

**APPROVED DECISIONS OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE PERMIT COMMITTEE (BELCom)  
held on Tuesday 07 August 2018 in the 8<sup>th</sup> Floor Boardroom  
at the Offices of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport,  
Protea Assurance Building, Green Market Square, Cape Town at 09:00**

**MATTERS DISCUSSED:**

**11. PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**11.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Farm 1777, Owloon, Paarl: MA  
HM / PAARL / FARM 1777**

**Case No:** 18013017HB0131M

**RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application with the following condition:

1. that any outstanding issues are dealt with and submitted to the HOMS supplementary meeting for approval. Issues arising from the BELCom minutes of 28 February 2018 have been complied with/ or not as annotated in the table below - those which require further attention by the applicant are noted.

Previous minute	Comment from meeting 07 Aug 2018
Building fabric, including the historic barn area, is to be recorded correctly. Requirements for historic T-shaped Outbuilding No.1, include but are not limited to: doors, windows and other openings which have not been clearly indicated on the drawings, are to be shown in all instances and correctly dimensioned. The plan must show walls, doors, windows, etc. scheduled for demolition and areas earmarked for alteration more clearly/ fully	Submitted drawings are acceptable
A werf development chronology plan, including assessment of all built fabric, is to be provided	Not complete. Must be a dedicated analysis (not called SDP) with using a proper key/legend to convey a sense of the seriously old werf. Correction required re Victorian 13 <sup>th</sup> c house.
The heritage practitioner is to motivate proposed gradings for various components of the werf.	Not done – Heritage Practitioner to attend to this
Detailed construction sections are required to clarify visual impacts on external elevations and, where applicable, interfaces between historic and new fabric.	Section supplied, raises following issues: Using same very large dormer type developed for the 1988 blg is not suitable for the late1700s T-blg. Does rear visual continuity of whole complex trump an appropriate dormer for historic house?
Landscape drawings showing levels and drainage, particularly related to the courtyard areas, but also including all	Incomplete: There is a contour plan... maybe there is no landscaping involved but what about behind the T-house?

other proposed landscape interventions are to be provided.	
The impact on the stone plinth of the new doors in the Outbuilding No.1 (kitchen) is to be assessed, any mitigation addressed, and the mitigated detailed solution shown in all drawings.	According to SH letter, the stone plinth is 1988. Issue has been dealt with sufficiently – committee approves.
Dormers need to be developed in another manner: they are too large, overpowering and not in keeping with the historic typology that this building represents. Some should be omitted entirely, others replaced with Velux-type windows to preserve the visual authenticity of roofscape to a higher degree. (The roof ridgelines and eave-lines should not be interrupted by the dormers).	Further attention required: i) Dormer on south wing to be the same as the dormer on the north wing ii) Roofscape/ provision of velux-type windows: the historic roofscape of the T shaped house needs a different design attitude to that employed for the contemporary building, to preserve a distinctive identity for the historic part of the roofscape. Therefore maximum of two velux-type window per roof side, excluding the "front" roof, to be used in the historic part of the roofscape.

HB

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

### 12.1 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 944, 126 High Level Road, Green Point: MA HM / CAPE METROPOLITAN / GREEN POINT / ERF 944

Case No: 18050315HB0606M

#### FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. While the Committee acknowledges, in principle, that demolition of this structure is conceivable in terms of its grade III C heritage status, several further requirements need to be addressed in order for a decision to be made. Understanding of urban heritage context is critical to addressing a suitable heritage outcome for any proposed replacement structures and buildings on the site.
2. The applicant is to identify and study the appropriate micro spatial context (study area), as well as providing examples of existing suitable (excellent) precedent from the broader Green Point/ Sea Point area for developing a site of this nature without loss of heritage quality for the urban townscape, and for the High Level Road. An identified boundary for a study area for a micro-spatial context study is to be submitted to the Committee by e-mail for approval before proceeding further.
3. Contextual heritage design indicators are to be prepared by a suitably experienced heritage practitioner.
4. The contextual heritage design indicators are to inform the subsequent design of the replacement structure.

HB

**12.2 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1079, 28 Vredehoek Avenue, Vredehoek: MA  
HM / CAPE TOWN / VREDEHOEK / ERF 1079**

**Case No: 15071004HB0715E**

**FURTHER REQUIREMENTS**

1. As the Committee was of the opinion that the current proposals are at least one full storey too high (some Committee members said two storeys too high), alternatives are to be explored that reduce the new development by one full storey, or more. The revised top floor must be configured as loft space within a predominantly hipped/pitched roof configuration, not a flat roof.
2. The overriding purpose must be to achieve as low an eaves line as possible in relation to the site's immediately surrounding context. All components of site and building-making are to be simultaneously thought through to arrive a best-possible solution. The possibility of using basement space as parking is strongly motivated by the Committee as a useful way forward in design terms. For this particular site, the use of a basement or half basement is particularly suitable, and is the Committee's preferred way forward, given the negative impact of excessive building height on the heritage significance of the townscape.
3. With regard to heights the applicant's revised submission is to provide dimensioned height datum/s, established at existing back of curb levels (at two points, given slope of street), for the consideration of the Committee. To be clear; the Committee suggests that at most, this site can cope with a ground floor of parking mixed with residential space, two further floors of apartments, and an inhabited "genuine roof space", and that moderating building heights downwards with the slopes, and towards the existing two to three storey existing buildings is appropriate.
4. Alternatives must also be explored in which the massing of the development steps in accordance with the inclines of the site, including the sloping street edge.
5. The ground level must include habitable spaces / apartments and not only parking and circulation.
6. Further clarity is required regarding landscaping (hard and soft landscaping, and including walling/gate elements) along the street interface: the committee noted that proposed insertion of palisade fencing for this development, if done without sufficient planting/design modulation to moderate impact, whilst admittedly a positive open interface, can still negatively impact streetscape – especially if all that there is to look at is parked cars.
7. The building must have "side spaces" between the building and its common boundaries, and these are to include planting (not token planting, but real planting with sufficient growing space).
8. Application of all the above points to design studies must be demonstrated in any follow up submission/s. It is noted that design is a re-iterative process, thus further comment will arise once new submission/s are made.

**HB**

**12.3 Proposed Total Demolition, Erf 363, 5 West Cliff Road, Hermanus: MA  
HM / OVERBERG / OVERSTRAND / HERMANUS / ERF 363**

**Case No:** 18030115WD0403E

**RECORD OF DECISION**

A design with the full support of OHAC has been submitted to HWC. The Committee therefore resolved to approve the total demolition of the existing dwelling with the suspensive condition that this be subject to the construction of the proposed replacement structure as per drawings Pres 01. Dated 5 July 2018, prepared by Wilh and Co, subject to the following condition:

- 1) The replacement structure on Erf 363 Hermanus must be completed within three years of the date of issue of the permit for demolition, failing which a new application to approve the proposed replacement structure will be required in terms of the NHRA, regardless of whether demolition of the existing structure has taken place or not.

**WD**

**13. STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION**

**13.1 Erf 9118, "Natural Sciences Building", Merriman Avenue, University of Stellenbosch, Stellenbosch: NM  
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / ERF 9118**

**Case No:** 17102002HB0605E

**RECORD OF DECISION**

As heritage resources can be retained intact behind what can be implemented as a removable set of building components, the Committee resolved to approve the proposal as per drawing No. 464-AD-1100; 464-AD-1302 & 464-AD-1303 dated 11 April 2017; 464-AD-1304; dated 17 February 2017 prepared by Derek Kock Architects subject to the following conditions:

1. That the existing lecture seating remain intact behind the dry walling.
2. That all new interior fittings be removable, with any junctions/ fixtures to existing fabric to be done in a manner that ensures future ease if/ when they are removed.
3. That the ceiling and windows in the upper portion of the gallery be retained and refurbished and this must be specifically confirmed by notation of the architects' drawings.

**HB**

**13.2 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 343, 48 Paul Kruger Street, Robertson: NM  
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / BREEDE RIVER WINELANDS / ROBERTSON / ERF 343**

**Case No:** 18060418WD0607E

**RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on 11 August 2018 (PB and WD).

**WD**

**13.3 Proposed Additions and Alteration at Erf 21314, Shoprite Checkers, Main Street & Lang Street Paarl: NM  
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / ERF 21314**

**Case No: 18052103HB0604E**

**RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application as it is removable, separate from the existing structure and an improvement on the existing entrance canopy, and does not detract from heritage significance of the building.

**HB**

**13.4 Proposed Additions and Alterations, Erf 1181, 45 Buxton Avenue, Gardens: NM  
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ORANJEZICHT / ERF 1181**

**Case No: 18031581WD0709E**

**FURTHER REQUIREMENTS**

The Committee resolved to conduct a site inspection of the interior and of the site to check the consistency of the previous approved plans. (PB, KDS and NI).

**WD**

**13.5 Proposed Additions on Erf 166500, 236 Lower Main Road, Salt River: NM  
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SALT RIVER / ERF 166500**

**Case No: 18062602ZK0628E**

**RECORD OF DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application with the proviso that detailed drawings showing the retention of as much of the existing fabric as possible when dealing with issues related to the NBR (for example fire safety) are provided by the applicant and submitted to HWC for approval.

**ZK**

**13.6 Proposed addition & alteration at Erf 227, 24 Van der Stel Street, Standard Bank, Tulbagh: NM  
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / TULBAGH / ERF 227**

**Case No: 18052113HB0531E**

**FURTHER REQUIREMENTS**

1. Fabric Analysis, not limited to the below points below, but paying particular attention to them:
  - a) Identifying whether or not boxed-in elements conceal decorative features and/or other historic fabric.
  - b) Identifying whether or not dropped ceilings conceal decorative features and/or other historic fabric.

- c) Identifying the nature of existing walls that are to be removed: identify whether they are of heritage significance spatially, or materially (or whether some are possibly later infill work).
  - d) Confirmation as to whether the original drawings of this building exist, including from Standard bank's own archive (a suitably qualified heritage researcher to establish this).
2. The Fabric Analysis to inform further decision making regarding the way forward – the committee has yet to consider the design proposal, as it awaits the further information.

HB

**13.7 Proposed Addition and Alteration at Erf 3413, 13 van der Stel Street, Stellenbosch: MA HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / ERF 3413**

**Case No:** 17102006HB0509E

**FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:**

- 2. Previously the Committee had concerns about the active relationship between the house and stoep being retained into the future; the revised proposal only partially addresses this, allowing a truncated piece of bedroom access to the stoep window. Further design work is required, such that:
  - a) The basic four-square plan is to remain legible by the inclusion of substantial (minimum 600mm) retained wall nibs.
  - b) Spatial sequencing in the planning provision for new bathrooms must allow bathrooms to be located towards the centre of the existing house, occupying the four-square plan as non-invasively as possible.
- 3. Regarding the enclosure of the stoep, the manufacturer's specs and a sample of the material proposed for the stoep enclosure are to be provided by the applicant. A front elevation is to be provided demonstrating how the stoep enclosure respects the existing stoep integrity such that the enclosure is a subservient element with minimal impact. Large scale details of the stoep/ stoep enclosure which further demonstrate the careful heritage approach are to be included. The original stoep detailing must be enhanced and offset by the new elements. New elements are not to dominate the heritage resource. Fixing details must be carefully thought through and detail drawings of those provided.

HB

**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 of the meeting.

Approved