

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 15 June 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1 Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Ms. Corne Alexander, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2 Attendance

Members

Ms. Corne Alexander	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Xola Mlwandle (left at 10:52am)	Heritage Officer	XM
Emily Jane Vowles	Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB

Staff

Ms. Nuraan Vallie	Assistant Director & Secretariat	NV
Mr. Olwethu Dlova	Backup Secretariat & I&APs	OD

Legal Advisor

Ms. Penelope Meyer	Deputy Director	PM
--------------------	-----------------	-----------

Observers

None

Visitors

Cindy Postlethwayt
Clive Theunissen
Anne Marie Fick
Carmen-Ann Wessels
Nicolene Visser
David Halkett
Carmen-Ann Wessels
Joon Chong
Laurie Flalkov
Mark Wüger
Jone Kros
Nazeema Duarte

Capacity

Heritage Consultant
Drakenstein Municipality
Heritage Consultant
Consultant & Architect
Consultant & Observing
Heritage Consultant
Applicant
I&APs Neighbours
I&APs Neighbours
I&APs Neighbours
Consultant & Architect
Consultant

Item

13.8 (held over); 13.23; 14.13.
13.24; 13.25; 14.13; 14.16.
13.25.
14.1.
14.1.
14.7.
14.1.
14.28.
14.28.
14.28.
14.25, 14.28.
14.23.

3 Apologies

Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Ms Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	Secretariat	NT
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Specialist Heritage Officer	SB

Absent

None.

4 Acceptance of the Code of Conduct

Members and staff raised their hands on the MS Teams platform to indicate acceptance of the Code of Conduct.

5 Approval of Agenda

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 15 June 2026 with the following additions:
EJV moved to adopt the agenda and RB seconded.

6 Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1 The Committee resolved to hold over the minutes dated 1 and 8 June 2026.

7 Disclosure of conflict of interest

7.1 None

8 Confidential matters

8.1 None.

9 Standing Items

9.1 Site inspections undertaken

9.1.1 None

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

9.2.1 None

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Erf 96655-RE, Newlands Swimming Pool, Newlands (RB)

DISCUSSION

- Site inspection undertaken on 6 May 2026.
- Graded IIIB.
- Outside of any formal HPO, inside the proposed Newlands PHA HPOZ.
- The site inspection was undertaken as part of a series of inspections to CoCT owned properties to assist with facilitating heritage approvals and potential exemptions to fast track applications in the interest of cooperative governance.
- Several issues were identified as per the site inspection report and recommendations of what kind of work could be exempted with a potential heritage agreement and what work would require public consultation or not.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 7 June 2026 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection and report to be noted at HOMs on 15 June 2026.
2. The exemptions & application requirements as detailed in the site inspection report to be endorsed by HOMs and subject to a Heritage Agreement.
3. All future applications to HWC made in terms of Section 34 or Section 38 of the NHRA are to be submitted by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner.

9.3.2 Erven 153-RE, 151-RE & 318, Sea Point Swimming Pool Complex, Beach Road, Sea Point (CSI)

- The site inspection report was held over until 6 July 2026.

9.3.3 Erven 829, 830, 832, 831, 828, 18 Victoria Street, Somerset West (SB)

- The site inspection report was held over until 22 June 2026.

9.3.4 Erf 1068, 166 St Georges Street, Simon's Town (SVB)

DISCUSSION

- Site inspection undertaken on 05 May 2026.
- The property is graded IIIA and is within the Simon's Town HPOZ.

- The subject of the inspection is the Municipal Library building, which is one of four buildings located on / partially on the property.
- The building is in a poor state, putting a resource of high local significance at risk. This requires immediate and careful intervention, which necessitates certain exemptions from Heritage Western Cape processes.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 12 June 2026 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection and report to be noted at HOMs on 15 June 2026.
2. The exemptions & application requirements as detailed in section 8 of the site inspection report to be endorsed by HOMs and subject to a Heritage Agreement.
3. All future applications to HWC made in terms of Section 34 or Section 38 of the NHRA are to be submitted by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 IACom 17 June 2026 (in-person)

- The Committee raised concerns regarding security.
- The ASD confirmed they would follow-up on the above.

9.4.2 BELCom 24 June 2026

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 None

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.6.1 None

9.7 Incomplete Applications

9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.5; 13.10; 13.11; 13.12; 13.15; 13.21

9.7.2 New Matters: 14.3; 14.4; 14.5; 14.6; 14.9; 14.11; 14.12; 14.29; 14.31; 14.32; 14.33; 14.34; 14.35; 14.36; 14.37

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

9.8.1 Matters Arising: None

9.8.2 New Matters: None

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising: None

9.9.2 New Matters: 14.17

9.10 Archaeological Matters

9.10.1 None

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

9.11.1 None

9.12 Permit deadline: 18 June 2026 (end of business)

9.13 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- A quick demonstration was shown so that officers are familiar with the new process of showing applicants when an item will be tabled using the SAHRIS platform.
- The main focus has been working on the S35/S36 form with a draft projected by end of the week/early next week to showcase to the officers.

- The Committee raised concerns about adding a check for Sectional Title situations as well as how the SDP amendment form asks for information.

10 **Administrative Matters**

10.1 Erf 173714-Re, East Quay Building, East Quay, Clock Tower Precinct, V&A Waterfront (EJV)

Case No: HWC25100104SJ1003

DISCUSSION

- On 13 October 2025 HOMs resolved to approve the MW application for the retrofitting of the East Quay Building subject to the submission of a close-out report.
- To ensure compliance, provide a record of heritage related methodologies, and track and record any minor deviations which have no impact on heritage resources, the heritage practitioner has proposed the submission of interim reports.
- Report 01 was noted by HOMs on the 9th of February 2026
- Report 02 was noted by HOMs on the 9th of March 2026
- Report 03 and a deviation enquiry was noted by HOMs on the 11th of May 2026 where the Committee resolved the following:

The Committee noted the interim report titled “Monthly Report 03 - Heritage”, dated April 2026, and prepared by Ursula Rigby, as adhering to the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 15 October 2025.

The Committee supported the proposed deviations to the roof terrace, namely:

- *An alternate lift housing configuration where a curved glazed shopfront is now envisaged, to repeat the form of the existing projecting stair housing.*
- *The addition of an aluminium clad canopy to the lift housing which projects for shelter and follows the curved glazed shopfront.*
- *A glazed frameless balustrade fixed to the inside of the existing parapet wall, as opposed to the painted mild steel balustrade which matched the existing on the lower level.*

The Committee resolved to request the following:

1. *All minor deviations, inclusive of the above, considered to not have a negative impact on heritage resources are to be reflected on a final drawing set and assessed by the appointed Heritage Practitioner for submission alongside the close-out report within 30-days of practical completion.*
- The roof terrace forms part of Building B which is considered to be NCW. The alterations do not impact any heritage material considered to be worthy of retention as per the heritage indicators provided in 2012, and the 2019 and 2024 SDP amendments nor the 2025 application and its noteworthy architectural details for Building B. The alterations will not pose significant visual impact due to being located on the terrace of the double-storey structure. The 2024 application states that Building B “provides contrast between old and new and verification of the historical layering evident in the precinct”, and the increase in contrast posed by the terrace deviation can be considered to support the continued layering.
 - Revised Plans: in order to meet the requirements for the issuing of the occupancy certificate for the site, the status quo needs to be captured in a plan set inclusive of all deviations noted in past interim reports and those supported by HOMs on the 11th of May. These changes above have been assessed to not impact negatively on the heritage resource and include:
 1. exterior stair changes
 2. exterior door changes
 3. exterior window changes (circular windows)
 4. blanked out windows
 5. roof terrace changes
 6. changes to the intended reuse of extant heritage timber have also been noted on these drawings and reported on in our interim reports. This change has been assessed to be enhancing to the heritage resource

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the revised plans numbered 0001 Revision F; 0900 Revision F; 1000 Revision G; 1001 Revision E; 1002 Revision B; 2000 Revision F; 3000 Revision F; 8001 Revision B; 8000 Revision D; 5000 Revision B; 4GF-FP Revision 4; 401-FP; Revision 4; 4RF-FP Revision 2; 4GF-FS

Revision 2; 401-FS Revision 2; 4GF-SD Revision 4; 401-SD Revision 5; 4GF-FW Revision 4; 401-FW Revision 4, dated May 2026, and prepared by Boogertman + Partners as being substantially in accordance with and adhering to the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 15 October 2025.

The Committee resolved to request the following:

1. All minor deviations, inclusive of the above, considered to not have a negative impact on heritage resources are to be reflected on a final drawing set and assessed by the appointed Heritage Practitioner for submission alongside the close-out report within 30-days of practical completion.

10.2 Case Review Update

- The Committee noted the need to standardise the case review in order to meet audit requirements

11 Monitoring by practitioner

11.1 None

12 Discussion of the Agenda

12.1 Item 14.19 - Farm 135 Portion 74; Farm 163 Portion 2, Thornvilla Farm, Langverwagten Road, McGregor, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: 27452EJV0218

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 22 July 2026 due to the mitigation measures requiring consideration.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13 MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 17659, 134 Adderley Street, Oudtshoorn, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25021312CN0210

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information: Application form, POP, Title Deed, POA, Plans, Locality Plan, Motivation and SG diagram - Received 5 June 2025
- The proposal is for a carport, a verandah to the rear, internal alterations and a new boundary wall to Rus Street.
- The property is not graded and outside an HPO.
- Work has been completed
- Oudtshoorn Municipality is aware of the comments from Oudtshoorn Heritage.
- Oudtshoorn Heritage do not condone illegal building work and cannot comment on work already completed. We wish to point out that much of the Art-Deco heritage of Oudtshoorn has been lost. It is therefore important to try to preserve what is left. We have no objection to the re-purposing of heritage buildings, but it needs to be done in a sensitive and responsible manner. We would recommend that the new wall built on Rus Street be plastered and painted to match the rest of the building.

COMMENT

HWC does not condone unauthorised work. The committee resolved to issue a Section 51 letter, as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

CN

13.2 Erf 56785, 7 Angelina Avenue, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27334CN0210 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389134>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: CoCT Comment and response to UCRRA's comments - Received on 4 June
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: No
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: The proposal includes the demolition of the existing guest room, dining room and partially covered terrace to accommodate a new ground floor extension creating an open-plan kitchen, dining and lounge area. Street-facing elements, including the original diamond-lead windows and front door, are retained. Replacement of non-original doors and windows is proposed on the non-street-facing elevations. Internal bathroom upgrades on the first floor are also proposed.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - UCRRA endorses the IIIB grading but raises concern regarding the replacement of existing timber windows with aluminum, noting the fenestration forms part of the building's heritage significance. UCRRA recommends retention and repair of the original windows where feasible and that should replacements be considered, a qualified heritage practitioner should undertake a heritage assessment to evaluate the windows' significance and assess impact. If windows are replaced, they should be sympathetic to the original character. UCRRA further has no objection to the internal work and extension.
- Response to objections: The applicant revised the proposal to retain the lead windows on the street-facing elevation. Replacement of windows is limited to the rear elevation due to safety and security concerns. The front door will be retained and restored, while newer doors will be replaced with contemporary alternatives.

HELD OVER

The Committee resolved to hold the matter over in order for all parties to be invited to the HOMs meeting.

CN

13.3 Erf 57703, 12 Heather Street, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28354CN0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397392>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: CoCT final comment and GLCA comments - received on 9 June
- Grading: IIIC/4 as per City Map Viewer
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For minor internal alterations, a study extension to the rear and boundary wall.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - GLCA has no objection

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

13.4 Erven 32604-RE & 32564, Vygekraal River & Nantes Park, 43 Cornflower Street, Athlone, S38(8)–NID

Case No: 25548EJV0630 <https://sahris.org.za/node/382890>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 8 June 2026
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a), (b), NEMA, and WULA.
- The proposal is to upgrade the Vygekraal River and the surrounding Nantes Park by upgrading the informal trading area, construction of a new in-stream treatment wetlands, construction of new pathways, upgrading the surface and constructing a new pedestrian crossing on Bosduif Road, construction of new rock weirs, construction of stormwater swales, constructing a new pedestrian bridge connecting the new pathways to Vanguard Mall, reshaping sections of the river bank to a more natural profiles wherever possible to allow for increased habitat diversity and more space for the river, constructing a new cycle and pedestrian route running parallel to Jakes Gerwel Drive and connecting with Vanguard Mall, construction of rock filter dams, constructing new off-stream wetlands, constructing a high-flow bypass, creating a new biodiversity garden and placement of a giant frame, constructing a new perimeter asphalt running track, re-surfacing existing pathways, re-surfacing existing multi-use court with new seating steps, constructing stormwater treatment areas and infiltration swales, constructing new seating steps down to the water and low-flow crossing, and changing the road surface at Blossom Street. The site is bounded by residential neighbourhoods and the Athlone Waste Water Treatment Plant. Nantes Park is graded IIIB and described as: "Public open space with high social and environmental significance. Additional archaeological sensitivity". A walkover of the site revealed fragments of glass and ceramics and occasional other debris such as bones, plastic and rusted metal fragments. The vast majority of these materials were modern, but a small proportion dates to the late 19th century. The origin of these materials is unknown and their context seems dubious. It is most likely that the deposits were introduced to raise and/or level the land along the river to reduce the chances of flooding. The archaeological materials therefore do not warrant grading. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low sensitivity.
- Consultant recommends no further studies but suggests periodic archaeological inspections take place. This suggestion cannot be enforced under s38(8) where no further studies are required. Via email, the consultant confirmed that the matter could not possibly benefit from a consultation process and a full HIA would be a waste of time and resources. There really is a vast majority of modern junk there and both sides of the river attest to the site having been levelled to raise the land.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon.

The HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

13.5 Erf 114915, 105 Chamberlain Road, Woodstock, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28706RB0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399336>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POP requires approval from admin and POA from the other owner is required.

RB

13.6 Erf 45878, 11 Linkoping Road, Rondebosch, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27937RB0324 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/394261>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026.
- Graded IIIB.
- Inside Upper Rondebosch HPOZ.
- Proposal is for a new carport (detached and does not trigger) as well as two patios on the front façade (lightweight structure) and swapping those windows leading out to the now covered patio, for sliding doors for access.
- This is minor work according to our guidelines, so no comments were sought.
- The patios have been constructed but the windows are yet to be converted.
- Given the area and the HPOZ, the streetscape interface is not tarnished by the already built patio as the second storey is the main contributor to the streetscape.

COMMENT

HWC does not condone unauthorised work. The committee resolved to issue a Section 51 letter, as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

For the above formal response to be issued, the applicant must first provide a proof of payment with the correct reference number indicating the correct amount having been paid as per the Provincial Notice 73/2025 in the Provincial Gazette Extraordinary No. 9088, dated 18 June 2025.

RB

13.7 Erf 47, 38 Stephan Street, Laaiplek, Velddrif, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27331RB0210 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/389120>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026.
- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has started and is essentially complete.
- The proposal involved regularising older additions and alterations as well as regularising further additions and alterations made by the new owners, such as internal drywalling, revamping the bathroom and kitchen and adding a verandah that has more floor space than the structure.
- Although not an HWC registered CB, Velddrif Heritage Foundation commented noting that the structure was likely a garage dating to at least 1965 which was later repurposed as a dwelling.
- Berg Rivier municipality commented that an HWC permit is required.

COMMENT

HWC does not condone unauthorised work. The committee resolved to issue a Section 51 letter, as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

RB

13.8 Farm 845 Portion 5, Drakenzicht 3 on Wemmershoek Road, Paarl, S38(8)-SDP Amendment

Case No: HWC23101707SB1018

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Stephanie Barnardt.

Cindy Postlethwayt was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- HIA was endorsed by IACom in April 2025
- This is the supplementary HIA that supplementary Visual Impact Assessment and that the amended Site Development Plan largely retains the development principles assessed in the endorsed HIA and Level 4 VIA. The revised layout complies with approved density and height parameters, maintains key visual corridors towards the Klein Drakenstein Mountains, retains the established landscape framework, and

reduces visual impacts in certain areas through a reduction in retail floor area, reduced parking provision, stepped building platforms, and the replacement of some higher-density residential components with lower-scale development along sensitive rural interfaces. The Committee was satisfied that the amended SDP is generally in accordance with the previously endorsed heritage and visual framework, subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and landscape management provisions.

- The SDP changes include the following:
 - The retail building platform has been redesigned into four stepped levels that follow the natural slope of the site, reducing cut-and-fill and lowering visual impacts from the R301.
 - The entrance circle was moved 30m further away from the R301 following Provincial Roads requirements.
 - The padel court building was relocated and reshaped into an L-configuration.
 - A smaller visual corridor between the padel courts and gym was removed and replaced with a larger visual corridor and pedestrian link connecting the retail and residential areas.
 - The gym building was relocated into the main retail precinct.
 - A new single-storey showroom building has been introduced in the north-western corner of the site.
 - Parking within the western green buffer was removed and relocated.
 - An open passage in the southern retail section has been enclosed for all-weather use.
 - The overall retail floor area has been reduced from 20,529m² to 18,370m².
 - Parking provision has been reduced from 662 bays to 632 bays.
 - The three-storey apartment blocks have been concentrated closer to the mixed-use village component rather than being spread more broadly across the site.
 - The southern and eastern edges now present a lower visual profile and a more sensitive transition to the surrounding rural landscape.
- The VIA concludes that the amended layout remains visually acceptable and compatible with the surrounding agricultural landscape, subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.
- Graded: NCW
- HPO: Inside the Proposed Klein Drakenstein Heritage Overlay Zone (Grade III)

HELD OVER

The application is held over as the SDP amendment must be submitted via SAHRIS.

SB

13.9 Erf 177650, C/O Rose and Waterkant Streets, Cape Town, S35-Destruction

Case No: HWC23121304SJ0110

Ms Ruan Brand introduced the item on behalf of Stephanie Barnardt

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Demolition of exposed historical wall footings uncovered during monitored earthworks on Erf 177650, with salvage and reuse of stone material within the proposed new development.
- Background: This was part of the conditions attached to the demolition permit (HWC23121304SJ0110) required the appointment of an archaeologist to monitor any sub-surface work on the site and stipulated that if archaeological material was discovered, work must stop and HWC notified immediately
- Archaeological monitoring during demolition works uncovered several late 18th–early 19th century wall footings associated with historic dwellings formerly located on the site prior to demolition in the late 1960s. The walls were constructed of Robben Island slate with clay mortar and correspond with historical mapping and photographic evidence of early residential development in the area. The remains have been partially disturbed by previous modern foundations and current development works. Archaeological monitoring found very limited associated artefactual material, and the archaeologist concluded that while historically interesting, the remains are of low archaeological significance. The applicant proposes that the walls be fully recorded before demolition and that salvaged stone be incorporated into the new building as a heritage feature.
- Grade: Some heritage significance

- HPO: Inside
- A site inspection was undertaken on the 14 May, it was note that no archaeological material was present beside the wall footing, however archaeologist on site found insignificant collection of glass, small pieces of earthenware and marble.
- Matter was before HOMs previous – 18 May, were the committee requested comments from the City of Cape Town (CoCT), the De Waterkant Civic Association (DWCA), and CIBRA.
- Comments: CoCT and DWCA, both supporting the demolition of the wall footings on condition that accurate surveying, detailed photographs, portion of the stone wall is recovered and curated.
- CIBRA support.
- Iziko has confirmed that they do not want to stone as it has no archaeological value, the condition curate refers to stone been stored on site and reused in the redevelopment.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition of the exposed historical wall footing as there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention. Approval is given on condition that:

1. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified archaeologist. The committee endorsed the appointment of TerraMare Archaeology to monitor the proposed work.
2. A representative sample of recovered stone must be curated and incorporated within the new development.
3. Full exposure, surveying and recording, as well as photographic documentation of the wall footings must be made by the appointed archaeologist.
4. A close-out report, compiled by TerraMare Archaeology, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion. The report must include details regarding the full exposure of the wall footings, survey and photographic recording thereof, and reuse of the recovered stone in the new build.

SB

13.10 Erf 190 14 Main Road, Clanwilliam, S34-Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28049SB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395617>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Photographs of the surrounding context, PoP confirmation and outstanding R4000 required

SB

13.11 Erf 2189, 8 Granger Bay, Boulevard, Green Point, S38(1)-NID

Case No: 28416SB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397663>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA & Letter of authority required.

SB

13.12 Erf 1054, 315 Ocean View Drive, Fresnaye, S34-Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28407SB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397652>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

30-day consultation period has not concluded

SB

13.13 Erf 329, 3 Breda Street, Oranjezicht, S34-Minor Work

Case No: 28478SB0511 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397996>

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Stephanie Barnardt.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: Minor internal changes within the existing building and a veranda over the proposed jacuzzi. The proposed minor internal changes consist of converting an existing office to a bedroom, demolishing

internal walls to create openings, and adding a few dry walls. There is also a jacuzzi with a veranda over proposed. The building plan uploaded to the case identify the proposed work as identified.

- Work start: yes
- Grade: IIIB
- HPO: Inside
- Comments: CoCT support as minor works,
- Outstanding information received on 5 June 2026.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SB

13.14 Erf 8207, 33 Plover Road, Heatherlands, George, S34-Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28333SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397291>

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Stephanie Barnardt.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: The proposal is to demolish the existing link between the historical core of the house and the later added lounge and kitchen spaces. The intension is then to enlarge the Foyer/Reception Room as indicated on the attached drawings. Along with new pool, some changes to windows and plaster and paint.
- Work start: no
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: George municipality had further requirements in terms of the town planning application but noted that the HWC permit is required as the building is older than 60 years.
- Outstanding information received on 9 June 2026, that included GHT comment of no objection.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SB

13.15 Erf 6784, 86 Meyer Street, Eastern Extension, George, S34-Additions, Alterations,

Case No: 28387SB0405 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397585>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Proof of consultation with George Heritage Trust is required.

SB

13.16 Erf 1250, 17 Wattle Grove, Pinelands. S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28299XM0423 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396390>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 02 June 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations to enlarge the existing bathroom and lobby area on the ground floor and add an upstairs bathroom off of an existing bedroom.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- E&HM has no objection to the proposed work.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.17 Erf 131, 12 Longmarket Street, Stanford, S31-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28515XM0513 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398078>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations to convert the existing garage and workshop into a new secondary dwelling as well as installing a sun shade above the side entry of the primary dwelling.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded
- Inside HPO and Conservation Area
- Overstrand municipality-OHAC supports
- Stanford conservation supports

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.18 Erven 9436 & 9438, 82 Alexandra Road, Parow, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28425XM0506 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397694>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 04 June 2026.- locality on motivation
- The application is for minor additions and alterations including re waterproofing of the flat roof, painting to east and west gables, replacement of suspended timber floors with timber on concrete slab, tiling repairs and repair to canopy over south east door.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.19 Erf 22025, 12 Eighth Street, Kensington, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28481XM0511 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398007>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026. The application is for the total demolition of the existing property which is fire-damaged dwelling due to vandalism.
- Work has started, not been completed
- Graded IIIC/NCW
- Inside HPO
- CoCT supports with recommendations as follows
- RECOMMENDATIONS

- Any original historical fabric of value revealed during demolition (e.g., covered windows, decorative elements) should be documented and salvaged if possible.
- Any future replacement building should respond positively to the historic vernacular character, form and architectural typology of the current structure.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the total demolition as there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention.

XM

13.20 Erf 480, 20 Avenue Marina, Bantry Bay, S34-Minor Wo

Case No: 28536XM0513 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398388>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 01 June 2026. The application is for additions and alterations for an addition of stairs to pool area and existing area to be a bathroom, small internal change of door to window and brick up of wall to a scullery.
Work has been completed (regularization)
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- E&HM support

COMMENT

HWC does not condone unauthorised work. The committee resolved to issue a Section 51 letter, as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

XM

13.21 Erven 5351 and 5353, 86 Barrack Street, District Six. S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27014XM0113 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388242>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company Resolution required

XM

13.22 Erf 7494, 15 Thirteenth Avenue, Kleinmond, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28623XM0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398876>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 08 June 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations to the existing property to replace the roof, windows and all finishes internally.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded
- Overstrand municipality-OHAC supports

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.23 Erf 17355 (previously Ptn 57 Farm 183), Adam Tas Street, Stellenbosch, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28596SVB0519 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398632>

Ms. Sofia Briel Introduced the item.

Cindy Postlethwayt was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- This matter was heard at HOMs on 01 June 2026 whereby the committee had the following further requirements:
 1. To confirm whether the building referred to as 3 in the current proposal corresponds to the building referred to as D in the original HIA and similarly whether a portion of the building referred to as R5 in the current proposal corresponds to the building referred to as E in the original HIA.
 2. Revised SDP showing only the structures for demolition overlaid with the previously approved SDP must be submitted.
- The site is outside of any HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- In response to the submission of an HIA, HWC issued a RoD dated 04 December 2015 approving the proposed mixed-use development of the property, subject to adherence to the heritage indicators (15050602GT0508E).
- In 2025 HWC received an application for proposed amendment to the phase 3 demolitions. This application was referred to the IACom 21 January 2026 meeting, where the committee issued the following comment: *"The Committee considered the updated development proposal to be substantially accordance with the previous HIA approval. No further processes in terms of S.38 are required. The Committee advised that since the additional of demolitions were not included in the S.38 approval, a separation S.34 permit application is required for those structures."*
- The current application is to fulfil the requirement of IACom that a separate S34 permit application be submitted for approval of the additional demolitions that were not included in the original S38 approval.
- As per the Stellenbosch Heritage Survey the site has a grading of IIIC and the statement of significances noted that *"The sawmill along Adam Tas Road is one of the most highly visible industrial sites in Stellenbosch. It is representative of the development of industrial activities in Stellenbosch in the early 20th Century. The site has landmark, historical and contextual significance"*.
- The applicant has confirmed that the building referred to as D in the original HIA corresponds with the building referred to as 12 in the current proposal. This building was assigned a partial grading of IIIC as per the original HIA, and this grading related to the kilns only.
- The applicant has also confirmed that the building referred to as E in the original HIA corresponds to a portion of the building referred to as R5 in the current proposal. This building was assigned a grading of IIIC as per the original HIA and it was recommended in this HIA that the building be retained if possible.
- As noted, the current application is for approval to demolish structures that were not previously approved for demolition in the original HIA. The structures older than 60 years now proposed for demolition are referred to as building 3, R4, R5, 6, R6 and R9 as noted on the demolition plan no AAHW01AR0037. To note that buildings 3 and R6 were previously approved for demolition as part of the 2015 HIA.
- Stellenbosch Municipality did not respond.
- SIG did not respond.
- SHF did not respond.
- As the IACom decision specifically directs the applicant to make separate Section 34 demolition applications, it is HOMs view that they were supporting individual consideration of each application. Given this the HOMs committee resolved to objectively re-evaluate the proposed demolition.
- The HIA supports retention of building E / R5 'if possible' and the applicant has motivated that retention is not possible.
- The committee notes the visual importance of the Adam Tas corridor and debated unconditional approval versus conditional approval. However, unconditional approval was deemed appropriate, given that the buildings proposed for demolition are setback and less visible from Adam Tas Road while building 12, which has the most visual prominence on to Adam Tas Road is proposed to be retained, mitigating the visual impact to this corridor.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the total demolition as there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention.

SVB

13.24 Erf 2415, 2 Elba Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25051201SVB0901

Ms. Sofia Briel Introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 26 April and 07 June 2026.
- Grading: Not Graded
- HPO: outside of any HPO
- Status of work/completeness: work is complete
- Brief proposal description: The completed work includes an extension which wraps around the north-eastern corner of the main structure and a small extension to accommodate an en suite bedroom on the southern side of the main structure. The completed work also includes a small extension to the western side of the existing garage.
- Consultation:
 - Drakenstein Municipality do not object to the proposal.
 - DHF noted that they cannot comment on complete work.
 - Paarl 300 does not support the proposal and note that they cannot comment as building work was completed without a permit.

COMMENT

HWC does not condone unauthorised work. The committee resolved to issue a Section 51 letter, as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

SVB

13.25 Erf 3432, 58 Main Road, Paarl, S27-Minor Works

Case No: 28606SVB0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398732>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen & Annemarie Fick were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 9 June 2026
- Grading: II
- HPO: inside the Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone of Paarl
- Status of work/completeness: work has been completed (regularization)
- Brief proposal description: The completed work is as per the deviations outlined in the close-out report.
- A close-out report was endorsed by HOMs at the meeting of 26 February 2026. The close-out report noted that although the work was completed in accordance with the HWC stamped plans, six discrepancies were noted namely:
 - At Outbuilding 1 Pizza oven omitted and afdak constructed per dimensions of existing rather than approved, which would have been double the size.
 - At Outbuilding 2 there is a yard wall in an amended configuration.
 - Changed window format in Staff Dining Room West wall.
 - Retained an existing window opening in Staff Dining Room on north wall.
 - Introduced a new small window opening in Staff Dining Room on south wall.
 - Larger opening between Finance office and Filing Room than approved, and single skin wall removed between Filing Room and Kitchen.
- Consultation:
 - Although the deviations are minor in nature DHAC were consulted and submitted a comment of no objection.

- The deviations submitted for approval were endorsed by the committee at the HOMs meeting xxx as part of the close-out report titled xxx, dated xxx and prepared by xxx. Given this, Section 51 is not applicable here and the plans can be endorsed as being substantially in accordance with this close-out report.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the revised plans numbered 4172- 00 Rev 02, 4172- 01 Rev 02, 4172- 02 Rev 03, 4172- 03 Rev 02, 4172- 04 Rev 02 & 4172- 05 Rev 2, dated 13 May 2026, and prepared by Arch on Main as being substantially in accordance with the close-out report endorsed by HOMs on 26 February 2026 and adhering to the conditions of the HWC issued permits, dated 11 February 2025, 24 March 2025 and 20 May 2025.

SVB

14 NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 1634, 16 Jonkershoek Way, Stellenbosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28717CN0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399358>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Carmen-Ann Wessels & Nicolene Visser were present for items and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications:
- Proposal: For extensive alterations and addition that include internal reconfigurations, replacement of most windows and doors, a new covered braai stoep, a double garage with mud room and domestic quarters, a separate studio and single garage, a new ensuite, a sunroom with an additional bedroom and ensuites, conversion of the existing garage into a bedroom and ensuite, and new boundary walls and gates.
- Consultation:
 - SMCAC does not support and state that the proposed new garages in front of the historical building are inappropriate for the site as they distract from the streetscape of the area.
 - SIG objects to aspects of the proposal, noting that the dwelling has contextual and architectural significance and contributes to the streetscape. SIG requests retention of the four timber windows, front door and existing pergola on the northern façade, and opposes their replacement with larger steel windows and a concrete-roofed structure. SIG further recommends that no new additions extend beyond the existing northern building footprint, that additional structures be confined to the western or southern portions of the property, and that the proposed curved window detailing be omitted. Comments on the internal alterations are reserved pending a requested site visit.
 - SHF did not comment in 30 days.
- Response to objections:
 - The applicant states that the proposal seeks a balance between retaining the building's heritage character and accommodating contemporary living requirements. The front door will be retained and repositioned centrally on the northern façade, while the enlarged windows could be revised to replicate the existing timber windows if required. The pergola is acknowledged as a significant feature and could be retained or reinterpreted in a lighter form. The applicant argues that additions have been designed to remain low-scale and recessive, that contemporary window forms distinguish new work from old in line with conservation principles, and that the internal alterations are largely reversible and do not materially affect the building's external heritage significance. The applicant is also open to facilitating a site visit if deemed necessary.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The applicant must submit revised proposals indicating the following:
 - a. Repositioning of the proposed garage structures behind the existing building line
 - b. Revision of the northern pergola to be more lightweight and permeable
 - c. The proposed fenestration revisions
2. The above must be circulated to I&APs for a further 14-day consultation period and comments or proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.

CN

14.2 Erf 164635, 16 Clovelly Road, Clovelly, S34-Deviation

Case No: 28718CN0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399361>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC24102101CN0507, Approved, permit dated 8 July 2025.
- Proposal: For a deviation from previously approved plans for the fire station. The proposed amendments involve relocating the appliance bay closer to the main entrance on Clovelly Road, reconfiguring the garage layout by reducing the width of the existing two garage doors to accommodate a third door, and marginally increasing the overall width of the appliance bay.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

14.3 Erf 1749-RE, 17 Malherbe Street, Paarl, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28772CN0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400362>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Coloured up plans, demo plan and clarity on plan dates required.

CN

14.4 Erf 9783, 26 Boston Avenue, Bellville, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28749CN0527 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399808>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA, all photos annotated in a pdf document, and outstanding payment of R4670 required

CN

14.5 Erven 3287, 3288, Ptn of 40206-RE, 54 Phendula Crescent, Khayelitsha, S38(1)-NID

Case No: 28861CN0605 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402770>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Letter of authority, Motivation and photos required

CN

14.6 Erf 6829-RE, 18 Langeberg Road, Durbanville, S38(1)-NID

Case No: 28812CN0602 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402061>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Motivation, External and Streetscape photos required.

14.7 Portion 5 of Farm 119, Hex River Valley, S36-Emergency

Case No: HWC26050601RB0610

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Mr. David Halkett was present for the item and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO, but within the Hex River Cultural Landscape.
- On 27 May 2026, HWC was contacted by David Halkett to inform them that the May storms had resulted in the Hex River flooding and that an informal farm burial ground on the subject property, consisting of four formal graves, a walled enclosure, and remembrance plaques, had been severely damaged.
- Four formal graves with headstones were identified, two/three of which are older than 60 years, and given how the NHRA is worded in terms of S36(3)(b), it means that the entire burial ground is covered by the NHRA.
- The graves are as follows based on the headstone inscriptions:
- Grave 1 - LEICESTER MAGUIRE DICEY, Born 2 Oct 1863, Died 29 Nov 1934 (Grave and contents 92 years old);
- Grave 2 - ETHEL [MARY] wife of LEICESTER, Born 22 Sep 1872 Died 23 May 1950 (Grave and contents 76 years old);
- Grave 3 - JACK DICEY Born 2 Oct 1903 Died 7 Aug 1982, and his wife ISOBEL MARGARET Born 16 Nov 1906 Died 25 Jul 1984 (Grave and contents 42-44 years old);
- Grave 4 - LEICESTER GUY DICEY Born 21 Apr 1901 Died 4 Oct 1966 (65) (Grave and contents 60 years old).
- These four graves along with the walled enclosure had essentially been cut in half with the riverbank eroding further up.
- The family has indicated that in terms of Grave 3, the remains are cremated and interred in the graves. The one casket has been identified, and it is believed that the other is still in situ and will easily be found.
- In terms of Grave 4, the remains have been identified lodged in the collapsed slope in a plastic mortuary bag/collapsed wooden coffin.
- In terms of Graves 1 and 2, their location is unknown and is assumed to either be washed down the river or underneath the collapsed bank.
- Three of the four headstones have been identified within the collapsed bank with the fourth, presumably underneath/in it.
- There are also four visible commemorative plaques in the remaining wall sections with three known plaques missing/part of the collapsed wall sections.
- The family has indicated that these plaques are commemorative and that there are no remains interred behind the plaques.
- After tabling the matter under admin at HOMS on Monday 1 June 2026, after guidance was sought from HWC's legal advisor, it was determined that any *ex situ* material could be salvaged without triggering the NHRA.
- However, remains still present/the burial ground enclosure triggers S36(3)(b).
- The proposal is for the family to salvage what they can from what remains and to demolish the remaining walls.
- They will then find a new location on the farm to re-inter what can be salvaged/create a new family/farm burial ground as the new river course/flooding events make the current location untenable.
- Grave 4's remains, which are exactly 60 years old, will be exhumed by a local undertaker. They will then be stored at the local mortuary so no remains, other than the recovered ashes will be left on site.
- Heavy machinery will be used to lift the heavy headstones and other material, but only once Grave 4's remains in the collapsed wall have been exhumed.

- A letter of support by the current farm owners and a representative of the family has been provided supporting all of the above, and as was advised by HWC's legal advisor at HOMS on 8 June 2026, S36(5) can be deemed as having been satisfied.
- The applicant has requested guidance from HWC whether an archaeologist actually needs to be on site for any of this work given that the only known in situ material is ashes and the human remains will be recovered by the undertaker as the family is concerned about growing costs.
- From the case officer, it is best practice to have an archaeologist monitor work on site. There is always a chance that unmarked or other informal burials occurred near this burial ground, such as people who worked on the farm, etc.
- Heavy machinery/demolition of the wall may disturb these kinds of burials unknowingly.
- Furthermore, there is a chance that the two 'lost' graves are underneath the collapsed bank and would likely need specialist archaeologist input in terms of exhumation if found.
- The applicant noted the re-internment plans are not for recreating another family burial ground on the farm and exact plans will need to be figured out still, however, given that most remains are cremated, that would likely be the course of action.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 36(3)(b) permit application. Approval is given on condition that:

1. Whenever heavy machinery is used on site or ground disturbing activities occur, this must be monitored by a suitably qualified archaeologist. The committee endorsed the appointment of David Halkett to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by David Halkett, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion of the exhumation and demolition of the burial ground walls. The close-out report must be inclusive of plans for the re-interment of the exhumed human remains and grave goods.
3. If further evidence of burials, other than the identified five Dicey family burials, is discovered during the execution of the activities above, all works must be stopped immediately, and Heritage Western Cape must be notified without delay.

RB

14.8 Erf 66875, 1 Cogill Road, Wynberg, Cape Town, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28754RB0528 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400062>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC.
- Inside the proposed Coghill Road Heritage Area HPOZ.
- Work has not started and applicant has indicated it is getting urgent due to waterproofing concerns.
- Proposal is to replace the asbestos roof with steel sheets which fit into the character of the dwelling/area.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

RB

14.9 Erf 7440, 27 Flambeau Street, Paarl, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28721RB0526 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399367>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal photographs required.

RB

14.10 Erf 29116, 5 Montreal Avenue, Mowbray, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28663RB0522 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399150>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC/NCW.
- Inside the proposed Lower Rosebank PHA HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for internal re-arrangements.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

RB

14.11 Erven 24622-RE & 24623-RE, 6 Uppercamp Road, Ndabeni/Maitland, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28775RB0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400611>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POP reference needs to be checked with admin, Streetscapes are Google Streetview, plans must accurately reflect extent of completed/unauthorized work vs proposed work.

RB

14.12 Erf 118, 8 Sir David Baird Drive, Bloubergstrand, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28747RB0527 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399804>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POP needs confirmation with admin, POA is required, CoCT E&HM comment is required.

RB

14.13 Erf 14348, Farm Uitkyk, Wellington, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28868RB0605 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402791>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present for this item and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(c) and (d) is triggered.
- Proposal is to establish a residential development, with specialist studies underway to determine the exact scope/extent.
- Palaeo is grey/insig/zero.
- Archaeologically, the land has been farmed for many years and any potential surface archaeology would be *ex situ* although there are two likely 19th century structures on site that might have historical archaeology related to them. Stone age archaeology is not that common and would likely also have been eroded by the farming given the underlying geology.
- Visually, the site sits within the Blouville Cultural landscape and along the Berg Road scenic route.
- The applicant recommends an HIA consisting of an Architectural Analysis, CLA, and VIA.
- The Committee noted that any archaeological concerns would be captured within the HIA, in particular as part of the Architectural Analysis with the history of the structures, and the CLA, as well as any SHS/local uses being covered by the CLA, and as such, is satisfied with the recommended studies to determine heritage impacts.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Architectural Analysis
2. Cultural Landscape Assessment
3. Visual Impact Assessment

RB

14.14 TR73/1 & MR583, R353, Leeu Gamka, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28687RB0522 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399304>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO although the provided screener notes the historic route/linkage provided by the R535 in connecting Fraserburg and Leeu Gamka through the Nuweveld Mountains.
- Work has not started.
- Eight of the bridges along the road require maintenance and general safety upgrades in the form of joint repairs, guard rails, etc.
- The following bridges are included: B4218 Dolfkraal River No 3 (km 33.42), B4217 Dolfkraal River No 2 (km 33.65), B4194 Dolfkraal River No 1 (km 33.91), B2896 Teekloof River (km 37.92), B2897 Slingerfontein River (km 55.98), B2898 Muggefontein River (km 62.88), B2899 Draaibanskraal 2 River (km 69.16), and B2900 Draaibanskraal 1 River (km 71.40).
- Work is considered minor as it is maintenance work and all of these bridges are considered NCW.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

RB

14.15 Erven 1540 & 1370, and Remainder of Erven 565, 1297, 1740, & 1298, Wilderness, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28857RB0604 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402759>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Officer has flagged concerns with the archaeological screening and requires proper screening/information on the context of where the new mains pipe will be laid down.

RB

14.16 Erven 31231, 31232, 34864 & 4752, Morgenzon Farm, Morgenzon Street, Paarl, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28875RB0606 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402804>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present for this item and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- Triggers S38(1)(a),(c)(i)(ii), and (d)
- Proposal is for a new residential/mixed use development across Farms Morgenzon, Olyfboom and Alphorex, Northern Paarl.
- The four erven involved are approximately 21,66 ha in extent.
- The historic buildings on the property and various noteworthy geological features are to be incorporated into the development.
- Palaeo is insignificant (Cape Granite is igneous rock which is not fossiliferous).
- The HP identifies heritage resources and potential impacts as follows:
- "Buildings/Structures:

- *The Morgenzon late 19th/early 20th C homestead and werf/curtilage: Graded IIIB (2010 Drakenstein Heritage Survey)*
- *Adjacent stylistically 1920's/1930's residence within the Morgenzon werf/curtilage: Graded IIIC (2010 Drakenstein Heritage Survey)*
- *The aforementioned werf-centred development pattern with other adjacent buildings is itself considered a heritage resource.*
- *The old barn off Alphorex Road. Not graded in the Drakenstein Heritage Survey but potentially a Grade IIIB structure.*
- *Landscapes:*
- *The treed setting of the Morgenzon werf cluster.*
- *Various geological outcrops of Paarl granite on the mid-slopes of the site.*
- *The abutting Paarl Mountain reserve with its exotic and indigenous vegetation*
- *The various mature trees and vegetation extending from the Paarl Mountain reserve into the upper reaches of the site, but beyond the urban edge that now traverses the property.*
- *An archaeological walk down by an appropriately qualified and experienced archaeologist, is to be conducted."*
- The HP recommends an HIA consisting of an Architectural Analysis, AIA, CLA, VIA, SHS, and given that the landscape is characterised by agriculture and horticulture/green space, they further note that an Agricultural and Botanical study, as part of the NEMA process, would also be incorporated into the HIA.
- DHAC pre-emptively noted that the application is being tabled and provided a lengthy comment of non-support for the proposal at DBAR stage based on the proposal's poor/non-alignment with 2013 heritage survey, 2018 Zoning Scheme bylaw, and 2019 Mountain slope policy.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Architectural Analysis
2. Archaeological Impact Assessment
3. Cultural Landscape Assessment
4. Visual Impact Assessment
5. Social Historical Study

RB

14.17 Erf 85094, 10 Putter Road, Muizenberg, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28761EJV0228 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400328>

CASE SUMMARY

- As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

FOR NOTING

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

EJV

14.18 Erf 3346-RE, Tokai Manor House, Tokai, S27-Minor Works

Case No: 28716EJV0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399356>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded II
- Inside Constantia Winelands Cultural Landscape
- Work has not started

- The proposal is to replace the existing distribution boards within the Manor House and in the Annex to the north, as well as their connection to the incoming mains supply. For the Manor House, a 110mm steel sleeve will be installed on the outside of the building, within a kicker pipe to be grouped with existing ones, with a 110mm core-drilled entry point above. From there, the cable will run within the ceiling void to the drop-down section above the DB. At the DB location, the cable will be surface mounted to minimise damage to historic fabric; existing cables were chased into the wall and will be left untouched. The new DB will be surface mounted to minimise repetitive damage to significant fabric. For the Annex, the cable will be chased into the external wall. The existing junction box will be removed, and the opening will be plastered and closed to ensure a neat finish. The Manor House cabling will be introduced adjacent to existing external cabling conduits, and therefore not pose any new visual impacts. The cabling will run through the ceiling space and descend in an area off any of the main rooms, and where electrical interventions are already located. The new cabling will be surface mounted to avoid impacts to fabric and boxed in to ensure minimal visual impacts. The new distribution board will similarly be surface mounted to avoid repetitive damage to fabric. It should be noted that the distribution board will be located an area where the original layout has been altered to accommodate a narrow service passage to the kitchen in the northeastern rear wing. While the wall fabric here is not original, the proposed interventions are undertaken with an abundance of caution, and in a manner that is most easily reversible to avoid repetitive damage to historic fabric. The cabling into the Annex building will be chased into the walls and made good. This structure, although within the PHS area, is of less intrinsic significance, and will not be negatively impacted by the proposed actions.
- The consultant recommends the following:
 - A permit be issued in terms of S.27 of the NHRA for the works as proposed in Section 5.2;
 - The exact position and routing of all services must be agreed with a heritage consultant prior to installation;
 - A close-out report on the satisfactory completion of the work should be submitted to Heritage Western Cape;
 - The client must provide a Certificate of Electrical Compliance to be included in the closeout report to ensure that the risk of electrical fire hazard has been appropriately and adequately mitigated.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources. Approval is given on condition that:

1. The exact position and routing of all services must be agreed with a heritage consultant prior to installation.
2. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified practitioner with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Katie Smuts to monitor the proposed work.
3. A close-out report, inclusive of a Certificate of Electrical Compliance, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

EJV

14.19 Farm 135 Portion 74 and Farm 163 Portion 2, Thornvilla Farm, Langverwagten Road, McGregor, S38(8)-HIA
Case No: 27452EJV0218 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389588>
 Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

FOR NOTING

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- HOMs on 2 March 2026 resolved to request an HIA with AIA and PIA for the proposal expand the netted cultivation activities on site by 72ha following the loss of vineyards and orchards during the 2023 flood as well as to establish a tourism facility on the bank of the existing in-stream dam inclusive of camp clusters, stilted cabins, and ablutions. The areas proposed for cultivation and the tourism facilities are carefully positioned in the flatter areas located between the steeper koppies and hills that dominate the landscape.

- In terms of cultural landscape: The sense of place associated with the historic character of McGregor, and the structuring element of the koppies to the northwest of the town have cultural landscape value considered to be of high sensitivity. However, it is unlikely that the proposed development will negatively impact any significant cultural landscape resources as the proposed activities are congruent with and contribute to the broader cultural landscape of the McGregor area. In terms of archaeology: a field assessment identified a very low density, weathered, disturbed, general scatter of MSA artefacts all located within the jeep tracks that traverse the areas proposed for cultivation. These observations have all been determined to have limited scientific value and as such, are considered to be Not Conservation-Worthy (NCW). The overall archaeological sensitivity of the area proposed for development is therefore low. In terms of palaeontology: The area is underlain by Middle Devonian marine to paralic sediments of the Tra-Tra Formation of Middle Devonian age. This unit is generally sparsely fossiliferous, and the study area contains bedrocks that are intensely cleaved and highly weathered near surface as well as poorly exposed. Conditions for fossil preservation and recording are accordingly very limited, and no fossil sites were recorded from the Bokkeveld Group bedrocks nor the overlying Late Caenozoic superficial deposits during the site walkover. It is concluded that the project area is of Low palaeosensitivity and anticipated impacts during the Construction Phase are of low significance.
- In terms of public participation: The McGregor Heritage Society supports the application but strongly requests that only the necessary fields get covered with the shade netting. They note that the proposed architectural style of the cabins does not align with the local McGregor vernacular and therefore should not be visible from Langverwagten Road. If they are visible from this main road, they will have a negative impact on the cultural landscape of the greater McGregor area. However, as these cabins are removable structures they do not pose a long-term negative impact on the cultural landscape. The applicant responds that the proposed agricultural tunnels will not be visible from the road into McGregor or from the town itself and that the tourism infrastructure will be limited to the built elements as described in Section 1 of the HIA with very little visual or landscape impact. The municipality noted that the Spatial Planning Category of the area is Core 1 SPC the objective of which is to maintain areas in a natural or near-natural state, with no further loss of habitat and that degraded areas should be rehabilitated, and only low-impact, biodiversity-sensitive land uses are appropriate. When asked whether this constituted support they did not reply.
- The HIA titled "Cultivation activities on Thornvilla Farm in McGregor, Western Cape," dated June 2026, and prepared by Jenna Lavin of Artefactual Heritage Consulting concludes on page 31 with the recommendations as follows: this project is supported from a heritage perspective as it is not anticipated that the proposed establishment of new cultivated areas will negatively impact on significant heritage resources on condition that:
 - A Chance Fossil Finds Procedure is implemented.
 - Although all possible care has been taken to identify sites of cultural importance during the investigation of the study area, it is always possible that hidden or subsurface sites could be overlooked during the assessment. If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils, burials or other categories of heritage resources are found during the proposed development activities, work must cease in the vicinity of the find and HWC must be alerted immediately to determine an appropriate way forward

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 22 July 2026 due to the mitigation measures requiring consideration.

EJV

14.20 Erf 1003, Old Gaol, Queen Street, Knysna, S27-Minor Works

Case No: 28780EJV0531 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400880>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded II
- Outside HPO

- Work has not started
- The proposal is to install a continuation of the existing palisade fence on the perimeter of the property. A substantial portion of the property is already enclosed by existing steel palisade fencing, and the proposed fencing constitutes a minor and reversible intervention intended to improve security and protect the heritage resource from unauthorised access and potential vandalism. The design of the fence is visually permeable and deliberately understated so as not to obscure views of the historic structure or alter the established relationship between the site and the surrounding streetscape. The intervention does not involve the alteration, removal, or disturbance of historic fabric of the heritage resource and will not negatively impact the cultural significance, architectural integrity, or heritage setting of the heritage site.
- Knysna Historical Society and Simon van der Stel Foundation support
- The Committee discussed context-specificity and noted that the palisade fencing, while not visually desirable, will secure the site and benefits the interests of the heritage resource.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

EJV

14.21 Farm 321, Kleyn Hagel Kraal, Pearly Beach, S38(8)–NID

Case No: 28837EJV0603 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402461>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to continue the mining operations at the Kleyn Hagel Kraal Quarry on the existing mine footprint but lowering the existing floor in a series of benches and faces to optimise the use of the available minerals on the site. No new infrastructure is proposed but the site now falls under new ownership.
- The mining application was first submitted under case number 130607TS08E where no further studies were requested. The re-opening of the quarry was submitted under case number HWC22112103AM1121, but no RoD is on file and the case notes only read "Item already dealt with".
- The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates high sensitivity; however, the mine has been in operation for over 10-years and will continue on the same disturbed footprint. Furthermore, Pether provided comment on the previous NID submission stating that the site should not be considered as of high sensitivity because the local geology "is deformed and faulted and the thinly bedded, muddier units are likely to have been zones of shearing and cleavage development". The map of relative archaeological and cultural theme sensitivity indicates low sensitivity.
- The consultant recommends no further studies

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA in terms of Section 38(1). A letter of no trigger to be issued.

EJV

14.22 Erven 13976-RE and 13750, Dreyersdal, Aristea Road, Constantia, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28876EJV0607 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402811>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Ms. Annemarie Fick was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIA
- Outside HPO

- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a), (c)(i), and (d).
- The proposal is to rezone and redevelop the site into a retirement complex inclusive of a healthcare centre and clubhouse. The site is a remnant of the historical Dreyersdal farm, north of the homestead and along the banks of the Keyzers River. The subject area, being located between two rivers, would have been a well-resourced location for the earliest inhabitants of the area. However, it has been extensively cultivated for more than 100 years and while it is possible that low density surface scatters of Middle and Later Stone Age artefacts may be present within the development area, these have limited scientific value. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates insignificant, low, and unknown sensitivity. Archaeological and Palaeontological screening by Artefactual confirms that no AIA or PIA is necessary. While located within the urban edge, the site functions as a transitional zone between urban, rural and riverine environments.
- Consultant recommends an HIA with Landscape Assessment and VIA

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Cultural Landscape Assessment
2. Visual Impact Assessment

EJV

14.23 Farm 6 Portion B of Portion 4, DR2160, St Helena Bay, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28869EJV0605 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402792>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Ms. Nazeema Duarte was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d).
- The proposal is to introduce a service station and ancillary infrastructure inclusive of a convenience store, retail component, car wash, and parking and circulation to the site. The development is aligned with municipal planning objectives and spatial development principles.
- The site is situated on a marine, wave-cut platform which is overlain by shelly, fossiliferous deposits of the Velddrif Formation. According to John Pether, the marine fossil shell content of the Velddrif Formation raised beaches and the ambient fossil fauna in the Springfontyn Formation coversands are of generally of low palaeontological sensitivity. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates insignificant, low, and unknown sensitivity.
- The archaeological sites on the Vredenburg Peninsula date predominantly to the later part of the Stone Age, although earlier material dating to the mid-late mid Holocene provides evidence of the occupation of the area by early San foragers. A walkover survey of the development site by TerraMare Archaeology recorded no archaeological material on the site. The same survey covered a wider area to the east and west of the fuel station site within which a spread of archaeological material was observed. Generally, however, these archaeological sites and materials are of relatively low archaeological significance. The construction of the fuel station may impact buried archaeological material of which there is no surface manifestation.
- The site of the 1497 skirmish between the Khoi and Portuguese in the Stompneus Bay Area is not known with any certainty but is likely to have been close to the beach. The distance of the proposed development site from the nearest beach and the low likelihood that any physical evidence of the skirmish survives, suggest that impacts are unlikely, although this is impossible to say with certainty, given the lack of hard evidence for the site of the event.
- Consultant recommends an HIA with AIA, PIA, and Cultural Assessment

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Palaeontological Impact Assessment
2. Archaeological Impact Assessment

EJV

14.24 Erf 1559, Section 1 Unit 07 Reena Court, 220 High Level Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28810SVB0603 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402058>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 09 June 2026.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: outside
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started
- Brief proposal description: the proposal is for minor internal alterations and replacement of a garage door with a window.
- Consultation:
 - The application is for minor works, however Sea Point for all were consulted and support the proposal.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SVB

14.25 Erf 1623, 10A Rosedene Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions, Alterations & Partial Demolition

Case No: 28748SVB0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399807>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Ms. Jone Kros was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: inside Sea Point HPOZ
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started.
- Brief proposal description: the proposal is for partial demolition and alterations to the ground floor and the addition of a second storey at the rear of the property.
- Consultation:
 - After revisions to the proposal the CoCT support the proposal with the recommendation that "the front garage structure is replaced with a carport as it would be more representative of the streetscape
 - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents' Association did not provide a comment.
 - Sea Point For All did not object to the proposal.
 - Cape Town Heritage Foundation did not respond.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SVB

14.26 Erf 164587, 23 Highfield Street, Green Point, S34-Alterations

Case No: 28712SVB0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399349>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 8 June 2026
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: within the Somerset Road PHA proposed HPOZ
- Status of work/completeness: not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for the addition of new stairways to front and back gardens, new bathroom and kitchen on the ground floor, a new bathroom added to the bedroom upstairs, a new skylight light to the roof, a new braai area in back yard and folding stacking doors from the kitchen and living areas.
- Consultation:
 - After amendments the CoCT support the proposal with the following conditions:
 - Retain and replace timber floors on ground floor where necessary, as removal of timber floors on ground level are not supported as it causes rising damp.
 - Retention of a nib section of the internal back wall in the kitchen. This should serve to support the removal of a significant part of the back wall currently supporting the second storey. This serves to prevent structural damage to the party wall.
 - Heritage oversight during construction to ensure protection of significant fabric.
 - Retention and repair of original timber windows and doors on primary facades, if required.
 - De Waterkant Civic Association did not respond.
- The HOMs committee agreed to proceed with revision 04 of the building plans without further consultation given that revision 04 is substantially in accordance with the plans reviewed by I&APs.
- The concerns regarding the fenestration have been resolved and the majority of the timber floors on the second storey are to be retained, given this, and considering the extent of wear and tear on the timber floors the committee deemed the loss of the ground floor timber flooring to be acceptable.
- The HOMs committee is of the view that in this instance it is the project team's responsibility to ensure that the work is structurally sound and waterproofed, and this does not require HOMs oversight.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SVB

14.27 Erf 167750, 8 York Street, Claremont, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28768SVB0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400349>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2026.
- Grading: IIIC/NCW
- HPO: within the Harfield PHA Road proposed HPOZ.
- Status of work/completeness: Work has not started.
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is to enclose a single door and alterations to fittings and fixtures.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources

SVB

14.28 Erf 23, 18 Kings Road, Sea Point, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28807SVB0603 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/401970>

Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Joon Chong, Laurie Fialkov, Jone Kros and Mark Wüger were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: outside of any HPO
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for total demolition of all structures on the site. The applicant has not provided plans for the replacement structure; however, the applicant has indicated in their motivation that the replacement building will likely be a multi-storey development that utilises the development rights permitted under GR4 zoning.
- Consultation (if applicable):
 - CoCT support the proposal.
 - SFB did not respond.
 - Ian Pretorius obo Sea Point for All & CTHF do not object to the proposal, however they are concerned about the impact the proposed 5 storey building and roof deck might have on the IIIB graded dwelling (25 Queens Rd, to the west) situated adjacent to this property in terms of privacy issues.
 - Anton van Baalen objection can be summarized as follows. The existing building contributes to the historic character of Sea Point and that demolition would erode the area's unique architectural identity and diminish the cultural landscape that has developed over decades. Further, he requests that the design incorporate the existing structure into the development to ensure continuity of place, strengthen community identity and enhance the long-term value of the area.
 - Laurie Fialkov objection can be summarized as follows. First, that the application fails to address the inevitable destruction of significant mature trees on and adjacent to the common boundary, which form part of the heritage resource and cultural landscape of the site. Second, that the proposed development (demolition included) is incompatible with the intact heritage character of the block in which the property is situated. The objector noted that the block has remained substantially intact since at least 1935; that the significance of the subject property has been assessed in isolation, relying on the IIIC designation to argue limited significance; and lack of consideration regarding the impact to the IIIB graded property at 25 Queens Road. The objector disputes the applicant's assessment that the subject property is a building of limited individual significance in an area undergoing transition. And lastly, the objector noted that the applicant's heritage motivation report is materially incomplete, and that HWC should require a formal Heritage Impact Assessment before the application is determined.
- Applicant's response to objection(s) can be summarized as follows:
 - While it is acknowledged that the existing structure forms part of the historical layering of Sea Point, it is classified as a Grade IIIC resource and is outside of a HPOZ, indicating that its significance is contextual and not of sufficient intrinsic value to warrant retention.
 - As confirmed by the City of Cape Town's Environmental and Heritage Management (E&HM) branch, the building has been altered over time, lacks architectural integrity, and does not contribute meaningfully to a significant heritage context. The proposal for demolition is therefore considered appropriate in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA. The suggestion to retain and incorporate the existing structure has been considered; however, due to the limited heritage significance, such an approach would not result in a meaningful conservation outcome.
 - The issues raised by interested and affected parties, including those relating to trees, broader precinct character, and the scope of the heritage report, have been addressed. These do not alter the identified level of heritage significance of the property, nor do they introduce additional heritage triggers in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).
 - The application has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of Section 34, and the heritage report is considered appropriate and proportionate to the significance of the resource.

REFERRAL

The committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom on 29 July 2026 due to delegations.

14.29 Erf 2729, 148 Ninth Street, Hermanus, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28782SVB0602 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400887>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Power of attorney, streetscape images and local authority comment required.

SVB

14.30 Erf 46644, Section 3 Outeniqua, 5A Lulworth Road, Rondebosch, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28799SVB0602 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400938>
Ms. Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Not Graded
- HPO: outside of any HPO
- Status of work/completeness: not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for replacement of various timber doors and windows with aluminium frames, within the same openings.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources

SVB

14.31 Erf 157880, 13 Wyecroft Road, Waverley Business Park, Observatory, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28773XM0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400363>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Local municipality and Conservation body comments required.

XM

14.32 Erf 8200, 20 Herbert Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28781XM0531 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400882>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Updated plan indicating work started, Response to objections by the Conservation body required.

XM

14.33 Erven 18303 & 18304, 23& 21 Glanville Road, Tijgerhof, Milnerton, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28719XM0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399362>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company/Trust Resolution required.

XM

14.34 Erf 51601, 34 Hamilton Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28720XM0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399364>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Updated plan indicating work started, Locality Map, Streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.35 Erf 260, 51 Hopkirk Way, Glencairn, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28722XM0526 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399368>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Power of Attorney required.

XM

- 14.36 Erf 1251, 68 Burg Street, Wellington, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28767XM0528 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/400345>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Both owners to sign Power of Attorney

XM

- 14.37 Erf 581, 8 Dysart Road, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28750XM0527 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399809>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs, Local municipality comments required

XM

- 14.38 Farm Driefontein 327-RE, Ptn 1 of Farm Driefontein 327, Farm Doorn Plaat 316-RE, Ptn 1 of Farm Doorn Plaat 316, Ptn 3 of Farm Doorn Plaat 316, Farm Nooitgedacht 322-RE, Farm Nooitgedacht 324 RE, Farm Long Acres 430-RE, Ptn 1 of Farm Koele Fontein 323, Ceres, S38(4)-HIA**
Case No: 26631CSI1110
 Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: The application relates to a realigned 132 kV overhead distribution line (SPVR9) associated with the approved Gydo Renewable Energy Project near Ceres. The original powerline route (SPVR6) had already formed part of an approved HIA and Environmental Authorisation process, but a landowner withdrew consent for the line to cross their property. As a result, a new route alignment (SPVR9) is proposed. The new line will be approximately 14.3 km long and connect the approved solar facility (SPVR8) to the Eskom Witzenberg Substation.
- Previously HOMS resolved to the following: Interim Comment:
 - The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:
 - 1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
 - 2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment
 - 3. Visual Impact Assessment
- The HIA assessed archaeological resources, palaeontological resources, cultural landscape impacts, visual impacts, graves and built environment impacts
- Archaeology Findings
 - No archaeological sites were identified along the proposed SPVR9 route, stone age archaeological resources were recorded during the 2025 field survey and several known rock art sites exist in the broader Koue Bokkeveld region, but these are outside the study area and will not be impacted.
 - A stone-built kraal (Site 305 / Waypoint 503), previously identified during earlier heritage studies, lies approximately 20 m north of the proposed line, and 150 m from the nearest pylon.
 - The report concludes that the structure will not be directly impacted and that there is no archaeological mitigation required. Site 305 must be designated a No-Go Area. And a **25 m buffer** around the kraal should be included in the EMP.
- Palaeontological impacts: Both SPVR6 and SPVR9 traverse highly sensitive geological formations.
 - Much of the affected area has already been disturbed by agriculture, roads, and existing infrastructure.
 - SPVR6 remains the preferred route from a palaeontological perspective. However, SPVR9 is considered acceptable. A recommendation for a Fossil Find Procedure must form part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).
- Visual and Cultural Landscape Impacts

- The report identifies the visual impact on the cultural landscape as the primary heritage concern.
- The route crosses agricultural landscapes, mountain plateau environments, areas with high scenic value, landscapes associated with eco-tourism and recreation. The upper mountain plateau is described as: highly scenic, largely undeveloped and having low visual absorption capacity, also vulnerable to visual intrusion.
- Landscape architect Antoinette de Beer found that:
 - The overall visual intrusion of SPVR9 would be High–Moderate.
 - The mountain plateau section is the most visually sensitive component.
- Visual impacts would be noticeable from elevated viewpoints and recreational areas.
- The specialist supports the route subject to mitigation measures and makes the following recommendations:
 - Avoiding ridgelines and skylines where possible, following natural contours, using topographic screening, careful micro-siting of monopoles, using slender monopoles instead of lattice towers, using matte, non-reflective finishes, rehabilitation of disturbed areas using indigenous fynbos vegetation.
 - Graves: no graves or cemeteries were identified during the field assessment.
 - Built Environment: no direct impacts on the built environment are anticipated.
- Public Participation: comments from Witzenberg Municipality and Interested and Affected Parties had not yet been included and would only be incorporated into the Final HIA submitted to HWC.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

The HIA is to be submitted via SAHRIS inclusive of specialist studies and the outcome of the public participation process.

XM

15. Other Matters

Admin matters

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

EJV moves to adopt and SJV seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 8 June 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Ms Corne Alexander, officially closed the meeting at 13:15.

18. Date of next meeting: 22 June 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR:

SECRETARY: _____

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners

AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society

BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association

BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement

CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers' & Residents Association

CoCT - City of Cape Town

CTHT - Cape Town Heritage Trust

CRM - Cultural Resources Management

DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association

Docomomo South Africa

DHS - Durbanville Heritage Society

EHM - Environmental Heritage Management department

FoBCA - Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area

FE - Friends of Elim

GLCA - Greater Lynfræ Civic Association

GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association

HVA - Harfield Village Association

HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay

HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association

HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association

HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment

ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa

KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association

KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association

LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District

MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society

NCW - Not Conservation Worthy

NEMA - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)

NID - Notification of Intent to Develop

NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association

OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage

Paarl300 Foundation

PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association

PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation

SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency

SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society

SFB - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association

SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town

STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society

SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation

SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust

GHT - George Heritage Trust

RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association

TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society

VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa

WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group

WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council

WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee

WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society

WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists

ABHC - Associated Bibbeys Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)

BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee

CBCRA - Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association

CSDBOA - Clifton-On-Sea & District Bungalow Owners Association

CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation

CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations

CMP - Conservation Management Plan

DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association

DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation

EMPr - Environmental Management Program

FHRA - Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association

FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts

GBRM - Great Brak River Museum

GVHAG - Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group

GCS - Greyton Conservation Society

HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation

HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting

HPO - Heritage protects overlay.

HWC - Heritage Western Cape

IACom - Impact Assessment Committee

IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee

KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society

MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society

NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation

NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body

NHRA - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999

NRA - Newlands Residents Association

OCA - Observatory Civic Association

OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee

PPP - Public Participation Process

PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust

RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee

SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System

SPFA - Sea Point for All Group

SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee

SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group

SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association

OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society

TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation

UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association

WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association

Ward 2 Forum

WCC - Whale Coast Conservation

WRA - Woodstock Residents Association

WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association