

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 1 December 2025 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

Mr. Ruan Brand	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Sneha Jhupsee	Specialist Heritage Officer	SJ (left at 10:00)
Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Specialist Heritage Officer	SB (left at 09:40)
Emily Jane Vowles	Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Chane Herman	Heritage Officer	CH
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM

Staff

Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Mr Olwethu Dlova	Back up secretariat	OD
Ms. Yusrah Hoosain	I&APs group chat	YH
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD

Legal Advisor

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

Observers

None.

Visitors

Anja le Roux	Overberg Municipal Property Manager	Item 13.3
Tanja Kruger	Architect	13.7
John Biernacki	Agent obo the owner	13.3
Corlie Smart	Applicant	14.9
Katherine Robinson	Stellenbosch Municipality	13.2
Tammy Leibrandt	Stellenbosch Municipality	13.2
Clive Theunissen	Drakenstein Municipality	Drakenstein items
Jonathan Kaplan	Applicant	14.11

Capacity

3. Apologies

Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
---------------------	-----------------------------	-----------

Absent

None.

4. Acceptance of the Code of Conduct

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

5. Approval of Agenda

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 1 December 2025 with the following additions:
Items 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 10.3 were added.
SJ moved to approve the agenda, and SVB seconded.

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 24 November 2025. SJ moved to approve the minutes, and CH seconded.

7. Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

8. Confidential matters

None.

9. Standing Items

9.1. Site inspections undertaken

9.1.1. Erven 4196, 4203 & 4204, Iziko Koopmans De Wet House, 35 Strand Street, Cape Town (RB & SJ)

9.1.2. Erf 94913-Re, Seafare House, 70 Orange Street, Gardens (SJ, SVB, EJY)

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

None.

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Erven 4196, 4203 & 4204, Iziko Koopmans De Wet House, 35 Strand Street, Cape Town (RB)

SUMMARY

- Site inspection conducted on 26 November 2025.
- Inspection conducted after a video was received showing plastering being removed from inside one of the museum rooms, which is not covered under the currently active permits (HWC23062711SJ0703, dated 10 August 2023, for roof sheet replacement and 21080603SJ1126E, dated 18 January 2022, for other minor restoration work).
- Graded II (1940 NMC), inside the Central City HPOZ.
- One of few remaining 18th century town houses in Cape Town. Fine architectural example with intact Neoclassic facade. Association with significant historical figures in the Cape and currently used as a museum by Iziko.
- Inside two of the upstairs rooms there was clear evidence of the walls having been stripped of plastering.
- The project architect and museum manager were both contacted.
- The project architect indicated that the contractor had done the work without permission but as soon as the architect saw it, they forced the contractor to stop and removed them from site.
- The architect indicated that they will be submitting an application in the new year for the plastering as well as to tend to a few other concerns highlighted in an upcoming structural engineering report.
- Preliminary investigation seems to suggest that this plastering and paint was added in the 1990s.
- No stop works order was issued as it appears that the project architect is in control of the situation.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 28 November 2025 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection and the site inspection report are noted at HOMS on 1 December 2025.
2. That a S27 minor works application be submitted for the replastering and other restorative maintenance work.

9.3.2 Erf 94913-Re, Seafare House, 70 Orange Street, Gardens (SJ)

SUMMARY

- Site inspection conducted on 26 Nov 2025 with HWC, DOI, and Gabriel Fagan Architects in attendance.
- Inspection requested to clarify permissible interventions for the DOI's modernisation programme balancing functionality vs heritage preservation.
- Grade IIIB and within Upper Table Valley HPOZ.
- The building reflects a layered, multi-period development, including the remains of the original cottage accessed from Rheede Street.
- Several heritage elements remain intact, though services layering is poor and requires intervention.
- Consultant has prepared development phasing analysis identifying areas of high/medium/low significance with initial design indicators (Annex A).
- The adjacent Labia Theatre historically influenced major planning changes on the site.

COMMENT

- The site inspection report is to be tabled at the Heritage Officers' Meeting on 01 December 2025 for noting.
- The heritage consultant is to confirm a Minor Works application with the ASD or SHO prior to submitting a formal application.
- A formal Section 34 application to be submitted to Heritage Western Cape once the proposal is finalized.

9.3.3 Purgatory Outspan Farm 1135, Jan Joubertsgat Bridge, Franschhoek Pass (SB & XM)

HELD OVER

The site inspection report is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 9 December due to officials been on leave and not being able to implement the final edits.

9.2. Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.2.1 IACom 3 December 2025

9.2.2 BELCom 5 December 2025

9.2.3 HOMS 9 December 2025

9.3 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

None.

9.4 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.4.1 Close-Out: **Erf 13162, 92 Main Road, Paarl, S27-Additions & Alterations (SJ)**

Case No: HWC24011805SJ0129

SUMMARY

- Graded II and within the Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone.
- The restoration of the Victorian villa and construction of new consultation rooms at were completed largely in accordance with the HWC approval dated 06 March 2024.
- Original timber elements were retained and repaired, hardwood floors restored, and the new additions are constructed behind the villa with appropriate landscaping and pergola structures.
- The overall outcome does not negatively affect the Paarl Main Road streetscape or the building's heritage significance.

- Material deviations made during construction include: the inward-sloping roof to the new consultation rooms; partial retention and conversion of a section of the existing garage; introduction of a server/IT room not originally shown; substitution of a planter box in place of the approved steps due to site levels; omission of timber ceiling boards in the reception; and slight alterations to pergola detailing. All deviations were communicated to HWC during construction and are considered non-detrimental.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled “92 Main Road, Paarl”, dated 25 November 2025, and prepared by Lareman Architects, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 06 March 2024.

9.4.2 Close-out report: Erf 874, CP Nel Museum, 3 Baron van Reede Street, Oudtshoorn (CH) Case No.: HWC25082817

SUMMARY

- A Section 27 minor works permit was issued on 9 September 2025 for alterations to the case iron gates and repairing the supporting sandstone columns at the entrance of the CP Nel Museum.
- A condition of the permit was for a close out report to be compiled by a suitably qualified heritage consultant.
- All stones supporting the two columns were removed by hand. I-beams were affixed to each gate along with a custom metal component providing a pivot mechanism for reinforcement and long-term functionality. A reinforced foundation was excavated and poured following which the metal posts were inserted and secured in the foundation. Each stone was carefully shaped to accommodate the newly installed I-beams and this work was carried out by stone masons (located in George). The cap stones were placed back into their position and pointing was done using the correct heritage-appropriate mixture.
- The Committee noted the close out report was prepared by Ms. Carol Jeal on behalf of Heritage Oudtshoorn.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled “CLOSE-OUT REPORT – Repairing of Gate-Supporting Columns”, dated 14 November 2025, and prepared by Carol Jean (obo Heritage Oudtshoorn), as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 9 September 2025.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 9.7.1 | <u>Matters Arising:</u> | 13.8; 13.15 |
| 9.7.2 | <u>New Matters:</u> | 14.7; 14.10 |

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

- | | | |
|-------|-------------------------|---|
| 9.8.1 | <u>Matters Arising:</u> | 13.5.; 13.6; 13.9; 13.12; 13.14; 13.16; 13.17; 13.18; 13.21 |
| 9.8.2 | <u>New Matters:</u> | None. |

9.8.3 Erf 1247, Mont Reve, 43 Regent Road, Sea Point, Cape Town, S34-Emergency Works Case No: HWC25111707SJ1119

CASE SUMMARY

- NHRA Trigger: Structure older than 60 years old.
- 22030411NK0322E: Endorsed HIA: Erven 284, 287, 288 & 289, Canonbury/Mont Reve, Sea Point.
ROD 15 March 2024 (revised proposal by Robert Silke).

- HWC24110659SJ1106: Colonnade collapse (EW): Erf 1247, 43 Regent Road, Sea Point. ROD 18 November 2024 with condition: "2. A revised SDP set indicating the reconstructed colonnade within the approved development must be submitted to HWC within three months of the date of this decision". Applicant submitted revised SDP in fulfilment of condition, and it was explained that it was an oversight from the consultant team.
- The work has started on the development.
- Graded IIIC and outside HPOZ.
- Proposal is for the emergency demolition of the structurally unstable vaulted gable structure (the historical garage) along Clarens Road and the reconstruction of a replica. The structural engineering report recommends demolition and reconstruction.
- Consultation: N/A EW

FOR NOTING

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the emergency application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.
The permit was issued on 26 November 2025.

9.9 Referrals to Committees

9.9.1 Matters Arising: None.

9.9.2 New Matters: 14.5 (IACom); 14.21 (IACom); 14.22 (IACom)

9.10 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising: None.

9.9.2 New Matters: None.

9.11 Archaeological Matters

None.

9.12 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

None.

9.13 Permit deadline:

2 December 2025 @ 15:00.

9.14 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- The create permit function can be used to issue our permits and stamped plans. As such, please use this function going forward instead of the RoD function for issuing of BE application approvals. If it is a S51, please use the RoD function as we are not issuing a permit. Please contact RB if you are struggling with navigating this function. Special thanks to the officers that have provided some feedback on this.
- The e-mailer is still having issues, so a gentle reminder to just let your applicants know as opposed to just relying on the case status change notification on SAHRIS.
- Officers to kindly also go through all their previous cases on SAHRIS to ensure that none of the RoDs are sitting in draft and that they have been published.
- There will be a quick clean-up of cases submitted before HWC launched onto SAHRIS during the week to clean up our incoming submissions dashboard.
- The S49 Appeals draft form will be provided to SAHRIS for building this week.
- The rest of the SAHRIS work, leading with the S35/S36 APM/BGG form, will be done next week for the SAHRIS admin team to enact the required changes.
- Other SAHRIS items, such as the SOPs will be updated accordingly after that.
- There is a plan to have an in office demo in January 2026 to just go over how the officers should be processing and to have a session where questions can be asked, to ultimately ensure that HWC is on the same page about SAHRIS processes and procedures.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1. Erf 13182, Thokozani Street- Diemersfontein Wine Estate, Wellington – HIA: SDP Amendment (CN) Case No: 22042610NK0429E

HELD OVER

The matter is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 9 December 2025.

10.2. Erf 149294-Re, Portswood Ridge, Site C, V&A Waterfront (SJ)

Case No: 18021307AS0214E

SUMMARY

- 2018: HIA for Sites B & C
- IACom 26 November 2018: S38(4) RECORD OF DECISION
"...The Committee does however not believe the proposed Blocks C1 and C2, adhere to the indicators and it is considered that they will visually overwhelm the grouping of villas and diminish its Grade IIIA significance. Blocks C1 and C2 also do not respect the character, scale, grain and significance of Portswood Road, being the gateway of the Waterfront.
In order to mitigate impact on the integrity, and significance, of the grouping of villas, the height of Blocks C1 and C2 shall not exceed that of the adjacent Merchant House, being 28m MSL.
The setback of building C1 from Helen Suzman Boulevard must be increased to line up with the south east facade of Merchant House, in order to maintain the landmark quality of Alfred House at the gateway to the Portswood Precinct.
Vertical breaks or articulation must be introduced to break up the potentially long monolithic bulk of C1 visually as part of the design development process. Façade treatment of this building must remain neutral and it should function as a background building.
Careful consideration must be given to the architectural character, massing and form of C2 to ensure a visually harmonious grouping with the adjacent heritage resources and to reduce its potential visual impact on the adjacent villas."
- Appeals 4 April 2019: S49 RECORD OF DECISION
"The appeal is upheld on condition that:
 - 1. Site Development Plans and elevation proposals which are in accordance with Mr. Macio Miszewski's presentation dated 20 March 2019 presented to the Appeals Committee are submitted to HWC for approval.*
 - 2. Council drawings must be submitted for approval by HWC.*
 - 3. Detailed landscape plans to be submitted for approval by HWC."*
- 14 October 2019: HWC endorsed SDP (Miszewski, 2019).
- 20 April 2021: CoCT approved SDP.
- Site B has been developed and Site C is now to be developed. Site C2 is no longer proposed and only Site C1 will be constructed. The hard and soft landscaping around the Portswood Villas will be expanded in the place of Site C2. Documentation has been submitted in fulfilment of Appeals conditions 2 and 3.
 - SDP for C1: VDMMA drawings (Annex D - condition 2)
 - Landscape Plan for Site C: Yes& Studio (Annex E - condition 3)

COMMENT

The Committee resolved to approve the SDP and Landscape plan as per the drawings numbered 0020 Rev 1; 0000 Rev 1; 0080 Rev 1; 0090 Rev 1; 0100 Rev 1; 0200 Rev 1; 0300 Rev 1; 0400 Rev 1; 0500 Rev 1; 0510 Rev 1; 0600 Rev 1; 0610 Rev 1 and LA_CS_101, dated 19-11-2025 and 06-11-2025, and prepared by VDMMA and Yes& Studio as being substantially in accordance with the previous HWC approved SDP dated 14 October 2019.

10.3. Platteklip Wash Houses Cape Nature PHS (WD)

- WD flagged that she could not attend this site inspection that was requested by SANParks and required clarity on who would be available.
- EJV, SVB, and CSI committed to attending the site inspection.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

None.

12. Discussion of the Agenda

12.1. CH to present on behalf of CN.

12.2. SJ and SB items to be heard first (13.11; 13.7; 13.8; 13.10)

APPROVED

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Multiple Farms, off the R303, Op-die-Berg, Ceres, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26631CSI1110 / HWC20110506CSI1110 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387011>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received for clarification regarding PoP
- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length., S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof;
- Previous case: HWC24032511CSI0819 (endorsed HIA with AIA, PIA and VIA)
- Proposed development: A 240 MWp Utility Scale Solar Photo-Voltaic Power Station in the Koue Bokkeveld, to the north of Ceres including a renewable energy power plant (SPVR 8), a battery energy storage system (BESS), point of connection (PoC), and overhead powerlines.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: No historical structures will be impacted
- Visual impacts: The R303 is a scenic route, powerlines will cut across it, not sure where exactly the power station will be located.
- Archaeology: Lithics and rock art were identified
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is very high and moderate.
- Consultant recommends HIA with AIA, PIA and VIA. Clarification regarding the new HIA has been provided via email, "This is a new application (Basic Assessment), for a proposed Alternative Distribution Line. One of the farmers has pulled out, so the applicant had to design a new route, but its for the same project."

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment
3. Visual Impact Assessment

CSI

13.2 Dorp Street, Oak Trees, Stellenbosch, S27 – Landscaping

Case No: HWC25102708EJV1104

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Katherine Robison, Tammy Leibrandt, and Clive Theunissen were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 21 November 2025
- Graded II
- Inside the Stellenbosch Historic Core
- Work has started and includes the removal and replacement of one tree
- The proposal is to fell 5 English Oak trees along Dorp Street. The trees have been subject to infestation by borer beetle and are no longer alive thereby posing a threat to pedestrians and public property. The trees will be replaced with Turkish Oak
- The municipality has no objection to the removal of these trees, with the proviso that similar mature trees are planted in their place. SHF support the removal but emphasise that new trees must be mature and that the surrounding paving must be designed to ensure adequate water filtration to support long-term health. SHF notes concerns that in the past, removed trees in the historic core were not replaced and were rather paved over. They also raise their concerns

regarding the municipality's reluctance to consult specialists and are therefore not convinced of the municipality's approach being sufficiently informed. SIG has no objection.

- The municipality confirmed in the meeting that Turkish Oak has proven to be the most robust against the borer beetle when compared to other tree species that were investigated for the replacement. Turkish Oak also offers a similar visual impact to the English Oak.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today.

DECISION

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

1. The work must be completed within 6 months of the issuing of this permit.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Katherine Robinson, must be submitted to HWC within 30-days of practical completion.

EJV

13.3 Erf 11-RE, 13 Kus Drive, Kleinbaai, Van Dyks Bay, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25110608EJV1111

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

John Biernacki and Anja Le Roux were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 25 November 2025
- Graded proposed IIIC
- Inside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to demolish the structure on site. The owner intends to sell the property but the structure extends beyond the erf boundaries by 95% onto municipal land and as such the municipality's property management department has objected to the transfer until the encroaching structure has been demolished.
- OHAC oppose the demolition and advise adaptive reuse to be investigated.
- In response, the applicant sought input from J. Biernacki who states that OHAC's comment regarding adaptive re-use carries no merit, since no such realistic 're-use' will be condoned by the municipality. The property is graded 3C and as such its conservation value is deemed to reside in the value of the structures street facing facades and their contextual value to the streetscape(s). However, the facades themselves are entirely prosaic and do not exhibit any features that otherwise might contribute to their conservation value. The original external joinery has been long since replaced in aluminium. In terms of context there is no contiguous streetscape in which the building plays a complementary role as all the adjacent buildings are of disparate and much more modern character. One might speculate that some of the closer buildings are of similar age and at one time they may have collectively exhibited a certain character and sense of place, around the harbour but any such buildings have long since disappeared under modern renovations and infrastructure development. Our contention in favour of demolition therefore is that the building itself does not exhibit sufficient conservation value nor does it play any contextual role in its immediate environs.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today.
- The Municipality confirmed in the meeting that they outright require the total demolition due to its encroachment. John Biernacki confirmed that the encroachment also poses a traffic safety risk as it results in a blind corner for cars along Kus Drive.

DECISION

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

EJV

13.4 Farm 747 Portion 23, Natte Valleij, Adam Tas, Stellenbosch, S38(8) – NID

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 19 November 2025
- Not Graded
- Inside proposed Grade II Landscape Unit; along the R44 scenic route
- Work has been completed
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i), NEMA and WULA
- The proposal is for the 24G rectification of the construction of the Wiesenhof Adventure Park along the Klappmuts River and rehabilitation of the tributaries thereof. Over the past decade, additions to the waterpark have been made inclusive of additional pools, parking, braai areas, and slide. There is further expansion proposed in the form of additional water slides, a pool enlargement, expansion of the parking area, and rehabilitation and reshaping of another section of tributary. Wiesenhof Adventure Park is situated on the western-most section of Portion 23 of Farm Natte Valleij directly adjacent to the R44 from which it is screened by the existing tree line. The historic Natte Valleij werf (IIIA) established in 1715 is approximately 720 metres to the northeast of the Adventure Park. Lievland (Proposed Grade II) is south of the site and the Wiesenhof Legacy Garden (IIIC) is to the east; both of which are screened from the park by existing vegetation. The applicant states that the proposed site is not considered to contain or anticipated to impact any resources of cultural heritage or historical significance. The palaeo-sensitivity is unknown in an area dominated by low and insignificant sensitivity.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

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

EJV

13.5 Erf 57635, 97, 1st Avenue, Claremont, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: HWC25093009SB1009

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: internal works that include demolition of internal walls – very minor internal work.
- Work start: According to the form – no
- Grade: 3C
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: na
- Additional information received 25 November - confirm that no new work has started.

FOR NOTING

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

SB

13.6 Erf 14, 11 Hoog Street, Piketberg, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: HWC25102903SB1030

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: Covered wooden deck with braai and develop a garage
- Work start: According to the form – no
- Grade: not graded - suggested graded of 3C or B (will need committee input)
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: Bergrivier Municipality will not provide a comment before HWC approval.

- Additional information received 20 Nov, email from municipality confirming that they will only comment after HWC decision

FOR NOTING

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

SB

13.7 Erf 635, 211 Voortrekstreet, Swellendam, S34 – Alteration

Case No: HWC25102301SB1028

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: new refuse area and boundary wall
- Work start: According to the form – no
- Grade: 3C/B - depending on committee input
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: Swellendam Municipality and Aesthetics and Conservation Advisory committee support
- Additional information received 14 and 21 November 2025.

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA in terms of Section 34(1). A letter of no trigger to be issued.

SB

13.8 Erf No 1908, Co Bree and Pepperboom Street, McGregor, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25072906CN0801

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Acceptable POP (reflecting the correct reference number) required.

SB

13.9 Farm 1447, 13 Varkens Vlei Road, Philippi, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25082840SB0922

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: four building on site to be demolished – shed like structures.
- Additional information received: 20 November
- Work start: According to the form – no
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: CoCT notes the building as NCW and only one building on site is older than 60years – hence support the demolition.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the total demolition as there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention.

SB

13.10 CA840-1, 829-RE, 656, 1212-RE, Zeekoevlei, Cape Town, S38(8) – NID

Case No: HWC23101723SB1017

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Potable water pipeline to supply the Cape Flats Waste Water Treatment Works (three route alternatives)

- Trigger: Section 38(1)(a) – linear development over 300 m
- Other: NEMA-DEADP
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: Cultural landscape (Philippi Horticultural Area), archaeological occurrences in broader area, but no direct impact expected.
- Archaeology: Unlikely to be impacted due to disturbed pipeline alignment and low archaeological sensitivity of the area.
- Palaeontological: Unlikely to be impacted. Area underlain by Witstrand Formation – moderate sensitivity but proposed works minimal and impacts unlikely.
- Visual/Cultural: None. Pipeline alternatives do not impact the significance or scenic/landscape elements of the PHA.
- Consultant recommends: No Further Studies (NFS)
- Additional information received: 24 November 2025.

FINAL COMMENT

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

SB

13.11 Erf 2134, Chardonnay Deli, 89A Constantia Main Road, Constantia, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25102304SJ1114

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- NHRA Trigger: Structure older than 60 years old.
- Additional Information: Previously ADM supermarket. One of few historical shop buildings remaining in a rural context on Constantia Main Road. Group Areas association. Originally part of Pagasvlei farm. Building contains dwelling with (three) shops adjoining. Internal walling altered.
- The work has started.
- Graded IIIB and outside HPOZ.
- Proposal is for the existing house to be converted to a restaurant. All of the work is complete with the exception of one wall to be demolished.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT EHM: support.
 - CRRA: stamped plans.
 - FoCG: do not comment.
- Outstanding information received on 23 November 2025

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.

SJ

13.12 Erf 245, 5 Jeffcoat Avenue, Bergvliet, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25082903SVB1110

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 21 November 2025.
- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.

- The proposal is for minor alterations to the main dwelling, including a new door with steps, replacement of a window, closing up another door and removal of some internal walls to create an open plan kitchen-dining room.
- CoCT support the proposal.

FOR NOTING

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

SVB

13.13 Erf 424, 65 Market Street, Prince Albert, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25102003SVB1027

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 04 November 2025.
- This application was heard at HOMs on 17 November whereby the committee requested the following further requirements:
 1. The applicant must submit a written response to all comments provided by the PACF, and a set of revised plans should the design be revised to respond to the comments.
- Further requirements received on 24 November 2025. The applicant has provided revised drawings that exclude the 2,1m high windows that the PACF objected to.
- The property is a proposed grade IIIC (Prince Albert Heritage Inventory) and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for various internal and external alterations including new internal walls, alterations to windows and doors.
- PACF partially supports the application. They did not support the proposed new narrow 2,1m high windows in the original north external wall of the NE bedroom, a single window with historically correct proportions would be more appropriate. However, they did support the remaining proposal.
- Prince Albert Municipality referred the application to HWC.
- All I&APs were invited to this meeting.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.14 Erf 647, 41A Church Street, Ladismith, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25100601SVB1021

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 17, 18 & 19 November 2025.
- The grading and HPO is Unknown.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for a bathroom addition to the main dwelling and an extension to the existing cottage to accommodate a new kitchen-dining room, bedroom and bathroom.
- Kannaland Municipality do not object to the proposal.

FOR NOTING

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

SVB

13.15 Farm 2/1119, La Dauphine, Excelsior Road, Franschhoek, S34 – Deviation

Case No: HWC25110808SVB1106

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Consultation with Stellenbosch Interested Group and Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation.

SVB

13.16 Erf 614, 5 Gray Street, Knysna, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No.: HWC25101405CH1020

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 20 November 2025.
- Not graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for an extension to the front of the property over the existing patio and to extend the existing staff lounge/kitchenette at the rear.
- Work has not started.
- Knysna Municipality supports.
- Knysna Historical Society provided comment about the signage and stating that the re-use of existing signage does not automatically imply that the signage was previously approved and therefore does not support the signage. KHS notes the amendments made regarding the horizontal wall cladding.
- Simon van der Stel Foundation supports.

FOR NOTING

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

CH

13.17 Erf 8928, Textile Street, Paarl, S34 – Minor Works

Case No.: HWC25101508CH1021

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 26 November 2025.
- Not graded outside SCPAOZ of Paarl.
- Proposal is for the installation of an internal lift in order to access the first floor from the parking area.
- Work has not started.

FOR NOTING

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

CH

13.18 Erf 1705, 19 Alex Pienaar Street, Strand, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25111307XM1114

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 20 November 2025.
- The proposal is for the construction of a new structure that will extend to the shared boundary with the adjacent Erf 35384 for a proposed new car wash. The garage structure on Erf 35384 is over 60 years old and, although it will not be demolished, our proposed structure on Erf 1705 will be physically connected to it. The side wall of the garage on Erf 35384 currently functions as the boundary wall between the two properties. Please find attached with this application the current

Site Development Plan (SDP) for Erf 1705 in support of this proposed addition. Work has not started.

- Graded IIIC/NCW, Outside the HPO
- CoCT comment: as there is/was no heritage value evident, the City therefore declines its opportunity to comment on this case from a heritage point of view and requests that HWC accepts and concludes this permit application without the City's comment as per
- HRF supports

FOR NOTING

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

XM

13.19 Erf 46356, 4 Irene Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC2510271XM1103

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 21 November 2025.
- The proposal is to regularize the as-built plans for compliance due to unauthorized work. The work includes a deviation from the approved plan Case No. 22052603MS0727E and the as built plans are for the extension of the carport and a covered patio.
- Work has been completed.
- The property is graded IIIC within the HPO
- CoCT supports
- The Newlands Community Improvement District has no objection

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

13.20 Erf 89764, 13 Colyn Road, Kalk Bay, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: HWC25110304XM1104

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 21 November 2025. The proposal is for minor on-site deviations that took place during the execution of works approved under a Heritage Western Cape permit was issued dated 30 March 2021 HWC Case No. 19100104TZ0303E. During construction, a number of minor alterations were implemented on site at the request of the client. These included small adjustments to internal layouts, window and door openings to address on-site construction constraints and improve overall functionality. All works were undertaken under professional supervision and are considered to remain consistent with the approved heritage intent and conditions of the HWC permit. Following completion of the works, the City of Cape Town Building Inspector, Mr Quentin Carelse conducted a site inspection as part of the Occupancy Certificate process. During this inspection, it was observed that several minor deviations existed between the approved drawings and the completed works. The Building Inspector advised that as-built drawings be compiled and submitted to Heritage Western Cape (HWC) for review and acceptance and ensuring that the as-built condition is formally recorded, in order to fulfil the requirements and to enable the City to finalise the occupancy process.

- Work has been completed.
- Accordingly, this report serves to:
 - Record the as-built condition of the property;
 - Assess the heritage impact of the works already undertaken; and
 - Motivate for HWC's acceptance of the as-built drawings, confirming that the works remain consistent with the approved design intent and that their impact is limited and acceptable within the heritage context.
- The property is graded IIIC within the HPO

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

13.21 Erf 954, Unit 207, 305 Beach Road, Sea Point, S34 – Minor Works **Case No:** HWC25110607XM1110

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 24 November 2025.
- The proposal is for additions and alterations for the enclosure of the balcony with aluminium glass windows.
- Work has not started
- The property is graded IIIC not within the HPO
- CoCT supports
- SFB supports

FOR NOTING

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

XM

13.22 Erf 1001, 11 Woodside Drive, Pinelands, S34 – Minor Works **Case No:** HWC25101702XM1106 Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 25 November 2025.
- The proposal is for minor work application which includes repair of internal and external wall cracks, securing existing roof trusses, repainting the house and roof.
- Work has not started.
- Graded IIIB, outside HPOZ.

DECISION

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

XM

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 8709, Via Main Road – St Peter's La Roche, Paarl, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26716CH1118 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387287>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal for a mixed used development comprising of 4 portions. A school is proposed on portion 1 (0.65ha - this is an expansion of the currently applied development of school which is in the process of HIA – SAHRIS case 25722). Portion 2 will consist of housing units (8.5ha). Portion 3 will consist of apartments (0.7ha). Portion 4 will be mixed use.
- The development has not started.
- The current land use is agricultural and a temporary school. The farm is no longer used for agricultural purposes.
- The site is within the urban edge of Paarl according to the May 2024/2025 Drakenstein MSDF and is earmarked for urban infill development. The expansion of the urban edge will allow for urban development to expand towards parts of Northern Paarl.
- Previous applications:
- (1) NID was tabled at HOMs on 18 July 2022 for the proposed mixed-use development. HOMs resolved to request an HIA with a AIA, BEA and VIA on the CL. Note: this HIA has not yet been submitted to HWC. The previously requested HIA was queried with the applicant and he responded stating that the scope (extent) and context (now located within the urban edge) is different to the 2022 application. The previous HIA was done and the RNID has to be withdrawn.
- (2) NID application for a proposed school. HOMs requested a HIA with a VIA. HIA was tabled at HOMs on 10 November 2025 (case no.: 383596CN1030; <https://sahris.org.za/node/383596>) to rezone the site from Agriculture Zone to Community Use Zone and for the development of a school. The HIA was referred to IACom on 3 December 2025.
- Heritage Resources Identified:
 - There is a formal werf of site with structures of heritage significance. These structures include the mid-19th century original house and outbuildings, a modest house (NCW), two workers houses (NCW) and the 1900s Victorian Villa (proposed Grade II). The site has historical and aesthetic significance particularly due to its position along Paarl's Main Road.
 - The street interface of the farm has been an integral part of the Noorder-Paarl townscape for over a century and is still today part of the gateway into the town from the north. This also forms part of the Scenic Route of the Paarl landscape.
 - The property forms part of the landscape setting of the town of Paarl. Reference was made to the adjacent residential development on Erf 8724 and where HWC required the 210m extension of the vineyard fronting to R45 to retain the cultural landscape along Main Road.
 - There is no known historical or contextual evidence to suggest the presence of archaeological material on the subject property. An archaeological study was done in 2022 by Agency for Cultural Resource Management for the neighbouring erf.
 - The subject property falls within a moderate sensitivity area and therefore may require a palaeontological desktop study for the proposed school development. However, all soils have been significantly disturbed by agricultural activities over the past 100 years, making the likelihood of finding any fossils highly unlikely.
 - There are no known historical or contextual evidence to suggest the presence of archaeological material on the subject property. An AIA was prepared in 2022 for the neighbouring Erf and found that the area does not appear to be a sensitive archaeological landscape. An AIA was prepared in 2008 for the neighbouring Erf (Erf 8724). The findings of the report noted isolated stone artefacts. The AIA concluded that it was unlikely that the neighbouring development would disturb any significant archaeological and palaeontological materials as the significance was rated as low
- Summary of impacts according to the NID: The proposed rezoning and development will not impact

any heritage structures. The proposed school buildings will be well back from the Main Road and the werf area, ensuring minimal visual intrusion and the residential developments will be gradient behind the historic werf. The site falls within the Urban Edge (2025 SDF), earmarked for urban infill.

- The site is located in a Scenic Route Overlay Zone.
- The heritage development indicators are outlined in Section 7 of the motivation report - pages 25 to 28. The indicators relate to respecting the historic werf's visual legacy from Main Road, avoiding urbanisation treatments in design and infrastructure, reinforcing the hierarchy of the historic werf, building form, massing and roofscape, architectural language and materiality and townscape design
- Heritage Practitioner recommends HIA with townscape assessment and VIA.

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Townscape Assessment
2. Visual Impact Assessment on the Cultural Landscape
3. Any relevant and associated Heritage Impact Assessments and their findings conducted in the past must be included and referenced in this assessment.

CH

14.2 Portion 6 of Farm Klein Constantia No.1121, Klein Constantia Road, Constantia, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26741CH1119 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387375>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Site is graded IIIA inside the Constantia Winelands Cultural Landscape.
- Proposal is for additions and alterations to the Klein Constantia Winery, new paved parking area (2540sqm) with an access road (770sqm), upgrading the existing concrete bridge and walkway, new timber decks (68sqm and 46sqm) and a water feature (500mm deep). The work to the winery includes new windows, internal alterations to the bathrooms, a new freezer and cold room. The winery is not older than 60 years. The proposed parking area will alter the existing grassed area.
- Site earthworks will take place comprising of approximately 375m³ of cut below the G5 layer within the parking area and approximately 155m³ for the road footprint.
- Previous applications:
 - (1) S34 permit for the extension of the loft - 22050317SJ0621E.
 - (2) S34 permit for minor deviations to loft extension - HWC23060902MS0623
- Heritage resources identified:
 - The 1790s historic homestead.
 - The Constantia Winelands Cultural Landscape
- Summary of anticipated impacts:
 - The existing material language of the farm should not be compromised.
 - The existing significant trees and gardens to not be negatively impacted.
 - The visual impact of the proposed parking should be considered.
- The heritage practitioner recommends NFS

COMMENT

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

CH

14.3 Erf 13183-RE, Corner Jan Van Riebeeck Drive and Bo Dal Road, Wellington, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 387397CN1120 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387397>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item on behalf of Ms Corne Alexander.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger(s): S38(1)(c) and S38(1)(d)
- Decision making authority: HWC

- Development footprint is approx. 7.5ha in extent. The current land use is vacant and the surrounding land uses are residential and farms to the north and east from the site.
- Proposal: To rezone the property from Neighbourhood Business to Subdivisional Area and be subdivided into:
- Portions 1 – 11 : Neighbourhood Business Zone
- Portions 12 – 13 : Transport Zone
- Consent Use will be sought to enable portions 9 – 11 to be utilised for warehousing purposes. The development is noted as being located within the urban edge.
- Heritage resources:
- Buildings: The closest heritage resource is the Diemersfontein historic homestead which, in terms of the most recently approved HIA, is, with its garden setting, graded IIIA in a IIIC werf (22042610NK0429E). Impact: None
- Archaeo-sensitivity: None listed.
- Paleo-sensitivity: Blue - no palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required.
- Consultant recommendation: No identified impacts to heritage resources - NFS
- Heritage Considerations: The property is deemed NCW. The development is seen as urban infill, not located in an HPO, scenic route, nor a declared cultural landscape. No impacts on any heritage resources.

DECISION

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

CN

14.4 Erf 38552-RE, 155 Steve Biko Road, Khayelitsha, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 387400CN1120 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387400>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item on behalf of Ms Corne Alexander

DISCUSSION

- Trigger(s): S38(1)(c)(i) and (ii), S38(1)(d)
- Decision making authority: HWC
- Property: Measures approx. 2.8ha in extent, with a current land use of vacant and illegal encroachments. The surrounding land uses are residential.
- Proposal: For a subsidised housing development on the property.
- Heritage resources:
- No resources were listed by the applicant.
- Archaeo-sensitivity: There has been no HIA's undertaken in the surrounding area. Impact: Nil to low
- Palaeo-sensitivity: Red - field assessment and protocol for finds is required and Green - desktop study is required. Impact: Unsure
- Consultant recommendation: NFS
- Heritage Considerations: There are no heritage resources close to the site nor is the property situated within an HPO or scenic route. No impacts.

DECISION

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

CN

14.5 Farm 123-RE, Via R302, Klipfontein Road – Bella Riva, Durbanville, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: HWC24090205CN1121

CASE SUMMARY

- HOMs on 14 October 2024 requested an HIA with a VIA on the CL.
- Proposal: For a mixed-use development (retail, residential) and Bella Riva mixed-use development, as well as associated infrastructure including a pipeline, access road, bridge, schools, electrical sub-

station and public and private open space.

- Heritage Resources Identified:
 - The project site forms part of the broader agricultural cultural landscape. The southwestern section, occupied by Braams Voerkrale, contains a farmstead established before 1938, with a small number of older structures and later additions. Only a few structures and mature trees hold cultural significance; most buildings are assessed as NCW. The structures identified as significant have historic, associative, and aesthetic value, supporting a Grade IIIB recommendation. The site does not fall within any proposed or declared HPO.
 - Palaeontological sensitivity is low and within the blue overlay on SAHRIS.
 - A 2008 AIA for Portions 1 and 2 of Farm 123 identified one low-density Early Stone Age artefact scatter of low heritage significance, likely disturbed by ploughing. No mitigation or further archaeological work was recommended.
- Heritage Assessment:
 - a) The Layout Plan is recommended for approval. The urban design indicators have informed the layout plan, taking the proposed and intended development to inform the indicators.
 - b) Further comments on the application:
 - SWMP ponds fall within Public Open Spaces and must be integrated with recreational areas.
 - Higher-density mixed-use development on the eastern edge is supported due to the likely airport expansion.
 - A registered Urban Designer must design each precinct to ensure high-quality outcomes and guide development parcels and Local Architectural Guidelines.
 - The MDSF should be minimally revised to align public realm and open space zones with the Master Landscape Framework and Urban Design report.
 - The Master Landscape Framework must be expanded with clearer design character, tree identification, and detailed landscaping for all precincts and boundaries.
 - The HOA should include built-environment professionals to guide decisions on architectural control.
 - More than one Controlling Architect is recommended.
 - Western boundary development must create an appropriate transition to agricultural land, informed by the Master Landscape Framework.
- Heritage Design Indicators:
 - 1. Urban Design:
 - a. Complete Streets
 - b. Public Realm
 - c. Squares & Piazzas
 - d. Built Form
 - 2. Cultural Landscape:
 - a. Structuring Elements and Precincts
 - b. Routes
 - c. Public Transport
 - d. Residential Principles
 - e. High Density Residential Zones
 - f. Medium Density Residential Zones
 - g. Low Density Residential Zones
 - h. Mixed Use Zones
 - i. Business Zones
 - j. Education Zone
 - k. Public Realm Zone
 - l. Public Parks
 - m. Open Space / Buffer Zone
 - n. Architectural Building Guidelines
 - o. Landscape Framework Plan
 - p. Lighting
 - q. Signage

- q. Existing Buildings, structures and associated trees.
- VIA:
 - The proposed high-density development will have a high visual impact on the surrounding rural character and nearby receptors, including at night due to increased lighting. Strong visual mitigation is essential. Extensive, rural-character landscaping is required to screen the development from sensitive receptors while still providing quality outward views for residents. Internal landscaping must soften and visually absorb the high-density built form so it does not detract from local or regional scenic quality. If the mitigation measures outlined in Section 9 and the HIA are fully implemented and monitored, visual impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT: Assessment:
 - The proposed conceptual mixed-use redevelopment which includes residential and utility components will change the character of the site and will result in the site losing its rural cultural character. However, the surrounding properties are subject to previously approved developments and encroaching urban sprawl (i.e. Cape Winelands Airport in the east & Greenville in the south).
 - The HIA adequately identifies the known heritage resources on site.
 - The gradings of the structures of Voerkrale as indicated on page 42 to 51 are noted.
- The findings of the Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) dated 2008 by ACO Associates are noted.
- The HIA does not reference previous heritage impact assessment(s) associated with the previous Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) other than the above archaeological study.
- The heritage indicators, on Page 81 of the HIA, that relates to the visual and spatial impacts are supported. The mitigation strategies and management of the retained structures are not included in the heritage design indicators and should be addressed. It is recommended that the management and integration of the retained heritage structures should be addressed in the Phase 2 conceptual design and proposal.
- The recommendations on Page 117 of the HIA, are supported and it is recommended that the following recommendation be included:
- Any demolition and alterations to structures older than 60 years require a Section 34 permit from Heritage Western Cape (HWC).
- EMD will provide detailed comment on the Landscape Plan during the required land use management application.
- DHS did not comment within 30 days.
- HIA Recommendations: Pages 4 & 5 of Executive Summary and page 117 of HIA:
 - This HIA be endorsed by HWC as meeting the requirements contained in the Response to the NID, dated 15 October 2024.
 - The statement of cultural significances and the heritage design indicators proposed in the report be accepted.
 - The specialist studies Visual Impact assessment (2024) and Archaeological Impact Assessment (2008) are recommended for approval.
 - The Urban Design Guidelines, dated September 2025 be approved and are used to inform the further detail of each precinct, route, and sub precinct.
 - The Architectural Guidelines dated September 2025 are approved.
 - The Development Framework layout and densities are approved. HWC require the following documents to be revised and resubmitted to HWC prior to the issue of the HWC Final Comment:
 - The MDSF can be minimally revised according to the recommendation: 'The development of the Public Transit Zone, Public Realm Zone, Public Park Zone and Open Space will be done in terms of the principles in the HWC future approved Master Landscape Framework and the recommendations of the Urban Design report'.
 - The Master Landscape Framework should be expanded upon to include more information and specific design character on each use precinct, streetscapes, and site boundaries. This document should be produced by a registered Landscape Architect with strong design skills and competent in the scale and complexity of this project. All retained and removed trees require identification

on this Landscape Plan. The landscaping of each route, precinct and sub precinct, and site boundaries should be clearly informed by this Masterplan. This Landscape Plan to be resubmitted to HWC for approval.

- The composition of the Homeowners Association should include built environment professional/s to be able to assess the Controlling Architect/s proposals and recommendations and guide the HOA to the best decision making.
- More than one Controlling Architect is a preferred structure for the future development control.
- The design of the development on the western boundary is important to create a suitable spatial transition to the agricultural farmland environment. This approach should be within the Master Landscape Framework.
- The management and integration of the retained heritage structures should be addressed in the Phase 2 conceptual design and proposal and be resubmitted to HWC for approval.
- Any demolition and alterations to structures older than 60 years require a Section 34 permit from HWC.
- If any changes are proposed for the Development Framework or/and the densities and uses of each precinct, a resubmission to HWC is required.
- The following visual assessment mitigation measure are to be included in the EIA
- EMPPr: During Construction Activities:
 - Survey and demarcate no-go areas to restrict earthworks and minimize disturbance and Limit extent of damage, keeping cut and fill to a minimum visual scarring. Only work in areas where construction is going to happen immediately.
 - Limit extent of damage, keeping cut and fill to a minimum. Minimise disturbance through fencing off construction areas, thereby protecting and retaining grass and vegetation in the areas that will not be built on.
 - Minimise disturbance visual scarring. Only work in areas where construction is going to happen immediately.
 - Revegetate service areas and public street verges immediately after construction and continue maintenance eternally.
- During Operational Activities:
 - It is of importance that the Visual Mitigation measures provided are carried through into the operation phase of the development. Responsibilities shift from the Developer to the Homeowners Association (HOA), with the following process procedures:
 - Homeowners Association (HOA) have an Operational Plan that clearly states their obligations in terms of ongoing maintenance of buildings and landscaping and that the maintenance actions comply with the architectural and landscaping guidelines provided for this Visual Impact Assessment and this VIA's mitigation measures.
 - HOA monitor the building and landscape guidelines for the individual erven
 - HOA maintain buildings and landscaping to a high standard.
 - HOA continue minimizing light pollution – restrict street light height to maximum 3m, luminaires must be top covered, low spill type lights to minimize light spill and pollution, keep outdoor lighting as bollard lighting, external lighting on buildings must be minimised or completely omitted etc.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 21 January 2026 due to HWC delegations.

CN

14.6. Various Erven, along Wellington Road & Lubbe Street, Durbanville, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 387316CN1118 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387316>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item on behalf of Ms Corne Alexander

DISCUSSION

- Trigger(s): S38(1)(a)
- Decision making authority: HWC
- Property: The development footprint is approx. 3000sqm in extent. The current land use is public roads and parking. The surrounding land uses are residential.

- Proposal: Installing 3km+ of 11kv cable infrastructure along the various properties.
- Heritage resources:
- No heritage resources listed by the applicant.
- Archaeo-sensitivity: Studies in the areas was for the R302 and the residential developments to the north east. Impact: None.
- Palaeo-sensitivity: Blue - no palaeontological studies are required however a protocol for finds is required
- Consultant recommendation: NFS
- Heritage Considerations: The area of development is surrounded with NCW properties. No impacts to heritage resources.

DECISION

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

CN

14.7. Various Erven, Diesel Road, Maitland, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 387455CN1121/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/387455>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Government Resolution required

CN

14.8. Erven 3 and 5, Paardekraal Road, Hartenbos, Mossel Bay, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26725CSI1118 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387327>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length.
- Proposed development: dune stabilisation and implementation of coastal erosion control measures consisting of the replacement of gabions with 6-8 layers of Geo containers/sandbags, wheelchair and concrete ramps, and the replacement of stormwater pipes during phase two, phase four, phase five, and phase seven.
- Current zoning/land-use: Open Space
- Built environment: Given the location of the study area along the high-water mark of the sea, the only structures located within the direct proximity of the study area include modern pedestrian walkways, slipways, parking, campsites, ablution facilities and landscape areas, none of which include structures older than 60 years and/or of any local cultural significance.
- Visual impacts: With the exception of early buildings, road alignments, the railway line etc., early traditional landscape patterns gradually dissolved owing to continuous urban expansion over several decades since. As such, the proposal would have no negative impact from this perspective. The proposed work is along sand dunes and no visual impact is expected.
- Archaeology: A desktop study was undertaken by Dr Lita Webley in which she recommends that the replacement of the -gabions is not expected to impact in situ archaeological material and that evidence of archaeological material might only become evident once the gabions are removed hence the chance and accidental finds protocol should be included in the EMP.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is unknown. The study area forms part of dynamic coastal strip, constantly impacted through tidal action and periodic storm events, which had furthermore been transformed through earthworks and construction related to the installation of various infrastructure and coastal protection works along the coast. It is therefore considered unlikely that further palaeontological studies would be warranted in this instance.
- Consultant recommends NFS

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and HWC Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPR and Environmental Authorisation.

CSI

14.9. Portion 236 of Farm 195, Farm Kraai Bosch, off Knysna Road, George, S38(4) – NID

Case No: 26768CSI1121 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387461>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Corlie Smart was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent
- Proposed development: Replacement of existing camping stands with 72 new chalets and the repurposing of an existing ablution facility into a guest lounge and entertainment area.
- Current zoning/land-use: Resort
- Built environment: None of the structures on site are older than 60 years, the caravan park was established 40 years ago.
- Visual impacts: Surrounding land-use is residential and agricultural in nature. The site is located within the urban edge. The proposed development will have minimal visibility, as the resort is effectively screened by the existing overnight rooms and natural vegetation, including large trees.
- Archaeology: An AIA was conducted on the adjacent site in 2006 and identified no significant pre-colonial archaeological material requiring mitigation in relation to the proposed development activities. Only minor earthworks will be required to level the ground for the new units.
- Palaeontology: The palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is unknown, however, no impacts are expected because of the minimal earthworks.
- Consultant recommends NFS

FINAL DECISION

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

CSI

14.10. Portion 43 of Farm 72, off the Old R43 Road, Caledon, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: HWC25073004CSI0808

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Proof of consultation, unabridged comments required.

CSI

14.11. Portion 5 of Farm 202, Farm Rietrivier, Op-die-Berg, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26740CSI1119 / HWC25111407CSI1119 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387373>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length., (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
- Proposed development: construction of both the enlargement of Helpmekaar Dam and a small new buffer dam with its accompanying ± 2km connecting pipeline as well as an agricultural expansion
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: No identified structures older than 60 years
- Visual impacts: Surrounding land use is agricultural, dam expansion and buffer dam would have no visual impact.
- Archaeology: Possible rock art close to the dam expansion and proposed buffer dam
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is very high. According to Professor Bamford, some the site is on very highly sensitive rocks of the Bokkeveld Group but the land is ploughed or

disturbed so a desktop with fossil chance find protocol should work

- Consultant recommends HIA with AIA and PIA

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment

CSI

14.12. Portion 71 of Farm 444, Farm Ganse Vallei, Bitou, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26700CSI1117 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387237>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent
- Proposed development: upgrade of the Gansevallei WWTW which aims to increase capacity, enhance operational efficiency, and ensure compliance with environmental regulations, supporting sustainable wastewater management and meeting the growing demand in the region
- Current zoning/land-use: WWTW
- Built environment: The Old Nick complex of 1860s structures lies just east of the site but will not be affected in any way.
- Visual impacts: Given that the site is an existing WWTW and that the upgrades will take place on old farmland within the bounds of the existing facility, no impacts to surface heritage resources are expected.
- Archaeology: A site inspection showed most of the site to be sandy/soily which shows why it was previously farmed. However, along the southern edge there was a small road cutting which had a gravel layer just below the surface (see attached photograph). Careful inspection of this did not yield any artefacts. A taller section could not be properly examined because the relevant deposit was too high up. Given the geology with the valley dominated by a sandy fill, significant archaeology is not expected to be present here.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is very high. With deep excavations for new treatment facilities, there is a reasonable likelihood of impacts to fossils.
- Consultant recommends HIA with PIA

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Palaeontological Impact Assessment

CSI

14.13. Erf 1667, Remskoek Street, Hoekwil, Wilderness, S38(4) – NID

Case No: 26731EJV1111 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387345>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(d).
- The proposal is to rezone 2.2 hectares of the site for the development of 3 tourist accommodation units (2 as-built) and the conversion of the existing studio to a second dwelling as well as the establishment of a conservation area. The site is a smallholding in Wilderness Heights with existing structures and accommodation units - the proposal therefore does not pose a change in character. Notable landmarks in the area include the Map of Africa lookout point just over a kilometre further south, and the site is not located along the coastline. The SAHRIS palaeo-map indicates low

sensitivity.

- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL DECISION

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

EJV

14.14. Farm 1166-RE, L'Ormarins, Franschhoek, S38(4) – SDP Amendment

Case No: HWC25010911EJV0110 / 26767EJV1121 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387460>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded Proposed II
- Inside the Dwars Valley IIIB Landscape Unit and below the R45 scenic route
- Work has not started
- HOMs in February 2025 requested an HIA with VIA for the proposed construction of a second dwelling on a portion of the historic L'Ormarins farm complex 100m north and downhill from the manor house replacing a fruit orchard. Following a site inspection, in August 2025 HOMs resolved to approve the HIA titled "Heritage Impact Assessment Report for a Second Dwelling", dated July 2025, and prepared by Christine Havenga, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), with specific reference to the recommendations on page 63 of the HIA
- The proposal has since been downscaled from 635m² to 600m² resulting in the removal of two bedrooms on the south-west elevation to comply with the provisions of the Stellenbosch Zoning Scheme necessitating the submission of an SDP amendment application.
- L'Ormarins falls within the "Equestrian Precinct" of the Dwars Valley Landscape Character Area characterised by high historic, ecological, aesthetic, and scenic significance with historic homestead and werfs with established gardens and avenues. The site is bisected by the Franschhoek Railway Line and the surrounding land-uses are predominantly agricultural, with Bridgehouse and guesthouses to the east and Boschendal to the west. The northern portion of the farm closest to the R45 Rural Scenic Route houses the Franschhoek Motor Museum, Drakenstein Stud, the L'Ormarins Winery, and the Anthonij Rupert Wines Head Office. The farm complex on the southern portion consists of the historical farm werf and original manor house, a secondary werf functioning as a distillery, a cellar built in 2004, three outbuildings, a wine room, the historic cellar, a storage cellar, a utilitarian storage building, an axial entrance avenue, parterre garden and orchard. The area is heavily treed and the patterns of cultivated fields, gardens, and dams is a marked contrast to the mountain wilderness beyond. It affords expansive views over the Dwars River Valley and Simonsberg Mountain and represents a significant farm complex and several landscape features. There is little remaining evidence for precolonial settlement of the area, but there is a rich and documented history of colonial settlement extending from the French Huguenots.
- Heritage indicators were proposed for the development inclusive of visual fit, setbacks, landscape features, accidental finds, the integrity of the werf, the spatial hierarchy, the axial orthogonal geometry of the homestead, existing planting patterns, utilisation of existing geometrics, and the height, apertures, and colours of the new structure.
- It was determined that the position of the second dwelling is obscured from the historic werf by mature tree lanes so that the height and roofscape do not visually intrude on the cultural landscape. The proposed dwelling is aligned with the east/west axis of the existing vegetable garden, and mimics the H shape of the manor house in form and footprint and has the same width as the existing outbuildings. The scale, proportion, form, materiality, and style are considered sympathetic to the historic werf while not attempting to mimic it. The structure as well as the proposed location in general complies with the proposed heritage indicators and is considered to be visually congruent with the historical context and sensitive heritage receptors on the bigger historical site. When assessing the SDP amendment against the indicators, the compliance remained congruent and the recommendations of the VIA remain incorporated into the final design.

- In response to the HIA, SIG had no objection and the municipality supported.
- The consultant recommends no further studies for the SDP amendment as indicated on drawings
 - Drawing A000, dated 21 May 2025
 - Drawing A100, dated 21 May 2025
 - Drawing A1-C101, dated 19 November 2025
 - Drawing A1-C102, dated 19 November 2025
 - Drawing A1- C103, dated 19 November 2025
 - Drawing A1-C104, dated 19 November 2025
 - Drawing A105, dated 21 May 2025
 - Drawing A106, dated 21 May 2025

FINAL DECISION

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. The revised SDP, as indicated on the drawings listed below, is substantially in accordance with the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) titled “Heritage Impact Assessment Report for a Second Dwelling”, dated July 2025, and prepared by Christine Havenga approved on 5 August 2025:

- Drawing A000, dated 21 May 2025
- Drawing A100, dated 21 May 2025
- Drawing A1-C101, dated 19 November 2025
- Drawing A1-C102, dated 19 November 2025
- Drawing A1- C103, dated 19 November 2025
- Drawing A1-C104, dated 19 November 2025
- Drawing A105, dated 21 May 2025
- Drawing A106, dated 21 May 2025

EJV

- 14.15. Farm 216 Portion 192, Uitzicht, Captain W.A. Duthie Avenue, Brenton On Lake, Knysna, S38(8) – NID**
Case No: 26723EJV1118 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387318>
 Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(d) and NEMA and LUPO
- The proposal is to rezone the entire property for the development of stilted cabins, a main dwelling structure, shed, maintenance house, and ancillary infrastructure such as internal roads and services via two alternatives. The site is primarily vacant apart from the foundations of modern structures and mature palm trees, and is bounded by agricultural vacant land to the east and low density single residential developments to the south as well as tourism-oriented establishment in the area. The site falls along the route of the railway line constructed between 1924 and 1928 between George and Knysna currently in disuse following landslides in 2006. In terms of cultural landscape, the site no longer evidences sensitive landscape features and the proposal is not expected to impact the landscape features of the environs. In terms of archaeology, there are only 2 AIAs that engage with the archaeology of the Brenton on Lake area of Knysna - a 2004 ACO assessment observed very sparse scatters of ESA and MSA lithics and a 2007 Nilssen assessment yielded no trace of pre-historic or historical archaeological resources. Nilssen pointed out that the area around the lake does not contain any suitable protein resources, in the form of marine shellfish, for prehistoric hunter-gatherers. The dense vegetation around this section of the lake also makes access difficult. Changes in the level of the lake during the maximum high of the mid-Holocene sea level during the prehistoric past would have impacted coastal settlements. Archaeological sites are more likely to be located on the coast or at a higher elevation, rather than along the shores of the lake. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates unknown sensitivity; however, given the location of the property along the shorelines of the Knysna River estuary, it is reasonable assume that soil conditions as well as landscape characteristics on and around the property would have been shaped over an extended period of time through ecological processes, including e.g. tidal action and

changing sea levels. We are therefore not convinced that a palaeontological study would be warranted in this instance.

- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and HWC Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMP and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.16. Farm 419, Mossel Bay, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26759EJV1121 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387442>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a), (c)(i), and NEMA.
- The proposal is to develop the Garden Route Gas to Power Project inclusive of a combine cycle gas turbine power plant, an associated grid connection, gas and/or auxiliary fuel pipelines, and water supply infrastructure via two alternatives. The facility is expected to connect to the Eskom high voltage Transmission Network via a substation and overhead power line to the adjacent Gourikwa Substation, as well as up to 15km of overhead power lines (1 existing and 1 or 2 new) to the Eskom Proteus Substation. Three power line corridor alternatives are being considered as part of the EIA process. The SAHRIS palaeo-map indicates a full scope of sensitivity from insignificant to very high. Previous AIAs in the area have noted archaeological resources spanning from the ESA to the colonial period inclusive of prehistoric human burials. The site is within relatively close proximity of Cape St Blaize and Pinnacle Point and falls within an area of high archaeological sensitivity. The proposed development is not located within a South African Protected Area, but does fall within the Gouritz Cluster Biosphere Reserve (GCBR). The GCBR was recognised in 2015 by UNESCO and falls under the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas World Heritage Site (CFRPA). The proposed development, however, does not fall in the CFRPA area of the reserve.
- Consultant recommends an HIA with AIA, PIA, and VIA

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment
3. Visual Impact Assessment

EJV

14.17. Erf 171555, Athlone, S38(1) – NID

Case No: HWC25050905RB1121 / 26766RB1121 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387457>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Application submitted in terms of S38(1) with S38(1)(a) being triggered.
- Site is the Vygekraal Muslim Cemetery of which the historic core is graded as IIIA by the CoCT.
- Falls outside of any HPO but the CoCT grading notes on City Maps notes that the cemetery extends well beyond the historic core today.
- Palaeo is blue/low.
- The proposal is for the construction of a new 2m tall boundary wall/fence with some palisade fencing between the brick columns for permeability, and a building of which one side will be used for storage and the other as a garage.

- The boundary wall will follow the existing boundary wall's footprint and the building is proposed on a parking area in front of a building which has no marked graves.
- The cemetery is of high social significance to the local Muslim community as it is associated with cultural and religious activity and is significant to public memory relating to living heritage. The continuing use of the site is of significant importance to the local community as religious practice dictates deceased family members be buried in the same cemetery as their ancestors, and in close proximity to their places of residence and mosque attendance.
- The applicant, an architect, recommends no further studies.
- It must be noted that the density of burials is quite high and although the proposed construction does not currently fall on areas of known graves, any earthworks near this cemetery, especially given its age and density, needs to be given extra consideration.
- The existing boundary wall had graves right up against it and these need to be mitigated.
- The Committee debated the matter at length and resolved that the best way to ensure that the living heritage aspects of the use of the site would actually be best covered by an AIA given that graves would likely be impacted.

DECISION

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment consisting of a Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey of the development footprint.
2. Consultation must be inclusive of the Muslim Cemetery Board and the Muslim Judicial Council.

RB

14.18. Erf 306, Jacobsbaai, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26724RB1118 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387326>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(c) triggered.
- The proposed development on Erf 306, Jacobsbaai, entails the establishment of a retirement village comprising 32 one-storey units arranged as a cohesive architectural entity around a central communal open space. Each unit will be occupied by a retiree or pensioner, or by a family including a retiree, in line with the definition of a retirement village and group housing under the Saldanha Bay Municipality Integrated Zoning Scheme By-law.
- The development footprint is 2871m², with additional landscaped communal areas providing open space, recreational facilities, and a central clubhouse. The proposal includes supporting infrastructure such as parking, refuse collection, and staff accommodation.
- The total area of the Erf is 2.2367 Ha of which 5371m² will be developed, including the roads and parking.
- The property is currently zoned Smallholding, and an application for rezoning to Residential Zone II with consent use approval is underway to enable the retirement village. The design and layout are intended to be harmonious with the existing low-density, rural-coastal character of Jacobsbaai, ensuring minimal visual and heritage impact.
- Palaeosig for the development is red/high.
- Applicant, a town planner, recommends no further studies.
- As the proposal entails only some trenching for foundations for single storey developments, and will likely contain backfill for the landscaping, the high palaeosignificance is not too big of a concern. This area has a relatively high archaeological significance, but there is nothing noted on this site so chance finds should suffice. Architecturally, the SDP shows a style that mimics the general Jacobsbaai/West Coast fishermen village feel and from a townscape perspective, this is located on the edge of the entrance to the town, so the rural change is a big change but one that seems to suit the character of the area.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

RB

14.19. Portions 13 and 45 of Farm Driefontein No 29, Philadelphia, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 26761RB1121 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387449>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- S38(1)(c) triggered according to the applicant.
- The applicant intends to expand the existing chicken broiler facilities.
- The 20 existing broiler houses were constructed prior to 1998. Environmental Authorisation was granted on 13 November 2006 for 4 additional chicken houses and a retention pond of 5000 litres capacity on Portion 45 of the Farm Driefontein No 29.
- Existing infrastructure on the farm includes the following:
 - Twenty four chicken broiler houses
 - Shaded Parking Area
 - Work areas
 - Office space
 - Staff housing
 - Retention pond
- The proposed expansion will entail the following:
 - Six new chicken houses of 125m long and 16m wide
- Palaeosig is low.
- No structures on the property are older than 60 years and there are no heritage resources identified.
- The broader area has some scatters of ESA and MSA artefacts but nothing formal.
- Applicant recommends NFS.
- Given the scale of the development, the Committee does not see a change in character.

COMMENT

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

RB

14.20. Portion 45 of Farm 159, Meerendal Farm, Durbanville, S38(4) – HIA

Case No: HWC23112104SB1124

HELD OVER

The case officer was on study leave when the HIA was submitted and will be heard at the next HOMS sitting, on 9 December 2025.

SB

14.21. Erf 17321, Rupert Museum Arts Quarter, Corner of Dorp Street and Strand Road (R44), Stellenbosch, S38(4) – HIA

Case No: 25620SJ0708 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/383243>

CASE SUMMARY

- NHRA Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site; (i) exceeding 5000sqm in extent.
- Approximate Development Footprint: 2.1542 ha
- Current Land Use: Undeveloped
- Current Zoning: Special Business
- Land Use of surrounding properties: Rupert Museum (IIIC), Mixed-Use, Undeveloped
- Grading and HPOZ: Graded IIIB and inside Stellenbosch Historic Core.

- Original NID (22.07.25): HIA with Townscape Assessment; Landscape Assessment & Visual Impact Assessment.
- Site, Context and History: Erf 17321 is located at the gateway to Stellenbosch's historic core, forming a green forecourt to the Rupert Museum on the corner of Lower Dorp Street and the R44. Historically part of the Libertas farm dating back to the late 17th century, the site formed part of Stellenbosch's early agrarian landscape linked to the Eerste River, Dorp Street, and historic wagon routes. The area remained rural until the late 20th century, when the construction of the R44 severed historic spatial connections and reshaped the town's gateway. The parent property (Erf 700) was subdivided in 1983, acquired by Rembrandt van Rijn Property Ltd in 1984, with vineyards planted on the site erf in the early 1990s and the Rupert Museum built nearby around 2005.
- Identified Heritage Resources:
 - Landscape & Townscape Value: Lower Dorp Street functions as a primary historic entrance into Stellenbosch, establishing a strong sense of gateway, threshold, and movement across key routes as one enters the town. East of the R44, Dorp Street retains its Grade II heritage significance as one of the country's best-preserved historical streetscapes, reinforced by the Eerste River as a major structuring landscape element with ecological and cultural depth. Within this setting, the site contributes meaningfully as a green forecourt, framing open views to the Cape Winelands mountain ranges, while the Rupert Museum acts as a contemporary cultural landmark that strengthens the identity and coherence of the emerging cultural precinct.
 - Site-Specific Heritage Value: Although the site contains no intrinsic heritage fabric, it holds important contextual value as a green gateway space that frames mountain views, reinforces its relationship with the Eerste River, and supports key pedestrian linkages within the precinct. The existing vineyard planting does not possess agricultural or historical significance and therefore carries no conservational weight. For these reasons, the HIA classifies the site as Grade IIIC (formal grading: IIIB), recognising its contribution through spatial and landscape qualities rather than built heritage.
- Findings of Separate Studies:
 - Townscape Assessment (Sarah Winter): The site is a strategic gateway into Stellenbosch's historic core, with strong contextual value as a green forecourt that enhances the legibility of the Lower Dorp Street precinct despite lacking intrinsic built heritage. Positioned between the agrarian Libertas Parva landscape and the historic streetscape east of the R44, the site plays an important role in the rural-urban transition. The study supports a "tread-lightly" development approach that retains horizontal massing, landscape integration, mountain view corridors, and pedestrian connectivity, concluding that the proposed Arts Quarter aligns well with these principles provided its greenery and permeability are maintained.
 - Landscape Assessment (Sarah Winter): The Landscape Assessment identifies four key landscape zones, each with distinct sensitivities: The Riverine Interface, Green Forecourt, Central Core, and Urban Interface. It highlights the Eerste River as an ecologically and culturally significant spine requiring a 32 m setback and rehabilitation and confirms that while the existing vineyard has no heritage or agricultural value, the green forecourt it creates remains an important spatial structuring element. The proposed landscape plan replaces the vineyards with a layered, indigenous, and ecologically restorative environment featuring wetlands, riparian planting, shaded pedestrian routes, and a public cultural park, strengthening the site's role as a transitional landscape and enhancing long-term ecological and heritage quality.
 - Visual Impact Assessment (Terra + Landscape Architects): The proposed Arts Quarter will not generate significant negative visual impacts, with key public viewpoints (including those from the R44, Lower Dorp Street, and the Eerste River corridor) retaining important mountain views such as Stellenboschberg, Simonsberg, and Papegaaiberg. The development's low, horizontal, and recessive massing, which steps down toward the river in the Cape-werf tradition, minimises visual dominance. With layered planting, riparian rehabilitation, and mature tree rows reinforcing its landscape integration, the VIA finds the proposal visually compatible, context-sensitive, and likely to enhance the area's overall visual character.
 - Archaeological (Scoping - not requested): The site has been previously assessed (Kaplan, 2013), with no known archaeological deposits identified on Erf 17321 itself, as most historical material

lies closer to the former river edges. The only residual risk relates to previously recorded dumpsite material. Any excavation below existing levels will require monitoring and mitigation, but the overall archaeological impact is considered low and easily manageable under standard NHRA permit conditions

- Heritage Design Indicators/Informants:
 1. Overarching landscape integration: retain green forecourt and establish varied landscape zones.
 2. Defined built footprint: development must remain in the “tread-lightly” platform outside the 32 m riparian buffer.
 3. Relationship to existing Rupert Museum: new buildings recessive, horizontal, and referencing Cape werf typologies.
 4. Landscape & visual setting: preserve mountain views and maintain planted edges.
 5. Riverine interface: restore ecological buffer, introduce wetlands, enhance riverside walkways.
 6. Pedestrian accountability: ensure public access across the site; emphasise walkability.
 7. Urban interface: improve gateway spatial quality and reinforce Dorp Street’s historical role.
 8. Transitional spaces: soften edges between urban, green forecourt, and riverine zones.
- Proposed Development: The proposal extends the Rupert Museum to create an integrated Arts Quarter, including:
 - Climate-controlled exhibition galleries
 - A 400-seat auditorium
 - Art Book Library and education centre
 - Artist-in-residence studios and creative workshop rooms
 - Riverside café and co-working spaces
 - Landscaped public park, courtyard, and outdoor performance areas
 - A design language based on werf spatial logic, linear buildings, and extensive indigenous landscaping.
 - The vineyards will be replaced with a layered ecological landscape with wetlands, green corridors, and urban-river transitions.
- Assessment of Development Impact:
 - Positive: The proposal enhances the cultural role of this strategic gateway by reinforcing the Rupert Museum’s landmark presence and preserving key mountain views. It replaces the ornamental vineyard with an ecologically and heritage-responsive landscape, strengthens pedestrian connectivity, and embeds new built form within a green framework to ensure a visually sensitive and context-appropriate development.
 - Neutral: Parking within the green forecourt will need sensitive mitigation, and although the built footprint increases, it remains aligned with the “tread-lightly” development zones. Potential future changes such as road widening, and mobility upgrades may affect the setting but are external factors beyond the project’s control.
 - Potential Negative: There is potential visual exposure if landscaping is not fully implemented, and construction near the river edge carries risks unless paired with ecological restoration. Archaeological risks remain low and can be effectively managed through standard monitoring procedures.
- Consultation:
 - Stellenbosch Interest Group (SIG): SIG has no objection to the proposed extension of the Rupert Museum, subject to the implementation of the recommendations of the HIA (19.11.25).
 - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation (SHF): no comment received during consultation period.
 - Stellenbosch Municipality Conservation Advisory Committee
 - Stellenbosch Municipality Heritage Section (SMHS)
- HIA Recommendations: page 16 of HIA.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 03 December 2025 due to HWC delegations.

SJ

14.22. Erf 3659, 21 Hof Street, Gardens, S38(4) – HIA

Case No: 26733SVB1119 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387347>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received 26 November 2025.
- An RNID dated 27 November 2019 requesting the following was issued for this property "HIA required consisting of a visual impact study on the surrounding townscape".
- The HIA has been submitted to HWC for review.
- The current proposal intends for the construction of a new parking structure and consulting block to the north of the historic hospital building as well as alterations and extensions to the hospital building itself.
- In terms of anticipated impacts on heritage resources. The HIA noted that excavation to construct the parking will obliterate any remnant archaeological sites, structures, features or materials. However, archaeological significance of the site has been identified as being low, and impacts are therefore similarly considered likely to be low despite the ever-present possibility of subsurface remains. The site is currently developed within the existing parking garage. Visual impacts are anticipated to be low to moderate for all viewpoints considered, with the exception of westerly views along Lingens Street where the proposed development will be clearly noticeable, and key views of Lions Head would be obstructed. The visual sensitivity of receptors in this area is, furthermore, considered to be high given the largely residential land use of the area. As the proposed parking deck has been designed to be of similar proportion to the adjacent existing buildings (limited to 4 storeys) it would not protrude above the existing urban fabric of the area. Therefore, it is not anticipated to form a prominent feature along the skyline and would blend into its surroundings to a large degree. Increasing the height of the structure is therefore not advised.
- Heritage indicators and guidelines were developed as part of the HIA and can be summarized as follows. The landmark qualities of the site are not easily undermined, and this aspect of the site can be considered resilient. The key indicators in terms of landmark qualities are to retain and enhance views of the structure from surrounding neighbourhood and that any interventions that serve to foreground the historic building and enhance it should be welcomed. It was noted that the site has a good street interface. The key indicators in terms of street scape are to retain green edges and mature trees and retain visually permeable boundaries.
- The mitigation measures proposed in the HIA can be summarized as follows. No specific archaeological mitigation is required. Should any archaeological material be encountered during construction, the appropriate measures should be implemented to notify the authorities and determine an appropriate way forward. In order to ensure the existing boundary trees survive, and to mitigate further loss of site VAC, an arborist should provide an arboricultural report or method statement detailing a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) that must be adhered to during the construction phase. This measure will reduce visual impacts at VP1 to low to moderate, and to moderate at VP3, VP5 and VP9. VP3, VP5 and VP9 impacts should be further reduced through the introduction of appropriate visual mitigation measures such as façade greening and the specification of non-reflective, high-quality materials and finishes for the building façade at this viewpoint. Further, given that, despite all precautions, there remains an inherent uncertainty regarding the long-term viability of the existing screening trees post-construction. As a result, it is recommended that a contingency plan be agreed to and put in place to address the possibility of tree mortality following construction. In such an event, it is proposed that mature trees of comparable screening potential be introduced as replacements in consultation with a registered Landscape Architect. It must be concluded that although visual impacts are largely limited at the townscape scale, residual visual impacts will remain at the streetscape scale as the proposed development will be partially screened but "noticeably visible" without mitigation, particularly along Hof Street. However, strict implementation of the recommended visual mitigation measures can reduce the visual impact from a Moderate (negative) to a Low (negative) significance.
- An independent review letter, prepared by Square One Landscape Architects was submitted along with the HIA, stated that as the reviewing landscape architects, who confirm that they have considered the Visual Impact Assessment for the proposed development, are satisfied with its findings, conclusions, and recommended mitigation measures.
- CIBRA supports the proposed interventions.

- CoCT support the proposed additions and alterations to the existing hospital and the demolition of the current parking area. However, they note that while the department supports the intention to develop this landmark site, and support in principle construction of a new parking block—including doctor's rooms and offices, with the proposed structure's scale and roof form--E&HM does not fully support the current set of plans as they compromise the contextual significance of the site and its contribution to its surroundings. The City's concerns can be summarised as follows:
 - The drawings referenced in the HIA and VIA are not the drawings submitted to the City of Cape Town. The City therefore considers the VIA to be outdated regarding the drawings submitted to the CoCT.
 - The LUMs approved landscape plan indicates the removal of all the existing mature trees on Hof Street and little to no room to mitigate the visual impact of the parking garage in the future with any new tree planting. However, they note that a different building footprint allowing for retention of trees has been assessed in the VIA. In summary the City's concern is with details of the LUMs approved landscape plan and that it does not align with the SDP.
 - The City notes that the recommendations of the Heritage indicators are not implementable, to mitigate visual impacts by installing trees of similar height on this edge to the trees currently there, due to the lack of space left between Hof Street and the proposed parking garage. The footprint of the proposed parking garage has to be reduced slightly and set back from the Hof Street boundary by 5m next to the Palm trees and by 10m next to the Coral tree, to accommodate the existing landmark Coral Tree, and to ensure that additional tree planting is possible along the Hof Street interface of the parking garage. This recommendation should be included as a Heritage indicator. The proposed trellis planting on the western (Hof Street) façade of the parking garage will not constitute a valid screening / landscaping substitute for mature trees on the Hof Street edge. Unmitigated building facades and removal of all street trees on the edge are not consistent with the heritage indicators and have a high negative visual impact on the streetscape by removing all mature trees and greenery which characterise the residential context.
- The City had additional concerns regarding details of the VIA, namely that:
 - Absence of any photographs showing the visual prominence of the landmark Coral Tree taken from Hof Street (other than the photographs included on page 24/48 of the VIA, Section 3.3.6).
 - No photographs clearly documenting the existing trees on the Hof Street interface of the existing parking garage, as the photographs included are taken from too far away.
 - Given that the LUMs approved SDP does not allow for retention of Coral Tree, the photomontage for VP1 in the VIA is inaccurate as it shows the Coral Tree canopy behind the building and over the top of the building, which mitigates the visual impact in the photographs. The CoCT notes that this photomontage must be re-done, in order to accurately inform decision-making. The City also notes that the building in the photomontage for VP1 is shown in a visually recessive colour and it will therefore be important to include as one of the heritage indicators that the parking garage must have a visually recessive colour.
 - The City notes that a VIA must be done more directly of the visual impact on Hof Street trees, i.e. lower down Hof Street, further north, so that the other trees are also visible, such as the mature palm trees and other smaller trees that will all be removed.
- Lastly the City notes that Square One landscape architects have supplied the landscape plan and then Square One Landscape Architects have also compiled the VIA dated 20 October 2023. The VIA is therefore not impartial.
- I&APs have been invited to the HOMs meeting of 01 December 2025.
- The HIA recommendations are as follows:
 1. Endorse this HIA as fulfilling the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA (No. 25 of 1999);
 2. Approve the proposed development as described in Section 8.0 with the following condition:
 - a. Tree Protection: If construction activities are approved, demolition and construction be executed with the utmost care and adherence to established best practices to minimize potential damage to the existing trees along the north-east and north-west of the site. Of particular heritage and visual significance is the existing indigenous *Erythrina lysistemon* (Coral Tree), a landmark tree that contributes to the unique character and

well-preserved streetscape of the Upper Table Valley Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (RSA;2025). It is recommended that an arborist provide an arboricultural report or method statement detailing a Tree Protection Plan that must be adhered to during the construction phase to ensure the existing northeast and north-west boundary trees survival.

- b. Materiality: All external material and finish specifications, including the building façade materiality and all ground-level hard landscaping, must be of high quality and non-reflective to reduce glare and visual intrusion.
 - c. Visual Permeability: Appropriate permeable fencing and street interface design along Hof Street and Lingens Street should be maintained and large, completely impermeable boundary walls should avoided.
 - d. Landscape Architecture: Should the heritage application be approved, it is recommended that the approved LUM's landscape plan be revised as part of the building plans approval process to align with the architects (EHH Architects) amended documentation (Section 8.1). The landmark Erythrina lysistemon (Coral Tree) must not be felled and as such should be indicated as "To be retained" on all landscape and site plans. The vertical greening through the installation of a stainless-steel cable or mesh trellis system and strategic screening tree planting that has been specified on the approved LUM's landscape plan should be retained as a condition of heritage approval as this will further decrease the visual intrusion on the Hof Street streetscape.
 - e. Architecture and Engineering: It is recommended that the structural foundations associated with the walls adjacent to the landmark Erythrina lysistemon be designed to have as little impact on the tree roots as possible. If deemed appropriate by the structural engineer, a pier-and- beam foundation methodology should be prioritized over a standard strip/trench foundation footing.
3. If any significant or in situ archaeological remains are encountered during development, all work in that area should be halted, and HWC notified so that a way forward can be determined. This could include appointing an archaeologist to undertake mitigatory recording and/or excavation; the fees for such work would be the responsibility of the developer.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 21 January 2026 due to HWC delegations.

SVB

14.23. Erf 8978-RE, Red Alder Street, Knysna, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 26755SVB1120 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/387416>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The triggers are:
 - S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length.
 - S38(1)(c)(i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
 - S38(1)(d) Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent.
- The proposal is to develop the vacant site for use as a school, including an academic campus as well as a sports facility. The development will disturb approximately 18,28 ha of the property. The proposal necessitates re-zoning from Agricultural Zone I to an appropriate zone. The proposed development will be implemented in two phases, each phrase comprising a 5-year period.
- The closest heritage resource is a IIIB graded building referred to as The Knoll located approximately 980m south-east of the site. The N2 is also located to the south-west approximately 3km.
- According to the applicant while no structures or ruins were noted during field work, possibly owing to factors such portions of the property have become overgrown by kikuyu grass, the chance of unearthing same during the construction cannot be discounted.
- The applicant also noted that a desktop study was undertaken by specialist archaeologist. The

potential for archaeological remains is Low and therefore potential impacts are likely to be low. No further archaeological studies are recommended unless historical archaeological resources older than 100 years, including but not limited to, ruins, household refuse sites and human remains will be impacted through the proposed development. As such, the HWC standard clause for Chance Finds applies.

- According to SAHRIS Palaeontological sensitivity mapping, the study area is highlighted as being of very high (red) palaeontological sensitivity where palaeontological field assessment and a protocol for potential finds are required. For this reason, an independent palaeontologist was commissioned to compile a Desktop Paleontological Study. According to the desktop study “the proposed site lies on the potentially very highly sensitive Enon Formation or younger sediments, but the undifferentiated strata do not contain fossils that would enable clear distinction of their lithotype and age. No fossils are known from this area. Nonetheless, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr. Based on this information it is recommended by the palaeontologist that no further palaeontological impact assessment is required unless fossils are found by the contractor, environmental officer or other designated responsible person once excavations or drilling activities have commenced. Since the impact will be low, as far as the palaeontology is concerned it is recommended that the project should be authorised.
- The applicant notes that analysis of earliest available aerial imagery (1936, 1957) for the area confirms early occupation of the property and surrounding landscape, which have since disappeared from the landscape. With the exception of roads and buildings remaining on adjoining Erven 12857 & 12858 to the northeast, none of the pre-modern (traditional) landscape patterns identified (in the report) seem to remain.
- The applicant notes that former archival research confirms that the farm Eastford had been occupied by colonial farmers since at least the late 18th century. The land use history of Eastford appears to consistently have been that of agriculture (grazing and cultivation). While it is known that the Eastford area was impacted through the Group Areas Act, which led to forced removals, the relevance of this socio-historic theme and possible relevance to the early history of Erf 8978, Knysna is unknown and were not researched in further detail as this would require comprehensive socio-historic research, which falls outside the ambit of a NID application as meant within the context of Section 38(1) of the NHRA.
- No visual impacts identified by the applicant. The heritage resources to the south-east of the site, approximately 980 plus metres away are located on the opposite slope of a valley, the proposed development will therefore not be visible from these sites. The contour surrounding the site and towards the N1 screen the site from view of the N1.
- According to the planner, the property is located inside the urban edge of the the Knysna Spatial Development Framework (SDF) and the development of this property for a “Place of Instruction” can be regarded as being consistent with the SDF.
- As per the recommendations on the SAHRIS application form the consultant recommend an HIA with Archaeological Impact Assessment & Socio-Historical and Cultural Study however the report contradicts this and recommends no AIA just CFP and defers to HWC to advise on the need for any specialist studies.

DECISION

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Social Historical Study

SVB

15. **Other Matters**

None.

16. **Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:**

EJV moved to adopt and CH seconded the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 1 December 2025.

17. **Closure:** The chairperson, Mr Ruan Brand, officially closed the meeting at 12H07

18. **Date of next meeting:** Tuesday, 9 December 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners	ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society	ABHC - Associated Bibles Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)
BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association	BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee
BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement	CBCRA - Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association
CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers & Residents Association	CSDBOA - Clifton-On-Sea & District Bungalow Owners Association
CoCT - City of Cape Town	CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation
CTHT - Cape Town Heritage Trust	CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations
CRM - Cultural Resources Management	CMP - Conservation Management Plan
DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association	DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association
Docomomo South Africa	DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation
DHS - Durbanville Heritage Society	EMPr - Environmental Management Program
EHM - Environmental Heritage Management department	FHRA - Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association
FoBCA - Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area	FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts
FE - Friends of Elim	GBRM - Great Brak River Museum
GLCA - Greater Lynfræ Civic Association	GVHAG - Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group
GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association	GCS - Greyton Conservation Society
HVA - Harfield Village Association	HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation
HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay	HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting
HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association	HPO - Heritage protects overlay.
HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association	
HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment	HWC - Heritage Western Cape
ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa	IACom - Impact Assessment Committee
KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association	IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee
KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association	KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society
LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District	MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society
MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society	NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation
NCW - Not Conservation Worth	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	