

**UNFORTUNATELY, NO
ACCREDITED URBAN
DESIGNERS ARE ON THE
PROFESSIONAL TEAM FOR
THIS PROPOSED PROJECT.**

as much of the then-surviving two- to three-storey historical fabric as it could and recycled it for contemporary use. Moreover, the internal planning record of the city during the 1980s clearly shows that a maximum height of 14 metres was recommended for buildings in this context.¹²

So we must observe that city engineering/planning from 1934 (when the Slums Act came into being) to the 1970s didn't really take heritage into account. The urban patterns and building typologies that had been the norm when the Bo-Kaap had extended and merged with like urban fabric all the way down to Long Street were put in check. Indeed, heritage tended to be either ignored or seen as an impediment to progress: redevelopment was rampant. The development 'rights' entrenched via the zoning scheme during the 1940s and 1950s encouraged the consolidation of many then relatively small and fine-grained erven into larger properties, so as to permit larger, multistorey buildings.

In urban design and urban heritage resources management there is much consideration of urban texture, grain and patterns. These are related to the significance of the public realm and to street typologies that are spatially defined by flanking development, their grain, the vertical and horizontal rhythms of abutting buildings of relatively narrow widths, and the resulting overall massing and patterns of development and enclosure.

The predominantly fine-grained urban building texture – obviously derived from a fine-grained cadastral ownership pattern of many relatively small properties constituting urban blocks – began to be replaced by consolidated, coarse-grained, larger properties (sometimes one property encompassing most or all of a city block, as was the case with the City Park/Christiaan Barnard building). It was because of this background, and the resistance to it by many public voices, that the CoCT founded an Urban Conservation Unit and started putting in place Conservation Areas where some modicum of controls remained, such as to reduce bulk 'rights' where that was in the public interest. Obviously, this relatively recent history has effect on what is suitable development for the site in question.

In fact, if anyone seriously thinks about this from a city planning and management point of view, tall buildings, on the one hand, and the surviving character of the Bo-Kaap, Riebeeck Square and Heritage Square, on the other, are completely contradictory. If the Bo-Kaap, Heritage Square and Riebeeck Square are worth retaining as significant heritage resources and indicators of Cape Town's history, then Heritage Square, the Bo-Kaap and Riebeeck Square must be protected from unacceptable buildings that have too large a mass and height and are logically out of place. This is why a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone was put in place (Figure 9).

The site is situated directly between two significant Provincial Heritage Sites, since both the Bo-Kaap and Riebeeck Square are Provincial Heritage Sites (PHSs) under the jurisdiction of the provincial authority, Heritage Western Cape (HWC). The Riebeeck Square PHS extends right up to the Buitengracht boundary of the site in question; the Bo-Kaap PHS has its eastern boundary across Rose Street from the site (Figures 9 and 10).

Since a portion of the site is within the Heritage Protection Overlay Zone, good practice would require that an accredited heritage practitioner establish:

- exactly what the heritage resources are that are situated within the broader context of the proposed development, so that:
- these may be mapped in plan and section and taken into consideration as constraints and informants to the development proposals from a number of heritage perspectives, including townscapes (views from far and near), streetscapes, and dominant building scale and character;
- the character/s of the sub-areas and the interfaces between the site in question and its context may be defined; so that:
- from a heritage perspective, design indicators and constraints are formulated as informants to any development proposals.

Apparently, the above was not done. Heritage Western Cape (HWC) was not even approached by the development team – or by the city. In pursuit of good practice, a Heritage Statement or, better still, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) prepared by an accredited heritage practitioner would normally be required as part of the proponent's documentation for such a development proposal. No such was prepared or required by the city administration. A belated and quite deficient one was prepared after the due date for objections. Also, and belatedly, HWC was asked to comment on the development proposals. The comments were strongly negative as were those of the Cape Institute for Architecture (CifA) and the Urban Design Institute of South Africa (Western Cape Branch). HWC and CifA have lodged appeals of the decision to approve the development proposals by the Municipal Planning Tribunal.

In this case it became incumbent on objectors to the proposals to marshal at least some of the required evidence from a heritage perspective. Some of this evidence is briefly set out here, only sufficient to show that the proposals have not been informed by properly derived heritage indicators.

As may be seen in the current inventory of heritage resources prepared by the CoCT, represented in Figures 9 and 10, the context of the site is rich in heritage resources. What is the character of the townscape and streetscape insofar as it is derived from heritage resources? The inevitable and logical bottom-line answer is that, while the dominant heritage-derived townscape and streetscape character has been compromised to