

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
APPEALS COMMITTEE**
**Held on Wednesday, 16 September 2020 via Microsoft Teams,
scheduled for 09:00**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Advocate Mandla Mdludlu opened the meeting at 09:07 officially and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Ms Katherine Dumbrell (KD)
Dr Andre van Graan (AvG)
Adv Mandla Mdludlu (MM)
Dr Nicolas Baumann (NB)

Members of Staff:

Ms Sandisiwe Matole (SM)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PMe)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Nuraan Vallie (NV)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Cathy-Ann Potgieter (CAP)

Visitors:

Mr Shafiek Biscombe
Mrs Patricia Botha
Mrs Heike Mentoer

Observers:

None

3. Apologies

Dr Antonia Malan (AM)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 16 September 2020

The Committee resolved to approve the Appeals Agenda dated 16 September 2020.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Appeals Minutes dated 19 August 2020

Approved Appeals Minutes 16 September 2020

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of the Appeals Committee meeting which was held on 19 August 2020.

6. Declaration of Conflict of Interest

6.1 None

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Tribunal Committees and Recent Court Decisions
None

8.2 Report back from HWC Council
None

8.3 Site Visits Conducted

8.3.1 13 Voor Street, Pniel, Stellenbosch

8.4 Potential Site Visits
None

8.5 Appointments

9 Matters Arising

9.1 Proposed Total Demolition of a Structure Older Than 60 Years on Erf 488, 13 Voor Street, Pniel, Stellenbosch

Case No: 19051414AS0626E

HM/CAPE WINELANDS/STELLENBOSCH/PNIEL/ERF 488

Appeals Committee members report back on the site inspection that was conducted on the 14th of September 2020. The site inspection report prepared by KD, MM, NB was tabled. See annexure SI1.

The following representatives were afforded an opportunity to make their submissions in support of their arguments.

Mr Shafiek Biscombe (owner representative), Mrs Patricia Botha (Appellant – SIG), and Mrs Heike Mentoer were present and took part in the matter as representatives.

Ms Sandisiwe Matole was requested by the Chairperson to give a brief introduction as far this matter was concerned.

DISCUSSION

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

- KD reported back on the site inspection.
- The Committee noted that the streetscape is fine grained, and that the block as a whole has a very distinctive character. The receiving environment is thus considered highly significant and sensitive. New interventions should be carefully managed to avoid negative impact.
- The Committee also noted that the double-storey component covers the full width of the site, which is contrary to the typology found in the block. As such the massing and form of the structure needs to be addressed by the architect.
- The criteria contained within the Conservation Management Plan need to be responded to individually.
- The Committee raised concerns regarding the Committee designing the building, and as such noted the need for a heritage practitioner to formulate indicators and informants for the designer to respond to. It was noted that it was not appropriate for the Committee to get involved with the design of the building.
- The Committee also noted that community heritage initiatives exist within the village and recommends that the applicant and designer consult with them as they have expertise to share.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

- The Committee requires that the applicant and designer consult with community heritage organisations with heritage expertise (such as the local museum and The Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust) and, if the need arises, with a heritage practitioner in order to provide this Committee with heritage indicators and design informants as well as a revised design that clearly respond to those indicators.

Sandisiwe Matole

10 New Matters

10.1 Proposed Residential Development on Watervliet Farm 1221, Paarl (S38.4 HOMs)

HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTIN/PAARL/FARM WATERVLIT/FARM 1221

Case No: 20070207SB0720E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

APPELLANTS

- Appellants are appealing the HOMs decision requiring an HIA

DISCUSSION

In summary, the committee noted and took the following into account:

- The Committee noted that the site has already been disturbed and development will result in minimal heritage impact.
- The Committee also noted that there is a significant footprint of the building included on the site, which will cause a change in character, but the question is whether the heritage significance is enough to require a Heritage Impact Assessment.

DECISION

- The Appeal was upheld, and no further studies were required.

Stephanie Barnardt

11. Other Matters

12. Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Decisions and Resolutions of the meeting were unanimously adopted by the Appeals Committee.

13. Proposed next date of the meeting:

21 October 2020

14. Closure: The meeting was adjourned at: 11:30

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON M Mdludlu

DATE 22/ 10/ 2020

SECRETARY A.Brown

DATE 22/10/2020

Annexure SI1

Committee Site Inspection Report for: Proposed total demolition and replacement building erf 488 13 Voor Street, Pniel

Submitted by Kathy Dumbrell on 16 September 2020

Street Address: 13 Voor St, Pniel

Grading: 3B

Nature of Application: Section 34 application.

Date of Site Visit: 14 September 2020

HWC Representatives:

Adv. M. Mdludlu

Dr. N. Baumann

Ms. K. Dumbrell

Reasons for Site Inspection: Proposed additions and alterations to the building which affects the streetscape qualities of the receiving environment, which is itself a heritage resource..

Findings of Site Inspection:

In the site inspection the following items were noted:

1. There is one double-storied, face-brick building in the row of predominantly single-storied houses with double-pitched roofs and unembellished end gables of which erf 488 forms a part.
2. Two examples of the use of the roofspace to gain an additional storey were noted nearby the subject property.
3. There is a consistency of building line along the streetscape of which erf 488 forms a part.
4. Voor street runs alongside the R310 Scenic Drive, separated from it by a green swathe, gardened in places with shrubs which to some extent obscure views to the houses in Voor Street.
5. The height difference between the Scenic drive and Voor st is approximately 1.5m
6. The Committee noted that the street immediately behind Voor St, Middel St had a particularly fine grain and pedestrian oriented quality which contributed substantial to the local character of the place.

Recommended Action:

To be considered at Appeals meeting on the 16th September 2020

Which committee should this report be submitted to: HWC Appeals Committee

APPROVED