

SFB PLANNING MEETING (13/2017)

MONDAY 7TH AUGUST 2017 AT 17h45

KMH Architects 116 Loop Street Cape Town

MINUTE OF PLANNING MEETING

1. Welcome & Apologies

Present: Rod Stevens, Lauren Bolus, Ari Vayanos, David Polovin, Larry Aberman, Lizaan Loedolff

Apologies: Paul Berman & Jacques van Embden

2. Previous Minutes

2.1. 24.07.2017 (12/2017)

Proposer: David Polovin

Seconder: Rod Stevens

3. Matters Arising

3.1. **ERF 700 FRESNAYE 24 AVENUE FRESNAYE:** Departures **- 08 August**

Application Number 70345706

Departure: Item 22(f)(ii): To permit to proposed garage to be set back 0m ILO 1.5m from the street boundary (Avenue Fresnaye Avenue) required

Item 22(d): To permit the proposed first storey terrace to be set back 0.0m ILO 3.5m the street boundary (Avenue Fresnaye Avenue) required

Description: It is proposed to erect a dwelling house on the property.

Note: LL spoke to TDA Professional Officer K Ngendahimana who informed her that the neighbours comments will only be ready after the deadline of 8 August.

Discussed: Departures are fairly insignificant. PlanComm want comments from the neighbours (703 & 688). We also require supporting documents.

Further discussions: We won't have access to the neighbours comments before the deadline to comment. PlanComm studied plans and reviewed plot layout. It does not seem to require an overlooking feature. The entrance gate stays where it is, brand new garage.

To proceed: LL to issue LONO

3.2. **ERF 77 SEA POINT 10 SOLOMONS ROAD:** Departures & Council Approval (By-Law) – **14 August**

Application Number 70344510

Departure: Item 60: The building to be setback 5.5m from the centre line of the street ILO 8.0m

Item 121: Pools on the 1st, 3rd and 7th storeys to be setback 0m ILO 1.0m required

Item 138: 3 parking bays ILO 6 parking bays required

Item 141: Vehicles to reverse across the footway
Parking within 10.0m of the street on the ground floor level

Description: It is proposed to accommodate a block of flats on the property

Discussion: Request traffic impact assessment. They have half the parking that they need. The apartments are 3 bedrooms, all en-suite, Erf is 162m². As a building, pleasant design but it has parking problems. The Spar parking is across the (already slim) road. Very concerned about the parking issue.

However, very close to MiCiti bus route. This building might enhance the look of the street. If the building is set back enough to where it does not obstruct the pavement, perhaps. Request Applicant to Present.

Newly Discussed: They are framing this application as holiday accommodation but the reality is that this might be used for residential living. The apartments are very big and occupants will most likely have 2 cars per unit. The applicant suggests tandem parking but the Planning Committee find that there is not enough space allocated for successful tandem parking. Parking might not be an issue if this is only used for holiday accommodation. Very accessible to public transport (close to 5 MyCiti Routes, 150m walk from Queens Beach Station and 90m walk from Tramway Stops). This site does not fall within PT1 or PT2 Parking Zone. The parking at the Spar building is always very congested. PlanComm suggests moving the placement of the garage doors further back to ensure that it does not obstruct the pavement. The Planning Committee do not object to the 3 parking spots instead of 6, but we do object to the placement of the garage doors. By moving the placement of the garage doors it will remove the temptation of parking in front of the building and obstructing the pavement

To proceed: PlanComm objects, LB to draft letter of objection

3.3. **ERF 987 SEA POINT EAST 38 ARHURS ROAD:** Demolition: HWC

- **ASAP**

Departures: None

Description: Demolition

Discussed: Old Victorian house, beautiful and in a very good state. It is not an Hpoz and it has not been graded. DP thinks we should object. The Committee feels conflicted and request the applicant provide stronger motivation.

Newly discussed: Applicant Mr A Lillie presented. The Planning Committee feels the house is in good condition. Mr Lillie shows the Committee location of the Erf, within a context of some other buildings of a similar age although these are generally much altered. There are no buildings in the immediate vicinity that have been identified as conservation-worthy. The City is currently regrading all Heritage affected buildings, they are also doing this on an ad hoc basis. In terms of the actual building, the bay window is original. The building went through massive renovation a couple of years ago. Other than the bay, the fenestration to the front is modern and the back of the exterior has been remodelled. They have removed internal walls, created arches using modern, hollow timber, columns. Many rooms, including the kitchen have been completely remodelled with the back of the house extended with a double storey addition. The only original features that remain are the bay window, fireplace and some doors. The rest of the house enjoyed extensive renovations. If it is not in a conservation area and Mr Lillie suggested that the building does not, given the extensive alterations, warrant a status of 3B and, in this context, it does not warrant conservation.

To proceed: LL to issue LONO

3.4. **ERF 926 SEA POINT EAST 35 ARTHURS ROAD:** Permanent Departures

- **31 July**

Case ID: 70331820

Departures:

- Item 22(d): To permit the new 1st floor addition to be 0.0m ILO 3.0m on the north rear common boundary
- Item 22(d): To permit the new 1st floor addition to be 1.165m ILO 3.0m on the east common boundary
- Item 22(c)(ii): To permit the new 1st floor addition to be 6.60m ILO 4.0m on to north rear common boundary

- Item 22(c)(ii): To permit the new 1st floor balcony to be 7.3m ILO 4.0m on the east common boundary
- Item 22(d): To permit portions of the proposed building beyond 12m from the street and within 3.0m from the common boundaries to be 84% (27.90m) of the remaining linear distance ILO 60% (20.033m)
- Item 22(e)(i): To permit external windows to be setback 1.165m ILO 1.50m required

Description: Construction started a number of years ago, build as they can afford.

Discussed: Aesthetically ill considered. Suspect that this is an application for retrospective approval. Should this be the case, applying now for approval on work done is not acceptable. We have no evidence of approved plans, in fact the building looks nothing like what has been built.

RS suggests: Applicant to provide stamped approved building plans for previous alterations, if not the Planning Committee will request a penalty given to the applicant. SFB Planning Committee do not support retrospective approval. LL to get more information. The Committee requests copies of the approved plans, plus a photocopy in colour of the changes they would like to make.

Newly discussed: The Planning Committee worked through the departures and the (newly received) approved plans. It seems as if they are extending the wooden first floor all the way to the boundary. The Planning Committee will object due to concern that this application might conflict with the National Building Regulations (Building PART T: SANS 10400-T:2011. FIRE) in that a potentially combustible structure on the first floor, as proposed at 0m on the common boundary, with a glass brick insert might present a potential fire risk for the neighbour. This objection shall stand until such time that we receive documentation that they comply with fire regulations.

To Proceed: LB to draft Letter of Objection.

4. New Applications:

4.1. ERF 1411 FRESNAYE 39 AVENUE PROTEA: Subdivision - 31 August

Application Number 70357241

Departure: None

Description: It is proposed to subdivide the subject property into two portions. Portion A ± 542m² and remainder ± 649m², for residential purposes.

Discussed: LB recused herself from this discussion. Two separate erven have been consolidated in 1962.

To Proceed: LL to issue LONO

4.2. ERF 401 SEA POINT CNR ARTHURS AND GRAHAM ROAD: Proposed Departure - 04 September

Application Number 70331166

Departure: Item 41(b): To permit a floor factor of 2.51 ILO 2.5

Item 138: To permit 8 off-street parking bays ILO 26 off-street parking bays.

Item 41(a): To permit coverage of 78.18% ILO 60% (existing 64.25%)

Item 41(e): To permit storey 1,2,3,4 and 5 being setback 1.06m & 0.6m ILO 4.5m from Graham Road and 1.06m on storey 6

Item 41(e): Departures from the north-west common boundary more than 18m from the street boundary (Arthurs Road).

Storey 1: 0m ILO 4.5m

Storey 2: 1.1m ILO 4.5m

Storey 3: 1.1m ILO 5.2m

Storey 4: 1.1m ILO 6.9m

Storey 5: 1.1m ILO 8.67m

Storey 6: 5.084m ILO 10.56m

Council to not require a street centreline setback of 8m from the centreline of abutting public street (Graham Road)

Description: Proposed 21 roomed boarding house

Discussed: PlanComm has seen this before and we objected due to the fact that it did not have enough parking, no provision for car stacking, the proposed building will be in conflict with urban design policies and not acceptable in term of urban design.

To proceed: LL to request applicant to present.

4.3. **ERF 906 FRESNAYE 295 OCEAN VIEW DRIVE:** Demolition: HWC

- **ASAP**

Departure: None

Description: Demolition

Discussed: 1950s house with asbestos roof.

Proceed: LL to issue LONO

5. Correspondence

5.1. **ERF 102 FRESNAYE 3 PRINCESS AVENUE**

An email received from Neighbour.

This association is registered with HWC and The City of CT as a conservation body. Therefore we are invited to comment on demolition applications. The house on ERF 102 FRESNAYE 3 PRINCESS AVENUE is not in a Heritage Overlay Zone nor is it graded. Nor is the context of neighbouring properties graded, therefore we have no grounds to object to the demolition application which will be decided by HWC.

6. General

7. Close

19:25

NOTES

HWC: Heritage Western Cape

LONO: Letter of No Objection

HPO: Heritage Protection Overlay

ILO: In Lieu Of