

**Approved Minutes 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**



1. Opening and Welcome

Note: Due to the Chairperson, Mr. Jason Knight tendering his apologies for not attending the meeting, the CEO, Dr Mxolisi Dlamuka presided over the election of an Acting Chairperson in terms of the rule 12(5) of the Rules of Order and Conduct at Meetings of HWC. The Committee elected Mr David Gibbs to chair the meeting.

The Acting Chairperson, Mr David Gibbs, opened the meeting at 09h05 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Rashid Fataar (RF)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr David Gibbs (DG)
Mr Mokena Makeka (MM)

Staff

Dr Mxolisi Dlamuka (MD)
Mr Jonathan Windvogel (JW)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Mr Thando Zingange (TZ)
Ms Nokubonga Dlamini (ND)
Ms Sandisiwe Matole (SM)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)

Observers

None

Visitors

Ms Claire Abrahamse
Dr Nicolas Baumann
Ms Jenna Lavin
Mr Christo Beukes
Mr Zainab Fakier
Mr Stuart Hermansen
Ms Belinda Gebhardt
Ms Alma Küspert

Ms Sarah Winter
Mr Murray Campbell
Mr Darryl Pryce-Lewis
Mr Liwalethu Mondli
Mr Grant Arendse
Mr Shlomi Azar
Mr Rohan Nothnagel
Ms Berendine Irrgang

3. Apologies

Mr Jason Knight (JK)

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 8 July 2020

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 8 July 2020 with two additional items.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 10 June 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 10 June 2020 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- MS: item 9.2

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

Nothing to report.

9.2 Proposed re-development for West Block of Rex Trueform Factory Complex, Erf 175934, Victoria Road, Salt River

MS recused himself and logged-off from Microsoft Teams.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

In terms of public participation, the Committee resolved to endorse the proposals with the recommendation that recordings of any workshops/ presentations be made available to the interested and affected parties.

WD

9.3 Proposed Total Demolish of 3 Buildings & Consolidation for the Development of a Four Storey (Lower Ground Parking, 2 Floors & A Floor in The Roof), 29 Alma Road, Rosebank, Erven 31751; Erven 31752; Erven 150019

The committee noted that the following Final Comment was made via email dated 6 July 2020 as per the Impact Assessment Committee (IACom) decision to do so on the 10 June 2020 and noted that the comment has been ratified electronically.

FINAL COMMENT (as per the above)

The landscaping plans by Planning Partners (drawing numbers 77214/004/Rev B and 77214/003/Rev B, both dated 12 May 2020, as submitted to HWC 30 June 2020, in response to the Further Requirements of the IACom meeting held on 10 June 2020, were reviewed by the committee members by email. All members confirmed:

1. that these correlate with the building plans approved by HWC; and
2. endorsed the landscaping plans as acceptable.

9.4 Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)

The CEO proposed that a meeting (physical) be held to further discuss the TRUP application, in a venue that will comply with health regulations under lockdown.

The Committee supported the CEO's proposal as detailed, noting the importance of reaching the I&APs through public participation despite the COVID 19 restrictions.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/ Virtual Assessments

None

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

For noting.

10.4 Potential Site Inspections

The Committee requested from HWC an official policy statement on site visits given COVID-19 restrictions.

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 (NID)

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

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

NID application was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Belinda Gebhardt and Mr Alma Küspert were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The cultural landscape is a primary heritage resource.
- The visual impact on the landscape gateway to Stellenbosch.
- Clustering of the facilities in a cultural landscape.
- The issue of risk.
- Visibility from the R310 scenic route.

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

Socio-Historic Study was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse and Ms Berendine Irrgang were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee commended the consultant on her professionalism and the excellent work undertaken in highlighting and documenting the social and industrial significance of the building.
- Ms Abrahamse advised the Committee that the framework report will be augmented as access to additional information becomes available and that the closeout report will be consolidated to include the full record.

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

Interim Heritage Impact Assessment Report was tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Sarah Winterand Mr Murray Campbell were present and took part in the discussion.

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.

KB

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

Updated Final Spatial Development Plan (SDP) and Landscape Plan were tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin and Mr Darryl Pryce-Lewis were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The two parking lots/spaces that were removed as requested in the previous IACom meeting.

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

Application documents for comment was tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

Ms Sarah Winter, Dr Nicolas Baumann, Mr Christo Beukes, Mr Liwalethu Mondli, Ms Zainab Fakier and Mr Grant Arendse were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The committee noted its significant reservations around various philosophical aspects of the increasing securitization of the precinct and the impact this has on the social and urban fabric of the City. Notwithstanding these concerns, the committee recognized the need to also comment on the practical, aesthetic and heritage aspects of the physical proposal as submitted to HWC for comment.

- Philosophical aspects: the perceived accessibility of Parliament, Government Avenue and Stal Plein to the people as a public spaces and the primary interfaces between government and the populace; the concept of fortification of the Parliament and the implications of this on the public realm; geographic extent of the national key point area; general consideration of security methodologies and alternative options for providing security, safety and surveillance; the extent of public participation and communication to aforementioned populace is advisable in cases of such national significance:
- Technical aspects: height of fence – architectural reference to building plinths and design features; clarification of the references to wrought iron (Tuyhuys Gateway) and cast iron (sections of fencing); a mock-up which has been installed on site (no comments received); poor quality of some of the graphics within the report.
- Detailed components: proposed canopy structure between 90 and 120 Plein Street; fence between National Council Building and Cultural Historical Museum; interface between old assembly and national assembly; and the retention of the fence line. Existing sentry posts to remain unchanged, existing sentry posts to be extended. The ownership of Bouquet street where the canopy was proposed was questioned. Indications are that this is land owned by the City of Cape Town. Given this, the question was raised as to whether the City had consented to the inclusion of this structure in the application made. Potential impacts on the Belvedere Building, the Masonic Lodge, Parliament Street and Stal Plein (inter alia), visual permeability of the precinct with respect to the transparency of governance. The proposed canopy outside Belvedere House is seen to be particularly problematic as Belvedere House is a Provincial Heritage Site and is a particularly fine example of its period and strategically positioned on the corner of a wider significant public space. The positioning of this canopy is purely functional with little consideration given to the negative impact that it will have on a heritage resource (a Provincial Heritage Site). The Committee therefore recommended that this canopy be removed.
- The Committee questioned the degree of public participation that has been undertaken. The buildings and associated spaces are of national significance and given this, the proposed interventions should have been the subject of wider and more meaningful dialogue. While it was noted that the City Bowl Ratepayers Association were notified it was also noted that this Civic Association represent a very small and geographically defined portion of the people of the City. In matters pertaining to significant civic space/places/buildings it was recommended that wider registered conservation bodies be approached for comment as well.

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

SDP, Gate House, and Golf Building Maintenance was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnhardt introduced the case.

Mr Mr Stuart Hermansen, Mr Shlomi Azarand Mr Rohan Nothnagel were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Mr Makeka referred to his concerns around the impact of the golf course and associated infrastructure upon the cultural landscape but had no further comments.
- The Committee thanked the applicants for a thorough and comprehensively illustrated submission.

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.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 13:20

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

12 August 2020

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____

APPROVED