

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via Microsoft Teams,
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 17 August 2022**



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)
Ms Janine de Waal (JdW)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Chris Snelling (CSn)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Ms Emmylou Bailey (EB)
Dr Tessa Campbell (TC)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Mr Mike Scurr (MS)
Mr Rashid Fataar (RF)

Staff

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Muneerah Solomon (MSo)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJh)
Ms Natalie Kendrick (NK)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Mr Reagon Fortune (RF)
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM)
Ms Corne Nortje (CN)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Robin George (RG)

Observers

None

Visitors

Dr Nicolas Baumann
Mr Stefan de Kock
Mr Henry Aikman
Dr Jayson Orton
Ms Jenna Lavin
Mr John Gribble
Mr Stephen van den Heever
Ms Erna van Zyl
Mr Tiaan Meyer

Mr Martin Kruger
Mr Paul Boshoff
Mr Clive Theunissen
Mr Lance Blaine
Mr Dave Halkett
Mr Gaarith Williams
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Mr Frank Cumming
Ms Adel Groenewald

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 17 August 2022

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 17 August 2022 with one addition (11.1).

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 20 July 2022

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 20 July 2022 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest

None

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Appointments

None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

The Committee also noted the following Appeals matters:

- Erven 2455 & 2456, C/O Joubert Street & Merriman Avenue, Stellenbosch
- Erven 10712-Re, 10713, 10715 and 14932-Re, Corner Albert Road and 1 Rail Street, Woodstock
- Proposed Alteration and additions on Erf 28173, 10 Dixton Observatory. Cape Town. S34
- NID: Farm La Motte 1038/8, R45, Franschoek
- S38(4) NID: Erven 842, 843, 2780 and 4563, 93 Voortrek Street, Swellendam
- 38(2) NID: Erf 19506, Duplex 7, Unit 213, Paardevlei Lifestyle Estate, Somerset West
- S.34 Proposed Additions, Alterations and Partial Demolition on Erf 3480, 35 Bosman Street, Stellenbosch

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:

None

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

- Renewable Energy Facility Applications. IACom recommends that such applications within approved Renewable Energy Development Zones (REDZ) be managed internally by HOMs unless there are cultural landscape concerns in which case the matter should be referred to IACom.
- Inconsistency of buffer zones around heritage resources need to be resolved.

- Minimum standards of cultural landscape assessment to be determined.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

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

11.1 Proposed Residential Development, Erf 13753-RE, 9 Brickfield Road, Salt River: NM HM/SAL RIVER/ERF 13753

Case No: 22061509MS0718E

Supplementary NID Report prepared by Dr Nicolas Baumann dated 10 June 2022 was tabled.

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the case.

Dr Nicolas Baumann (heritage consultant) and Mr Martin Kruger (Architect and Urban Designer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- CoCT grading is questioned, as it appears as though the building in question has no apparent heritage value.
- The status of a proposed HPOZ of the context was questioned but with the view that it did not warrant formal protection as a HPOZ.
- Apart from the Main Road strip there is no heritage significance within the context affected by the proposed development.
- The Committee notes that the question around grading would be resolved within the demolition application by CoCT.

RESPONSE TO NID:

The IACom noted that no heritage resources would be impacted negatively by the proposed development and that no further heritage studies were required.

MS

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

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

13.1 Proposed Micro-Process Winery, Tasting Facility, Farm Shop, Visitors' Facilities and Functions Venue Portion 1 of Farm 1558, Paarl: NM HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTIEN/ PAARL/ PTN 1 OF FARM 1558

Case No: 22040411NK0405E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Aikman Associates dated July 2022 and VIA prepared by Antoinette Raimond Landscape Architectural Consulting dated May 2022 were tabled.

Ms Natalie Kendrick introduced the case.

Mr Henry Aikman (heritage consultant) and Mr Clive Theunissen (Drakenstein Municipality) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- There is no rezoning application required.
- This is a consent use matter (concerning uses ancillary to the primary agricultural zoning).
- The Committee notes that the consent use proposal is not problematic from a heritage perspective and being supportive of the tourism value of the Cape Winelands.
- Lack of detail in terms of the proposal with respect to building changes and landscape intervention is problematic in terms of informing a decision on the impact on heritage resources.
- Mitigation recommended within the VIA noted.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

Although the Committee supports the consent use application in principle, due to insufficient detailed information within the proposal, the provisions of S.38(3) have not been satisfied within the HIA.

The Committee requires the submission of detailed development proposal indicating the full scope of the proposed intervention as well as the detailed landscape plan as integral to the submission.

NK

13.2 Proposed Business Centre on Portions of Erven 852 & 857, Struisbaai: MA HM/CAPE AGULHAS/ STUISBAAI/PORCION OF ERF 852 & 857

Case No: 22012512NK0126E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by Stefan de Kock was tabled.

Ms Natalie Kendrick introduced the case.

Mr Stefan de Kock (heritage consultant) and Mr Paul Boshoff (Architect) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted some positive refinement to the proposal, including the shifting of the circular element from the corner and the substantial landscaping and bermed interface along the street edge.
- The intention to mitigate the scale of the shed is supported in principle, however the architectural response (with respect to the Cape Vernacular components) is open to interpretation.
- The primary heritage resource consists of the cultural landscape of the fisherman's cottages embedded within and open space and its associated vegetation and dune environment (especially regarding the relationships in terms of the scale of the buildings and scale of landscape).

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee notes that the HIA prepared by Stefan de Kock satisfies the provision of S.38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee further supports the amended recommendation in the HIA as follows:

1. A comprehensive landscaping plan, undertaken by a suitably qualified landscape architect must be submitted to Heritage Western Cape for approval prior to the implementation of the development.
2. The study area boundary onto Main Road must be landscaped through use of indigenous coastal vegetation, including milkwood (*Sideroxylon inerme*) as well as faster-growing indigenous species in accordance with the above landscaping plan. Such landscaping must be implemented with the commencement of construction and be maintained throughout the operational phase of the development.
3. The overall nocturnal footprint of the proposed development must be limited, and exterior lighting must be planned and orientated to avoid lighting overspill, particularly onto the adjoining PHS areas.
4. The HWC Chance Fossil Finds Protocol must be implemented and maintained throughout the construction phase of the proposed development.
5. If any human remains or significant archaeological materials are exposed during development activities, then the find should be protected from further disturbance and work in the immediate area should be halted and Heritage Western Cape must be notified immediately. These heritage resources are protected by Section 36(3)(a) and Section 35(4) of the NHRA (Act 25 of 1999) respectively and may not be damaged or disturbed in any way without a permit

from the heritage authorities. Any work in mitigation, if deemed appropriate, should be commissioned and completed before construction continues in the affected area and will be at the expense of the developer.

6. Interested and affected parties should consider engaging with heritage Western Cape regarding the potential expansion of existing formal protection to also include historic elements still remnant within the cultural landscape, including but not limited to, the Hotagterklip historic burial ground situated on Erf 922, Struisbaai, as well as remnants of “die damme” located on Erven 922 and 853, Struisbaai.

The Committee resolved to approve the proposals on condition that the landscape plan to be submitted to HWC for approval.

NK

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 Kwagga Wind Energy Grid Section 1 to 7, Beaufort West: NM
HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST/VARIOUS FARMS/KWAGGA**

Case No: 20220518SB0519E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The wind turbines are already approved, and in comparison, the gridline would have minimal impact.
- The proposal is outside of a Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ).
- The extent to which the proposal avoided topographical features.
- APM comments were noted and endorsed.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee endorsed the HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting dated June 2022 as satisfying requirements of the S.38(3) of the NHRA.

Notwithstanding, the cumulative impact of the wind energy facilities already approved, the Committee notes that the proposed gridline would have minimal impacts upon the cultural landscape heritage resources.

The Committee, therefore, has no objections to the proposal and recommends that the consenting authority impose recommendations as follows:

1. A palaeontologist must conduct a preconstruction survey of the final authorised alignment well in advance of construction to determine whether any areas require avoidance or mitigation;
2. An archaeologist must conduct a preconstruction survey of the final authorised alignment well in advance of construction to determine whether any areas require avoidance or mitigation;
3. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follows:

1. The committee endorsed the HIA for the Kwagga EGI 1-7 in the HIA by ASHA Consulting (June 2022) pg's 34&35:

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.2 Proposed Hoogland 1 Wind, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 1

Case No: 21060101SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 13.5km away from the closest turbines and the current preferred layout has been informed by discussions with SANParks.
- 10-15km view shed from a National Park is generally considered to be of medium significance but needs to be tested.
- Contextualisation of a proposed development across scales (regional, local and site scales) is always required in a heritage assessment process.
- Assessment and grading of cultural landscapes requires unpacking in terms of a consolidated mapping of visual (aesthetic), built environment and archaeological resources including the mapping and identification of buffers associated with such heritage resources.

- The protected natural landscape potentially affected by wind energy facility development should form part of the cultural landscape assessment especially where it involves a national park.
- The grading of cultural landscapes needs to be qualified in terms of existing and proposed formal protection status and the heritage management implications thereof.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA. The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations of the HIA as follows:

1. The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed;
2. The archaeological site at waypoints 1978 and 1979 that will be overlapped by a turbine footing must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation must target the densest part(s) of the scatter within or close to the impact zone;
3. The two graves at waypoint 1696 must be fenced with a regular farm-style fence with a pedestrian entrance gate so as to ensure that they are easily identifiable on site. The fence must be placed at least 5 m from the graves and the electrical cable must be placed a minimum of 5 m away from the fence, but preferably further if possible;
4. Trenching within 30 m of waypoint 1696 must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO;
5. Road construction work around the Slangfontein farm werf must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO to ensure that the walls remain unharmed;
6. A pre-construction survey of the entire minimised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micro siting (if possible);
7. The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
8. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
9. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
10. Landscape scarring must be minimized during construction;
11. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
12. All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
13. A CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
14. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
15. Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists;
16. Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
17. On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
18. Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;

19. In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
20. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the highest visual sensitivity areas and within 1 km of the R381, as well as turbines 72 and 75 due to their proximity to the Slangfontein homestead which is a IIIA cultural landscape;
21. Replacement structures for the existing bridges on the local access roads must be designed to have a similar appearance to the current structures; and
22. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follows:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg's 95-96
2. The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind energy facility road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.3 Proposed Hoogland 2 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 2

Case No: 21060102SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 13.5km away from the closest turbines and the current preferred layout was informed by discussions with SANParks.
- 10-15km view shed from National Park is considered of medium significance.
- Contextualisation across scales (regional local sites).

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA. The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations of the HIA as follows:

1. Archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed;
2. The two graves at waypoint 702 must be fenced with a regular farm-style fence with a pedestrian entrance gate so as to ensure that they are easily identifiable on site;
3. The cable trench proposed through the historic farm complex of Bulskolk (in the vicinity of waypoint 113) must be sure to avoid impacting any ruined structures or other features in the vicinity;
4. Roadworks within 30 m of the graves at waypoint 702 must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO;
5. Trenching within the historic werf at Bulskolk (in the vicinity of waypoint 113) must be monitored by relevant project staff and/or the ECO to ensure that the various features remain unharmed;
6. A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
7. The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
8. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
9. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
10. Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
11. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
12. All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
13. A CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
14. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
15. Temporary laydown and areas and batching plants should be located in areas approved by the visual specialists;
16. Substations and O&M Buildings to be located in unobtrusive low-lying areas away from provincial and district roads where possible;
17. On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
18. Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
19. In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
20. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations to ensure a maximum of 60 turbines, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas and within 1 km of the R381;
21. Replacement structures for the existing bridges on the local access roads must be designed to have a similar appearance to the current structures; and

22. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg's 96-98
2. The archaeological site at waypoint 1703 that will be crossed by a proposed wind farm road must be excavated prior to construction. Excavation should at least cover the area to be disturbed

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.4 Proposed Hoogland 3 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 3

Case No: 21060103SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 40km away from the closest turbines and is therefore not an issue.
- 10-15km view shed from a National Park is generally considered to be of medium significance.
- Contextualisation of a proposed development across scales (regional, local and site scales) is always required in a heritage assessment process.
- Assessment and grading of cultural landscapes requires unpacking in terms of a consolidated mapping of visual (aesthetic), built environment and archaeological resources including the mapping and identification of buffers associated with such heritage resources.
- The protected natural landscape potentially affected by wind energy facility development should form part of the cultural landscape assessment especially where it involves a national park.
- The grading of cultural landscapes needs to be qualified in terms of existing and proposed formal protection status and the heritage management implications thereof.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA. The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations of the HIA as follows:

1. The various sites that will be directly impacted must be considered for protection through micrositing or else, if unavoidable, archaeological mitigation (recording, tracing and photography of engravings; excavation and sampling of artefacts) must be implemented. This affects waypoints 123-124, 131, 132, 150, 151, 1563, 1564, 168, 173 & 1854;
2. If during the pre-construction survey it is decided that some engravings that can be protected in situ are too important to risk, then mitigation should be effected there too;
3. Micrositing is strongly advised to avoid the ruins at waypoints 1563 and 1564;
4. The various sites whose buffers will be intersected and where the activity will be quite close to the site should be marked on the ground with No-Go signage. This affects waypoints 128, 1660, 1827 & 1835;
5. A pre-construction survey of the entire minimised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible). This will include a re-evaluation of the four sites listed above for on-site protection;
6. The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
7. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
8. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
9. Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
10. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
11. All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
12. If a CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
13. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
14. On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
15. Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
16. In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
17. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping turbines in the high visual sensitivity areas, as well as Turbines 54, 66, 67, 68, 69 and/or 70 which are within the main part of the rock art landscape; and
18. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg's 95-96
2. The various sites that will be directly impacted must be considered for protection through micro-siting or else, if unavoidable, archaeological mitigation (recording, tracing and photography of engravings; excavation and sampling of artefacts) must be implemented. This affects waypoints 123-124, 131, 132, 150, 151, 168, 173 & 1854.

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.5 Proposed Hoogland 4 Wind Farm, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND 4

Case No: 21060103SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 40km away from the closest turbines and the current preferred layout has been informed by discussions with SANParks.
- 10-15km view shed from National Park is considered of medium significance.
- Contextualisation across scales (regional local sites).

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA.

The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations of the HIA as follows:

1. The farm road to be reused adjacent to waypoint 1807 may not be widened towards the north;
2. The various sites whose buffers will be intersected and where the activity will be quite close to the site should be marked on the ground with No-Go signage. This affects waypoints 1780, 1801, 1806, 1807, 1588-1598 and 1781-1791;
3. The complexes at waypoints 1588-1598 and 1781-1791 must be monitored by the ECO during road construction;

4. A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised footprint must be undertaken in order to determine whether any further archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micro-siting (if possible);
5. The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
6. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
7. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
8. Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
9. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
10. All areas not required during operation must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
11. A CAA-approved warning system which only requires the red lights to come on when an aircraft is in the vicinity exists at the time of construction, then such a system must be used to reduce the night-time impacts to the sense of place;
12. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
13. On-site signage to be discrete, and billboards prohibited. Signage to be fixed as low as possible, preferably against a backdrop to avoid intrusion on the skyline;
14. Security and other outdoor lighting to be fitted with reflectors to conceal the light source;
15. In the event of decommissioning, the site must be rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
16. If the wind farm is approved and the final layout does not need all approved turbine locations, then where a choice exists between turbines to be dropped, and all other factors are equal, priority should be given to dropping Turbine 96; and
17. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg's 96-97.
2. The farm road to be reused adjacent to waypoint 1807 may not be widened towards the north.

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.6 Proposed Hoogland North Grid Connection, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND GRID NORTH

Case No: 21070803SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 40km away from the proposed development.
- 10-15km view shed from a National Park is generally considered to be of medium significance.
- Contextualisation of a proposed development across scales (regional, local and site scales) is always required in a heritage assessment process.
- The proposed grid connection is not considered to have impacts on cultural landscape issues.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA.

The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations as follows:

1. A pre-construction survey of the entire final alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be undertaken in order to determine whether any archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
2. The final alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
3. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
4. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
5. All heritage structures must be avoided by the powerline by at least 50 m whether occupied or not;
6. Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
7. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
8. All areas not required during operation must be fully rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
9. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
10. Switching stations and temporary laydown areas should be located away from scenic features, farmsteads and public roads; and

11. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg's 60-61
2. A pre-construction survey of the entire final alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be undertaken in order to determine whether any archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

15.7 Proposed Hoogland South Grid Connection, Beaufort West: NM HM/CENTRAL KAROO/BEAUFORT WEST / HOOGLAND GRID SOUTH

Case No: 21070803SB0818E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting and dated June 2022 was be tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) and Mr Lance Blaine (developer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- APM comments were noted and endorsed.
- The Karoo National Park is situated more than 13km away from the proposed development and has been informed by discussions with SANParks.
- 10-15km view shed from a National Park is generally considered of medium significance.
- Contextualisation of a proposed development across scales (regional, local and site) is always required in a heritage assessment process.
- The proposed grid connection is not considered to have impacts on cultural landscape issues.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the provisions of S.38(3) of the NHRA have been satisfied within the HIA.

The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendations as follows:

1. A pre-construction survey of the entire authorised alignment (powerline and service tracks) must be undertaken in order to determine whether any archaeological sites may need mitigation or protection through micrositing (if possible);
2. The final layout must be evaluated by a palaeontologist to determine which areas, if any, need a pre-construction survey. These will be previously unsurveyed and potentially sensitive areas;
3. If necessary, and subject to the agreement of Heritage Western Cape, a Workplan application should be submitted prior to the palaeontological survey to allow for sample collection during the survey;
4. A palaeontological chance finds procedure must be incorporated into the EMPr;
5. All heritage structures must be avoided by the powerline by at least 50 m whether occupied or not;
6. Landscape scarring must be minimised during construction;
7. If road surfacing is required then low contrast materials such as concrete with brown exposed aggregate should be used, where possible;
8. All areas not required during operation must be fully rehabilitated in accordance with the Rehabilitation and Revegetation Plan;
9. Visually sensitive skylines, rock outcrops and steep slopes must be avoided as per the recommendations of the visual impact assessment;
10. Switching stations and temporary laydown areas should be located away from scenic features, farmsteads and public roads; and
11. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by ASHA consulting (July 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg 64

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

**15.8 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 1: NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS**

Case No: 22070415SB0705E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by CTS and dated July 2022 was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The proposal is within a designated Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ).
- The wind energy facilities associated with the proposed grid connection have already been approved.
- APM comments are noted and endorsed.
- The gridline connection will have minimal additional impact given that the wind energy farm was already approved.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the HIA satisfies the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA. The Committee endorses the HIA and recommendation as follows:

1. A no development area of 50m is implemented around sites PP2_EGI_21, 26 and 27.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage consulting (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on p.g 38.

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

**15.9 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 2: NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS**

Case No: 22070416SB0705E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by CTS and dated July 2022 was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The proposal is within the Komsberg REDZ.
- Wind energy facilities have already been approved in the immediate area.
- APM comments are noted and endorsed.
- The gridline connection will have minimal additional impact given that the wind energy facility was already approved.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the HIA satisfies the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA. The Committee endorsed the HIA and the recommendation of the HIA as follows:

1. A no development area of 50m is implemented around sites PP2_EGI_21, 26 and 27
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage consulting (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg 30.

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

**15.10 Pienaarspoort WEF External Grid Connection 3: NM
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / WITZENBERG / MATJIESFONTEIN/ VARIOUS FARMS**

Case No: 22070417SB0705E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by CTS and dated July 2022 was tabled.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The proposal is within the Komsberg REDZ.
- Wind energy facilities have already been approved in the immediate area.
- APM comments are noted and endorsed.
- The gridline connection will have minimal additional impact given that the wind energy facility was already approved.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee notes that the HIA satisfies the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA. The Committee therefore endorsed the HIA and the recommendation of the HIA as follows:

1. A no development area of 50m is implemented around sites PP2_EGI_21, 26 and 27
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

The Committee supported the APM comments as follow:

1. The Committee endorsed the report by CTS Heritage consulting (June 2022) and the archaeological palaeontological recommendations on pg. 30.

The above comment is valid for a period of 5 years from the date of the written notification thereof to the applicant. This period may, for good reason, be extended provided that application for the extension is made in writing prior to the expiration of the period.

SB

**15.11 Proposed Rezoning, Subdivision and Development of Part of the Remainder of Erf 460 in St Helena: NM
HM/WEST COAST / SALDANABAY / ST HELENA BAY/ ERF 460**

Case No: 16101404AS1017E

Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ACO Associates and dated June 2022 was tabled.

Ms Ayanda Mdludlu introduced the case.

Mr Dave Halkett (heritage consultant), Mr John Gribble (Archaeological and Heritage Specialist) and Mr Stephen van den Heever (add designation) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- Notwithstanding that the formal commenting has closed, the Committee notes that the HIA states that there are ongoing discussions with an interested and affected party identifying as a First Nations Group who had indicated that the site is a sacred site.
- The HIA did not, however, unpack this further, and as such the committee has no means of ascertaining the veracity of this claim. It would be irresponsible of the Committee to take this matter further without the issue of the intangible heritage of the site being explored further and included within the ambit of, and assessed in, the HIA.
- The Cochoqua grouping claiming sacred connections with the site had been notified of the IACom meeting and indicated that it was not able to attend due to limited access to technology and ancestral belief systems.
- The Committee supports meaningful engagement on these issues and therefore is prepared to undertake a site visit once the claims around the sacred nature of the site have been clarified and confirmed and addressed in the HIA.
- Specialist input in the consultation process is recommended to address the intangible heritage resources associated with the site and the claims around its sacred value.
- HIA to incorporate the outcome of this consultation process around intangible heritage aspects in terms of fulfilling the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA.

INTERIM COMMENT:

Given that the "sacredness of the site", or intangible heritage, has only been noted and not further addressed or even assessed in the HIA, it cannot be regarded as being in compliance with the provisions of s38(3) of the NHR Act.

This is an important aspect that must be addressed and assessed before the committee can comment further.

AM

- 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 CCT Masterplan: Block 28 (Strand/Waterkant): MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CITY CENTRE CBD / ERVEN 846 - 870**

Case No: 21112311SJ0228E

Advice documents prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue was tabled.

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the case.

Mr Gaarith Williams (CoCT), Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant), Ms Erna van Zyl (CoCT), Mr Frank Cumming, Mr Tiaan Meyer (architect) Mr John Gribble (Archaeological and Heritage Specialists) and Mr Dave Halkett (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The process of getting early advice and embedding and developing this in the Phase 1 HIA to follow was supported.

- The nature of the proposed podium was questioned, and it was felt that far more variety in terms of height, scale and massing could be explored. The City’s “Tall building Policy” may not necessarily be the correct model to follow in this instance.
- In principle the 60-metre height can be accommodated on this site given the scale of the street, but this aspect requires further testing.
- The importance of the public ground plane / pedestrian experience was emphasized: nature, scale and hierarchy of street to be probed.
- The Lutheran complex - a more accurate representation of the setback of the modern extension - should be shown since impacts on this block have been highly contested heritage matters.
- St Andrews Church complex & Prestwich Street memorial are also key informants to this site (scale / context).
- The “urban wall” concept for Buitengracht St was noted as part of the broader proposal. This can be a positive city element but requires a refined architectural approach so that this does not degenerate into a bland or harsh city element.
- With respect to this development within the broader context explored, the notion of there being a degree of simplicity and harmony overall, rather than a series of buildings displaying complex geometries and setbacks was seen as a positive.

ADVICE:

The Committee endorses the approach taken by the development team in principle and commends the team for the work done thus far. It does however note that further exploratory work which addresses the issues raised in discussion would help further inform and refine the proposed development model in order to provide Comment on a Phase 1 HIA.

SJ

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 14:00

29. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

21 September 2022

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR:

DATE:

SECRETARY:

DATE: