

**MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
INVENTORIES, GRADING AND INTERPRETATION COMMITTEE**

**Approved Minutes of a meeting of the Inventories, Grading and Interpretation Committee  
of Heritage Western Cape held on 25 September 2014, at 09H30 in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor  
boardroom at the Offices of the Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport, Protea  
Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town**

**1. Opening and Welcoming**

The Chairperson, Dr Antonia Malan, opened the meeting at 09h30 and welcomed everyone present.

**2. Attendance**

**Inventories, Grading and Interpretation Committee:**

Dr Antonia Malan  
Ms Maureen Wolters  
Ms Quahnita Samie  
Ms Laura Robinson  
Mr Ignatius de Swardt  
Mr Stefan de Kock  
Dr Stephen Townsend

**HWC Staff**

Ms Jenna Lavin

**Visitors**

None

**3. Apologies**

Mr Rowen Ruiters

**4. Disclosure of Interest**

None

**5. Approval of the agenda**

The agenda was approved

**6. Approval of minutes of previous minutes dated:**

- 23 June 2014

The Committee resolved to approve the minute with one amendment on page 2.

- **24 June 2014**

The Committee resolved to approve the minute.

- **13 August 2014**

The Committee resolved to approve the minute.

## **7. Confidential matters**

None

## **8. Administration Matters**

### **8.1 Grading of former National Monuments**

Mr Hall noted that the purpose of grading National Monuments, as required by Section 58, is in the interest of transformation and nation-building.

**The committee noted that:**

- A discussion is required regarding the “tolerance for change” or “reconstruction”.
- The question was asked as to whether the degree of reconstruction impacts on significance or authenticity.

**The committee decided that:**

In instances where the committee does not have sufficient information regarding earlier ‘restorations’, a conservative approach to regarding should be used and the grading is likely to remain as is.

### **8.2 Methodology for assessing surveys**

Mr Hall highlighted the need for a more efficient way to deal with the inventories presented to the IGIC.

**The committee noted that:**

- It was agreed that all of the Grade I and II resources must be looked at in detail.
- An audit methodology is proposed for Grade III resources ie a representative sample is selected that is looked at in detail and is critically assessed.

- It was suggested that the selection of the sample should be taken from each precinct so that a range of resources are covered across diverse areas.
- Gradings are relative in terms of the geographic location of the resource and its context ie a Grade IIIB in Green Point will be different to a Grade IIIB in Robertson.
- It is noted that the gradings included in surveys are not necessarily absolute and are contingent on the quality and depth of information submitted to inform the grading. Additional information and detail may change the grading.
- It was agreed that gradings should always include a description of the party (consultant, official, committee, etc) which determined the grading and the date of the determination. In other words, for a grading to be useful in decision-making, the 'authorship' and date of the grading is necessary.

**The committee decided that:**

A process is required in order to review the grading. An argument is required to substantiate any challenge to the grading. This concept should be included in HWC's Short Guide to Grading and in the Guide to Surveys.

A pre-briefing meeting is recommended between the commissioners of the surveys and the IGIC to develop tender requirements (this is self-evidently before consultants are appointed).

Surveyors should engage with the IGIC at an early stage and provide a sample cross-section of proposed gradings for discussion.

An update to the Guide to Surveys is required and also possibly a workshop.

### 8.3 City of Cape Town Grading

**The committee noted that:**

The CoCT understands that it is competent to grade. As such, they contend that if the CoCT has provided a grading in terms of its grading process (a three-tier system), HWC cannot change the grading in its committee meetings.

At present, the CoCT is not grading everything. The CoCT is using different processes for gradings and HWC has requested that the kind of grading process used on applications is communicated to HWC with submissions. It was also noted that the recent CoCT gradings have been carried out by small and often very inexperienced officials and interns and have not had any public or expert input; and the pre-2000 gradings are self-evidently not reliant on NHR Act criteria of significance.

**The committee decided that:**

The CoCT surveyors must comply with the HWC guidelines and the methodology used must be presented to HWC at least for a first geographical area before HWC could concede that the CoCT gradings are useful.

Indeed, the process of grading is always iterative; and the very notion that gradings determined by unknown individuals or groups, particularly those made in surveys (rather than individually on the basis of detailed historical and contextual research and assessment) should prevail as a matter of course is self-evidently unsustainable.

## **9. Appointments**

### **9.1 None**

## **10. Surveys**

### **10.1 Stellenbosch Survey**

The committee assessed a range of structures and their proposed gradings. Please see the attached Excel Spreadsheet with specific recommendations.

#### **The committee noted that:**

We appreciate and acknowledge, and are very grateful for, the amount of work and effort that has been put into this survey. The historic core of Stellenbosch is of enormous heritage significance. The Heritage Foundation website is an exemplary initiative for making heritage information accessible.

However,

- Important relevant information is not included in the templates submitted to HWC (information related to assessing significance, such as a brief 'statement of significance').
- The mapping provided is inadequate and does not assist with understanding the survey.
- The photographs provided are not always adequate for assessment.
- There is inconsistency between the information provided in "General Evaluation", "Significance" and the tick box indicating assessment.
- The Aesthetic significance, if nothing else, must be assessed to inform the grading.
- There was considerable disagreement over the gradings submitted in the survey and the gradings as determined by the committee. In many cases in

the survey, the information provided did not substantiate the proposed grading.

**The committee decided that:**

Given inconsistencies in data capture and queries regarding proposed grading as well as a lack of substantiating information, the survey as submitted cannot be approved at this stage. The committee looks forward to engaging with the SHF and Municipality regarding the way forward.

## 10.2 Knysna Survey

The committee assessed a range of structures and their proposed gradings. Please see the attached Excel Spreadsheet with specific recommendations.

**The committee noted that:**

The committee referred to the correspondence submitted by André Vercueil [Our Ref: 4 June 2014] and the interim inventory of listed buildings submitted in September 2009. The contents of the letter refer to the development of a local by-law that requires the adoption of an inventory of heritage resources.

The inventory has been submitted to HWC in terms of S 30(5) of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999). Approval of the interim inventory by the HWC IGIC does not infer that the local authority has competence to make decisions on heritage matters under its jurisdiction. HWC retains jurisdiction to make decisions in terms of the formal and general protections contained in the NHRA.

- The submitted inventory is incomplete in that buildings that are identified and numbered on the maps have not all been included in the inventory or assessed.
- In addition, not all significant structures have been identified in the maps and as such, the mapping is incomplete.
- The recent Guidelines must be referred to regarding mapping requirements.
- Consideration needs to be given to the description of the boundaries of conservation precincts such as Church Square, Belvidere and Millwood Museum complex..
- Proposed conservation areas are too broad and do not seem to relate to the proposed gradings.

**The committee decided that:**

We appreciate and acknowledge, and are very grateful for, the amount of work and effort that has been put into this survey. Based on the submitted information, the

committee agreed with most of the proposed gradings. As this is an interim (and incomplete) inventory, the committee looks forward to the submission of the completed survey.

The committee recommends that a delegation from HWC meets with the author and the Municipality regarding a way forward.

## **11. GRADING OF PREVIOUS NATIONAL MONUMENTS**

11.1 None

## **12. NOMINATIONS OF PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES.**

12.1 Update on PHS's for Gazette in September

Miss Lavin updated the IGIC on the four new Provincial Heritage Sites that were gazetted on 23 September 2014. These sites are:

- Harold Cressy High School, Cape Town
- St Georges Cathedral, Cape Town
- Verlorenvlei Heritage Settlement, Piketberg
- Diepkloof Rock Shelter, Piketberg

## **13. De-proclamation of existing Provincial Heritage Sites.**

13.1 None

## **14. OTHER MATTERS**

14.1 None

15. **DATE OF NEXT MEETING: 26 September 2014**

17. **CLOSURE** **15:30**

Mr Andrew Hall  
ACCOUNTING OFFICER  
For Head of Department