

JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY

HERITAGE ASSESSMENT SURVEYING FORM

Compiled by: Dr JJ Bruwer, 2002-07-29

JJ Bruwer ©

Cellphone: 082 325 5823

NAME OF PLACE: 146 JEPPE STREET BUILDINGPrevious/alternative name/s : *Tayob's Building*

LOCATION: Street : corners Jeppe, Loveday and Kerk
 : [146 Jeppe; 60, 62, 64, 66, Loveday; 37 Kerk]
 Street number :
 Stand Number : 1129, 1130, 1135, 1136
 Previous Stand Number:
 Block number : AG
 GIS reference :

ZONING: Current use/s :
 Previous use/s :

DESCRIPTION OF PLACE:

Height :
 Levels above street level : one
 Levels below street level :
 On-site parking :

CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS:

Walls:

Roof:

Windows:

SITE FEATURES:

ALTERATIONS:

INTEGRITY:

INSCRIPTION:

ARCHITECT:

Portal Partnership Inc.

BUILDER:

CONSTRUCTION DATE:

Date on plans : (original plans not found)
Approval of plans :
Completion date :

BUILDING STYLE:

Post Modern Decorative.

BUILDING TYPE:

Single storey shops to street building.

ENVIRONMENT:

The diminutive scale of this building affords a better view to the surrounding buildings.

CONDITION:

Good.

URGENT ACTION:

SAHRA RECORD REGARDING ALTERATIONS, RENOVATIONS, RESTORATION:

PROTECTION STATUS: (under National Heritage Resources Act, 1999)

- General protection: Section 34(1) structure/s
- Formal protection: provincial heritage site
- national heritage site
- provisional protection
- heritage area
- listed in provincial heritage resources register

Relevant Gazette Notice:

Gazette description:

FORMER PROTECTION STATUS: (under National Monuments Act, 1969)

NOTES:

DEEDS INFORMATION:

Original ownership:

PRE-HISTORY OF SITE:

ARLINGTON MANSIONS:

Note that the information below was sourced from an archive file of SAHRA (NMC Files 9/2/228/1, Johannesburg General) and that the comments appearing in brackets, are solely those of one of the authors of the survey, viz. Catharina J.M. Bruwer:

17 May 1993:

Mr Michael Scholes from the architects firm Louis Karol Architects addressing the following letter dated 17 May 1993 to The Chairperson, National Monuments Council:

"ARLINGTON MANSIONS COR. LOVEDAY 7 KERK STREET, JOHANNESBURG – STAND NO'S 1129 AND 1130 JOHANNESBURG. I was approached by Mr. Stainer of Wreckers to access the historical importance and architectural merit of the above building, with a view to its preservation or demolition. I have visited the building and obtained copies of the original plans. I have also had a Meeting with Mr. Van Graan of ISAA concerning the proposed demolition. Neither the Monuments Council nor the TIA have, I believe, copies of the plans. A set is enclosed for your reference. The plans were approved in 1925, with an an (sic.) additional (sic.) two floors approved in 1926. It can be assumed that the later was a deviation plan and that the building was built in 1926, which is the date on the façade. To attempt an objective assessment of the building, I have looked at a number of issues, which are as follows:

(a) DATE OF CONSTRUCTION :

1926

(b) ARCHITECT :

James Cook, who is of no importance to the architectural development of Johannesburg's Architectural History.

(The following are extracted from various sources consulted during the survey:

Chipkin: "Marc Obel (of Obel & Obel Architects) once recalled that they "were considered the first architects of that period' – a position hotly contested by the prolific firm of J.C. Cook & Cowen, who designed vas Art Deco piles and were working, at the beginning of 1934, on fourteen major buildings. Cook & Cowen were the architects of Dunvegan Chambers (AC-4), noted for its sculpted relief decoration, and Broadcast House, as well as buildings like Dorchester Mansions in Rissik Street (AQ-3) and Stanhope Mansions in Plein Street, both embellished with startling Art Deco relief patterns." To illustrate the point made by Chipkin, it is appropriate to record that the architects J.C. Cook and Cowen, *inter alia*, designed two of the seven buildings situated on Block V, and five of the total of nine buildings situated on Block AC. These building are a few examples of the many interesting buildings in Johannesburg, designed by J.C. Cook & Cowen.)

(c) CURRENT USE :

GROUND FLOOR - Retail shopping of indifferent quality.

UPPER FLOORS - Bedsitter residential flats.

(d) HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS :

The building is not, as far as I am aware, associated with any important personalities or events in the history of Johannesburg.

(e) EXTERNAL ENVELOPE :

The main façade is a mixture of Arts and Crafts and late "Johannesburg Edwardian". The Arts and Crafts Style is not common in Johannesburg. Arlington Mansions was not, however, built concurrent with the movement in Europe, (see also the fax of Mr André van Graan] nor is it a consistent work of architecture. The façade facing the street is not in good condition and I suspect that many defects are hidden by a recent coat of paint.

The façade facing the internal court is of no architectural merit and is in shocking condition.

(f) ENTRANCE LOBBY :

The entrance lobby to the flats is in very poor condition, the lift (this was one of the old fashioned lifts) is boarded up and there is no evidence of arts and crafts detailing.

(g) INTERNAL PLANNING :

The building comprises a number of bedsitter type flats, accessed off an open balcony. There is nothing to commend the planning, which is typical of a low budget project.

(h) INTERNAL CONDITION :

The condition of the inside of the flats is very poor and desperately in need of attention.

(i) GENERAL CONDITION :

The condition of the building is in all respects very poor.

(j) SUMMERY :

Arlington Mansions, in my opinion, has little architectural merit and is of no historical significance. The architect was not important in the historical development of Johannesburg. (See also the fax from Mr André van Graan.) The condition of the building is very bad and was, I believe, a fairly cheap commercial development. The "Arts and Crafts" Style was in all

likelihood seen as a cheap way of making a façade. (See also fax from Mr André van Graan.)
I am given to understand that façade retention is not possible. Were it so, I do not think the façade is of sufficient merit to warrant the costs. The loss of residential accommodation is not to be taken lightly. The current condition of the flats, however, verges on being a slum.

CONCLUSION :

I do not believe there is sufficient justification to withhold permission to demolish Arlington Mansions. The undersigned would be pleased to meet with the ISAA and National Monuments Council to discuss the matter further, should you deem it necessary."

29 June 1993:

"MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN TRANSVAAL PLANS COMMITTEE HELD ON 1993-06-29 AT THE PINES, PARKTOWN, JOHANNESBURG.

1. PRESENT

Mrs F Bird (Chairman) [Flo]

Mr A Van Graan [André, Architect]

Mr H Prins [Herbert, Architect]

Mr D Rodd [Douglas, Architect]

Miss M [Micha] Birch (Professional Officer/Secretary)

2. WELCOME

The Chairman welcomed all present.

3. INTERVIEWS

3.2. Arlington Mansions, Johannesburg (9/2/228/1) [5 Kerk; 60, 62 Loveday Streets.]

At 14:00 Mr Steiner and Mrs Marais of Wreckers Demolishers, Mr Scholes (an independent architect who was representing the owner of the building), and Mr Katz (the estate agent who was acting as a go-between) joined the meeting. They came to see the Plans Committee to appeal against the Committee's refusal to grant a demolition permit for Arlington Mansions. Mrs Bird explained that there was a misunderstanding and that they should appeal to the Northern Transvaal Plans committee as this Committee had already reached a decision regarding this matter. A meeting with the Northern Transvaal Plans Committee could be arranged as soon as possible. Mrs Bird informed the deputation that the building had been inspected by the Committee and that this had not in any way changed their decision. Mrs Bird continued to explain that the Act stipulated that buildings were important with regards to their historical, cultural and/or aesthetical value. This building was a rare Arts & Crafts building in the Johannesburg CBD. Furthermore Mrs Bird explained that the condition of a building was not taken into account, the NMC did not issue 'demolition permits by decay'. Mr Katz explained that due to the control of the Rent Board they could never generate an income which could carry the maintenance costs of the building. As result of this the building had deteriorated throughout the years. Mrs Bird pointed out that the NMC had to exercise the Act in terms of what was laid down in it, it was the NMC's function to maintain our heritage. Mr Scholes said that he had checked all listings and said that he had found no documentation on this building. He questioned the importance of this building due to the fact that it had never been identified and recorded. Mr Scholes questioned the viability of retaining this uneconomical building. He explained that he had received a report from a plumber stating that every single bath, wasbasin, toilet and sink in the building needed to be replaced. Further more the electrical works were in a state of disaster. According to him the whole building was in a state of collapse. Mr Scholes went on to say that the building was situated on a very prominent site in the Johannesburg CDB and that this position was part of the urban planning strategy. He stated that the JCC had inspected the building and that they supported the demolition. Mrs Bird replied by stating that the lists which Mr Scholes considered to be so thorough did not include other important buildings such as the Diagonal Street buildings. She went on to say that there were other parameters other than scholarly, academic [sic.] or architectural. Mr Prins said that there was no comprehensive list of important Johannesburg buildings. He explained that the NMC was not only concerned with the architectural value of a building but also with its social and historical importance. He continued to say that Mr Scholes must accept the fact that the Committee had put its mind to the decision and would not change its mind. Mr Katz explained that the water consumption exceeded the total income of the building. He said that they could never put up a rental which could make the building viable, the building was not in a residential area [this is strange as the *Fattis Mansions*: AH-3, was situated diagonally across Arlington Mansions at 65, 67 Loveday Street; *Manners Mansions*: AE-3 - is situated one block down towards Joubert Street] and it was impossible to convert the building to offices. He believed that nobody would buy the building as an investment. Mr Steiner concluded by saying that the whole country was in a dire financial and economical state. He said that this was a classic example of a stand which could contribute positively to the economy of the country. He said that he was in favour of what the NMC did but that we had a responsibility towards the growth of the country. The committee replied by saying that when Wreckers submitted a signed tender a demolition permit would be issued immediately."

28 July 1993:

"FAX NO. 012 323 1675; ATTENTION OF: MIKA BIRCH; FROM: ANDRÉ v. GRAAN; DATE: 28.7.93 (or 27 as date has been altered); COMPANY: ISAA.

ARLINGTON MANSIONS

A very fine, late example of Arts and Crafts Style Building and the only example of its application in Johannesburg.

The Art & Crafts Style continued to be reflected in the design of buildings up to the Second World War and in Britain one finds the proponents such as Lutyens, Oliver Hill, Goodhart Rendel & C Cowes Voysey as well as Sir Giles Gibert Scott continuing to use this architectural vocabulary despite the introduction of the Modern Movement in the 1930's. The Modern Movement was regarded as avant garde and reactionary and did not have the popular appeal of Arts and Crafts. This one should not confine any assessment of this style to the decade after the turn of the century. Arlington Mansions is a very fine essay in the Free Style Arts & Crafts Style and shows strongly the influence of Lutyens, particularly his design for Overstrand Hall and particularly the domestic style of CFA Voysey, one of the most important Arts & Crafts architects of all. Voysey used the same way of massing using bay windows for expression, simple window treatment, and plain rendered or roughcast walls. There are strong similarities in the elevation of Arlington Mansions (in its original form) and the house called Broadleys in the Lake District which was regarded as one of Voysey's fine designs and a building which influenced architects for many years. The facebrick detailing around the windows is similar to that used by Detmar Blow (1867-1939) for Happisburgh in N (rest of word not eligible). The additions to Arlington Mansions are sensitively handled by Cooke (sic.) who as a partner of Maurice Cowen created many fine buildings in Johannesburg including His Majesty's."

PREVIOUS TENANT:

By 1954: 62a Loveday Street - African Pet Co.

The final word is left to Van Der Waal: "Less important hotels were also located on the edge of the business district. This was in line with the tendency for residential buildings to be gradually crowded out of the city centre – a trend that was to be continued in later years. Indeed, this marked the beginning of the slow death of the city core, which would eventually contain only commercial buildings and lack all vestiges of night life." (Van Der Waal, G-M.: From Mining Camp to Metropolis...).

NEWLYN MANSIONS:

The corner building known as *Newlyn Mansions*, was situated at 64, 66 Loveday Street and 146 Jeppe Street. It was designed by Sinclair, Duncan McDonald and completed during 1934. Both *Newlyn Mansions* and *Arlington Mansions* were demolished to make way for the existing building!

HISTORY:**GENERAL NOTES:**

Estimated cost of building	:	(original plans not found)
Estimated cost of drainage	:	
Accommodation approved	:	
Valuation at completion	:	
Occupied	:	

CURRENT TENANTS:**SOURCES:**

For additional illustrative information, see relevant supplementary photo album in electronic format.

See SOURCES DOCUMENT for information on sources consulted with reference to this document.

RECORDED BY:

Heritage Resources Management team Johann J and Catharina JM Bruwer.
Unless otherwise indicated photographs by Catharina JM Bruwer.



28 9 2003