

**Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment
Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 08H15 on Wednesday, 19 May 2021**



MATTERS DISCUSSED

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

11.1 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

**12.1 Proposed Rezoning and Residential Development on Erf 878, Riebeek Kasteel: NM
HM/SWARTLAND/RIEBEEK KASTEEL/ ERF 878**

Case No: 20030413SB0528E

INTERIM COMMENT:

IACom recommends that a heritage impact assessment be conducted inclusive of the following:

1. Townscape analysis
2. Visual Impact Assessment
3. Heritage design indicators

SB

**12.2 Proposed Development, Greenways Hotel Site, Erf 56421, 1 Torquay Avenue, Claremont: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CLAREMONT/ERF 56421**

Case No: 20081705KB0718E

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee agreed that the addition of internal fencing and boundary treatment as shown on fig.13 in the HIA will not impact negatively on heritage significance and in particular the grade IIIA setting of the Manor House. The Committee however queried changes reflected on the Spatial Development Plan (SDP) layout, particularly with respect to portion 1, and required clarity regarding this approval which is noted as having lesser heritage impact. Due to the need to provide feedback urgently, the Committee agreed to provide a decision via email rather than referring the matter back to the next Committee meeting, provided that the matter can be easily clarified in a summary letter to HWC.

KB

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

**13.1 Proposed Redevelopment Erf 46732, RE 22 Rouwkoop Road, Rondebosch: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/RONDEBOSCH/ERF 46732**

Case No: 19112802LB0129E

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

IACom had no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing building but required further application of heritage indicators, specifically to the Rouwkoop interface, corner threshold and river edge portions of the site.

SB

**13.2 Revised proposal, based on the requirements of IACom on ERF 4722, Wellington: NM
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/WELLINGTON/ERF 4722**

Case No: 17080109ZK0122M

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee agreed that the concerns previously expressed have been addressed in the option 4 layout presented and that the proposal presented an opportunity for a managed development on this site. The unresolved mechanism for dealing the southern portion needs to be confirmed. The Committee therefore requires an SDP plan which addresses this concern and can be basis of final comment.

KB

**13.3 RE of Erf 144264, 1566015 and 17233, Newlands Cricket Ground: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/NEULANDS/ RE OF ERF 144264, 166015 AND 172333**

Case No: 14092208GT0825E

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee approved the tree revised sketch plans as tabled numbered, 518-OvP-NCG-007 Rev 0, Masterplan – Tree Management Plan, dated 26 April 2021 prepared by OvP.

WD

**13.4 Proposed development on Erf 174009, Boundary by Strand, Bree and Waterkant Street, Cape Town: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CBD / ERF 174009**

Case No: 19073112WD0904E

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee endorsed the 3rd revision as tabled as sufficiently in accordance with the approve application with the provision that the roof level extended area does not increase beyond the

area as indicated on the architect drawings numbers 0901 101 REV A, 0901 102 REV A, 0901 109 REV A, 0901 104 REV A, 0901 105 REV A, 0901 106 REV A, 0901 107 REV A, 0901 108 REV A, 0901 200 REV A, 0901 201 REV A, 0901 202 REV A, 0901 300 REV A, 0901 301 REV A, dated 30 March 2021(including the 3D views presented in report prepared by Dr Townsend dated 16 April 2021) and a mechanism be put in place by the applicant to ensure that ad hoc uses do not extend beyond the volume.

SB

- 13.5 Proposed Integrated Rapid Transport System - M24, M5, Erven 52424, 52423, 58104, 58105 and 110205, Lansdowne: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ CLAREMONT/ ERVEN 524524, 52423, 58104, 58105 AND 110205**

Case No: 16062006WD0928M

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application as meeting the requirement of S38(3) of NHRA.

SB

- 13.6 Proposed new residential development Erven 103,104 & A portion of Rotterdam Street, Wittedrift: MA
HM/BITOU/WITTEDRIFT/ERVEN 103 & 104**

Case No: 19090401AS0927E

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to endorse the addendum to the HIA prepared by Lize Malan as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

- 13.7 Proposed Mixed-Use Development on Klapmuts Farm, Ptn 3 of Farm 742, REM Ptn 2 Farm 742, Paarl: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL/ PTN 3 OF FARM 742, REM PTN 2 OF FARM 742**

Case No: 20032416JW0331E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed and supported the findings and recommendations including the implementation of the mitigation measures of the supplementary HIA and associated documentation prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt as meeting the requirements 38(3) of the NHRA. That, despite the high negative impacts of the preferred alternative, given the current approval for development in place and on the basis of the anticipated sustainable socio-economic impacts, the Preferred Alternative could be acceptable and could proceed if all mitigation measures, outlined in the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) and the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) are

implemented in full. These measures are desirable as they improve the acceptability of the development, and they should be included as conditions of environmental authorization.

SB

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 Low Cost and Gap Housing Development on Re /1/1222; Re/1200; Portion 4/941; Portion 7/1220 And Erf 115, Simondium, Drakenstein Municipality: NM HM/CAPE WINELANDS/DRAKENSTEIN/SIMONDIUM/RE/1/1222; RE/1200; PORTION 4/941; PORTION 7/1220 AND ERF 115

Case No: 19102332SB1107E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee agreed to support and endorse the HIA and supporting documentation as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA. Alternative A is supported along with the conditions noted in the HIA.

1. Care must be taken not to impact on any possibly unmarked burials that may occur outside of the recognized boundaries of the cemeteries. Should any unmarked burials be impacted, work must cease immediately and SAPS and HWC must be contacted regarding the appropriate protocol.
2. The existing trees associated with the cemeteries must be retained and enhanced. Consideration should be given to the reinstatement of public open space around the cemeteries. Development in this zone must be restricted.
3. The werf node entrance must be recognized as important due to the character of the site and as such, it is therefore necessary for this space to be a landscaped space of relief. It is recommended that a small area of the existing planting is retained as visually-greened space
4. The design of the new houses should look to continue the strong “longhouse” typology of the area as it represents a built culture to which people’s way of life has adapted. The semi-detached structure is therefore preferred.
5. The basic BNG model must have a 30-degree pitch roof and provide the basis of infrastructure for a front stoep.
6. Plots must run perpendicular to the street and should be rectangular, with the shorter side addressing the street edge. A ratio of around 1:2,5 for the short and long boundary lengths of the rectangular plots is recommended. Furthermore, it is recommended that the front facade of the houses must be placed within the first 3 metres of the street boundary
7. Opportunities for new structures and design guidelines to respond to prevailing typologies are indicated in Appendix 1 and should inform the development
8. As many of the semi-detached structures with the full gambit of “add ons” (stoep, chimney and lean-to - Figure 11.2b) as possible should be located around the cemetery spaces, as these will be the most visible.
9. Road hierarchies should be emphasised through the scaling down of smaller, residential roads. Laterite finishing and fewer ‘step-up’ pavements are recommended.

10. The scale of roads should be the minimum possible. Insensitive, over-engineered, hard elements will compromise the character of a townscape as a whole and should be avoided. Instead, a “woonerf” approach to street-making should be taken.
11. Existing trees on the site be retained as much as possible and reinforced with additional planting to retain and enhance the rural character of the site.

SB

**15.2 Proposed Subdivision for Prospective Residential Units on Erf 177476, Main Road, St. James: MA
HM/CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ST JAMES/ERF 177476**

Case No: 17090415AS0914M

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee is of the opinion that whereas the HIA addresses the middle and upper erven (portion 2 and 3) comprehensively as well as mitigation measures to be undertaken to address the existing structures on the site, insufficient information has been provided in respect of Portion 1, and therefore the requirements of S38(3) have not been met. The Committee requires heritage-related design indicators, including parameters and constraints for development, to be determined for Portion 1 and included in the HIA. These are to address the most appropriate positioning of any buildings on Portion 1, amongst other things.

SB

**15.3 Proposed development of the Pienaarspoort Wind Energy Facility 1 on Rem Farm Bruwelsfontein 249, near Touws River: NM
HM/ BREEDE VALLEY / TOUWSRIVIER / REM FARM 249**

Case No: 20092103SB0921E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed and supported the findings and recommendations of HIA as meeting the requirements of S38(3) of the NHRA, which includes the removal of the seven of turbines from the sensitive cultural landscape zone.

1. A 100m no-go buffer must be implemented around the significant identified archaeological sites (P07 and 35524)
2. A 900m no-go buffer area must be implemented around identified farm werfs (Bruwelsfontein, P024). The turbines currently proposed to be located within this buffer area must have their positions adjusted accordingly.
3. The Environmental Site Officer (ESO) should be made aware of the possibility of important fossil remains (bones, teeth, fish, petrified wood, plant-rich horizons etc) being found or unearthed during the construction phase of the development. The ESO must monitor for fossil material of all major surface clearance and deeper (> 1m) excavations on an on-going basis during the construction phase. The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Procedure must be used in this regard.

4. The proposed turbines located within Landscape Units A and B (and marked in red in Figure 6.1) must be removed.
5. The design criteria identified in section 5.1 above must be adopted and implemented in the design and layout of the development.
6. Should any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources be found during the proposed development, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward.
7. If unmarked human burials are uncovered, work must cease, and HWC must be contacted immediately regarding an appropriate way forward as per section 36(6) of the NHRA.

SB

**15.4 Proposed Site Development on Erf 177887- RE, Ottery: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ OTTERY / ERF 177887**

Case No: 15101207WD1113E

INTERIM COMMENT:

The Committee endorses and supports the findings and recommendations including the updated grading of the Phase 1 HIA as follows:

1. Supports the retention of the historic complex on the eastern precinct of Erf 177887- RE Ottery for retention and future use;
2. Support the recommended cultural significances of the site;
3. Support the Heritage Design Indicators to guide future development on site.
4. Support the recommended gradings of the heritage resources on the property.

SB

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 Draft Dune Maintenance Management Plan for Dolphin Beach Dune MMP: NM
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ BLOUBERGSTRAND/ DOLPHIN BEACH**

Case No: N/A

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Awaiting APM comment

SB

27 Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above. CM moved to endorse and adopt the resolutions and decisions and DS seconded.