

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 08H15 on Wednesday, 19 May 2021**



1. Opening and Welcome

Note: Due to the Chairperson, Mr. David Gibbs being unable to join the meeting until 09h00, and tendering apologies until able to join. Ms Waseefa Dhansay 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 08h19 and welcomed everyone present via Microsoft Teams.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Rashiq Fataar (RF)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM) joined at 08:30
Mr David Gibbs (DG) joined at 08:50
Mr Gaarith Williams (GW)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Mr Jason Knight (JK)

Staff

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)
Ms Anita Shologu (AS)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM)
Ms Muneerah Solomon (MS)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)

Observers

None

Visitors

Mr CN Louw
Ms Lize Malan
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Ms Sandra van der Merwe
Dr Luyanda Mpahlwa
Mr Erich Maske
Mr Gerhard Swart
Mr Des Raymer
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Ms Marise Potgieter
Mr Tony Barbour
Prof Walter Peters
Mr Nicholas Arnott
Mr Nic Wiltshire

Mr Andre Wiehahn
Ms Louise Hyde
Mr Andrew Hoeks
Mr Thabo Mashologu
Ms Janine Maske
Ms Giselle Courtney
Dr Stephen Townsend
Mr John Willson-Harris
Mr Jaco Dippenaar
Ms Charnelle Kluth
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Mr Barend Kellerman
Mr Philip Smith
Ms Adel Groenewald

3. Apologies

Mr Sipiwo Mavumengwana (SM)

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 19 May 2021

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 19 May 2021 with three additional items.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 14 April 2021

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 14 April 2021 and resolved to approve them with no amendments.

5.2 Minutes dated 23 April 2021

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 23 April 2021 and resolved to approve them with no amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- DG: items 12.2, 13.2 and 15.1
- MS: item 13.1

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Appointments

8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

CAP provided the Committee with a reported back on the outcomes of the following Appeals:

- Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 1430, 30 Bradwell Road, Vredehoek, CT. S34
- Tribunal: Proposed Demolition, Erven 55165 and 55166, 8 & 10 Feldhausen Road, Claremont
- Proposed Total Demolition of Erf 405, 11 Oldfield Road, Sea Point

9.2 Committee times

For noting.

9.3 Draft Heritage Protocol

For noting.

9.4 Site inspection protocol procedure and participation

Members and staff noted concerns around general capacity issues and adherence to site inspection protocols, and the need to manage this effectively given current constraints. PM agreed that this would be raised and discussed further at the upcoming Committee workshop in June 2021. The Committee also agreed that applicants and external parties should not be present

at site inspections, which are set up for the Committee to view the site and/or to consider any queries arising from the documents reviewed. The Committee also agreed it is preferable to free up administration staff time and to facilitate site protocols, administration and co-ordination of site inspections by the committee members themselves (liaise with HWC staff in order ensure admin and financial protocols are adhered to). The Committee further agreed to allocate site inspection attendees and visit coordinator at the end of the meeting to assist smooth administration process.

9.5 Committee participation and composition

The Committee members noted that certain agenda items required architectural design expertise beyond that of one or two members of the Committee, and this was of particular concern when members need to recuse themselves. Two potential solutions were noted:

1. The matter should be taken up at Council for further discussion and,
2. Committee members should advise (along with attendance, recusals, and potential site visits) whether any additional expertise is required for a particular upcoming agenda item so that other members with expertise could be co-opted timeously.

9.6 Emergency protection on Watergat

Committee members who undertook the Simondium site inspection noted the collapsed state of the Watergat homestead and the need for an emergency repair order and rehabilitative work. Together with this the latent potential for the state-owned land to be used positively was noted. HWC to take this matter further with the relevant Department.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:

- Proposed Low Cost and Gap Housing Development on Re/1/1222; Re/1200; Portion 4/941; Portion 7/1220 And Erf 115, Simondium, Drakenstein Municipality
- Proposed Redevelopment Erf 46732, RE 22 Rouwkoop Road, Rondebosch
- Proposed Subdivision for Prospective Residential Units on Erf 177476, Main Road, St. James

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

Noted

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

None noted

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 Proposed Rezoning and Residential Development on Erf 878, Riebeek Kasteel: NM HM/WEST COAST/ SWARTLAND/RIEBEEK KASTEEL/ ERF 878

Case No: 20030413SB0528E

Application form and relevant documentation were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr CN Louw and Mr Andre Wiehahn (Inter Active Town & Regional Planning) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) application compiled by environmental scientist was noted.
- IACom noted the high significance, and strategic location of the site.
- The site falls within a proposed Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).

INTERIM COMMENT:

IACom recommends that a heritage impact assessment be conducted inclusive of the following:

1. Townscape analysis.
2. Visual Impact Assessment.
3. Heritage design indicators.

SB

12.2 Proposed Development, Greenways Hotel Site, Erf 56421, 1 Torquay Avenue, Claremont: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CLAREMONT/ERF 56421

Case No: 20081705KB0718E

DG recused himself and joined the applicants and handed over the Chair to MS for this item.

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Lize Malan (heritage consultant), Mr David Gibbs (assisting the applicant) and Ms Louise Hyde (UCRRA) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The HIA dealing with the boundary treatment was reviewed by all members.
- Committee queried the changes to portion 1 and required evidence of approved envelopes.
- The nature and placement of the fencing was discussed.
- The Committee noted the consultant's suggestion regarding the architectural guidelines and potential impact on significance. Any comment will be included in the final decision.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee agreed that the addition of internal fencing and boundary treatment as shown on fig.13 in the HIA will not impact negatively on heritage significance and in particular the grade IIIA setting of the Manor House. The Committee however queried changes reflected on the Spatial Development Plan (SDP) layout, particularly with respect to portion 1, and required clarity regarding this approval which is noted as having lesser heritage impact. Due to the need to provide feedback urgently, the Committee agreed to provide a decision via email rather than referring the matter back to the next Committee meeting, provided that the matter can be easily clarified in a summary letter to HWC.

KB

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

13.1 Proposed Redevelopment Erf 46732, RE 22 Rouwkoop Road, Rondebosch: MA HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46732

Case No: 19112802LB0129E

MS recused himself and logged off MS Teams.

IACom members reported back on the site inspection undertaken on 29 April 2021. See Annexure SI 1.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (heritage consultant), Mr Andrew Hoeks (Project Manager), Ms Sandra van der Merwe (Docomomo), Mr Thabo Mashologu (General Manager: Property Development and Investment of Communicare) and Dr Luyanda Mpahlwa (architect) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The heritage significance of the building as submitted by Docomomo and the heritage consultant's response was noted.
- The options for adaption versus demolition and replacement were noted.
- The Committee was of the opinion that the building had some architectural and social interest but that it was not worthy of formal heritage protection.
- The provisions of Section 38 allow for heritage input on the replacement development, particularly given the location of the building adjacent to an existing HPOZ, and its strategic location on Rouwkoop Road at the Liesbeek River crossing and threshold, with an important corner condition.
- The proposed development should demonstrate a positive response to these conditions.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee had no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing building but required further application of heritage indicators, specifically to the Rouwkoop interface, corner threshold and river edge portions of the site.

SB

13.2 Revised proposal, based on the requirements of IACom on ERF 4722, Wellington: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/WELLINGTON/ERF 4722

Case No: 17080109ZK0122M

DG recused himself and logged off MS Teams. MS returned to chair this item.

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Khanyisile Bonile introduced the case.

Ms Janine Maske (Blouvillei Action Group), Mr Erich Maske (Blouvillei Action Group), Ms Giselle Courtney (Blouvillei Action Group) and Mr Gerhard Swart (Urban Dynamics) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The applicant presented the mitigated response.
- The BAG opposition was restated.
- The urban rural transition zone was noted.
- Setback and view lines were considered.
- Concern was raised over the legal mechanism for managing the southern portion single residential area and the potential split zoning to tie down the land use.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee agreed that the concerns previously expressed have been addressed in the option 4 layout presented and that the proposal presented an opportunity for a managed development on this site. The unresolved mechanism for dealing the southern portion needs to be confirmed. The Committee therefore requires an SDP plan which addresses this concern, which can be the basis of final comment.

KB

**13.3 RE of Erf 144264, 1566015 and 17233, Newlands Cricket Ground: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/NEULANDS/RE OF ERF 144264, 166015 AND 172333**

Case No: 14092208GT0825E

Revised Sketch Plans of previously approved HIA were tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay introduced the case.

Dr Stephen Townsend (heritage consultant) and Mr Des Raymer (architect) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- It was noted that approval was granted in 2015 with the provision that building plans and tree replacement plans be referred to the Committee.
- The Committee noted correspondence from OVP with respect of the tree replacement.

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee approved the tree revised sketch plans as tabled numbered, 518-OvP-NCG-007 Rev 0, Masterplan – Tree Management Plan, dated 26 April 2021 prepared by OvP.

WD

**13.4 Proposed Development on Erf 174009, Boundary by Strand, Bree and Waterkant Street, Cape Town: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CAPE TOWN CBD/ERF 174009**

Case No: 19073112WD0904E

Third revision prepared by Dr Townsend was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Stephen Townsend (heritage consultant) and Mr John Wilson-Harris (architect) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The visibility of the proposed amendment was discussed.
- Incremental changes over the time were noted.
- Proposed Fenestration in third revision an improvement upon previous version was noted.

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee endorsed the 3rd revision as tabled as sufficiently in accordance with the approved application with the provision that the roof level extended area does not increase beyond the area as indicated on the architect drawings numbered 0901 101 REV A, 0901 102 REV A, 0901 109 REV A, 0901 104 REV A, 0901 105 REV A, 0901 106 REV A, 0901 107 REV A, 0901 108 REV A, 0901

200 REV A, 0901 201 REV A, 0901 202 REV A, 0901 300 REV A, 0901 301 REV A, dated 30 March 2021 (including the 3D views presented in report prepared by Dr Townsend dated 16 April 2021) and a mechanism must be put in place by the applicant to ensure that ad hoc uses do not extend beyond the volume.

B

**13.5 Proposed Integrated Rapid Transport System - M24, M5, Erven 52424, 52423, 58104, 58105 and 110205, Lansdowne: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/CLAREMONT/ERVEN 524524, 52423, 58104, 58105 AND 110205**

Case No: 16062006WD0928M

Application documents were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant) Mr Jaco Dippenaar (engineer), Ms Marise Potgieter (urban designer), Ms Charnelle Kluth (urban designer), and Mr Tony Barbour (social specialist) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The thorough information and comprehensive documentation were noted.
- The Committee noted the potential positive opportunity for the city.
- The Committee further noted that the landscape plan can be reviewed by City of Cape Town (CoCT) without further HWC involvement

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application as meeting the requirement of S38(3) of NHRA.

SB

**13.6 Proposed New Residential Development Erven 103,104 & A portion of Rotterdam Street, Wittedrift: MA
HM/BITOU/WITTEDRIFT/ERVEN 103 & 104**

Case No: 19090401AS0927E

Addendum to HIA prepared by Lize Malan was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Lize Malan (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee acknowledged the comprehensive report.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the addendum to the HIA prepared by Lize Malan as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**13.7 Proposed Mixed-Use Development on Klapmuts Farm, Ptn 3 of Farm 742, REM Ptn 2 Farm 742, Paarl: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/PAARL/ PTN 3 OF FARM 742, REM PTN 2 OF FARM 742**

Case No: 20032416JW0331E

Supplementary HIA and associated documentation prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the documentation was clear and comprehensive.
- Extensive stakeholder engagements were acknowledged.
- The site is noted to fall within broader Stellenbosch Bridge framework plan.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed and supported the findings and recommendations including the implementation of the mitigation measures of the supplementary HIA and associated documentation prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt as meeting the requirements 38(3) of the NHRA. The Committee noted that, despite the high negative impacts of the preferred alternative, given the current approval for development in place and on the basis of the anticipated sustainable socio-economic impacts, the Preferred Alternative could be acceptable and could proceed if all mitigation measures, outlined in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and the Social Impact

Assessment (SIA) are implemented in full. These measures are desirable as they improve the acceptability of the development, and they should be included as conditions of environmental authorization.

SB

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 Low Cost and Gap Housing Development on Re /1/1222; Re/1200; Portion 4/941; Portion 7/1220 And Erf 115, Simondium, Drakenstein Municipality: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/SIMONDIUM/RE/1/1222; RE/1200; PORTION 4/941; PORTION 7/1220 AND ERF 115

Case No: 19102332SB1107E

DG recused himself from this item.

IACom members reported back on the site inspection undertaken on 17 May 2021. See annexure SI 2.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Site inspection noted positive attributes of the site and its place making potential.
- The existence of the two cemeteries as part of open public space system was noted.
- The Committee noted the topography and its capacity to absorb the building typology

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee agreed to support and endorse the HIA and supporting documentation as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA. Alternative A is supported along with the conditions noted in the HIA.

1. Care must be taken not to impact on any possibly unmarked burials that may occur outside of the recognized boundaries of the cemeteries. Should any unmarked burials be impacted, work must cease immediately and SAPS and HWC must be contacted regarding the appropriate protocol.
2. The existing trees associated with the cemeteries must be retained and enhanced. Consideration should be given to the reinstatement of public open space around the cemeteries. Development in this zone must be restricted.
3. The werf node entrance must be recognized as important due to the character of the site and it is therefore necessary for this space to be a landscaped space of relief. It is recommended that a small area of the existing planting is retained as visually-greened space.
4. The design of the new houses should look to continue the strong “longhouse” typology of the area as it represents a built culture to which people’s way of life has adapted. The semi-detached structure is therefore preferred.

5. The basic BNG model must have a 30-degree pitch roof and provide the basis of infrastructure for a front stoep.
6. Plots must run perpendicular to the street and should be rectangular, with the shorter side addressing the street edge. A ratio of approximately 1:2,5 for the short and long boundary lengths of the rectangular plots is recommended. Furthermore, it is recommended that the front facade of the houses must be placed within the first 3 metres of the street boundary
7. Opportunities for new structures and design guidelines must respond to prevailing typologies are indicated in Appendix 1 and should inform the development.
8. As many of the semi-detached structures with the full gambit of “add-ons” (stoep, chimney and lean-to - Figure 11.2b) as possible should be located around the cemetery spaces, as these will be the most visible.
9. Road hierarchies should be emphasised through the scaling down of smaller residential roads. Laterite finishing and fewer ‘step-up’ pavements are recommended.
10. The scale of roads should be the minimum possible. Insensitive, over-engineered, hard elements will compromise the character of a townscape as a whole and should be avoided. Instead, a “woonerf” approach to street-making should be taken.
11. Existing trees on the site should be retained as much as possible and reinforced with additional planting to retain and enhance the rural character of the site.

SB

**15.2 Proposed Subdivision for Prospective Residential Units on Erf 177476, Main Road, St. James: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ST JAMES/ERF 177476**

Case No: 17090415AS0914M

IACom members reported back on the site inspection undertaken on 29 April 2021. See annexure SI 3.

Professor Walter Peters (heritage consultant), Mr Barend Kellerman (Kellerman Joubert Heyns Incorporated), Mr Nicholas Arnott (EAP) and Mr Philip Smith (CoCT) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Previous submissions (earlier HIA, VIA updated) were noted.
- Mitigation of unauthorized work was discussed.
- The capacity of site to accommodate additional units with respect with access and associate infrastructure was also noted.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee is of the opinion that, whereas the HIA addresses the middle and upper erven (portion 2 and 3) comprehensively as well as mitigation measures to be undertaken to address the existing structures on the site, insufficient information has been provided in respect of Portion 1, and therefore the requirements of S38(3) have not been meet. The Committee requires heritage-related design indicators, including parameters and constraints for

development, to be determined for Portion 1 and included in the HIA. These are to address the most appropriate positioning of any buildings on Portion 1, amongst other things.

SB

**15.3 Proposed development of the Pienaarspoort Wind Energy Facility 1 on Rem Farm Bruwelsfontein 249, near Touws River: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ BREEDE VALLEY/TOUWSRIVIER/REM FARM 249**

Case No: 20092103SB0921E

HIA and associated documentation prepared by CTS Heritage were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Nic Wiltshire (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted.
- The suggested archaeological walkdown was queried.
- The Committee acknowledged the thorough documentation and assessment.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed and supported the findings and recommendations of HIA as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA, which includes the removal of the seven of turbines from the sensitive cultural landscape zone.

1. A 100m no-go buffer must be implemented around the significant identified archaeological sites (P07 and 35524).
2. A 900m no-go buffer area must be implemented around identified farm werfs (Bruwelsfontein, P024). The turbines currently proposed to be located within this buffer area must have their positions adjusted accordingly.
3. The Environmental Site Officer (ESO) should be made aware of the possibility of important fossil remains (bones, teeth, fish, petrified wood, plant-rich horizons, etc) being found or unearthed during the construction phase of the development. The ESO must monitor for fossil material of all major surface clearance and deeper (> 1m) excavations on an on-going basis during the construction phase. The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be used in this regard.
4. The proposed turbines located within Landscape Units A and B (and marked in red in Figure 6.1) must be removed.
5. The design criteria identified in section 5.1 above must be adopted and implemented in the design and layout of the development.
6. Should any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources be found during the proposed development, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward.

7. If unmarked human burials are uncovered, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward as per section 36(6) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.4 Proposed Site Development on Erf 177887- RE, Ottery: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/OTTERY/ERF 177887**

Case No: 15101207WD1113E

HIA and associated documentation prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Comprehensive documentation acknowledged and appreciated.
- The Committee was of the opinion that previous IACom comments have been addressed satisfactorily.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee endorses and supports the findings and recommendations, including the updated grading of the Phase 1 HIA as follows:

1. Supports the retention of the historic complex on the eastern precinct of Erf 177887-RE Ottery for retention and future use;
2. Supports the recommended cultural significances of the site;
3. Supports the Heritage Design Indicators to guide future development on site; and
4. Supports the recommended gradings of the heritage resources on the property.

SB

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

16.1 None

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 None

25 SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

25.1 None

26. OTHER

**26.1 Draft Dune Maintenance Management Plan for Dolphin Beach Dune MMP: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/BLOUBERGSTRAND/DOLPHIN BEACH**

Case No: N/A

Draft Management and Rehabilitation Plan were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Adel Groenewald (Doug Jeffery Environmental Consultants) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Awaiting APM comment.

SB

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 16:30

The Chair thanked the members of the committee and HWC staff and guests for their preparedness, presence and meaningful participation in the meeting.

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

23 June 2021

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR:

DATE:

SECRETARY:

DATE:

DRAFT

Annexure S11

IACOM COMMITTEE SITE INSPECTION REPORT Erf 46732-RE, 22 Rouwkoop Road, Rondebosch

Case No.: 19112802LB0129E

Submitted by: Dave Saunders on May 2021

Erf/Farm No.: Erven 46732-RE, Rondebosch

Street Address: 22 Rouwkoop Road

Registered Owner: Cummunicare

Grading: Grade IIIC heritage resource

Nature of Application: Redevelopment of the site

Date of Site Visit: 29th April 2021

HWC Representatives: None

Sarah Winter, Dave Saunders and Cecilene Muller (IACOM)

Reasons for Site Inspection: IACom resolution to assess the site

1. Assess the remaining fabric in order to better understand the significance of the site, and
2. Assessment of the context

Area Inspected: Site and surrounds.

Findings:

Recommended Action:

Members to report the findings of the inspection at the next Committee meeting.

Which committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom

PHOTOGRAPHS:

THE SITE



FIGURE 1 A: Front façade of Werverdiend (22 Rouwkoop Road)



FIGURE 1 B: Back façade of Werverdiend (22 Rouwkoop Road)



FIGURE 2: Additions to the main structure



FIGURE 3: Narrow entrances, staircases and corridors



FIGURE 4: Small inner courtyards with an aging plumbing system, use for laundry



FIGURE 5: Damp in the walls and bad electrical wiring



FIGURE 6: Additional features



FIGURE 7: Trees within the property

THE RECEIVING ENVIRONMENT



FIGURE 8: The entrance to the site



FIGURE 9: The street at the back of the site



FIGURE 10: The Roman Catholic church buildings on the boundary of the HPOZ across the road from the site

DRAFT

Annexure S12

IACom Committee Site Inspection Report for:

Erf/Farm No.: **RE /1/1222; RE/1200; PORTION 4/941; PORTION 7/1220 AND ERF 115, SIMONDIUM, DRAKENSTEIN MUNICIPALITY**

Street Address: **WATERGAT ROAD**

Registered Owner/Applicant:

Grading: Refer to HIA Report

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

Date of Site Visit: 17 May 2021

HWC IACOM Representatives: Mike Scurr; Sarah Winter; no other parties present.

Reasons for Site Inspection: To view the development and context of the site, and to consider the proposed indicators and proposed Gap Housing development in this significant context.

Report submitted by: Mike Scurr 19 May 2021

Area Inspected: The site and its surrounding context.

Findings:

The context includes key elements within the built and natural landscape. Members were able to consider various elements which have informed the scheme, including the relationship of the site to the R45, the undulating topography of the site, the nature of the existing civic facilities and placemaking elements such as school, clinic, cemeteries, sports fields, roads, etc, and how these in turn present opportunities to inform elements of a positive settlement pattern. The presence of informal settlements in the area was also noted, as were the proximity to Nieuwe Sion and the Nieuwe Sion farm village to the south. The church with its spire was also noted, as this has been illustrated as one of the heritage indicators.

Committee members also took the opportunity to revisit the surrounding wider context of the area, including the provincial government land holdings which include Bien Donne and the other semi-institutional land holdings and village settlements.

The committee members present concluded that the site is well suited to sensitive and socially positive development in a manner which builds on and reinforces the patterns very evident on site.

Action: To be discussed at IACom on 19 May.

Which Committee should this report be submitted to:

IACom

Photographs by Mike Scurr:







DRAFT