

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 15 October 2025 via MS
Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Ms Heidi Boise, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Ms Heidi Boise (HB) (Chair)
Ms Helene van der Merwe (HvdM)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Members of Staff:

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Sofia Vy Menell Briel (SBr)
Ms Yusrah Hoosain (YH)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Nuraan Vallie (NV)

Visitors:

Mr Bruce Wilson
Ms Jone Kros
Ms Melissa Wilson
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Mr Shilo Hope
Ms Teresa Raposo

Ms Ursula Rigby
Ms Charlotte Chamberlain
Mr Steven Piha
Ms Malaki Filliano

Apologies

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 15 October 2025.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 15 October 2025.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 22 August 2025

The Committee resolved to hold over the minutes. WD to meet with the secretariat and provide feedback to Committee members via email.

5.2 BELCom Minutes dated 17 September 2025

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 17 September 2025 and resolved to approve them with amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest:

None

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

WD reported back on the following Appeals matters:

- Proposed development on Portion 38 of Farm 510, Jamestown, Stellenbosch
- Erf 1997, 1 Thornhill Road, Green Point

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:

Nothing to report.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition

Nothing to report.

8.4 Compulsory Repair Orders follow up

For noting – report back regarding Palace Barracks in Simonstown; Muizenberg Train Station; and the Old Tannery in Wellington.

8.5 Erf 3035, 51 Bryant Street, Bo-Kaap

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the next meeting due to submission of new information received post closure of the agenda. In addition, due to the ongoing application, as well as the new submission, the Committee seeks procedural advice from the legal advisor of HWC.

8.6 Vergelegen Estate

With reference to the BELCom comments dated 23 July 2025:

A policy which deals with potential sites for this and other temporary structures to guide, inter alia, future placement, definitions, materiality and number of structures at any one time and which analyses the impact on heritage resources to be drafted and submitted by the HOC to HWC for approval within 3 months of the date of written notification of this decision to be extended from June 2025 to September 2025.

The case officer is to follow up with the applicant regarding the above.

SJ

8.7 SAHRIS Preview Workshop

HWC hosted an engagement session on 19 September 2025 which demonstrated the Section 38 NID application process – these applications are fully functional on the system. The next phase is the soft launch of the Section 27, 28, 29, 31 and 34 process before the end of October 2025. The aim is to be fully functional on SAHRIS for submissions early 2026.

WD

8.8 BELCom Meeting Transcript

WD will address the matter with Secretariat and provide the feedback to the Committee via email.

8.9 Follow up HWC Workshop for BELCom members

WD will address the matter with the CEO.

9. Standing Items

9.1 Report back on Close-Out Reports

None

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

Noted

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Erf 889, 54 Kloofnek Road, Tamboerskloof

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Erf 45516, 3 Nursery Road, Rosebank
- Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 None

12. STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR TOTAL DEMOLITION

12.1 Erf 45516, 3 Nursery Road, Rosebank: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ROSEBANK / ERF 45516

Case No: HWC25080109CN0804

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 2 October 2025.

Mr Bruce Wilson (applicant), Ms Ursula Rigby (Cape Institute for Architecture), Ms Jone Kros (applicant), Ms Charlotte Chamberlain (Rosebank and Mowbray Planning and Architectural Committee - RAMPAC) and Ms Melissa Wilson (developer) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The property is graded IIIC and located within the Rosebank proposed Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The application proposes the total demolition of all three structures on the property. At this stage, no information has been provided on any potential replacement building or future development.
3. The application was tabled at BELCom on 17 September 2025, where it was resolved to defer the matter pending a site inspection. On 2 October 2025, members of the BELCom undertook the required site inspection.
4. The City of Cape Town's Environment and Heritage Management Branch did not submit comments within the 30-day commenting period.
5. The Cape Town Heritage Foundation supported the proposal.
6. RAMPAC and CIFA do not support the proposed demolitions without sight of the designs for proposed replacement structures
7. The applicant submitted a response to RAMPAC's objection.
8. All I&APs were invited to attend the meeting.
9. The Committee noted that interiors of all buildings were considered unremarkable: accordingly, the discussion focussed on exterior architectural elements and urban considerations. The main areas of the discussion:
 - a. Main Road urban interface (including the relationship to the Baxter Theatre),
 - b. Nursery Road urban interface,
 - c. Corner Condition (corner of Main and Nursery Roads),
as set out below.
10. Main Road interface:
 - a. The double-storey Main Road building has a strong urban presence, defined by its four-bay colonnaded walkway with open balconies above. Extending toward Nursery Road and spanning a wide pavement heavily used by students and pedestrians, the colonnade provides both a visual accent along this route and a clear architectural rhythm through its evenly spaced columns, giving this segment of Main Road a distinctive urban identity. Despite its short length, it possesses a clear urban and

architectural significance. It sits hard up on Main Road, giving it high visibility even from passing vehicle traffic.

- b. The shady colonnade and corner shop contribute to the aesthetic, social, historical, and associative qualities of this urban setting, reinforcing community identity, landmark visibility, and everyday pedestrian use.
- c. The two-storey building behind the colonnade has masonry walls with regular openings and a characteristic pitched roof common in the area. This contrasts with nearby modernist buildings which differ from this pattern.
- d. At a streetscape level, the Main Road building has a strong visual and spatial connection with the Baxter Theatre's entrance plaza. This means that while the Main Road building may not possess high material heritage value, design-wise, its massing, colonnade interface, and proximity to the street edge create a strong and active urban realm opposite the Baxter Theatre. The way the colonnaded building steps forward toward the Baxter Theatre establishes a close spatial dialogue with the theatre's entrance plaza, reinforcing urban cohesion across the street. The intervening roadway does not break this relationship in urban terms.

11. Nursery Road interface

- a. The two single-storey cottages along Nursery Road are simple dwellings with intact stoep walls and front boundary walls of curvilinear design.
- b. The Committee agreed that the heritage value of the cottages is limited compared to the Main Road building.
- c. Although their demolition and replacement may be considered, their replacement in relation to the Main Road/Nursery Road corner condition warrants thought.

12. Corner Condition

- a. The treatment of the Main Road/Nursery Road corner is critical, as it influences the broader character of both street edges.
- b. Although the existing corner buildings are not materially elaborate, the current corner design makes meaningful urban gestures that support the character and pedestrian scale of the area.
- c. The manner in which this corner is handled in any future re-design is therefore of importance.

13. Additional issues considered:

- a. The Committee noted the fact that the City has applicable urban design guidelines, and that any assessment of the site must consider the broader urban heritage context, as raised by CIFA and RAMPAC. The Committee agreed with I&APs that attention needs to be given to the fact that the buildings in question form part of a meaningful urban landscape, particularly in their relationship to the Baxter Theatre and its surrounding public realm.
- b. The deteriorated condition of the Main Road structure was discussed in the context of drawing a distinction between architectural simplicity and urban significance. It was noted that if the existing colonnade (which extends over City-owned sidewalk space) is removed, reinstating a similar structure would be difficult as the City typically discourages rebuilding in these circumstances.
- c. The Committee acknowledged that heritage considerations in this case must be balanced with the site's potential for appropriate adaptive redevelopment, particularly in response to increasing residential demand within the city.

- d. I&APs concerns about approving demolitions or alterations without clarity regarding the nature, scale, and street interface of replacement buildings along both Main Road and Nursery Road were acknowledged.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee has no objections to the proposed total demolition as there is insufficient material heritage significance to warrant retention of the structures, however the strong spatial landmark qualities contributed by the splayed corner combined with the double storey colonnade are the very elements that create the robust urban, social and street level heritage significance of the site and surrounds. The Committee acknowledges the context to be of high heritage significance and therefore the following is required:

1. Heritage design informants including graphic streetscape analyses for the replacement structure compiled by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner must be submitted to HWC.
2. The concept of the splayed corner combined with the double storey colonnade must be explored and illustrated as part of the heritage urbanism design informant's exercise.
3. Design Plans and a 3D rendition for the replacement development must be submitted to HWC in alignment with the heritage design informants.
4. The above must be circulated to I&APs for the 30-day consultation period and comments and proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.

SBr

**12.2 Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ROSEBANK / ERF 45507**

Case No: HWC25012412XM0729

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 1 October 2025.

Mr Steven Piha (owner) and Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site is graded as 3B and is located within a proposed Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The City of Cape Town through its Environment and Heritage Management Branch do not support the proposed demolition.
3. Objections to the demolition were also received from the neighbouring properties at 9, 14 and 15 Nursery Road, as well as from the Florence Villas Body Corporate. The applications were held over by HOMs on 11 August 2025, pending a site inspection to determine the significance of the property. The site visit was undertaken by HOMs on 20 August 2025, after which the matter was tabled at a subsequent HOMs meeting. The Committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom for consideration, in light of the

objections received and to obtain advice regarding the potential retention of the structure.

4. No comments were received from RAMPAC within the 30-day commenting period.
5. The applications were held over by HOMs on 11 August 2025, pending a site inspection to determine the significance of the site. The site visit was conducted by HOMs on 20 August 2025, after which the matter was tabled at a subsequent HOMs meeting. HOMs resolved to refer the application to BELCom in light of the objections received and to seek advice regarding the potential retention of the structure.
6. The application was tabled at BELCom on 17 September 2025, where it was resolved to defer the matter pending a site inspection. On 2 October 2025, members of the BELCom undertook the required site inspection.
7. The property comprises two distinct buildings. Stylistically, the portion fronting directly onto the street contains the remains of an early villa, likely dating from the 1880s. Behind it, between the villa and the railway line, is a later block of flats, constructed on what would originally have been the villa's garden, a space which likely extended all the way to the railway line.
8. The interiors of both sections are representative examples of their respective periods, reflecting the architectural and spatial characteristics typical of each era.
The property represents a combination of two main periods of construction, the earlier phase likely dating to the early 1880s, and a later addition dating from approximately the late 1920s to early 1930s. This coexistence of these distinct architectural periods within a single property is particularly unusual and noteworthy.
9. Externally, the building displays a predominantly 1930s architectural language, which visually and stylistically carries across to the older portion along the southern wing fronting Nursery Road. This interplay between the two phases is of particular interest, as significant elements from both periods remain legible and have survived.
10. The northern wing retains, most of the architectural features characteristic of the late 1920s to early 1930s, whereas the southern wing reflects a more complex layering, incorporating features from both the earlier villa and the later period.
11. The original windows on the front façade have been replaced with steel-framed, leaded-glass windows a rare and distinctive feature, with only a handful of comparable examples known in Cape Town. The southern wing also retains four-panel late 19th-century doors and fireplaces from the earlier villa phase.
12. In the northern wing, there are fine teak casement windows with leaded glass, three-panel doors, and teak joinery, all representative of the late 1920s to early 1930s period. These details collectively provide valuable insight into the evolution of the building and its successive adaptations over time.
13. Within the streetscape, the surrounding buildings vary in both scale and architectural style, creating a diverse urban fabric. Before considering the broader urban context, it is important to note the building's material integrity and layered historical qualities, which together contribute significantly to its architectural and heritage value.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee refused the application for total demolition.

XM

13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS

**13.1 Erf 889, 54 Kloofnek Road, Tamboerskloof: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / TAMBOERSKLOOF / ERF 889**

Case No: HWC25090804SVB0909

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Thursday, 23 October 2025 at 11:00 (HB, HvdM, and KDS).

SBr

**13.2 Erf 3035, 51 Bryant Street, Bo-Kaap: MA
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / BO-KAAP / ERF 3035**

Case No: HWC25062412SJ0625

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over to the next meeting due to submission of new information received post closure of the agenda. In addition, due to the ongoing application as well as the new submission the Committee seeks procedural advice from legal advisor of HWC.

SJ

14 HERITAGE AREAS: SECTION 31 CONSENT APPLICATIONS

14.1 None

15 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 29 PERMIT

15.1 None

16 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 28 REFUSAL

16.1 None

17 HERITAGE REGISTER: SECTION 30 PROCESS

17.1 None

18 PUBLIC MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS: SECTION 37 PROCESS

18.1 None

19 REQUESTS FOR OPINION/ADVICE

19.1 None

20 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

20.1 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. OTHER

22.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee resolved to adopt the resolutions and decisions as minuted.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 11:50

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

19 November 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____