

**Approved Decisions 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, 15 May 2019**

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 None

13 SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION

**13.1 Proposed Redevelopment, Erven 3189, 3200-3203, 192-198 Loop Street, Cape Town: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ERVEN 3189, 3200-3203**

Case No: 17111314KR1115M; 16061504KR0728M; 130117ZS11M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- In response to the site inspection report back, Mr Aikman noted that the Madame Zingara and Cara Lazuli portions of the site, which the Committee had not been able to inspect previously, due to that entrance being bricked-up, had less surviving fabric than the Ivory Room, and not more, as was intimated in the site inspection report.
- Mr Aikman advised that the owner was happy to arrange for the brickwork to be taken down temporarily to allow the Committee to inspect the portions of the site which they were unable to. The Committee agreed to this.
- The Committee also noted that the applicant had tabled the application with the CIFA as requested, and that they were still awaiting their formal comment.

INTERIM COMMENT:

On the advice of the heritage practitioner, the Committee resolved to undertake a supplementary site inspection on the 24th of May at 11:00.

HB

**13.2 Proposed Redevelopment of Portion 2 of Farm 481, Stellenbosch: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/STELLENBSOCH/ PTN 2 FARM 481**

Case No: 18081303HB0903M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the report back from the site inspection, and agreed that a proper fabric analysis of Barn 4 is required, in order to assist in determining the age of the structure, (which could further define its significance), as well as

provide clues in respect of the appropriate detailing, as well as the nature and extent of the proposed alterations and additions to this structure.

- A fabric analysis of Barn3 would also be required for similar reasons.
- The Committee noted the proposed additions to Barn 4, and were sympathetic to the proposed use as an event venue, and the notion of adding to the rear of the Barn was supported in principle. The Committee did however express concerns around the amount and scale of additions as currently proposed, and noted that these must be subservient to the barn.
- It was recommended that an architect with the requisite heritage experience in dealing with structures of this nature is engaged to conduct a fabric analysis of the barns, and assist with the proposed alterations or conservation work for these structures.
- It was also recommended that appropriate informants be provided in the HIA in order to guide a suitable and appropriately scaled response for the proposed additions to Barn 4.
- The location of the proposed parking is supported.
- The heritage practitioner was commended on the very thorough and informative HIA report thus far.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee awaits the updated information, as per discussion to be included in the HIA.

HB

13.3 Proposed mixed-use development on Erven 884, 889, 895 and 5856, Reitz Street, Masonic Hotel Precinct, Robertson: NM HM/ROBERTSON/ERVEN 884, 889, 895 AND 5856

Case No: 181002306AS1101M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the written concerns received from the Robertson Museum and an affected neighbour.
- The Committee considered the site inspection report and endorsed its findings, noting that the area in which the development is located is a heritage context, notwithstanding its current absence of formal protection. The Committee agreed that the streetscape is a heritage resource.
- Whilst the Committee was satisfied that the proposed development, and its planning typology could comfortably sit within this heritage context in principle, a number of strong concerns was expressed.
- The Committee noted the recommended conditions in respect of the semi-detached cottages located on the property, however noted that the interior, lean-to sections and service additions of the two cottages had not been assessed in the HIA. In that regard the HIA could not be considered as having complied with the provisions of s38(3), as neither a proper assessment of heritage significance, nor the impact of the proposed development on significance has been undertaken.
- The HIA assigned a Grading of IIIB to the Masonic Hotel, which the Committee endorsed. However, the Committee noted that the proposed development entails almost the wholesale removal of internal historic fabric from the hotel. It is strongly questioned as to whether this would be an appropriate response, as it would clearly impact negatively on the significance of this structure. The internal

fabric is noted as being as equally important in contributing to heritage significance, as its façade, and the two cannot be divorced. The Committee noted that a proper analysis of the internal fabric is required, and that this should inform an appropriate internal development response which does not detract from the significance of the structure.

- The Committee further noted its concern in respect of the scale, bulk, detailing and massing of the proposed development. The Committee had observed that the site plays a transitional role between the commercial character of Reitz Street, and the residential character of Hoop Street, however the development itself has not responded to this, and instead, has imposed an over scaled, and bulky development model into the site, particularly the supermarket component, which, whilst responding to the requirements of the proposed anchor tenant, has not responded to the identified heritage resources, or scale and character of the streetscape, or the structures on the site noted as having significance. Furthermore, the architecture appears to be unresolved.
- The Committee does not accept that a preconceived development model should be inserted into the environment with only proposed mitigations proposed to lessen impact.
- Instead, appropriate heritage informants must be provided by the Heritage Practitioner that will guide an appropriate development model and form, that responds to heritage resources.
- The Committee agrees with the Heritage Practitioner that the proposed signage wall proposed for Hoop Street is inappropriate.
- It was finally noted that new drawings had been prepared by the applicants', which includes a new entrance off Church Street, which is a significant streetscape. The Heritage Practitioner informed the Committee that the new drawings had not been assessed in the HIA. This must be rectified.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The current HIA is regarded as incomplete, and the Committee awaits a revised and updated HIA submission, which responds to the concerns raised by the Committee and which complies with the provisions of s38(3).

AS

13.4 Proposed deviations to existing SDP for mixed-use development on Longkloof Studios, Erf 152678, Kloof Street, Gardens: MA HM/GARDENS/ERF 152678

Case No: 110727TG34

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed.

- This site inspection was undertaken due to the changes to the Site Development Plan (SDP) resulting in the recommendation that the major portion of the facade of the red brick MLT building be rebuilt and not be retained due to structural concerns arising from the parking basement construction. The revised proposal submitted shows the retention of the central corbel arched entrance section (together with the intact upper double sliding sash and 1919 date), as well as the stone plinth. The remainder would be demolished and rebuilt.
- The interior is heavily modified, but the '*parti*' of the building, with the central staircase and flanking spaces remains clear. There is certainly scope to regain significance by sensitive interventions in the interior generally.

- More troubling is the impact of the demolition and rebuilding of the facade, the retention of the plinth and central area notwithstanding, for reasons noted below:
 - the fenestration has undergone change over time, to allow larger windows, and the brickwork scars can be read in the building. This subtlety would be lost.
 - the pattern of larger service doors each side of the main doorway is still evident.
 - the changes show the evolution of the building over time.
 - the red brick is well patinated and has mellowed over time, adding to character and significance.
 - these changes, though deviating from the original 1919 design, do not detract from the facade as the design is tough enough to handle this.
 - reconstructing poses a risk of 'sterilising' the facade.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee members present agreed to the presentation of an updated proposal by the applicant since this directly addressed concerns raised. This revised proposal, dated 15-05-2019, for the main façade is supported since the heritage and architectural issues as noted by the Committee are addressed in the redesign. The applicants request for rebuilding the short façade on the northern side was similarly supported.

The revised drawings as per above are to be submitted to HWC for approval.

AS

**13.5 Proposed Development, Erven 8504, 8505 and 8513, Woodstock: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/WOODSTOCK/ ERVEN 8504, 8505 AND 8513**

Case No: 16072505WD0810M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Mr Tayyib Ogier, and Mr Rushaan Bester, on behalf of the District Six Beneficiary and Restitution Trust, made representation to the Committee.
- Concerns raised include the loss of the historic residential use of the site, as well as the proposed development not responding to the concerns previously raised by the IACom in respect of the development being seen to respond to the residential context and scale down drastically. They added that they would prefer a mixed-use building, with a residential component.
- The applicants responded, noting that the site is zoned as MU2, and that the revised proposal reflects a far better articulated building, with punctured openings, instead of strip windows, that reflect the a more residential architecture.
- The Committee noted that whilst it agrees that from an architectural point of view, the proposed building is one which is better resolved, it did not consider that previous concerns raised by the Committee had been adequately addressed.
- It was reiterated that the significance of the site is not any tangible qualities per se, but its high social significance. This was previously a small block of residential buildings which had survived the forced removals of the Apartheid era, (ironically because they were probably not zoned for residential use at the time, as indeed

was the case with the Francis Osbourne Street blocks), and that their more recent loss had effectively further erased a very significant layer of the heritage and memory of District Six.

- It was also noted that at the time when The Boulevard was initially approved, all heritage resource indicators had acknowledged the significance of the current subject site, then a residential block, and the design of The Boulevard at the time had to respond accordingly in order to not overwhelm, the significance of the block.
- Notwithstanding that the Committee agreed that architecturally the revised building is better resolved than the previous submission, it did not believe that the building provides a meaningful transition between The Boulevard and the surviving residentially scaled fabric.
- It was noted that previous comments from the Committee informed, *“the site has always been a part of residential District Six fabric, and not The Boulevard office park”*, and that, *“the site must be seen as a part of, and respond in scale and street-frontage to, the finer grained and scaled residential fabric still surviving in the area. As such, any proposed development on the site must scale down drastically in height and transition between The Boulevard building to a residentially scaled development on its street frontage”*.
- The Committee agreed that the revised proposal had not scaled down drastically, as requested, and does not reflect, or acknowledge, the site’s historic role or use, as a residential block.
- In its current form, the Committee noted that it could not approve the development as it stands, as it is still one which primarily responds to the scale and use of The Boulevard, and further erases the memory and meaning and significance of a once vibrant residential community.
- The applicants agreed that they will take the findings back to the developer, and that they will engage with the objectors in order to see if there is a solution that can be found which would be to the benefit of all parties.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee does not support the proposed development in its current form, and will await the submission of any revised material that addresses concerns raised.

WD

**13.6 Proposed Demolition of existing buildings & development of an apartment building at Erven 332, Re-335 & 336, Braemar Road, Green Point: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ GREEN POINT/ ERVEN 332, RE-335 & 336**

Case No: 18032809ZK0510E

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Mr Burnett, appearing on behalf of the Green Point Ratepayers Association (GPRA) provided brief comment to the Committee, noting that the GPRA did not believe that there had been any fundamental change to the proposed development and had not meaningfully addressed the previous comment provided by the IACom. The GPRA believes the amended proposal still reflects an “applied articulated façade” only.
- The applicant submitted that the proposed development had been meaningfully articulated, and that height of the development had been dropped by 1,2m. It was submitted that the building sits much better in its context.

- The Committee noted that it had previously concurred with the consultants grading of the structures earmarked for demolition, and had agreed that they were of lesser intrinsic significance in themselves, the grade III structures identified *do* contribute the proposed Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ) in which they are located, and reflected the residential qualities of the wider Braemar Estate lying to the West. As such, any replacement building or set of buildings must reflect this and should not be of such scale that it would result in the site being excised from the proposed HPOZ.
- The Committee noted concern in respect of the overall scale and bulk of the revised proposal, and further noted that although the height had been dropped by 1,2 m, the Committee had clearly set neighbouring buildings to the left and right as a height datum to which the structure should respond along its Braemar Road edge. The documentation submitted however, had not provided any drawings which demonstrated the relationship between the height of the proposal, and the neighbouring buildings, and as such the Committee was unable to provide further comment in this regard.
- The applicants must submit additional drawings, (streetscape), which show the proposed development in relation to its neighbouring blocks of flats

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee awaits submission of the additional information requested.

HB

13.7 Proposed Subdivision, Rezoning and Development on Erf 46115, 2 Glen Darrach Road, Rondebosch: MA HM/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46115

Case No: 171124111ZK1128E

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- This application was previously tabled at the IACom meeting of 10 October 2018. Representations were made by I&APs and the proposal was discussed at length. This comment should be read in conjunction with the site inspection report and the minutes of that IACom meeting. At that meeting, the proposal was supported by the Committee, with only two further requirements: (1) Further roof articulation of Blocks 1 and 3 and meaningful articulation of the façades of Block 3 and (2) more detailed plans, including a Landscape Plan.
- Ms Rigby and Dr Townsend made representations on behalf of the Rustenburg Valley Residents' Association (RVRA), who has also submitted a written comment. The RVRA maintained that the environmental quality and townscape of the area would be substantially disrupted by the bulk and form proposed in the new development and that the greening of the edges of the site only, would be insufficient in mitigating the impacts on the surrounds. They noted an increase in density of $\pm 60\%$, when compared to the existing density of the neighbourhood and expressed doubt as to whether the purported amount of tree planting on the site was feasible and adequate. They were also of the view that Blocks 1 and 3 remain excessively monolithic and that even the smaller blocks that abut the streets are inadequately articulated.
- The Committee indicated that that the amount of densification was considered sensitive and was appropriate for this context. Some were of the view that the proposal was in fact quite conservative / suburban in nature. The design response, including pitched, hipped roofs was supported and the fragmented,

two-storey buildings along Glen Darrach Road and Lovers Walk were considered to have a domestic character and to make an appropriate transition between the public domain and the larger blocks within in the private domain behind.

- The Committee enquired about the nature of the greening shown on the Landscape Plan above the parking basement portion. The landscape architect, Ms Bormans, confirmed that these were pergolas, not trees in planters, and that the proposed trees of stature were to be located beyond the edges of the parking garage, within the sections facing the public domain - Glen Darrach Road and Lovers Walk. The Committee also enquired whether both Oak Trees along Lovers Walk would be retained. Ms Bormans confirmed this.
- The Committee reiterated their support for the development proposal and was unanimous that the two outstanding issues, previously raised, have been adequately addressed for the application to be approved. The Committee supported the additional roof and façade articulation, as well as the updated landscape plan.
- It was noted that façade articulation on the larger blocks (Blocks 1 and 3) could be enhanced even further and should be explored during the next round of design development. Final building plans must be submitted to IACom for endorsement.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorses the HIA report of July 2018 and the supplementary report of April 2019 as having complied with the provisions of s.38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee approves the demolition of the existing structures on the site and the proposed development, subject to the following conditions:

1. The layout, nature, height and envelope of any proposed new buildings must be substantially in accordance with the updated sketch drawings by Dekker Papendorf Architects, being:
 - a) Site Development Plan. Rev 4. dated April 2019;
 - b) Basement Parking Plan. Rev 4. dated April 2019;
 - c) Ground Floor Plan. Rev 4. dated April 2019;
 - d) First Floor Plan. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - e) Second Floor Plan. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - f) Roof Plan. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - g) Site Sections. 1-4. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - h) Site Section 5. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - i) North and East Elevations. Rev.4. dated April 2019;
 - j) South and West Elevations. Rev.4 dated April 2019.
2. That the proposed landscaping to the development is substantially in accordance with the Landscape Plan prepared by Terra+, being Drawing No. 071-02.2/2, dated 22/02/2019.
3. That Final Building Plans, showing architectural detailing, as well as edge detailing to Lovers Walk, and a Final Tree Management Plan, is submitted to Heritage Western Cape for endorsement, prior to Building Plan submission to the City of Cape Town.
4. That an archaeologist is contracted to oversee and monitor all development related earthworks *prior* to any construction work taking place on the site. A monitoring report must be submitted to HWC for record purposes within three months of the conclusion of earthworks.

AS

**13.8 Proposed Subdivision for Prospective Residential Units on Erf 177476, Main Road, St. James: NM
HM/ST JAMES/ERF 177476**

Case No: 17090415AS0914M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Clarification was requested by the Committee in respect of the dwelling approved on the existing property by the City of Cape Town (CoCT), and it was queried as to whether a s38(1) NID was ever submitted to HWC. This does not appear to have been the case.
- It is understood that civil works have taken place on site, which have had considerable impact on the site. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) was noted as being more than six months old, which had not taken the site in its current state into account. Mr Aikman was informed that the VIA must be updated.
- The Committee noted that it would be appropriate for the Committee to conduct a site inspection in this instance, in order to more fully understand the site, and work which has already taken place.
- The Committee will await submission of updated information to be formally submitted to HWC before it sets a date for this inspection. This can be done via email.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee awaits the submission of the updated information requested and will set a date for a site inspection once this has been received by HWC.

AS

**13.9 Proposed Redevelopment of Erven 27617 and RE 27377, co Main Road and Dickens Street, Salt River: NM
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/SALT RIVER/Erven 27617 and RE 27377**

Case No: 18081303HB0903E

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Ms Abrahamse noted that additional drawings have been prepared which reflect changes made to the scheme, following comment received from the CoCT Heritage Resources Section, but that they had not yet been assessed in the HIA.
- The Committee agreed that these drawings could be entered into the record, as they are generally in accordance with the proposed design already submitted. However, as they have not yet been commented on in the HIA report, this would need to be remedied, before any decision can be taken in respect of the proposed development, and that Interim Comment will be provided by the Committee in the meanwhile.
- The Committee commended Ms Abrahamse on her very comprehensive report that had in particular teased out the urban design and heritage related informants which pertain to the site, surrounds and streetscape. The Committee endorsed the report's findings in respect of the significance of the structures located on the site, as well as the heritage informants provided.

- A good amount of discussion followed, which centred around the identification and assessment of heritage resources in the context which is acknowledged as a streetscape which contains a number of very fine and significant modernist architecture, which has social association with the clothing industry.
- Notwithstanding its noting that the site and street falls within a proposed HPOZ, the streetscape, noted as being generally hostile, with a degraded ground level interface, is acknowledged by the Committee as being difficult to classify as a consistent streetscape or heritage resource in itself, but rather that the stretch of Victoria Road between the Cavalla factory, and Rex Trueform Building, (a recently declared Provincial Heritage Site), to the north-west, through to Browning Road, in the south-east, should be viewed as a “sequence of events”, (the “events” being the significant modernist buildings as objects in space), that are revealed as one travels down Victoria Road. Views of these iconic buildings should not be obscured and they should not be drowned out by excessive massing or visual “noise”.
- In this regard, the Committee did express certain concerns, in that the proposal as reflected both in the submission and additional drawings presented, appears to reflect a large and bulky building that dwarfs the Grade IIIA House of Monatic building, and therefore runs against the notion of a “sequence of events”. The proposed forecourt space bordering the House of Monatic at ground level was acknowledged, but the cantilevered Levels 5-7 and the development behind the forecourt were not considered to adequately comply with the heritage indicator, which require the proposal to “*respond to the perceived datum/band of middle-rise fabric along this part of the street, between 3 and 5 storeys*” and the creation of an articulated base for taller buildings.
- The applicants responded by noting that the proposed building has been further broken up, and set back from the House of Monatic in order to address these concerns. It was however acknowledged that the drawings submitted do not as yet, reflect the intent, and that these will be further worked on.
- The Committee noted that it supports in principle the proposed treatment, and partial demolition to the double storey Grade IIIC Victorian structure (Erf 27617) which is being retained within the development, however noted that currently, and based on drawings provided, this structure appears somewhat dwarfed by the scale and massing of the proposed development. This needs to be explored further.

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee awaits the submission of the updated HIA and drawings.

HB

**13.10 Proposed Residential Development of Portion 32 of Farm Haasendal 222, Brackenfell: NM
HM/STELLENBOSCH/FARM HAASENDAL 222**

Case No: 17050411AS0519E

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted a previous decision and approval in respect of the property which was granted by HWC in 2012.
- The Committee agreed that heritage resources would not be impacted by the revised development proposal.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee endorsed the HIA report as having complied with s.38(3) of the NHRA and resolved that the proposed development may proceed.

AS

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 Proposed residential village on Farm Esperant, Erf 4722, Blouvillei, Wellington: MA
HM/WELLINGTON/ERF 4722**

Case No: 17080109ZK0122M

It was brought to the attention of the Committee that objectors had not been informed that the item was to be tabled.

The Committee sought clarification as to whether there was a time limit for comment from HWC to be provided to DEADP, and it was noted that the EAP had withdrawn the application from the NEMA process in order to first satisfy heritage requirements.

As such, it was noted that no party would be prejudiced if the application were held over until the next meeting in order for all parties to be present.

IACom noted the site inspection undertaken on 6 May 2019, and resolved that as neither the representatives of the applicant, nor the objectors were present, the site visit report should be forwarded to them in the meantime

The matter will be heard at the next meeting on 12 June 2019.

AS

**16.2 Farm 41 Boterberg Philadelphia Service Station, Philadelphia: MA
HM/ Cape Town Metropolitan/ Philadelphia/ Farm 41 Boterberg**

Case No: 15062211WD0624M

DISCUSSION

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee was informed that following their Final Comment in respect of this application, the developer had taken the opportunity to further revise the development proposal in attempt to address some of the concerns previously

raised by the Committee. The Committee agreed therefore that a Revised Final Comment could be provided.

- The EAP informed the Committee that SANRAL has to provide another service station on the other side of the road to one which exists, if, as in this case, road improvements have precluded a vehicle travelling in the opposite direction from being able to turn into it.
- The Committee noted that the scale of the proposed development had been reduced, the site removed further away from the Farmstead, that clusters of trees more typical of the Swartland landscape had been provided, the truck stop had been separated from the main forecourt, and that the proposed berm on the western side had been removed.
- The Heritage Practitioner noted that the development had been improved, but that there were still concerns about the scale of the buildings. The Committee agreed with the consultant that a single storey, 6m wide 'longhouse' model would be far preferable to the over scaled building alternatives as submitted.
- The Committee noted the changes, however reiterated that it is the petrol station typology in this location; the scale of the buildings, the attendant works associated with petrol stations which includes signage and lighting, as well as the engineered and macadamized entry road and traffic circle, and that it is the cumulative negative impact of that on an identified Grade IIIA landscape to which it was strongly opposed.
- Whilst agreeing with, and endorsing the consultant's mitigatory recommendations, the Committee resolved not to support the proposed development, or its typology, in this location.

REVISED FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee reiterated its previous endorsement of the HIA as having met the requirements of s.38(3) of the NHRA, however for reasons as tabled in the discussion, and previously provided by the Committee, cannot support the proposed development, as it will have a negative and irreversible impact on identified heritage resources.

In particular, the current service station buildings adjacent to the forecourt are considered to be over-scaled in width and height. A single storey, longhouse model, with a width of no more than 6m and a pitched, corrugated iron roof, would be more appropriate.

WD

**16.3 Proposed residential development on Portion 1 of Farm Johannesdal 1202,
Pniel: NM
HM/STELLENBOSCH/FARM JOHANNESDAL 1202**

Case No: 14082003AS0826M

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Monday, 3 June 2019 (CM, FV, CSn, MS, MM and SM).

AS

**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 **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.