

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 13 January 2021**



1. Opening and Welcome

Note: Due to the Chairperson, Mr. David Gibbs tendering his apologies for not attending the meeting, PM 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 Mike Scurr to chair the meeting.

The (Acting) Chairperson, Mr Mike Scurr, opened the meeting at 09h02 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Sipiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Mr Rashiq Fataar (RF)
Mr Jason Knight (JK)

Staff

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Nosiphiwo Thafeni (NT)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Aneeqha Brown (AB)
MS Nokubonga Dlamini (ND)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)

Observers

Irene Nofel (Nazareth House Representative)

Visitors

Mr Bruce Eitzen
Ms Cillié Malan
Mr Charl de Villiers
Mr Conrad de Jager
Mr Andre Pentz
Ms Amalie Comrie
Mr Chris Purcell
Mr Jonathan Kaplan
Ms Jenna Lavin

Ms Berta Hayes
Ms Patricia Botha
Ms Natasha Lamb
Mr David Halkett
Mr Henri Comrie
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Mr Coenraad De Jager
Dr Nicolas Baumann

3. Apologies

Mr David Gibbs (DG)
Mr Gaarith Williams (GW)

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 13th January 2021

The Committee resolved to approve the Agenda dated 13th January 2021 with minor changes. DS accepted the motion and SW seconded.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 9th December 2020

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 9th December 2020 and resolved to approve the minutes with no amendments. CM proposed the motion and DS seconded.

6. Disclosure of Interest

6.1 None

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 Letter from the Department of Transport and Public Works (DT&PW) re Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) was noted.

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the outcomes of the Appeals matters and was noted.

9.2 Proposed Development on Jonkersdrift Farm (Farm 1440, 1441, 334/17 & 334/9), Jonkershoek Valley, Stellenbosch

SB introduced the item.

Report back on the site inspection.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee discussed the NID application and the section of the NHRA under which the application was made.
- The revised SDP plan submitted following the site inspection related to the four farm portions.
- The Committee will review the matter with the applicant in the meeting.

SB

**9.3 Proposed Nautica Development on Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/MOUILLE POINT/ERF 1942**

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the application was in terms of S38(4) and not 38(8), and the format and content of the report would be discussed under the relevant agenda item.
- The Committee discussed whether the required supplementary information regarding the view sheds from Fort Wynyard was provided.

SB

9.4 Secondment to Committees

The matter of secondment of members of other committees to IACom was discussed and it was confirmed that protocols are in place for the prior agreement and arrangement of this if and as necessary.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:

Site inspections were undertaken on Friday the 08th January 2021.

- Re 1/697, Farm 1/1113, Ptn of Erf Re 353, Erf 1449 and 1450, De Hoop Farm, Malmesbury.
- Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point.
- Jonkersdrift Farm, Stellenbosch - (Farm 1440, 1441, 334/17 & 334/9).

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

The Committee discussed administrative matters related to two cases under administrative matters.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

None

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 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13. SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

13.1 Proposed siting of employee housing, deli and 3 new dwellings on Jonkersdrift Farm. Housing development on Jonkersdrift Farm (Farm 1440, 1441, 334/17 & 334/9):MA HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH/ JONKERSDRIFT FARM 1440,1441, 334/17 & 334/9

Case No: 20041707SB0603E

Report back on the site inspection. RF provided report back on the inspection and read out the report for the record. See attachment SI1.

Mr Bruce Eitzen (New World Associates Landscape Architects (Heritage Practitioner), Mr Cillié Malan, (Solvation Architects), Ms Berta Hayes and Ms Patricia Botha (Stellenbosch Interest Group) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Correct section of the NHRA – noted that since ‘farms’ are not ‘erven’ the application should have been in terms of S38(1)(c)(i) related to a site larger than 5000 sq m and not S38(1)(c)(ii).
- Clarity was sought from the applicant regarding proceeding with the combined application, since the application could have been done as separate applications. The applicant’s representatives advised that the development be considered as a combined application.
- The landscape character of the Jonkershoek Valley being worthy of Grade IIIA in terms of its intactness and representativity.
- The need for the development of architectural guidelines to address building character, form and layout and for these to be informed by heritage-based indicators and the mapping of these informants.
- The omission of the agricultural building portion on Farm 1441 was noted, as per supplementary plan provided post the site inspection.
- The degree to which the site will be seen from the Jonkershoek Road scenic drive taking into account the planted landscape, riverine vegetation and low-lying topography.
- The proposed new dwellings need to be informed by rural built form and landscaping typologies and patterns of rural settlement development as opposed to suburban or urban typologies.
- The existing primary agricultural rights pertaining to second dwellings on the farm.
- The inadequacy of the existing architectural guidelines and the extent to which these informed a ‘foreign stylistic’ typology of the combined agricultural-dwelling building.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee supports the concept of the location and arrangement of the additional buildings on the 3 farms concerned in principle, however further development of heritage indicators is required. The HIA is not yet considered S38(3) compliant. The Committee requires the submission

of an updated HIA (or a supplementary HIA report) which addresses the concerns noted including, inter alia, architectural idiom and the need for expanded architectural guidelines to address built form character, height, scale, form, landscaping, access arrangements, etc.

The updated information is to be circulated to I&APs when submitted to HWC.

SB

**13.2 Erf 905 and Remainder Erven 904 and 905, Vredehoek: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN/METROPOLITAN/VREDEHOEK/ERVEN 904 AND 905**

Case No: 18071104AS0713M

The Revised Heritage Impact Assessment was tabled.

Ms Nokubonga Dlamini introduced the case.

Mr Andre Pentz (Urban Design Services), Mr Henri Comrie (Architect/ Urban Designer), Ms Amalie Comrie (I&AP), Ms Natasha Lamb (I&AP), Chris Purcell (I&AP), Mr Coenraad de Jager (Developer) and Mr Charl De Villers (GVAG) were present and took part in the discussion.

Ms Irene Nofel (Nazareth House Representative) observed the proceedings.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Contents and thoroughness of the updated urban design document were commended.
- Urban designer presented response to IACom's Further Requirements of 16th September 2020 and drew attention to the varied roofscape, basements allowing positive streetscapes, percentage of open space, 15m cap and the corner activation.
- The I&APs noted that they had not been afforded the opportunity to review the updated information.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee commended the applicant on the clarity, thoroughness and completeness of the documentation supplied, in particular the urban design system of coding which will enable the design to be implemented and verified accordingly. The Committee confirms that the HIA meets the requirement of S38(3) and that the previous concerns have been addressed, and that accordingly the development may proceed.

ND

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

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

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

**16.1 Proposed Mixed Use Urban Node Re 1/697, Farm 1/1113, Ptn of Erf Re 353, Erf 1449 and 1450, De Hoop Farm, Malmesbury: MA
HM/SWARTLAND/MALMESBURY/ RE OF PTN 1 OF FARM 697, PORTION 1 OF FARM 113, RE OF FARM 1113, RE OF FRAM 301, RE OF FARM 353**

Case No: 19110103SB1106E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Report back on the site inspection. SW reported back on the site inspection and read out the report for the record. See attachment SI2.

Mr Jonathan Kaplan (ACRM (Archaeologist) and Mr Bruce Eitzen (New World Associates Landscape Architects – Heritage Practitioner) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Grading of landscape was identified as Grade IIIC in the HIA report but the report was unclear as to why the site constitutes a landscape worthy of formal protection.
- There is a lack of clarity on how the HIA process has informed or provided value to the SDP.
- There is a lack of clarity in the HIA report in terms of the ruins being identified as not conservation-worthy and the HIA recommendation being that the ruins being retained and subject to a CMP.
- The Committee noted the APM Committee's comment that sampling of the pre-colonial artefacts in three areas of the densest artefacts' concentration on the property (i.e. an area of 10m x 10.m each) is required under an approved Workplan.

FINAL COMMENT:

Notwithstanding that the HIA does not adequately address heritage issues at various scales. The Committee is of the opinion that the proposed development will have minimal impact on the landscape. This is largely due to the recognition of the larger 'green' landscape framework elements such as hilltops and riverine corridors are integrated into the proposed development. The landscape context does not possess scenic or cultural landscape qualities worthy of formal protection. While consideration needs to be given to the visible location of the site in relation to the N7 corridor and at the entrance to Malmesbury, and the stitching together with the existing community and urban fabric, it is appreciated that these are not strictly heritage issues.

Given that the ruins are identified as Not Conservation Worthy, the Committee does not require these to be conserved or subject to a CMP.

The HIA does not meet the requirements of Section 38(3) but there are no heritage resources worthy of formal protection. The development may proceed.

SB

16.2 Proposed SANSA Space Operations at portion 8 of Farm Matjiesfontein: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/ MATIJESFONTEIN/PTN 8 OF FARM MATJIESFONTEIN

Case No: 19092518WD0926E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Mr Bruce Eitzen (New World Associates, Landscape Architects) and Ms Jenna Lavin (CTS Heritage) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The PIA (by John Almond) noted that the impacts on palaeontology would be low and he recommended monitoring by the ECO and the implementation of the fossil chance finds procedure.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The HIA is endorsed as meeting the requirements of S38(3). The recommendations of the HIA are endorsed including the preferred alternate site 2.

The Committee endorsed the following recommendation based on the available information; there is no objection to the proposed development on condition that:

1. Alternative 2 (Area A2 and Area B) is the preferred development alternative in terms of impacts to heritage.
2. The HWC Chance Finds Procedure must be adopted during the construction phase due to the high palaeontological sensitivity of the area.
3. The recommendations included in the VIA be implemented including:
 - I. The perimeter treatment and fencing must be sensitive to the natural context and must be appropriately coloured to blend into the surrounding vegetation. Silver, black and bright green fencing should not be used.
 - II. Where safety and technical standards permit, colours that blend into the natural environment and vegetation must be used for the antennae and associated infrastructure. These should be darker, duller colours that can disguise the infrastructure in the landscape. In the case of the reflective areas of the four large antennae, a naturally coloured tint should be considered for the working surface.
 - III. Buildings must be made from local materials where possible and should draw from existing building traditions.
 - IV. A landscape plan is developed for avenue or block planting of gum trees or similar that fit into the cultural landscape to screen the proposed infrastructure from the PHS. This planting should be focused on the south and eastern side of the railway line.
 - V. Wanton stripping of vegetation that causes scarring on the landscape must be avoided.
 - VI. Lighting must be minimized and carefully controlled and must be developed with sensitivity to the rural landscape.
 - VII. Waterwise, indigenous planting, and green-star building practices must be used.

4. Equipment must not be placed on the upper southern slopes of the perched valley in Area B that have a long-distance view of Matjiesfontein.
5. The HWC Chance Finds Procedure must be adopted during the construction phase due to the high palaeontological sensitivity of the area.

SB

16.3 Proposed Nautica Development on Erf 1942, Beach Road, Mouille Point: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/MOUILLE POINT/ERF 1942

Case No: 20032622SB0615E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case

Report back from Site Inspection. DS reported back on the inspection and read out the report for the record. See attachment SI3.

Dr Nicolas Baumann (Heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee supports the notion of additional bulk sensitively positioned on the site.
- Missing info ex National Monuments Council (NMC) documentation is to be sourced with specific reference to the preservation of view lines from Fort Wynard. It is understood that these were the subject of detailed discussions and an agreement reached with NMC. Defined view planes from demarcated positions at the Fort were established by the City of Cape Town and the NMC. These should be on record and must be sourced.
- The application is in terms of S38(4) and is therefore subject to a decision by HWC.
- The results of the public participation process are to be integrated into the HIA report and the HIA submitted in terms of 38(4).
- HWC's S38(3) public participation guidelines are to be referenced.
- Consideration of the visual spatial relationship between the coastal defense system and key positions at the Fort (key gun emplacements and the elements which make up the 'field of sea'. The unbroken horizon and a degree of sea below the horizon (as part of the significance of the horizon), Robben Island, and key geographical elements (signaling points such as the Blaauwberg and Tygerberg) in the background must be assessed.
- The current building form is considered to be problematic in terms of the protruding element and roof plane.
- Consideration of the retention of uninterrupted horizon line.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee requires the HIA to be updated to address the concerns noted. DS agreed to assist the applicant with locating the earlier information related to the view cone dating from the time of the earlier development C1990.

SB

16.4 Proposed 150MW Kruispad PVSEF on Kruispad 120, East of Velddrift: NM HM/WEST COAST/BERGRIVER/VELDDRIFT/K RUISPAD 120

Case No: 16112202AS1124E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ACO were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr David Halkett (ACO-Associates cc) and Johmandie Pienaar (Environmental Planning and Design) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The absence of archaeology in the area was noted.
- The palaeontological investigation undertaken by Dr John Pether indicated that the likelihood of finding fossils was quite low in the upper surface soils. Excavation penetrating below 0,6m could encounter the Langebaan Formation which is known to contain fossils. Implementing a Fossil Finds Procedural was recommended.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The HIA is endorsed as meeting the requirements of S38(3). The recommendations in the HIA are endorsed including the suggested visual mitigation and mitigation measures for possible fossil finds. If any marked or unmarked graves are encountered on construction, work must immediately halt and HWC must be contacted.

SB

16.5 Proposed Bentonite and Zeolite Mining Activities on Erf 1412, Heidelberg: NM HM/EDEN/HESSEQUA/HEIDELBER G/ERF 1412

Case No: 20070808SB0710E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ACO were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr David Halkett (ACO-Associates) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- No information regarding the archaeological record of the area was reported.
- Findings of the PIA noted that "any future mining within the central part of the Kirkwood Formation is likely to expose fossiliferous zones". The palaeontologist recommended that the ECO should notify a suitably qualified palaeontologist if fossils were uncovered and that the Fossil Finds Protocol should be implemented.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The HIA is endorsed as meeting the requirements of S38(3). The recommendations in the HIA are endorsed. If any marked or unmarked graves are encountered on construction, work must immediately halt and HWC must be contacted.

SB

**16.6 Proposed Bentonite and Zeolite mining activities on Ptn 1 of Farm 585, Uitspanskraal, Heidelberg:NM
HM/EDEN/HESSEQUA/HEILDELBER G/PTN 1 OF FARM 585**

Case No: 20070809SB0710E

Heritage Impact Assessment and associated documentation prepared by ACO were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr David Halkett (ACO-Associates cc) Mr Johmandie Pienaar (Enviro-EAP) and John E. Almond (Natura Viva cc) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- No information regarding the archaeological record of the area was reported.
- Findings of the PIA noted that “any future mining within the central part of the Kirkwood Formation is likely to expose fossiliferous zones”. The palaeontologist recommended that the ECO should notify a suitably qualified palaeontologist if fossils were uncovered and that the Fossil Finds Protocol should be implemented.

FINAL COMMENTS:

The HIA is endorsed as meeting the requirements of S38(3). The recommendations in the HIA are endorsed. If any marked or unmarked graves are encountered during construction, work must immediately halt and HWC must be contacted.

SB

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 None

24. ADVICE

24.1 New Commonwealth War Graves Commission Memorial, Company's Garden, Cape Town

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (Heritage Practitioner) and Mr David Hart (CoCT E&HRM) were present and took part in the discussion. The process followed to date and that envisaged going forward was noted.

COMMENT:

The Committee agreed that a S27 process should be followed instead of S38 given that the entire Company Garden is a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS). The City of Cape Town and a heritage consultant should tailor the process and content of the S27 application to inform the desired interim comment in due course. The City of Cape Town will revert to HWC at an early stage with a proposed outline of the public consultation process for comment. This submission should include the scope of the heritage study being undertaken. It was further agreed that two members of BELCom would be co-opted on to IACom as and when required for this matter/application.

SB

25 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

25.1 None

26. OTHER

26.1 None

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above. CM moved to endorse and adopt the resolutions and decisions and DS seconded.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 17:20

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

10th February 2021

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON

DATE:

SECRETARY

DATE:

APPROVED

Annexure S11

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for: Jonkersdrift Farm Master Plan

Erf/Farm No.: Farms 1440, 1441 and 17/334 Jonkershoek, Stellenbosch.

Street Address: Jonkersdrift Road, Stellenbosch

Registered Owner: Stoney Meadows Investments 11 (Pty) Ltd

Grading: IIIA

Nature of Application: **SECTION 38(4)**

Date of Site Visit: **08.01.2021**

HWC Representatives: **Rashiq Fataar, Sarah Winter, Mike Scurr – (IACOM) Stephanie Barnardt - (HWC)**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM RESOLUTION TO ASSESS THE SITE AND CONTEXT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AREAS**

Report submitted by **MIKE SCURR** on **12.01.2021**

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Friday 08 January 2021 by three IACom members. The owner's representatives (Willem Roos and Johan van Zyl) and architect (Cillié Malan) were present in addition to Bruce Eitzen, author of the HIA. Further, two members of the Stellenbosch Interest Group (SIG), Berta Hayes and Patricia Botha, were present since they had not been allowed to view the property during the public commenting period.

It was noted at the outset of the inspection that no discussion on the merits or otherwise of the proposal would take place and any comments would be limited to points of clarification only.

Area Inspected:

Members of the committee met at the entry gateway and travelled (separately due to Covid precautions) to the various sites within the farm grouping. Areas and aspects inspected include:

- The river and bridge crossing
- The historic werf area (in passing only)
- Site locations of the various proposed staff houses and second houses, deli etc
- The oak avenue, vineyards, general paddock and garden areas

Items Noted:

Despite the extensive HIA documentation supplied, the content and structure was not considered clear enough for the committee to make a decision. The committee had agreed it was necessary to visit the three farm areas in order to understand and appreciate both the landscape character and the proposed development site areas in order to make an informed decision.

At the site of each proposed staff house and second house, the architect clarified the orientation, access and height of the development to all in attendance.

On site it was pointed out by the architect that, following non-approval by the local authority, the agricultural building on farm 1441 was to be omitted. It was agreed that an Area Diagram plan would be sent to HWC prior to the meeting.

The owner noted the potential complication of the deli being part of the plan and expressed a view that the combined application should not prejudice other more straightforward aspects of the application. It was noted that this would be discussed when tabled at IACom.

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting (13/01/2021).

Which committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom

Photographs:

A selection of key informing images taken on site are included in this report.





Annexure SI 2

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for:

Erf/Farm No.: **De Hoop Re 1/697, Farm 1/1113, Portion of Erf Re 353, Erf 1449 and 1450, Malmesbury**

Street Address: **Off the N7, Malmesbury**

Registered Owner: **Agri Industria (Pty) Ltd, Newport Group, Flanagan & Gerard**

Grading: **Ungraded**

Nature of Application: **Section 38(8)**

Date of Site Visit: **08.01.2021**

HWC Representatives: **Mike Scurr; Sarah Winter; Rashiq Fataar; Stephanie Barnardt**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM resolution to assess the site and context in order to provide comment on the HIA specifically with respect to the scenic and visual issues contained in the HIA report as follows:**

Scenic Landscape: The preliminary Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) of the area assigned a Grade IIIb ranking to the Malmesbury Hills in which the site is located to the SW. The open farmland comprising mostly degraded renosterveld grassland used for grazing characterises this hilly landscape, with two high hilltops on *Fairview* and *Highlands* commanding the landscape.

Visual Landscape: Seen on the N7 Highway on approaching Malmesbury the landscape has landmark status with sweeping views down to the Diep River and up to the hills to the southeast.

Extract from page 14 of the HIA report

Report submitted by **Sarah Winter on 12.01.2021**

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Friday 8th January 2021 attended by 3 IACom members.

Area Inspected: Views across the site from an elevated position in proximity to the southern boundary of the site, just west of the N7.

Items Noted:

- The location of the site relative to the urban edge of Malmesbury, Abottsdale and the N7.
- The proposed development resulting in a very large extension of the urban edge of Malmesbury to the south and adjacent to the N7.
- The green framing elements to the site consisting of a stream defining the southern edge of the site, the Diep River along which historical settlement (Malmesbury and Abottsdale) has occurred, the proposed future agri-allotments on northern edge of the site, and the hilltops characteristic of the Swartland landscape.
- The landscape context possessing scenic and/or visual qualities not worthy of formal protection as a Grade IIIB landscape as identified in the report. However, consideration needs to be given to the visible location of the site in relation to the N7 corridor and at the entrance to Malmesbury and in stitching together with the existing community and urban fabric.
- Many of the issues are non-heritage related planning issues.

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting to be held on the 13 January 2021.

Which Committee should this report be submitted to:
IACom at the meeting held on the 13 January 2021.

Photographs by Mike Scurr:



Annexure SI 3

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for:

Erf/Farm No.: **1942**

Street Address: **Beach Road, Mouille Point**

Registered Owner: **GrowthPoint**

Grading:

Nature of Application: **Section 38(8)**

Date of Site Visit: **08.01.2021**

HWC Representatives: **Mike Scurr; Sarah Winter; Rashiq Fataar; Dave Saunders, Cecilene Muller, Stephanie Barnardt**

Reasons for Site Inspection: **IACOM resolution to assess the site and context in order to provide comment on the impact of the proposed development on existing and protected significant views from Fort Wynyard across the property in question.**

Report submitted by Dave Saunders on 12.01.2021

Site Procedure & Findings:

The site inspection was conducted on Friday 8th January 2021 attended by 5 IACom member.

Area Inspected: Views over the site in question from various positions from key positions (gun emplacements) at Fort Wynyard .

Items Noted:

- The National significance of the site as a complex intact coastal defense system spanning the Anglo Boer War, the First World War and the Second World War. In this regard, it is probably to must significant of its kind in the Country.
- The international significance of the 'disappearing gun' one of only a very small remaining number of its kind.
- The position of the proposed new development directly in front of Fort Wynyard.
- The composition of the costal view from various key positions at the Fort. The unbroken horizon with a degree of visible ocean, Robben Island, and key signaling positions in the background (Blouberg, Tygerberg etc).

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next IACom Committee meeting to be held on the 13 January 2021.

Which Committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom at the meeting held on the 13 January 2021.

Photographs by Mike Scurr:



APPROVED