

**Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the Meeting of Heritage Western
Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)**

**Commenced at 08:30 and held on Thursday, 14 October 2021 via
Microsoft Teams**



MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 None

12. STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR TOTAL DEMOLITION

**12.1 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 50290, 15 Colinton Road, Newlands: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ NEWLANDS/ ERF 50290**

Case No: 21083101MS0903E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition application as the subject building has insufficient significance to warrant retention.

MS

**12.2 Proposed Removal of Crane on Erf 10256, Tanker Basin, Monument Road, Table Bay Harbour: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ NEWLANDS/ ERF 50290**

Case No: 21052709SB0528E

RECORD OF DECISION:

Taking into account further information provided by the applicant regarding the significance of this structure the Committee resolved to approve its demolition as this will not negatively impact heritage significance.

SB

**12.3 Proposed Total Demolition Erf 10617, Corner Tabak and Station Street, Paarl: MA
HM/PAARL/ERF 10617**

Case No: 21050609KB069E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition on condition that the replacement development is substantially in accordance with the conceptual proposals indicated on drawings numbered 0133 – ERF31899 PAARL STATION – SK08 – HERITAGE – Sheet – A101 – SITE PLAN and 0133 – ERF31899 PAARL STATION – SK08 – HERITAGE, both dated 7 October 2021 and as underpinned by the heritage indicators.

The final proposals to be subject to the approval of Drakenstein Municipality (heritage section). The Committee expects the submission to include a detailed soft and hard landscaping plan that clearly indicates ground level linkages with the adjacent public realm and that mitigates potential negative impacts from parking both within and surrounding the development.

Should the site not be developed in accordance with the approved plans within 3 years of the granting of the demolition permit, any proposed development thereafter must be resubmitted to HWC for approval.

KB

**12.4 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 353, Sea Point West: NM
HM/SEA POINT/ERF 353**

Case No: 21030811KB0920E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition of the subject building as it has insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention.

The Committee resolved with two members dissenting not to invoke the so-called Gees Judgement as the surrounding area was not considered to constitute a heritage resource, while recognising the significance of the adjacent Sea Point Fire Station and old municipal show rooms.

KB

13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS

**13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 47721, 4 Lea Road, Rondebosch: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ ERF 47721**

Case No: 21071501XM0813E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee reiterates its support in principle for the covered veranda. Concerns regarding the refinement of detailing remain. The following is therefore still required:

1. Details of the form and junction with the existing structure. Oversailing eaves should be considered.
2. All elevations to include the entire building to enable a better understanding of the architectural context of the proposal.
3. Reconsideration of the 1:50 scale sections that are currently inconsistent in terms of roof slope.

The applicant to investigate lowering the roof to below the adjoining eaves line and plaster string moulding (head height permitting).

XM

**13.2 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 20553, 3 Queens Street, Durbanville: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / DURBANVILLE/ ERF 20553**

Case No: 21051301MS0916E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. The Committee requires that the lean-to extension visible on north elevation (proposed open plan office) be amended in terms of roof detail to match historic detail in other words to fit underneath the main house eaves.
2. The Committee requires that the south facing proposed dormer window be more consistent in terms of the fenestration being sympathetic to the character of the house.

MS

**13.3 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 12235, 312 Main Road, Eastcliff, Hermanus: NM
HM/ OVERBERG/ OVERSTRAND/ HERMANUS/ ERF 12235**

Case No: 21060304MS0906E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The applicant is to provide the Committee with a set of drawings clearly distinguishing between what is currently proposed and what has previously been approved in terms of a valid permit from HWC. The documentation must include all elevations. A revised 3D model reflecting the current proposals in relation to the previous 3D model for the southern extension is strongly recommended.

The applicant also to provide photographs of the buildings in their current state including previously approved alterations already completed. This must include views from the cliff path.

MS

**13.4 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 97982, 10 King Street, Newlands: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ NEWLANDS/ ERF 97982**

Case No: 19120902LB1212E

HELD OVER:

This matter is held over to enable the heritage consultant to be properly briefed so that he can advise the owner accordingly. This will include the provision of whatever additional information is required to enable BELCom to apply its mind appropriately.

MS

**13.5 Proposed Minor Works, Erf 54613, Herschel High, Herschel Road, Claremont: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CLAREMONT/ERF 54613**

Case No: 21091321XM0913E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee supports the proposed reconstruction in principle but requires the following information before it can approve the work:

1. A detailed method statement of how the work will be conducted.
2. Specifications of the materials and elements to be used in the reconstruction.
3. Particulars regarding the skills of the contractor for this kind of work including examples of similar work done in the past, if possible.
4. The exercising of a monitoring brief by a suitably skilled and experienced heritage professional with a detailed closeout report submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

The Committee strongly recommends that an architect with appropriate heritage experience involving structures of this nature be engaged to assist.

XM

**13.6 Proposed Alteration and Additions on ERF 32001, 21 Nieuwe Street, Prince Albert: NM
HM/PRINCE ALBERT/ERF 32001**

Case No: 21083107KB0913E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee does not have concerns with the proposals in principle: It is mainly a case of how it is done while ensuring that removal of old fabric is minimized. It is therefore strongly recommended that the applicant engage the services of a suitably experienced heritage architect to assist. This should include specifications regarding compatible mortars plasters and renders. Revised proposals to be submitted to HWC for final approval.

KB

14 HERITAGE AREAS: SECTION 31 CONSENT APPLICATIONS

14.1 None

15 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 29 PERMIT

15.1 None

16 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 28 REFUSAL

16.1 None

17 HERITAGE REGISTER: SECTION 30 PROCESS

17.1 None

18 PUBLIC MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS: SECTION 37 PROCESS

18.1 None

19 REQUESTS FOR OPINION/ADVICE

19.1 None

20 OTHER MATTERS

20.1 Tribunal Directive on the Proposed Restoration, Erf 55307, 43 Vineyard Road, Claremont: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CLAREMONT/ERF 55307

Case No: 20101305SM1013E

COMMENT:

The Committee generally prefers the direction that concept design alternative 2 (the 'commercial alternative') provides in terms of enabling stronger spatial links with the historic building and the well (amongst others).

The Committee has no objection in principle to the new structure having a clearly contemporary architectural expression provided that it presents a neutral backdrop to the historic building, which must remain the focus of the new development.

There are no concerns in principle regarding the scale of the new building as conceptually presented. Some concerns were expressed regarding the rectilinear massing of the roofline although some members did not regard this as a concern.

The physical integrity of the well needs to be respected and is one of the reasons for the in-principle support of the 'commercial alternative'.

WD

21.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee resolved to adopt the resolutions and decisions as minuted.