

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 16 February 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	SB
Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
Ms. Chane Herman	Acting Specialist Heritage Officer	CH
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Emily Jane Vowles	Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM

Staff

Mr. Olwethu Dlova	Secretariat	OD
Ms. Yusrah Hoosain	I&APs group chat	YH
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Ms. Colette Scheermeyer	Deputy Director (Left at 09h00, return 12:00)	CS

Observers

Visitors

Ashley Lillie	Capacity Applicant / Heritage Practitioner	Item 14.27
---------------	--	----------------------

3. Apologies

Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB
Ms. Penelope Meyer	Deputy Director	PM
Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB

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 16 February 2026 with the following additions:
Added Item 9.11.4 Erf 97631, 41 Newlands Ave, Newlands (RB)
EJV moved to adopt the agenda and CSI seconded.

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1. The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 9 February 2026.
EJV moved to adopt the minutes and CN seconded.

7. Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

8. Confidential matters

None.

9. Standing Items

9.1. Site inspections undertaken

None.

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

None.

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 DR1609 & DR1625, Rondevlei Midden Sedgefield (RB)

- Site inspection conducted 2 Feb 2026 at DR1609 & DR1625, a shell midden near Sedgefield / Knysna following DoI concerns about emergency permit close-out report recommendations (i.e., HWC24111401RB1114).
- Purpose was to review completed gabion wall stabilisation and discuss maintenance responsibilities and requirements to place site on heritage register.
- Site is an archaeological shell midden in a road reserve (NHRA S35), proposed Grade IIIB, dated ~6.5 ka (rare regional Wilton material).
- Gabion wall appears structurally effective in protecting the midden *in situ*.
- Concerns noted that the wall looks generic with no indication of archaeological significance and ends abruptly/visually incongruously.
- Vegetation already growing in mitre drain may require ongoing maintenance.
- Archaeological material observed in dune mole rat spoil heaps on opposite side of road.
- Dense milkwood vegetation extends onto adjacent private properties, complicating assessment of midden extent.
- Access agreements with private landowners likely required for further investigation.
- GPR or other non-disturbance surveys unlikely to work due to vegetation cover; alternative proposed approach may include using surveyed points, aerial imagery, and targeted STPs in clearings.
- Main significant deposit is a ~140 mm thick ashy shell lens dated to ~6.5 ka; other areas are heavily disturbed by mole activity.
- Opportunity identified for interpretive/directional signage using existing traffic pole or gabion wall.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 9 February 2026 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. That after the final close-out report has been submitted to HWC and HWC is satisfied with the report, that HWC draft a plan to ascertain the extent of the midden to assist with placing it on the register.
2. After the extent has been established, that HWC work with the DoI and private landowners to design signage for the site.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 IACom on 18 February 2026

9.4.2 HOMs on 23 February 2026

9.4.3 BELCom on 25 February 2026

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 Tribunal site inspection undertaken to Erf 775-RE, 469 Main Road, Paarl on Friday, 13 February 2026.

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.6.1 Close-Out Report: Erf 3432, 58 Main Street, Paarl (CH)

Case No.: HWC15040905CH1504 / HWC25021907SJ0225 / HWC24112808SJ1115

- HWC issued S27 permits on 11 February 2025 (maintenance and upgrades), 24 March 2025 (replacing roof sheeting and alterations) and 20 May 2025 (additions and alterations).
- The close-out report dated 30 January 2016 was prepared by Anne-Marie Fick (Heritage Consultant).
- Although the work was completed in accordance with the HWC stamped plans, six discrepancies were noted namely:
 - At Outbuilding 1 Pizza oven omitted and afdak constructed per dimensions of existing rather than approved, which would have been double the size.
 - At Outbuilding 2 there is a yard wall in an amended configuration.
 - Changed window format in Staff Dining Room West wall.
 - Retained an existing window opening in Staff Dining Room on north wall.
 - Introduced a new small window opening in Staff Dining Room on south wall.
 - Larger opening between Finance office and Filing Room than approved, and single skin wall removed between Filing Room and Kitchen.
- This work was assessed by the heritage practitioner who noted that there was no loss of historic fabric and that the deviations did not negatively impact on the significance of the heritage resource.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled "Fruitworks Close Out Report", dated 30 January 2026, and prepared by Anne-Marie Fick Heritage Consultant, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permits, dated 11 February 2025, 24 March 2025 and 20 May 2025.

9.6.2 Close-Out Report: Kleinbosch Farm, 9/1576, Dal Josaphat (SB)

Case No.: 21091320SB1004E

Discussion

- The archaeological close-out report was prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects for Malherbe Rust Architects and fulfils the conditions of the Record of Decision (RoD) issued in terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA). The project relates to the redevelopment of historic structures at Kleinbosch Farm, a declared Grade II Provincial Heritage Site.
- The archaeological work was undertaken by Ms Katie Smuts between April and December 2023 and included site visits, limited excavation, and monitoring of construction activities. The trenching aimed to identify the historic footprint of the Gedenkschool building, specifically the end wall of its earlier configuration.
- The excavation successfully located the return of the end walls of the earlier Gedenkschool structure.
- The identified footings likely date to the early 19th century (possibly late 18th century), confirming the historic footprint identified through architectural overlays of historic plans and imagery.
- No intact in situ archaeological deposits or discrete middens were identified.
- Artefacts recovered from the orchard area were found in disturbed contexts, likely affected by ploughing and agricultural activity.
- Intersecting pits identified south of the Gedenkschool yielded mixed assemblages and are interpreted as landscaping features (likely tree planting pits) rather than intact refuse deposits.
- Monitoring was partly retroactive, limiting contextual interpretation, and wet conditions affected trench inspection.
- All finds were documented but not retained due to the disturbed nature of the deposits and the scope of the work.
- The report conclusions:

- The archaeological work confirmed the historic footprint of the Gedenkschool building and supports the accuracy of the proposed extension, which aligns with the historic extent of the structure. No significant intact archaeological deposits were identified that would preclude development.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled “Kleinbosch Archaeological close-out report”, dated 26 January 2026, and prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects for Malherbe Rust Architects, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued workplan, dated 16 May 2022.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

- 9.7.1** Matters Arising: 13.7 (google streetscape photographs), 13.17 (Coloured-up plans required),
9.7.2 New Matters: 14.1, 14.5, 14.6, 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.15, 14.17, 14.21, 14.24, 14.28, 14.35, 14.36, 14.37, 14.38, 14.44, 14.49, 14.50, 14.51, 14.52, 14.53, 14.54

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

- 9.8.1** Matters Arising: None
9.8.2 New Matters: None

9.9 Referrals to Committees

- 9.9.1** Matters Arising: 13.3 (IACom)
9.9.2 New Matters: 14.7 (IACom), 14.14 (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

9.11.1 Farm 281 Portion 55, Paapekuil Fontein, Cape L'Agulhas (EJV)

DISCUSSION

- On the 3rd of February 2026, HWC were contacted by Mabeth Crafford of CTS Heritage regarding the discovery of a cave site ('Spoekhoek') on Farm 281 Portion 55, Paapekuil Fontein, Agulhas.
- The possible LSA/MSA site consists of a series of caves:
 - A smaller cave with shell middens, OES, and lithics
 - A larger cave with potential deposits. M. Crafford believes roof collapses may have hopefully preserved any deposits below
 - A series of smaller caves with deposits
- The site was exposed by recent vegetation clearing and may be under pressure from development activities within 100m. These include the sale of the erven along Marine Drive at the bottom of the inclined valley in which the cave sites are situated.
- M. Crafford suggests a grading of IIIA and requests that HWC investigate the protection of the site.
- The AHS and Municipality have been notified of the site. AHS confirmed that both they and the municipality are aware of the site; however, the case officer has received no confirmation from the municipality.
- Proposed way forward:
 - The case officer is to make contact with the property owner to establish existing knowledge of the site and existing mechanisms for its protection.
 - The site is to be recorded on SAHRIS as a Grade III Heritage Resource.

9.11.2 Portion 15 of Farm 186, Sedgefield (RB)

DISCUSSION

- A landowner on the opposite side of where the Rondevlei midden (see item 9.3.1) was discovered, has reported some MSA and LSA lithics as well as faunal remains on their property.
- They believe these have been brought up by dune mole rats and are part of a larger midden.
- Not at threat due to being discovered on the property, as opposed to during a development/land clearing.
- A site inspection is encouraged as the complainant mentioned several middens in the area and given the discovery of another midden (see item 9.3.1) it would be good to record this as the area will be under increased development pressure with improved access roads.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

The matter will be discussed offline to ascertain the heritage significance of the multiple middens/archaeology reported in the general region recently and to find a way forward to ensure that these are considered in future works.

9.11.3 Rem of farm 11/219, Hartenbos (SB)

DISCUSSION

- A small family cemetery comprising 9 (possibly 10) individuals in the northern section of the affected cul-de-sac at Hartland.
- Four graves are below the required construction excavation depth and will remain undisturbed.
- Subject to the outcome of the 60-day Public Participation Process (PPP), the intention is to rebury the exhumed remains in the same locality at a greater depth to avoid further disturbance.
- The affected area will be professionally surveyed, and the cemetery will be formally recorded on the title deed.
- A commemorative plaque will be installed immediately north of the cul-de-sac.
- In Dr Nilssen email he notes that he has had discussions the developer, and site personnel indicate unanimous agreement that further disturbance should be avoided and that all affected remains should be reburied together.
- The PPP notice is being finalised and will commence once Afrikaans and isiXhosa translations are completed.
- Clarification is requested as to whether the reburial of human remains, and associated artefacts may proceed under the current permit.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

The previous AIA and HIA to be reviewed and spatial information to be obtained regarding the new burials. A new permit application may be required at Section 36(3)c) of the NHRA is triggered.

9.11.4 Erf 97631, 41 Newlands Ave, Newlands (RB)

DISCUSSION

- HWC entered into a mitigation agreement for the subject property at the end of 2025, after a burial was disturbed while the owners were inserting new foundation blocks (HWC25111806RB1119).
- An archaeologist was formally appointed via this mitigation agreement and after they sifted the spoils on site, they submitted a report to note that the main burial and associated spoils have been sorted through.
- In line with receiving this report, HOMS issued an e-mail comment that the stop works order for the site would be lifted but specifically noting that, according to a condition in

the mitigation agreement, that any trenching below the current foundation levels must be monitored by the appointed archaeologist.

- HWC was contacted on 13 February 2026 to report that another burial was found on site, closer to a boundary wall.
- A formal e-mail was received later that day providing some more detail.
- For HWC to understand fully how to guide the appointed archaeologist and how this new discovery may fit into the mitigation agreement, HOMS required more information.

COMMENT

The Committee noted the e-mail received from Dr Jayson Orton, the appointed archaeologist, on Friday 13 February 2026 regarding the discovery of a burial on the subject property. The Committee requests the following information:

1. A detailed timeline of the discovery including information on the archaeologist's monitoring schedule; and
2. Contextual information on the discovery, specifically at what depth the burial was discovered and the current status of the remains and associated artefacts.

9.12 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

None.

9.13 Permit deadline:

9.13.1 Deadline for permits, close of business Tuesday, 17 February 2026.

9.14 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- The in-person SAHRIS training, that was originally moved due to last minute unavailability from staff, is happening on Tuesday 17 February 2026. Due to a booking issue from the Department, it will be online, so full attendance is expected.
- There is a draft SOP on OneDrive that, if there is time, the team will run through it on the day, or another small schedule will be set to go through it.
- Gentle reminder of the SAHRIS webinar on 27 February 2026. If HOs have received SAHRIS queries, they could add this as a post-script response to encourage attendance from applicants popping queries though.
- HWC's first official Appeal has been submitted on SAHRIS. CH is coordinating it and it is for a 2023 BELCom decision.
- During this, it was noted that if an Appeal is not linked to an existing case on SAHRIS, that there is no simple way to be notified via the system. As such, a special viewer has been built that RB and WD will check regularly until a long-term solution can be implemented.
- The S35 and S36 editing is happening on the stage site. RB is running with this and should have a final version to show the team by early next week.
- Officers are reminded that when HOMS refers cases, that Committee members will not have access via SAHRIS so the OneDrive case files must still be populated – not just a link to be provided. Once HWC has new Committee members appointed by the new Council, those Committee members will be trained on SAHRIS usage.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1. Bergrivier Municipality Environmental Framework (SB)

Case No: Na

DISCUSSION

- The Bergrivier Municipality Environmental Management Framework (EMF) applies to the entire municipal area and provides a strategic framework to guide development while safeguarding sensitive cultural and natural heritage resources. HWC has been asked to comment on the EMF and stated whether the document complies with heritage legislation and

supports informed decision-making by identifying areas where heritage resources may be vulnerable to development pressure.

- The EMF describes the current biophysical, socio-economic and built environments, with specific attention to sensitivities and risks that may impact heritage resources, including land transformation, infrastructure expansion, and settlement growth. Public participation formed part of the EMF process, ensuring that heritage values and community concerns were considered in the development of management measures.
- The EMF has a section on heritage protection and management. Key objectives include the development and maintenance of a municipal heritage register in accordance with Sections 30(5) and 31 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), the identification and protection of heritage-worthy buildings, trees and landscapes, and the conservation of historic settlements and routes. The EMF identifies important West Coast heritage themes such as palaeontological resources, pre-colonial archaeology, early colonial settlement patterns, agricultural history, transport and trade routes, and scenic cultural landscapes. Heritage is further promoted as a socio-economic asset through tourism, recreation, and heritage routes.
- Significant heritage resources within the Bergrivier Municipality include archaeological sites associated with early human occupation and pastoralist communities, historic agricultural and fishing landscapes such as Bokkomlaan and the Berg River Estuary, distinctive vernacular architecture including the Sandveld Langhuis, mission settlements such as Goedverwacht, historic towns including Aurora and Piketberg, and infrastructure of scientific and technological importance such as Maclear's Beacon and the Piekenierskloof Pass.

REFERRAL

The matter was referred Jonathan Windvogel for advice.

10.2. Erf 1552, 43 Mossel River Drive, Kwaaiwater, Hermanus (CH)

Case No.: 27182CH0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388649>

- A site visit was conducted on 13 February 2026 in order to confirm the status of work on site.
- HWC noted that the existing structure had already been demolished.
- The decision taken on 9 February 2026 is replaced with the below comment in response to the unauthorized demolition.

COMMENT

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

For the above formal response to be issued, the applicant must first provide a proof of payment with the correct reference number indicating the correct amount having been paid as per the Provincial Notice 73/2025 in the Provincial Gazette Extraordinary No. 9088, dated 18 June 2025.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1. None

12. Discussion of the Agenda

12.1. (14.42) Erf 3289, 20-14, Stokery Road, Wellington, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27237SVB0131 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388801>

- The Committee resolved that under the circumstances a second S51 letter could be issued as the unauthorised work was minor and had no impact to heritage resources. This is subject to a strict condition that further unauthorised work will not be regularised, and criminal charges may be laid.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 3638, Bredasdorp Primary School, Long Street, Bredasdorp, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27068EJV0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388341>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading Unknown
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to replace the asbestos slate and roof sheeting for replacement with zinc-aluminium roof sheeting and new flashing, rainwater goods, fascias, and ancillary elements as well as the repairing of water damaged ceilings

DECISION

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

EJV

13.2 Erf 47599, 19/27 Coniston Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25112019RB1121

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 30 January 2026.
- Graded IIIB.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to add a veranda and braai area to the rear/well screened side of the road (corner property).
- CoCT supports.
- RCID did not respond to request for comment within 30 days.

DECISION

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

RB

13.3 Portion 4 of Farm 6 St Helena Bay, S38(8)-HIA

Case No: 26708SB1117 <https://sahris.org.za/node/387260>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Rezoning and subdivision of a portion of Portion 4 of Farm 6, Stompneus Bay, to create a mixed-use residential development (185 residential erven, open spaces, crèche, church, and transport zone).
- Zone: Currently Agriculture, proposed Subdivisional Area (Residential Zone IV, Open Space Zone I, Institutional Zones I & II, Transport Zone II).
- Location: Stompneus Bay, St Helena Bay,
- Current use: Vacant land covered with natural vegetation; no buildings present.
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: Outside

- Constraints: few constraints and limitations, and the area was comprehensively surveyed for heritage resources
- Anticipated Impacts on Heritage Resources
- Archaeology: The West Coast has very rich archaeology (Stone Age tools, shell middens, pastoralist sites), especially near the coastline. Many studies show dense archaeological material along the shore and dunes. However, no significant archaeological sites were recorded inside the proposed development area. The land is already disturbed by nearby housing, roads, and the Lucky Star factory. The site is on the edge of town and not in the highly sensitive coastal midden zone. Previous studies near the site mostly recorded small, low-density scatters of shells or stone flakes, not major sites. One 2022 survey west of the site found scattered material, so similar small finds may exist below the sand.
- Hence, there is a low to moderate chance of finding small, scattered archaeological material during construction, but no high-significance sites are expected.
- Palaeontological: The site lies on young Quaternary sands (Q2), which are too recent to contain fossils. A small portion contains QB1 coastal deposits, which elsewhere have produced fossil shell layers, but those are generally low significance in this area. The landscape around the site has been heavily developed, further reducing fossil potential.
- Hence, fossil sensitivity is low, and significant palaeontological finds are not expected.
- Visual: site lies next to existing residential areas, and the land has no visual heritage value.
- Built: No built heritage on the property. No impact.
- Cultural: No cultural, living heritage, or graves identified. No impact.
- Alternatives: None noted. Development follows municipal SDF and is located within the urban edge; no heritage-driven alternatives required
- PPP: "As this application is made in terms of NEMA, the public consultation on the HIA will take place with the broader public consultation process required for the Environmental Impact Assessment process and will be managed by the lead environmental consultants on the project.
- In addition, HWC requires consultation with registered conservation bodies. For this project, this will include the West Coast Aboriginal Council (WCAC), who will be afforded a 30 day period in which to submit comments."
- Additional information received 6.2.26 - pop and the ppp - there has been no objections received. I note the municipalities comment, but these are not registered conservation bodies.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the matter to IACom on 11 March 2026 due to HOMs delegation.

SB

13.4 Erf 160, 81 Sands Road, Wilderness, S34-Additions & Alteration Case No: HWC25100607SB1023

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delpont introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal:
- Work start: no
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: George municipality supports, George Heritage Trust support as heritage footprint of the house and milkwood trees remain.
- Additional information received 5 February 2026, included a Heritage Assessment that indicated that proposal in sensitive manner and will not result in negative impact, Furthermore, plans have been updated.

DECISION

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

13.5 Erf 72130, 20 Churchill Road, Plumstead, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27139SB0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388515>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: additional story and a bit, and new braai to the rear.
- Work start: No
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: CoCT supports
- HO: Support

DECISION

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

13.6 Erf 89801-RE, 15 Duignam Road, Kalk Bay, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 26979SVB0107/ HWC25111703SVB0107 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388145>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item of behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 05 February 2026.
- The property is graded IIIC and within the Muiz St James Kalk B HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for total demolition of the dwelling on the site and construction of a replacement dwelling.
- CoCT did not respond.
- Kalk Bay and St James Ratepayers & Residents Association did not respond.
- Kalk Bay Historical Association provided a comment which does not conclusively object to nor support the proposal. The comment can be summarized as follows:
 - They presume that the architect is familiar with Council's Heritage Guideline Pamphlet, studied the local context, and intend on designing a building that fits into the heritage character of Kalk Bay. They further note that they are surprised by the plans presented and look forward to revision that have been informed by all of the above.
- In response to the Kalk Bay Historical Association comment, the applicant notes that the heritage practitioner was the author and creator of most of the CoCT Heritage Brochures, including the Kalk Bay and St James pamphlet; the heritage indicators outlined in the heritage statement were given to the architect prior to the design of the building. In their response the applicant has tabulated the main design consideration provided in the Kalk Bay St James CoCT heritage design pamphlet. They noted that the table demonstrates how the proposed design is intended to follow the suggested guidelines of the CoCT for work in the Kalk Bay and St. James HPOZ. The proposed design of the house is very similar to the other new houses built recently in this portion of Duignam Road, i.e., it is double-storey on an embedded garage basement, has hipped roofs, large, with glazed areas shielded with pergolas or lean-to roofs, and the street boundary interface is a series of stone retaining planter walls. Overall, the summary indicates that the proposal meets these guidelines. There are some areas where the design can be improved to better align with the spirit of the guidelines. These include:
 - i. Introducing more stepped stone terraces from the street boundary, and reducing the height of these retaining walls. Also, staggering the stone walls to avoid long walls.
 - ii. Reducing the size of the staircase window and increasing the area of solid walling.
 - iii. Reducing the width of the second-floor verandah lean-to roof to only cover the

- iv. Introducing a bay window protrusion for the bedrooms, with timber clad spandrels, to improve scale and as a direct reference to these devices often found in the area.
- After discussions with the architect and owner, these amendments were supported, and the final proposal now incorporates them.

DECISION

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

SVB

- 13.7 Erf 4565, 16 Louie Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: HWC25071507XM1106

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Streetscape photographs required.

XM

- 13.8 Erf 47533, 11 Coniston Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27037XM0114 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388278>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 5 February 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations which were completed following the previous building plan approval. dated Jun 2025 which indicates how the built structure differs to the previous building plan approval. these alterations were the deviations from the approved plans which we have documented in the as built drawings in colour. The changes completed up exclude the covered patio. The covered patio was completed in 2021.
- Work has been completed
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- RCID has no objections

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

- 13.9 Erf 156110, 114 Campground Road, Newlands, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 26958XM0106 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388117>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for additions and alterations for work has completed including old, worn carpet removed, replaced in part with new timber floors, original wood floors uncovered & restored. Furniture refurbished, with a small number of new pieces added. Woodwork restored, curtains reconditioned & reinstalled in original position - Previous Applications Applicable to the Site SAHRIS Case ID: HWC25101403-HWC Reference Number: HWC25101403SVB1015
- Work has completed- regularization

- The property is graded IIIA.
- Within the Kelvin HPOZ

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

13.10 Erf 16222, 51 Addison Road, Salt River, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 26983XM0107 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/388169>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for maintenance and repair, Minor Additions and Alterations (including shopfitting)
- Fire escape staircase rebuilt due to deterioration, Bathroom window changed, as well as minor internal changes.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside the HPO

DECISION

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

XM

13.11 Erf 48828, 61 Newlands Avenue, Newlands, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27159XM0124 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388561>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 09 February 2026. The proposal is for internal alterations, minor additions and replacement of existing roof to create a new roof loft space.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside the HPO
- CoCT comment: HRS is of the opinion that the submitted proposals have responded sympathetic enough to mitigate impact of the new extension into its context. We believe that the potential impact by the proposals on heritage resources within the precinct will not be negative due to the following reasons: The architectural language, scale and massing used take into account the context of the received environment. As a result, HRS support the proposed alterations and additions, as it will not have a negative impact on the existing heritage resources.
- The Newlands Community Improvement District NPC (Newlands CID) has no objection

DECISION

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

XM

13.12 Erf 59096, 105 Rokeby Road, Belthorn Estate, Landsdowne S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 26987XM0109 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388179>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 06 February 2026. The proposal is for the total demolition of the site.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC, Outside HPO
- CoCT support

DECISION

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

XM

13.13 Erf 7870-RE, 133 Sir Lowry Road, Foreshore, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No.: 26950CH0106 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388108>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 February 2026.
- Graded IIIB inside HPO
- Proposal is for the addition of steel container office units on the 1st storey patio.
- Work has not started.
- Previous permit was issued 28 June 2022 (22012803CN203E - approved at BELCom on 9 June 2022).
- CoCT supports however has concerns with the loadbearing capacity of the historic structure and whether it can structurally support the number of containers proposed. The City requested that options for mitigation be explored to which the applicant confirmed that the shifting of these containers away from the edge would not be possible as this would affect minimum circulation requirements elsewhere. The design has however been amended to provide for visual mitigation by means of plastering and painting the bottom of the containers on the first storey to match the existing parapet wall. CoCT supports with the following recommendations/conditions:
 - HWC to further assess the potential structural impact on the heritage resource.
 - Further consideration be given to the positioning of the 'Office 6' container at the upper level along the western elevation - which has the most visible impact on the building from Sir Lowry Road vantage point.
- To note: the 2022 comment was reiterated in the current submission.
- WRA supports.
- This is a reapplication of the work that was approved by BELCom in 2022. The location of the containers above the heritage resource remains as previously approved. Additional elements have been added which includes a new internal fire escape staircase, the installation of powder aluminium shopfront and two pergolas with timber slat infill.

DECISION

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

CH

13.14 Erf 21, 15 Glengariff Road, Park Lane, Unit 5, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27193CSI0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388682>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 6 February for streetscapes
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for bathroom alterations and internal reconfiguration of the space.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application

DECISION

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

CSI

13.15 Erf 21, 15 Glengariff Road, Park Lane, Unit 8, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27191CSI0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388676>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 6 February for streetscapes
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for internal reconfiguration and bathroom alterations
- CoCT provided comment and support the application

DECISION

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

CSI

13.16 Erf 398, 6 Lodge Road, Oranjezicht, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27053CSI0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388307>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 5 February for PoA
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for the reconstruction of the first floor due to the poor initial construction which resulted in leaking and structural issues.
- CoCT provided comment stating that E&HM supports the removal of the current roof addition as it has no intrinsic significance; and will support another roof addition in principle. Design development, as suggested by our department, is acknowledged and supported. E&HM is not usually in support of mono pitched roofs in heritage environs, but has no objection to the current proposal as previous insensitive work is to be removed.
- CIBRA provided comment and support the application

DECISION

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

CSI

- 13.17 Erf 90246, 7 Behr Road, Kalk Bay, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27051CSI0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388303>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Coloured-up elevations required.

CSI

- 13.18 Erf 41708, R301 Wemmershoek Road, Paarl, S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 27166CN0126 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388595>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was requested for streetscape photos and response to the objection – received on 6 February.
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 15060803WD0622E - HIA
- Proposal: To demolish the building numbered 6.1 on the property.
- Consultation:
- DHAC notes an objection to the total demolition and states the building must be retained and incorporated into any future development.
- Paarl 300 does not support and notes that historical analysis is based on a gable date. There is no evidence that supports this aspect, and it must be proven that the Homestead and barn on the werf are modern structures with no heritage significance.
- DHF has no objection
- Response to Paarl 300 objection: The applicant responded by providing information from the HIA undertaken in 2016 that the site has no historical or cultural significance.
- Heritage Considerations: The building exhibits characteristics of the Cape Dutch Revival architectural style, a stylistic movement that emerged in the early 20th century rather than during the original Cape Dutch period. Based on photographic evidence and the dated front gable, the structure was constructed in 1948 and represents a later stylistic replica rather than an authentic Cape Dutch homestead. The internal layouts and finishes visible in the photographs are modern in character and do not reflect significant historic fabric. The suggested grading of IIIC by the municipality supports the conclusion that the building is of low heritage significance. The architectural style can be noted as similar to 4 Yarrowdale, Pinelands application vide HWC23111611 and 24 Homestead Avenue, Bergvliet vide HWC25052612.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

The case officer to review the previously approved HIA (2015/6) to determine if the building was part of the HIA's approval process.

CN

14. NEW MATTERS

- 14.1 Erf 237 39 Nuwe Street Elim, S27-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27288CH0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388968>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Agulhas Municipality comment and AHS comment required.

CH

- 14.2 Erf 1054, 15 Fairway Avenue, Hermanus, S34-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27220CH0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388757>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal alterations and various additions to the existing structure.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports.

DECISION

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

CH

- 14.3 Erf 12842, 3 Fourie Street, Hermanus, S34-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27291CH0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388976>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal alterations, alterations to the fenestration and the addition of two covered patios and a garage.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports

DECISION

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

CH

- 14.4 Erf 13262, Helderberg Men's Residence, Piet Retief Street, Stellenbosch, S34-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27298CH0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388999>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Mr Andriaan Lategan obo the Helderberg Alumni Association was present, was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded inside the historic core of Stellenbosch.
- Proposal additions and alterations to the student accommodation wings. The work includes new roofs (trusses, sheeting and bargeboard), rainwater goods, general plaster repairs, the addition of entrance doors to stairwells, enclosing certain balconies, extending certain toilets and general refinishing.

- Work has not started.
- Stellenbosch Municipality does not support the proposal stating that the additions are inappropriate for the student residence as the building has an intangible heritage nature (student garden life). The balcony enclosures will negatively impact on this intangible nature. The windows to the rear of the building are not to be stepped but rather line up with the existing windows.
- SHF did not comment within 30 days.
- SIG did not comment within 30 days.
- ClfA did not comment within 30 days.
- The Helderberg Alumni Association stated that they do not agree with some of the information contained in the heritage statement specifically with regards to the significance of the structures. The Alumni Association stated that the Ou and Nuwe Gebou both have aesthetic and historic significance. Reference was made to the social, historical and associational significance of the trees and the stories behind the planting of the trees. Comments were made regarding the existing layout of the structure and how it currently embraces social cohesion. Further to this, it was stated that the enclosure of balconies, creating kitchens in each section and closing off entrances with doors will break that cohesion, dissipating the residence's culture and traditions in time, leaving Helderberg "plain old apartment block". It is agreed that maintenance is required however the Association is of the opinion that most of the proposed changes not required.
- The Stellenbosch University provided a response to the Alumni comments stating that various role players were consulted, that all inputs and concerns were considered in the planning of the proposed upgrades and that the University is committed to conducting the project in a way that is transparent, inclusive and respectful of both the social and heritage context of the residence.
- The following was noted in the report:
 - No detail was provided about the balcony enclosures negative impact on intangible heritage. This includes expressing how the alterations will impact long held student traditions and practices. These appear to be uniquely defined to this residence within the broader Stellenbosch University community.
 - The tangible architectural and aesthetic significance of the buildings are deemed to be low and are considered to have insufficient significance to warrant grading.
 - Intangible heritage in itself cannot be managed in terms of the NHRA. However, the physical factors contributing to the nature of intangible heritage indeed can. That would, in this instance, include the potential enclosures of balconies and possibly room layouts. On the basis of the property's intangible heritage contributing to its social significance (identified as HIGH in this report's heritage statement), an overall re-grading of the affected buildings could be warranted.
 - The proposed maintenance and alterations are required to meet contemporary statutory standards and redecorating/refinishing internal and external wall surfaces; are all necessary and there is no reason why these works should not proceed.
 - The garage/outbuilding proposed for demolition is not considered to be of heritage significance.
 - The other points were related to issues of contention between the stakeholders, internal stakeholder engagement process and possible grounds of appealing the application.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 16 February 2026.

DECISION

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

- 14.5 Erf 281, 51 Benzuidenhout Street, Stanford, S31-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27258CH0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388857>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

OHAC comment and streetscape photographs required.

CH

- 14.6 Erf 601, 8 Caledon Street, Stanford, S31-Additions &Alterations**
Case No: 27265CH0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388884>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs and OHAC comment required.

CH

- 14.7 Erf 115705-RE, 47 Cauvin Road, District Six - Phase 6, S38(4)-HIA**
Case No: 27308CN0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389030>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

District Six Beneficiary & Redevelopment Trust comments required.

CN

- 14.8 Erf 1748, 24 Cathedral Street, George, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27293CN0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388987>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: HWC23101826CH1019 - Minor Works for a planter approved
- Proposal: For adding internal walls to the outbuilding.
- Heritage Considerations: The outbuilding is visible on the 1956 aerial photo. No impacts to any heritage resources.

COMMENT

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

CN

- 14.9 Erf 2152, 12 Second Avenue, Paarl, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27271CN0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388905>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For minor internal alterations, solar panels and a new carport.
- Consultation:
- DHAC did not provide comment in 30 days
- DHF cannot comment on work that has been started or completed. Had the DHF received the application before work started, the committee would not have objected to the proposal.
- Paarl 300 does not support and note they cannot comment on work already started or completed without a permit, but have no objections and will not be appealing.
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts.

COMMENT

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

CN

14.10 Erf 234, 36 Glengariff Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions&Alterations

Case No: 27304CN0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389022>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photos and I&AP comments required

CN

14.11 Erf 25946, 259 Lower Main Road, Observatory, S34-Additions&Alterations

Case No: 27224CN0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388768>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

I&AP comments and motivation required.

CN

14.12 Erf 4319, 7 Nantes Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27234CN0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388784>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POP with reference number, Title Deed, Company Resolution, Legible plan, Internal and streetscape photos, motivation and SG diagram required.

CN

14.13 Erf 47073, 4 Oakhurst Avenue, Rondebosch, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27261CN0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388874>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For the addition of a loft room within the roof space.
- Consultation:
- RCID has no objection
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the IIIC graded heritage resource.
- Officer Recommendation: Section 51 under ASD

COMMENT

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

CN

14.14 Brandberg Wind Energy Facility, Laingsburg, S38(8)-HIA

Case No: 25823CSI0806 <https://sahris.org.za/node/383924>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- NID summary: NID was heard at HOMS on 18 August 2025 whereby the Committee resolved to request an HIA with AIA, PIA, and VIA
- Proposed development: Establishment of the up to 600 MW Brandberg Wind Energy Facility ("WEF") and associated infrastructure consisting of up to 83 Wind Turbines, internal and access

roads, an Operation and Maintenance (O&M) Building, x2 Independent Power Producer ("IPP") 33/132 kV portions of the on-site substations, a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS), powerlines, a temporary construction camp, temporary laydown areas and temporary batching plants.

- Visual impacts: The N1, as a low significance scenic route, will receive visual impacts due to a few turbines located on the first ridges to the north of the road. The visual consultant has suggested omitting these turbines or else reducing their height, but the former measure is preferred. It is the opinion of the heritage consultant that a slightly reduced height will not meaningfully change the impact assessment and that the impact is caused by the presence of the turbines regardless of their height. The VIA has determined that there are multiple approved Renewable Energy Facilities (REFs), including both wind and solar facilities, within 50 km of the Brandberg WEF (as per the National DFFE Renewable Energy EIA Application (REEA) database, 2025 Quarter 1). As such, the introduction of the Brandberg WEF will exacerbate the cumulative impacts resulting from REF development in the broader areas and cumulative visual impact is expected to be of High to Very High significance. However, considering the location of the Brandberg WEF and many of the approved REFs within the Komsberg REDZ, Nuleaf has concluded that the cumulative visual impact is expected to be within acceptable limits. The VIA recommended the following in order to reduce the visual impact, especially along the N1 and the southern portions of the study area which are located beyond the boundary of the REDZ:
 - 1. It would be preferable from a visual perspective that turbines should be placed behind the first hills located along the N1. This specifically pertains to a possible total of five (5) turbines, namely turbines number 37, 47, 52, 53 and 54. It is highly recommended that turbines 37, 47, 53 and 54 are either relocated or removed as these four (4) turbines have no high ground between them and the N1 and are very visually prominent. It is also recommended but not compulsory to relocate or remove turbine 52, while still very visually prominently it is acceptable from a visual perspective.
 - 2. Should the above not be undertaken then it is recommended that the tip-height of the above five (5) mentioned turbines and an additional two (2) turbines, namely turbine numbers 37, 41, 46, 47, 52, 53 and 54 not exceed 240m. While this recommendation will reduce the visual prominence slightly it will not reduce the frequency of exposure or the expected visual impact on sensitive receptors along the N1 or the southern portions of the study area which are located beyond the boundary of the REDZ.
 - 3. The removal and relocation of the five (5) turbines from the first hills located along the N1, as proposed in point 1, is the preferred course of action by the author of this report.
- Archaeology: Archaeological material across the site was sparse, with relatively few Stone Age finds, mostly occurring as light, poorly contextualised artefact scatters in lightly gravelled areas. The most notable was an ESA scatter of about 30 flakes, without any cores, located on a sandy patch near a rock/gravel source. Other smaller scatters included ESA, MSA, and more recent LSA (Holocene) artefacts. The most significant Stone Age site was a painted rock shelter on the left bank of Rietpol se Rivier. It contains fine-line maroon paintings and numerous orange/red finger smears, with associated stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, and some bone on the shelter floor. Historical archaeology included several stone-walled ruins with associated artefact scatters, mainly dating to the 19th century, though possible late 18th-century settlement may also be present but difficult to detect. More recent features included mud-brick ruins, notably one near the main west-east road. A single stone beacon was also recorded on a hill, although such beacons are typically common on farms. Graves were found in six locations although three locations were close together in one area and two locations were close together in a second area. These vary from formal, fenced farm graveyards with several graves to a single formal, fenced grave accompanied by three informal stone-packed graves, to less formal graveyards with no fence (Figure 35) and single stone-packed graves. The two graves at waypoints 1582 (Figure 37) and single grave at 1583 were quite close together and both waypoints occur near to a historical settlement. Although similar in style, the former two graves appear older than the latter one.
- Palaeontology: Almond (September 2025) prepared the PIA and noted that there were minimal impacts to palaeo resources stating, "The great majority of the Brandberg WEF project area is, in

practice, of LOW Palaeosensitivity, with sparse, small and largely unpredictable areas of HIGH to VERY HIGH sensitivity related to surface concentrations of tetrapod skeletal remains and petrified wood. The provisional palaeosensitivity mapping shown on the DFFE Screening Report is accordingly contested here. The proposed WEF project area is not fatally flawed from a palaeontological heritage viewpoint. No palaeontological No-Go areas or buffer zones have been identified here. There are no objections on palaeontological heritage grounds to the proposed development. Since they can all be readily mitigated in the Pre-Construction Phase, the known fossil sites should not be used to constrain the design of the WEF final layout. Three closely-spaced, high-sensitivity vertebrate fossil sites (Locs. 865, 866, 1777) as well as a small area rich in fossil wood recorded on Farm 63 Cannon Fontein (see Figures 7 and 8) should be mitigated through professional sampling by the palaeontological specialist in the Pre-Construction Phase, should they lie within 30m of the proposed Final Layout of the WEF. Once the proposed Final Layout is available, this should be cross-checked against the available palaeontological database and sensitivity mapping by the palaeontological specialist. A Chance Fossil Find Protocol should be consistently applied by the ECO during the Construction Phase of the WEF development. "

- Public Participation Process: The environmental assessment practitioner ran a single consolidated public participation that included the local municipality. No specific heritage-related comments were received, although within the overall PPP several comments referred in a general sense to the mapping and description of heritage resources (and all other types of sensitivities) within the overall EIA process. It is noted that while no written comments related to heritage were received, Laingsburg Municipality commented verbally during a focus group meeting that the heritage of the region had traditionally been related to agriculture but that a move towards the generation of wind power was strongly evident and that wind power would become a new heritage of the area.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 18 February 2026 due to the visual impact and mitigation measures proposed.

CSI

- 14.15 Erf 1753, 12 Cotswold Avenue, Gardens, S34-Additions&Alterations**
Case No: 27307CSI0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389027>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Trust resolution required.

CSI

- 14.16 Erf 17980, 3 Ranger Road, Fish Hoek, S34-Additions&Alterations**
Case No: 27295CSI0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388990>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for a new scullery and entrance hall.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application stating that the resource has not been graded yet but the nature of the proposed work is minor, will not impact negatively on the streetscape qualities of the resource and can be reversible should it be deemed necessary.

DECISION

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

CSI

- 14.17 Erf 2898, 44 Rustenberg Way, Stellenbosch, S34-Additions&Alterations**
Case No: 27301CSI0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389015>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company resolution, all photographs required.

CSI

- 14.18 Erf 602, 32 Homestead Way, Pinelands, S34-Additions&Alterations**
Case No: 27313CSI0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389054>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to include new dining room and entrance hall and internal reconfiguration.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application stating there will be no impact on the significance of a heritage resource or its context. E&HM has no objection to the proposed work. They have recommended heritage oversight during construction to ensure protection of significant fabric
- PRRA have no objection and stamped the plans

DECISION

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

CSI

- 14.19 Erf 8596, off Pienaar Street, George, S38(8)-NID**
Case No: 27247CSI0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388836>

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., (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof;
- Proposed development: Sewerage pipeline approximately 1370m in length with varying diameters
- Current zoning/land-use: Open Zone I
- Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical structures
- Visual impacts: None expected, Vacant, degrade land, infested with grass and invasive alien vegetation
- Archaeology: No archaeological resources were identified. Sensitivity according to the screener report is very high as the proposed development is within 2km of a PHS
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is unknown and is surrounded by areas of low sensitivity.

FINAL COMMENT

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

CSI

14.20 Erven 1155, 1162, 1165, 1167, 1169, 525 & 526-RE, Gordon's Bay, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27251CSI0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388843>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
- Proposed development: entails the decommissioning of the existing Gordon's Bay Pump Station No. 4 and the construction of a new Breakwater Lane Pump Station. The pumpstation covers approximately 5752 m² and includes a new reinforced concrete substructure and superstructure. Following the completion of above-mentioned pump station, the current pump station (GB PS No. 4) and associated infrastructure will be decommissioned. Demolishing existing wet wells, existing concrete inlet chamber, valve chambers and other onsite manholes and disposing of any excess material.
- Current zoning/land-use: Open Space 3: Special Open Space.
- Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical structures.
- Visual impacts: The property is vacant land that is highly degraded and disturbed
- Archaeology: The archaeological sensitivity according to the screening report is low.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is low and moderate and the sensitivity according to the screener report is medium. Due to past disturbance on site, caused by surrounding development and other anthropogenic factors, there is a very small chance that any resources will be uncovered on the proposed development site.

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 to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

CSI

14.21 Erf 31907, 11 Park Road, Mowbray, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27309EJV0208 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389036>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Externals and streetscape required.

EJV

14.22 Erf 351-RE, 17 Signal View Close, Tamboerskloof, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27232EJV0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388780>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Ursula Rigby was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for internal alterations and the extension of the existing deck to allow for the addition of a plunge pool and jacuzzi
- CoCT and CIBRA support

DECISION

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

EJV

14.23 Erf 64814, 2 The Mews, 68 Rosmead Avenue, Kenilworth, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27310EJV0208 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389039>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC/NCW
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal includes fenestration changes, replacing the boundary wall, the addition of a mudroom within the footprint of the existing porch, and internal retrofitting

DECISION

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

EJV

14.24 Erven 2017-RE; 671-RE; 672, 22 Avenue Des Huguenots and 23 & 25 Avenue Fresnaye, Fresnaye, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 27270EJV0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388900>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal, external and streetscape photographs required

EJV

14.25 Farm 1460 Portion 83 (Portion of Portion 1), Deltameer, Groot Drakenstein, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 27260EJV0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388873>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION:

- Not Graded
- Inside the IIIA Dwars River Landscape Unit
- Work has not started
- Applicant has not selected a trigger but s38(1)(c)(i) is applicable
- The proposal is to introduce a 3-bedroom dwelling and outbuilding with garage, staff accommodation and parking on the site. The site has a history of agricultural use and has therefore been disturbed. It is surrounded by similar agricultural properties, mainly wine farms, and industries to the west, and borders the Deltameer Parent Farm and Lekkerwijn Historic Country Guesthouse on said property. The SDP provided indicates that the existing Eucalyptus Trees alongside the farm tracks on this portion of the farm will be kept intact, thereby causing no visual disturbance to Lekkerwijn and surrounding wine farms. The architectural design of the proposed house is aligned to the typology of the surrounding built environment which further mitigates any visual impacts. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates unknown sensitivity
- Consultant recommends no further studies

DECISION

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

EJV

14.26 Farm 219, Hartland Lifestyle Estate, Hartenbos, Mossel Bay, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27254EJV0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388853>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d).
- The proposal is to develop the site in three portions: 1. A Secondary School with hostel, admin building, hall, clubhouse, fields, and athletics tracks; 2. A Tertiary Education Centre with student accommodation, sports fields, and courts. 3. A hospital, associate infrastructure, and helicopter landing pad. The development will necessitate the building of access roads, parking facilities, and a sewer pump station and services. The site has been used for dryland wheat and vegetable agriculture since 1939. Despite the map of relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity indicating low sensitivity, a large number of ESA resources were recorded during a field assessment and impact to SA archaeological material may therefore be high. An emergency permit (HWC25111401SB1114) for Portion 11 of Farm 219 was issued in November 2025 for the recovery of human remains unearthed during construction. These human remains were not believed to be associated with the formal cemetery on site identified by the HIA. The map of relative palaeontological theme sensitivity indicates very high sensitivity; however a PIA was conducted by Prof. Marion Bamford who notes that while the site lies on the highly sensitive Enon Formation, this formation is used as a catchall for Cretaceous and younger sediments that are not distinct enough to assign to another formation. The lithology includes cobbles, conglomerates, sandstones and transported debris unlikely to yield fossils of scientific value. No further PIA is therefore required but the CFP should be implemented.
- Consultant recommends and HIA with AIA

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

EJV

14.27 Erf 162, 15 Avenue le Croix, Fresnaye, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 27315RB0209 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/389056>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Mr Ashley Lillie (applicant) was present and took part in were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Proposal is for total demolition.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT E&HM supports with conditions, but the full comment provides for a good analysis of the property's significance:
- "The building on the subject property is visible on the early 1900s map of Sea Point. Building plans designed by MB Torsten, dated 1903, confirm that the house was one of the early 20th century villas located on a generous plot.
- The building on the subject property is also visible on the 1926 aerial view. It was still located on a generous plot spanning between Ave la Croix and Ave Fresnaye and accessed from Ave Fresnaye. This neighbourhood expanded rapidly in the early 20th century. The surrounding plots have by now been developed and the two rows of Edwardian style houses with Cape Dutch

Revival gables can be seen on Ave la Croix and Ave le Seuer. These are still intact. It is therefore noted that although the property does not fall within a declared or proposed HPOZ area, it falls within an intact streetscape that should be considered when any changes, or possible threat to it, is proposed.

- The original 1903 dwelling represented a fine example of early twentieth-century Cape domestic architecture. Designed during a period when Herbert Baker was establishing the architectural vocabulary of the British Empire at the Cape, the house exhibited clear influences from his work: decorative gable ends, square bay windows, and Arts & Crafts detailing.
- The original design comprised an elegant L-shaped plan with two beautifully proportioned gable ends—one facing northeast toward the garden and entry avenue (Avenue Fresnaye), the other facing northwest. These two wings wrapped around a covered stoep, with the entry hall positioned in the knuckle of the L-plan. From this entry hall, a staircase provided access to the upper floor, partially inserted within the high-pitched tiled roof. A downstairs passage with beautifully designed archways led from the hall to the dining room, kitchen, and guest bedroom.
- The house was raised on a sandstone plinth to accommodate the northward slope of the site, with an entry staircase ascending to the stoep. The stoep featured a timber support structure and timber railings. Interior finishes included timber joinery and floors, pressed steel ceilings, decorative archways, and period fireplaces.
- Critically, the house was designed in relationship to its generous garden, with the principal elevation and entry sequence oriented toward Avenue Fresnaye. This relationship between building and landscape was integral to the architectural conception.
- The building has been fundamentally altered by two main events that have destroyed its heritage integrity:
 - 1. Subdivision and Contextual Severance (late 1940s/1950s)
 - The property was subdivided, severing the house from its front garden and original entry point on Avenue Fresnaye. This was not merely a reduction in property size but a complete reversal of the building's designed orientation. The house, conceived with its principal elevation facing the garden to the northeast, was suddenly accessed from what had been its rear service elevation.
 - The interior was reconfigured to accommodate this new orientation. Rooms were rearranged, new openings were created between spaces, and the carefully considered spatial sequence from garden to entry hall to principal rooms was destroyed. The current approach to the house is through a street-facing carport, entering via a narrow passage flanked by utility spaces—a condition entirely at odds with the original design intent.
 - 2. Insensitive Second-Floor Addition (late 1940s/1950s)
 - The original upper floor, comprising three bedrooms sharing one bathroom, was deemed inadequate. Rather than a sympathetic addition, a completely new concrete structure was constructed over the stoep area. This addition:
 - – Destroyed the original entry hall and stoep, which were defining elements of the design
 - – Overshadowed the original spatial relationships
 - – Inserted new bathrooms and dressing rooms between the two flanking gable ends
 - – Compromised the northeast elevation (originally the principal facade) with modern fenestration and exposed external plumbing
 - – Destroyed the hierarchy and proportions of the original composition
- The northwest elevation retains only the original gable end with its square bay window as a reminder of Torstenson's design. The remainder of the building presents as a confused assemblage of periods and interventions.
- A full demolition permit is sought for the building on Erf 162. No replacement structure has been presented. The property falls outside the HPOZ. It is also strongly suspected that the house will be replaced by an assertive apartment block as the property is zoned GR2.
- The building has been graded on the City's inventory as a IIIB heritage resources as it is considered intrinsically significant.
- Heritage conservation seeks to preserve buildings that retain sufficient integrity to convey their

architectural and historical significance. The test is not merely age, but whether the essential character-defining elements remain legible and intact. In this case, the cumulative effect of the subdivision and structural alterations has eroded the very qualities that justified the building's heritage significance:

- Contextual integrity: The designed relationship between building and landscape has been severed and reversed;
- Spatial integrity: The entry sequence, room arrangements, and internal spatial relationships have been fundamentally reconfigured;
- Architectural integrity: Principal elevations have been compromised, the stoep character has been destroyed, and the massing has been altered by an insensitive concrete addition;
- Material integrity: Original fenestration patterns, external expression, and architectural detailing have been obscured or destroyed on key elevations.
- What remains is not a compromised historic building that could be sympathetically restored through careful intervention.
- Rather, it is a fundamentally altered structure that bears limited resemblance to Torstenson's 1903 design and can no longer convey its intended architectural narrative. Although many of its original features such as timber joinery, timber flooring, timber staircase and pressed steel ceilings with period fireplaces are still intact, the house has been severely compromised.
- Loss of the lush green garden will be highly regrettable. Too many garden spaces have been lost due to overdevelopment of expensive properties during the past decades.
- Similarly, as the historic context of the immediate neighbourhood is still very much intact, the loss of this house will impact negatively on the coherent heritage environment.
- Unless there is commitment to substantial reinstatement—including removal of the concrete second-floor addition, restoration of the stoep and entry hall, reinstatement of original elevations and fenestration, and ideally reunification with the original garden setting the retention of this building would amount to preservation of a compromised shell rather than genuine heritage conservation.
- Such comprehensive reinstatement would likely prove economically unviable and architecturally problematic given the extent of structural interventions. Under these circumstances, retention of the existing building on heritage grounds, cannot be successfully argued. Demolition, followed by appropriate redevelopment that respects the heritage context of the surrounding area, represents a more honest approach than retaining a heavily compromised structure to preserve our heritage.
- Demolition of the compromised heritage resource is therefore supported on condition that:
- 1. Cognisance is taken of the significance of the neighbourhood and subsequent redevelopment of the property is to be done in a sensitive manner so as not to compromise the integrity of the surrounding significant row houses. An attempt should be made to retain some of the mature vegetation.
- 2. All original elements and features that are still intact are to be salvaged and offered as original materials to be used in other restoration efforts as a condition of approval."
- CTHF initially provided a comment of none support, specifically noting that the Cape Revival Gable villa style adds to the collection of Cape Revival buildings in the area.
- After seeing the report by CoCT E&HM, CTHF amended their comment to a comment of support with conditions as follows:
- "We agree with the above report that this 1903 dwelling is one of the last remaining early dwellings in Fresnaye and that its loss will be regrettable. However, as the house had suffered serious insensitive alterations, its current heritage value is indeed compromised. However, the Foundation is of the opinion that full restoration is possible or a reimagined design (retaining all original fabric and adding new layering). The Foundation is very concerned that the demolition of this c1903 dwelling will have a negative impact on the coherent heritage environment, particularly the two sets of Cape Revival cottages. We are therefore of the opinion that demolition of the compromised heritage resource can only be supported on condition that:
- 1. Building plans of the replacement structure will first be submitted and approved by E&HM and HWC before a demolition permit will be issued. These building plans must take cognisance of the

significance of the neighbourhood, ensuring a sensitive redevelopment (height, form, scale, materiality) that will not compromise the integrity of the surrounding significant row houses, retention of mature vegetation and additional landscaping must also be addressed."

- Neither SFA or SFB responded to request for comment within 30 days.
- The applicant responded to these comments as follows:
- "The house as originally designed and executed was a fine example of a substantial dwelling of the period and, being set on a generous property, it clearly was a landmark in the area.
- When the property was subdivided in the 1940s this resulted in the reconfiguration of the house, a process that deprived it of the orientation originally conceived and executed. This resulted in various internal alterations to create a new entrance. Over the years further alterations were made, most notably the removal of the original verandah roof and the construction of a substantial double storeyed verandah, fully enclosed at first floor level.
- Later substantial alterations included the conversion of the original ground floor bedroom into an extension of the original dining room (with a modern fireplace inserted). Added to these changes is the complete refenestration to the gabled bookend to the former front façade, together with new fenestration in other positions.
- In short, while retaining some elements of the original, the house has lost the qualities that would have made it an interesting and conservation-worthy structure.
- As it currently exists, the house, while retaining roof form, and apparent intactness when viewed from Avenue la Croix, has been substantially altered and in the process lost those qualities that are associated with a Grade IIIB heritage resource. The house does not, as it currently exists, appear to warrant a grading of IIIB.
- The comment provided by the City of Cape Town recognises that any notions of being able recapture and reinstate the original in any meaningful way is not realistic.
- The general contest within which the property is located is without any particular heritage qualities. While the house is located in proximity to other graded structures, neither they nor the context are such as to warrant any conditions being imposed in respect of a replacement structure on the site."
- All parties were invited to today's meeting.
- HOMS debated the matter, specifically looking into three majors aspects:
- 1. Whether there is some kind of street context to consider as per the comments received. The Committee ventilated the matter and although there is a semblance of a character emerging, the street has not been graded by the CoCT nor is this within either a HPO or a proposed HPO.
- 2. Whether the structure contributes to this character. The Committee ventilated the matter and noted that there is barely a character present, but this structure is set back and hidden from the street in terms of how its gables may contribute to the Cape Dutch Revival Gable style of other properties on the street. However, as it was agreed there is no heritage character worthy of consideration here, the Committee decided that the structure does not contribute to any discernible streetscape, especially as a few houses up already have multi-storey modern apartment blocks. As such, it was ventilated that invoking Gees would not be required.
- 3. Whether the property is worthy of retention in its current form. Although it is graded IIIB, as the CoCT comment noted, the major loss of garden space and original architectural orientation along with the unsavoury additions over the years, especially the balcony, the structure would require considerable work to reinstate it to a conservation worthy state, and this might be futile given that a new structure exists on the garden area that would also need to be restored. In sum, there was no heritage reason as to why the structure should be retained on heritage grounds.

DECISION:

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

- 14.28 Erf 19132, 52 Dirkie Uys Road, Somerset West, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: HWC25111308RB0204 / 27277RB0204 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388931>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Coloured up to scale plans showing the extent of completed work required.

RB

- 14.29 Remainder of Farm CA1165, off the R302, Cape Farms, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: HWC25062602RB0206 / 27303RB0206 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/389020>
Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(1) application submitted.
- Applicant has ticked that S38(1)(c) has been triggered.
- Falls within the Groot Pheasantekraal Cultural Landscape as well as the Durbanville Hills Cultural Landscape.
- Proposal is to install a 15m tall telecoms mast which would be screened by mature gum trees from the road and next to a building at the Fisantekraal shooting range.
- Palaeosensitivity is blue/low.
- Applicant recommends NFS.
- The Committee noted that the mast is only 15m tall and would barely be visible with those gum trees, and as such, does not change the character of a site greater than 5000sqm.

COMMENT

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

RB

- 14.30 Portion 25 of Farm Klein Bottelary No 17, 25 Bottelary Road, Botfontein Smallholdings, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 27279RB0204 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388943>
Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(1) application with S38(1)(d) triggered.
- Within the Botfontein Smallholdings Grade IIIC Cultural Landscape.
- Proposal is to rezone the site so that the activities that have been happening on the site since at least the 1980s are regularised (from Agricultural to Mixed Use).
- Palaeosensitivity is blue/low.
- As there is no real development proposed, but rather a regularisation of ongoing mixed-use activities, and the only heritage indicator is the Botfontein Smallholdings Cultural landscape, which is meant to act as a buffer for urban sprawl and the Stellenbosch Farms, the current uses fit perfectly into that style of use.
- Applicant recommends NFS.

DECISION

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

RB

- 14.31 Portion 20 of Erf 516, Klipdrift Complex, De Hoop Nature Reserve, Swellendam, S35-Destructive Analysis**
Case No: HWC25112108RB0209
Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The material is from the Henshilwood and Niekirk excavations at Klipdrift shelter.
- The site is technically not graded and is within the De Hoop Nature Reserve.
- Proposal is to sample 6 OES fragments, 5 engraved OES fragments, and 16 faunal teeth,

excavated from the Howiesons Poort and Post Howiesons Poort layers.

- The OES and 4 teeth already went for Strontium isotope analysis under permit 20042401SB0413E (25 April 2020).
- They will now, along with the other samples, undergo Carbon and Oxygen isotope analysis.
- The sampling will be done by Julie Luyt at the UCT isotope lab and will be couriered via FedEx from the Cape Town Mobile Lab, with support from the repository, Iziko.
- The Committee saw no major issues with this proposal. There is enough other OES material that the engraved sections need not be harmed.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

RB

14.32 RE Erf 177245, 14 Highwick Drive, Kenilworth, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27286RB0204 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388961>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB.
- Within the proposed Kenilworth PHA HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for work to the rear only, namely:
 1. Addition of a steel and timber pergola with polycarbonate roof sheeting
 2. two windows to be replaced with new timber doors - existing opening widths to be retained
 3. low patio walls to be replaced with stairs for better flow to the garden
- HOMS informally agreed on 11 February 2026 that this constitutes minor works, and the application was amended on SAHRIS accordingly.

DECISION

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

RB

14.33 Rem of Morning Star 141, Off N7, Vissershok, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 27266SB0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388885>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Construction of the relocated N7 Vissershok Weighbridge (Alternatives 6 & 7) on Rem of Morning Star 141, including main weighbridge structure, services building, offices, parking, fencing, service infrastructure, slipway roads, weigh-in-motion facility, and upgrading of TR11/1. Demolition and rehabilitation of the existing weighbridge ± 2 km south.
- Trigger:
- S38(1)(a) – Linear development exceeding 300m
- S38(1)(c)(i) – Development exceeding 5 000m²
- Application in terms of S38(8)
- Other: NEMA – DEA&DP (Ref: 16/3/3/1/A1/41/3042/25)
- Grade: CoCT to be check – not working still.
- No graded heritage resources identified.
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: There is an historical structure (pre-1938) about 390m west which will not be impacted. Early 20th century domestic artefact scatter (low significance. Historic tree-lined avenues which will not be impacted
- Archaeology: Widespread early 20th century ceramic and glass scatter linked to former farmstead (post-1927). Very low significance. Some material may be over 100 years old but

largely low heritage value. Impacts considered negligible.

- Palaeontological: Low sensitive area according to SAHRIS (blue), hence low impact.
- Visual/Cultural: No significant landscape impact. Existing weighbridge to be demolished and rehabilitated. Tree-lined avenues will not be affected. No real change to cultural landscape character.
- Consultant recommends: NFS with Chance Finds Procedure fossil and HWC accidental finds protocol for possible unmarked graves.

FINAL COMMENT

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

The HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds protocol must be included in any form of EMP and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

SB

14.34 Remainder Erf 12397, Lagoon View Drive, Pezula Golf Estate, Knysna, S38(8)-NID Case No: 27316SB0209 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389057>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Construction of a 25m high tree-type cellular tower with associated 12m x 12m base station infrastructure, equipment cabinet, 2.4m palisade fencing with razor wire, 3m access gate, lightning spike, navigation lights, and 2m x 2m foundation excavation (1.5–2m deep). Removal of existing nursery shade cloth structures.
- Trigger: Section 38(8) – Application linked to another authority (NEMA).
- No Section 38(1) triggers applicable – won't trigger (a), (b) nor change the character of the site
- Other: NEMA – DFFE (Ref: 14/12/16/3/1/8/111)
- Grade: No graded heritage resources identified.
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: None identified. Site is within a built-up urban estate and previously disturbed (former plant nursery).
- Archaeology: No archaeological resources identified. Site previously transformed and disturbed.
- Palaeontological: moderate according to the screener, unknown according to SAHRIS, given the size of the footprint, impact is low.
- Visual/Cultural:
- Located within a modern residential golf estate (Private Open Space II zoning). No identified cultural landscape or heritage visual impacts.
- Consultant recommendations: NFS
- HO: There is no S38(1) trigger hence no trigger.

COMMENT

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

SB

14.35 Erf 50356, 15 Kildare Road, Newlands, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition Case No: 27312SB0209 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389052>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

NCID and CoCT comment and photographs of the streetscape is required.

SB

- 14.36 Erf 697 48 Marais St, Lochnerhof, Strand, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27269SB0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388898>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

SG diagram and confirmation if work is complete required.

SB

- 14.37 Portion 111 of the Farm Joostenbergvlakte 728 Paarl Road, Kraaifontein, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 27292SB0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388980>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA and site photographs required

SB

- 14.38 Kasteelberg, Vredenberg, S35-Dating**
Case No: HWC25102207SB0211

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Photographs are required.

SB

- 14.39 Erf 109872, 86 Dean Street, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27268SVB0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388897>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded IIIB and within the Westerford HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is to replace the asbestos roof sheeting with Victorian profile sheeting, to replace the timber sash windows, replace precast post / timber fence with new boundary walls, and for internal refurbishment including a new bathroom.
- CoCT support the proposal.
- NCID support the proposal but recommend that the new street boundary wall be of a similar design to the one next door, on the mountain side, incorporating palisade fencing on a low wall between piers, accommodating a hedge.

DECISION

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

SVB

- 14.40 Erf 2188, 8 Fritz Sonnenberg Road, Green Point, S27-Minor Works**
Case No: 27264SVB0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388879>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- The property is part of the graded II Green Point Common and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for hand dug trenches across the site to make connections between the existing underground services network on the site and the new development on the adjacent Erf 2189, Green Point.

DECISION

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

14.41 Erf 2562, 8 Tecoma Way, Pinelands, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27225SVB0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388769>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO. However, the CoCT notes the grading a NCW in their comment.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for two additions, to accommodate a new gym room and for a new laundry room. The proposal is also for infill of the existing courtyard, alterations to the existing garage and for construction of a new covered braai area.
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- Pinelands Residents & Ratepayers Association stamped the plan in support of the proposal.
- The Ward Councillor Riad Davids also stamped the plan.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.42 Erf 3289, 20-14, Stokery Road, Wellington, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27237SVB0131 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388801>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 11 February 2026.
- The property has a suggested grading of IIIC, as per the Drakenstein Heritage Survey.
- The property is within the Wellington Central Special Character Protected Area. The site is also located at the point on Stokery Road that Lady Loch Road scenic route terminates and is therefore essentially along a Scenic Route.
- Work has started. The completed work includes demolition of various internal walls (outlined in green); construction of a new internal wall (filled in in red); and creation of 3 new openings (filled in in red). The proposed work includes installation of four new large windows, construction of a new internal wall and fitting out of the space for the proposed new coffee shop use.
- Heritage Western Cape issued an S51 letter to the property owner in November 2025 for unauthorised alterations to the property (HWC25110720CH1110). Given the minor nature of the unauthorised work that has once again been enacted without approval with no impact to heritage resources, a further Section 51 Letter is considered appropriate for issuing. However, should further unauthorised work be undertaken on the property, criminal charges will be laid.

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.

As per the Notice titled "Issuing of Letters in Respect of Work Undertaken Prior to Application Being Made to HWC" issued on 24 October 2024, HWC will not be issuing multiple Section 51 letters for contraventions of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) committed on the same property by the same person. Should further unauthorised work take place, plans will not be regularised and criminal charges may be laid.

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.

SVB

14.43 Erf 4942, City Hall, 56 Corporation Street, Cape Town City Centre, S27-Minor Works
Case No: 27274SVB0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388916>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

Ms Laura Milandri was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded II and within the Central City HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is to install an HVAC system, specifically air conditioning at the City Hall's Nelson Mandela Exhibition.
- Despite being submitted as minor works, the applicant consulted I&APs.
- The CoCT support the proposal.
- CIBRA did not respond to the request for comment.
- The site has a CMP in place.
- The Heritage Practitioner's recommendation is as follows: The proposed HVAC installation at the Nelson Mandela Exhibition is seen as supportable from a heritage perspective, due to appropriate mitigation of the visual impacts and limited changes to original building fabric. Although the installation does not fully align with the guidelines of the City Hall Conservation Management Plan (Urban Design CC (3 April 2018), which prefers concealment of services, the alternatives - such as the introduction of false ceilings or the reinstatement of passive ventilation - would result in greater harm to the significance of the space or would be impractical. On the whole, this report concludes that the proposed HVAC installation is a justified and proportionate intervention that will achieve necessary functionality while maintaining the heritage significance of the Nelson Mandela Exhibition, and the wider City Hall. Therefore, this report recommends that Heritage Western Cape approve the proposed alterations and additions, as described in Section 5.0 of this report. Further, it is recommended that:
 - An architect with heritage experience be appointed to oversee the construction phase of the proposed additions.
 - A close-out report be submitted to HWC within 30 days of final completion of the work.

DECISION

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

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

SVB

14.44 Erf 4942, City Hall, 56 Corporation Street, Cape Town City Centre, S27-Minor Works
Case No: 27289SVB0205 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388969>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA required.

SVB

14.45 Erf 65-RE, 49 Dirkie Uys Street, Franschhoek, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27284SVB0204 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388958>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

Claire Abrahamse was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is Graded IIIA and within the Franschhoek Historic Core and within the buffer area of Grade II Main Road & Huguenote Road scenic route.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for alterations to the main house and outbuildings, including partial removal of the internal "spine wall", the raising of the roof pitch to allow for the roof loft to be habitable, and the incorporation of dormer windows. The proposal is also for partial demolition of the outbuildings to make way for a new garage and adjoining driveway.
- A previous application for alterations and additions to the building was approved by HWC in July 2024 (HWC24071005CSI0711)
- Stellenbosch Municipality support the proposal and refer it to HWC.
- SIG advised that the property is outside of their area of interest.
- SHF were consulted but did not respond.
- The Ward Councillor was consulted and did not respond.
- Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayers Association submitted objections to the proposal dated 05 January 2025. The applicant then submitted a response to these objections and received a revised objection letter from the conservation body, dated 29 January 2026. This revised objection letter and the applicant's response can be summarized as follows:
 - FHRA objected to the extent of the internal opening to the spine wall, as the idea of keeping this wall intact contributes significantly to the historical reading and hence layering of this fabric. The applicant responded by saying that the opening width was reduced in the previous revision and that a smaller opening will not afford the liveability that the current one does, making the partial removal of the spine wall a potentially wasteful exercise.
 - FHRA object to the opening up and removal of a significant portion of the old external wall (right of the annotation "Kitchen" dwg 1.101). However, the applicant noted that this work had already been approved by HWC in July 2024, the approval remains valid and is simply being incorporated into the current set of plans.
 - FHRA note that the accommodation sought in the loft would be acceptable if contained within the existing ridge height and building envelope. The revised pitch & ridgeline height addition of 98cm and new dormers is not supported. The applicant responded by saying that the latest plans drop the overall ridge height increase of the roof from 1.4m to 0.98m. According to the applicant, unfortunately, the current roof loft volume does not align with South Africa's Building Standards, and to retain the roof ridge and drop the floor would potentially damage the historic joists and timber boards that are so characteristic of the ground floor space. The landowner has produced a study of the heritage houses in Franschhoek, to show that many of them have living areas in the loft, including IIIA-graded resources. It is important to remember that the 980mm increase in height is accompanied by a return to a more historically-correct 40-degree pitch, and that the ridgeline of the building is set back from the gable itself. Because of the triangulation of the roof form, this increased height (of below a metre) is further visually mitigated.
 - Further, FHRA note that the proposed dormer windows – despite their reduction in size and setback from wall face - remain intrusive viewed against the backdrop of a traditional roof form - notably when viewed from the side street and side elevation (De Villiers St.). These are not supported and should be removed. In response the applicant noted that the study as part of Annexure A shows the prevalence of dormers in the area. Additionally, there are already smaller dormers in the position of two of the proposed ones, which can already be seen from De Villiers Street.

- Lastly FHRA noted that the inherited photo voltaic panel layout dominates the roof form and when viewed as a complete roofscape do not contribute to the historic signifiers and advised that they possibly be positioned elsewhere such as on the garage roof. The applicant notes this, however stated that for the moment the PV panels will not be replaced, but that this comment shall be taken into account should the system need to be upgraded or changed in the future.
- All I&APs have been invited to today's meeting.
- The recommendation of the Heritage Report are as follows: The report reviews the proposed building plans in light of the indicators and concludes that the proposal should be approved, although with conditions. The conditions being:
 - 1. The incorporation of thinner bargeboards along the end gables (to be no thicker than the existing ones) to retain the delicacy of this elevation.
 - 2. The new roof sheeting must be Victorian Profile, and cannot be a standard charcoal colour. An anthracite colour, closer to black, is instead recommended (i.e. Anthracite Grey/RAL 7016). The flashings to top and sides of the roof cannot be wider than those already on the structure. The sides of the new dormer windows should also be vertically clad in the roof sheeting and flashed in front, so that they "read" as part of the roof.
 - 3. Interior doors and all related architraves and linings to be re-used within the house.
 - 4. The ground floor ceiling reeded beams and floorboards are not to be altered.
 - 5. Only lime plasters should be used on the building. Portland cement plasters, or the mixing of Portland cement in lime plaster, is strictly prohibited.
 - 6. The exterior of the house and outbuildings should be limewashed.
 - 7. The interior of the house should be painted using a breathable, non-acrylic paint.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following:

1. A revised drawing set is to be submitted incorporating the recommendations of the Heritage Report, dated January 2026, prepared by Claire Abahamse as listed on page 50.
2. The applicant in consultation with the architect and property owner are to consider the use of skylights and a single dormer instead of the three proposed dormers. Should this be incorporated it is to be reflected on the aforementioned revised drawing set for submission to HWC.

SVB

14.46 Erven 825, 1123, 1124-RE, 1125-RE, 1128, 1129, 1130, 1133, 1134, 1142, & 1160, 127-135 Dorp Street, Stellenbosch, S38(1)-NID

Case No: 27314SVB0209 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389055>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item on behalf of Ms. Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 09 February 2026.
- The trigger is S38(1) (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent and (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof
- The proposed development entails the conversion of the historic Georgian buildings known as Transvalia, Alma, Bosmans House and Tinetta into a hotel, with restaurants and retail spaces on the ground floor. The row of garages behind the buildings will be converted into additional accommodation. The public parking area and bathrooms behind will be upgraded.
- The site is within the Urban Edge and within the Stellenbosch Historic Core.
- The buildings on the site have various gradings. Erven 1123, 1133 and 1142 have a recommended grading of IIIA in terms of the Stellenbosch Heritage Survey and are referred to as Transvalia, Bosman House 1, Alma and Tinetta. Erf 1134 has a proposed grading of II and is referred to as Bosman House. The remaining erven have either been assessed as having no heritage significance or have not been assessed.

- The heritage practitioner describes the significant buildings as a group of Georgian buildings in Dorp Street and notes that the proposed internal alterations may affect historic fabric.
- In terms of palaeo impacts, the heritage practitioner notes that the site falls within a green paleo area (meaning that a desk top study is required). However, given that there is no plan to extend the building footprint (except for one proposed small light weight structure), and the whole site has been extensively disturbed over time, the practitioner has not recommended the need for a specialist.
- In terms of townscape impacts the practitioner notes that the site is part of the Dorp Street streetscape and that conversion to a hotel may impact the streetscape.
- According to the heritage practitioner the conversion of the building complex to a hotel with restaurants and retail outlets, may impact the Dorp Street streetscape and adjoining cross streets, such as Piet Retief. Care should also be taken that historic fabric is retained and restored sensitively and that additions do not impact negatively on the historic buildings. Given this, the Heritage Practitioner's recommendation is for an Architectural (i.e., fabric analysis, historical analysis, material analysis etc.), and Townscape Assessment.

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. Architectural Assessment
2. Townscape Assessment

SVB

14.47 Erf 1634, 3 Croxteth Road, Green Point, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27249XM0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388838>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for internal alterations, and ground floor addition to rear of property.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- CoCT supports
- GPRRA has no objection

DECISION

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

XM

14.48 Erf 2424, 46 St Georges Street, Somerset West, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27287XM0204 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388962>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for additions and alterations for the existing terrace roof to be enclosed to create a new entrance hall, one internal wall to be demolished to incorporate the lounge as part of the dining kitchen open plan, the old back door to be replaced with reused window.
- Work has not started.
- Previous Applications Applicable to the Site: Permit issued Case No 19052303 KB0731E.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO

DECISION

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

XM

14.49 Erf 292, 51 Edison Drive, Meadowridge, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27242XM0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388827>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Updated Building plan indicating work started., Streetscape photographs
Consultation comments: Local municipality required.

XM

14.50 Erf 31910, 2 Myburgh Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27222XM0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388761>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Consultation comments: Local municipality and Conservation bodies required.

XM

14.51 Erf 6142, 17 Kathleen Street, Bellville, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27252XM0202 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388851>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Consultation comments: Local municipality required.

XM

14.52 Erf 70547, 5 Selby Road Plumstead, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27267XM0203 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388887>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.53 Erf 8890, 71 16th Avenue, Bellville, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27306XM0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389026>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs
Consultation comments: Local municipality required.

XM

14.54 Erf 98035, 13 Prideaux Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27230XM0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388778>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Consultation comments: Local municipality

XM

15. Other Matters

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

CH moves to adopt and CN seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 16 February 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Stephanie Barnardt, officially closed the meeting at 13:07

18. Date of next meeting: 23 February 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners Archaeologists

AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society

BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association

BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement

CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers & Residents Association

CoCT – City of Cape Town

CTHT – Cape Town Heritage Trust

CRM - Cultural Resources Management

DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association

Docomomo South Africa

DHS -Durbanville Heritage Society

EHM – Environmental Heritage Management department

FoBCA- Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area

FE - Friends of Elim

GLCA- Greater Lynfræ Civic Association

GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association

HVA- Harfield Village Association

HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay

HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association

HBRRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association

HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment

ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa

KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association

KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association

KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society

LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District

MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society

NCW – Not Conservation Worthy

NEMA - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)

NHRA - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999

NID - Notification of Intent to Develop

NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association

OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage

Paarl300 Foundation

PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association

PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation Committee

SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional

ABHC - Associated Bibbys Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)

BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee

CBCRA -Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association

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

CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation

CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations

CMP – Conservation Management Plan

DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association

DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation

EMPr - Environmental Management Program

FHRA -Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association

FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts

GBRM - Great Brak River Museum

GVHAG- Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group

GCS - Greyton Conservation Society

HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation

HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting

HPO – Heritage protects overlay.

HWC – Heritage Western Cape

IACom - Impact Assessment Committee

IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee

MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society

NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation

NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body

NRA - Newlands Residents Association

OCA - Observatory Civic Association

OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee

PPP - Public Participation Process

PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust

RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural

SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System

SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society

SFB - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association

SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town

STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society

SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation

SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust

GHT - George Heritage Trust

RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association

TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society Association

VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa

WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group Ward 2 Forum

WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council

WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee

WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society

WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association

SPFA - Sea Point for All Group

SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee

SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group

SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association

OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society

TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation

UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers

WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association

WCC - Whale Coast Conservation

WRA - Woodstock Residents Association

WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association

APPROVED