities so intertwined with this factory and space. Rex Trueform and the site of Rex 2 had a formidable influence on the lives of black working-class residents of Cape Town and on the larger clothing industry, on the development and nature of black female labour in particular in Cape Town, on the trajectory of Western Cape and national trade unionism and labour politics, and even on the identity and consciousness of Cape Town."* (Supplementary comment, Oct 2019, p1).
- The Committee was in agreement with the site's proposed Grade II grading and the proposal that it be included in the Rex Trueform Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) already in place on the opposite side of Victoria Road.
- The Committee commended the applicants for the way that they have engaged with the stakeholders and have incorporated their comments. The research undertaken and the report were also commended.
- South African Clothing and Textile Workers' Union (SATWU) noted that while the ex-workers who attended the HIA workshop on 8 June 2019 consented to participate in the research, they did not give their explicit consent for their details – names, years of service, etc - to be published in the HIA, and for this reason SACTWU requested that the HIA report, which forms part of the record, removes or redacts their private information. The numbers of attendees would suffice.
- The Committee enquired whether the Phase 2 HIA would be a holistic proposal for the whole site or separate submissions for the different development phases. The applicants confirmed that one holistic proposal was envisaged for the Phase 2 HIA, but that implementation could be phased.
- The Committee noted that whilst no proposal was on the table as yet and no architects have been appointed, the Grade II significance of the building merited of specialist architectural input.

INTERIM COMMENT:

1. The Committee endorses the Phase 1 HIA report, including its identification of heritage resources, the assessment of significance and the heritage indicators.
2. A suitably qualified architect with appropriate experience in Modernism must be included in the development team to advise during the design stage and Phase 2 HIA. Furthermore, the input of an industrial sociologist, with experience in organised labour actions of the 1970's to 1990's must be included at the Phase 2 HIA stage.
3. As requested by SACTWU, the applicants must submit the revised Phase 1 report, omitting the names of attendees at the workshops.

AS

**13.2 Proposed Mixed-Use Development on Erf 169125 (Remainder of Erf 112657), Conradie Precinct, Pinelands: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/PINELANDS/ERF 169125 OF REM OF 112657**

Case No: 14102807AS1029M

New Conradie Park Urban Design Framework, Landscape Masterplan and Motivation dated 11 October 2019 were tabled.

Mr Andrew September introduced the case.

Ms Brogan Bradfield and Mr Guy Briggs were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the revised gridiron layout and orientation differed considerably from the previously-approved proposal.
- It was however also observed that the revised layout still respected the identified heritage resources on site and that the layout in itself was not of heritage significance.
- The gateway precinct is to be retained and further enhanced by the landscape masterplan (CPLM, 2019:11,35)
- No additional heritage impacts were anticipated

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee noted that the revised Urban Design Framework and Landscape Masterplan do not impact on heritage resources. The revised proposal is supported.

AS

**13.3 Proposed Retirement Estate on Erven 1098, 1099, 1120 And 13753, Schoenstatt Estate, Constantia: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CONSTANTIA/SCHOENSTATT**

Case No: 15052005AS0525M

DS recused himself and joined the applicants.

Refined SDP dated 25 October 2019 was tabled.

Mr Andrew September introduced the case.

Mr Istvan Gosztola and Ms Helen Seaman were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the total number of units has been reduced from 88 to 82 and that all 55 cottages are now single storey. The massing of the proposed central facility has been broken up and accurately reflects the form and function.
- None of the three primary resources, being the Schoenstatt complex (Chapel and High Constantia House), the tree canopy of the development site and the Constantia Main Road scenic route, would be detrimentally affected by the

amendments to the layout. In fact, the reduction in height of the units was considered to reduce impacts and overall massing.

COMMENT:

1. The Committee considers the revised layout to be generally in accordance with the previously approved layout and no additional impacts on heritage resources are anticipated.
2. The revised Site Development Plan, as per Drawing No. 0446/SK 1001 Rev.D, dated 25 October 2019 is supported.

AS

13.4 Proposed Development - Old Tannery, Re of Erf 40 and Erf 45, Wellington: NM HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ WELLINGTON/ RE of ERF 40 AND ERF 45

Case No: 19062106WD1023E

Application documents were tabled.

Mr Andrew September introduced the case.

Mr Graham Jacobs was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The proposal is for the redevelopment of the site into a new commercial hub with shops, offices and industrial craft facilities, as well as new parking facilities. This includes the demolition of certain outbuildings on the periphery of the historic core.
- The historic core of the precinct consists of factory buildings and a brick chimney.
- Mr Jacobs pointed out that the rescue restoration of the roof lantern of Block E had been approved by HWC and had been completed.
- Some concern was expressed by the Committee about the lack of clarity on (a) the overall vision for the site and (b) how the industrial archaeology will be preserved and celebrated. The project would have benefitted from the input of an industrial archaeologist. More detailed information regarding interpretation strategies would be required in due course.
- Whilst the demolition of the northeast extension to the Admin Block BB was regrettable, it was understood that the re-aligned vehicular entrance was unavoidable to accommodate roads engineering requirement and that the partial demolition was required.
- The Committee was in agreement with the Municipality that the proposed pergola structure to the north-east of Block E will partly obscure, and thereby detract from the landmark characteristics of the adjacent brick chimney.
- Some discussion was had regarding the need for a site inspection. It was agreed that adequate information was available to assess the overall proposal, but that a site inspection *may* be required when the more detailed proposals are submitted.
- Comments were requested from interested and affected parties (I&AP's).

RECORD OF DECISION:

The report satisfies the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

The development proposal Option 3, including the identified demolitions, is approved, subject to:

1. The omission of the proposed pergola within the historic core;

2. That detailed sketch plans for existing and proposed buildings, read in conjunction with Heritage Informants 01 and 03 in the HIA report and which include place making qualities, materiality, interpretation and handling of industrial archaeology as key items, be submitted to this Committee for endorsement,
3. That a detailed landscape plan be prepared for endorsement by this Committee, based on the composite site development plan by Osmond Lange Architects & Planners (Diagram 06D in the HIA submission) read in conjunction with Heritage Informant 02 in the HIA report. The landscape plan must, in particular, take into account mitigation of visual impacts from the parking area on the northwest portion of the site.
4. That detailed external lighting proposals and signage guidelines, read in conjunction with Heritage Informants 05 and 06 in the HIA report, be prepared for the endorsement of this Committee.
5. That a suitably qualified heritage practitioner with appropriate historical architectural and spatial expertise be engaged to conduct a monitoring brief of all works impacting on historic fabric, and that this individual be required to prepare interim monitoring reports to HWC and/or a close-out report to HWC within 60 days of final completion of the project.

WD

**13.5 Proposed Development on Portion 1 of Farm 723, Mosaic Private Sanctuary, Stanford: NM
HM/STANFORD/PTN 1 OF FARM 723**

Case no: 18120612AS1016M

MS recused himself and left the room.

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Aikman & Associates including appendices were tabled.

Mr Andrew September introduced the case.

Mr Henry Aikman and Mr Jed Kritzingner were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The design indicators in the HIA (p14) are noted and supported in principle.
- The contemporary rural architectural expression and dark, visually recessive materials were commended. The applicants confirmed that the slatted screens enclosing the covered walkways would be visually semi-permeable.
- The proposal 'touches lightly' on the landscape, is well set back from the 1892 homestead and would not intrude on its landmark status and isolation in the landscape. Green visual screening was also provided.
- The Stanford Heritage Committee supports the proposed development.

RECORD OF DECISION:

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

The Committee resolved to approve the development, subject to the mitigation measures set out in the Visual Impact Assessment being implemented.

AS

- 14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES 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** None
- 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 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES**
- 23.1 Maintenance and Upgrades - Bains Kloof Pass: MA
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ WELLINGTON/ BAINS KLOOF PASS**

Case No: 19050303SB0619E

Supplementary report and construction drawings were tabled.

Ms Stephanie-Anne Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Henry Aikman was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee supported the engineering design drawings in principle.
- It was noted that the project would benefit from a desktop archaeological study, to identify potential impacts.
- The Committee clarified that both a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) were required.
- A CEMP for *this* project was required prior to any construction work, to minimise impacts.
- A CMP would be a condition in due course, if/ when a section 27 permit is issued, to guide future maintenance projects. The Committee also endorsed the recommended conditions contained in the applicant's report.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. A desktop archaeological study is required.
2. A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must be submitted to this Committee for endorsement.
3. A suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect must be appointed to prepare generic proposals and guidelines for hard and soft landscaping interventions, and this must be submitted to this Committee for endorsement.

SB

24 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. OTHER/ ADVICE

25.1 Section 34 Proposed Alteration and Additions at Erven 11120 and 11121, 76 Albert Road, Woodstock: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ERVEN 11120 & 11121

Case No: 19060502HB0605E

MS recused himself and left the room.

Supplementary Report dated 16 October 2019, S34 permit application and updated booklet of sketch plans dated 1 November 2019 were tabled.

Mr Andrew September introduced the case.

Ms Laura Milandri and Mr Jandre Pieters were present and took part in the discussion.

A letter from the Woodstock Residents' Association (WRA) dated 5 November 2019 was tabled and was read out in full.

DISCUSSION:

Discussion included, but is not limited to the following:

- The Committee considered in particular the illustration of revised ground floor elevations and the set back of the interface with Sussex Street.
- The Committee noted the WRA's concerns regarding *inter alia* gentrification but observed that HWC can only operate within the confines of its mandate and current law and policy.

- The Committee noted the improvements that were made to the proposal subsequent to the previous submission, particularly to the ground storey, which was more integrated and 'honest'. It was noted that the Sussex Street interface was more active with no clutter. The elevations and articulation respond well to the street environment. At the upper levels, the building was set back from the neighbourhood behind it and did not present a blank façade.

DECISION:

The revised development proposal, with 3D renders and drawing numbers CON 01, CON 02, CON 03, CON 04 and CON 05, contained in the submission dated 1 November 2019 addresses the concerns previously raised. The proposed alterations and additions are approved.

AS

26 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

26.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

27. CLOSURE: 14:08

28. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 4 December 2019

CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE** _____

SECRETARY _____ **DATE** _____