

SFB PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING (03/2019)

MONDAY 18th OF FEBRUARY 2019 AT 17h45

8TH FLOOR NORTH WHARF 1 LOWER BREE STREET FORESHORE CAPE TOWN

MINUTE OF PLANNING MEETING

1. Welcome & Apologies

Apologies: David Polovin

Present: Larry Aberman, Aris Vayanos, Victor Morris, Ori Saban, Lauren Bolus, Lizaan Loedolff, David Rose, Gordon Metz

Partially Present: Fred Durow, Lyle Van Der Merwe

2. Previous Minutes

04.02.2019 (02/2019)

Proposer: Lauren Bolus

Seconder: Victor Morris

3. Short Notice Agenda Items

3.1. Gees Judgement

In accordance with the Gees Judgement, proposed plans must be submitted with any demolition application of a building older than 60 years should the building be located in a HPOZ or located near heritage significant buildings.

4. Matters Arising

4.1. ERF 956-RE FRESNAYE 7 AVENUE FONTAIN BLEAU: Alterations & Additions: HWC - **ASAP**

Departure: 6.950m ILO 4m (Boundary side height)

Description: Addition of ground storey garage, new stairwell and first storey scullery.

Discussed: Proposed plans include enclosing the outside parking area. From a Heritage POV, LONO. The raised levels will be towards the back of the site and the elevations are recessed back into the street. Comments from the neighbours required along with the City Advertisement, outlying the departures.

Newly Discussed: The committee can only comment from a Heritage point of view and will not comment on the departure. Comment for a departure can only be formed once it has been advertised by The City. Comment from City Heritage: "No Objection as there will be no negative impact on the Heritage resource nor the streetscape".

To Proceed: LONO (with no comment on the departure)

4.2. ERF 486 SEA POINT 5 MILTON ROAD: Demolition: HWC

– **ASAP**

Departure: N/A

Description: Total Demolition

Discussed: LA recused himself and VM is against the demolition. The committee request confirmation on the proposed plans for the erf after the demolition. From a Heritage point of view only, no objections.

Newly Discussed: LA recused himself. Zoned as GR5. This building does not contain excessive heritage significance as this style is widely available. The

erf is too small to take advantage of GR5. City Heritage Comment: "The City's 2015 grading audit has graded the resource 'not conservation worthy'. The property does not fall inside an HPOZ or proposed HPOZ".

To Proceed: LONO

Fred Durow and Lyle Van Der Merwe entered the room to present on 4.3

4.3. ERF 1245/667 SEA POINT WEST 6/8 NORFOLK ROAD: Rezoning, Consolidation, Departure
(Application Number: 70431787) – **04 MAR**

- Departure:**
- Rezoning:** To rezone Erven 1245 and 667 from GR5 to GR6
 - Consolidate:** To consolidate Erven 1245 and 667 Sea Point West
 - Departures:**
 - Item 41(e):** To permit a portion of the fifth storey of the building (above 25m in height from base level) to be 0m ILO 10.395m from the south eastern common boundary.
 - Item 41(e):** To permit a portion of the sixth storey of the building (above 25m in height from base level) to be 0m ILO 12.159m from the south eastern common boundary.
 - Item 41(e):** To permit a portion of the fifth storey of the building (above 25m in height from base level) to be 1m ILO 10.395m from the north western common boundary.
 - Item 41(e):** To permit a portion of the sixth storey of the building (above 25m in height from base level) to be 1m ILO 12.159m from the north western common boundary.
- Description:** To convert the existing Blocks of Flats to a Boarding House (Home for the Aged-Retirement Home) and to add two storeys to the existing building. The proposed Boarding House will accommodate a total of 19 units containing a total of 50 bedrooms. Existing access and egress to the site will be via the existing carriageway crossing in Wisbech Road. Thirty on-site parking bays is provided (containing 4 tandem bays) on the subject property.
- Discussed:** GR6 is 50m in height. No indication if notices were serviced on the City issued advertisement. Suspect that this is for number 4, 6 and 8 Norfolk Road.
- Newly Discussed:** Applicant has approved plans for block of apartments but has since changed direction and the proposal will now be for a retirement home (independent living). The application includes the two erven to be consolidated and the addition of two floors, hence the rezoning. The aesthetic of the design has also been toned down and softened. The ground floor will be a communal space that will include medical services, deli, reading space etc. The proposed building is not out of scale or height with the rest of the street. The concern is the approval is tied to that so if the applicant wants to convert it to a block of apartments, they need to go through the correct parking procedures. Legally it will be registered as a retirement home with certain restriction such as no person under 50 will be allowed to purchase an apartment in this block. As for fire requirements, the building will need to have installed a lift big

enough to fit stretchers and that will work in case of fire since the elderly residents won't be able use the stairs quickly. Parking requirement is 0.5 per bedroom. They need 26 bays. The setbacks and the floor area will remain the same, it is the parking bays where the difference comes in. On level 5 and 6 the middle section is allowed; the side columns are the setback departments on the two levels. Shared facilities such as a gym, pool etc will be on the top floor. It seems as if the neighbours on the right might be affected, only if the bedrooms and not the bathrooms are on the right, but this block has been advertised to. GM shows concern that the proposed plans show the block positioned more forward than the other buildings on this street. Floor Factor is increase from 2407m² to 3008m².

Fred Durow and Lyle Van Der Merwe leave the meeting.

The only difference between a block of apartments and a retirement home is the amount of parking needed. Another issue is the departures might have a negative effect on the streetscape.

Although still in line with the 4.5m guideline, the proposed plans show the building set more forward than the rest of the buildings in this road. If it was in line with the other buildings from a streetscape point of view, GM won't have a problem with it. The SFB Planning Committee rarely supports bulk up requests over 10%, this application calls for 25%, which is excessive.

To Proceed: Objection

5. Items for comment:

5.1. ERF 656 FRESNAYE 68 AVENUE ST CHARLES: Alterations & Additions: HWC - ASAP

Departure: N/A

Description: Refurbishing the living areas, remodelling the scullery, kitchen, lounge and dining room. Externally, proposed extending the pool deck and screen with timber and a pergola. Addition of a store room at the back of the existing garage.

Discussed: Letters of No Objection signed by all surrounding and affected neighbours.

To Proceed: LONO

5.2. ERF 921 SEA POINT 57 ARTHURS ROAD: Alterations & Additions: HWC - ASAP

Departure: N/A

Description: **Interior:** Layout will be unaffected, but the ceiling of the rear section will be lowered and a first floor added in under the existing roof (the original roof truss structure will be removed and replaced in precisely the same configuration). A bedroom and bathroom and study space will be inserted into this loft space (lit by roof windows set in the plain of the roof at the rear only) creating the necessary space for this growing family.

Exterior: The external envelope of the house will remain, effectively, as is; but the inappropriate verandah roof-sheeting will be re-instated echoing the original; and the two windows, also long-replaced with poor modern frames, will be replaced with French-doors copying the

next-door neighbour's fenestration; and some minor decorative features will be restored.

Discussed: Not intrusive

To Proceed: LONO

5.3. ERF 91 SEA POINT 178 HIGH LEVEL ROAD: Departures – 11 MAR

(Application Number: 70424781)

- Departure:**
- Item 22(f)(ii): To permit the proposed carport to be setback 0.0m ILO 1.5m from High Level Road.
 - Item 22(d): To permit the proposed first storey deck and pergola to be setback 0.0m ILO 3.0m from the North common boundary.
 - Item 22(d): To permit the proposed first storey deck and pergola to be setback 0.8m ILO 3.0m from the west common boundary.
 - Item 22(d): To permit the linear distance after 12m mark from street boundary to be 15.91m ILO 13.95m from North and Western common boundary.
 - Item 22(c)(ii): To permit the height of the proposed pergola to be 6.5m ILO 4.0m permitted.
 - Item 162(1)(a): To permit the proposed building work in a Heritage Protected Overlay Zone.

Description: The property is very altered with few original built features remaining and a poor interface with the streetscape at High Level road. The areas affected by the alterations and additions are out of date and in need of maintenance and repair. The owner wishes to replace the existing deck and pergola on the Northern common boundary due to maintenance issues. The proposed extension of deck structure will afford the owner exterior access to the top level deck from the second storey. The proposed design addresses any overlooking into the neighbouring property on the Western common boundary by use of a vertical horizontal screen. No overlooking into the neighbouring properties on the Northern common boundary applies, as the properties are covered with roof scape, with no view of any exterior or private spaces.

Discussed: Like for like changes, no changes from the streetscape. The applicant will extend the balcony and add balconies to every floor. A wide variety of different styles of homes on this road.

To Proceed: LONO

6. Correspondence

7. General

8. Close

19:13