

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 1 June 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	SB
Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM

Staff

Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	Secretariat	AB
Mr. Olwethu Dlova	Backup Secretariat & I&AP	OD

Legal Advisor

Penelope E Meyer	PM
------------------	-----------

Observers

Ms Kate Foss

Visitors

Visitors	Capacity	Item
Ms Sahra Golding	Owner	13.22
Mr Frederik Lotter	Consultant	14.31
Mr Peter Train	I&AP	14.5
Ms Laura Milandri	Consultant	14.5
Mr Raymond Smith	Applicant	13.16
Mr Clive Theunissen	Municipal official	Drakenstein Municipality
Mr Andre Roux	Planning Consultant & Applicant	13.5
Mr Chris Schoeman	Consultant	13.10
Edwin van den Heever	I&AP	
Mr Mark Zuckerman	Architect	13.19
Ms Lian Kruger	I&AP	
Ms Meagan Alexander	Owner	13.13
Ms Ursula Rigby	Consultant	13.3
Mr Heinrich	I&AP	
Ms Nathaniel Cameron	Applicant	13.13
Mr Stuart Burnett	Conservation body representative	13.13
Mr Jacqueline O'Reilly	Applicant	13.13
Mr Andre Moolman	Applicant	13.19
Mr Piet Steyn	I&AP	
Ms Viv McDonald	Neighbour	13.22
Inge Delport	Architect	
Mr Henk Lourence	I&AP	14.5
Mr Stuart Hermansen	Consultant	14.36 & 14.38
Prof Antonieta Jeradino	I&AP	14.7

Mr Dries Nienaber	I&AP	
Mr Stefan de Kock	Consultant	14.22
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt	Consultant	14.37
Mr Jone Kros	Consultant	14.47
Ms Bianca Oliver	Grace Wison Architect	14.47

Apologies

Ms Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Emily Jane Vowles	Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB

Absent

None.

3. 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.

4. Approval of Agenda

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 1st June 2026 with the following additions:

Added item 9.10.3 – Hex River Burial Ground Storm Damage (RB)

CSI moved to adopt the agenda and CN seconded.

5. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

5.1 The Committee resolved to approve the previous minutes of 25th May 2026 with the following additions:

Held over to next week.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest

6.1. None.

7. Confidential matters

None.

8. Standing Items

8.1. Site inspections undertaken

9.1.1 None.

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

Matters Arising: None

New Matters: None

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Ptn 1 of Farm Annex Langverwacht 245, via Vinewood Road, Stellenbosch Farms (Kuilsvier) - CN

- A joint site inspection was undertaken by HWC, CoCT Land Use Enforcement and the City Building Inspector on 22 May 2026 following a complaint received by the City of Cape Town regarding the use of the property and alleged alterations to buildings.
- The inspection included the core werf area and associated outbuildings, including the Manor House, Cellar, Manor House Cottages, Long House, Manor House Villa and various dwellings on the property. The owners advised that the NGO had recently taken ownership of the farm and that current activities were limited to maintenance and repair work.
- Several buildings on the farm were confirmed or suspected to be older than 60 years, with some structures dating back more than 100 years. It was noted that alterations

and repair work had previously been undertaken to a number of buildings with no record of applications or approvals from HWC for these works.

- The property is graded IIIA and forms part of the Bottelary Cultural Landscape and retains a collection of historic agricultural buildings associated with the original farm werf. Additional works observed on site included recently erected fencing around the property and maintenance work to the Manor House, including repairs to timber windows, floors and wall cracks.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 22 May 2026 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection was noted at HOMS on 27 May 2026.
2. The site inspection report tabled at HOMS on 1 June 2026.
3. The owners must appoint a suitably qualified heritage practitioner to prepare a heritage statement (HS) assessing all buildings on the farm in relation to both the proposed work and work previously undertaken. This assessment must evaluate the impact on heritage resources, particularly in light of concerns that substantial unauthorised work may have been undertaken by previous owners without any record of approval from or submission to HWC, as well as the additional work undertaken by the current owners.
4. A holistic Section 34 application must be submitted for all work undertaken to buildings older than 60 years on the farm. The HS must be submitted with this application.
5. Section 38 application must be submitted for the erection of a fence around the property.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 IGIC (4th June 2026)

9.4.2 Appeals (10th June 2026)

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 None.

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.1.1 Erf 24290 RE, De Nieuwe Molen, Maitland Garden Village

Case No: HWC25021318EJV0225

DISCUSSION

- On 19 March 2025, HOMs permitted the restoration of De Nieuwe Molen Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) subject to the submission of a close-out report.
- The close-out report details the work undertaken inclusive of:
 - cleaning of the building and repainting of the walls both internally and externally
 - patching and repainting of external timber cap boarding, beams and braces
 - re-thatching the roof and bird-proofing between the trusses and cap ring
 - remaking of doors to match existing
 - re-making of window casements
 - replacing rotten floor boards
- The report confirms that the work was monitored and implemented to a good standard
- Case Officer confirmed that the work was undertaken in accordance with the approved scope of work.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled “De Nieuwe Molen Maintenance: Section 27 Permit Application Close-Out Report”, dated May 2026, and prepared by Gabriel Fagan Architects, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 18 March 2025.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.7, 13.8, 13.27,

9.7.2 New Matters: 14.3, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9, 14.10, 14.11, 14.15, 14.16, 14.23, 14.24, 14.25, 14.28, 14.29, 14.30, 14.33, 14.34, 14.39, 14.40, 14.43, 14.44, 14.45

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

9.8.1 Matters Arising: None

9.8.2 New Matters: None

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising: None

9.9.2 New Matters: None

9.10 Archaeological Matters

9.10.1 Erf 11155, Zwelihle, Hermanus (SB)

Still under investigation.

9.10.2 Herold's Bay Country Estate - Portion 7 of Buffelsfontein No 204 (SB)

Held over until next HOMs.

9.10.3 Hex River Burial Ground Storm Damage (RB)

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

None.

9.12 Permit deadline:

COB Tuesday, 2 June 2026.

9.13 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

Based on SB's feedback at last HOMs, RB has been trialling the "On Agenda" procedure on the case landing page and some applicants have already responded positively. It is suggested that all case officers try this going forward.

JH has returned from the Northern Cape trip so there will be a push for the S35/S36 process.

With EJV and SVB on leave, RB has not worked on the Built Environment Checklist but will as soon as they have returned.

The Officers flagged some concerns with the locality mapping and image document from applicants.

10 Administrative Matters

10.1 DR01722, Gamkaskloof Pass – DoI NEMA S30A Directive (RB)

- HWC was contacted on 26 May 2026 regarding storm damage to the pass, which is a PHS.
- In line with the DOI Emergency agreement, a letter was issued to allow for emergency works to occur to remove landslides from the pass and to make the pass safe.

FOR NOTING

The Committee noted the permit issued on 27 May 2026 for DR01722 (Gamkaskloof Pass).

10.2 Maintenance Management Plan (MMP) for the Steenbras Water Scheme (RB)

- There is no trigger in terms of S38(1) and there is no EIA or BA taking place (i.e., nothing under S38(8).
- The applicants are compiling a management plan for the CoCT and wanted heritage inputs. There is some work outside of this area for which a BA will be submitted and HWC will check for a 38(1) trigger then.
- The case officer has verbally advised them that, in the plan, there are plans to demolish structures older than 60 years and they will need to apply for a S34 permit for that.

FOR NOTING

The Committee noted the submission of the Maintenance Management Plan (MMP) for the Steenbras Water Scheme and awaits further confirmation of potential National Heritage

Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) triggering activities, such as demolitions of structures older than 60 years in terms of Section 34(1) or proposed developments in terms of S38(1)/(8).

10.3 Erf 922, Langvlei Retirement Village, Struisbaai (CSI)

- Concern was raised in IGIC on 7 May by a member of the public regarding human remains that were discovered on Erf 922.
- The discovery had been made by a member of the public doing historical research at the Hotagterklip Fisherman Village. They had found the remains on top of a mole hill.
- The remains were covered up at the location in which they were found. A hole approximately 30cm deep was dug and the remains were placed back.
- This was not reported to HWC at the time of discovery hence no further action could be taken.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

Photos of remains if available, contact information of the person who made the discovery, the context of the discovery and whether SAPS were called to site, determine if the remains are archaeological based on the information provided.

10.4 Erf 2067, 75 Kloof Road, Fresnaye, Cape Town (case ID 27072SB0116).

- Reason for decision requested.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1 None

12. Discussion of the Agenda

1. 13.3 Erf 46023, 23 Lovers Walk, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations
2. 13.5 Erf 1220, 62 Bain Street, Wellington, S34-Minor Works
3. 13.6 Erf 237, 36 Kerk Street, Elim, S27-Total Demolition
4. 13.11 Erf 2882, 12 Beach Road, Kommetjie, S34-Minor Works
5. 13.13 Erf 578, 10 Dysart Road, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations
6. 13.30 Erf 33030, Cressy Road, Garlandale, S38(4)-HIA

HELD OVER:

Additional time required to read through the revised HIA and to determine if IACom requirements have been met. Matter will be on the HOMs agenda, 8 June 2026

7. 14.5 Erf 88317, 2 Rodwell Road, St. James, S34-Additions & Alterations

8. 14.19 Farm 1139-RE, Malmesbury, Saldanha Bay, S38(8)-HIA

REFERRAL

The application to IACom on 17 June 2026 due to the mitigation measures requiring consideration.

9. 14.32 and 14.37 are duplication.

10. 14.41 Erven 797, 798 & 799, 10, 10A & 12, The Glen Road, Sea Point, S38(4)-HIA
Case No: HWC24050604SJ0624

REFERRAL

refer the application IACom on 17 June 2026 due to delegations

11. 14.48 Erven 65105, 65107, 65108, Cedar House School, Kenilworth, S38(4)-HIA

REFERRAL

Refer to IACom as there is a number of objections from surrounding neighbours although the CoCT support

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 179758, 4 La Cases Road, Newlands, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25090914CH0922

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 23 October 2025 and 21 May 2026... required streetscape photographs, NCID comment and applicant to respond to the CoCT objections.
- Graded IIIB outside HPO. Inside proposed HPO.
- Proposal is to extend the front stoep, the addition of a bike store room and garden store at the side of the building, internal alterations, addition of a kitchen and braai room at the rear and a new bedroom, bathroom in the roof space with two dormers (1 at the rear and another towards the eastern side of the roof).
- Work has not started.
- CoCT does not support the application stating that the proposal is not sympathetic enough to mitigate the impact of the additions into its context and the Newlands Village Guidelines. Reasons for objection: The architectural language, scale, window size and proportions of the proposed dormers do not take into account of the existing heritage resource or context of the received environment. CoCT notes that there are other examples of dormer windows in the Newlands Village however these dormers will be visible from La Cases Road. The dormers are over scaled and will have a negative impact on the building and area. The gable windows are a foreign architectural element and is therefore not supported. CoCT recommends that the drawings be revised.
- NCID supports and stamped the plans.
- Applicants' response to CoCT comment:
 - The proposal has been carefully considered within the context in order to balance functional requirements with sensitivity to the existing streetscape and historic fabric.
 - The proposal is considered consistent with an established precedent within the immediate context. Reference is made to the density and evolution of village cottages over time that shows gradual patterns of change to create layered and characterful roofscape where dormers and roof extensions form part of the established visual language of the area.
 - The roof sheeting of the dormer will match the colour of the existing roof therefore ensuring visual continuity and reducing the visual impact of the addition when viewed in the broader roofscape.
 - The vertical proportions of the windows will be reinforced through the use of mullions, maintaining a rhythm and scale sympathetic to the existing architectural character of the building and surrounding cottages.
 - The width of the dormer, although wider than what would be ideal, if necessary to provide the minimum headroom required from a safety and functional perspective. From both a heritage and architectural perspective, it was considered more appropriate to retain a centrally positioned dormer element, even if slightly wider, rather than offsetting it to one side, which would disrupt the balance and cohesion of the roof form.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 1 June 2026.
- Members questioned the assigned Grade IIIB grading and considered the property to be more appropriately graded Grade IIIC. The Committee noted that the property is located within a proposed HPO and that the City's objection relates primarily to the scale, visibility and contextual appropriateness of the proposed dormers. Members indicated that the information provided was insufficient to adequately assess the objection or determine whether similar dormers exist within the immediate context. The Committee therefore resolved to request a streetscape analysis, with particular focus on the presence, scale and visibility of dormers within the surrounding area, to assist in assessing the heritage impact of the proposal and the validity of the City's concerns.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. A streetscape analysis with a particular focus on dormer windows within the street's context.

CN

13.2 Erf 2284, 38B Long Street, Grand Daddy Hotel, Cape Town, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28127CH0410 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395912>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 22 May 2025... required POA authorizing Phillippus Bernardus to submit on behalf of the owner, CoCT comment, CIBRA comment and outstanding fee of R4000.
- Graded IIIA inside HPO
- Proposal is for an addition of a small ablution block on the roof.
- Work applied for has already been completed.
- CoCT supports.
- CIBRA did not comment within 30 days.

COMMENT

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

CN

13.3 Erf 46023, 23 Lovers Walk, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No.: 28190CH0415 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/396073>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 26 May 2025... required Rustenberg Valley Residents Association comment, external photographs of the entire front facade and carport to be indicated on the boundary elevation.
- Graded IIIB inside HPO
- Proposal is to replace the timber floor on ground level with concrete slab, internal alterations to the internal layout, drywall partitions and refurbishments to the bathroom at the upper level, replacing an existing window opening with a sliding door on the rear of the upper level, balcony, timber deck, lightweight aluminum carport, replacing the boundary wall and retaining structure with a new driveway configuration matching the existing stone cladding and removing the existing planter structure.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports on condition that the carport be reconsidered as it detracts from the structure's IIIB significance
- Rustenberg Valley Residents Association (RVRA) does not support the boundary wall, gate and sloped roof carport due to the site being part of an important grouping of historic dwellings. RVRA provided the following comments:
 - There is no clarity on whether the new 1.8m high stone cladding wall is natural or imitation stone. RVRA states that the boundary walls in this part of Lovers Walk are not stone clad and are constructed with natural stone.
 - Concerns with the removal of approximately 40m³ of soil associated with existing vegetation to accommodate the vehicular access off Lovers Walk.
 - Demolishing the existing stone wall and building a new wall after removing a large amount of soil associated with mature foliage disrupts and detracts from the heritage significance and the streetscape.
 - The continuous low natural stone walls with plastered capping along Lovers Walk, Grotto and Stanley Road is one of the most important character defining elements within the Upper Rondebosch HPOZ.
 - The proposal contradicts the CoCT heritage guidelines that addresses boundary wall designs in historic areas. RVRA therefore recommends that this be redesigned.

- RVRA states that a streetscape study be submitted to fully assess and appreciate the impacts of this proposal.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 1 June 2026.
- The Committee noted the objections raised by the RVRA and agreed that the applicant must respond to all concerns raised by the I&APs. The committee considered that the impact of the proposed boundary wall, stone cladding and carport on the historic streetscape could not be adequately assessed and requested a streetscape analysis with Heritage Design Indicators (HDIs) to inform the proposal. Any revised design must be circulated to registered I&APs for a 14-day comment period. Clarification was also requested on whether the proposed carport will impact any historic fabric.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Applicant must confirm if the carport is attached to the structure older than 60 years.
2. The applicant must submit a streetscape analysis in order to revise the design based on heritage indicators.
3. The above must be circulated to I&APs for the 14-day consultation period for comments. If no comment provided, proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.
4. Applicant must provide responses to I&AP comments that are not in support of the application.

CN

13.4 Erf 80522, 35 Gordon Road, Heathfield, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No.: HWC24102413CH1028

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 June 2025 and 27 May 2026... required POP with HWC reference number, application form to reflect correct property details (should be Erf 80522, 35 Gordon Road, Heathfield instead of Erf 730, 8 Weenen Road, Milnerton), streetscape photographs, CoCT comment and locality plan.
- Graded NCW outside HPO.
- Proposal is for internal alterations, extension to the front, addition of a bedroom, bathroom, extending existing bedroom and addition of deck area with pergola.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports.
- Case officer recommends approval under ASD

DECISION

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

CN

13.5 Erf 1220, 62 Bain Street, Wellington, S34-Minor Works

Case No.: 28413CN0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397658>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Mr. Clive Theunissen & Mr. Andre Roux joined for the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: POA to be signed by both owners, plans to conform with DHF & DHAC comments and indicate work that has started/completed received 22 May.
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: From the annotated plan, it seems that more than half the work has been completed.
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For converting the dwelling into a coffee shop. The works include internal reconfigurations, partial demolition of selected internal walls, conversion of existing spaces for customer seating, kitchen,

storage and ablution facilities, a new entrance door, veranda extensions, a covered deck, pergola and painting.

- Consultation:
 - DHAC has no objection on condition that the new side door be consistent with the character of the building, and the current position of signage is not supported.
 - Paarl 300 does not support and state they cannot comment on work already started/completed without a permit but have no objection and will not be appealing.
 - DHF 10 Oct 2025 - no objection in principle to the proposed change of use or the removal of the steel staircase but notes several discrepancies on the submitted plans requiring clarification and amendment.
 - DHF 10 Dec 2025 - objects to the proposed wrap-around verandah extension and requests clarification on the retention or replacement of the Bain Street stoep columns. The committee also requests updated street elevation photographs and notes that the plans remain non-compliant with SANS 10400 Part A colour coding requirements, preventing a final comment.
- Response to comments:
 - The applicant revised the proposal in response to DHAC's comments by removing the proposed signage and replacing the previously proposed side entrance door with a design more consistent with the character of the building. In response to DHF's comments, the applicant confirmed that the existing Bain Street stoep columns will be retained, with new columns to be painted white to match the existing character. Updated street elevation photographs were submitted, and the plans were amended to comply with SANS 10400 Part A colour coding requirements. The applicant, however, retained the proposed wrap around verandah extension, noting that DHAC did not object to this aspect of the proposal.
- Committee noted that the applicant had responded to the concerns raised by DHAC through amendments to the entrance door design and removal of the proposed signage. While DHF maintained its objection to the wrap around verandah extension, the committee considered that the proposal was sympathetic to the heritage resource and that the objection did not raise substantive heritage concerns. The committee was generally supportive of the proposal but noted that the submitted plans did not clearly indicate all proposed and unauthorised work. Further requirements were therefore requested to submit revised plans that clearly colour-code all proposed work and annotate any work that has already commenced or been completed.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Applicant must revise the plans to indicate all proposed work in colour and to annotate work that has started/been completed.

CN

13.6 Erf 237, 36 Kerk Street, Elim, S27-Total Demolition

Case No.: 27509CN0223 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389878>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: POA & response to FOE comments received on 21 May 2026.
- Grading: Proposed grade IIIA Elim Survey. Statement of significance notes retention of historical fabric and features, contextual, architectural and historical significance. Elim Guideline Type 2 house.
- HPO: Located within Zone 1 (Historic Core) of Elim.
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: The proposal is to reconstruct the house with new walls and a new thatched roof in accordance with Elim's heritage guidelines. This application was submitted as alterations and additions, however this is a total demolition as no historic fabric will remain.
- Consultation:
 - Agulhas Municipality supports
 - FOE recommends that a structural engineer assess whether the remaining structure is salvageable. If found unsafe, demolition of the remainder is supported based on the condition of the building. FOE further states that the replacement dwelling must comply with the Elim Guidelines, with the front elevation reflecting the

character and scale of surrounding houses. A thatched roof is required, with roof heights subordinate to adjacent properties and rear structures lower than the main roof. Window proportions, inclusion of a window above the front door, and roof form (including tapered ends) must align with the guidelines. Internal changes are acceptable, subject to compliance.

- Agulhas Heritage Society has no objections and notes that its important to maintain the historical architectural landscape of Church Street.
- Response to objection:
- The applicant states that the existing dwelling is structurally unsound and proposes a sensitive reconstruction in line with the Elim Guidelines and Friends of Elim recommendations. The design will retain the traditional thatched roof, appropriate roof heights, proportions, detailing, and streetscape character to ensure the dwelling continues to contribute positively to the heritage character of Church Street.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposed replacement structure is deemed in accordance with the Elim Guidelines and FOEs comments, however. FOE notes a window to be inserted above the front door - this is a type 2 house and no windows above the door for type 2. Type 3 has a window above the door.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. A structural engineer's report must be compiled by a suitably qualified structural engineer with heritage experience, and this must be submitted to HWC within 60 days.

CN

13.7 Erf 57398, 3 Talana Close, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No.: 27594CN0302 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390150>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photos required.

CN

13.8 Erf 11956, 51 Regent Street, Woodstock, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25090901CSI0916

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 20 May for WAAC comment.
- Work applied for has been completed
- Graded IIIC/4
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the addition of a storey to the existing dwelling and internal alterations
- CoCT provided comment noting previous unauthorised work which detracted from the significance of the structure but supported the application overall.
- SRHS provided comment and support the application
- WRA provided comment stating that they do not condone unauthorised work and agreed with CoCT that the work done by previous owners was inappropriate.
- WAAC did not provide comment within 30 days.

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

13.9 Erf 135, 50 Long Street, Montagu, S27-Minor Works

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 27 May for trust resolution, updated motivation for removal of boundary wall and lean-to structures
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded II
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the conversion of the building into a Plato restaurant including internal alterations. The outside of the building is to remain unchanged with only the boundary wall being lowered. External work includes the removal of a pergola and partial removal of the garage which is a later addition. Most of the added on lean to dwelling structures would be entirely removed to re-establish the original footprint of the main. The applicant noted that their intention in removing the lean-to section running parallel to the rear of the building is to restore and enhance the original Cape Dutch form and geometry. By removing this addition, the historical significance of the building will be greatly improved, as approximately 80% of the original exterior will once again be exposed and visible to visitors.
- Montagu Heritage Association provided comment and support the application noting the sensitivity of the alterations and the retention of heritage character.
- HOMS Discussion:
- The Committee noted that the work is minor in nature and obtaining comment from the Municipality is not necessary and a close-out report will be sufficient to ensure the work is sensitive to the heritage resource.

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 and to compile a close-out report
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.

CSI

13.10 Erf 19825, 2 Dorette Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28455CSI0509 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397950>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen and Chris Schoeman joined

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 26 May for PoA
- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for replacement of corrugated roof sheeting, replacement of wooden floors with tiles in the dining room, replace dry-walling with concrete wall in the en-suite, new steel balustrade and replacement of concrete beam with IPE steel beam on the stoep, and replace two garage wooden roof support beams with IPE steel beams

DECISION

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

CSI

13.11 Erf 2882, 12 Beach Road, Kommetjie, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27927CSI0323 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394137>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 20 May for updated motivation
- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for first and second story extensions and internal reconfiguration
- CoCT provided comment and do not support the application stating that although the building is ungraded, it contributes to the scenic, environmental, and social significance of Kommetjie. The current proposal is excessive in its massing which does not fit into its immediate context including its proximity to 'The Kom'. It is also directly adjacent to the Kommetjie Cultural Landscape which has a grading of IIIA. The architectural style of the proposal is supported but the massing is not.
- Kommetjie Heritage Society did not provide comment within 30 days.
- Applicant response: The proposal acknowledges heritage authority comments but argues that the site itself has no significant heritage value, despite being within a sensitive broader context. The design responds to its surroundings by working within the existing building footprint, maintaining the established spatial structure, and avoiding overdevelopment. Following prior feedback from the Land-Use department, the design was substantially revised to reduce impact, including removing an entire storey and minimising departures. The proposal aligns with Kommetjie's varied residential character and does not introduce an inappropriate scale or typology. Concerns about bulk have been addressed through a stepped, tiered design, setbacks, and material treatment to soften visual impact. The development is not expected to negatively affect the coastal cultural landscape, views, or environmental qualities. Remaining departures are limited and considered reasonable. Overall, the proposal is presented as a contextually responsive, appropriately scaled development that respects its setting, and approval is requested.
- All parties have been invited to attend HOMS.
- HOMS Discussion:
- The Committee noted that the massing is not a heritage concern as the building is not graded. The IIIB landscape does not act as an HPOZ and therefore the scale and massing of the structure does not have an impact on the streetscape context as there is a precedent which exists in the neighbouring property. The stepped back tiered design ensures that the proposal fits into its surrounds.

DECISION

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

CSI

13.12 Erf 56953, 40 Cleveland Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28484CSI0511 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398010>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 27 May for CoCT comment
- Work applied for has been completed
- Not Graded - CoCT comment graded as NCW
- Outside HPO
- Completed work is for an extension to the existing dwelling to create additional living space including entertainment room, study, bedroom, and en-suite.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application.

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.

CSI

13.13 Erf 578, 10 Dysart Road, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28065CSI0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395653>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Nathaniel Cameron, Meagan Alexander, Stuart Burnett took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 27 May for annotated plan
- Work applied for has started
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to the existing dwelling and first floor addition to include new kitchen, extended lounge and bedroom areas, new balcony, lounge, and bedroom with closet. All internal walls have been demolished. The front exterior wall has not been demolished to date.
- CoCT provided comment stating the proposed internal changes are acceptable to HRS, however, HRS does NOT SUPPORT the closing up of the front stoep as shown on the plans submitted.
- GPRRA provided comment stating that what is proposed is extensive alterations to a grade IIIB dwelling, one of 5 historic link homes located in the Green Point Heritage Protection Overlay Zone. These alterations include removal of a shared heritage chimney, adding an additional storey, and alterations to existing heritage windows. Significant unauthorised building work has already been under way which shows how inappropriate these alterations are. We strongly recommend that this application be refused.
- Applicant response: The proposed enclosure of the front stoep is a sensitive intervention aimed at preserving the property's historic character while improving security and functionality. The design is in keeping with the original façade, with similar examples already present in the street. The property previously suffered from neglect and unauthorised occupation, and that the open stoep remains vulnerable to rough sleepers, creating safety concerns—especially for a family with a young child. Overall, the proposal is presented as a minimal and respectful change intended to enhance safety, privacy, and liveability without compromising the heritage character of the building or streetscape.
- All parties have been invited to attend HOMS.
- HOMS Discussion:
- GPRRA support a referral to BELCom considering the grading and HPO status.
- The owner noted the stoep is susceptible to vagrants and that the changes proposed do not negatively impact the heritage resource.
- The architect did not have anything further to add.
- The Committee noted the Victorian row housing typology. There is precedence for stoep enclosures, but the addition of a storey would negatively impact the streetscape context.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom on 24 June due to objections received.

CSI

13.14 Portion 71 of Farm 158, Farm Goree, Wenzile Avenue, Ashton, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28004CSI0329 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395457>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 21 May for confirmation of length of pipelines and trigger regarding bridge. Applicant confirmed that the S38(1)(b) trigger was ticked incorrectly.
- Trigger: S38(1)(b) Construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length., S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -
- Proposed development: Establishment of a small farming development which will include livestock, specifically 320 pigs and 150 goats.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: The land is vacant, no impacts to any historical structures expected

- Visual impacts: None expected as it is within the urban edge and the land use will remain the same.
- Archaeology: No impacts to any archaeological materials expected as the land is agricultural in nature.
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is moderate.

COMMENT

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

CSI

13.15 Erf 3123, 12 8th Avenue, George, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28412RB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397657>

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 20 May 2026.
- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for the addition of a new single garage, a new covered patio, a new bed and bathroom, and a new laundry room.
- Some internal walls are also proposed to be removed to create a more open plan internal layout.
- GHT and SVDS offered comments of no objection.
- George municipality did not respond to request for comment within 30 days.

DECISION

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

RB

13.16 Erf 7075, Stella Road, Somerset West, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28278RB0422 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396302>

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 27 May 2026.
- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Two previous NIDS were responded to with NFS: 17062213WD0623E for the residential development of 27 erven and 22012704NK0216E for the services installation.
- Work has not started.
- Application is for the demolition of three structures on the property for the residential development to proceed.
- CoCT E&HM offered a comment of no objection.
- HRF supported the CoCT comment but noted that they would have preferred that the main dwelling be retained.

DECISION

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

RB

13.17 Erf 90779-RE, 34 Tennant Road, Wynberg, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28362RB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397404>

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 25 May 2026.
- Property is graded IIIA (just checking potential missed PHS from pre-1940s).
- Inside the proposed Wynberg Schools area PHA.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for minor works in the form of adding fire protection measures and a ramp on site.
- Previous approval (HWC25100304CSI1003) was for the additional of a sluice room, detox room, and a bathroom.
- CoCT E&HM support the current proposal.
- WRA was approached for comment, and more detail was requested but then no further response was received within 30 days.
- Officer recommends approval.

DECISION

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

RB

13.18 Erf 25848, 3 Wesley Street, Observatory, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27855RB0317 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391571>

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 26 May 2026.
- Graded IIIC.
- Inside Upper Observatory HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to add a rear extension to expand the liveable portion of the property.
- OCA commented that they support on condition that the final plans detail how the proposal fit into the context/neighbour's boundary inclusive of rainwater detail and that the sewer line is done in an appropriate manner.
- CoCT E&HM support via internal memo comment.
- Given that the area has varied architectural typologies and various gutter systems, the Committee agreed that the visual concerns raised by OCA are inherently dealt with, with the proposed box gutters. Furthermore, the sewer line is not a visual/impactful heritage consideration, so officer recommends approval.

DECISION

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

RB

13.19 Erf 1396, 17 Bradwell Road, Vredehoek, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28523RB0512 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398326>

Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Mr Mark Zuckerman was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 25 May 2026.
- Graded IIIC.
- Outside of any declared HPO (inside proposed Vredehoek PHA).
- Work has not started.
- Proposal involves extensive alterations and additions in the form of:
 - Alterations to primary street-facing facade including enclosure of the stoep.
 - Removal of original features including the front door and rear half portion of the original roof.
 - Addition and alteration to the garage (west of the house).

- – Extensive addition and alteration to the rear half portion of the house.
- CoCT does not support and the following is the conclusion of their lengthy comment:
- "The proposed alterations and additions would have a negative impact on the heritage significance of this resource. The proposal is unacceptable in its current form due to:
 - • Unsympathetic and incompatible architectural character
 - • Removal or alteration of significant fabric and character-defining elements
 - • Loss of legibility of the original heritage resource
 - • Impact on streetscape character and setting
- The proposal does not represent sensitive or appropriate development of a heritage resource and fails to comply with heritage conservation principles.
- A revised proposal addressing these fundamental concerns could potentially be supported on heritage grounds.
- Alternative design approaches that would be more appropriate include:
 - – Retaining primary elevations (i.e. the porch and front door) with minimal or no alteration
 - – Maintaining the roof form and ridge line of the original building albeit our department will have no objection to an appropriate pitched roof extension (double storey) of the current historical house.
 - – A double storey addition to the rear can therefore be accommodated albeit extensive design development is encouraged as the new volume should complement the existing.
- The new proposal should be considered first for full support and will a 3D concept model be useful in this regard.
- – Adopting an architectural language that is contextually responsive—either contemporary but respectful, or sympathetically traditional in character
- – Respecting traditional proportions in fenestration and detailing for the new work to the rear of the existing house."
- Applicant responded as follows:
- "Comments from EMH are erroneous as the stoep will not be affected as it is being enclosed in glass.
- The front door is remaining and unaffected. Although the rear half portion of the original roof is to be removed, it will be setback almost 15m back from the street. Modern structures have been built across the road (no 16) and overlook 17 Bradwell."
- All parties have been invited.
- The Committee ventilated the matter and noted that there is no coherent streetscape character or typology with modern apartments all around the subject property. The rear addition, although modern would not detract from the streetscape, as there is none.

DECISION

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

RB

13.20 Erf 22025, Eighth Street, Kensington, S34-Total Demolition

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

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

POA required.

XM

13.21 Erf 50796, 27 St Thomas Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28420XM0506 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397669>

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 25 May 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations, upgrade and restoration of the existing property.
- Including addition of Patio roof, entrance covering, bedroom behind house and boundary wall
- Alterations: Remodelling of internal spaces. some walls removed and room function changes.

- Loft room added in existing roof space with new dormer window, Door and window changes.
- Work has not started.
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- GLCA stamped the plan

DECISION

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

XM

13.22 Erf 96982, 10 Dumbarton Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27636XM0304 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/390260>

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

Saraha Golding (owner) and Viv McDonald (Neighbour) took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 25 May 2025. Committee requested for the council submission drawings to be submitted. And confirmation on work started- the applicant confirmed that no building work has commenced, the contractor has only started digging trenches for where the new build would've gone, but that has stopped.
- The proposal is for an addition of an ensuite bathroom to the main bedroom, extension of the garage, removal of the external timber staircase, addition of an entrance foyer, addition and removal of internal walls, and a pergola addition.
- Work has not started.
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The GLCA has no objection
- Neighbour offered objection relating to concerns raised regarding the proposed works, specifically about the roof overhang potentially extending over the boundary line onto the neighbouring property.
- Applicant's response- states that a drawing mistakenly showed the roof overhang extending over the property boundary. The applicant states this was an error made during preparation of drawings for heritage approval rather than council submission drawings.
- The applicant clarified to the neighbour that:
- They do not intend to build over the boundary line, and such construction would not be permitted.

DECISION

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

XM

13.23 Erf 584, 23 Sipres Road, Thornton, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28233XM0420 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396204>

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 25 May 2025.
- The application is for additions and alterations a ground floor extension, converting the existing garage into a bedroom as well as the addition of a carport to this residential property.
- The ground floor addition will include 1 bedroom, bar lounge and a kitchen and bath.
- Work has not started
- Not graded
- Outside HPO

DECISION

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

XM

13.24 Erf 334, 55 Jeffcoat Avenue, Bergvliet, S34-Total Demolition

Case No:27590XM0302 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/390131>

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 12 May 2025.
- The application is for the total demolition of the structure and pool.
- Work has started but has not been completed.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- HRS has no objection to the demolition.

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.

XM

13.25 Erf 1140, 291 Beach Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28406SVB0506 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397651>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 26 May 2026.
- The property is graded IIIA and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for alterations to allow for universal access to the building including ramps, upgrades to entrances as well as hard landscaping.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.26 Erf 20257, House 953 (Sectional Title No 98) Helderberg Village , Somerset West, S34-Minor Works

Case No:28342SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397336>

Ms. Staphanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: minor repairs to non-structural cracking to wall surfaces, repairs to fascias, painting, treating wooden frames and fences, and internal works in internal spatial improvements, the addition of a toilet cubicle within the existing garage, and sensitive modifications to the garage door opening.
- Work start: No
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Outstanding information received 27 May 2026, including streetscape photographs - not the best.

DECISION

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

SB

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

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

CoCT comment is required

SB

13.28 Erf 13220, Off Stokey Road, Wellington, S38(4)-NID Case No: 28404SB0605 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397619> Ms. Staphanie Barnardt introduced the item. Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Construction of a new boundary wall on vacant land on Erf 13220, Wellington.
- Trigger: Section 38(1)(a) – Construction of a wall/barrier exceeding 300m in length.(140mm? per side, 8m gate – this is from the plans)
- Other: none
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Heritage resource: No heritage resources identified on site. Vacant industrially-zoned land located on the outskirts of Wellington.
- Archaeology: No archaeological resources identified. Low archaeological sensitivity anticipated due to location and nature of proposed work.
- Palaeontological: According to SAHRIS Moderate, but low sensitivity anticipated due to location and nature of proposed work.
- Visual/Cultural: No visual or cultural heritage impacts anticipated. Surrounding context predominantly industrial.
- Consultant recommends: NFS
- Additional information received 25 May 2026- site photographs.
- Since there is no reason to believe heritage resource will be impacted.

DECISION

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

SB

13.29 Erf 983, 8st James Street, Somerset West, S34-Additions &Alterations Case No: 28296SB0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396380> Ms. Staphanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: replacing the roof, windows, new entry and some internal changes.
Work start: no
- Additional information received on 7 May that include POA.
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: outside
- Applicant confirmed that they only learned recently that the approval was still outstanding on the heritage application. That is work had already commenced. That included restored the window louvres and timber front doors.

- The committee note the works as minor as the roof profile is not changing.

DECISION

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

SB

13.30 Erf 33030, Cressy Road, Garlandale, S38(4)-HIA

Case No: HWC24101108XM0304

Ms. Staphanie Barnardt introduced the item.

HELD OVER:

Additional time required to read through the revised HIA and to determine if IACom requirements have been met. Matter will be on the HOMs agenda, 8 June 2026.

SB

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 2195, Cnr Laing Street & Eendrag Street, George, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28618CN0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398762>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB according to the George Heritage Asses Register 2013. The applicant recommends that the property be graded NCW due to the cumulative impact of extensive additions and alterations which have materially compromised the architectural and heritage integrity of the property.
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Has started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For a new bedroom addition to the northeastern façade, a new bathroom and a new entertainment room to the western rear of the property.
- Consultation:
 - George Municipality states that they have no comments in terms of heritage on the proposal from Spatial Planning.
 - GHT objects to the application, raising concerns regarding possible unauthorised work undertaken without approval from HWC, the cumulative loss of heritage significance through successive changes, and the negative impact of intrusive additions, particularly the corner braai and boundary walls, on the streetscape and sense of place. The Trust is of the opinion that approval may set an undesirable precedent and recommends that the application be refused in its current form and that a more compliant approach be pursued to address past unauthorised works and restore heritage significance where possible.
 - SVDSF Southern Cape supports the proposed rear addition but raises concerns regarding the front façade alteration extending beyond the original stoep and the scale of the proposed chimney, which is considered visually intrusive and detrimental to the remaining heritage character of the dwelling. Recommendation is for the façade alteration and chimney design to be reconsidered to better retain the surviving heritage qualities of the property.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposed additions have been revised in response to comments received through a reduced and more recessive roof form, a lower chimney height, and improved finishes to the braai structure. While some interior fabric remains, the exterior architectural integrity and contextual significance of the property have been substantially compromised through cumulative alterations and loss of original fabric over time. As such, the survey grading of IIIB is not considered warranted, with an NCW grading considered more appropriate.

DECISION

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

CN

14.2 Erf 367, 34 Berg Street, George, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28564CN0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398482>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Mr. Stefan de Kock joined for the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: for alterations and additions to the existing dwelling and outbuilding, including a new street-facing pergola, outdoor braai area, internal reconfiguration of rooms and replacement of internal doors and floor finishes.
- Consultation:
 - George Municipality did not comment in 30 days
 - GHT did not comment in 30 days
 - SVDSF Southern Cape: 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

14.3 Erf 6520, 15 Upington Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28619CN0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398769>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Plan indicating work started/been completed and I&AP comments required

CN

14.4 Erf 88203, 260 Main Road, Muizenberg, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28579CN0516 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398597>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications:
 - HWC25010602SVB0109, S34MW for internal bathroom and kitchen alterations, restoration to the moseley tile cladding, repair the eaves, paint the external plastered masonry walls; sand, seal and repair the existing windows, repair to glazing and glazing putty. Repair garage door. Permit dated 5 February 2025.
 - HWC25021313CSI0214, S34MW for internal alterations to bathroom and kitchen. Permit dated 26 February 2025.
- Proposal: For the reconstruction of the rear conservatory using a new timber support structure with the existing cut glass panes reinstated, alterations to the garage including new gates, slab and improved access arrangements, installation of solar panels on the north-facing roof slope, installation of a new security gate to the covered rear yard, and demolition of the existing toilet block within the covered yard to improve lighting and functionality.

DECISION

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

CN

14.5 Erf 88317, 2 Rodwell Road, St. James, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28598CN0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398709>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Ms. Laura Milandri & Mr. Peter Train joined for the item

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: The current proposal has not started; however, previously unauthorised work is noted on the plan
- Previous Applications: HWC25060505CH0702, S34MW for installation of solar panels on the roof, repair leaks and replace asbestos roof and gutters. Permit dated 22 July 2025.
- Proposal: For the demolition of the existing kitchen roof and replacement with a new raised contemporary roof with clerestory windows; removal of internal walls between the kitchen and scullery to create a unified kitchen space; alterations to openings and installation of new aluminium windows and sliding doors; installation of a double-sided fireplace; replacement and restoration of portions of flooring; and associated internal alterations. The application also notes previously completed unauthorised work, including the bricking up of a garage opening and alterations to openings within the domestic quarters
- Consultation:
- CoCT supports
- Kalk Bay – St James Ratepayers and Residents Association & Kalk Bay Historical Association object to the proposed contemporary kitchen roof and glazed elements, stating that alterations to a significant building within the HPOZ should follow the traditional architectural language of the original structure rather than introduce a contemporary addition. The associations recommend that an alternative solution be explored for bringing additional sunlight and mountain views into the kitchen.
- Response to objection:
- The applicant opposed the objection from the Kalk Bay Historical Association, arguing that the contemporary addition follows accepted conservation principles by clearly distinguishing new work from historic fabric. It was further noted that the alterations are located at the rear of the building and do not impact the significance of the primary façade or streetscape.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposal is largely confined to the rear and internal service areas of the dwelling and will not materially impact the primary façade or landmark presence of the building within the streetscape. The additions remain subordinate to the historic structure and are clearly legible as contemporary interventions, avoiding a false sense of historical development. The affected kitchen and service areas have undergone multiple alterations over time and retain reduced integrity, while the unauthorised work appears limited to areas of lower significance with no substantial loss of important historic fabric.
- The committee noted that work is being undertaken to less significant building work, the work is facing Rodwell Road and not Main Road. The proposal is partially set back and the proposals are acceptable. The conservation body comments are noted to be more based on aesthetic than heritage related.

DECISION

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

CN

14.6 Farm 1166-RE, via R45 - L'Ormarins, Franschhoek, S38(1)-NID

Case No: 28543CN0514 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398418>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger(s): S38(1)(c)(i)
- Decision making authority: HWC
- Property is approx. 42ha in extent, with a zoning of Agricultural and the current land use of agricultural and equestrian uses. The surrounding land uses are also agricultural.
- Proposal: For the construction of two new stable barns and an equestrian library/museum on L'Ormarins 1166 Remainder, Paarl, to support the existing equine facilities on the farm. The buildings are proposed around the existing Drakenstein Stud stables to create a werf-like arrangement and will function in association with the agricultural and equestrian use of the property, including occasional event use.
- Heritage resources:
 - The property forms part of the broader L'Ormarins agricultural landscape and is situated within the Franschhoek Landscape Unit F04, identified in the Stellenbosch Cultural Landscape Management Plan as a Grade IIIB cultural landscape. The site falls within the R45 scenic route corridor and is associated with the historic agricultural development of the valley, having origins dating to the late seventeenth century. The farm is presently characterised by the Drakenstein Stud facilities, paddocks, agricultural uses and associated tourism activities, including the Franschhoek Motor Museum. The heritage significance of the site is primarily derived from its contribution to the wider cultural landscape, scenic qualities, agricultural character and equestrian land use.
- Archaeo-sensitivity: No recorded archaeological resources are known from the proposed development footprint. The site has been extensively transformed through longstanding agricultural activities, equestrian uses and previous development.
- Palaeo-sensitivity: The site falls within an area of insignificant palaeontological sensitivity (grey on the SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map). Given the nature and scale of the proposed development within an already transformed agricultural landscape, impacts on palaeontological resources are expected to be low.
- Consultant recommendation: NFS
- Heritage Considerations: The property forms part of the broader L'Ormarins Estate, a proposed PHS, and derives significance from its agricultural history and contribution to the Franschhoek cultural landscape. The proposed development is located within the existing Drakenstein Stud precinct and comprises facilities directly associated with the established equestrian use of the farm. The new buildings are arranged around the existing stallion stables in a werf-like configuration that reinforces the existing development pattern. Given their location, scale and design, the proposal is not anticipated to result in significant impacts on heritage resources or the cultural landscape.

DECISION

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

CN

- 14.7 Erf 1472, 73 Hout Bay Main Road, Hout Bay, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 28583CSI0517 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398610>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company resolution required.

CSI

- 14.8 Erf 1505, 28 Burg Street, Wellington, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28620CSI0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398770>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Annotate what work has been completed on the plans, applicant to confirm if the plan has been revised in line with the comments received from DHAC and WHF, streetscape photos (google), Paarl 300 comment required.

CSI

- 14.9** Erf 3670, Fancourt Golf Estate Clubhouse, off the R404 Blanco, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28604CSI0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398728>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photos required.

CSI

- 14.10** Erf 673 6 Glenwood Way, Pinelands, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28562CSI0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398477>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Both title deed holders to sign PoA required.

CSI

- 14.11** Erven 3779-RE & 3774 Multiple Roads Langa, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 28546CSI0514 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398423>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Site photos required.

CSI

- 14.12** Farm 92, Steenbokfontein, Steenbokfontein Cave, Lambert's Bay, S35-Analysis
Case No: HWC25100603CSI0520
Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.
Dr Antonieta Jerardino joined for the item

Discussion

- Work applied for has not started
- Previous approval: 20012303AS0310E
- Proposed research is for invasive sampling of mastic (adhesives residues) from three artefacts from Steenbokfontein Cave with the use of the gas chromatography - Mass Spectrometry (GC-MS) analysis.
- Dating sample and sample to be destroyed: SBF16 artefact (Fig. 3) is a quartz flake mounted on mastic and appears to be part of a barb-like projection, SBF30 artefact consists of an adze mounted on a piece of mastic recovered from unit TWIG in square K3, SBF31 is an object made entirely of mastic and was retrieved from the stratigraphic unit 'Bottom ST' in square J3.
- Purpose of research: The research forms part of the Ancient Adhesives Project, which investigates how prehistoric glues were produced and used. By analysing wear patterns and microscopic residues on stone artefacts from Steenbokfontein Cave, researchers can determine how the tools were used, whether they were hafted, and what adhesive materials may have been involved. To accurately identify organic ingredients such as tree resins, gums, and tar, GC-MS analysis is required. Different adhesive types reflect varying levels of technological knowledge and production complexity, making their identification important for understanding the skills, resource use, and technological sophistication of precolonial people.
- West Coast Aboriginal Council did not provide comment within 30 days.
- Iziko provided a letter of support for the destructive analysis.
- HOMS Discussion:
- The Committee noted that the cigar shaped mastic object is very unique and there is concern with the destructive analysis regarding how much of the object would be destroyed. UCT were initially supportive of the non-destructive analysis but have since objected to the destructive analysis. Clarification regarding the methodology is required to determine how damaging the analysis will be to the unique mastic object being tested.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. A methodology must be submitted to HWC that provides clarity on the proposed destructive sampling technique detailing how this technique will result in less than 0.01g of material being removed, how this will not cause further damage to object SBF-31 and/or how potential further damage will be mitigated.

CSI

14.13 Portion 30, Farm Modderfontein, c/o R305 & Hectorskraal Road, Riversdale, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28595CSI0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398631>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has been completed
- Previous application: HWC23050814AM0510 - does not look like the application was completed.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Completed work is for replacement of deteriorated asbestos roof sheeting with new pre-painted corrugated roof sheeting, replacement of the structurally compromised timber roof structure with a new timber roof structure, replacement of existing steel window units with aluminium window units within the same structural openings and configuration, general refurbishment and repair of the existing farmhouse, repair and upgrading of finishes where required to ensure the continued usability of the building.
- HOMS Discussion:

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

14.14 Portion 31, Farm Nooitgedacht, Oudtshoorn, S35-Deviation

Case No: HWC260515CSI0515

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has started
- Previous approval: HWC24111103CSI0114
- Proposed research is for small-scale test excavation, surface collection of fossil remains, and associated dates on recovered samples. The applicant stated that based on their initial field season, it would be very helpful for to modify our sampling approach. In particular:
 1. In our permit applications, we proposed to conduct a single 1m x 1 m test excavation within each of our target caves. It is now clear that some of these caves are enormous—e.g., 10s to 100s of meters in length, with multiple distinct chambers at different depths. Getting a better sense of where the fossil deposits are (or are not) in these large caves would benefit from a few more test pits in different parts of the cave system.
 2. Our permit proposal focused on test excavations, but we never considered surface collection. We found that some of our target caves has Pleistocene fauna dispersed the surface—and surface collection of these specimens would help us with our broader goals of assessing the paleontological potential of the caves.
- The aim of the research is to gain a more complete understanding of the quaternary fossil sites at Nooitgedacht by recovering in situ fossil material and establishing a chronological framework.

- Oudtshoorn Municipality provided comment and support the application
- There is a repository agreement in place with Iziko

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

CSI

14.15 Erf 1613, 17 Leinster Road, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28589EJV0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398619>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

PoA; streetscapes; and GPRRA Comment required.

EJV

14.16 Erf 10656, 2 Stowe Street, Woodstock, S34-Restoration; Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28590EJV0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398620>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

PoA; resolution; streetscapes; and WRRRA and SRHS Comment required.

EJV

14.17 Farm 13 Portion 2, Farm 4 Portion 18, and Farm 14 Portion 7, Redelinghuys Bulk Water Pipeline Redelinghuys, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28554EJV0514 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398442>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a), NEMA, and WULA.
- The proposed project entails the replacement and upgrading of the existing Redelinghuys Bulk Water Pipeline, which is currently the sole source of potable water to the town of Redelinghuys. The existing pipeline, installed in 1999, comprises a 3.25 km long, 315 mm diameter uPVC pipeline that was laid within an open concrete channel. Due to prolonged exposure, fire damage, ultraviolet degradation, insufficient cover, and frequent failures, the infrastructure has reached the end of its operational life. A new 315 mm diameter uPVC bulk water pipeline of approximately 3.25km aligned adjacent to and largely parallel with the existing pipeline will be constructed within a nominal 5 m-wide construction disturbance footprint. The pipeline route is classified as predominantly brownfield development, as it follows an existing, previously disturbed pipeline corridor and servitude that has been affected by earlier construction activities, farming operations, access tracks and service infrastructure. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates moderate sensitivity while the map of relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity screener indicates low sensitivity with localised areas of high/very high sensitivity due to being within 50m of a Grade IIIC heritage site and within 100m of an ungraded heritage site, neither of which will be impacted by the proposal due to the disturbed footprint.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

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.

14.18 Erven 5113-RE and 40173, Gustrouw Road, Firlands, Gordons Bay, S38(8)-NID**Case No:** 28600EJV0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398716>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d) and NEMA.
- The proposal is to construct low-, medium-, and high-density housing, education, and mixed-use facilities across the site. The site is vacant, has been designated for mixed-use, and falls within the urban edge. It is located at the edge of the existing development of Gordon's Bay south of the N2, and immediately west of the residential development of Admiral's Park. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates low sensitivity and various Archaeological Impact Assessments have been conducted for other land in the vicinity and found no archaeological constraints or limitations to development. The area has lost any scenic significance as increased industrial and residential development has come to dominate the landscape.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

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.

14.19 Farm 1139-RE, Malmesbury, Saldanha Bay, S38(8)-HIA**Case No:** HWC25080505EJV0811 / 25860EJV0811 <https://sahris.org.za/node/384041>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- HOMs on 18 August 2025 request an HIA with AIA and PIA for the development of a Manganese and Iron Ore storage and conveyor facility on 61ha of the northernmost section of the property.
- In terms of the landscape: The area proposed for development is located within the Saldanha Bay IDZ which has already been extensively disturbed through the establishment of mining activities here as well as the construction of industrial infrastructure associated with the Saldanha Steel factory. It is not anticipated that this proposed development will negatively impact on any significant cultural landscape resources, nor is the proposed activity a change of character within an area that is already heavily industrialised.
- In terms of archaeology: The West Coast of South Africa forms a very sensitive archaeological landscape and has made a major contribution to the understanding of the archaeological sequence of Southern Africa. No heritage resources of significance were identified within the development area. In addition, the field assessment conducted in November 2025 confirmed that the Site recorded on SAHRIS as a Grade IIIB burial is unlikely to reflect a burial and is more likely a natural pile of rocks (Observation 001). This feature is proposed as Not Conservation-Worthy (NCW). Additionally, the field assessment confirmed the location of the concrete floors of 20th-century ruins (Observation 003), and confirmed that these features are also NCW. The field assessment also identified an upper grindstone (Observation 002). While this archaeological artefact is likely dated to the Later Stone Age, it is also determined to be NCW as it was found in isolation without any associated archaeological deposit and therefore has limited scientific value. The proposed development is mostly located outside the 500m high-sensitivity shell midden zone, with only the Conveyor to Port crossing through the 500m sensitivity area.

- In terms of palaeontology: According to the SAHRIS Palaeosensitivity Map, the development sites are underlain by sediments of very high fossil sensitivity. In the palaeontological assessment completed by Pether (2014) for the Saldanha Bay IDZ, Pether notes that “Beneath a thin cover of sand, the project site is underlain by calcareous aeolianites and calcretes of the Langebaan Formation. These strata do not appear to be very fossiliferous, but the fossils that have been found in the broader vicinity are of profound scientific value, raising international interest in the region”. A single ex situ marine gastropod (*Charonia* sp.) was identified within limestone debris derived from the Langebaan Formation, suggesting the potential for additional fossil material within subsurface calcretised layers. This specimen provides direct evidence of marine palaeoenvironments during deposition. Due to its ex situ nature it has been graded as NCW.
- No comments were received during the public participation period.
- The HIA titled “Proposed Development of a Manganese and Iron Ore Storage and Conveyor Facility in Saldanha Bay”, dated May 2026, and prepared by CTS Heritage concludes on pages 37 to 38 with the following recommendations:
- There is no objection to the proposed development from a heritage perspective on condition that:
 - The Environmental Control Officer must monitor excavations around the stone cairn during the construction phase to definitively rule out the possibility of a buried grave.
 - The HWC Chance Finds Procedure must be implemented for the duration of excavation activities
 - Should any buried archaeological resources or human remains or burials be uncovered during the course of development activities, work must cease in the vicinity of these finds. Heritage Western Cape (HWC) must be contacted immediately in order to determine an appropriate way forward.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 17 June 2026 due to the mitigation measures requiring consideration.

EJV

14.20 Erf 248 New Harbour Precinct, Westcliff Road, Hermanus, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28608EJV0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398734>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The New Harbour Complex is graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for the total demolition of the structure on site to allow for redevelopment. The structure, a large industrial, mid-20th century type, is currently abandoned and in a state of disrepair. Evidence suggests the building was constructed considerably later than the earlier abalone canning factories that were historically located adjacent to the harbour breakwater. Given its condition and lack of historical significance, the structure is considered to hold no intrinsic heritage value and is suggested for grading as Not Conservation Worthy (NCW). Due to its substantial setback from the harbour area, the total demolition of this structure will not adversely affect the aesthetic or landmark qualities of the harbour precinct, and its removal may enhance the overall character and visual coherence of the harbour complex.
- OHAC support. WCC did not respond to the request for comment.

DECISION

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

EJV

14.21 Farm 257 Portion 32, Misgunst, Fransmanshoek, Vleesbaai, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 28643EJV0521 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398924>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and NEMA.
- The proposal is to construct a primary dwelling and driveway across 950m² of the well-vegetated property. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates unknown sensitivity and the map of relative palaeontological sensitivity indicates medium sensitivity; however, the applicant notes that away from the immediate coast the fossil potential of the Strandveld Formation sands is poor overall and the relatively small scale of the excavated subsurface volume entailed in the proposed development renders the likelihood of intersecting the very sparsely distributed fossil bones improbable and such finds would very likely be the remains of species living today. Consequently, the palaeontological sensitivity of the Strandveld Fm. sands in the vicinity of the development footprint is considered to be low to marginal. The map of relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity indicates low sensitivity, and an archaeological walk-through revealed that the affected portion of the larger property for the proposed development footprint is situated on a vegetated dune of sterile aeolian sands where no heritage resources of either pre-colonial or colonial origin were seen. Although the presence of archaeological resources in sub-surface sediments cannot be ruled out entirely, it is highly unlikely that significant archaeological resources are present in the affected area. The site is not visible from the access road to Fransmanshoek nor from any other public roads, scenic routes or access points. Consequently, the proposed access and structure will have no impact on the aesthetic value of the area.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

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 EMP_r and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.22 Erven 815, 3319, and 4174, Dutch Reformed Church, Bodorp, George, S27-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28673EJV0522 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399188>

Ms. Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Mr. Stefan de Kock joined into the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Graded II
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- In 2019 HWC approved an application for the installation of ClearVu fencing to secure the northern precinct of the GDRC (19013106AS0208E). This was only partially implemented whilst the approved paving was full implemented. The former permit has since lapsed.
- Since implementation of the above works the church has unfortunately experienced a significant increase in crime-related incidents occurring on the larger, unsecured southwest portion of the GDRC, which have become increasingly difficult to manage. As a result, it has been decided that securing the southeast portion of the complex can no longer be avoided. The proposal is therefore to expand the existing paved area and install ClearVu fencing around the southwest portion of the site, as well as to construct a feature wall next to the new main entrance and

install additional signage along Courtenay Street. Importantly, the longest continuous stretch of fencing is 176m in length and there therefore is no s38(1)(a) trigger

- The Municipality did not respond to the request for comment. The GHT do not object to the proposal and align themselves to the conditions that a comprehensive landscaping plan be submitted and clarity on the management of public access once security measures are in plan is provided. The applicant responded stating that a landscaping plan has been recommended and that the DGRC representative confirmed that public access would still be possible from Church Street. The S.v.d.S Foundation do not support the fixing of the fence directly onto the original boundary wall as this may compromise the integrity and heritage value of the historic fabric and recommend the fence be set back from the existing wall, using the setback space for planting. The applicant responds that while this method was explored, it was determined that it would further erode the church ground and effectively create a “no man’s land” which would be even more difficult to manage than present conditions that gave rise to the need for introduction of security measures.
- The applicant recommends that the application be approved subject to the following:
 - A comprehensive landscaping plan for the undeveloped portion of the PHS must be prepared and submitted to HWC for approval together with a timeframe for implementation. Existing mature and semi-mature trees must be retained.
 - Signage located on the PHS along Courtenay Street must be moved eastwards to align with the footprint of the formalised car parking area. No additional signage may be allowed to proliferate along the remaining PHS boundaries. (
 - Daytime public access to the church grounds must be allowed for.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. A comprehensive landscaping plan for the undeveloped portion of the Provincial Heritage Site must be prepared and submitted to HWC for approval together with a timeframe for implementation. Existing mature and semi-mature trees must be retained.
2. Alternative options for boundary fencing types and placement must be explored.
3. The landscape plan must be circulated to I&APs for a 14-day commenting period prior to submission to HWC.

EJV

- 14.23 Erf 2846, 15 Hope Street, George, S34-Additions, Alterations, & Demolition**
Case No: 28612RB0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398742>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Drawing set must have elevations coloured up, showing email address of the George municipality official contacted, and proper POP required.

RB

- 14.24 Erf 63975, Unit 16 (Section 23) Kenmain Gardens, 272 Main Road, Kenilworth, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28586RB0517 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398616>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape and internal images required (and perhaps POP).

RB

- 14.25 Erf 3931, 8 Hout Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28622RB0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398872>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

DHAC comment required. required.

RB

14.26 Erf 1740, 4 Leeuwendal Crescent, Oranjezicht, S34-Extension
Case No: 28567RB0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398495>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape images and unstamped drawing set required.

RB

14.27 Remainder Erf 651, off Jasper Way, Noordhoek, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 28540RB0514 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398412>
Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(a) and (c)(i) triggered.
- The property has been cleared of invasive species by the owners over the last 20 years and is within the Cape Floral Region World Heritage Site.
- Proposal is to develop five residential dwellings and ancillary staff quarters on the currently agricultural zoned Remainder of Erf 651, Noordhoek.
- The concept relates to low density single residential buildings and infrastructure that would align with the visual characteristics of the mountainside including an "off-grid" approach and they will be on the lower portion of the undeveloped Erf.
- Palaeo is a mix of blue (low) and orange (high).
- A site visit on 30 April 2026 found no surface evidence of archaeology and research by the applicant attributes much of this to invasive (Australian) vegetation that heavily disturbed the surface.
- Furthermore, archaeologically relevant sites, scatters, and burials have generally been closer to the beach in this area.
- Visually, the CoCT has assigned a grading of IIIA to the site (as part of the greater mountainside) with the resource described as:
- *"Natural landscape of high scenic and landmark qualities. Forms part of the Table Mountain chain and is a buffer between the urban areas and the Table Mountain National Park."*
- Applicant recommends an HIA consisting of a VIA.

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Visual Impact Assessment

RB

14.28 Erf 114915, 105 Chamberlain Road, Woodstock, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28706RB0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399336>
Mr. Ruan Brand introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Resolution from Hospitality Connection CC for someone to be able to sign on their behalf, and a POA for all owners that the applicant can submit on their behalf required.

RB

14.29 Remainder of Portion 1 of Farm 330, Herolds Bay, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 28724RB0526 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399371>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Photographs required.

RB

- 14.30 Erven 264 & RE/248, 3 Goosen Road, Prince Alfred Hamlet, S34-Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28591SB0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398621>
Ms. Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Previous Title deed is required.

- 14.31 Erf 1291, 33 Church Street, Stellenbosch, S34-Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28558SB0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398469>
Ms. Stephani Barnardt introduced the item.
Mr. Frederik Lotter was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: Reduce the footprint of the current approved application, in order to keep the character of the existing courtyard and pool area, and to add a smaller addition.
- Summary of the motivation: Originally constructed in 1713 and later converted from a private residence into a boutique hotel, the property has undergone several approved heritage-sensitive additions over the years to support its continued use as a luxury tourism destination.
- The document explains that rear wing additions were first approved in 2007, creating the existing East and West Wings and establishing the current 16-room hotel. Subsequent proposals between 2014 and 2023 explored additional accommodation expansions, including approved additions of hotel rooms and rooftop facilities. Although Heritage Western Cape approved these proposals, some were either not implemented or delayed, particularly due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Permit renewals were subsequently obtained.
- The current 2025–2026 proposal represents a reduced and amended version of the previously approved scheme. The revised design seeks to retain the character of the internal courtyard and pool area, improve room quality through additional windows and balconies, and reduce the visual and physical impact of the additions. The proposal retains the approved four-storey height of the rear wings but reduces the overall footprint substantially, with only a minor 1m extension to the West Wing.
- Following comments from Stellenbosch Interest Group, aspects of the design were amended to improve heritage sensitivity, including removing an external staircase and lift shaft, incorporating more sympathetic façade treatments, and reducing visual bulk. The additions remain set back behind the historic structure and are largely concealed from street level.
The proposal forms part of a broader vision to reposition Coopmanhuijs as a luxury wellness hotel with a “live-in museum” character that celebrates and restores the historic Dutch and French influences associated with the original 1713 building. The owners and design team argue that the proposal will strengthen the heritage character and tourism value of the property while respecting the significance of the historic structure.
- Work start: no
- Grade: IIIB
- HPO: inside
- Comments: Municipality was in support of deviation, SIG has not support and note that the western four-storey wing, are excessive in height, visually intrusive, and incompatible with the heritage character, scale, setting, and historic streetscape of the IIIA-graded Coopmanhuijs and surrounding Stellenbosch Urban Conservation Area. SHF did not comment within 30 days.
- The committee compared the plans and noted that the footprint is less than previously approved.
- The committee noted that less of impact and therefore in support of application.

DECISION

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

- 14.32** Erf 17355, off Adam Tas Street, Stellenbosch, S34-demolitions and alterations
Case No: 28596SB0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398632>
Ms. Stephani Barabardt introduced the item.

DUPLICATION

The application is a duplication with 14.37. Item to be heard under 14.37

SB

- 14.33** Section 57 of sectional plan SS 478/1995, within erf 156869, Unit 128, Victoria Junction, Prestwich Street, Cape Town, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28594SB0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398627>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company resolution, body corporate resolution, elevation of the plans, better streetscape

SB

- 14.34** Erf 9437, Unit No. 7, St Blaize Terrace, Mossel Bay, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28572SB0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398590>
Ms. Stephani Barabardt introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

SG diagram, more external and streetscape photograph is required.

SB

- 14.35** Erf 1139, Off the M12, Burgandy, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 28709SB0526 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399340>
Ms. Stephani Barabardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Construction of a storage facility and associated infrastructure on Erf 1139, Burgundy, including a storage building, doggy daycare, garages, parking, internal roads, gatehouse and services infrastructure.
- Trigger: Section 38(1)(i) – development exceeding 5 000m² in extent.
- Other: NEMA, DEA&DP application.
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- However, boarder an area that requires further investigation and IIIC.
Heritage resource: No built environment, cultural landscape, or living heritage resources identified on site.
- Archaeology: No archaeological resources identified and the screen report confirm low sensitivity.
- Palaeontological: Low palaeontological sensitivity indicated. However, moderated according to the screener report. No anticipated impact but chance finds recommended.
- Visual/Cultural: No identified visual or cultural heritage impacts.
- Consultant recommends: No HIA or specialist heritage studies required.
- The proposal is located within a previously disturbed and partially cleared portion of the broader Burgundy Estate development area, with no identified heritage resources or anticipated impacts to heritage resources. No further studies, Chance finds procedure to apply.

FINAL COMMENT

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

SB

- 14.36** Erf 17324, Al Perold Building, Merriman Avenue, Stellenbosch, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28559SVB0515 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398473>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Mr Stuart Hermanssen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded IIIA and is within the Stellenbosch Historic Core.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for the refurbishment of the existing laboratories in the semi-basement.

DECISION

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

SVB

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

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

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Cindy Postlethwayt was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 25 May 2026.
- The site is outside of any HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- In response to the submission of an HIA, HWC issued an RoD dated 04 December 2015 approving the proposed mixed-use development of the property, subject to adherence to the heritage indicators (15050602GT0508E).
- In 2025 HWC received an application for proposed amendment to the phase 3 demolitions. This application was referred to the IACom 21 January 2026 meeting, where the committee issued the following comment: *"The Committee considered the updated development proposal to be substantially accordance with the previous HIA approval. No further processes in terms of S.38 are required. The Committee advised that since the additional of demolitions were not included in the S.38 approval, a separation S.34 permit application is required for those structures."*
- The current application is to fulfil the requirement of IACom that a separate S34 permit application be submitted for approval of the additional demolitions that were not included in the original S38 approval.
- The building referred to as D in the original HIA and referred to as 3 in the current proposal was assigned a partial grading of IIIC as per the original HIA. The grading related to the kilns only.
- The building referred to as E and referred to as R5 in the original HIA was assigned a grading of IIIC as per the original HIA. It was recommended that this building be retained if possible.
- As noted, the current application is for approval to demolish structures that were not previously approved for demolition in the original HIA. The structures older than 60 years now proposed for demolition are referred to as building R4, R5, 3, R9, and 6 as noted on the demolition no AAHW01AR0037. The proposal is also to alter the building referred to as building 12.
- Stellenbosch Municipality did not respond.
- SIG did not respond.
- SHF did not respond.
- The committee requested clarity on how the buildings proposed for demolition correspond with the buildings in the original HIA and requested that this information be provided in writing to the case officer. The committee also requested building plans for the proposed alterations to building D.
- Ms Postlethwayt requested if the alterations for building 12 could be dealt with in a second application as the details of the proposal have not yet been finalized. The committee agreed that this would be acceptable, however given that building 12 is not older than 60 years, in order to assess the development holistically, the plans for building 12 should be submitted to HWC for approval once finalized as a condition of approval.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. To confirm whether the building referred to as 3 in the current proposal corresponds to the building referred to as D in the original HIA and similarly whether a portion of the building referred to as R5 in the current proposal corresponds to the building referred to as E in the original HIA.
2. Revised SDP showing only the structures for demolition overlaid with the previously approved SDP must be submitted.

SVB

14.38 Erf 2141, Mike de Vries Building, Merriman Avenue, Stellenbosch, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28588SVB0518 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398618>

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Stuart Hermansen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded IIIC and is within the Stellenbosch Historic Core.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for the refurbishment of the existing laboratories in the building.

DECISION

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

SVB

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

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

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

PoA, Title Deed and streetscape/contextual images required.

SVB

14.40 Erf 8892, Firwood Farm, New Eskdale Street, Paarl, S34-Alterations

Case No: 28534SVB0513 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398383>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

PoA, Local authority comment and registered conservation body comment required.

SVB

14.41 Erven 797, 798 & 799, 10, 10A & 12, The Glen Road, Sea Point, S38(4)-HIA

Case No: HWC24050604SJ0624

Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- An RNID was issued on 18 July 2024 requesting an HIA with a Townscape Study and Visual Impact Assessment (HWC24050604SJ0624) for the proposed consolidation and redevelopment of the properties. This would entail total demolition of all structures and the construction of a low-rise block of flats with 15 units.
- HIA Findings Overview:
 - An HIA with Townscape Study and Visual Impact Assessment have been submitted to HWC. The Townscape Study and Visual Impact Assessment have been integrated with a Built Environment Assessment within the HIA.
 - The HIA assessed the architectural significance as none, the townscape/visual significance as low and the streetscape significance as medium.
 - The findings of the specialist studies were presented as Heritage-Based Design Indicators. Plans were reviewed and assessed in terms of the indicators in April 2025. Further

clarifications/additions were proposed in order to ensure that the heritage-based design indicators are more fully met. The scheme has been graphically tested against the indicator diagrams and has been found to largely comply with these. However, the following further mitigations were suggested on a detailed level, to introduce a finer grain to the street response: the inclusion of individual pedestrian gates from the street edge into the garden spaces could be considered; and the enhanced of the central “break” in the block through the slight setback of the balconies in this “zone” as well as the use of a differing paint colour or façade materiality in this area. Despite this the heritage practitioner notes that in general, the proposal is now seen to comply with the heritage indicators, and therefore heritage impacts are judged to be within acceptable parameters for the area, the context, and the HPOZ.

- The HIA anticipates the following impacts on heritage resources. The proposal shall have some impact in the context, introducing a 4-storey building where previously single storey houses existed. However, the architects have interpreted the heritage-based design indicators and undertaken further mitigation to ensure that the proposal retains a sense of grain and fragmentation, responds to the architectural composition of the mid-century low-rise flats in the area, scales down and sets back as much as possible to the neighbouring structures, and ensures a positive streetscape interface along The Glen Road. This also ensures that the proposal will continue to visually blend into its context at the scale of the street. Therefore, the anticipated heritage impacts are believed to be within acceptable levels.
- CoCT were consulted and initially raised concerns regarding the design of the building, but after design revisions supported the proposal.
- Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents' Association did not provide a comment.
- Sea Point For All did not provide a comment.
- Ward Councillor did not provide a comment.
- Simon van der Stel Foundation/Cape Heritage Trust did not provide a comment.
- Ms Isabela Moreira objected to the proposal the relevant heritage related objections can be summarized as follows:
 - The proposed development is inconsistent with the established scale, style, and heritage value of the surrounding properties and does not appropriately respond to its immediate context.
 - While the applicant has made some effort to articulate the façade and introduce setbacks, the proposed design fails to adequately respond to its immediate neighbours. A development of two-storeys or less is recommended.
 - Risk of precedent setting and consequent compromising the objectives of the HPOZ and eroding of the heritage character and streetscape of Glen Road.
 - Issues with the consultation process and lack of transparency and consultation.
 - Structural Risk to adjacent heritage dwellings.
- All I&APs have been invited to HOMs 01 July 2026 meeting.
- HIA recommendations:
 - The site does not exhibit any intrinsic heritage significance.
 - Being on the outer edge of an HPOZ, it is not located in an area of very strong urban character, but rather is contributive. The site and area is also not visually sensitive, being on the edge of an HPOZ which is characterised by a variety of buildings. Therefore, the most significant heritage element evident on the site is the positive response to streetscape evident in the various “layers” of buildings making up this varied townscape.
 - The redevelopment of the site offers an opportunity to better respond to this prevailing townscape pattern, and the indicators look to ensure this response.
 - In addition, it must be acknowledged that this scheme triggers a Section 38 process only because of the small laneway located between the properties, being a separate erf, and ordinarily this type of project would only require a Section 34 and HPOZ approval process. Therefore, the indicators are also appropriate to, and have been established in response to, an HPOZ assessment.

- Regardless, and following mitigation both internal to the heritage impact assessment, and as resulting from public consultation, on balance, the heritage impacts of the proposed development are deemed to be low, and the proposal is seen to form a positive, contextually-responsive example for other, higher density housing planned in this vicinity.
- Therefore, it is recommended that Heritage Western Cape endorse this report and approve the proposed development in terms of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 17 June 2026 due to delegations.

SVB

- 14.42 Erf 9795-RE, Constantia Uitsig, Klein Constantia Road, Constantia, S38(4)-Endorse building plans**
Case No: 14102165AS1029M
 Ms. Chiara Singh introduced the item.
 Cindy Postlethwayt was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded IIIA, is within the Constantia Winelands Cultural Landscape and is outside of any HPO.
- In an interim comment dated 14 August 2015 HWC endorsed the Phase 1 HIA.
- In relation to the Phase 2 HIA, in a Record of Decision dated 25 January 2016 HWC resolved to approve the SDP Plan number SD 01_1100 Rev 1 dated 16 November 2015.
- In a Final Decision dated 01 October 2019 HWC explicitly considered, inter alia, the relocation of the Indoor Area and agreed to endorse the final proposal as submitted. The record of decision included the condition that the final architectural drawings are submitted to HWC for endorsement prior to final building plan submission. These final architectural drawings are before the committee today.
- The Heritage Practitioner notes in their cover letter that "the plans are in accordance with the HWC 2019 approved SDP and associated plans"

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the plans numbered 2.100, 2.101, 2.102, prepared by M S Rodseth Architect, and dated February 2026, as meeting the conditions of the IACom final decision dated 01 October 2019.

SVB

- 14.43 Erf 10383, 15 Tokai Road, Tokai, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28599XM0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398714>
 Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal photographs required

XM

- 14.44 Erf 480, 20 Avenue Marina, Bantry Bay, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28536XM0513 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398388>
 Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Updated plan indicating work started, Streetscape photographs required.

XM

- 14.45 Erf 8606, 24 Astra Avenue, Goodwood, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28575XM0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398593>
 Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

CoCT comment required.

XM

- 14.46 Erf 80685, 3 Ashford Road, Heathfield, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 28614XM0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398750>
Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Comments required.

XM

- 14.47 Erf 5515, 8A, 8B, and 10 Rainier Street, Malmesbury, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28621XM0519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398775>
Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.
Jone Kros and Bianca Oliver was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for proposed repair, maintenance, and alteration works to three buildings situated on Erf 5515 for conversion of the buildings into guest accommodation. The additions and alterations include including: bricking up existing windows; insertion of new windows and moldings; replacement of doors and windows; removal of chimneys; removal of burglar fencing; new staircases and openings.
- Work has not started
- Not graded however the buildings were assessed and the practitioner the proposed gradings as follows:
 - Building A (8B Rainier Street): Grade IIIC
 - Building B (8A Rainier Street): Grade IIIA
 - Building C (10 Rainier Street): Grade IIIB
- Not within any HPO
- The heritage report concludes that the proposed maintenance and repair works would not negatively impact the heritage significance of the site, provided that the recommended specifications and conservation measures are followed. And the consultant recommends approval.
- Swartland municipality and FoBCA did not provide a response within 30 days
- The Ishaqua Aikonese Cochoqua Heritage Conservation Body has no objections

DECISION

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

XM

- 14.48 Erven 65105, 65107, 65108, Cedar House School, Kenilworth, S38(4)-HIA**
Case No: HWC24091806SJ0925
Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

CASE SUMMARY

HIA Prepared by Michael Morris, March 2026

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is for the proposed consolidation and redevelopment of Erven 65105, 65107, and 65108 in Kenilworth for the expansion of Cedar House School. The application was triggered in terms of Section 38(1)(c)(ii) of the NHRA as the proposal involves the alteration of the character of a site comprising three or more erven.

The proposal forms part of Cedar House School's long-term consolidation strategy to relocate activities currently operating from satellite campuses on Rosmead Avenue back onto the main school precinct adjoining Ascot House, a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS).

The proposed development includes:

- Consolidation of the three erven into a single land unit of approximately 2163m².
- Retention and adaptive reuse of the existing houses for educational purposes.

- Internal alterations to convert the buildings into classrooms, offices, staffrooms, and an art room.
- Construction of a new infill classroom building linking the existing structures.
- Demolition of garages, swimming pools, boundary walls, and minor ancillary structures.
- Replacement of existing boundary walls with more permeable and contextually appropriate treatments.
- Rezoning from GR2 to CO1 to formalise use as a place of instruction.

The development would accommodate approximately 125 learners relocated from existing satellite campuses, without increasing the overall learner numbers currently approved for the school.

Heritage Context

The site is located adjacent to Ascot House, a Provincial Heritage Site with significant architectural and historical value. The subject erven contain buildings older than 60 years and are graded as follows:

- Erf 65105 – Grade 3C
- Erf 65107 – Some heritage significance
- Erf 65108 – Not conservation worthy

HWC previously determined that an HIA, including a Townscape Study and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), was required due to anticipated visual and architectural impacts on surrounding heritage resources.

Findings of the HIA

The HIA concludes that the proposed development would not result in significant adverse impacts on heritage resources, subject to compliance with the Integrated Heritage Design Indicators contained in the report.

These include:

- Heritage impacts at the broader landscape scale are considered negligible to low, with the established garden suburb character of Lower Kenilworth retained.
- Localised impacts are assessed as low to moderate and largely confined to the subject erven.
- Impacts on Ascot House (PHS) are considered low, with the proposal maintaining its visual prominence, spatial setting, and heritage significance.
- The VIA rates the overall visual impact as low to moderate.
- Streetscape character along Ascot Road, Goldbourne Road, and Bray Road is considered to be maintained through retention of existing street-facing forms and compatible architectural treatment.

The report further notes that:

- The adaptive reuse of the existing buildings contributes to the long-term sustainability and economic viability of the adjacent Provincial Heritage Site.
- The proposal supports a more integrated and functional educational campus model.
- Archaeological and palaeontological sensitivity of the site is low.

Recommendations

The consultant recommends that HWC endorse the HIA as compliant with Section 38(3) of the NHRA and approve the development subject to conditions, including:

- Compliance with the Integrated Heritage Design Indicators.
- General accord with the architectural drawings prepared by Design Matters Architects.
- Implementation of protocols for accidental discovery of archaeological, palaeontological, or human remains during construction.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 17 June 2026 due to the mitigation measures requiring consideration.

XM

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

XM moves to adopt and CA seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 1 June 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Ms Stephanie Barnardt, officially closed the meeting at 14:35

18. Date of next meeting: 8 June 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners

AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society

BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association

BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement

CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers ' & Residents Association

CoCT – City of Cape Town

CTHT – Cape Town Heritage Trust

CRM - Cultural Resources Management

DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association

Docomomo South Africa

DHS -Durbanville Heritage Society

EHM – Environmental Heritage Management department

FoBCA- Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area

FE - Friends of Elim

GLCA- Greater 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

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists

ABHC - Associated Bibbeys Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)

BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee

CBCRA -Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association

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

CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation

CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations

CMP – Conservation Management Plan

DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association

DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation

EMPr - Environmental Management Program

FHRA -Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association

FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts

GBRM - Great Brak River Museum

GVHAG- Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group

GCS - Greyton Conservation Society

HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation

HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting

HPO – Heritage protects overlay.

HWC – Heritage Western Cape

IACom - Impact Assessment Committee

IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee

KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society

MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society

NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation

NCW – Not Conservation Worthy	NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body
NEMA - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)	NHRA - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999
NID - Notification of Intent to Develop	NRA - Newlands Residents Association
NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association	OCA - Observatory Civic Association
OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage	OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee
Paarl300 Foundation	PPP - Public Participation Process
PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association	PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust
PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation	RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee
SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency	SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System
SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society	SPFA - Sea Point for All Group
SFB - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association	
SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town	
STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society	SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee
SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation	SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group
SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust	SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association
GHT - George Heritage Trust	OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society
RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association	TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation
TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society	UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association
VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa	WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association
WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group	Ward 2 Forum
WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council	WCC - Whale Coast Conservation
WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee	WRA - Woodstock Residents Association
WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society	WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association
WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association	