

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

**Commenced at 08:30 and held on Friday, 16 April 2021 via
Microsoft Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Mr Graham Jacobs, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ) (Chair)
Prof Walter Peters (WP)
Mr Dennis Belter (DB)
Ms Helene van der Merwe (HvdM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)

Members of Staff:

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Ms Xola Mlambo (XM)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)

Visitors:

Mr Marshall Chitovhoro
Mr Henry Aikman
Ms Quanhita Samie
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Mr Johan Cornelius
Mr Philip Smit
Mr Patric Pietersen

Mr Jan Korff
Mr Chris Murphy
Mr Peter Buttgens
Ms Adelaide Cambrink
Mr Ross Robertson
Mr Ayrton Rudolph
Mr Lalon Ivo

3. Apologies

Ms Mishkah Collier (MC)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 16 April 2021.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 16 April 2021.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 24 March 2021

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 24 March 2021 and resolved to approve the minutes with minor amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest:
None

6.1 Recusals
None

7. Confidential Matters
7.1 None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

CAP reported back on the outcomes of the following appeals and tribunals matters:

- Proposed redevelopment of Erven 45530 and 45531, Nursery Road.
- Erf 905 and Remainder Erf 904 Vredehoek for Calgro M3 Developments.
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erven 24514 and 24515, 10 Parow and Milner Streets, Maitland.
- Proposed Restoration, Erf 55307, 43 Vineyard Road, Claremont, CTS34-A&A.
- Response to NID: The Proposed Residential Development Located on Erven 3135, 2570, and 7155, Somerset West, Cape Town.

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:
Nothing to report.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition
Nothing further to report.

8.4 Demolition applications

The implications around heritage safeguards concerning sites with heritage significances was discussed.

9. Standing Items

9.1 Report back on Closeout Reports
Nothing to report.

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings
Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda
Noted.

10. Appointments

10.1 None.

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 43 Kerk Street, Elim: NM HM/OVERBERG/ELIM/ERF 43

Case No: 20120809KB0112E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The property is located within the town's historic core but its actual position needs to be more clearly indicated.
- Friends of Elim do not support the proposal.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

Before the Committee can apply its mind properly, the following information is required:

1. The location of the site on the development plan of Elim in relation to the various zones 1-5 as indicated in the '*Elim Riglyne vir Bewaring*' of October 1995 p5.
2. Contextual information including elevations of the buildings on either side of the subject site to illustrate the relationship of the proposal to its neighbours, particularly in terms of eaves lines, roof ridge lines and overall scale and massing.
3. A written response to the Friends of Elim's concerns given that these have not been addressed in the design proposals.

KB

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

12.1 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 3053, 23 Anderson Street, Goodwood: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/GOODWOOD/ERF 3053

Case No: 20070605SM0210E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Marshall Chitovhoro (architect) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIIC.
- The Committee regards the property as having insufficient significance to warrant retention.
- The Committee notes that the property does not fall within a HPO.

- The Committee does not believe that the surrounding area is of sufficient significance to warrant the implementation of the so-called Gees Judgement although there are concerns with the appearance of the current replacement proposals.
- The City of Cape Town objects to the proposal as they were concerned with the loss of the existing envelope and its replacement with a block of apartments.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS:

The Committee strongly suggests that the existing building be recycled if at all possible or, alternatively, that the design of the replacement building be reconsidered to be more sympathetic to the neighbourhood, particularly with regard to street interface, façade articulation, roof configuration and general massing.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition application as not significantly impacting heritage value. The Committee further notes that the property does not fall within a heritage area and does not find it appropriate to apply the so called Gees Judgement.

SB

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

13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erven 439, 440 & 442, 47 & 49 Napier Street & 13 Jarvis Street, The Village Lodge, De Waterkant: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ DE WATERKANT/ ERVEN 439, 440 & 442

Case No: 19080507LB0807E

HELD OVER:

This item is held over to 28 April 2021 due to its complexities.

SB

13.2 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 714, 3 Milner Road, Sea Point: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/SEA POINT/ERF 714

Case No: 20102304ND1028E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Xola Mlambo introduced the case.

Mr Jan Korff (architect) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The building contributes to the character of the HPO.
- The proposals obscure the building and are overscaled within the streetscape.
- Concerns were expressed regarding the proposed boundary wall alterations.
- Consistency of the proposed balustrading in relation to the existing.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee requires revised proposals to achieve the following:

1. Boundary alterations that are more appropriately scaled in relation to the streetscape to enable the house to be more visible as a contributory element within this streetscape. That would include the substantial setting back or removal of the currently proposed pergola.
2. A boundary wall with elements that have a vertical rather than horizontal emphasis.

The Committee recommends that the applicant consider a balustrade treatment that is consistent with the existing stoep balustrade of the house.

XM

**13.3 Proposed Redevelopment of Erf 13355, 230 Victoria Street, Woodstock: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/WOODSTOCK/ERF 13355**

Case No: 21012606TZ0128E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Mr Henry Aikman (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- A list of differences between the previous and current proposals would have been helpful.
- It is regrettable that the applicant did not superimpose the revised proposals on his analysis of the street facades, given that this was the ultimate purpose of that exercise. The Committee was nonetheless (with some effort) able to establish the nature of potential heritage impacts by comparing that analysis with the revised proposals submitted.
- The site is graded IIC and is located within a HPOZ.
- CoCT did not support the proposal.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application on condition that the existing ground floor fenestration openings are retained. Apart from the latter, the Committee regards the application as having met previous requirements.

KB

13.4 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 1187, 371 & 373 Main Street, Paarl: MA HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ERF 1187

Case No: 20081708ND1119E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Xola Mlambo introduced the case.

Mr Chris Murphy (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- This site is graded III B and is located inside Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

While the applicant has provided certain additional information, this is still insufficient for the Committee to make a properly informed decision. The applicant is to revisit the "Further Requirements" as previously recorded, as well as the Drakenstein Municipality's comments.

XM

13.5 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Erf 386, 273 Longmarket Street, Bo-Kaap: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/BO-KAAP/ERF 386

Case No: 21010404ND0119E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Quanhita Samie (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussion.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee notes that the unauthorised work is a deviation on approved plans for a total new build. Given that the property falls within an HPO, the nature of its context is a factor that must also be carefully considered. Consequently before this Committee can recommend whether charges be laid for the unauthorised deviation, further information regarding the spatial context is required.

KB

13.6 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 2041, 23 Buitenkant Street, Bredasdorp: MA HM/OVERBERG/BREDASDORP/ERF 2041

Case No: 21011903SM0219E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Peter Buttgens (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIIB.
- The Agulhas Heritage Society and Cape Agulhas Municipality did not comment within the 30 day period.
- The Whale Coast Conservation body responded and said they do not comment on applications in Bredasdorp.
- The Local Authority approved the buildings plans in terms of the NBR act, without ensuring that all other applicable laws were also complied with.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application as indicated on drawings 001 Rev N dated 22 Febuaury 2021 as not impacting heritage significance, but on condition that lean-to roofs as typically indicated in Section CC be adjusted to attach to the external wall face.

SB

13.7 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 56039, 6 Paradise View, Claremont: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CLAREMONT/ERF 56039

Case No: 20121003KB0324E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the revised simplified parapet on the building marked 'Block B' as meeting previous requirements.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

While the redesigned junction between the manor house and south-east wing is considered an improvement, the applicant is urged to investigate further alternatives that would impact less on the south east gable end of this house given its fine architectural detailing, even though the main views of the gable can be seen only from the internal courtyard and not the street.

KB

13.8 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 884,6 Exner Avenue, Vredehoek: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/VREDEHOEK/ERF 884

Case No: 21031006KB0318E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Adelaide Combrink (CoCT) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee notes the CoCT's intention to declare the area within which the subject property falls, a heritage area. Nonetheless, the Committee notes that the subject streetscape does not have the cohesive architectural quality as was the case (Vredehoek Avenue) that resulted in the so-called Gees Judgement.
- The site is graded IIIC and located outside a HPOZ.
- CoCT does not support the proposal.
- CIBRA supported the proposal.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee notes the disparate architectural character of the area which does not fall within a declared HPO. (The Committee however notes the intention for this area to be included in an HPO). The building has insufficient architectural significance to warrant retention and/or incorporation into a new structure. Consequently the proposals are approved as not impacting negatively on heritage significance.

KB

13.9 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 28905, 9 Strubens Road, Mowbray: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/MOWBRAY/ERF 48642

Case No: 14050201KB0508E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is graded IIIC and is located within HPOZ.
- CoCT support the revised proposal.
- RAMPAC did not comment within the commenting period.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application as not impacting negatively on heritage significance.

KB

13.10 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 46723,5 Kingsbury Way, Rondebosch: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46723

Case No: 20101308KB1103E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Mr Johan Cornelius (heritage consultant), Mr Ross Robertson (representing the applicant) and Mr Philip Smith (CoCT) were present and took part in the discussion.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the amended proposals as indicated on drawings (ROBE01/19d), dated 11 February 2021 as having met previous requirements.

KB

13.11 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 48642, 42 Kildare Road, Newlands: NM HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/NEULANDS/ERF 48642

Case No: 21021008KB0216E

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Mr Peter Buttgens (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS:

The Committee suggests, on architectural and urban design (i.e. non-heritage) grounds, that the architect consider addressing, with regards to the proposed extension, the scale and monolithic nature of its boundary walls on its south-west and south-east sides.

The Committee suggests on similar (non-heritage grounds) that the fenestration on the north-east side be reconsidered with reference to the glazed veranda street frontage of the historic house, and that the bagged façade finish be changed to plaster and paint.

RECORD OF DECISION:

After considering the new information provided by the applicant, the Committee resolved to approve the application as indicated on drawings (2007-MD100,2007-MD102,2007-MD103& 2007-MD104,) , dated 15 July 2020 as not negatively impacting heritage significances.

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 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

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

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 16:15

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

28 April 2021

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____