

79

**MINUTES OF MEETING  
OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LANDSCAPE PERMIT COMMITTEE (BELCOM)  
Held on Thursday, 20 January 2011, 1st Floor Boardroom at the offices of the  
Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport,  
Protea Assurance Building, Greenmarket Square, Cape Town at 09h00**

---

**1. Opening and Welcome**

The meeting was officially opened at 9h10 by the chairperson, Dr Stephen Townsend and welcomed all members and staff present.

**2. Attendance**

**Committee Members:**

Dr Stephen Townsend  
Mr Trevor Thorold  
Mr Patrick Fefeza  
Ms Maureen Wolters  
Ms Sarah Winter  
Mr Roger Joshua  
Mr Tim Hart

**Staff Members:**

Mr Andrew Hall  
Ms Christina Jikelo  
Mr Shaun Dyers  
Ms Ntombi Nkoane  
Mr Jonathan Windvogel  
Ms Lithalethu Mshoti  
Mr Ronny Nyuka  
Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka

**Visitors**

Mr Ashley Lillie  
Mr A Berman  
Mr C Abrahamse  
Mr E Holme  
Mr A Holme  
Mr Chris Snelling  
Mr A Pentz  
Mr D Hart  
Mr T Mgedesi  
Mr J Rennie

**Observers**

Ms Margot van Heerden	City of Cape Town	Metropolitan
Mr Bewin September	City of Cape Town	South Peninsula

**3. Apologies**

Ms Ziyanda Manzana

**4. Confidential Matters**

**5. Approval of minutes of previous meeting held on the 9 December 2010**

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes with certain minor amendments.

**6. Appointments:**

None

## **7 Administration Matters**

### **7.1 Clocktower Precinct**

A faxed letter dated 5 January 2011 had been received from the City of Cape Town regarding the Clocktower Precinct. This letter complains regarding certain actions of the V&A.

- In the discussion it was noted that:
- The letter claimed that more than the approved 49m of grain silo had been demolished
- The City of Cape Town requested that HWC investigate these allegations and report back to the City Manager
- This has not yet been done
- The letter is not very informative
- The decision taken by HWC in July 2010 outlined concern over progressive loss of heritage.
- Further development of the V&A Waterfront should respond to Heritage indicators.

#### **Recommendations**

- A committee member, Mr Hart will conduct a site visit and report back to the committee on the appropriateness of the demolition
- The Case Officer must provide the committee member conducting the site visit with background information and plans before the site visit is conducted.
- The case officer must find out from the City of Cape Town what exactly their accusations are.
- The Case Officer must request comment on these accusations from Mr Bauman, the Heritage Practitioner.
- A letter is to be sent acknowledging receipt of the letter dated 5 January 2011.
- The Case Officer must report back to Mrs Jikelo and Mr Hall on the requested comments before the next BELCom meeting.

**Zwelibanzi Shiceka**

### **7.2 Welgelegen, UCT: PHS**

A letter had been received from Dr Gwen Fagan.

The matter was very briefly discussed and the Committee agreed that it should be responded to. Dr Townsend, as chair, agreed to draft a response for the Committee to add to. He also agreed to have an informal discussion about heritage-related matters on the UCT campuses with Owen Kinahan, the chair of the UCT Building Committee

## **8 APPEALS**

### **8.1 Erf 692, 27 Belle Ombre Road, Tamboerskloof: Proposed Alterations and Additions-Section 34**

The Matter was tabled in Appeals meeting held 14 January 2011

- The matter had been to the Appeals Committee
- The Appeals committee upheld the BELCom decision.

## MATTERS ARISING

### 9 SECTION 27

#### 9.1 **St Mary's on the Braak Anglican Church, Stellenbosch: Alterations and Additions – Section 27** **HM/STELLENBOSCH/ST MARY'S ON THE BRAAK ANGLICAN CHURCH**

Supporting document prepared by HB Architects, dated 6 October 2010, plans and photographs to be tabled.

Documents had been delivered to Dr Stephen Townsend, Mr Roger Joshua and Mr Trevor Thorold

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The committee saw these documents on 14 October 2010 and there is nothing new to be discussed.

**Tamar Grover**

#### 9.2 **Erf 44201, UCT Middle Campus, Rondebosch: Satisfaction of Condition of Approval of Section 38(4) Decision associated with Section 27 PHSs** **HM/RONDEBOSCH UCT MIDDLE CAMPUS/ERF 44201**

Notes of Site meeting attended by Ms Winter, Mr Thorold and Dr Townsend and the heritage practitioner and landscape architect on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2010 were tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The height of the new building was a condition of the Heritage Impact Assessment, however now services are protruding above the roof.
- The sculptures are not shown on the landscape plan.
- The committee has concerns over the cumulative impact of development
- The committee has concerns about the design of the paving to be used
- The Summer House and Japonica Walk are PHSs
- The committee is dismayed with the design proposal for Kramer Plaza and its surrounds however it was agreed that no heritage resources will be impacted

#### **Recommendations**

- An explanation is required from the University with regard to the height of the new building as services are protruding above the roof level approved.
- The landscape plans are approved recognising that the details surrounding Kramer Plaza are poor, however this does not constitute an impact on heritage resources and as such is not part of heritage approval.
- Precinct level plans are required for the remaining landscape issues affecting the Japonica Walk, Summer House, Woolsack Gardens and Bremner Woodlands and these must be submitted as separate applications.
- The interventions impacting the graveyard must be submitted to SAHRA.

- The notes of the site meeting are to be conveyed to the University.
- The committee recommends a “softening” of the Woolsack “edge” and a reduction in its verticality
- The recommendations made in the notes from the subcommittee must be altered to read “The proposed landscape plan is approved”.
- The University should be reminded of its undertaking to prepare a Landscape Management Plan for the Middle and Lower Campuses.

**Shaun Dyers**

### 9.3 Agulhas Lighthouse Precincts

In the discussion it was noted that

- This matter has previously been before BELCom on 25 November 2010
- Ms Walters, Mr Thorold and Ms Winter had conducted site visits subsequently
- The committee considers the process followed by the applicant to be flawed which has led to the belated appointment of the heritage consultant and detailed design before proper consideration of heritage-related constraints
- The siting and scale of the proposal are inappropriate and the schedule of accommodation is excessive
- The site can accommodate some kind of tourist facility
- The proposal does not respond to the carrying capacity of the site nor to the specific sensitivities of the site
- The site is archaeologically very sensitive
- The entire Agulhas Lighthouse Precinct is a Provincial Heritage Site
- The historic lighthouse structure is in a very poor condition

#### Recommendations

- Heritage resource-related design indicators must be addressed
- The heritage resource-related design indicators must determine the functional program rather than the other way round
- The design indicators must also take archaeological indicators into account
- The CEO must discuss with DEADP the way in which they deal with approvals for applications involving Provincial Heritage Sites.
- The case officer must draft a letter for the CEO to send to Mr Rennie outlining the concern of HWC regarding the maintenance and repair of the lighthouse structure in terms of a previous application before BELCom and requesting advice regarding the progress of that project.

#### DECISION

Given that the site is a declared PHS and one both archaeologically and visually sensitive, the committee resolved not to accept the report and rejects its findings. The committee requires that the design process be re-initiated.

**Zwelibanzi Shiceka**

**10 SECTION 34**

**10.1 Erf 64060, La Rochelle, 8 Morgenrood Street, Kenilworth: Alterations and Additions – Section 34  
HM/KENILWORTH/ERF 64060**

Report prepared by Claire Abrahamse with consultation of Mr Trevor Thorold, dated January 2011, application, photographs and plans were tabled.

Mr. Thorold recused himself.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The building should be a grade IIIA and not IIIB.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to the recommendations laid out in Ms Abrahamse's e-mail dated 19 January 2011, excluding point A.

**Tamar Grover**

**10.2 Erf 1056, Corner Fritz Sonnenberg & Portwood Roads, Green Point: Partial Demolition of Stadium Buildings – Section 34  
HM/GREEN POINT/ERF 1056**

Heritage Statement prepared A.G. Pentz dated November 2010 were tabled.

Documents had been delivered to Ms Sarah Winter, Mr Roger Joshua and Mr Tim Hart

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The matter was before BELCom on the 9<sup>th</sup> December 2010
- It was previously determined that BELCom required a Social Study in order to quantify the socio-political significance of the building.
- It was requested by the applicant (Mr Pentz) that the required social study be taken in parallel with the upgrade
- Letters of support from the community were provided; representatives of three community groups were present and they reiterated their support for the project.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to the social survey being conducted during the construction process.

**Ronny Nyuka**

**10.3 Erf 110091, 88 Waterkant Street, Cape Town: Alterations and Additions – Section 34  
HM/CAPE TOWN/ERF 110091**

Application and plans by the architect, Alan Walt were tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The building is a Grade IIIB in an urban conservation area.
- This development will have a high visual impact on a number of heritage resources in the immediate surrounds.

#### **DECISION**

- Clarity is required on height of surrounding buildings.
- It is required that City Council stamps are provided on submitted plans.
- The committee requests the use of more suitable material e.g. Timber.
- The committee supports in principle the position of the deck below and behind the parapet
- The committee does not support the 2m metal and fiberglass screen surrounding deck.
- More detail is required with regard to this application.

**Ntombi Nkoane**

#### **10.4 Erf 881, 43 Avenue St Charles, Fresnaye: Alterations and Additions – Section 34 HM/FRESNAYE/ERF 881**

Site visit report was tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- BELCom previously requested a site inspection.
- Site was seen by Mr Joshua and Dr Townsend.
- The proposal to add a second floor is effectively a demolition

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application as total demolition.

**Ronny Nyuka**

#### **10.5 Erf 158/1 Farm Ongegung, Vissershok Road Durbanville: Total Demolition - Section 34**

In the discussion it was noted that

- This matter has previously been at BELCom in December as item 12.1
- A site visit was conducted by Ms Wolters
- A recently constructed dam has had a detrimental effect on the old stables
- The proposal is to demolish the stable barn and to construct the new barn with gables similar to those on the existing barn.
- Although the stable barn has an interesting vernacular history, the context of the agricultural complex is already highly compromised

- The committee is pleased to learn that the new building will have plastered gables as opposed to metal cladding

#### **DECISION**

- The committee resolved to approve the demolition and, by implication, the development of the new barn is approved
- It is recommended that the interesting components of the stable barn are re-used in other parts of the farm complex.

**Jonathan Windvogel**

### **11. ADDITIONAL MATTERS ARISING**

#### **11.1 Letter from the City of Cape Town regarding the cleaning of monuments**

In the discussion it was noted that

- The committee is concerned with the appropriateness of cleaning monuments
- It is appropriate to retain a patina

#### **DECISION**

- The City of Cape Town must consult with its own heritage section for advice and research regarding the most appropriate consultant and contractor in each case.

#### **11.2 SAHRA Notification of Intention to Designate District 6 as a National Heritage Site.**

In the discussion it was noted that

- SAHRA has not withdrawn the notification as previously advised.
- The CEO should approach SAHRA in order to seek clarity and formal advice as to the effects of declaration on HWC's responsibility in terms of the Act

#### **11.3 Somerset West Methodist Church: Application for Demolition**

In the discussion it was noted that

- The committee requested information on the nature of the interactions between HWC and the affected community.

#### **DECISION**

The case officer, Ms Grover, is to report back to the committee at the next BELCom meeting.

**Tamar Grover**

### **NEW MATTERS**

### **12. SECTION 27**



**12.1 Erf 9768, St Stephens Church 110 Bree Street, Cape Town: Additions – Section 27  
HM/CAPE TOWN/ERF 9768**

Motivation prepared by Gert de Wet, dated 11 January 2010, photographs and plans were tabled

Documents had been delivered to Mr Roger Joshua and Dr Stephen Townsend.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- There are a number of outstanding issues with regard to this application.
- Written comment from the Cape Institute of Architects is required and it is suggested that other bodies such as the Simon van der Stel conservation body are approached for comments
- Written comments are required from the City of Cape Town.
- It is unlikely that Heritage Western Cape will deal with this matter before the resolution of outstanding matters with regard to the Church and the private use of public resources.
- It is recommended that architects without heritage expertise must get advice or input from a heritage specialist when dealing with buildings of such great heritage significance.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved not to support the proposal, but is not assessing it as yet and will wait for the information requested before making a formal decision.

**Zwelibanzi Shiceka**

**12.2 Erf 4942, Darling Street, City Hall, Cape Town: Restoration – Section 27  
HM/CAPE TOWN/ERF 4942**

Supporting document prepared by John Rennie, dated 12 January 2011 and application to be tabled

Documents had been delivered to Mr Roger Joshua, Mr Trevor Thorold and Dr Stephen Townsend

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The application is to remove the ceiling roses make casts a reconstruct the roses.
- The current roses are in poor condition.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application.

**Shaun Dyers**



### 13 SECTION 34

#### 13.1 Erf 8029, 5 Lewes Street, Somerset West: Alterations and Additions – Section 34 HM/SOMERSET WEST/ERF 8029

Application, plans and photographs were tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The requested approval is for an existing structure built without permission in 1985.
- The impacted heritage resource on the site is a house older than 60 years but it is ungraded and not in a conservation area.
- The building has no heritage significance and is not affected by the new building.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the application

**Jonathan Windvogel**

#### 13.2 Erf 1093, 18 Main Drive, Sea Point: Total Demolition – Section 34 HM/SEA POINT/ERF 1093

Application, plan and photographs were tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The building is ungraded and it is outside the urban conservation area.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition as the building has no heritage significance.

**Ntombi Nkoane**

#### 13.3 Erf 6369, Corner Barlinka Avenue & Wingerd Road, Somerset West: Alterations and Additions – Section 34 HM/SOMERSET WEST/ERF 6369

Application, plans and photographs were tabled.

In the discussion it was noted that:

- The application is for the demolition of internal walls.
- Ms Walters will conduct a site visit.
- It appears from photographs that there is insufficient cause for the committee to reject the proposal.

**DECISION**

The committee resolved to approve the demolition subject to Ms Walters' confirmation that no heritage resources will be impacted by the demolition

**Ronny Nyuka**

**13.4 Erf 80246, 14 Elstree Road, Heathfield, Cape Town: Total Demolition – Section 34**

**HM/CAPE TOWN/ERF 80246**

Application plans, and photographs to be tabled

In the discussion it was noted that

- The property in question is not situated within a conservation area
- Work has previously been done on the property in 1971
- The local authority approves the demolition

**DECISION**

The committee resolved to approve the demolition

**Jonathan Windvogel**

**13.5 Erf 115349, Corner Bronnies Road, Diep River: Total Demolition – Section 34**

**HM/DIEP RIVER/ERF 115349**

Application, plans and photographs to be tabled

In the discussion it was noted that

- The committee believes that the building in question is not older than 60 years
- The building has no heritage significance

**DECISION**

The committee resolved to approve the demolition

**Ntombi Nkoane**

**13.6 Erf 586, No. 160 Kloof Road, Bantry Bay: Alterations and Additions – Section 34**

**HM/BANTRY BAY/ERF 160**

Applications, plans and photographs to be tabled

In the discussion it was noted that

- The application involves an ungraded building outside of an urban conservation area

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved not to approve the application.

**Recommendations**

- The committee requires a heritage statement by an appropriately skilled heritage practitioner to be submitted that assesses the historical architecture of the structure and the impacts of previous alterations on the integrity of the site
- The heritage statement must also assess the architectural character of the proposal
- Mr Joshua and Dr Townsend will conduct a site visit
- Work must stop with immediate effect.

Ntombi Nkoane

14 OTHER MATTERS

None

15 CLOSE

The meeting adjourned at 15:30

16 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

CHAIRPERSON 

SECRETARY 

17 February 2011

DATE 17/2/2011.

DATE 17/2/2011