

**Adopted Resolutions and Decisions of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment
Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via MS Teams
at 08H00 on Wednesday, 15 April 2026**



MATTERS DISCUSSED

11. SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP (NID)

11.1 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13. SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

**13.1 Restitution Redevelopment on Erf 115705-RE, 47 Cauvin Road, District Six - Phase 6: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / DISTRICT SIX / REMAINDER OF ERF 115705**

Case No: 27308CN0206

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the S38(4) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), PHASE 6 DISTRICT SIX REDEVELOPMENT HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT dated 6 February 2026 and prepared Rennie Scurr Adendorff as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

This approval is subject to the recommendations and conditions contained in the HIA that:

1. The following mitigatory measures be implemented to limit impacts to archaeological heritage resources:
 - 1.1. The archaeologist must brief workers on site of the locations of sensitive areas, and instruct the machine operators to exercise due care in clearing the rubble overburden in those identified areas;
 - 1.2. The archaeologist must undertake intensive monitoring of all works in the area of the demolished cottage on the Lydia School site at 12 Chatham Road;
 - 1.3. The archaeologist must conduct periodic monitoring of the four other locations indicated in Section 8.3:
 - a. 43-45 Chatham Road,
 - b. 25-31 Chatham Road,
 - c. 11 and 13 Rochester Roads, and
 - d. Chatham Road plots;
 - 1.4. Workplans must be submitted that propose the archaeological methodology for mitigating each of those sites should significant, in situ material/features/fabric be encountered during site clearing;
 - 1.5. Where significant, in situ material is identified during site clearance at these sites, work in that area must cease, and the monitoring archaeologist must notify HWC through the Case Officer;
 - 1.6. If it is deemed necessary, systematic excavation must be undertaken to mitigate the site prior to its destruction, this must be initiated in terms of the workplans submitted;

- 1.7. Any securely provenanced material arising from systematic excavations must be prepared and submitted to Iziko for curation and storage;
- 1.8. Granite kerbstones must be retained for reuse as far as is feasible;
- 1.9. If human remains are uncovered, work must cease until the project archaeologist and HWC have been notified, the significance of the material has been assessed and a decision has been taken as to how to deal with the findings.
- 1.10. A close out report must be submitted to Heritage Western Cape once all earthmoving and archaeological work on site is completed; a copy of this report is to be uploaded to SAHRIS.
2. The following provisions must be implemented to limit impacts to socio-historic significance:
 - 2.1. The old names for this area of 'Draai Docks' or 'Dry Docks' and the 'Bo-Draai' that made up Phase 6 must be retained as far as possible – and integrated with stories;
 - 2.2. Including cobbled/varied street textures;
 - 2.3. Rochester Street: In memory of Lydia Williams and the Primary School;
 - 2.4. Open spaces that support social gathering and interaction: inspired from the Rag processional route;
 - 2.5. Re-connecting streets to the memory of the mountain;
 - 2.6. Creating spaces to remember legends: From Rugby to Politics and the Cape Corps.
3. The following provisions must be implemented with regard to visual impacts:

Planning Phase Mitigation Measures

 - 3.1. Introduce visual screening through strategic screening vegetation and low, landscaped berms.
 - 3.2. Given the sensitive nature of the receiving environment, screening using trees and hedges, where appropriate.
 - 3.3. Large retaining structures must be stepped and designed to be integrated with natural vegetation and planting.
 - 3.4. Building forms and volumetric/elevational components must be articulated to avoid a monolithic form and flat facades.
 - 3.5. Retain existing vegetation as far as possible and do not damage or destroy vegetation on adjacent properties. Existing trees must be protected in accordance with a tree survey and tree management plan.
 - 3.6. A landscape master plan must be prepared by a SACLAP registered professional landscape architect and implemented during construction. The landscape master plan must include visual screening that offsets the visual impact of the proposed built forms and establishes a green network of indigenous vegetation at the site.

Construction Phase Mitigation Measures

 - 3.7. Store and keep excavation machinery and trucks out of sight of surrounding areas as far as possible.
 - 3.8. Ensure that excavation machinery and trucks entering and leaving the construction area do not leave any rubble, sand, rock, branches or other unwanted material on roads linking to the area.
 - 3.9. Where required, use appropriate hoarding and materials that blend into the surrounding vegetation. Ensure that construction hoarding is dark in colour and free of excessive branding.
 - 3.10. Ensure that the construction area is kept neat and clean. Collect and dispose of litter appropriately to prevent any potential wind-blown litter on or off the site (ecological protection zones to be protected).
 - 3.11. Ensure that site clearing is delayed as long as possible prior to construction in any particular area. Limit site clearing to within the minimum footprint required for construction.

- 3.12. Control erosion immediately to prevent visual scarring of the landscape.
- 3.13. Control dust using the appropriate dust suppression techniques.
- 3.14. Rehabilitate eroded/denuded areas as soon as possible following construction in any particular area.
- 3.15. Protect existing vegetation in all areas that do not fall directly into the construction footprint.
- 3.16. Prohibit excessive signage outside the construction camp.

Operational Phase Mitigation Measures

The VIA notes that the findings of the report may need to be amended on the completion of a lighting and signage plan

- 3.17. Use exterior colours that have low reflectivity value and blend with the surroundings and the contextual character of the site/surrounding area.
- 3.18. Make use of natural, contextually appropriate materials.
- 3.19. Keep reflective surfaces to a minimum or ensure that these areas are shaded by roof overhangs, where possible.
- 3.20. Ensure that non-reflective; colour appropriate paving surfaces are used as far as possible.
- 3.21. Lighting must be low energy and must be shielded down lighting to minimize light impacts and night and light spillage into the surrounding ecological protection areas. No flood lights, and neon lights should also be prohibited.
- 3.22. Outdoor security lighting fixtures and luminaires must be carefully selected to minimize light spillage and positioned/angled to avoid undesirable 'sky-glow'. Light sources must be automated, shielded and directed directly into the site but never directed upwards into the sky/open air.
- 3.23. Large retaining structures must be stepped and designed to be integrated with natural vegetation and planting. Given the sensitive nature of the receiving environment, screening using large trees, where appropriate.
- 3.24. Ensure that the proposed boundary fencing is permeable and softened with planting to provide visual screening. Use appropriate colours that are visually recessive.
- 3.25. Make allowance for ongoing landscape maintenance to allow site vegetation to mature sufficiently to allow the environment to achieve maximum VAC.
- 3.26. Site clearing must be carefully controlled to minimize potential damage and/or erosion and all areas that are disturbed must be repaired and rehabilitated.
- 3.27. All areas disturbed on and off-site during construction activities must be rehabilitated using appropriate vegetation.

4. The following provisions must be implemented with to limit townscape impacts:

Urban Block Layout and Street Grid

- 4.1. The solid part of the boundary wall treatments must comprise a retaining wall plinth. If of terraforce, this must be substantially planted. If of brick, it must be finished with textured plaster.
- 4.2. Fencing must be applied above, with a degree of visual transparency.
- 4.3. The street tree planting proposed on the pavement here is supported, but a benign but wind-hardy species that can achieve sufficient height to create an avenue must be favoured here over purely indigenous tree species, which may not achieve the visual continuity of an avenue of trees.

Public Spaces and Streets

- 4.4. Greening strategy must be more extensively applied along Rochester Street, between the intersection with Portsmouth until the staircase connecting to Christiaan Street at Public Open Space A. This is because this is the street that will naturally make the pedestrian link between Justice Walk and Zonnebloem.

- 4.5. Landscaping along Rochester Street must be confirmed in a detailed landscape plan.
Streetscape: Street Interface, Heights, Building Platforms and Roofs and Streetscapes along Rochester and Christiaan Streets
- 4.6. While the street interface along Christiaan should achieve an appropriate “urban wall” quality, and while Rochester may, in time, become an internal street, in the interim while no urban development is proposed on the opposite side of Rochester, the reduction of street facing garaging must be taken up wherever possible – for instance on the corner units where there is an option to access the garage from the side street, or behind the units.
- 4.7. To ensure the short-term edge treatment, the boundary wall specification (i.e. permeable fencing) must be clearly noted on a detailed landscape plan as well as applicable building plans.
5. The following design and architecture provisions must be implemented:
- 5.1. While architectural design and forms are deliberately set up to be reminiscent of historic District Six, the urban rather than suburban nature of the architecture is to be foregrounded, particularly with respect to the street edges and urban interfaces;
 - 5.2. The materiality of formerly varied road surfaces must be remembered through the use of interlocking pavers instead of tar as part of the design of roads where appropriate and where City regulations permit;
 - 5.3. Granite kerbstones must be retained during site works and reused for pavements throughout the development;
 - 5.4. A detailed Landscape Plan must be submitted to HWC for review, and accompany the Local Authority submissions to provide detail on the following:
 - 5.4.1. the design of the detention pond as a multi-purpose public space;
 - 5.4.2. The design of the proposed POS A, indicating mitigation of retaining walls/ visual connections into the space.

The approval contained in this decision is valid for 5 years from the date of this decision. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

CN

13.2 Proposed Residential Development on Erf 533, Zeekoevlei Crescent, Durbanville: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / DURBANVILLE / ERF 533

Case No: 25927CSI0818

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the S38(4) Supplementary HIA, prepared by Anne-Marié Fick, dated 31 March 2026 as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The above approval is subject to the implementation of the mitigation and design requirements set out in this report and the accompanying visual impact assessment with regards to the following:

1. Architecture: In order to preserve the visual integrity of the homestead within the residential complex wherein it is located, the new built form must be restricted in terms of mass, scale, form and detailing to be coherent with the established architecture of the estate, which is controlled through a

set of architectural guidelines approved in the initial HIA phase. This ensures homogeneity for the new fabric, while maintaining the hierarchy of the homestead architecturally. The guidelines have been adapted where necessary to include the more restrictive rules for this new portion of development, which are:

- a. Single-storey only
 - b. Maximum 30° roof pitch
 - c. Articulated massing to reduce bulk
 - d. Horizontal emphasis
 - e. Muted earth-tone colour palette (grey/charcoal roofs only)
 - f. Natural, textured, low-reflectivity materials
2. Screening: Landscape Measures must ensure the maintenance of established screening as well as establishment of further screening through planting.
 - a. Retention and reinforcement of screening vegetation
 - b. Establishment of a vegetated berm along the northern boundary
 - c. Large indigenous trees (500L–1000L) planted within the road reserve
 - d. Additional planting on western boundaries to soften edges
 - e. Protection of established landscape during construction
 - f. Replacement tree clusters where removals occur
 3. Buffers must be retained to strengthen the werf curtilage envelope
 - a. Minimum 15–20m landscaped buffer between new dwellings and homestead garden edge
 - b. Prohibition of retaining walls beyond building setback lines
 4. To prevent hard edges along the werf curtilage envelope, Visual Permeability must be maintained
 - a. Avoid solid boundary walls
 - b. Maximum 900mm solid wall + 900mm palisade on homestead-facing boundaries
 - c. Hedging or permeable fencing preferred
 5. To keep a more rural and consistent character throughout the infill and along the werf envelope edges, Lighting & Roads must be designed and maintained to have:
 - a. Downward-facing, shielded lighting
 - b. Bollard street lighting only 45
 - c. 5.5m road width with exposed aggregate and rollover kerbs consistent with estate character

The approval contained in this decision is valid for 5 years from the date of this decision. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

CSI

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**16.1 Erven 32103 and 6300-RE, Stikland Hospital, Old Paarl Road, Bellville: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / BELLVILLE / ERVEN 32103 AND 6300-RE**

Case No: 20070811ND0812E

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the S38(8) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled "Proposed Development of Portions of Stikland Psychiatric Hospital", and prepared Cindy Postlethwayt, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The Committee also approves the proposed demolition of the buildings older than 60 years indicated on the demolition plan in Annexure D of the HIA.

The endorsement contained in this comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

EJV

**16.2 Farm 1085 Portion 1, 1085-RE, Rickety Bridge, Dassenberg Road, Franschhoek: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH/ FRANSCHHOEK / FARM 1085 PORTION 1, 1085 REMAINDER**

Case No: HWC25052013EJV0520

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the S38(8) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled "Rickety Bridge Farm: Various Restorations, Alterations & Additions", and prepared Graham Jacobs, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

This endorsement is subject to the following:

1. The development proposals as indicated in the drawings and 3D renders in the Wolff/Open City Heritage Impact Assessment Architect's Report dated 31 March 2026 (Annexure H2 in this HIA) together with the Landscape Framework Plan (Rev 13) dated March 2026 by CNdV (Tanya de Villiers) (Annexure J in this HIA) are endorsed subject to the following:
 - a. That a monitoring brief must be exercised by a suitably qualified and experienced architect with appropriate heritage experience, and landscape architect with heritage experience to provide, respectively, input into the more detailed architectural and landscape design proposals substantially in accordance with the design approach and intentions set out in the Rickety Bridge Heritage Impact Assessment – Architect's Report by Wolff/open City Architect's Report dated 31 March 2026; and that the HWC endorsed heritage architect and landscape architect monitor that work during the construction phase of the project with discretion to revert back to HWC should the heritage and/or landscape architect not be satisfied with the architectural and/or landscaping (as the case may be) as the project proceeds on site;

- b. That a monitoring brief must be exercised by a suitably qualified and experienced architect with heritage experience to provide input into the detailed development of the lighting installation designs, and monitor that related work during the construction phase of the project with discretion to revert back to HWC should he/she not be satisfied with that installation design development;
- c. That the findings and recommendations contained in the archaeological impact assessment (AIA) (Annexure E) dated October 2025 prepared by Dr Lita Webley must be adopted, viz. that there are no fatal flaws with the development on Rickety Bridge and that the development be allowed to proceed, but subject to the recommendations and mitigation measures of the AIA (re. p 27) being included in the EA and EMPr.; and
- d. That the findings and conclusions contained in the desktop palaeontological impact assessment (PIA) (Annexure F) dated October 2025 prepared by Dr Graham Avery must be adopted, viz. that the Rickety Bridge Upgrade is located in a VERY LOW to MODERATELY SENSITIVE palaeontological area, but subject to conditions with stated cautionaries (re. pp3 & 9-11)

The endorsement contained in this comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

EJV

**16.3 Farm 1066-RE, Basse Provence Farm, 45 Main Road, Franschhoek: MA
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH/ FRANSCHHOEK/ FARM 1066-RE**

Case No: HWC24101612CSI1028

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the Supplementary HIA prepared by Graham Jacobs dated 31 March 2026 as meeting the requirement of S.38(3) of the NHRA subject to:

1. Detailed building plans for adaptive reuse of the winery building, informed by an assessment of the existing fabric, fittings and equipment must be submitted to HWC for approval by this Committee, prior to the submission of final building plans to the Municipality.

This endorsement is subject to the following:

1. The development proposals as indicated in the drawings and 3D renders in the Wolff/Open City Heritage Impact Assessment Architect's Report dated 31 March 2026 (Annexure G2 in this HIA) together with the Landscape Framework Plan (Rev 13) dated March 2026 by CNdV (Tanya de Villiers) (Annexure H in this HIA) are endorsed subject to the following:
 - a. That a monitoring brief must be exercised by a HWC endorsed suitably qualified and experienced architect and landscape architect with appropriate heritage experience, to provide, respectively:
 - (a). Input into the detailed architectural and landscaping designs which are to be substantially in accordance with the design approach and intentions set out in the Wolff/Open City Heritage Impact Assessment Architect's Report dated 1 April 2026 in conjunction with the Landscape Framework Plan (Rev 12) dated March 2026 by CNdV (Tanya de Villiers);
 - (b) provide input into the detailed development of the lighting installation designs in conjunction with the architects.

- b. That, during the construction phase, the architect and landscape architect referred to above have discretion to revert back to HWC should they not be satisfied with the interventions to any historic fabric and/or new lighting installations and/or the landscaping (as the case may be) as the work proceeds on site; and
- c. That the findings and recommendations contained in the archaeological impact assessment (AIA) (Annexure E) dated October 2025 prepared by Dr Lita Webley must be adopted, viz. that there are no fatal flaws with the development on Basse Provence and that the development be allowed to proceed, but subject to the recommendations and mitigation measures of the FILIA AIA baseline report: Section 7.2.2.: Planting Guidelines and Section 7.2.3: Lighting Guidelines being included in the EA and EMPr or as otherwise amended by the VIA specialist in conjunction with the monitoring architect and landscape architect referred to above.

The endorsement contained in this comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

CSI

**16.4 Erf 438, of the R43, Stanford: MA
HM / OVERBERG / OVERSTRAND / STANFORD / ERF 438**

Case No: 26708SB1117

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The submission of a revised design for the proposed gatehouse, which must be reduced in scale, by the removal of the large entrance canopy.

SB

17 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

17.1 None

18 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT

18.1 None

19 SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT

19.1 None

20 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

20.1 None

21 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT

21.1 None

22 SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT

22.1 None

23. SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES

23.1 None

24. SECTION 47 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS

24.1 None

25. ADVICE

25.1 None

26. SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS

26.1 None

27. OTHER

27.1 None

28. Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above.