

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 18 May 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Mr Ruan Brand, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr. Ruan Brand	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Chane Herman (<i>left at 12:00</i>)	Specialist Heritage Officer	CH
Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Specialist Heritage Officer	SB
Emily Jane Vowles	Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM

Staff

Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	I&APs/back up secretariat	NT

Legal Advisor

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

Observers

None.

Visitors

	Capacity	Item
David Halkett	Applicant	Admin item
Sarah Winter	Applicant	Admin item
Juan van Tonder	Architect	13.10
Jarryd Seagell	Owner	13.9
Tyrone Middendorp	I&AP	13.9
Muneerah Solomon	CoCT E&HM	14.19
Johan Cornelius	Heritage Practitioner	13.9
Debbie Votin	Owner	13.10
Anne-Marie Fick	Heritage Practitioner	14.6
Viv McDonald	I&AP	13.19
Jonathan Kaplan	Heritage Practitioner	14.16
Nicole Oehley	Architect Representative	14.20 & 14.50
Jone Kros	Applicant	14.19
Chirsten Africa	Applicant	14.24
Cahlan Willaims	Applicant	14.47
Sydney Holden	Town Planner/Owner Representative	14.36
John Wilson Harris	Architect	14.20 & 14.50

3. Apologies

None.

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 18 May 2026 with the following additions:

- Item 11.1 was added.

CN moved to adopt the agenda and CH seconded.

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 11 May 2026.

EJV moved to adopt the approval of the minutes and SVB seconded.

7. Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

8. Confidential matters

None.

9. Standing Items**9.1. Site inspections undertaken**

9.1.1 Erven 91454 and 91455, 4 and 6 Remington Road, Wynberg – 14 May 2026 (EJV)

9.1.2 Erf 27233, 3 Park Villa, Observatory – 14 May 2026 (SB)

9.1.3 Erf 177650, Cnr Rose and Waterkant Streets, Cape Town – 14 May 2026 (SB)

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

None.

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Erven 3934, 3935, 3936, and 3958, Long Street Municipal Baths, 311 Long Street, Cape Town
Emily Jane Vowles presented the item.

DISCUSSION

- HOMs on 6 May undertook a site inspection of the Long Street Municipal Baths alongside representatives from the City of Cape Town.
- In cooperation with the City of Cape Town, HWC resolved to undertake site inspections of five (5) properties within the municipality. Through a values-based approach, HWC would assist in identifying the attributes that contribute to the heritage significances of the sites, interventions required to uphold the integrity of these attributes, and interventions deemed to pose no impact to heritage resources that may be exempted from Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA). It was proposed that the findings of the site inspections would then inform Heritage Agreements for each property, where appropriate, in order to ensure compliance with the NHRA while reducing any administrative burden posed by the permitting process.
- The Long Street Municipal Baths were inaugurated in 1908 making them the first municipal swimming pool in Cape Town. Designed by the City of Cape Town's engineering department, the baths included changing boxes, a club room and 'slipper baths'. In 1926, the baths were extended to the north-east to include Turkish Baths, an extension designed by the architects MacGillivray and Grant most well-known for the Norwich Union Building in Cape Town. According to the Attic Exhibition at City Hall, use and enjoyment of the Long Street Municipal Baths was limited to only white residents for

the first 70-years of its existence. The Baths were nearly demolished in the 1960s, but ultimately retained. Their significance lives on not only in their distinct function and corresponding materiality, architectural expression, and continued use, but in the history of exclusionary politics and community memory attributed to this well-loved Cape Town landmark.

- HOMs inspected and assessed the foyer, change rooms, office space, plant rooms, generator rooms, pool room, and Turkish Baths, identifying significant spatial qualities, materiality, and character-defining elements as well as potential maintenance required and the site's capacity for change.

COMMENT

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

1. The site inspection and report to be noted at HOMs on 18 May 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.

9.3.2 Erven 91454 and 91455, 4 and 6 Remington Road, Wynberg

- The site inspection report was tabled under item 14.19 on the agenda.

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

- The site inspection report was held over to be heard at the HOMS meeting of 25 May 2026.

9.3.4 Erf 27233, 3 Park Villa, Observatory (SB)

- The site inspection report was tabled under item 13.10 on the agenda.

9.3.5 Erf 177650, CNR Rose and Waterkant Streets, Cape Town (SB)

- Site inspection was undertaken on the 14 May, site inspection report was discussed.
- During demolition, archaeological monitoring revealed slate wall footings from the late 18th to early 19th century. These were linked to historic dwellings that once stood on the site.
- A site inspection showed that later development had disturbed the remains. They are now mostly surrounded by clay, rubble, and modern concrete foundations, and there were very few artefacts found nearby.
- The archaeologist determined that, although the remains are of historical interest, they have low archaeological significance.
- Because of the need for basement excavation and lateral support, keeping the wall footings in place is not practical.
- The committee discussed the demolition of the exposed wall footings and the conditions that full archaeological recording, surveys, and photographic documentation, and if the historic stone is salvaged or reused in the new development. However, deemed the application incomplete as there are no comments from local authority or registered conservation bodies.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 IACom, 20 May 2026

9.4.2 BELCom, 27 May 2026

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 Hearing held for Lower Dorp Street, Stellenbosch

9.5.2 Hearing held for Erf 7691-RE, 14 Lewes Street, Somerset West

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.6.1 None

9.7 Incomplete Applications

9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.15; 13.16; 13.17

9.7.2 New Matters: 14.4; 14.7; 14.8; 14.9; 14.10; 14.11; 14.13; 14.15; 14.18; 14.22; 14.23; 14.25; 14.28; 14.29; 14.30; 14.32; 14.34; 14.35; 14.37; 14.39; 14.40; 14.42; 14.43; 14.44; 14.45; 14.46; 14.49; 14.54; 14.55; 14.56; 14.57; 14.59

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

9.8.1 Matters Arising: 13.6; 13.13

9.8.2 New Matters: 14.2; 14.26; 14.51

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising: None.

9.9.2 New Matters: None.

9.10 Archaeological Matters

9.10.1 Erven 734-RE, 735, 737, 738-RE, 739, 9564, 9565, 33 Chiappini Street, Cape Town - HIA (CN) Case No: HWC23061502CN0619

DISCUSSION:

- The applicant requests clarity from HWC regarding the implementation of Condition 3.4 of the approved HIA for the Provincial Pavement Testing Lab site. Specifically, confirmation is sought that any archaeological monitoring, recovery, and removal of human remains, grave furniture, or archaeological material encountered during site clearance may be managed through a Section 38(4) workplan approval process, rather than requiring separate permits under Sections 35 and 36 of the NHRA. In addition, the applicant requests confirmation that no further public participation or advertising process would be required, given that exhumation and associated notices were historically undertaken in the 1920s and no concerns relating to human remains were raised during the recent HIA public participation process.
- The consultants note that certain assumptions relating to archaeological monitoring, human remains, and permitting requirements were included in the approval and were not queried by IACOM at the time of decision-making. It was further noted that the development is currently out to tender by the Department of Infrastructure and that questions have been raised by potential bidders regarding archaeological risks and human remains on site.

COMMENT

The Committee noted the request for clarity on the IACOM RoD dated 16 July 2024 relating to the archaeological monitoring. The Committee confirms that, as per Section 38(10) of the NHRA, the workplan process is applicable and no separate section 35/36 permit is required at this time.

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

None.

9.12 Permit deadline

Tuesday, 19 May 2026 COB

9.13 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- A meeting was held with JH on 15 May 2026 and the following was discussed:

- Working on the S35/S36 form and a hard deadline for the soft launch at the end of June 2026. This is priority one.
- Follow ups with the developers with respect to 1) implementation of the Google API reliant Site Creation tool being integrated into all application webforms, and 2) the issues with the download all button occasionally downloading a random heritage report in the downloaded pack
- Follow ups internally will be had in the coming weeks with PM on the drafted POA and Ts&Cs.
- The banners will be updated to reflect: 1) that forms in draft and unedited for more than 60 days will be automatically deleted, and 2) to inform the public of the potential upcoming delays/backlog with applications and reminding them of the 60-day outcome regulation.
- Minor changes throughout, such as the permit extension option feeding into the HWC form and clearer instructions on banking details ito of applicants erroneously paying SAHRA instead of HWC are also being implemented/explored.
- There will be a SAHRIS engagement at the start of Quarter 2 – Friday 7 August 2026. Details TBC.
- The issue of browsers operating in dark mode was discussed and will be mentioned to the SAHRIS admin team.
- A Built Environment Application Form checklist will be constructed soon.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1. NID Enquiry - RD2410: Walking and Cycling Upgrades in the Cape Town CBD and Sea Point Areas (CN)

DISCUSSION:

- The consultant is seeking guidance regarding the process requirements for the proposed introduction of cycle routes within the CBD and Atlantic Seaboard. The proposed routes are interconnected, located within existing road reserves, and collectively exceed the 300m trigger threshold. Advice is requested on the appropriate approach to the NID process, specifically whether a single consolidated NID may be submitted for the broader route network, given the extensive linear nature of the project and associated volume of streetscape photographic documentation required
- The Committee discussed that the submission of three separate NIDs is required in accordance with the three blue lined zones indicated on provided route map, rather than a single consolidated NID for the broader walk and cycle network. This approach was considered more appropriate given the differing heritage contexts, cultural landscape sensitivities, and potential impacts associated with each zone. The applicant must motivate the heritage implications and potential impacts relevant to each respective zone within the applicable NID submission.

COMMENT

The Committee resolved that three separate NIDs must be submitted as per the three zones as indicated on drawing number 12610 HA-LO 04, dated April 2026, as prepared by Daveng Consulting Engineers.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1. Erf 127-RE, 46 Long Street, Montagu

Case No: 28161CN0413 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395980>

DISCUSSION:

- HOMs on 28 April resolved to issue a comment on the application stating that the Committee is supportive of the proposed interventions. For HWC to issue a permit, the following is required:
 - 1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate heritage experience to oversee the proposed work

- 2. HWC is to be provided with the details of the consultant and their CV confirming suitability to oversee the work
- 3. A letter of appointment to be signed by the applicant and consultant
- Once the above has been fulfilled, HWC will provide the required permit."
- Mr Roberts is a registered Professional Architect with SACAP and registered with VASSA. He has experience with heritage-related projects and applications submitted to HWC, including work involving historic buildings and restoration projects. Based on the information provided, he is considered suitably qualified to undertake the required close out reporting.

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. A close-out report, compiled by David Robert, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

12. Discussion of the Agenda

None.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 234, 46 Bath Street, Montagu, S34-Minor Works
Case No.: 27965CH0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395344>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Further requirements received on 13 May 2026. HOMs required a sworn statement declaring that work has not commenced on site and that the application form was filled out incorrectly.
- Not Graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal fit out for the Standard Bank building.
- HOMs on 20 April 2026 took a decision to issue a S51 letter in response to the application form stating that the work has already been completed. The applicant on 4 May 2026 confirmed via email that an error was made on the form and that no work has started on site. The owners are awaiting HWC and council approval prior to work commencing on site.

DECISION

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

CH

13.2 Erf 14035, 75 Salisbury Street, Woodstock, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27862CN0317 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391794>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information: CoCT, WRA and WAAC comments received on 8 May 2026.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC25092901XM1008 - Noting the application was incomplete and was

for the addition of a second storey above the main dwelling. Objection from all I&APs. Application not formally withdrawn and assuming this application supersedes the previous proposal.

- Proposal: Internal alterations to the existing dwelling, including reconfiguration of living spaces, kitchen and bathroom upgrades, and removal of non-original internal partitions, together with a rear extension of a single-storey flat roof rear addition to accommodate a new bedroom. Changes are limited to the rear, including changes to doors and windows.
- Consultation:
- CoCT supports
- WRA has no heritage comments
- WAAC supports approval without conditions

DECISION

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

CN

13.3 Erf 1783, Cnr Napier & Montagu Streets, George, S34-Total Demolition **Case No:** 28000CN0329 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395449>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Company Resolution, correct SG diagram, external photos and George Mun comments required - received 21 April, 12 and 15 May 2026.
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For total demolition of the structures on site
- Consultation:
- George Municipality states that the property is listed in the heritage inventory and as such a permit from HWC is required.
- GHF has no objection
- SVDSF supports
- Heritage Considerations: The building is not worthy of retention.

DECISION

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

CN

13.4 Erf 48778, 9 Oak Avenue, Newlands, S34-Additions & Alterations **Case No:** 27810CN0313 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391357>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Streetscape photos and NCID comments - received on 29 April
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside (proposed HPO)
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For the addition of a new loft within the existing roof structure with a dormer window facing the rear, the enclosure of the patio area, a new timber deck, limited internal alterations,

the introduction of a small swimming pool, and modifications to the boundary wall.

- Consultation:
- CoCT does not support due to the negative impact of the proposals and state that 1. The removal and infilling of the existing door opening will negatively impact the historic character of the semi-detached cottage and its contribution to the streetscape and 2. The rear dormer should align with the neighbouring semi-detached unit by starting at the same point on the main roof to maintain architectural consistency between the adjoining cottages.
- NCID supports the proposed rear roof (dormer) extension, as it is consistent with the adjoining unit and does not impact the primary street-facing roofscape. However, they raise concern regarding the relocation of the front door, noting that shifting it off-centre may negatively affect the traditional three-bay cottage typology, albeit with limited visibility due to the boundary wall.
- Response to Objections:
- CoCT - 1. Door opening: The entrance is largely screened from the public realm by the existing boundary wall, limiting its visibility from the street. In addition, a review of the Oak Avenue streetscape shows varied door placements, indicating that a centrally positioned entrance is not a defining or consistent character element. The proposed double door, incorporating mullions reflecting the proportions of the existing windows, maintains the rhythm of façade openings and remains visually compatible with the architectural language of the building. 2. The dormer has been designed to relate to the adjoining unit through similar materials and proportions, ensuring visual cohesion across the shared roofscape. Dormer additions and roof alterations are common in Oak Avenue and the surrounding area, reflecting an established pattern of adaptation within the neighbourhood. As the dormer is positioned toward the rear roof plane, its visibility from the main street will be limited and only partially visible from certain oblique viewpoints.
- Heritage Considerations: The heritage resource has limited streetscape visibility due to the boundary wall, the proposal is not considered to materially impact heritage significance. The changes are in keeping with the varied character of the area and are acceptable.
- All parties were invited to the HOMs meeting today
- HOMs generally supported the proposal, noting that the rear dormer addition was acceptable and would not materially impact the streetscape character. While some concern was raised regarding the relocation of the front door and the potential future visibility of the façade should the boundary wall be altered, the majority of the Committee considered the proposed changes acceptable within the varied and asymmetrical character of the streetscape. It was further noted that the existing front door would no longer serve a functional purpose due to the internal staircase configuration.

DECISION

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

CN

13.5 Erf 86264-RE, 202 Main Road, Muizenberg, S34-Minor Works Case No: 28158CN0413 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395975>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information Res/Letter of Authority, streetscape photos and motivation for proposed work - received on 6 May.
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 22082908CH0831E- Approved: alterations to create additional office space and insert facilities appropriate to a larger staff contingent.
- Proposal: For the installation of fire-compliant elements such as fire doors, shutters, walls and

ceilings as well as upgrades to finishes.

DECISION

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

CN

13.6 Erf 435, 16 Exeter Avenue, Bishopscourt, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28281EJV0422 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396328>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding Information received on 11 May 2026
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for internal alterations, repositioning of fenestrations, and replacing fenestration where required

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

EJV

13.7 Erf 18091, Off R304, Newinbosch Farm (formerly Cloetesdal), Stellenbosch, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 28034RB0331 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395565>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received (technically 18 May 2026 - confirmation of no response on comments).
- IIIC on the Stellenbosch survey but a 2020 HWC endorsed HIA notes it as NCW.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Previous applications were to revitalise the row houses for use as classrooms as part of the Church development endorsed by HWC in 2020.
- HWC processed this application, along with two deviation applications in the past year and a half.
- On site now, the team has discovered that the only relevant heritage fabric cannot accommodate this use as the mud brick is too weak and disintegrating.
- The structural engineer instead recommends total demolition.
- The team is on site enacting the total demolition for the shed under the approved HIA and the team has asked if they can extend the work onto this building without formal consultation, noting that the municipality and all CBs agreed to the NCW gradings in the 2020 HIA.
- HWC advised the applicant that this cannot be accommodated on heritage grounds and comments are required.
- SM and SHF did not respond to request for comment within 30 days and SIG provided a comment of no objection.

DECISION

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

RB

13.8**RE Erf 2002, Betty's Bay, S38(8)-NID**

Case No: 28050RB0402 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395619>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information (i.e., archaeological screening) submitted on 13 May 2026.
- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(a) triggered.
- Proposal is for Overstrand Municipality to upgrade a water reservoir (by demolishing the current one and having it on the same footprint) and to install a water supply line at Betty's Bay.
- It will be aligned to an existing jeep track rather than through intact/undisturbed natural vegetation.
- Applicant recommends NFS and did not identify any heritage resources.
- Palaeosensitivity is blue/low.
- The area is just off the R44, which could be considered a scenic route, but the work would not have any impacts to that experiential quality.
- Betty's Bay is however an incredibly archaeologically sensitive area, with a rocky shoreline and known middens.
- The provided archaeological screener did not identify any obvious surface sites/finds after a walkover survey.
- Applicant recommends NFS.

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 must be included in any form of EMPr and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

RB

13.9**Erf 2067, 75 Kloof Road, Fresnaye, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition**

Case No: 27072SB0116 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388347>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Tyrone Middendorp, Johan Cornelius and Jarryd Seagell were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: rear double-storey addition and internal alterations to an existing building, including ancillary structures, with the historic street façade retained.
- It is noted in the motivation that the new double-storey wing at the rear, linked by a set-back element, ensuring the original structure remains dominant and is not visible from Kloof Road.
- Alterations: Internal modifications for improved functionality, including the removal of a non-original dining room extension to enhance spatial clarity.
- Ancillary Structures: Construction of a new garden wall and a modest pool house, designed to complement the existing architecture without detracting from the historic building
- Work start: no
- Grade: 3B
- HPO: outside
- Previous permits: 2018 (18080614WD0808E) for change to the street facing façade but was never implemented. The current proposal is more conservative.
- Comments: Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents' Association has no objection.
- Sea Point For All notes that they can only comment once completed building plan, there is an

email chain but cannot find the final comment. There was some concerns about tree loss.

- City of Cape Town has no objection.
- Erleigh and Associates Inc. objects to the proposal and noted that negatively impact the surrounding heritage context, including neighbouring heritage properties and the nearby HPOZ. The objectors claim the proposal introduces excessive rear bulk and height, disrupts the historic streetscape and scenic route character, overshadows and visually dominates their Grade III property, and fails to properly consider the wider heritage environment and public realm.
- Additional information received on 29 April 2026, that includes a heritage statement that notes that the house was originally built in 1906. Although the building is more than 60 years old and protected under Section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act, it is not located within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ). The house has undergone several alterations between the 1960s and 1990s, which changed parts of the original structure and reduced some of its heritage significance. However, important heritage elements remain intact, including the street-facing façade, decorative gables, chimneys, pressed ceilings, fireplaces, and overall architectural character.
- The surrounding area of Fresnaye has changed significantly over time, with many historic buildings demolished and replaced by modern developments and apartment blocks. The report argues that the broader area no longer has sufficient integrity to justify formal heritage area protection.
- The report concludes that the proposal will not negatively impact the heritage value of the property and may improve the legibility and functionality of the historic structure.
- Additional information received on 29 April 2026, that includes response to objections, which notes that the main objections were around privacy and overlooking, overshadowing and loss of sunlight, loss of views, impact to heritage resource and change to the character and ground levels and building height.
- Consultant argues that the area is not within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ) and contains a mix of old and modern buildings with different heritage gradings. Because the area has already changed significantly over time, it is not considered a cohesive heritage area. The proposed additions are therefore said to have little impact on the broader heritage character. It is further noted that there is no overlooking or loss of privacy. It also argues that a fully compliant building could actually create more privacy issues than the current proposal. The report also notes that neighbouring properties already experience some overshadowing from existing trees and vegetation. The report states that the proposed addition is lower than the maximum permitted height and partly built into the slope of the site. And the applicants state that official City ground level information and a survey were used to confirm the building height complies with CoCT regulations.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today.
- Committee noted that the property falls outside any HPOZ/proposed HPOZ and that the surrounding context lacks a strong coherent heritage character.
- Members discussed that the building has already undergone previous alterations and that the proposal continues the layered evolution of the site while distinguishing new work from the original structure.
- The scale, setback, and placement of the additions were considered unlikely to negatively impact the streetscape, surrounding heritage resources, or scenic route.
- Objections were discussed, with members noting that several concerns focused more on planning arguments than on heritage impacts.
- The committee discussed the retention of internal heritage fabric and noted that significant original features are proposed to be retained and refurbished, with most interventions focused on later additions.
- Members agreed that the proposal retains the significance and overall spatial character of the historic structure.
- The size of the site and the existing built character of the area were considered sufficient to accommodate the additions without unacceptable heritage impacts.
- It was noted that interested and affected parties had been invited to comment and that proof of

notification should be placed on record.

- A site inspection was discussed but members considered that sufficient information had been provided through the submission documentation.
- The committee was generally supportive of the proposal

DECISION

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

SB

13.10 Erf 27233, 3 Park Villa, Observatory, S34-Additions and Alterations
Case No: 27071SB0116 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388345>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.
Debbie Votin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: Internal alterations to reconfigure the existing dwelling layout
- Creation of a new open-plan living area, new main bedroom, guest bedroom, and new lounge area; Addition of one new bedroom; suite bathroom etc
- Work start: According to the application form - no
- Grade: 3C
- HPO: Inside
- Outstanding information received on the 23 and 28 April that included the following: Observatory Civic Association comment that had no concerns except for the southern roof portion, needs to be step back to reduce visual concern's and CoCT updated comment noted support based on the amended plans.
- The Committee ventilated the matter after noting the site inspection report and that there was no uniformity within the street and as such, introducing more non uniformity would not detract from the heritage value/streetscape of the surrounds with the proposal.

DECISION

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

SB

13.11 Erf 983, 8 St. James Street, Somerset West, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition
Case No: 28296SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396380>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Confirmation on status of work; confirmation of Minor Works applicability; Updated site photographs (should work be completed); and Power of Attorney required

SB

13.12 Erf 10097, 38 Blinde Street, District Six, S34-Alterations
Case No: 28048SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395613>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 08 May 2026.
- The property is graded IIIA and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.

- The proposal is for demolition of the rear external wall of the structure to accommodate a new open stoep area as well as a deck and plunge pool.
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- CIBRA supports the proposal.
- In terms of the CoCT survey the site was *"Identified by NMC for formal protection - not followed through"* and the structure is *"Late 19th century residential densification. Now rare remaining fabric associated with District Six. Good architectural example. Good interface with the streetscape. Landmark streetscape."*

DECISION

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

SVB

13.13 Erf 3609, 233 7th Street, Hermanus, S34-Alterations & Partial Demolition **Case No: 28256SVB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396243>**

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 07 May 2026.
- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for various internal and external alterations to the main dwelling, second dwelling and garage structure.
- OHAC supports the proposal.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SVB

13.14 Erf 58022, 31 Rutland Street, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations **Case No: 27967SVB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395351>**

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 May 2026.
- The property is graded IIIC/NCW and is within the Harfield PHRA Road proposed HPOZ.
- Work has been completed.
- The completed work is a slight extension to the living room at the rear of the property as well as various internal alterations and alterations to doors and windows.
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- Harfield Village Association did not respond.

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

13.15	Erf 5601, 11 Union Street, Strand, S34-Minor Works Case No: 28077XM0407 https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395739 OUTSTANDING INFORMATION: Consultation comments required.	XM
13.16	Erf 334, 55 Jeffcoat Avenue, Bergvliet, S34 Total Demolition Case No:27590XM0302 https://www.sahris.org.za/node/390131 OUTSTANDING INFORMATION Confirmation on work having started required.	XM
13.17	Erf 84804, 27 Westlake Drive, Westlake, S34-Total Demolition Case No: 27987XM0327 https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395427 OUTSTANDING INFORMATION: POA and CoCT comment required.	XM
13.18	Erf 935, 30 Church Street, Wellington, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 26645XM1111/ https://www.sahris.org.za/node/387051 Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item. DISCUSSION • Outstanding information received on 13 May 2025. • HOMs requested confirmation with the status of the work on site, applicant confirmed no work has started as they are waiting for approval. the carport was approved before that's showed as existing. Now we are only doing internal changes. • The application is for an addition of a carport and two additional internet kiosks to the existing FNB building. • Work has not started. • Graded IIIA • Within the Wellington protected area • Drakenstein municipality support • DHF did not comment within 30 days DECISION The Committee resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.	XM
13.19	Erf 96982, 10 Dumbarton Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 27636XM0304 https://www.sahris.org.za/node/390260 OUTSTANDING INFORMATION: The plans are to be revised to reflect the correct boundary lines and to indicate clearly in red or clouded in red where work has started as distinct from work proposed and annotated as such.	XM

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 11481, 36 Church Street, Wellington, S34-Minor Works **Case No: 28376CN0504 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397540>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 22030128KB0309E - Approved alts & ads; HWC24081535EJV1001 - Approved wall repair phase 1
- Proposal: For the demolition and rebuilding of the existing structurally failing side parapet wall, as part of phase 2 repairs, on new foundations in accordance with the engineer's specifications. The rebuilt wall will match the existing structure, with limited associated works including bricking up existing openings, removal of the attic hatch, and retention of the existing roof structure.
- Consultation:
 - DHAC has no objection
 - WHF has no objection
 - DHF has no objection
 - Paarl 300 did not comment in 30 days

DECISION

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

CN

14.2 Erf 1154, 40 Union Avenue, Pinelands, S34-Minor Works **Case No: 28370CN0501 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397483>**

CASE SUMMARY

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For internal reconfiguration that includes a new home office, sunroom, verandahs and pergolas, replacement of windows and doors and planters to the front facade.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

14.3 Erf 1165-RE, 41 Avenue La Croix, Fresnaye, S34-Total Demolition **Case No: 28311CN0424 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396506>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started

- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: To demolish all structures on site and retaining the sandstone boundary wall.
- Consultation:
- CoCT supports
- SFB & SFA did not comment in 30 days.
- Heritage Considerations: The building is considered to have limited heritage significance and does not appear to warrant retention. While the property contributes to the immediate streetscape to some degree, the structure has undergone various alterations over time and is located within a largely transformed and contemporary urban context surrounded by predominantly NCW buildings. The demolition is therefore not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the broader heritage character of the area
- Officer Recommendation: Approval
- The Committee generally considered the resource to be more appropriately graded IIIC rather than IIIB, noting that while some intact architectural elements remain, the building has undergone various alterations over time and is relatively isolated from a broader coherent heritage context or streetscape. The Committee was therefore generally supportive of the proposed total demolition without a replacement structure. It was also noted that the sandstone boundary wall and gateposts may hold some heritage significance, but their retention was not considered as a condition of approval as its noted on the demolition plan to be retained.

DECISION

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

CN

- 14.4 Erf 1220, 62 Bain Street, Wellington, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28413CN0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397658>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA to be signed by both owners, plans to conform with DHF & DHAC comments and indicate work that has started/completed required

CN

- 14.5 Erf 1365, 7 Smith Street, McGregor, S27-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28395CN0505 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397598>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Declared PHS (Part of Erven 4 & 100); The site has been assessed provisionally as Grade IIIA heritage resource in a draft survey undertaken in 2019-20 under the auspices of the McGregor Heritage Society. The statement of significance notes “high heritage significance in terms of tangible and intangible heritage. Confirms in terms of vernacular form, scale and materiality, Excellent street interface, Landmark building on streetscape.
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC25092920CH1001 - Approved MW with Close Out Report: Maintenance, repairs, internal and external work to all buildings except the Manor House, Guest Cottages and Watermill Structure. Work is still being carried out and the close will be prepared once work has been completed.
- Proposal: The works include internal alterations to the existing manor house/restaurant that include the removal of dry walls, creation of new openings, reconfiguration of bathrooms, and upgrades to guest facilities. In addition, three new freestanding structures are proposed, namely a laundry, pool house, and garage/workshop with staff quarters. The proposals are intended to

support the continued use of the property as guest accommodation and restaurant facilities while remaining visually subservient to the historic buildings on site.

- Consultation:
- Langeberg Municipality notes the application and submission to HWC is supported
- McGregor Heritage Society supports noting the style, form, proportion, materiality appropriate and not impacting the heritage resource nor the streetscape negatively.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposal is deemed appropriately scaled and visually recessive in relation to the historic werf and the surrounding cultural landscape. The internal alterations are minor and not impacting. The new structures are deemed modest in form and materiality and are sufficiently subservient of the heritage resources on site.

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 work must be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Louise van Riet to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Louise van Riet and inclusive of the work permitted under both case numbers HWC25092920CH1001 and 28395CN0505 in one consolidated report, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

CN

14.6 Erf 2139-RE, 213-217, Main Road, Paarl, S34-Minor Works Case No: 28340CN0429 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397324>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Ms. Anne-Marie Fick was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIA
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 21012103SM0127E - Section 51 issued; 21012103KB1005E - Further requirements issued, application deemed not finalised.
- Proposal: For the removal of the existing tenants' fit-out elements to restore the building to a neutral state including the removal of internal wall tiles, repainting of interior surfaces, removal of kitchen equipment and fixed extractor installations, as well as the removal of company signage installed.

COMMENT

The Committee is supportive of the proposed interventions. For Heritage Western Cape (HWC) to issue a permit, the following is required:

1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate heritage experience to oversee the proposed work
2. HWC is to be provided with the details of the consultant and their CV confirming suitability to oversee the work
3. A letter of appointment to be signed by the applicant and consultant

Once the above has been fulfilled, HWC will provide the required permit.

CN

- 14.7 Erf 4408, 5 Carletta Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28314CN0424 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396512>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
PoP, Trust Resolution, POA, updated photos, I&AP comments and updated motivation required.
- CN
- 14.8 Erf 57703, 12 Heather Street, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28354CN0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397392>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
CoCT final comment and GLCA comments required.
- CN
- 14.9 Erf 135, 50 Long Street, Montagu, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28390CSI0504 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397588>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Langeberg Municipality comment, trust resolution, additional streetscape photos required.
- CSI
- 14.10 Erf 2956, 13 Verbena Way, Pinelands, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28317CSI0425 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396516>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
CoCT comment required.
- CSI
- 14.11 Erf 346-RE, 15 Firmount Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28339CSI0429 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397312>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
All photos required.
- CSI
- 14.12 Erf 575, 22 Avenue Normandie, Fresnaye, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28356CSI0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397398>
- Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.
- DISCUSSION**
- Work applied for has started
 - Previous approval: HWC25040710XM0417
 - Graded IIIC
 - Outside HPO
 - Proposed deviations are minor in nature as described in Section C of the heritage report: the pool pump enclosure, stacking door instead of sliding door, amendments to en-suite bathroom, retention of wall extent in main living area to provide more stability for the roof, positioning of exterior stair adjusted.
 - Applicant confirmed that all deviated work has been completed.
- 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.

CSI

- 14.13 Erf 97236, 20 Midwood Avenue, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28366CSI0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397409>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Signed POA, CoCT comment, streetscape photos required.

CSI

- 14.14 Erven 10528, 10529, 10530, 10531 & 10532, 140 Church Street, Mariners Village, Westcliff, Hermanus, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28403CSI0505 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397618>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent; (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof;
- Proposed development: 165 units in the form of apartments, townhouses and terrace houses of maximum 3 storeys. The development will include landscaped greenspace, parking, a recreation centre and retention ponds.
- Current zoning/land-use: General Residential Zone 1: Town Housing and Open Space Zone 3: Private Open Space / Vacant
- Visual impacts: None expected as the surrounding land-use is residential in nature and the height is 12.5m in accordance with the zoning scheme.
- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is a mix of high and low.
- Officers noted the lack of palaeo resources in the area and although the site is potentially archaeologically sensitive, the surrounding developments would have displaced resources out of context.

DECISION

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

CSI

- 14.15 Farm 999, Farm Jakkasfontein, Malmesbury, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28322CSI0428 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396555>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Proof of payment with correct reference required.

CSI

- 14.16 Portion 7 of Farm 80, Farm Palmiet Drift, George, S38(8)-NID**
Case No: 28389CSI0405 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397587>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Mr. Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (i)

exceeding 5 000m² in extent;; S38(1)(d) Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent.

- Proposed development: Establishment of a borrow pit of 4.56ha for stone aggregate. The northern side of the excavation will be 10m deep against the 630m contour and on the southern side it will be a maximum 40m deep. Provision is made for a stormwater trench and detention pond on the northern side of the access road. The topsoil will be removed to the high side of the road and mitre drains will be added along steeper sections. An access road of ±6 m wide will also be provided
- Current zoning/land-use: Agriculture I / Vacant
- Visual impacts: The site is located just off the N12 and would not be visually obstructive due to its positioning within the valley
- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources. Sensitivity on the screener report is low.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is low. Professor Bamford provided a letter stating that since there is only a very small chance of trace fossils occurring in the project footprint, we request exemption from any further palaeontological impact assessment. A fossil chance find protocol has been included here in case fossils are found when blasting and mining commences.

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 must be included in any form of EMPr and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

CSI

14.17 Erf 37801, Heatherdale Primary School, 157 Belgravia Road, Athlone, S34-Minor Works Case No: 28321EJV0428 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396554>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO but alongside the Belgravia Road living heritage resource as a route used during the protests of the 1980s
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to remove and replace the asbestos roofing and, where necessary, the timber structures, to demolish and rebuild the deteriorated bathroom structures on the same footprint, and the undertaking of general maintenance and refurbishments of the school buildings.

DECISION

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

EJV

14.18 Erven 13853-RE and 144052-RE, 22 Lawley Street, Woodstock, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 28346EJV0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397353>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Consultation comments and streetscapes required

EJV

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Jone Kros was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for the total demolition of the two semi-detached, single-storey structures on site. Some original elements remain, including timber floors, internal doors and portions of ceiling detailing. These elements occur alongside later insertions and modifications. Alterations to the buildings, including changes to finishes, boundary treatments, and the introduction of security elements, have modified the original character of the structures. The properties present a largely inward-facing condition, with limited visual or spatial engagement with the street. Both sites include associated outbuildings, hard landscaping, and on-site parking areas, contributing to a utilitarian character. The subject property is located within an established urban area of Wynberg characterised by a mix of residential, apartment, and institutional uses. The surrounding context reflects a varied and evolving built environment, with a range of building scales and typologies present, including single-storey dwellings and mid to high rise apartment buildings. The area does not exhibit a consistent or cohesive architectural character, but rather a layered urban condition shaped by incremental development over time.
- The CoCT, WRRRA, and CTHF did not provide comment within 30-days. Two objections from neighbours were received concerning: increased crime, negative impact on property values, and risks of vagrancy following demolition. While these matters fall outside the scope of heritage-related considerations, the applicant has confirmed that these risks will be proactively managed through a structured and continuous development process.
- Two HOMs officials undertook a site inspection on 14 May 2026 as the sensitivity of the receiving environment to a replacement structure required assessment to determine whether Gees was applicable. Officers walked the length of Remington Road, north-west along Riverstone Road, and south-west along Aliwal Road assessing the integrity of the immediate area and its contribution to the abutting proposed HPO. The area is mix of NCW, IIIC, and IIIB heritage resources with the Education Museum Provincial Heritage Site to the rear of the subject site fronting Aliwal Road. A visit to the PHS confirmed that the site does not contribute to the experience of the Education Museum nor will its demolition and replacement negatively impact on the PHS. IIIB graded resources include numbers 9 and 11 Remington Road, the trio along Cornwell Place, and 1, 1A, 3, and 3A Riverstone Road. The site does not contribute to the experiential quality of the latter two roads as it is screened by the contemporary apartments further up Remington Road and the large block on the corner of Riverstone and Aliwal Roads. At streetscale, 9 and 11 Remington Road, while retaining legible aspects of their original envelopes and roofscapes, have been subject to inappropriate security accretions that sever their connection with the street. The receiving environment does not demonstrate significant heritage sensitivity, and the site and its immediate surroundings do not contribute to the proposed Kenilworth HPO.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today
- During the meeting, the CoCT verbally supported the demolition of the structure on site.

DECISION

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

14.20 Erf 149294-RE, Victoria & Alfred Hotel, V&A Waterfront, Cape Town, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28327EJV0428 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396805>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.
Nicole Oehley was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB
- Inside the V&A Waterfront IIIA Cultural Landscape and proposed HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to reroof the hotel by removing and replacing the roof sheeting as the material and flashings are weathered. Where appropriate, the replacement will be like-for-like with Victorian Profile while the shallow pitch of the central roof will be replaced with secret fix diamondek profile to prevent against leaking experienced by the hotel in the past. A safety walkway is also proposed on this section of the roof and similarly will not be visible.

DECISION

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

EJV

14.21 Farm 1259-RE and Erven 606 and 603, PNB4, PNB5 and PNB7 Middens, Paternoster, S35-Dating
Case No: HWC26050501EJV0504

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to undertake radiocarbon dating of shell and charcoal material excavated in 1996 currently housed at UCT. The 11 samples will undergo Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (AMS) dating to establish their chronological sequences, and at least 50 % of each sample will be destroyed for this purpose. This, however, comprises less than 2% of the collection. No radiocarbon dates have been obtained for these sites, and more sites in Paternoster need to be dated in order to better reconstruct the precolonial settlement and subsistence trends and landscape uses for this area.
- UCT and the West Coast Aboriginal Council support the proposal while the ACKTC did not respond to the request for comment

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

EJV

14.22 Erf 515, 5 Avenue Le Sueur, Fresnaye, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28368EJV0501 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397412>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Outstanding R4000 payment; streetscapes; consultation comments required

EJV

- 14.23 Farm 167 Portion 68, Riet Vallei, Montagu Road, Montagu, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28378EJV0504 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397543>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Resolution; site photographs; consideration of the palaeontological sensitivity required

EJV

- 14.24 Erf 523, Off the R326, Stanford, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28391EJV0405 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397589>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Inside the Local Area HPO, declared Stanford Heritage Area, and along a route of regional scenic significance
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to install an Electric Vehicle (EV) charging station and solar panel installation on the erf. The current land uses consist of an Agricultural co-op, fuel pumps, a small shop operating out of container units and a nursery. The site falls within the urban edge and avoids intrusion into both the historic town core and the surrounding rural landscape. The proposed EV charging station and solar PV facility are compatible with the current land use and various landscaping techniques should be implemented to ensure any potential visual impact is nullified. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates very high sensitivity due to the presence of the Bokkeveld Group; however, considering the proposal is located on an already developed commercial node containing hard-surface paving, buildings, fuel infrastructure, parking areas, and service yards will not impact palaeo resources. The entire erf has been substantially transformed by past construction and earthworks associated with the existing retail and service station operations. Given the longstanding disturbance, no intact or undisturbed geological horizons remain exposed on the site surface. All proposed development activities will occur within a previously modified footprint and no bulk earthworks are proposed.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

DECISION

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

EJV

- 14.25 Erf 3123, 12 8th Avenue, George, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28412RB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397657>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POP with correct reference number/confirmation from admin to confirm payment can be allocated as well as proof of consultation with the municipality required.

RB

- 14.26 Erf 51375, 12 Chesham Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28348RB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397359>

CASE SUMMARY

- Graded IIIC/NCW.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.

- Proposal is to add a new first storey the main dwelling and outbuilding as well as adding a new garage and carport (the carport would connect the garage to the main dwelling).
- CoCT E&HM offered a comment of no objection.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

RB

14.27 Erf 46225-RE, 20 Mount Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 28410RB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397655>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC.
- Inside the Westerford HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to add an extra storey, making internal alterations, and to add a pool (freestanding and not a trigger).
- NCID commented as follows:
 - We note the location of this Grade IIIC structure mid-block in the Westerford HPOZ with no street interaction.
 - The Westerford HPOZ has fairly dense grain of mainly Victorian and early 20th century housing.
 - Appropriate building forms and finishes should relate to the characteristic historic cottage typologies, i.e. pitched roofs with painted masonry walls.
 - This upper floor addition introduces uncommon materials (Nutec cladding) as well as a lower pitched roof (30degrees) than what is characteristic (35degrees minimum).
 - Furthermore, the height of the upper floor relative to the lower floor presents as unproportional, with the long facade as bulky.
 - Although located in the centre of the block, it is likely that this addition will be visible due to its height.
 - Exploring a lower wall plate and steeper roof pitch may allow the proposals to settle more comfortably into the block.
- CoCT E&HM commented as follows:
 - It has been noted by HRS during the LUMS process that although the proposed external Nutec cladding is not common to the immediate area, the proposed building form and scale is. If paint colour is sensitive to the immediate area the proposal will not have a negative impact on the character or significance of the HPOZ. Furthermore, the dwelling is positioned away from the street however still contributes to the overall character of the HPOZ. The additional storey is considered somewhat in keeping as it replicates certain elements (e.g. sash windows and shutters) found on the ground floor which, in principle, will not impact the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties. HRS has no objection to the proposal.
- The Committee ventilated the matter, noting that the property falls inside the HPO and the NCID comment needs to be engaged with by motivating for the current design despite the objection or to have design revisions to mitigate the issues raised in the objection.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The applicant must submit a written response to the NCID comment motivating for approval of the proposal on heritage grounds and/or submit revised plans in response to the NCID comment

- 14.28 Erf 90779-RE, 34 Tennant Road, Wynberg, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28362RB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397404>

OUTSANDING INFORMATION:

Clarity on ownership and relevant POAs and Resolutions, Streetscape images, WRA, and CoCT E&HM comment required.

RB

- 14.29 Erf 70879, 37 Southfield Road, Plumstead, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28372RB0503 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397531>

OUTSANDING INFORMATION:

CoCT E&HM comment required.

RB

- 14.30 Erf 9185, 57 Kerk Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28336RB0429 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397307>

OUTSANDING INFORMATION:

Confirmation on whether this application can be processed simply as a substantially in accordance situation (HWC25021010EJV0214) as the deviations are related to the sewer lines only.

RB

- 14.31 Farm Le Chasseur No 207, Robertson, S38(8)-NID**
Case No: 28324RB0428 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396558>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(C)(i) triggered.
- Proposal is for the clearance of indigenous vegetation for the expansion of cultivation areas and the construction of a broiler poultry facility.
- Palaeosig is a mix of red (very high), blue (low), and the majority of it, including the broilers in an area of unknown sig.
- Archaeology for this general area is sparse and most regional finds have been ESA, MSA, and LSA artefacts that are ex-situ.
- Visually, the site sits amongst cultivated land, and is low lying. No visual intrusion/impacts are foreseen.
- Applicant recommends NFS.

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 must be included in any form of EMPr and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

RB

- 14.32 Erven 19661, 19672, 19761, and multiple street parcels, Milnerton, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28409RB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397654>

OUTSANDING INFORMATION

POA for Trisha Sukhdeo to submit the NID obo the CoCT required.

- 14.33 Erf 170960, 10 Jacobs Ladder, St James, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28394SB0505 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397593>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: proposed minor works to the flooring, internal openings, upgrades to kitchen, removal of outside toilet, new fence around the garden, closing of bedroom doors and additional shower.
- Work start: no
- Grade: IIIB
- HPO: Inside

DECISION

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

SB

- 14.34 Erf 1054, 315 Ocean View Drive, Fresnaye, S34-Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28407SB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397652>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents' Association, Sea Point For All and City of Cape Town comment required.

SB

- 14.35 Erf 8207, 33 Plover Road, Heatherlands George, S34-Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28333SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397291>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

GHT comment required.

SB

- 14.36 Erf 2187, 46 Caledon Street, Somerset West, S34-Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28334SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397305>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Sydney Holden was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: In 2024, new owners bought the property and converted it into a shop/business premises, added extra storage at the back, and renovated the building. According to the plans, new work been proposed including a new living room, store, kitchen, bathroom, reroofing
- Work start: yes – based on motivation and photographs
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: CoCT declines opportunity to comment as building as no heritage, HRF abstains from further comments as the work is completed.

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.

SB

- 14.37 Erf 6784, 86 Meyer Street, Eastern Extension, George, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition, Restoration**
Case No: 28387SB0405 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397585>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Proof of consultation, street photographs that are not google and previous plans are required.

SB

- 14.38 Erf 4266, Cnr of Blake and Mill Street, Paarl, S34-Maintenance (minor works)**
Case No: 28397SB0505 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397601>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal photographs (without learners), POP incorrect reference, POA and Resolution required and signed by WGE is required.

SB

- 14.39 Erf 13220, Off Stokey Road, Wellington, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28404SB0605 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397619>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Site photographs required.

SB

- 14.40 Erf 20257, House 953 (Sectional Title No 98) Helderberg Village, Somerset West, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28342SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397336>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs required.

SB

- 14.41 Erf 25104, Tygerberg Hospital Estate, Parow, S38(4)-HIA**
Case No: 19040206AS1202E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Phased 2 of the HIA for the redevelopment of the Tygerberg Hospital Estate, including a new hospital on the western portion of the site, new access and circulation works, and associated precinct restructuring in line with the Tygerberg Re-Imagined Urban Design Framework 2024.
- Zone: Tygerberg Hospital Estate / Tygerberg Estate
- Location: Francie van Zijl Boulevard, Parow,
- Current use: Existing hospital estate and related medical, support, circulation, parking, and service infrastructure.
- Grade: The estate as a whole is treated as a Grade 3A cultural landscape / socio-historic resource; the Laundry Building is Grade 3B; many other existing buildings are graded Not Conservation Worthy.
- HPO: Outside
- Constraints: Key constraints include the Hardekraaltjie Cemetery 50 m buffer, possible unmarked

graves, the need to protect the Laundry Building buffer, the presence of the Erik Laubscher mosaic murals, and the estate's weak permeability, safety, and fragmented pedestrian network.

- Anticipated Impacts on Heritage Resources: Overall impacts are assessed as manageable and mostly low after mitigation, with the main concerns being archaeology, cemetery-related memorialisation, built fabric demolition, and the transformation of the apartheid-era spatial layout.
- Archaeology: The main archaeological-disturbance of possible unmarked burials within the Hardekraaltjie Cemetery buffer; mitigation includes monitoring, stop-work procedures, archaeologist training, and consultation if human remains are found.
- Palaeontological: No significant palaeontological issue is highlighted in the report summary provided.
- Visual: Visual/townscape impacts are assessed as strongly positive because the redevelopment should improve accessibility, safety, green structure, and public realm quality.
- Built: Built environment impact is low, because most affected buildings are graded Not Conservation Worthy; however, the Laundry Building requires special control and the mural artworks require protection or careful relocation if affected.
- Cultural: Cultural landscape and socio-historic impacts are central to the HIA. The site is strongly associated with apartheid-era spatial planning, forced removals, segregated healthcare, and community memory, and the report recommends memorialisation and oral-history work.
- Alternatives: The report supports redevelopment under the UDF framework rather than leaving the estate unchanged, with the new hospital precinct and supporting spatial restructuring presented as the preferred approach.
- Consultant recommend: The consultant supports the redevelopment, subject to implementation of the UDF, archaeology controls, cemetery buffer protection, memorialisation planning, treatment of the mosaic artworks, and further heritage management measures.
- consultation/PPP: Public consultation was undertaken and should continue, especially with affected communities and stakeholders linked to Hardekraaltjie / Tiervlei-Ravensmead. The project also includes a new hospital delivered through a public-private partnership (PPP).
- EIA/NEMA status: None however there is Section 34 permit process is running in parallel for demolition of the building-related heritage matters.
- Recommendations: Do not encroach into the 50 m Hardekraaltjie buffer except appropriate landscaping; appoint an archaeologist for training and monitoring; stop work if human remains or archaeological material are found; protect the Erik Laubscher mosaics in situ or remove professionally if needed; prepare a Commemoration Strategy; and implement redevelopment in accordance with the Tygerberg Re-Imagined UDF 2024

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 as the site is graded IIIA and involves a sensitive matter due to the Hardekraaltjie cemetery, and the site in being considered as a PHS.

SB

14.42

Erf 177650, corner of Rose and Waterkant Streets, Cape Town, S35-Destruction
Case No: HWC23121304SJ0110

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Comments required from CoCT, De Waterkant Civic Association, POA, Title deed, City Bowl Residents and Ratepayers (CIBRA) comment required.

SB

14.43 Erf 11233-RE, 26 Reed Street, Bellville CBD, S34-Alterations
Case No: 28400SVB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397608>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Delegation document or similar to confirm that the official may sign obo CoCT.

SVB

14.44 Erf 1140, 291 Beach Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28406SVB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397651>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal, streetscape images and POP required.

SVB

14.45 Erf 1511-RE, 21 Grimsby Road, Three Anchor Bay, S34-Alterations
Case No: 28309SVB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396501>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Coloured up to scale plan with dimensions required.

SVB

14.46 Erf 5057-RE, Kidbrooke Place Retirement Village, Chanteclairre Avenue, Onrusrivier, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28310SVB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396502>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA, title deed, trust resolution and streetscape images required.

SVB

14.47 Erf 50-RE, 5 Upper Hillwood Avenue, Bishopscourt, S34-Alterations, Additions & Partial Demolition
Case No: 28414SVB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397659>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Cahlan Williams was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO. However, the CoCT recommend a grading of NCW in their comment.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal includes extensive additions and alterations, partial demolitions including the removal and replacement of the roof and chimneys as well as alterations to fenestrations and several other internal alterations.
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- Tanja Golding obo Bishopscourt Residents Association had the following comments and objections:
 - They would like to see the existing architectural heritage and landscape/gardens of Bishopscourt retained. They would also like to see what can be found of the original historic structure on the site shown in the applicant's research and if they can be incorporated into the architecture, as a recognition of the past history. They are against any form of demolition of existing structures or garden.
- The applicant's response to the objection is as follows:
 - "The structure has not been graded in terms of the City's heritage survey nor is it located within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone. As outlined in the heritage motivation and confirmed by the City of Cape Town's Heritage Resources Section (HRS), the subject

structure is a much-altered mid-20th century dwelling that does not retain sufficient significance to warrant conservation. The City has previously (2020) commented on the structure indicating that it does not contain any significance worthy of retention a position reaffirmed in its recent comment."

- All I&APs have been invited to today's meeting.
- The applicant has estimated that the structure has fabric dating back to 1958, 1968 and 1994.
- The committee noted that based on the information provided the structure is not considered culturally significant or to have any heritage value. Given this, it was felt that it would be unreasonable to request that further analysis or research be done to determine original fabric or revised proposals that better incorporate this fabric into the design. The concerns regarding impact to landscape/gardens were deemed not to be a heritage concern in this instance.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.48 Erf 56, 24 Caledon Street, Stanford, S31-Alterations, Additions & Partial Demolition
Case No: 28358SVB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397400>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 14 May 2026.
- The property is Not Graded and is within the Stanford Heritage Area Overlay Zone.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for extensive alterations and additions to the building.
- Stanford Heritage Committee supports the proposal however they had suggestions for the applicant to consider, which they included in their comment.
- OHAC supports the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.49 Erven 162988 & 53980-RE, 269 Main Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28363SVB0504 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397405>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape/contextual images required.

SVB

14.50 Farm 42, Moravian Church Tower, Genadendal, S27-Minor Works
Case No: 28377SVB0405 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397542>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

John Wilson Harris was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is a graded II.
- Work has not started.

- The proposal is for remedial work to stabilize the church tower. The remedial work includes underpinning of the tower structure, filling of cracks internally and externally and painting to match existing.
- Member of the committee noted that an APP site inspection and accompanying report was completed by HWC for this property in 2022. This report identified maintenance and conservation issues. The concern raised in today's meeting is that no application to address these maintenance and conservation issues has been submitted in the four years since the findings of this 2022 report.

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 work must be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Gabriel Fagan Architects to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Gabriel Fagan Architects, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

SVB

14.51

Erf 178677, 228 Albert Road, Woodstock, S34-Emergency Works

Case No: 28374SVB0504 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397537>

CASE SUMMARY

- Grading: The property is partially graded IIIB and partially graded IIIC
- The property is partially graded IIIB and partially graded IIIC and is within the Albert Road HPOZ.
- The proposed work has not started; however, work has commenced on site in accordance with previous approvals.
- The proposal is for like-for-like replacement of unsound brickwork walling with sand mortars as well as like-for-like replacement of shopfronts in the shop facade wall.
- An HIA for the property was endorsed by IACom in December 2020 (2003304JW0318)
- Minor deviations from the 2020 HIA were approved by HWC in August 2024 (HWC24072204SJ0722)
- The application has been submitted as an emergency, with the nature of the emergency outlined as follows:
 - The existing vertical water proofing was removed from the outside face of the wall. The existing bricks and mortar were exposed. Upon inspecting the wall, the following was found: There is no brick force in these walls; most of these bricks can be removed by hand as sand was used as jointing material.
 - The building façade wall below the parapet wall is currently in a worse condition than the parapet wall. Bricks are held in place with vertical shutter boards. Once shutter boards are removed, the wall will collapse. The poses a safety hazard as the entire wall is structurally unstable and should be demolished.
- This application was approved under ASD on 11 May 2025 with the following conditions:
 - A close-out report compiled by a suitably qualified heritage consultant must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion. The close-out report must focus on the heritage elements retained within the approved development.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve as an emergency application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources and urgent intervention was required.

SVB

14.52 Erf 1103, 10 Mills Street, Durbanville, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28313XM0424 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396511>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for additions and alterations including;
- Proposed new Garage and Trailer Store additions to the existing dwelling.
- Proposed roof sheeting replacement and internal alterations and renovations.
- Proposed new boundary wall and screen walls.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- Durbanville Heritage Society have no objection to the proposal

DECISION

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

XM

14.53 Erf 52474, 47 Columbus Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28338XM0429 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397311>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for additions and alterations including internal alterations: existing garage converted to store room and bathrooms; additions: new entertainment room and bedroom with en-suite.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded- CoCT graded NCW
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The GLCA has no objection

DECISION

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

XM

14.54 Erf 8051, 47 New Street, Somerset West, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28343XM0430 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397345>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs, Consultation comments: Conservation body comments required.

XM

14.55 Erf 817, 9 Brompton Avenue, Bantry Bay, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28401XM0505 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397612>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Both owners to sign Power of Attorney, Consultation comments: Local municipality required.

XM

14.56 Erf 23884, 9 Camp Road, Maitland, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28361XM0430 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397403>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company/Trust Resolution required.

XM

14.57 Erf 1246-RE, 20 Verster Street, Paarl, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 28312XM0424 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396510>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company/Trust Resolution, Annotated Internal, Consultation comments: Conservation body comments required.

XM

14.58 Erf 89758, Portofino Flat 3 (Section 4), 90 Main Road, Kalk Bay, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28402XM0505 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397617>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for minor additions and alterations including internal alterations: a woodburning fireplace and chimney
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The Kalk Bay Ratepayers Association And Kalk Bay Historical Association has no objection

DECISION

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

XM

14.59 Erf 1021 Unit 404 Curzon Place, 229 Beach Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28393XM0505 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397592>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs, Consultation comments: Conservation body comments required.

XM

15. Other Matters

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

CN moved to adopt and XM seconded the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 18 May 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Mr Ruan Brand, officially closed the meeting at 13:13

18. Date of next meeting: 25 May 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 Lynfrae 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

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists

ABHC - Associated Bibbys 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

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

Ward 2 Forum
WCC- Whale Coast Conservation
WRA - Woodstock Residents Association
WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association

Approved