

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held on the 1st Floor in the Boardroom, Protea
Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 6 March 2019**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Mr Chris Snelling (CSn), opened the meeting at 09H06 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Guy Thomas (GT)
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Dr Lita Webley (LW)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS) Co-opted

Staff

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Mr Andrew September (AS)
Ms Stephanie-Anne Barnardt (SB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Heidi Boise (HB)

Observers

Ms Sina Bohringer
Ms Cara Stedlak

Visitors

Dr Stephen Townsend	Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom
Ms Jennifer Whitehead	Mr Unathi Mayongo
Mr Andrew Berman	Mr William Whitaker
Ms Danjelle Midgley	Mr Trevor Thorold
Mr Simon Birch	Mr Neil Franks
Mr Sebastian van Greunen	Mr Zane De Decker
Mr John Lanham	Ms Gill Lanham
Ms Fidna Caira	Ms Robyn Campbell
Dr Kathleen Batena	Mr Charl Bruwer
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue	Mr Peter Büttgens
Mr James Crosswell	Mr Jankel Nieuwoudt
Ms Katie Smuts	Ms Veronique Fyle

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

- 4.1** The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 6 March 2019 with additional items.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

- 5.1 The Committee resolved to approve the minutes dated 13 February 2019 with a minor correction.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- MS: item 21.1

7. Confidential Matters

- 7.1 None

8. Appointments

- 8.1 None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals Committee, Tribunal and Court Cases

- 9.1.1 PM reported back on the following Appeals matters:

- Proposed Development on the Remainder of Erf 49306, The Cannon Brewery, Cannon Street, Newlands: Section 38(4)
- Proposed Total Demolition at Erf 944, 126 High Level Road, Green Point: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition, Replacement Structure, Erf 3032, 150 Buitengracht Street, Bo-Kaap: Section 34
- Proposed Total Demolition at Erf 290, 29 Ocean View Drive Green Point: Section 34
- Stellenbosch University
- Proposed Addition & Alteration at Erf 191, 119 Buitenkant Street, Gardens: Section 34
- Proposed Partial Demolition and Multi-Storey Addition on Erf 2657, 62-66 Wale Street, City Centre CBD: Section 34

- 9.1.2 PM reported back on the following tribunal matters:

- Philippi Horticultural Area
- The River Club.

9.2 Newlands Cricket Ground, Camp Ground Road, Newlands

Dr Stephen Townsend was present and took part in the discussion.

Ms Dhansay provided an introduction by way of a power point presentation.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The matter before the Committee was an amendment to previously approved Sketch Plans in respect of the Newlands Cricket Ground (NCG).
- The Committee noted that it had previously endorsed a set of revised Sketch Plans on 8 March 2017, confirming at the time that those plans were “generally in accordance” with those which were initially approved in July 2015.

- In this instance however, the amendment involved the proposed insertion of a new building, equivalent to three storeys in height, along Campground Road – a land parcel that was previously not earmarked for development.
- Notwithstanding the observation made that previous practice has been to endorse amendments from a heritage point of view, it was agreed that it is not possible for the Committee to endorse the drawings tabled as being generally in accordance with those previously approved or endorsed.
- Whereas the previous endorsement had involved revised Sketch Plans that indicated a shifting of buildings already approved, as well as the introduction of new basement levels, those changes were insignificant from a heritage point of view and were generally in accordance with the approved Sketch Plans. This proposal however, entails the introduction of a substantial new building on what the IACom regarded as an important component of the site; this being the main public entrance to the stadium and associated cricket related infrastructure. Given this, the part of the site in question has very high visibility.
- The Committee agreed with the observation that there is no provision in the NHRA for amending conditions of approval, and noted that it is not possible to deal with the revision to the Site Development Plan (SDP) in that manner.
- It was suggested therefore, that the correct approach in this instance would be to submit a new Notification of Intent to Develop (NID), the reasons being as follows:
 - The Committee resolved that the 'site' is the whole of the NCG. Indeed, the previous HIA, and the Grading of II as mooted by the heritage practitioner, had in itself regarded the site as the whole ground. Given the significance of the site is one which is linked to the cultural significance of the role of Newlands as a cricket venue, it is not possible to separate individual parcels from the rest of the venue. They are clearly linked.
 - Having agreed that the 'site' is the whole of the NCG, (and exceeds 5 000m²), it was then agreed by the Committee that the new building, which is at a prominent location and would change the nature of this interface from introverted to extroverted, would change the character of the site. In this respect, the applicability of s38(1)(c)(i) of the NHRA is satisfied.
 - It was agreed that a NID would be submitted to HWC, and at the request of Dr Townsend, this would be tabled at IACom for a decision to be taken in terms of the provisions of s38(2) of the Act.
 - The NID and any accompanying documentation must be submitted to HWC at least three weeks prior to the IACom meeting where it is to be tabled.

ADVICE

The applicant must submit a NID to HWC, which will be considered by IACom.

WD

9.3 Proposed Redevelopment of the Tygerberg Hospital Estate on Erf 15350 (Remainder of Erf 14298), Parow

Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom, Ms Jennifer Whitehead and Mr Unathi Mayongo were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Clarification was sought by the Department of Health in respect of certain of the conditions that were imposed by the Appeals Committee.
- Specifically, the concern was around implications for the proposed maintenance of the Hospital Building, as well as the potential addition of a new structure to that building.
- The Committee noted that the relevant building was not older than 60 years, had not been identified as having heritage significance, and that this 'precinct' had been excluded from the requirement for a Phase II HIA needing to be conducted.
- The Committee noted that it would therefore be practical, and appropriate, to separate the proposed refurbishment and maintenance work to this portion of the site, from the HIA which was conducted for the future redevelopment of the whole hospital site and to submit a separate NID for this portion only.

ADVICE:

The Committee advised the applicant to submit an NID to HWC. This can be dealt with by HOMS.

AS

9.4 Resignation of Professor le Grange

The Committee noted with regret the decision of Prof Le Grange to resign from the Committee and requested that the Chair writes a letter to Prof le Grange, expressing gratitude for his contribution to the Committee, especially in the field of urban design considerations, heritage conservation and as a mentor.

9.5 Wupperthal

CSn provided feedback to the Committee which was noted.

9.6 Venue for Committee Meetings

CSc informed the Committee that HWC is intending to hold Committee meetings outside of Cape Town as part of its outreach program to be more accessible to people in the Western Cape as a whole.

The Committee pointed out that if alternative venues were considered, they should be more accessible to the community (also by public transport) and not less. It was agreed that members of IACom would direct any comment to the Chair, and that these would be tabled at the HWC Council meeting on 13th March 2019.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections

None

10.2 Report back from ExCo, Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the agenda

Noted.

10.4 Potential Site Inspections

- Proposed construction of two wind energy turbines on The Buffeljags Abalone Farm, Farm 357 (Bredasdorp) near Pearly Beach

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

11 SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

11.1 None

12 SECTION 38(4), INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 Proposed Total Demolition of 3 Buildings & Consolidation for the Development of a Four Storey (Lower Ground Parking, 2 Floors & A Floor in The Roof) Erven 31751; Erven 31752; Erven 150019: MA HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ROSEBANK/ERVEN 31751; ERVEN 31752; ERVEN 150019

Case No: 17111605ZK1122E

Section 38(4) application documents, revised drawings by MBS Architects and a covering letter by Urban Design Services were tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Dr Stephen Townsend, Mr Andrew Berman, Mr William Whitaker, Ms Danjelle Midgley, Mr Trevor Thorold, Mr Simon Birch, Mr Neil Franks, Mr Sebastian van Greunen and Mr Zane De Decker were present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- General concern was expressed about the architectural resolution of the proposal as tabled. Indeed, it was felt that the proposal had regressed from the one previously seen by the Committee in February 2019 and commented on by objectors.
- The Committee reiterated its previous comment that if the existing structures were identified as having contributory (Grade IIIC), significance, then it stands to reason that any replacement structures should not detract from the identified

heritage resource; being the townscape of the proposed HPOZ, and should likewise contribute to it.

- The previous proposal, which could be described as a ‘background building’, with a consistent architectural style, was close to being an appropriate replacement building and only required recognition of the context which should inform the scale of certain elements, (openings for e.g.), as well as some further articulation, to break up the massing.
- Instead, the latest proposal however included the introduction of low-pitch, over-scaled roofs that are considered to be inappropriate elements within this townscape, which, since they were orientated lengthways, exacerbated the massing of the buildings.
- It was questioned whether previous comments made in respect of the proposed development had been misinterpreted, as clearly the proposal as tabled was not considered to contribute positively to the townscape. The applicant requested that they be given a further opportunity to resolve this issue, and it was agreed that revised proposals could be submitted for final consideration by the Committee.
- The revised proposal must respond to the concerns that have been raised, and must be more reflective of the prevailing townscape. This could either take the form of flat roofs or pitched roofs, but overall must be meaningfully articulated.
- The applicant should ensure that I&APs are given the opportunity to view the final proposal at least three weeks prior to the matter being tabled at IACom, and the I&APs should ensure that any comment on the revised proposals are submitted to HWC at least a week prior to the IACom meeting at which the matter is to be tabled.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee awaits the revised proposals, taking cognisance of the concerns previously expressed.

SB

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

13.1 Proposed Heuningvlei Estate, Retirement Village Estate and Mixed-Use Development, Erf 1148/1, Bredasdorp: NM HM/BREDASDORP/ERF 1148/1

Case No: 17070604ZK0818E

Basic Assessment Report [including HIA and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA)] was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the site had been identified by the consultant as being of Grade IIIC significance.
- Bredasdorp is noted as being a historic “kerkdorp” which is set within, and is reflective of, a historic rural cultural landscape of the wider Overberg region, and is of historic and heritage significance in its own right. The historical town has an orthogonal grid layout, centred around the Dutch Reformed church. More recent

town expansion to the west takes the form of a grid at an oblique angle to the original grid layout.

- The Committee noted that whilst the site has been included within the Urban Edge in terms of the Municipality's Spatial Development Framework (SDF), it has been identified for continued agricultural use.
- Furthermore, specifically referred to in the SDF proposals, is that the site should be seen in the context of protecting scenic landscape elements, as well as the site's role as being part of the town's gateway from Napier, being the main entry point into the town.
- Whilst the Committee has no objection in principle to the site being developed, the Committee had a number of concerns. These include, but are not limited to the following:
 - The proposed town planning concept, largely a gated community, goes against the SDF indicators, which require agriculture (or at least some agriculture) to be retained and to "*carefully consider the visual impact of any future development on RE Erf 1148*".
 - The proposed fan-like layout, with grand, tree-lined boulevards wholly ignores the existing gridiron town layout, and there is no spatial integration, with even the more recent suburban extremities of the town. It was unanimously considered that the proposed model, (including the so-named proposed vernacular motif), is an inappropriate model to be attached to a modest 'Dorp' setting.
 - Its high visibility will be exacerbated by the extent of the site (22ha), the strong fan-like geometry and sameness in architecture and it will dominate the approach to the town from Napier. The development as proposed will therefore present a very strong and highly visible 'built-form' which lacks any urban design-based relationship with its distinct context. Smaller clusters of development would be more appropriate than one large, sprawling scheme. Apart from following the contours of the hill, there is no analysis of the existing townscape or indication as to how the proposed form etc. responds to or is informed by the cultural landscape in which it is located. It appears as if this is a model that has been superimposed onto, rather than responding to the landscape.
- Consideration was given as to whether the HIA complied with the provisions of s38(3) of the NHRA, and the Committee was unanimous in concurring that it did not.
- The following issues were highlighted.
 - Although comment from various branches within the Municipality was noted in the Basic Assessment Report, there is no evidence of, or reference to, the results of public consultation in the BAR or the HIA, as required. Even if no comments were received from the public, this should be clearly stated.
 - The HIA has not fully assessed the nature and significance of the Townscape, or indeed the role of the site as a primary gateway to the 'Dorp'.
 - Coupled with this, is that the HIA has not meaningfully assessed the impact of the development on all heritage resources, including the rural cultural landscape. The Committee notes that the HIA has graded the site as IIIC, but there is no assessment of the impact of the development on the site as a heritage resource, or its role as a Gateway to the Dorp. It is not regarded as sufficient to note that the site falls within the Urban Edge, without also further interrogating the other provisions made for it in the SDF, as well as the impact of the development on a site identified as IIIC, i.e. 'contributing to the wider cultural landscape'.

- The VIA was felt to be inadequate in this regard, and has not properly assessed the actual impact of the development using appropriate imagery of the proposed development, photo-montages or 3D modelling. Furthermore, the Committee disagrees with the ratings provided in the VIA, as it is clear that the visual impacts on the approach to the town via the R316 will be high, not moderate. The VIA specialist has simply not provided enough visual evidence to back up this conclusion.
- There is no evaluation of the impact on heritage resources relative to the sustainable social and economic benefits to be derived from the development, as required in terms of s38(3)(d). Indeed, the concept of an exclusive, gated community, is in the opinion of the Committee, the antithesis of this. It is also unclear what type of hospital is proposed and who it will serve. There has been no meaningful assessment of a broad range of alternatives or reasons provided for dismissing the two alternatives that were investigated.
- Other than tree planting, visual mitigation by means of an alternative development typology, or layout, was not investigated.
- The Committee was unanimous in its agreement that the model as proposed for this site, is wholly inappropriate in an identified rural cultural landscape setting.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The report does not, at this stage, comply with the provisions of s38 (3) of the NHRA.

SB

13.2 Erven 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695 & 177761 at 19 Loop Street, Cape Town: MA HM/CAPE TOWN CBD/ERVEN 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695 AND 177761

Case No: 17111302WD1129M

Revised proposals were tabled.

Ms Waseefa Dhansay gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue, Mr Peter Büttgens, Mr James Crosswell and Mr Jankel Nieuwoudt were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The plans tabled before the Committee are submitted in compliance with a condition imposed by IACom when approving the HIA.
- The Committee noted that certain changes have been made to the design of the building. Specifically, in response to the common, (southern), boundary and roof.
- The Committee noted that the revisions are generally in accordance with the approved submission, and that furthermore they had improved on the previous revision.

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the submission as per Drawing Numbers; 02-04-001, 03-04-01 and 03-04-002, dated 20-02-2019 and the photo-montages, as submitted.

A full set of building plans must be submitted to HWC for stamping. This can be dealt with by HOMS.

WD

- 14 **SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSE 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 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 **Proposed 325MW Kudusberg Wind Energy Facility and associated infrastructure, Matjiesfontein and Sutherland, Western Cape: MA HM/ WITZENBERG/KUDUSBERG WEF**

Case No: 18071105AS0904E

MS recused himself.

Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) as required previously was tabled.

Mr Andrew September gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Ms Katie Smuts and Ms Veronique Fyle were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the submission of the VIA, which was not included with the documentation previously.
- Discussion was predominately held around the recognition that the Wind Energy Facility and its associated infrastructure would undoubtedly impact on identified heritage resources, and that the cumulative impact on the landscape of the noted number of wind farms, either thus far constructed or approved, within the region would be enormous.
- However, the Committee also recognizes that the 'site' falls within an identified Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ), and that these areas were specifically selected in lesser populated, or travelled areas, in order to ensure the least possible impact.
- The Committee accepts that by concentrating WEF's within these areas, impact on heritage resources in the wider scenario is curtailed.
- It is accepted that although heritage resources will be impacted on, in this particular instance, this would be outweighed by the socio and economic benefits of the proposed development, which are of national importance.

FINAL COMMENT:

The HIA complies with the provisions of s38(3) of the NHRA.

The proposal is supported and it is recommended that the consenting authority imposes the following conditions on the development:

1. Substation Alternative 1 is the recommended substation alternative, although Substation Alternatives 2 and 3 are not considered to be a no-go option;
2. Construction Camp 2 is the recommended construction camp alternative, although Construction Camp 1 is likely to be an acceptable alternative. Construction Camp 3 should be considered a no-go option;
3. The realignment of Access Road Alternative 1 renders it an acceptable choice, while Access Road Alternative 2 is likely to be an acceptable alternative. The proposed alignment for Access Road Alternative 2 should be subjected to a walkdown by an archaeologist prior to commencement of development to identify any areas or sites that require protection or mitigation, should it be selected;
4. Common Access Road 1 has been realigned to the east to avoid Wind Heuvel farmstead and is considered an acceptable route. The road should not be widened or altered at this point and a proper fence should be erected around the Stadler graveyard (KDB081);
5. The following buffers should be observed around identified heritage resources:
 - a. Graves: no development should be permitted within 50m of identified graves and cemeteries; existing roads within this buffer should not be altered or widened;
 - b. Cave site (KDB045): construction staff should not be permitted within 200m of the site;
 - c. Farmsteads: no turbines should be located within 500m of farmsteads;
 - d. Kraals, stone walling and ruins > 100 years: construction staff should not be permitted within 100m of these sites and no development should occur within 15m of these sites; and
 - e. Archaeological finds: no buffers are recommended for the isolated artefacts identified in this survey.
6. All site crew should be informed of the heritage significance of the resources in the study area, and those sites near development infrastructure, or easily reached (Table 2) should be inspected by the ECO during the construction phase to ensure they are being respected;

7. The alignment of the proposed road over the ridge saddle south of Pad se Hoek close to turbines 25 (-32.870067, 20.376674) and 26 (-32.868236, 20.381335) should be subject to an archaeological walkdown prior to construction;
8. The R356 should be put forward for recognition as a scenic route to afford its scenic qualities and historic significance some measure of protection going forward;
9. New construction work, construction camps, substations or access roads should not impact negatively or threaten any of the historic built form, which is part of the history and land use evolution of the cultural landscape by observing appropriate buffers around these features;
10. If supported in consultation with local inhabitants (of permanent or seasonal habitation, owners or labourers), the negative impact of non-local inhabitants on cultural lifeways and language, employees associated with the new WEF should be reduced by housing the employees away from the CLAs;
11. Impact of the proposed WEF on local inhabitants (of permanent and seasonal habitation, owners and labourers) should be monitored by the Holder of the Environmental Authorisation through a grievance mechanism described in the EMP. Such a grievance mechanism should take into account economic and social inequality and be made accessible and known to all inhabitants of the CLAs, not just the land owners. Such a grievance mechanism should be in place for the duration of the development process through to the end of the decommissioning phase;
12. The Chance Fossil Finds Protocol (See Appendix 2.2) should be implemented in the event of the discovery of significant new fossils during the construction phase;
13. Monitoring of all major surface clearance and deeper (> 1m) excavations for fossil material (bones, teeth, petrified wood, etc.) by the ECO on an on-going basis during the construction phase. Significant fossil finds to be reported to Heritage Western Cape (HWC) (Western Cape sites) or the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) (Northern Cape sites) for recording and sampling by a professional palaeontologist;
14. The final layout to be assessed by an archaeologist, with field surveys conducted where necessary;
15. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted at once. The find should be reported to the heritage authorities (SAHRA in the Northern Cape and HWC in the Western Cape) and may require inspection by an archaeologist to determine whether mitigation should take place and what form that mitigation should take.

AS

21.2 Proposed Construction of Two Wind Energy Turbines on The Buffeljags Abalone Farm, Farm 357 (Bredasdorp) near Pearly Beach: NM HM / BREDASDORP / BUFFELJAGS ABALONE FARM 357

Case No: 18030515SB0308E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ACRM was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt gave a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr Charl Bruwer was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- SB reported that a cease works order has been served.
- The concerns raised by the APM were noted.
- A NID was submitted in March 2018 and an HIA was requested. This was submitted in January 2019. The HIA was for the construction of three wind turbines but the Committee noted that two turbines and possibly new roads have already been completed.
- In 2010, an AIA by Jonathan Kaplan was conducted for the Abalone Farm. He identified numerous shell middens and test excavations were undertaken by Pro-Active Archaeology in 2011. According to the 2019 HIA by Kaplan, a site of Grade III C significance was destroyed by turbine WTG1.
- It was noted that the VIA was conducted by the owner of the facility;
- It was therefore concluded that the construction work has taken place without an application for approval under Section 38(8) or the issue of a Section 35 permit.

The Committee informed the Environmental Assessment Practitioner that notwithstanding the Archaeological report submitted, as well as previous approvals granted in respect of the Abalone farm, it is not currently in a position to provide qualified comment on the impact of the unauthorized work without undertaking a site inspection to ascertain the significance of archaeological site WTG1 and the damage done to the site and to ascertain the impacts of the access roads and the powerlines on possible archaeological resources and whether there was associated approval prior to the HIA by HWC.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection (LW, GT, CM and SB to liaise).

SB

**21.3 Proposed Construction of Two Powerlines Servicing Beaufort West WEF, Central Karoo: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST WEF**

Case No: 16050523AS0802M

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by PGS Consulting was tabled.

Mr Andrew September gave a PowerPoint presentation.

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Previous approvals were noted.

FINAL COMMENT:

The HIA complies with s38(3) of the NHRA. HWC supports the proposal and recommends that the following conditions are imposed by the consenting authority.

Archaeology:

The AIA report is endorsed with the following amendment to the recommendations:

1. From the information presented in the archaeological report and to the specialist knowledge of the committee members, the APM Committee is of the opinion that

the mitigation measures proposed in the report are not warranted, but, as a best practice measure, any “find spots” and/or sites that can be avoided, should be avoided.

2. If the archaeological conditions are stipulated in the EMP, then there is no need for a separate Archaeological Management Plan.
3. Demarcate the ridge where Site 2 is located as a no-go area during the construction of the Trakas substation.
4. A walk down of the final alignment of the powerlines will be required if the alignment deviates from the centre alignment of the corridor.

Palaeontology:

1. The ECO responsible for the electrical infrastructure developments should be made aware of the potential occurrence of scientifically-important fossil remains (e.g. vertebrate bones, teeth, burrows and trackways, petrified wood, plant-rich beds) within the development footprint.
2. During the construction phase all major clearance operations (e.g. for new access roads, turbine placements) and deeper (>1 m) excavations should be monitored for fossil remains on an on-going basis by the ECO.
3. Should substantial fossil remains be encountered at surface or exposed during construction, the ECO should safeguard these, preferably in situ. They should then alert the relevant provincial heritage management authority as soon as possible.

AS

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23. SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES

23.1 None

24 SECTION 42 – HERITAGE AGREEMENT

24.1 None

25. OTHER/ ADVICE

25.1 None

26 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

26.1 The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions.

27. CLOSURE: 14:43

28. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 10 April 2019

CHAIRPERSON _____ **DATE** _____

SECRETARY _____ **DATE** _____