

**Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment
Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 8 July 2020**



MATTERS DISCUSSED

11. SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP (NID)

**11.1 Proposed Stellenbosch Waste Transfer Facility on Farm RE 279, Stellenbosch, Cape
Winelands: NM
HM/STELLENBOSCH/FARM 279**

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

RESPONSE TO NID:

The Committee recommended that a heritage practitioner with cultural landscape experience be appointed to undertake a HIA to clearly identify the heritage resources potentially impacted upon by the proposed activity.

SB

12 SECTION 38(1), INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 27616, 364 Victoria Road, Woodstock: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ WOODSTOCK/ ERF 27616**

Case No: 18032702HB0328M

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse both the social and historic study and the implementation plan.

WD

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

**15.1 Proposed Residential Development, Erf 8892, Firwoods, Paarl: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ERF 8892**

Case No:19120617AS1213E

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee is unable to engage meaningfully as they had not received the full package of information. The item was deferred to the next IACom meeting.

WD

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**16.1 Proposed Rezoning, Subdivision and Consolidation to re-develop the site, Erven 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 23, 32, 36 and Portion 8 of Farm 64, Malmesbury: MA
HM/ WEST COAST/ SWARTLAND/ MALMESBURY/ ERVEN 1845, 1846, 1847, 1848, 1849, 1850, 23, 32, 36 and PORTION 8 of FARM 642**

Case No: 19060710SB0607E

REVISED FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the SDP and Landscape plan as presented as meeting the requirements.

WD (LB)

**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 Parliament Precinct Security Upgrade: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CAPE TOWN CBD/ PARLIAMENT PRECINCT**

Case No: 20061502WD0617E

FINAL COMMENT:

1. Philosophical aspects: The Committee endorsed (in principle) the imperatives of securing the Parliamentary Precinct and its environs with respect to national key point considerations, but raised questions with respect to the message that this conveys to the public with respect to access to Parliament. The Committee felt that there are a host of opportunities and options to address security concerns whilst maintaining the sense of place and historical character and dignity of the interface between the Parliamentary Precinct and the broader public realm, both on the Plein Street/Roeland street side and the highly significant Government Avenue urban spine and Company's Garden, which are key urban structuring and place-making elements. The Committee is therefore of the opinion that overt visual securitization of Parliament may project the impression that it is fortifying itself against the public which it exists to serve. IACom as a Committee is available to provide guideline or additional options for a state security apparatus to consider ameliorating these concerns. The committee is concerned that the proposals will have significant social implications as well as material impacts upon tangible heritage resources. The heritage resources are not only the physical, heritage-fabric elements of the perimeter interface, but also the manner in which these relate to the Avenue and the ensemble as a whole (the intangible). The current raising of the fencing at St George's Cathedral was also noted and the issue of cumulative impact on key city public spaces must not be under-estimated.
2. The proposal includes the extension of three existing of Guard houses, the retention of two Guard houses as they are, the raising of the height of the perimeter fence and the introduction of new canopy structures at certain entrances.
3. With reference to the recommendations made by the consultants within the HIA report: (see extracts copied below)
 - a. It is recommended that SAHRA and HWC endorse this HIA as having fulfilled the requirements of Section 38(3) NHRA as per HWC's recommendations and including its recommendation for a visual impact study.

- b. It is recommended that SAHRA issue a NHRA Section 27 permit of approval for the proposed development as contained in the drawings attached to this report. It is recommended that endorsement by HWC and approval by SAHRA of the proposals be subject to the following conditions:

- i. The proposed canopies over Belvedere Street (also called Bouquet Street) and the Roeland Street entrances are to be reconsidered. While it is acknowledged that the project team has looked at alternatives to mitigate visual impacts, the visual impacts are still considered substantially negative.

The Committee supports this condition and recommended that the Belvedere House canopy be removed

- ii. Further detailed design development is required to address the junctions on either side of the historic entrance to Tuynhuys on Government Avenue to ensure minimal visual impact on the Tuynhuys architectural ensemble and associated garden forecourt. This detailed design resolution including cross sections is subject to further heritage assessment and must be submitted to HWC for comment prior to SAHRA's approval.

The Committee supports this condition.

- iii. A minor adjustment to the overhang to the south of the guard house structure at the Parliament Street entrance is required in terms of setting it back from the horizontal main roof line facing Parliament Street.

The Committee supports this condition.

- iv. All work to the historical perimeter fencing is to be undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced contractor to be jointly approved by HWC and SAHRA. This work must be supervised and monitored by Etienne De Kock or a suitable alternative specialist of similar professional standing, experience, and expertise to be jointly approved by HWC and SAHRA. Monthly progress reports prepared by this specialist must be submitted to HWC and SAHRA for endorsement and must include a photographic record and description of work in progress. Monthly site meetings must be undertaken. Such site meetings must be coordinated by the project managers and include representatives of the Parliament Precinct Security Stakeholders Committee, the project team, the heritage consultants, the contractor, HWC, SAHRA and the City of Cape Town Heritage Section as well as the abovementioned specialist supervisor. Minutes of these site meetings must be undertaken and included in monthly progress reports.

The Committee supports this condition.

- v. A close out report must be prepared by the heritage consultants and be submitted to HWC and SAHRA for endorsement within 30 days of practical completion of the work. This report must include input from the abovementioned specialist as it concerns the perimeter fencing interventions. The close out reporting process must be integrated with a phased work plan and accordingly submitted as each phase of the interventions is completed.

The Committee supports this condition.

- vi. The extension to the Parliament Street guard house will involve below ground excavation which may impact on archaeological remains and therefore must be subject to archaeological monitoring.

The Committee supports this condition.

- vii. Whereas the proposed interventions involve alterations to Belvedere House, which is a PHS, a separate NHRA Section 27 permit application to HWC is attached as Annexure B. It is recommended that HWC approve the internal proposals in principle subject to detailed building plans being submitted once the exact refurbishment has been finalized within the overall scope of works.

The Committee supports this condition.

Whereas the Parliamentary Precinct is located within a HPOZ in terms of the City of Cape Town Development Management By-Laws, separate City approval will be required for the proposals.

The Committee supports this condition.

The committee further recommends that the detailed architecture proposals must have the input and guidance of an architect with appropriate heritage and conservation experience, prior to the finalization and submission of detailed drawings to HWC for comment and to SAHRA for approval as outlined above.

WD

23.2 Proposed Development of Golf course and Hotel on Hazendal Estate, Stellenbosch: NM HM/HAZENDEL/ERF 222

Case No: 18120510AS50712E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committte resolved to endorse the application as having met the further requirements as well as the addional items now included, namely the gate house, golf academy driving range and golf maintenance building.

SB

24 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. ADVICE

25.1 None

26. OTHER

26.1 None

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as minuted above.

Adopted Resolutions and Decisions