

**Approved Minutes of the Additional Meeting of Heritage Western
Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)**



**Scheduled for 09:00 and held on Thursday, 15 October 2020 via
Microsoft Teams**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Mr Graham Jacobs, officially opened the meeting at 09:02 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ) (Chair)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Mr Dennis Belter (DB)
Mr Guillaume Narainne (GN)
Prof Walter Peters (WP)
Mr Stuart Hermansen (SH) left at 12:00

Members of Staff:

Mr Thando Zingange (TZ)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Nokubonga Dlamini (ND)
Ms Sandisiwe Matole (SM)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)

Visitors:

Ms Sandra Hustwick
Ms Lize Malan
Ms Berta Hayes
Dr Rolf Annas
Mr Johan Cornelius
Mr Wana Bacela
Mr David Gibbs

Mr John Wilson-Harris
Ms Patricia Botha
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Mr Anton van Biljon
Mr Mike Slayen
Mr Frederik Lötter

3. Apologies

Ms Mishkah Collier (MC)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 15 October 2020.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 15 October 2020.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 30 September 2020.

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 30 September 2020 and resolved to approve the minutes with minor amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest:

6.1 Recusals

- SH: item 11.1

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the outcomes of the following Appeals and Tribunal matters:

- Proposed Total Demolition of a Structure older than 60 years on Erf 488, 13 Voor Street, Pniel, Stellenbosch: Committee members have offered to provide advice to the applicant if required.
- Proposed Residential Development on Watervliet Farm 1221, Paarl (S38.4 HOMs).
- River Club.

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:

There were no cases to report.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition

Nothing to report.

9. Standing Items

9.1 Site Inspections Conducted (8 October 2020):

- Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 1197, 13 Noordwal West Street, Stellenbosch, Cape Winelands.
- Transgression Report of Erf 3, Round House, 217 Kloof Road, Camps Bay.
- Proposed New Storage Facility on Hazendal Estate, Farm Haasendal 222, Stellenbosch.

9.2 Potential Site Visits

- Puntjie (date to be confirmed)

9.3 Report back on Closeout Reports

Nothing to report.

9.4 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.5 Discussion of agenda

Noted.

10. Appointments

10.1 None.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Proposed New Storage Facility on Hazendal Estate, Farm Haasendal 222, Stellenbosch: MA HM/STELLENBOSCH/FARM HAASENDAL 222

Case No: 19102928AS1107M

SH recused himself and logged off MS Teams.

BELCom reported back on the site visit undertaken on 8 October 2020. The site visit report submitted by SJ was tabled as per the attached Annexure SI1.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee has no objections to the proposed massing and envelope characteristics of the proposal. However, the Committee is concerned that the roller shutter housing of the entrance door should be behind and not in front of the beam (see section BB).
- The proposal forms part of a “family” of similar structures at this end of the property.
- There are however concerns with the location of the proposal given that the adjacent small shed is temporary and will create a gap in the werf layout once removed.
- This gap could be mitigated by improved positioning of the proposal and/or appropriate landscaping.
- There is currently no composite site development and landscaping plan for the property and therefore the Committee is not yet able to make a final decision on this application.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

Given Committee’s concerns regarding the insufficient information referred to under discussion, the Committee requires the following:

1. Landscaping proposals around the new structure which may require this structure to be shifted to ensure that this area is properly defined and enclosed spatially.
2. A composite site development and landscaping plan that indicates clearly what has been approved, when it has been approved, what has yet to be approved, and what is proposed: for the property as a whole.
3. A composite set of heritage indicators drawn from the previous HWC submissions to be read in conjunction with No.2.

Points 2 and 3 above will also be requirements for all future applications in terms of S27 and S38 of the NHRA.

SB

11.2 Transgression Report of Erf 3, 217 Kloof Road, Round House, Camps Bay: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CAMPS BAY/ERF 3

Case No: 20083101TZ0903E

BELCom reported back on the site visit undertaken on 8 October 2020. The site visit report submitted by GJ was tabled as per the attached Annexure SI2.

Ms Sandra Hustwick (CoCT), Mr John Wilson-Harris (Heritage architect), Mr Mike Slayen (SANParks) and Mr Wana Bacela (SANParks) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The property is a PHS and falls within the core area of a World Heritage Site (although the World Heritage status refers to the biosphere only).
- The site has a very high heritage significance which needs further research.
- No formal public engagement processes have been conducted prior to this submission.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

Before the Committee can consider the merits of this application, a formal public engagement process needs to be conducted. This must include providing I&APs not only with the information submitted to this Committee but also the following:

1. An updated status report on the transgressions that includes a diagram in plan form highlighting work approved by HWC since the SDP by Fagan Architects was prepared, and identifying all unauthorized work up to the present; and
2. Proof of advertising to Interested and Affected Parties together with a summary of comments received from I&AP's.

The public engagement process to be conducted in accordance with HWC Public Consultation guidelines of June 2019.

TZ

11.3 Proposed Alterations and Additions on Erf 9245, Strand Street, Cape Town: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CAPE TOWN CBD/ERF 9245

Case No: 20092201TZ1001E

Application documents were tabled.

Mr Thando Zingange introduced the application.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- That the building forms part of National Heritage Site and has been submitted to HWC for comment prior to consideration by SAHRA.
- The buildings are grade I and grade II.
- CoCT supports the proposal.

COMMENT:

The Committee has no objections in principle to the proposals but wishes to draw SAHRA's attention to the following:

1. It would be advisable to change the roof sheets to 'Cliplock' profile sheets or similar before installing the solar panels. This would avoid potential future maintenance issues while providing a better securing platform for the solar panels. It would also provide the opportunity for cables to be concealed under the roof.
2. Care must be taken, when making good, to use materials that are compatible with the buildings historic fabric e.g. by using lime mortars and renders etc.

TZ

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

12.1 None

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

**13.1 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 1197, 13 Noordwal West Street, Stellenbosch, Cape Winelands: MA
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH/ERF 1197**

Case No: 20040702KB0420E

BELCom reported back on the site visit undertaken on 8 October 2020. The site visit report submitted by WP was tabled as per the attached Annexure SI3.

The revised submission was circulated to the SIG and the SHF who have noted the context. They remain concerned.

Ms Lize Malan (Applicant), Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group), Ms Berta Hayes (Stellenbosch Interest Group), Mr Anton van Biljon (Owner), Mr Frederik Lötter (Architect) and Mr David Gibbs (Landscape architect) were present and took part in the discussion.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee, having inspected the site and its surrounds, remains unconvinced by the proposals. In order to take the matter forward in a positive matter, it is recommended that further alternatives, informed by an analysis of the streetscape, be explored.

KB

13.2 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 609, 27 Alexandra Avenue, Oranjezicht: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ORANJEZICHT/ERF 609

Case No: 18030512HB0315E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (Heritage Consultant) was present and took part in discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The building is graded 3A and falls inside HPO.
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- CIBRA does not support the proposal.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee has concerns regarding the possibility of the unauthorised work being visible from Forest Street. The Committee is also concerned that the concerns expressed by CIBRA have not been addressed. This information is therefore required in a manner that reflects a critical engagement with the issues raised.

KB

13.3 Proposed Additions to existing structures on Erf 4461, Paarl: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ERF 4461

Case No: 20071002SM0713E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Sandisiwe Matole introduced the case.

Dr Rolf Annas (Drakenstein Heritage Foundation) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIIC and is located inside the Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone of Paarl.
- Drakenstein Municipality has no objection to the proposal.
- Drakenstein Heritage Foundation noted the discrepancies between the plans and the photographs.
- Paarl 300 did not comment within the 30-day period.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee notes that discrepancies between the photographs and drawings remain and this appears to include an inaccurate reflection of the street slope. The drawings need to be corrected before this item can be assessed. That includes correcting the scale of the garage, parapet and door heights. The Committee encourages the garage parapet to be as low as possible and could be stepped from the existing parapet height.

The Committee recommends that the revised drawings include cappings on the extended pillars of the street boundary walls.

SM

13.4 Proposed Alterations and Additions Erf 63772, 2 Sunngindale Road, Kenilworth: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ KENILWORTH/ ERF 63772

Case No: 20071512SM0723E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Sandisiwe Matole introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIIB and is located inside the proposed HPO.
- CoCT does not support the application.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the proposals as not impacting heritage significance with the exception of the large window on the north west elevation. This window is excessively scaled in relation to the building.

FURTHER REQUIREMENT:

Revised proposals for the window on the North West elevation are to be submitted to HOMs for approval.

SM

13.5 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 46972, 84 Campground Road, Rondebosch: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46972

Case No: 20080310ND0805E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Nokubonga Dlamini introduced the case.

Mr Johan Cornelius (Heritage Consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee supports the increased solidity of the current proposals as this enables the historic building to remain the focus of the whole.
- The Committee notes and supports the removal of the high level strip gable windows as previously requested.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. The Committee notes that there are discrepancies between the earlier proposals and 3D options 1-4. These need to be resolved and an integrated set of documentation submitted.

2. The Committee has concerns that there are no references in façade treatment that would inform the design of the new. This requires to be rectified to enable more architectural acknowledgement between the old and new.
3. The revised drawings must indicate clearly and accurately where existing elements have been removed, new elements introduced and where old elements are being recycled. Minimal interventions on historic fabric will be strongly favoured.

NB

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 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee adopted the resolutions and decisions as minuted.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 15:24

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

28 October 2020

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____

Approved

Annexue SI1

Proposed New Art Storage Facility on Hazendal Estate, Farm Haasendal 222, Stellenbosch

Submitted by Shawn Johnston, Dennis Belter, Walter Peters and Graham Jacobs

HWC Case Number: 19102928AS1107M

Erven No.:

Street Address: Bottelary Road, Stellenbosch

Nature of Application: Proposed New Storage Facility on on Hazendal Estate, Farm Haas

Date of Site Visit: Thursday, 08 October 2020 at 12:30

HWC BELCom Representatives:

Graham Jacobs, Walter Peters, Dennis Belter, Shawn Johnston

HWC Staff: Olwethu Dlova

Met on site by: Stuart Hermansen, Planner and Owner

Grading: National Monument and Provincial Heritage Site (Grade II)

Comments - refer Appendices to the Heritage Statement:

Application and Case file submitted to HWC

Reasons for Site Inspection:

The minutes notes of the BELCom meeting 30 September 2020 have reference.

The committee scheduled the site visit to inspect the location of the proposed new art storage facility as described in the applications and drawings submitted by the applicant to HWC. The committee needed to obtain first-hand knowledge of the overall Hazendal site and how the proposed new art storage facility is located in conjunction to the historic core of the Hazendal Homestead and new development. The committee need to obtain further information on the exact site location, the proportions of the new build, the cladding and design of the proposed building.

Further concerns regarding the creeping and constant additions to the structural footprint on the landscape needed to be clarified. The lack of a comprehensive layout plan for the site indicating historic, current and future building additions was raised and requested at the site visit.

The committee clarified the various aspects of the application on site with the architect, planner and owner regarding;

- Location;

- Hights;
- Design;
- Clading; and,
- Functionality.

Recommendations

The committee to discuss the application at the BELCom meeting dated 15 October 2020.

Photographs

Approved

Annexure S12

Unauthorized Alterations & Additions, ERF 3, Round House Camps Bay

Submitted by Graham Jacobs

HWC Case Number: 20083101 TZ 0903E

Erf No.: 3

Street Address: The Glen, Camps Bay

Nature of Application: Section 27 – PHS

Date of Site Visit: Thursday 8 October 2020

HWC Belcom Representatives: Graham Jacobs, Walter Peters, Shawn Johnston, Dennis Belter

HWC Representatives: Olwethu Dlova

Met on site by: -

Grading: Grade 2, (Check whether The Glen falls within the extended World Heritage Site that includes the Table Mountain National Park as extended and endorsed by UNESCO in 2020 from 553 000 ha to 1 094 742 ha.

Re: <http://www.nhc.org.za/table-mountain-now-world-heritage/>

Rezoning: N/A

Comments: Comments from the CoCT (owner) but no feedback from I&AP's. Given the high significance of the site and the nature of the unauthorized work, the lack of a record of involvement of I&AP's in this instance is particularly concerning.

Reasons for Site Inspection: To check on site the impact of the unauthorized works to the significance of this landscape as a high value heritage resource. It is either close to, or forms part of a World Heritage Site. This needs to be confirmed.

FINDINGS OF SITE INSPECTION:

1. The site has at least very high historical, aesthetic, and architectural/cultural landscape significance as briefly summarized in Points 3-5.
2. The BELCOM members were met on site by Mr John Wilson Harris (Fagan Architects) who was responsible for the preparation of a non-compliance report on all unauthorized work undertaken at the Round House up to 23 May 2018. He confirmed that he has no idea of whether any further unauthorized work had been conducted since that report had been completed. It is not clear why it has taken so long for the unauthorized work to be presented to BELCOM.

3. The subject site dates back to the mid-18th C at least, with the Round house originally having been a military observation post used by the Dutch East India Company for maintaining surveillance of the route from the Buitepost Kamptz Baai to Kloof Nek. (There are known to have been various other blockhouses in the area but none that were circular like the Round House).
4. After the Round House became militarily redundant, it was sold into private ownership after which it served as a small farm homestead until the owner went bankrupt. Thereafter, it appears to have been converted by Lord Charles Somerset into a shooting box for guests. (Marine Villa i.e. the Company Guest House was not that far away). Although no formal record of Somerset's involvement with the property is known to exist, the property has Somerset's proverbial fingerprints all over it. It would not have been unusual for Somerset to hide his upgrading of the Round House as this would likely have been considered extravagant by the authorities in Britain (he was already spending a small fortune on the upgrading of Newlands House).
5. The property retains elements of a rare surviving (probably unique in SA) radiating Georgian pleasure garden with the Round House as centerpiece. It is also part of a broader cultural landscape that may extend as far as Marine Villa, formerly on the site of the current Camps Bay civic center and library. This aspect of significance is contained in a heritage statement by ARCON dated October 2000 which needs to be consulted (amongst others) for a better understanding of the heritage significance of the site¹. This is a site that clearly needs to be studied further to properly inform future additions and alterations, both with regard to the Round House, its Annex and the surrounding gardens.
6. To quote from a CoCT Transgressions Assessment Report prepared in February 2020 (p5):
"Although the principle of functioning as a wedding venue, and or catering to large numbers of the public is supported in principle, it is the devastating loss of character and sense of place, which the Round House is known for, which is the ultimate transgression".
 I support this view. However, I submit that the description of the Round House and terraces by the CoCT is limited to a spatially localized and therefore worryingly incomplete understanding of the site in relation to its surrounds as part of a much larger landscape artefact (amongst others).
7. The unauthorized works consequently seriously detract from the historical/aesthetic significance of the site. While certain additions for sustaining the property as a commercially

¹ This document was prepared for SANPARKS and approved by SAHRA in 2000. It therefore must be considered as baseline information, which does not appear to have been the case. Copies of this document must be on file at both SANPARKS and SAHRA.

viable entity in the face of funding shortages is acknowledged and therefore acceptable in principle, the manner in which many of these have been executed are crude and clearly not in keeping with the site's unique character and integrity. They are also not commensurate with the site's significance. There is furthermore no historical interpretation of this significance which is clearly warranted. This applies not only to its buildings, but also its landforms, surrounding planting, routes, and historical spatial sequencing². Many of aforementioned attributes are currently totally lost within many of the unauthorized accretions. These accretions are clearly not informed by a knowledge of those attributes either.

RECOMMENDATIONS

My view is that there is insufficient material tabled at this stage for the Committee to have an adequate understanding of the significance of the site to determine whether the nature and extent of the proposed remedial works are sufficient and/or appropriate in all instances.

The following is therefore recommended:

3. An updated heritage statement of the property taking into account all other spatially-related studies on the property conducted from 2000.
4. A set of underlying heritage-related principles for informing all proposed additions and alterations informed by the updated heritage statement;
5. An updated status report on the transgressions that includes a diagram in plan form highlighting work approved by HWC since the SDP by Fagan Architects was prepared, and identifying all unauthorized work up to the present; and
6. Proof of advertising to Interested and Affected Parties in accordance with HWC's guideline on advertising, together with a summary of comments received from I&AP's.

The last point is considered relevant given the high significance of the property and the fact that I&AP's with a known interest in sites such as this (e.g. the Vernacular Architecture of SA; Heritage SA/Simon van der Stel Foundation; and the Cape Institute for Architecture have not had an opportunity to provide input.

GRAHAM JACOBS

² For example, the 'farm road' referred to in the CoCT report (Figure 2 p7) is probably a lot more significant than that description suggests. Indications are that this road was primarily the reason for the round military observation post (later to become the Round House) being constructed. The higher road (Kloof Nek Road) was constructed later. Furthermore, there is no reference to the fact that this is a site designed to be approached from below (the current approach is from the top) nor mention of the relationship of the so-called farm road alignment with the end of Table Mountain. The latter is unlikely to be coincidental.

Annexure S13

Proposed additional floor, ERF 1197, Stellenbosch (Just Joey).

HWC Case Number: 20040702

Erf No.: 1197

Street Address: corner of Noordwal-Wes and Helderberg Streets

Nature of Application: Section 34 Additions

Date of Site Visit: Thursday 8 October 2020

HWC Belcom Representatives: Graham Jacobs, Walter Peters, Shawn Johnston, Dennis Belter

HWC Representatives: Olwethu Dlova

Met on site by Frederik Lötter (architect), Lize Malan (Heritage practitioner), Anton van Biljon (Owner).

Grading: Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation has graded the building IIC (2011). The property also falls within the recently expanded historical core of Stellenbosch (Malan,2020:6).

Zoning: Multi-unit Residential, but an application for a departure to Section 78(2) of the zoning scheme is also required, as the property is smaller than a 1000m². As a result, the building parameters of the Conventional Housing zone, which limits buildings to 2 storeys in height applies to the property which measures just more than 900m (Malan,2020:4).

Comments: While the HWC-approved 2-storey development was underway, construction of the third floor commenced but ceased as this was clearly illegal work (Malan,2020:3-4).

FINDINGS OF SITE INSPECTION:

The BELCom members concur with the finding of the heritage practitioner: The value of the [historical, corner] building lies in its contribution to its context (Malan,2020:8).

The members also agree with the assessment of particular buildings with in the streetscape and the conclusion that these have had “[a negative] impact on the sense of place” (Malan,2020:11).

RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the above findings, the new building should address both its site with historic corner building *AND* the streetscape.

Consequently, as a work of ‘infill architecture’ BELCom members were unanimous, the 3-storey cubic building does not fit into the established streetscape.

Although a subsequent proposal for greening the projecting face to Helberderg Str was submitted for consideration by BELCom on 15th October, neither the committee nor the participating representatives of the registered Stellenbosch heritage commenting parties accepted this measure of mitigation as sufficiently addressing the inherent problem.

The applicant has a few choices: Either construction stops with the realization of the 2 storeys as approved, or the cube is separated from the historic building, both options of which would place the development outside the ambit of BELCom but not necessarily of the local heritage bodies.

If, however, the possibility of an additional storey is to be pursued with BELCom involvement, the architect would have to study and analyse the streetscapes of the surrounds ie the receiving environment, to which the heritage practitioner has identified the [historical, corner] building as contributing value to.

It is submitted that beyond technicalities as the height of the ridge of historic building, double-storey, or a blanket 10m building height, the criteria to be met with is whether the proposal fits in its context, either comfortably or energetically (ie 'adding value' with a positive 'impact on the sense of place').

Helderberg Street even has at least one 4-storey building, which proves that the criteria for successful infill architecture here is, perhaps, less a matter of height than of modulation of the cube and its articulation.

Alternative design options should be explored for achieving a better fit. These could include conceptualizing the additional floor as a loft, modulating the form and opening to a roof terrace, or a combination, but be compatible with the massing, scale, materials, and architectural features of neighboring buildings which define the streetscape.

Obviously, interested and affected parties must be given the opportunity to comment before any re-submission to HWC.

Prof W Peters, Friday, October 16, 2020

Reference

Malan, L (April 2020) Heritage Statement. Just Joey.