

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 26 August 2026 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

Due to the Chairperson, Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom, being unable to attend the meeting, and tendering apologies, Ms Waseefa Dhansay presided over the election of an Acting Chairperson in terms of the Rule 12(5) of the Rules of Order and Conduct at Meetings of HWC. The Committee elected Mr Shawn Johnston to chair the meeting.

The Acting Chair, Mr Shawn Johnston, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

Mr David Saunders was co-opted from IACom for the duration of this meeting.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Ms Heidi Boise (HB)
Ms Kate Foss (KF)
Mr Siphiso Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS) (co-opted)

Members of Staff:

Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Chloe Petrus (CP)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Jwalane Lekama (JL)
Mr Yunus Ogier (YO)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)

Visitors:

Mr Ashley Lillie
Mr Byron Nichles
Mr Chris Snelling
Ms Corlie Smart
Ms Isabelle Engelbrecht
Ms Tamar Shem-Tov

Ms Adelaide Combrink
Mr Laurie Fialkov
Ms Christine Havenga
Mr Clive Theunissen
Mr Cahlan Williams
Mr Bruce Wilson

Apologies

Mr Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS) (Chair)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 26 August 2026.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 26 August 2026.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 29 July 2026

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 29 July 2026 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest and acceptance of the code of conduct:

All committee members have accepted the Code of Conduct and confirmed that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

6.1 Recusal

WD recused herself from Item 13.1, having submitted the Provincial Heritage Site nomination in her personal capacity and not in her capacity as an official of Heritage Western Cape.

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the following Appeals matters:

- Erf: 2067, 75 Kloof Street, Fresnaye
- Erf 96982, 10 Dumbarton Road, Rondebosch
- Erf 33030, Cressy Road, Athlone

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.

8.5 Erf 3236, 154 Bree Street, Cape Town: MA

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 5 August 2026.

Ms Ashley Lillie (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the findings of a recent site inspection undertaken in early August. The site inspection identified significant concerns regarding work undertaken in relation to the approved Section 34 permit. In particular, the concrete slab had been cast prior to the site inspection and without the required approval. Various deviations from the approved permit and previously authorised works were also identified. Concerns

were raised regarding the structural implications of the new slab, particularly its ability to be supported by the significant front façade and flank walls. Further deviations were noted in relation to work undertaken to the existing concrete intervention at the rear of the building.

2. The Committee expressed concern regarding the apparent lack of appropriate professional oversight and coordination on site. It was noted that architectural and structural drawings, including stamped approved drawings, were not available on site and that there did not appear to be a clearly appointed architect providing the required construction-stage professional supervision. The changing project team and absence of adequate coordination were considered particularly concerning, given the sensitivity of the heritage resource and the nature of the works being undertaken.
3. Significant concerns were also raised regarding the structural integrity of the building and the vulnerability of the existing historic fabric. The Committee noted that structural monitoring had been proposed as a means of assessing the impact of the new slab. The heritage consultant confirmed that the structural engineer, Mr Jacques Retief of Henry Fagan and Partners, had remained involved with the project and was monitoring the structure. The Committee nevertheless considered that the structural monitoring, methodology and reporting requirements should be formally documented and, if the project proceeds, incorporated as an appropriate condition. It was further considered necessary for monitoring reports to be submitted to Heritage Western Cape at an agreed frequency.
4. Heritage Consultant advised the Committee that he had been appointed to fulfil the heritage monitoring requirements of the project and had not been involved in formulating the proposal for the concrete slab. He confirmed that the slab proposal had been submitted on 15 July, but that the slab was subsequently cast without authorisation. He had immediately brought the unauthorised work to the attention of Heritage Western Cape. Following the Committee's site inspection, he had recommended that work be stopped pending resolution of the outstanding matters. He further advised that the architect had subsequently been re-engaged and that updated drawings were being prepared. At the time of his most recent site inspection, no substantive construction work was proceeding, although the slab had been cast too high and was being chipped back, resulting in exposed reinforcement. He confirmed that the structural engineer remained involved and that further work should not proceed until the slab issue and proposed variations had been properly resolved.
5. The Committee noted that the permit had not been complied with and that unauthorised work could not simply be retrospectively authorised. The Committee noted that the appropriate regulatory procedure would be to afford the applicant 14 days to provide reasons why the existing permit should not be withdrawn. The Committee supported following this process to ensure that any subsequent decision was procedurally sound and defensible.
6. After consideration of the site inspection findings, the professional advice received and the information provided by the heritage practitioner, the Committee agreed to issue a Stop Works Order due to the potential ongoing risk to the heritage resource and the structural integrity of the building. The Committee further agreed that the applicant should be given 14 days to motivate why the existing permit should not be withdrawn, taking into account the identified deviations and unauthorised works.
7. The Committee further agreed that the Stop Works Order should require the applicant to make the site safe and protect the heritage resource pending further consideration.

Particular attention should be given to protecting the concrete slab and exposed reinforcement from rain and water ingress. Waterproof sheeting should be securely installed and adequately fastened against prevailing winds, with appropriate measures taken to prevent water from reaching or damaging the historic fabric.

8. The Committee requested that the applicant provide the outstanding information required to enable a proper assessment of the matter. This should include updated architectural drawings reflecting the works actually undertaken, structural drawings and engineering documentation, a schedule of deviations from the approved permit, the structural monitoring methodology and relevant reports, an assessment of the current condition of the structure and heritage fabric, confirmation of the appointed professional team responsible for construction-stage supervision, and proposed mitigation measures addressing the unauthorised slab and other deviations.
9. Following receipt and review of the applicant's motivation and outstanding technical information, the matter should be reconsidered by the Committee to determine an appropriate mitigation and regulatory pathway. It was noted that a heritage agreement may potentially form part of the eventual resolution, subject to the Committee's assessment of the information received and compliance with the applicable statutory process.

DECISION:

1. That, in terms of regulation 4(3) of the Regulations to the NHRA promulgated on 29 August 2003 in PN 298 of 2003 the applicant be given 14 days in which to motivate why the permit should not be withdrawn taking into account the deviations from the said permit.
2. That a stop works order be issued as a matter of urgency to prevent further impact to the heritage resource. The concrete slab to be covered with waterproof sheeting to prevent any water from accessing the heritage fabric, such sheeting to be secured to prevent shifting in adverse weather conditions. The making safe with waterproof sheeting is expressly excluded from the stop works order.

CN

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

For noting

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 921-RE, 122 Main Road, Constantia
- Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 158516, Adderley Street Flower Market, Trafalgar Street, Cape Town City Centre

- Proposed Alterations and Additions, Revised Plans on Erf 266-RE, 1 Surf Road - Avalon Apartment Block, Sea Point

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Erf 3236, 154 Bree Street, Cape Town
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 208-RE, Webers Valley Road and Saleka Street, Jamestown, Stellenbosch
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1749-RE, 17 Malherbe Street, Paarl
- Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 23, 18 Kings Road, Sea Point

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 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 921-RE, 122 Main Road, Constantia: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CONSTANTIA / ERF 921-RE

Case No: 28858EJV0604

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the case.

Ms Adelaide Combrink (CoCT), Ms Christine Havenga (heritage consultant) and Mr Byron Nichles (owner) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered a Section 34 application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and related structures. The Committee requested clarification regarding the subdivision of the property, specifically whether the existing buildings proposed for demolition straddle the subdivision boundary.
2. The heritage consultant confirmed that the property had previously been subject to an approved subdivision and that a further subdivision-related application was currently being processed by the City of Cape Town. The owner clarified that the subdivision had been approved in 2021 and had not lapsed. An application for an extension had subsequently been submitted by the previous owner and remained under consideration by the City. The extension was intended to provide additional time to comply with the subdivision conditions and obtain the necessary Section 34 certificates before the two portions could be separately registered.
3. The City of Cape Town advised that, while the City supports the subdivision and associated development in principle, such development should not occur to the detriment of a conservation-worthy heritage resource. The City indicated that there appeared to be opportunities for adaptation and alterations to the existing dwelling

while retaining its significant form and features. It was further noted that opportunities may exist to extend or adapt the building footprint without compromising the site's landscape and mature vegetation.

4. The Committee was advised that the matter before it was specifically a Section 34 application for the demolition of a structure older than 60 years. The subdivision itself falls outside the heritage authority's mandate in the circumstances described, and any land-use or subdivision-related concerns would need to be addressed through the appropriate City processes. The Committee therefore agreed that its consideration should remain focused on the heritage resource and its significance.
5. A discussion followed regarding the heritage grading of the property. It was clarified that the property had been ungraded when the application was initially submitted to Heritage Western Cape. The City's mapping system had subsequently been updated to reflect a Grade IIIC grading, which, in terms of the applicable Council decision, is accepted by Heritage Western Cape. The City confirmed that the grading had been established through the ongoing heritage audit process and that the property had been assessed as Grade IIIC. The heritage practitioner explained that the assessment undertaken for the application had similarly considered a possible Grade IIIC grading, although the significance was considered to relate more strongly to the landscape setting than to the dwelling itself.
6. The Committee raised concerns regarding the condition of the building and the extent of alleged vandalism described in the application. It was noted that the photographic evidence appeared to show a relatively intact exterior, despite the application's description of substantial internal damage. The Committee therefore sought clarification regarding the actual condition of the building and whether alternatives to total demolition had been adequately investigated, particularly adaptation or adaptive reuse.
7. The owner explained that the property had been broken into approximately six days after transfer earlier in the year and that substantial damage had occurred internally. It was reported that ceilings in five rooms had been removed, electrical cabling and plumbing had been stripped, and damage had occurred to bathroom fittings, floor finishes and other internal elements. The owner indicated that the external photographs did not adequately reflect the extent of the internal vandalism. The owner also supported a site inspection so that the Committee could assess the condition of the property directly, together with the heritage practitioner and architect.
8. The Committee expressed support for undertaking a site inspection before making a determination on the demolition application. The Committee considered that a physical inspection would assist in establishing the actual condition of the building, assessing the extent and nature of the alleged vandalism, understanding the relationship between the existing structures and proposed subdivision, and determining whether viable alternatives to total demolition could be considered.

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Wednesday, 9 September 2026 at 09:30 (SJ, KF, HB, KDS and GJ).

XM

**12.2 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 208-RE, Webersvalley Road and Saleka Street, Jamestown, Stellenbosch: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / JAMESTOWN / ERF 208-RE**

Case No: 28924EJV0611

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 13 August 2026.

Ms Corlie Smart (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the application following an extensive review of the case file, including the various reports and comments submitted by heritage conservation bodies and the Stellenbosch Municipality. A site inspection was undertaken on 13 August 2026.
2. During the site inspection, the Committee considered the historical character of the Jamestown area, including the remaining areas where historic heritage fabric is still substantially intact. The property is currently reflected as Grade IIIC and is not situated within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ). In considering the application, the Committee took into account the significance, intactness and physical condition of the existing structure, as well as whether it continues to warrant a Grade IIIC grading or should instead be regarded as not conservation worthy. The Committee also considered the building's contribution to the streetscape and its interface with the surrounding streets, together with the changing character and development pressures within Jamestown.
3. It was noted that a land-use departure had been granted to enable the subdivision of the property into four portions. The Committee recognised that the subdivision and associated development form part of the broader context but considered the heritage implications of the existing structure independently, particularly its historical context, current physical condition and contribution to the surrounding streetscape.
4. The Committee observed that Jamestown is undergoing substantial change and densification and that, ideally, historic and older building fabric should be retained as a legible layer within the evolving urban environment. In this particular case, however, The Committee considered that the building's ability to remain legible as a heritage resource would be limited once the site is fully developed. The Committee further noted that the building was in a severely dilapidated condition and that significant intervention would be required to bring it up to an acceptable standard. Although similar building typologies remain embedded within the broader Jamestown context, the Committee questioned whether this particular structure continued to warrant a Grade IIIC grading. The Committee also considered its isolated position, setback and relationship to the street corner to be factors limiting its heritage contribution.
5. The Committee supported these observations, noting that the building is relatively isolated and that much of its historical context within the Jamestown landscape has been lost. The Committee considered that there was limited contextual support remaining for retaining the building as a Grade IIIC resource. Having regard to the condition of the

structure, its isolated position and the surrounding development context, ~~she~~ the Committee supported the proposed demolition.

6. The Committee considered that the building no longer made a sufficient heritage contribution to warrant retention as a Grade IIIC resource.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition as the building has insufficient heritage significance to warrant its retention.

CSi

**12.3 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 1749-RE, 17 Malherbe Street, Paarl: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / DRAKENSTEIN / PAARL / ERF 1749**

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

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 13 August 2026.

Mr Clive Theunissen (Drakenstein Municipality) and Ms Isabelle Engelbrecht (architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee undertook a site inspection on 13 August 2026. The site was found to comprise approximately three distinct structures, namely the original single-storey Edwardian-period dwelling, a later twentieth-century accommodation block to the rear, and a single-storey outbuilding. The Committee's assessment distinguished between these structures in considering their respective heritage significance and potential for retention.
2. The original dwelling was found to have undergone internal alterations, with some evidence of external alteration, although the exterior remains relatively legible in terms of its period character. The dwelling retains a number of architectural features that contribute to its heritage and streetscape value, including its wraparound curved veranda, bay windows, decorated gable, arched entrance columns and mature trees. The site inspection further established that the dwelling contributes to the historic character of Malherbe Street and forms part of a broader layered streetscape in which older vernacular, Edwardian and Victorian fabric is increasingly interspersed with larger contemporary residential developments.
3. The Committee noted that, although the dwelling is not necessarily a rare example of its architectural type, it remains legible as a historic building and contributes positively to the streetscape. The Committee considered the relationship of the dwelling to the surrounding historic environment, including its proximity to the Toringkerk and Afrikaans Language Museum, to be significant. The Committee supported the demolition of the later rear accommodation block and the outbuilding but expressed reservations regarding the demolition of the original dwelling.

4. The Committee supported these observations and noted that Malherbe Street remains relatively intact and forms part of an important historic area. The Committee considered the position, orientation, setback and building envelope of the dwelling to be indicative of a former villa-type development set within a garden, rather than the more repetitive row-house typology found elsewhere along the street. The Committee considered that there was insufficient information before the Committee to make an informed decision regarding the total demolition of the dwelling and recommended that further information be provided, particularly in relation to heritage design indicators and how these could inform a revised development proposal.
5. The Committee noted that the information currently available was insufficient to support the demolition of the original dwelling. The Committee also expressed concern regarding the proposed replacement development, which the Committee did not consider making a sufficiently positive contribution to the streetscape in its current form. The Committee therefore supported the request for additional information and the involvement of a suitably qualified heritage practitioner.
6. The applicant's architect acknowledged that the proposed design required further work. The architect confirmed that the application had been prepared through the architectural practice and that no separate heritage practitioner had been appointed to assist with the application. The architect further indicated that the current proposal represented a significant revision of the earlier design, following comments received from local heritage bodies, but accepted that further design development could still take place.
7. Drakenstein Municipality highlighted the broader historical significance of the area, noting that the property falls within an area associated with historic forced removals. Drakenstein Municipality advised that buildings dating from this period require careful reassessment with regard to both their architectural and social-historical significance. Drakenstein Municipality indicated that the municipality was considering the future development of the area and that heritage character and the history of forced removals would need to form part of that process. Drakenstein Municipality considered that the subject dwelling should not be treated as a building that could simply be lost through the development process and supported its retention and incorporation into future development.
8. The Committee accordingly concluded that insufficient information was available to support a determination approving the total demolition of the original dwelling. The Committee agreed that further information was required before the heritage implications of the proposed demolition and redevelopment could be properly assessed. In particular, the Committee supported the preparation of heritage design indicators to guide a revised proposal and recommended that a suitably qualified heritage practitioner be appointed to assist the applicant in developing the proposal.
9. The Committee further agreed that the historical and social significance of the area, including its forced-removal history, should be properly considered as part of the further assessment. The later twentieth-century rear structure and outbuilding were regarded differently from the original dwelling, with members generally indicating that their demolition would be acceptable, subject to the overall assessment and revised proposal.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved that, prior to determining the application for total demolition, further information is required to enable the Committee to adequately assess the implications of the proposed replacement development on the identified heritage resources and established heritage context of Malherbe Street and the surrounding area.

The following is required:

1. Heritage design indicators are to be prepared to guide the proposed replacement development, having particular regard to the cultural significance related to the forced removals, distinctive built, topographic and natural character of the area, the established scale and roofscape of Malherbe Street, and the relationship of the subject site to abutting and nearby heritage resources.
2. The heritage design indicators are to be prepared by a suitably qualified architectural practitioner with appropriate heritage expertise. A detailed CV demonstrating relevant qualifications and experience is to be submitted to BELCom for approval prior to the preparation of the heritage design indicators.
3. Revised development proposals, informed by the approved heritage practitioner, are to be submitted. The revised proposals are to demonstrate an appropriate response to the identified heritage context and are to address, amongst other matters, the overall scale, form, massing, height, roofscape, setbacks, orientation and street interface, as well as the relationship of the proposed development to the immediate built, natural and topographic context.
4. The revised proposal is to be supported by contextual elevational studies along Malherbe Street and the relevant adjoining street frontage(s), showing sufficient surrounding built context to clearly demonstrate the height, scale, massing, setbacks and roof characteristics of the proposed development in relation to the established streetscape and identified heritage resources.
5. Accurate contextual 3D views/renders are to be submitted illustrating the proposed development within its immediate built and natural environment. The 3D representations are to correspond accurately with the architectural drawings and clearly demonstrate the relationship of the proposal to the surrounding buildings, streetscape, topography and identified heritage resources.
6. The revised proposal, heritage design indicators and supporting heritage information are to be circulated to the registered Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) for a 30-day commenting period prior to resubmission to BELCom. All comments received, together with the applicant's responses thereto, are to accompany the resubmission.
7. The application for total demolition is to remain pending until the above further requirements have been satisfactorily addressed, and the additional information has been submitted to and considered by BELCom.

CN

12.4 Proposed Total Demolition on Erf 23, 18 Kings Road, Sea Point: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERF 23

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

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 5 August 2026.

Mr Bruce Wilson (architect) and Mr Laurie Fialkov (objector) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee undertook a site inspection on 5 August 2026. The site inspection focused on the significance and intactness of the existing building, its contribution to the streetscape, and its relationship to adjoining and nearby heritage resources. One such nearby resource identified by the Committee was the property at 25 Queens Road, which is recorded as a Grade IIIC resource. The Committee also considered the broader context of Kings Road and Queens Road and the extent to which the surrounding historic residential character remains intact.
2. The site inspection established that Kings Road retains a legible layer of older, predominantly low-scale residential buildings, together with identified heritage resources along Kings Road and Queens Road. The area is nevertheless clearly transitional, with larger-scale development occurring within the surrounding blocks, including redevelopment immediately opposite the subject property. The Committee therefore recognised that the area cannot be regarded as a wholly intact historic streetscape, but rather as a surviving historic residential layer within an evolving urban environment.
3. The existing dwelling has been altered and refurbished over time, although its overall residential form and roofscape remain legible. Internally, surviving historic elements include timber flooring, panelled doors, a fireplace, characteristic openings and elements of the earlier spatial arrangement. The later additions and service areas have been more extensively altered. The application proposes the complete demolition of the existing dwelling, with parameters for a replacement development included in the applicant's documentation.
4. The Committee noted that the principal considerations for the Committee were the significance and intactness of the existing building, its contribution to the streetscape, the implications of total demolition, and its relationship to adjoining and nearby heritage resources. The Committee consider whether the potential impacts associated with demolition and the proposed replacement development could be adequately addressed through appropriate conditions.
5. The Committee noted the relatively little intrinsic heritage significance remains in the building and that its contribution is modest. However, the Committee considered that the broader context should be recognised, as the surrounding streetscape retains a degree of historic intactness. The Committee noted that the existing building contributes through its modest scale, form and low-pitched roofscape, which form part of the prevailing residential character of the street.

6. The Committee noted that the property is not located within an HPOZ or a conservation area and is not within a proposed conservation area. The Committee did not consider the building's modest residential character, ordinary roof form or contribution to the streetscape to constitute sufficient grounds for requiring its retention. The Committee further cautioned against using the demolition application to address matters that are principally planning considerations. The Committee noted that the application should be assessed as a straightforward demolition application and, given the absence of sufficient heritage grounds for retention, the Committee did not support making demolition conditional upon the proposed replacement development.
7. The Committee also considered concerns raised by members of the public regarding the mature trees on the property and the broader streetscape. In particular, concern was expressed regarding a large *Ficus elastica* tree situated close to the boundary between properties, which was reported to be approximately 100 years old and to be affecting the foundations of the surrounding buildings. The Committee clarified that, in the circumstances described, the tree was not regarded as a heritage consideration and that its management constituted a maintenance and property-management issue rather than a matter determining the Section 34 application. It was further noted that the property is not situated within an HPOZ and that the tree is not an indigenous protected species.
8. A member of the public further submitted that the subject property should not be viewed in isolation, as it forms part of one of the few remaining substantially intact sections of Kings Road. The concern was that the cumulative loss of buildings within the block could affect the established streetscape character. The Committee noted these concerns but distinguished between the broader planning and urban-design implications of redevelopment and the specific heritage considerations falling within its mandate.
9. The Committee accordingly considered the extent to which the existing building's remaining heritage significance justified its retention, having regard to its physical condition, alterations, modest architectural character, streetscape contribution and the broader transitional nature of the area. The Committee also considered the implications of the proposed replacement development, while recognising that matters relating primarily to development scale, departures and planning rights would fall within the relevant municipal planning processes.
10. The Committee indicated that there were insufficient heritage grounds to require the retention of the existing building. Subject to the final formulation of the decision and any appropriate heritage-related conditions, the Committee was inclined to support the demolition application, while recognising the importance of the surviving historic residential character of Kings Road and the need for any future development to respond appropriately to its surrounding context.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the demolition as the building has insufficient heritage significance to warrant its retention.

SBr

**12.5 Proposed Total Demolition, Additions and Alterations on Farm 10154, Weltevrede Road, Prince Albert: NM
HM/ CENTRAL KAROO/ PRINCE ALBERT/ FARM 10154**

Case No: HWC25070304CH0801

HELD OVER:

The matter was held over by consent of all parties to the next BELCom meeting, scheduled for 23 September 2026, at the request of the applicant.

RB

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

**13.1 Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 158516, Adderley Street Flower Market, Trafalgar Street, Cape Town City Centre: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CITY CENTRE / ERF 158516**

Case No: 29185SVB0703

DISCUSSION:

1. The Committee noted that a nomination for the declaration of the Adderley Street Flower Market as a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) has been submitted and requested confirmation of the current status of the nomination.
2. The Committee considered it important that the status of the PHS nomination, and the stage reached in the declaration process, be clarified prior to determining this application. In this regard, reference was made to the recent Salt River Hall matter considered by Council, where the status of the PHS process had implications for the extent of the decision that Council was able to take.
3. The Committee therefore requested clarity on whether the current status of the PHS nomination has any implications for BELCom's mandate and its ability to determine the present application.

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Wednesday, 9 September 2026 at 11:30 (SJ, KF, HB, KDS, DS and GJ).

Due to the nature of the application, the Committee requires the ongoing attendance by Mr Dave Saunders when this item is considered because of his expertise in the matter.

SBr

13.2 Proposed Alterations and Additions, Revised Plans on Erf 266-RE, 1 Surf Road - Avalon Apartment Block, Sea Point: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERF 266-RE

Case No: 29040CN0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405104>

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Wednesday, 9 September 2026 at 13:30 (SJ, KF, HB, KDS and GJ).

CN

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 12:00

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

23 September 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON_____

DATE_____

SECRETARY_____

DATE_____

APPROVED