

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 19 April 2023**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Mr David Gibbs, officially opened the meeting at 09:00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr David Gibbs (DG) (Chair)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Ms Katie Smuts (KS)
Ms Samantha Lee (SL)
Mr Chefferino Fortuin (CF)
Ms Helene van der Merwe (HvdM)

Staff

Ms Penelepe Meyer (PM)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJh)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Corne Nortje (CN)
Ms Zikhona Sigonya-Ndongeni (ZSN)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)

Observers

None

Visitors

Dr Nicolas Baumann
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Chief Khaesen Maart
Mr Chris Snelling
Mr Piet Louw
Mr Carin Smuts
Ms Claire Abrahamse
Ms Marika Abrahams
Mr Dennis Fabian
Ms Adel Groenewald
Mr Cahlan Williams
Ms Kathy Dumbrell
Chief Ewold Smith
Ms Antonette de Beer

Mr Neil Schwartz
Mr Burgert de Jager
Mr Clive Theunissen
Mr Henry Aikman
Mr Aldrich Louis
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Ms Jacky Poking
Mr Lionel Uithaler
Ms Anastasia Messaris
Mr Christos Simos
Ms Quahnita Samie
Ms Melun Jephtha
Mr Jonathan Kaplan

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent
None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 19 April 2023

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 19 April 2023 with minor changes.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 15 March 2023

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 15 March 2023 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

- DS: item 13.1
- SL: item 13.1
- KS: item 13.3 and 13.5

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Appointments

None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the following appeals matters:

- Proposed Partial Demolition, Alterations & Additions on Erven 2445 & 2546, Cnr Joubert & Merriman Street, Stellenbosch
- Proposed removal of five Eucalyptus trees on Erf 665, 8 Weyers Avenue, Durbanville
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 155802, 5 Victoria Road, Foreshore
- Proposed Semi Destructive Analysis of Sediment in Pancho's Kitchen Midden, Elands Bay
- Proposed Semi Destructive Analysis of Sediment in Mike Taylor Midden, Elands Bay

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:

- Proposed Development on Erven 2902, 2802, 2791, 2798, 2799-RE, Corner Dorp & Buitengracht Street, Bo-Kaap
- Proposed New (Re) Development on Erven 284, 287, 288 & 289, Cnr Clarens & Regent Road, Sea Point
- Proposed Alterations and Redevelopment of Re Farm 1592, Paarl (Adara Palmiet Valley Estate)

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

For discussion.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed enclosed Padel Court on Portion 1 of Farm 1791 Spice Route Destination, Suid-Agter Paarl Road
- Proposed Development of a Portion of the Remainder of Farm 1305, Stellenbosch (Schoongezicht)

MATTERS DISCUSSED

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

11.1 Proposed enclosed Padel Court on Portion 1 of Farm 1791 Spice Route Destination, Suid-Agter Paarl Road: NM CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / PTN 1 OF FARM 1791

Case No: HWC23031310SJ0314

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on 5 May 2023.

SJ

11.2 Proposed Hotel on Erf 149294-Re, Quay 7, East Pier Precinct, V&A Waterfront, Cape Town: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / WATERFRONT / ERF 149294-RE

Case No: HWC23022810SJ0227

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Dr Nicolas Baumann (heritage consultant) and Mr Neil Schwartz (Waterfront Planning Manager) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- This is a new application following the advice of the IACom.
- The site contained warehouse graded IIIB which has been demolished, the remaining footprint forms the location for a proposed new structure. The wider V&A context has a grading of IIIA.
- Draft Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is already in progress and will include a public participation process.
- A height limit of 24m had been set originally. The height of the design proposal (34m) was challenged at the Appeal committee, where a maximum height of 29m was agreed. In addition, the 'dematerialized' nature of the design for the upper levels are to be observed.

- Notwithstanding that the design process has advanced substantially, the heritage and visual indicators which arise from the HIA process (including Visual Statement) must inform the design resolutions and not merely post-rationalize foregone design conclusions.

RESPONSE TO NID:

Heritage Impact Assessment is required, inclusive of a Visual Statement which focuses on the nature of built form typology, scale, character and materiality appropriate to the heritage context of the site. (Note: a full Visual impact assessment is not required).

SJ

11.3 Proposed Development of a Logistics Hub to Stockpile and Export Manganese and other Commodities on Farm 1132 (Portion 2 of Yzervarkensrug No 129, Portions 8 and 13, Yzervarkensrug No 127 and Portion of Farm 195), Saldanha Bay: NM HM / WEST COAST / SALDANHA BAY / FARM 1132 (PORTION 2 OF YZERVARKENSRUG NO. 129, PORTIONS 8 & 13, YZERVARKENSRUG NO. 127 & PORTION OF FARM 195)

Case No: HWC23012007AM0320

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the case.

Chief Khaesen Maart (Cochoqua Khoisan Community) and Mr Aldrich Louis (applicant) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The site is located within a landscape formally used by First Nation Groups for grazing livestock;
- It is also acknowledged that the West Coast was used by pre-colonial hunter-gather and pastoralist groups spanning many thousands of years as evidenced by its rich archaeological record amongst other evidence.
- Linkages of this specific site to being used by First Nation Groups for grazing livestock needs to be viewed within the provisions of the NHRA and given the already the highly transformed industrial landscape possible remaining linkages are likely tenuous from a heritage management perspective.
- Potential archaeological impact.
- Health and safety concerns were raised with respect to Manganese as a hazardous (toxic) material, yet these issues should be dealt with in terms of environmental legislation.
- The proposed manganese handling facility would be located with an existing Saldanha Steel facility for handling steel and iron ore. It was noted that the surrounding environment context was highly disturbed and degraded.
- I&APs to be properly engaged within the HIA process for meaningful consultation.
- A recommendation was made for the Cochoqua Khoisan Community to register formally as an I&AP with HWC to ensure official communication channels in heritage processes (Case officer to assist in providing information).

RESPONSE TO NID:

Heritage Impact Assessment of the proposal is required, including an Archaeological Impact Assessment to address the significance of historical use of the site by First Nation Groups.

AM

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT**12.1 Phase 1 HIA for Urban Hub Development on Erven 2902, 2802, 2791, 2798, 2799-RE, Corner Dorp & Buitengracht Street, Bo-Kaap: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / BO-KAAP / ERVEN 2902, 2802, 2791, 2798, 2799-RE**

Case No: 21102502SJ1109E

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 14 April 2023. See attached annexure SI1.

Mr Chris Snelling (heritage consultant), Mr Piet Louw (architect and urban designer) and Ms Jacky Poking (Bo-Kaap Civic and Ratepayers Association) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Meaningful and comprehensive public participation and engagement with I&APs must be included in the heritage process.
- The indicative development envelope included within the heritage indicators needs more detailed clarification in terms of appropriate height and scale in this particular heritage context.
- A townscape, streetscape, and contextual analysis with views from various vantage points is to be considered, including the significance and visual relationships of Mosques in proximity of the site.
- The design proposal in terms of its implication of proposed uses on the public interface and integration into the life of the community needs careful consideration.

INTERIM COMMENT:

1. Meaningful and comprehensive public participation and engagement with I&APs must be included within the heritage process.
2. The indicative development envelope included within the heritage indicators needs more detailed clarification in terms of appropriate height and scale in this particular heritage context.
3. A townscape, streetscape, and contextual analysis with views from various vantage points to be considered, including the significance and visual relationships of Mosques in proximity of the site.
4. The design proposal in terms of its implication of proposed uses on the public interface and integration into the life of the community needs careful consideration.

SJ

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

13.1 Proposed Redevelopment of the Artscape Precinct on Erven 186 and 187, Roggebaai, Cape Town: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CITY CENTRE / ROGGEBAAI / ERVEN 186 AND 187

Case No: 18100908AS1011E

DS and SL recused themselves and logoff from MS Teams.

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the case.

Ms Cindy Postlethwayt (heritage consultant), Mr Burgert De Jager (BFH de Jager are the Principal Agents and Project Managers) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Whereas IACom formerly recorded a decision, the official communication to the applicant was incorrectly entitled as “response to draft basic assessment”. The Applicant has requested that this clerical error be corrected, and the Record of Decision be re-issued with the correct title.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to support the amendment to read “Record of Decision” based on the following recommendation:

1. Given that the 2020 HIA met the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA (as specifically indicated in the recommendations of said report); and that the Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the IACom Meeting 9 September 2020, and the published Approved IACom Minutes 9 September 2020 constitute a legally binding decision of HWC (regardless of the fact that a recording of the meeting cannot be found by the Administration); and given that the written record of this decision clearly erroneously refers to it as a “RESPONSE TO DRAFT BASIC ASSESSMENT: INTERIM COMMENT”, HWC is requested to instruct the Administration to urgently issue a correct response as a “Record of Decision”.

CN

**13.2 Proposed New (Re) Development on Erven 284, 287, 288 & 289, Cnr Clarens & Regent Road, Sea Point: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERVEN 284, 287, 288 & 289**

Case No: 22030411NK0322E

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 14 April 2023. See attached annexure SI2.

Ms Claire Abrahamse (heritage consultant) and Ms Marika Abrahams (Berman Brothers Property Group) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The retention of the colonnaded element of the corner building as contributing to streetscape character and corner treatment.
- The need for the retention of more depth to the garage structure.
- The recommendation to commemorate the social history in relation to the Group Areas Act and Apartheid in the urban setting in some interpretive way, to prevent the erasure of a layer of heritage (whose heritage is important).

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to support the HIA as meeting the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA and endorse the recommendation of the HIA but requires refinements of the architectural proposal to address streetscapes scale and proportion as discussed.

This requires the refinement of the proposals indicating the retention of the colonnade on the corner building and the reinstatement of the proportion of the original openings on the façade of the garage structure.

A commemoration of the social history to be incorporated into the development.

SJ

13.3 Proposed Re-Development at Erven 3189, 3200 - 3203; 192 - 198 Loop Street, Cape Town: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CITY CENTRE / ROGGEBAAI / ERVEN 3189, 3200, 3201, 3202, 3203

Case No: 17111314KR1115M

KS recused herself and logoff from MS Teams.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the case.

Mr Henry Aikman (heritage consultant), Mr Dennis Fabian (Fabian and Make architects) and Ms Anastasia Messaris (Fabian and Make architects) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- An HIA was approved with conditions in 2019. This submission has been made to address these conditions.
- Extension of the basement parking was queried, however, upon comparison with the earlier submission, was found to have been already agreed to.
- It was noted that the design proposal included access onto a proposed first floor rooftop terrace that would be set directly behind the historic parapet facing Loop Street (refer L2 Plan and Section BB). Requires further discussion.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The building plans are not in accordance with what was previously approved. The Committee does not support the current proposal for the roof of the historical building facing Loop Street being used as a terrace with associated balustrade due to potential negative visual impacts on the integrity of the historic facade.

MS

13.4 Proposed Alterations and Redevelopment of Re Farm 1592, Paarl (Adara Palmiet Valley Estate), Paarl: MA HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / RE-FARM 1592

Case No: 22042902CM0509E

Ms Cecilene Muller introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 13 April 2023. See attached annexure SI3.

Mr Clive Theunissen (Drakenstein Municipality) and Ms Carin Smuts (architect) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- This is a S.38(8) application.

- The werf ensemble has heritage significance, notwithstanding later alterations to buildings.
- The proposed Guard house (building 17) was discussed in terms of appropriate architectural expression.
- The proposed roof windows in the front façade of the Homestead (building 1) were queried, (the front south elevation should remain intact without the insertion of roof windows) however roof windows at the back can be supported.
- Age of guest accommodation building 2 to be confirmed as being older than 60 years or not. (Aerial imagery suggests that the building is indeed older than 60 years). An emergency works permit is required to complete replacement of the roof in order to protect the structure. All further work to cease until the approvals process has been completed. Any unauthorized work is to be managed separately.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved that the HIA meets the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee further endorses the recommendation of the HIA, prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue, heritage specialist dated 22 February 2023 as follows:

1. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development, then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.
2. In terms of the NHRA Section 38(8), HWC assesses the application positively and provides a positive comment for the DEA&DP assessment and decision

Endorsement of the HIA is based on the following detailed issues being resolved at a building scale with building plans required to be submitted to HWC to approval.

The Committee supports the above, and further notes that whereas most of the proposed building work will not impact heritage significance; following three aspects of the proposals are identified as of primary concern, namely

- a. proposed alterations to the historic **Homestead** (glass enclosure, roof windows)
- b. the proposed **Guest Accommodation building** adjacent to the homestead,
- c. the proposed **Guard House** / reception just outside the werf entrance, which should be considered carefully in terms of its placement and detail resolution.

Whereas these interventions may be supported in principle in terms of the Site Development Plan process, going forward, further detailed design resolution should be submitted to HWC for approval, inclusive of a conservation management strategy. HWC also notes the importance of the treescape, and the proposed 'light touch' in terms of landscape and site engineering interventions, in order to preserve the authenticity and rustic quality of the farmstead.

With respect to the above, in order to address the areas of concern:

- a. **Homestead: South Elevation** & front historic axial view of the house should be retained intact, without the insertion of roof windows in this primary façade. (However, roof windows would be permissible at the back, (facing towards the boundary and not towards the werf)
- b. **Homestead: East Elevation** & aspect presented to the secondary precinct: the proposals for frameless glass enclosure should be refined holistically and in detail to address slenderness

- and colour of structure so as to 'recede' visually, and to address practicalities such as waterproofing and ventilation, to avoid future ad-hoc interventions, and to retain the vine and planted border to be incorporated into the new structure. IACom recommends that the glass enclosure aligns with the edge of the parapet, not the centre, to preserve the symmetrical presentation of the stairway balustrades. (i.e. the proposed position of glass line in relation to moulded stair balustrade to be reconsidered).
- c. The interior floor level is about 100mm lower than the exterior terrace flooring which is problematic. IACom recommends lowering the exterior floor level to below the level of the interior floor.
 - d. **Guest Accommodation Building:** door configuration as shown on the South Elevation is to be adjusted to reflect a more traditional arrangement of single doors with fanlights and separate casement windows either side, which may be more appropriate in the werf context.
 - e. **Guardhouse:** This structure should respond to the architectural character of this setting near to building 2 and the werf wall in terms of its presentation to the approach and the main werf entrance, with respect to simplicity of form, whitewashed walls, parapet, and plaster molding details.

With respect to the Drakenstein Municipality grading proposals, the heritage significance of the Homestead building itself has been diminished by the 1990's alterations (post-fire), however, due to its age, history, and role as an anchor within the setting, should be considered as having grade IIIA heritage significance, (if not a PHS). The assembly of werf and associated buildings within its landscape context should be considered as having at least grade IIIA heritage significance. There is considerable heritage value in the cultural landscape context as a whole which appears to have the wider protection of Drakenstein Municipality conservation measures.

CM

**13.5 Proposed Construction of a Temple, Administrative Unit and Utility Building on Erf 160695, 80 Liesbeeck Avenue, Observatory: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ OBSERVATORY/ ERF 160695**

Case No: 21053105AM0608

Ms Katie Smuts recused herself and logged off from MS Teams

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the case.

Ms Quahnita Samie and Ms Kathy Dumbrell (Heritage Consultants) were present and took part in the discussion.

The Committee resolved to discuss this matter as a closed session without I&APs being present.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Development of the site is supported in principle.
- The Committee has concerns around some aspects of the site planning and spatialization of certain elements in terms of their impact upon the heritage context and edges of the site, especially the western edge facing the river.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee notes that the requirements of 38(3) of the NHRA have been met in terms of the HIA process. The Committee therefore resolved to approve the development with the following conditions in order to ensure a minimal heritage impact on the landscape qualities of the heritage context:

1. The site development plan must be revised in detail to address the heritage context, in particular the adjacent heritage resources, to retain the landscape quality and visual permeability of the riverine setting and open space character.
2. The proposed new accommodation building directly adjacent to the approach road must be set back from the road to retain oblique views towards the Valkenburg homestead, including its reconstructed façade.

AM

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 Development of a Portion of the Remainder of Farm 1305, Stellenbosch (Schoongezicht): MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / REM OF FARM 1305**

Case No: 222030707NK0328E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on 5 May 2023.

SB

**15.2 Proposed Extension of the Residential, Light Industry and Business Precincts on the Western Portion of Portion 5 of Farm 742: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / PORTION OF PORTION 5 OF THE FARM 742**

Case No: 20032416JW0331E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt the case.

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

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee had indicated an interest in visiting the site but noted that this would not be possible within DEA&DP timeframes, given that that EAP had elected not to engage in pre-application consultation. The Legal Advisor noted concern that this deviated from the SOP, and placed pressure on HWC to comment with urgency.
- The Committee noted that planning for development of the Klapmuts node had happened in parallel with the compilation of the Stellenbosch Heritage Resources Inventory, which has

graded some of the landscapes that would be affected by the development as having high significance.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the heritage impact assessment prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt dated March 2023 as meeting the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA and furthermore, the Committee supports the following recommendations of the HIA:

1. Development of portion of Farm 743/5 in accordance with the development proposal Stellenbosch Bridge Phase 3B, together with the associated development and landscape guidelines as appended to this report, on condition that:
 - a. The Mitigation, Management and Monitoring measures included as Section 14 in this report, and in the associated VIA are undertaken. These measures will improve the acceptability of the development, and they should be included as conditions of NEMA authorisation.
 - b. The mitigation measures proposed in the SIA appended to this report be implemented. These measures will improve the acceptability of the development, and they should be included as conditions of NEMA authorisation.
 - c. The visual impacts of this phase of development, specifically per the mitigation measures, be reassessed and submitted to HWC for comment at SDP level, prior to Municipal Approval.

SB

**15.3 Proposed Housing Development on Erf 325, Jacobaai: NM
HM / WEST COAST / SALDANA BAY / JACOBAAI / ERF 325**

Case No: HWC23021602SB0322

Ms Stephanie Barnardt the case.

Chief Khaesen Maart (Paramount Chief of the Aikonese Cochoqua Tribe), Chief Ewold Smith (First Nation), Mr Jonathan Kaplan (heritage consultant) and Mr Pieter Smith were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The West Coast environment at the regional scale has a unique landscape quality and character.
- Coastal bays along the West Coast typically provide focal points for settlement patterns extending from pre-colonial to colonial to post-colonial periods.
- From a scenic (aesthetic) perspective they provide a 'sense of place' within a vast open coastal plain characteristic of the West Coast.
- There is need to ensure that these special coastal places are provided with sufficient breathing space, ensure a positive public interface and are not privatised in terms of public patterns of access.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

For requirements of S.38(3) to be met, the Committee requires the following:

1. Mapping of heritage resources, in particular the archaeological resources referred to in the text.
2. Mapping of planning parameters, including confirmation of the urban edge.
3. Engagement with I&APs.
4. A proper assessment of the broader cultural landscape context and the impact of the proposed development on settlement patterns, particularly in relation to the adjacent coastal bay.
5. Updated statement on the heritage significance of the existing buildings on the site (further to the NID dated 2011 by others).

SB

**15.4 Proposed Housing Development on Erf 1475, Jacobsbaai: NM
HM / WEST COAST / SALDANA BAY / JACOBAAI / ERF 1475**

Case No: HWC23021602SB0322

Ms Stephanie Barnardt the case.

Chief Khaesen Maart (Paramount Chief of the Aikonese Cochoqua Tribe), Chief Ewold Smith (First Nation), Mr Jonathan Kaplan (heritage consultant) and Mr Pieter Smith was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The West Coast Environment at the regional scale has unique quality and character.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

For requirements of S.38(3) to be met, the Committee requires the following:

1. Mapping of heritage resources, in particular the archaeological resources referred to in the text.
2. Mapping of planning parameters, including confirmation of the urban edge.
3. Engagement with I&APs.
4. A proper assessment of the broader cultural landscape.
5. Mitigations measures to be implemented should archaeological resources be discovered on site.

SB

**15.5 Proposed Housing Development on Erf 595, Greyton: NM
HM / OVERBERG / THEEWATERSKLOOF / GREYTON / ERF 595**

Case No: 19052710CM0626E

Ms Cecilene Muller the case.

Ms Antoinette de Beer (VIA Specialist) and Ms Melun Jephtha (environmental consultant) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The committee had concerns with respect to the planning layout which needs to be informed by an urban design layer, taking heritage and visual indicators into consideration. These indicators need to be interpreted in urban design terms to inform meaningful placemaking including streetscape, townscape and landscape within the significant cultural landscape context, which includes the settlement of Greyton and its adjacent settlements; taking cues from how these have responded to the Riviersonderend riverine corridor over time. The overriding character of these settlements, including the role of Genadendal, as part of the settlement pattern (in relation to natural setting qualities and historical patterns of settlement and the appropriate response to building on these patterns of settlement) needs to be further explored in terms of a combined urban design and landscape analysis.
- There is a particular historical response of built form and layout within the valley, which has resulted in a particular built form character, which should inform the proposed extension to Greyton; and, taking into account alternative approaches to housing delivery and housing backlog, and yet still be integrated within a village concept within its totality contained within its natural and cultural settlement. An extension to Greyton must be conceived as a logical and carefully considered layout to ensure that it remains an integrated component of the broader Riviersonderend cultural landscape, as opposed to being an 'appended' (and stand-alone / self-referential) housing development with an absence of cohesiveness and integration into the townscape qualities of Greyton in its broader setting.
- To avoid using typical roll-out of government sponsored housing as precedent where houses are placed in centre of small sites. Refer Greyton village itself with houses set close to the street which forms a positive public urban interface.

INTERIM COMMENT:

1. The committee had concerns with respect to the planning layout which needs to be informed by an urban design layer, taking heritage and visual indicators into consideration. These indicators need to be interpreted in urban design terms to inform meaningful placemaking including streetscape, townscape, and landscape within the significant cultural landscape context, which includes the settlement of Greyton and its adjacent settlements; taking cues from how these have responded to the Riviersonderend riverine corridor over time. The overriding character of these settlements, including the role of Genadendal, as part of the settlement pattern (in relation to natural setting qualities and historical patterns of settlement and the appropriate response to building on these patterns of settlement) needs to be further explored in terms of a combined urban design and landscape analysis.
2. There is a particular historical response of built form and layout within the valley, which has resulted in a particular built form character, which should inform the proposed extension to

Greyton; and, taking into account alternative approaches to housing delivery and housing backlog, and yet still be integrated within a village concept within its totality contained within its natural and cultural settlement. An extension to Greyton must be conceived as a logical and carefully considered layout to ensure that it remains an integrated component of the broader Riviersonderend cultural landscape, as opposed to being an 'appended' (and stand-alone / self-referential) housing development with an absence of cohesiveness and integration into the townscape qualities of Greyton in its broader setting. Given the comments regarding the context and the urban design component to address the concerns of placemaking according to heritage precedent.

CM

- 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 None

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above.

28. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 18:30

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

17 May 2023

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: 

DATE: 17 May 2023

SECRETARY: 

DATE: 17 May 2023

APPROVED