

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 20 April 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

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

Staff

Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	I&APs	NT
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Mr. Olwethu Dlova	Back-up Secretariat	OD

Legal Advisor

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

Observers

Visitors

Visitors	Capacity	Item
Anika Smit	Architect	14.7
Bruce Burmeister	Rondebosch Improvement District	13.29
Clive Theunissen	Drakenstein Municipality	Drakenstein items
David Marais	I&AP	
Doron Goldberg	Neighbour	13.28
Harriet Clift	Applicant	13.15
Imaan Barnes	I&AP	
Jone' Kros	Applicant	13.3, 13.9 and 14.1
Martin Witbooi	I&AP	13.15
Nick Smith	Attorney	13.28
Urkye du Preez	I&AP	14.7
Bruce Wilson	Applicant	13.3, 13.9 and 14.1
Claire Abrahamse	Applicant	13.30
Gys le Roux	Owner	13.14
Pete Da Silva	Owner	13.29
Lenize Gerber	Wellington Heritage Foundation	13.11
Jonathan Kaplan	Applicant	14.23
Kobus van Wyk	Applicant	13.19 and 14.49

Phillipa Duncan	Wynberg Residents & Ratepayers Association	13.19
Johan Cornelius	Applicant	13.28
Garth Hamilton	Architect	13.28
Nicolene Visser	Applicant	14.7
Celine Oates	I&AP	
Paul Walker	I&AP	
Rob Henson	I&AP	
Bruce McLvor	I&AP	

3. Apologies

None.

Absent

None.

4. Acceptance of the Code of Conduct

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

5. Approval of Agenda

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 20 April 2026 with the following additions:
EJV moved to adopt the agenda and CN seconded.

- 10.2 Erf 9013, 29 Morgenster Avenue, Somerset West (CSI)

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1. The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 30 March 2026. CSI moved to adopt the approval of the minutes and SVB seconded.

6.2. The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 13 April 2026. XM moved to adopt the approval of the minutes and CN seconded.

7. Disclosure of conflict of interest

7.1. None

8. Confidential matters

8.1. Site inspections undertaken

- 8.1.1.** Zeldenrust House - Erf 3346-RE, 40 Orpen Road, Constantia (CH + CN)
Refer to Confidential Minutes dated 20 April 2026.

9. Standing Items

9.1. Site inspections undertaken

- 9.1.1** Erf 63714, 1-3 Stellenberg Avenue, Kenilworth (SB) – 16 April 2026.

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 16 April 2026.

- 9.1.2** Erf 855, 17 Exner Avenue, Vredehoek (CSI)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 16 April 2026.

- 9.1.3** Erf 1086, 36 Vredehoek Avenue, Vredehoek (CH)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 16 April 2026.

- 9.1.4** Erf 258, 4 Avenue De Longueville, Fresnaye (SVB)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 16 April 2026.

9.1.5 Erf 56442, 31 Upper Sidmouth Avenue, Bishopscourt (SVB)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 16 April 2026.

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

None.

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Erf 63714, 1-3 Stellenberg Avenue, Kenilworth (SB)

DISCUSSION:

- A site inspection was conducted on 16 April 2026 following a complaint of unauthorized work at a Grade IIIB heritage resource. Maintenance work, including repainting the entrance ways, boundary wall and gates, was observed; however, no active construction was underway at the time of inspection.
- A desktop review confirmed that no heritage permit had been issued for the current work taking place.
- Although work had ceased and a Stop Works Order was not issued, the owner was informed that a permit is required. It was recommended that no further work continue until a Minor Works Permit Application is submitted and approved by Heritage Western Cape.

9.3.2 Erf 855, 17 Exner Avenue, Vredehoek (CSI)

- This site inspection report will be presented in the open session of this meeting under item 13.14.

9.3.3 Erf 1086, 36 Vredehoek Avenue, Vredehoek (CH)

- This site inspection report will be presented in the open session of this meeting under item 13.3

9.3.4 Erf 258, 4 Avenue De Longueville, Fresnaye (SVB)

- This site inspection report will be presented in the open session of this meeting under item 13.28.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 BELCom (22 April 2026)

9.4.2 HOMS meeting prep for May and June 2026 (WD)

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 None.

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.6.1 None.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.23

9.7.2 New Matters: 14.5, 14.6, 14.9, 14.10, 14.12, 14.12, 14.16, 14.18, 14.20, 14.26, 14.27, 14.29, 14.31, 14.36, 14.37, 14.38, 14.39, 14.40, 14.41, 14.42, 14.43, 14.46, 14.47, 14.48, 14.51, 15.52 and 14.53

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

9.8.1 Matters Arising: 13.4, 13.11, 13.22 and 13.25

9.8.2 New Matters: 14.22

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising: None

9.9.2 New Matters: None

9.10 Archaeological Matters

9.10.1 Erf 97631, 41 Newlands Ave (RB)

DISCUSSION:

- The Committee is well aware of the situation at the subject property where HWC entered into a mitigation agreement with the owner to handle the discovery of a grave on site at the end of 2025.
- Deeper earthworks on site are now completed.
- The appointed archaeologist has provided a report to just summarise the monitoring (condition 4.2.2 of the HA), although it is not a formal condition to submit a report at this stage, but rather once consultation has concluded.
- In short, one extra grave was discovered (reported to HWC and dealt with at the start of 2026). However, further contextual and holistic interpretation seems to suggest that the grave was previously exhumed and that the coffin nails and cranial fragments from this grave are simply what was left behind as opposed to the initial theory of it having been destroyed by the acidity found in a constantly fluctuating water table in the area.
- The public consultation portion will commence shortly.

FOR NOTING

The Committee noted the report titled "ARCHAEOLOGICAL MONITORING AT ERF 97631 (41 NEWLANDS AVENUE), NEWLANDS", dated, 17 March 2026, compiled by Jayson Orton.

9.10.2 Remainder of Visserhok 957, Durbanville, Archaeological Mitigation Report: Proposed Van Schoorsdrif Interchange and Associated Roads - 14031804AS0328E (SB)

DISCUSSION:

- ASHA Consulting conducted archaeological mitigation for the construction of a new road on Visserhok Farm, north of Cape Town. Four archaeological sites were initially identified, but only two (VHK2014/001 and VHK2024/001) fell within the final development footprint and required mitigation.
- Site VHK2014/001:
This site had already been largely destroyed by construction activities prior to mitigation. Sampling was limited to sieving of spoil heaps and topsoil. Recovered material included Later Stone Age (LSA) artefacts, along with historical and modern material. The assemblage suggests mid- to late Holocene occupation, possibly older than 2000 years.
- Site VHK2024/001:
This site was partially impacted by construction but approximately 60–70% remained intact and was systematically excavated. A large assemblage of stone artefacts (over 6000 pieces) was recovered, dominated by LSA material with some residual Middle Stone Age (MSA) artefacts. The site reflects repeated occupation, with a clear concentration of artefacts indicating a focal activity area.
- Material Culture:
Both sites contained mixed assemblages of LSA, historical (mainly 19th century), and modern material, reflecting long-term and overlapping land use, including farming activities. Notable finds include a glass bead and a pipe stem fragment.
- Disturbance:
Both sites were affected by modern disturbance, including road construction and historic ploughing, which has mixed and redistributed archaeological material.
- Conclusion:
The archaeological resources within the development footprint have been adequately mitigated through sampling and excavation. Although some loss of context occurred due to

prior disturbance, sufficient material was recovered to record the archaeological significance of the sites.

- Recommendation:

No further archaeological mitigation is required, and the development may proceed.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled "Archaeological mitigation report, proposed Van Schoorsdrift interchange and associated road", dated 30 March 2026, and prepared by ASHA Consulting, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 24 May 2024.

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

9.11.1 None.

9.12 Permit deadline:

COB Tuesday 21 April 2026

9.13 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- Several hotfix things have been implemented (e.g., Section A is now Step 1 on all forms, the HM reference section is now only visible to officers, BE minor works section has been revamped, etc.).
- Awaiting some internal conversation for confirmation of things like the HWC POA and T&Cs.
- HWC FAQ page is live as a consolidated page linking to all HWC loaded guides, application forms, notices, etc. : <https://sahris.org.za/HWC-FAQ>
- A new site management tool has been developed, and the team will be shown this soon. It will work well for long term site monitoring for site inspection reports.
- To note, some officers are changing case statuses before issuing permits/RODs. Please only do this once issued as the applicant gets an email when the case status is changed and if it reads closed (approved), for example, and there is no permit/ROD it causes confusion. If you are uncertain about anything, please contact RB for clarity.
- The brochure FAQ for NIDs has been released.
- Conservation Body specific/intimate training to be looked into.
- The marketing/filming is being edited.
- Clinton is handling technical SAHRIS admin while Jake is on leave and Nancy continues handling general SAHRIS admin from SAHRA's side.
- Once Jake has returned from leave, the S35/S36 process will be worked on to be finalised by end of June.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1. Cape Flats Aquifer (CFA) Project (RB)

DISCUSSION

- Minor pipe layout changes from the 2018 approved HIA.
- To note, is that all project, irrespective of triggering S38(1) must come to HWC as NIDs as part of that approval.
- In this case, it is very minor pipe layout changes from that approval with the heritage screening revealing no further concerns.
- The Committee agreed that it was substantially in accordance to the layout approved as part of the 2018 HIA and that no further NID or otherwise would be required.

COMMENT

The Committee noted the email received on 2 April 2026 detailing the revised pipeline route for the Cape Flats Aquifer (CFA) project. The layout was deemed to be substantially in accordance with the approved layout from the 2018 HIA and a new NID need not be submitted for these pipeline route changes.

10.2. Erf 9013, 29 Morgenster Avenue, Somerset West

Case No: HWC24092511CSI1610

Discussion

- The matter was tabled at IACom in July 2025 whereby the Committee issued further requirements: "The Committee requires that further consideration be given to concerns pertaining to the potential negative impact of a three-storey apartment block at the interface of a protected natural environment i.e. the Lourens River and a Grade II cultural landscape. In order to mitigate this impact, consideration should be given to the reconfiguration of the proposed development in order to reduce the height of buildings at the interface to the river and to fragment the block and avoid the presence of a solid built form along this interface."
- Proposed development is for the demolition of the existing guest house and the construction of a residential development comprising 39 apartments provided within 2 blocks. Block A being 2 apartment levels above parking and block B being 3 levels of apartments. The structure on site may have enclosed a small structure older than 60 years but it is much altered and of no architectural significance. All structures are deemed NCW.
- The applicant has indicated that the owner would like to withdraw the application as they have obtained a legal opinion on the validity of the requirement for the submission of a NID in the first instance. On the basis of this opinion, the applicant has been instructed to withdraw the HIA and proceed to prepare a Section 34 application for the portion of the building on the property that is older than 60 years, the only aspect requiring HWC authorisation.
- PM: HWC cannot prevent an applicant from withdrawing an application if they believe that they have legal basis to do so.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the matter to IACom on 20 May 2026 for discussion.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1. None.

12. Discussion of the Agenda

12.1. Portion 1 of Farm Uyekraal No 189, Malmesbury Farms, Saldanha Bay, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: HWC24091145RB0912

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 due to the objection resulting in HOMS not having delegation to process the matter.

12.2. Portion 18, 16 & RE/14 of Farm 362, Schrywershoek, Southeast of the hamlet of Churchhaven, West of the Langebaan Estuary and East and North of the West Coast National Park, Saldanha, S38(8)-HIA

Case No: HWC24042203SB0823

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 due to visual concerns and highly sensitive landscape.

12.3. RE/13, RE/1/13, 1/14, Roam WEF, Off N12, Prince Albert, S38(8)-HIA

Case No: 25301SB0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/submissions/35124>

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 as the WEF is located outside of a REDZ and visual and palaeontological impacts have been identified.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 4834, 68 Barry Street, Robertson, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27850CH0317 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/391565>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 1 April 2026.
- Potential IIIC (according to the Langeberg MSDF) outside HPO. The heritage practitioner recommends a IIIC grading due to the structure being landmark building with architectural and aesthetical significance, the social significance relative to the Barry family and later associations with the Avalon Hotel Group and contextual significance for its contribution to the Robertson townscape and streetscape.
- Proposal is to complete renovations that were previously approved by HWC in 2023, regularize work done by the previous owner and new alterations to the existing buildings. There are three buildings on site namely the Grand Hotel, the Wellness Centre building and Travel Lodge building.
- Work has started.
- Previous applications:
 - S34 permit issued on 13 July 2023 for A&A (HWC23061908RG0628). The previous permit included the condition for a close out report however it was never submitted due to the property being sold in September 2025.
- Langeberg Municipality supports.

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 must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.
2. The close-out report must, in addition, document the previous approved work as permit dated 13 July 2023.

CH

13.2 Erf 505, 17 Flower Street, Hermanus, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27924CH0324 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/393961>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 13 April 2026.
- Graded IIIC inside HPO
- Proposal is for internal alterations to the bathroom and the addition of a family room, patio pergola and scullery/pantry.
- 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

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Jone Kros and Bruce Wilson were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is to demolish the existing structure on site.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT notes that the building has undergone some alterations however these changes have not compromised the significance of the building. CoCT does not support the proposal for the following reasons:
 - The existing structure retains a degree of integrity with regards to fabric, form and spatial layout, architectural character and setting.
 - The documentation provided does not justify for the demolition. Furthermore, the demolition appears to be motivated by development potential and no replacement structures have been presented.
 - The demolition would result in loss of architectural quality and craftsmanship, erosion of historic streetscape character and sense of place, loss of local identity, diminishment of the heritage context for surrounding properties and will set a precedent for demolition of heritage resources in the area.
- CoCT recommends that alternative approaches be considered such as retention and sensitive additions and alterations on site and adaptive reuse to ensure ongoing conservation of the heritage resource.
- CIBRA stated that they cannot comment on the demolition without plans for the replacement structure.
- CTHF did not comment within 30 days.
- Applicants response to the objections:
 - The existing dwelling contributes to the general historical fabric of Vredehoek; however, it is not a rare, intact, or architecturally distinguished example of a typology that defines the character of the precinct. The building has been subject to cumulative alterations overtime which have reduced its architectural integrity and character. The grading of IIIC does not imply that the structure should be retained irrespective of condition or context but rather than its value is in its contribution to the broader streetscape. Where that streetscape is fragmented, altered or no longer intact, the justification for retention is correspondingly reduced.
 - While there are some original fabric elements that remain, the structure has undergone numerous alterations and modifications including changes to internal layout, additions and adjustments to boundary conditions and street interfaces. These interventions have diminished the authenticity and legibility of the original building. The structure no longer represents a fully intact or coherent example of the Edwardian typology as referenced in the CoCT comment.
 - The streetscape is described as a layered and discontinuous urban condition rather than a coherent or intact heritage ensemble. Historic aerial imagery and mapping indicate how the precinct has evolved incrementally over time with phases of alterations, replacement and infill developments resulting on a mixed and uneven urban grain. Within this context there is no single structure that functions as a defining anchor of streetscape character. The contribution of the subject dwelling must therefore be understood as limited.
 - The precinct constitutes the precedence of larger institutional and multi-unit developments including the Nazareth House precinct which has already introduced a different scale and grain to the urban environment. Therefore, the project must be assessment with the broader precinct scale.
 - Any attempt at retention would require interventions of such extent that the resulting structure

would retain only a superficial relationship to the original building fabric. This would undermine, rather than conserve, the heritage value associated with the structure.

- Alternatives to demolition, including retention, adaptive reuse, and extension, were considered during the early stages of the project. However, these options were found to be impractical without extensive reconstruction of the existing structure.
- Regarding the absence of a detailed replacement building proposal, should HWC consider it necessary, this can be provided as part of a subsequent submission. Any future development will be assessed through the City's Development Management Scheme and Municipal Planning By-Law. The absence of a replacement proposal at this stage does not affect the assessment of the existing building's heritage value.
- Demolition of the structure would not result in the erosion of a coherent or highly intact historic streetscape. The character of this portion of Vredehoek Avenue is derived from its layered evolution, varied built form, and relatively weakly defined street edge, rather than from the preservation of every individual structure.
- HOMs conducted a site inspection on 16 April 2026.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 20 April 2026.
- The Committee noted the following:
 - The site inspection confirmed that the property has limited heritage significance, with its contribution to the streetscape diminished by alterations, the boundary wall, and the fragmented surrounding context.
 - The streetscape similarly lacks coherence in character and has considerable building typologies. There are nodes of art-deco influence, but the site is flanked by less significant structures and a modern intervention would be well-placed in this context.
 - According to the CoCT map viewer the buildings styles are a mix of arts & craft and art deco with one or two Edwardian dwellings. From certain vantage points along the street it does have good character. However, due to the bend of the road the subject property is not immediately read in relation to the other arts & craft or art deco buildings along the street.
 - The experience of the subject property is compromised by the large NCW structure adjacent to it (across Erven 2431 and 1087-RE). The NCW structure disproportionately impacts on the experience of the subject property from the street, and it breaks up the streetscape.
 - The replacements structure poses no negative impact on the more architecturally significant structures further west along the avenue or in the parallel Rudley road.

DECISION

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

CH

13.4

Erf 234, 46 Bath Street, Montagu, S34-Minor Works

Case No.: 27965CH0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395344>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 13 April 2026
- Not Graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal fit out for the Standard Bank building.
- Work applied for has already been completed.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to issue a S51 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.

13.5 Farm 663, Meaker Road, Paarl, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No.: 27479CH0219 / HWC25102307CH0219 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389777>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Further requirements received on 15 April 2025. HOMs on 30 March 2026 required internal and external photographs of the second dwelling, heritage statement that assesses significance and impacts of the proposed interventions, a written response to DHAC comment and for all unauthorized work to be documented in the heritage statement and annotated on the drawings.
- Not Graded within the Sonstraal Road Scenic Route Overlay Zone. At the 16 March 2036 meeting, DHAC retracted their comment regarding the IIC grading and stated that the werf is graded IIIA.
- Proposal is to renovate the farmhouse/second dwelling. The work includes internal alterations, raising the roof to accommodate a kitchen, dining/living room, bedroom, walk in closet and bathroom. All windows and doors will be replaced with aluminum. No work is proposed to the main dwelling.
- Work has not started.
- DHAC does not the proposal and recommends the following:
 - - The proposed gables to the new extension must be removed.
 - - The replacement of all the existing windows and doors with aluminum is not supported.
 - - A heritage statement must be provided for comment which assesses the significance of the heritage resource and the proposed alterations and additions.
- DHF supports provided that no work is undertaken on the main dwelling. The design of the proposed end gable should not replicate that of the main house and must be simplified.
- Paarl300 Foundation did not comment within 30 days.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 20 April 2026
- The Committee noted the following:
 - The photographs demonstrate very clearly that there is no architectural significance inherent in the structure.
 - The new roof will follow the same roof typology as existing. The gable ends on the second dwelling are simplistic and does not replicate the holbol gables.
 - Although the second storey addition to the second dwelling will be visible from the Werf, the proposed height of the second storey addition will not detract from the main dwelling.
 - The applicant confirmed that no unauthorized work had taken place to the structure and that the windows and doors are existing.

DECISION

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

13.6 Erf 1512, 6 Blouvillei Road, Wellington, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27892CN0319 <https://sahris.org.za/node/392895>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information was requested for streetscape photos and confirmation if work has been completed - received on 2 & 10 April 2026.
- Grading: Not graded

- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Started but not complete.
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: Retrospective approval is sought for alterations undertaken by the previous owner, including the construction of a swimming pool and garden area, partial enclosure of the rear porch with a steel roof structure, reconfiguration of internal bathrooms, and the insertion of additional windows and doors. New work proposed by the current owner includes extending the existing roof sheeting over the porch and enclosing the north side of the porch.
- Consultation:
- DHAC has no objection and notes the work to be completed.
- DHF has no objection
- WHF has no objection
- Heritage Considerations: The building could be regarded as a IIIB from the photos, however not graded. The proposals are minimal, internal and to the rear. Little to no impact to the heritage resource.

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.

CN

13.7 Erf 229, 50 Bath Street, Montagu, S34-Total Demolition Case No: HWC25050715CN0402

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: Not graded, as per 2015 SDF and draft SDF 2023-2028 that is based on Ms. Abrahamse Desktop Heritage Survey 2013.
- HPO: Outside (inside proposed heritage area) as per draft SDF 2023-2028.
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: To demolish the old wagon building to the rear of the property.
- Consultation:
- Langeberg Municipality supports a submission to HWC.
- Montagu Heritage Association objects to the demolition citing that the building is the oldest wagon house in Montagu
- Structural Engineer's report: The assessment identified multiple structural defects including spalling concrete at column bases, corroded reinforcement, extensive cracking in brickwork, rising damp, plaster delamination, roof and timber damage, and foundation movement. The office and former dentist buildings show repairable defects with recommended remedial works such as concrete repairs, brick stitching, corrosion treatment, and lintel installation. However, the storage building is considered structurally unsafe, with significant movement, roof failure, wall panel instability, and is recommended for demolition due to health and safety risks.
- Heritage Considerations: From the photos the building does not seem worthy of retention and has now deteriorated to the point of no return. It might be the oldest wagon house in Montagu according to MHA, but I don't think a heritage statement is warranted here.
- The committee noted that while the age of the structure is a factor of significance, potentially being one of the oldest of its kind in the area, this value is outweighed by the severely compromised structural integrity. The committee indicated that where the condition of the

building prevents the retention of its age value, there is little justification for its preservation on that basis alone.

DECISION

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

CN

13.8 Erf 2932, 54 Rathfelder Avenue, Constantia, S34-Minor Works **Case No: 27411CN0216 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389391>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The item was put under investigation at HOMs on 23 Feb to investigate if a permit was issued for the solar panels on the roof, and to look at the cumulative impact on the heritage resources.
- Grading: IIIA on the City Map Viewer. BELCom (27 July 2016) notes in the discussion of the item that the site has been graded by IGIC as Grade II and has also been nominated as a PHS but this process is still ongoing. The application was submitted as a Section 34.
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: All work has been completed
- Previous Applications: 15106008KR0415E - Proposed extension application was before BELCom. Could not locate minutes with an approval.
- Proposal: Proposed conversion of the roof space of the main house into a storage area, with openable, flush-mounted skylights for natural light and ventilation. The proposal largely contained within the existing roof void and access via a new timber staircase. The proposal includes solar panels on the main dwelling and the outbuilding.
- Heritage Considerations: Given the new photo record, it can be determined that the proposed interventions do not impact on the significance of the building nor site.

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.

CN

13.9 Erf 583 & Erf 570-R, 28 & 26A Chiappini Street, Cape Town, S34-Total Demolition **Case No: 27466CN0218 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389625>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.
Joné Kros was present for the item

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC/4 on the City Map Viewer
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC25040205SJ0304 - S38(4)NID: To demolish all structures on the sites and redevelop the site with a new 11 storey mixed-use structure. The site is proposed for consolidation from the current configuration of 4 erven (568, 569, 571, 583) and 2 servitudes (570-Re, 570-0-1). HIA incl. 1. Architectural Assessment, 2. Desktop Archaeological Impact Assessment, 3. Townscape Assessment, 4. Visual Impact Assessment requested by HOMs on 6

May 2025. Email uploaded by this applicant indicating the previous NID via ref HWC25040205SJ0304 has been withdrawn.

- Proposal: For total demolition of the building.
- Consultation:
- CoCT supports
- CIBRA requests to at least have an impression of the intended new building(s) or structures which would replace an existing structure. Without at least an impression of the intended new building CIBRA have no reference to comment on.
- CTHF has no objection
- DWCA did not comment in 30 days.
- Heritage Considerations: The building is deemed not worthy of retention, as it does not hold any architectural or cultural significance.

DECISION

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

CN

13.10 Erf 98504, 127 Milner Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: HWC25091710CN1029

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.
Bruce Burmeister was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for CoCT and RCID comments and plan indicating work started/completed - received on 13 & 16 April 2026
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Outside
- Status of work: Not started
- Previous approvals: 19102501TZ1029E - Additions of roof slab over existing patio area on the rear of the building. Internal alterations of existing spaces. Addition of the first-floor library.
- Proposal: The proposal for alterations and additions is to convert existing garage into new office and replace existing flat concrete roof with a newly proposed mono-pitch IBR roof. Build two ablutions, one is located outdoor near the ex. Chapel and a newly proposed disabled WC next to the main ex. dwelling. Two newly proposed garages, one near Milner Road by entrance and one next to main dwelling. Propose alterations to the ex. patio area. On the second floor, newly proposed parapet wall for new portion of roof over private library room and proposed new concrete stairs in ex. patio are into newly proposed addition of sunroom. The proposal also includes a forecourt roof attached to the church and facing onto the road.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - RCID did not provide comment in 30 days.
- Heritage considerations: The applicant confirmed the at no work has started. The work is deemed reasonable towards to the heritage resource and little to no negative impacts anticipated.

DECISION

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

CN

13.11 Erven 17856 and 17857, 337 and 338 Watersedge Drive, Pinnacle Point, Mossel Bay, S27 – Consolidation; Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27200EJV0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388709>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 13 April 2026
- Inside the Pinnacle Point PHS buffer zone
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to consolidate the two erven and undertake additions and alterations to connect the dwellings on either erf with the addition of guest bedrooms above the garage and internal alterations.
- Pinnacle Point Homeowners Association have no objection; Heritage Mossel Bay support and stamped the plans in approval

DECISION

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

EJV

13.12 Erf 14079, 83 Roodebloem Street, Woodstock, S34 – Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27055CSI0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388314>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 13 April for revised plans and streetscape photos
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for the remediation of the enclosed stoep and raising the existing boundary wall 1.8m, the retractable outdoor PVC roller blinds which intrudes over onto the boundary will be removed/demolished. Only the retractable awning which covers the stoep area will be kept.
- CoCT provided comment and do not support the application and have stated although the intention to undo the detrimental enclosure of the stoep is positive, in the boundary wall proposal, the 500mm permeable portion at the top is insufficient due to the fact that the wall increases in height as it steps down the street. The 1.8 m height is agreed to on condition that a minimum of 600mm of visually permeable palisade be provided along the entire length of the wall; the solid portion of the wall below should not exceed 1200mm in height at any point. This should be stepped with the slope. This is a typical proportion for walls in heritage contexts which allows for the site to contribute to the street. The previous columns, at the original height evident on the streetview image below, should be retained. CoCT further requirements: The elevation is not annotated. It should be confirmed that pedestrian gate and upper section of wall is visually permeable palisade. Clarity also needed on whether any work is proposed on the façade (windows).
- WRA provided comment and do not support the application noting that for undoing the illegal enclosure of the stoep, we would like to note that the stoep was not simply concreted up at the front, between the columns, but also at both sides, and the roof awning was extended to the site boundary and covers the entire stoep, enclosing the space. Regarding the wall proposal, we will object to a solid wall any higher than before the illegal building, not properly stepped up on the slope or exceeding 1.2m at any point. Including a permeable portion, the wall would need to be below 1.8m and the design would have to be heritage compatible.

- WAAC provided comment and do not support the application noting that 1. Points made by Berendine Irrgang of the CoCT Environment and Heritage Management Branch noted, with regards to scale and proportion of the works. These need to be adhered to as the minimum, or propose a larger volume of the boundary wall be metal work / fencing rather than walling Walling & fencing to tier with the slope of the site, with the tallest section of wall being proposed at 1800mm being measured from the lowest side of the property and adjacent Erf 14078. The question needs to be asked – can the proposal not work with or be sensitive to the existing heritage brickwork walling? 2. We recommend that the existing metalwork (gates & fence items) currently on site be reworked / reused, as it is sensitive to the Woodstock HPOZ and has far better aesthetics than what the application proposes. (see image below as reference).
- Applicant response: The plans have been revised in response to the City's comment. WRA comments regarding the heights of the boundary wall have been adhered to and inline with the requirements. As per the comment from the WAAC. The reason for the request of raising the solid boundary wall is merely for security reasons. My client has previously had his work tools and materials stolen through the metal work (gate & fencing). The client has however advised that he will be reusing the metal fencing at the open permeable areas which would still fall in line with the WAAC request of reusing the metal fencing and gate.
- All parties have been invited to HOMS.

DECISION

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

CSI

13.13 Erf 2928, 16 Disa Avenue, Kommetjie, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27945CSI0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394541>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received 13 April for CoCT and KHS comment and title deed.
- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to the existing dwelling with new roof to replace the asbestos roof, an addition of a main bedroom & en-suite, study, laundry, terrace, car port, and changing the existing garage to a second bedroom.
- CoCT and Kommetjie Heritage Society provided comment and support the application.

FOR NOTING

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

CSI

13.14 Erf 855, 17 Exner Avenue, Vredehoek, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27779CSI0312 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391194>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Gys le Roux was present and took part in the in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 30 March for power of attorney signed by the other title deed holder, CoCT formal comment sheet.
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC/4

- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for a flat roof second story addition to the existing dwelling with chromadek cladding
- CoCT provided comment and do not support the application stating the current proposed work is not supported as it will detract from the significance of the semi-detached typology, the contextual significance of the site and the roofscape of the area. The flat roof second storey and extensive chromadek cladding is out of keeping to the abutting unit, and the existing significant historical elements and features of near distant sites. Additions to the existing roof such as appropriately placed roof dormers (for rooms in a roof) is a way forward. Or alternatively is an extension to the rear encouraged. The latter can extend from the current ground floor footprint with either its own hipped pitched roof or have a flat roof and deck. Internal changes such as an internal staircase can be accommodated.
- CIBRA provided comment and do not support the application stating design of roof terrace roofing and balustrade to tie in with those on the first floor, so that these elements relate and uniformly. Choice of cladding material not supported, preferably one type, eg timber or bamboo planks or bamboo castellated cladding. The applicant revised the design and CIBRA supported the second revision.
- Applicant response to CIBRA: 1. Support the concern that the roof terrace cladding material to match level 01 cladding material. 2. We have altered design of pergola over to be demountable to reduce visual impact 3. In essence support the change in cladding material to composite wood – as supported by CIBRA, 4. We would like specific comment from HWC if original cladding material of Chromadek cladding could be considered as alternative.
- Applicant response to CoCT: 1. We question City of Cape town comment “extensive chromadek cladding is out of keeping to the abutting unit, and the existing significant historical elements and features of near distant sites”. The design approach was taken to provide modern low maintenance alternative in light colour to offset the new addition from the old. 2. We question City of Cape Town comment “detract from the significance of the semidetached typology”. The addition is visually obstructed with existing pergola and planting. The building as a whole is also set back from the street edge with existing garage door on the street boundary. We feel the proposed addition does not affect the streetscape and is scaled to still depict semi-detached typology in an modern design. 3. Our response to “Additions to the existing roof such as appropriately placed roof dormers (for rooms in a roof) is a way forward. Or alternatively is an extension to the rear encouraged. The latter can extend from the current ground floor footprint with either its own hipped pitched roof or have a flat roof and deck.” Addition to the rear is not possible as a result of servitude located at the rear of the building. The current roof allows for very little additional floor space gained and positioning the staircase to allow access to the roof has large implication on the existing ground floor layout.
- All parties have been invited to HOMs.

DECISION

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

CSI

13.15 Erven 5667 & 5668, c/o Drury Lane and Kent Street, Zonnebloem, S35 – Destruction & Demolition Case No: HWC260407CSI0407

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Harriet Clift and Martin Witbooi were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 14 April for proof of payment
- Work applied for has not started

- Proposed work is for destruction/demolition of potential archaeological foundations of structures dating to the late 19th century which were demolished in the 1950s. It is not anticipated that any significant artefactual deposits would be found in association with these remains. The site has been identified for redevelopment for affordable housing. While there are no S34 and S38 permit requirements, it is likely that there may be foundations on the site that could be deemed archaeological. Based on previous experience in the area, foundations are likely to be present, but of low archaeological significance.
- Graded NCW/Requires Further Investigation
- According to CoCT map viewer: Site of demolished dwelling. Some archaeological potential for remains of late 19th century dwellings along Roeland street. Also forming part of District Six. Appears to have been some changes to ground levels.
- A repository agreement with Iziko has been submitted.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

Approval is given on condition that:

1. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified archaeologist with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Harriet Clift to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Harriet Clift, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.
3. A monitoring brief must be given to contractors on site with the HWC chance and accidental finds protocol attached.

CSI

13.16 Erven 9711, 9712, 9713, & 9714, 27 Tara Street, Durbanville S38(1) – NID **Case No: 27857RB0317 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391580>**

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 8 April 2026.
- 38(1)(c)(ii) triggered.
- The proposal is for consolidation and subdivision that will result in a gated estate of 9 erven and a right of way servitude (no rezoning).
- There are no heritage resources being impacted as per the applicant, and officer agrees with this (palaeo is blue/low, no archaeology here, no visuals, no historical/intangible histories, etc.).
- However, the character is changing from an open residential area to a closed off estate, hence the NHRA trigger.
- The Committee debated the matter and deemed there to be no change in character with the proposal.

COMMENT

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

RB

13.17 Erf 534, 2 Hoog Street, Piketberg, S34 – Additions & Alterations **Case No: 27735RB0310 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390641>**

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 15 April 2026.
- Not graded and outside of any HPO (but I would say likely a IIIB hence not recommending for ASD).

- Second deviation for original application (HWC25081905SJ0819, first deviation HWC25102106SB1021).
- Original and first application was for adding a courtyard with braai room, pergolas, and pool.
- Current proposal changes some of the walls from glass panels to brick (west) and lowering of other walls (east).
- The pergola is now steel and no longer timber.
- Different veranda windows and different doors (from sliding to stacking) will now be used.
- The veranda roof is also changing to timber and corrugated sheeting from the original concrete slab.
- Work has not started.
- Municipality have no objection to the current proposal.

DECISION

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

RB

13.18 Portion 1 of Farm Uyekraal No 189, Malmesbury Farms, Saldanha Bay, S38(8) – HIA Case No: HWC24091145RB0912

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 due to the objection resulting in HOMS not having delegation to process the matter.

RB

13.19 Erf 67397, 5 Lindley Road, Wynberg, S34 – Total Demolition Case No: 27699RB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390398>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

Kobus van Wyk and Phillipa Duncan were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 15 April 2026.
- Graded IIIB.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to demolish the structure on site.
- CoCT do not support, stating that this needs to be preserved and that it may set the precedent for high and denser developments.
- WRA did not respond to request for comment within 30 days.
- HWC conducted a site inspection to interrogate the discrepancy between the heritage statement that claims the structure to be NCW and the CoCT comment that insists that the structure is a IIIB.
- The site inspection report that was tabled at HOMS on 30 March 2026 and concluded that there is no heritage context remaining and that alterations over the years have reduced much of the original fabric with better examples of the Edwardian Row Style typologies elsewhere in Wynberg.
- All parties have been invited.
- The Committee, along with the applicant and the WRA representative, ventilated the matter and agreed that the precedent had already been set for high rise developments and that there are better examples of the Edwardian row typology elsewhere (even nearby) in Wynberg.

DECISION

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

RB

- 13.20** **Portion 18, 16 & RE/14 of Farm 362, Schrywershoek, Southeast of the hamlet of Churchhaven, West of the Langebaan Estuary and East and North of the West Coast National Park, Saldanha, S38(8)-HIA**
Case No: HWC24042203SB0823

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 due to visual concerns and highly sensitive landscape.

SB

- 13.21** **Megora 1a, 1b, 1c and 2 solar PV facilities, the Megora EGI 2 between PV 2 and 1a, and associated infrastructure, on Remainder of the farm badfontein no.10, near Murraysburg, S38(8)-HIA**
Case No: 26432SB1017 <https://sahris.org.za/node/386259>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Megora PV Combined Projects HIA assesses the heritage impacts of developing four solar PV facilities (Megora PV 1A, 1B, 1C, and 2, each 90-170 MW), a 132 kV overhead power line (EGI 2), substations, BESS, roads, and infrastructure on 859 ha of the Remainder of Farm Badfontein No. 10 near Murraysburg (not Beaufort West), Western Cape. The sites lie in the Beaufort West REDZ (REDZ 11), with current extensive grazing/agricultural use and generally low heritage significance, outside Heritage Protection Overlay zones.
- Zone: Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ) – Beaufort West area.
- Location: Near Beaufort West.
- Current use: Primarily agricultural (extensive farming/grazing).
- Grade: Generally low heritage significance (no high-grade resources identified).
- HPO: Outside
- DFFE as decision authority – HWC needs to provide a comment as soon as possible as comment period closed on 8 April.
- Constraints:
 - Located within a REDZ (strategic development area) – REDZ 11 zone
 - Visual sensitivity (tourism receptors).
 - Large-scale footprint (cumulative impacts with other RE projects).
- Anticipated Impacts on Heritage Resources:
- Archaeology:
 - Archaeological findings across the project areas are sparse and of low significance (Grade 3C or ungradable). Identified resources include ephemeral Later Stone Age (LSA) artefact scatters, isolated stone cairns (likely historical farm markers), a grindstone, and minor stone features. These resources are of low heritage value and can be avoided or mitigated.
- Palaeontological:
 - The study area is underlain by formations with generally high palaeontological sensitivity (Teekloof and Balfour Formations); however, no fossil occurrences were identified within the development footprints, despite fossiliferous outcrops in the broader area. Impacts are therefore considered unlikely, subject to the implementation of a chance finds protocol.
- Visual:
 - The development will introduce large-scale infrastructure (PV arrays up to ±4.5 m in height and substations up to ±18 m), resulting in moderate, negative, long-term visual impacts at a local scale. This will alter the existing Karoo pastoral landscape character; however, the area is already undergoing a transition towards an industrial renewable energy landscape within a Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ).
- Built:
 - No significant built heritage resources occur within the project footprints. Nearby historical structures and farm infrastructure are located outside of the impact areas and will not be

- affected.
- Cultural:
 - The broader cultural landscape is characterised as a lightly utilised, evolving rural landscape with moderate visual sensitivity. While the development will alter landscape character, this change is consistent with ongoing renewable energy development in the region. Impacts are considered low to moderate and mitigable.
 - Graves and Burials (if needed to include):
 - Two farm cemeteries (Grade 3A, high local significance) occur within the wider study area but are located outside the project footprints and will not be impacted.
 - Alternatives:
 - Multiple layout iterations undertaken to avoid CBAs and sensitive features.
 - Site selection within REDZ supports strategic avoidance.
 - Consultants recommend:
 - Proceed with development subject to mitigation measures; impacts acceptable and no fatal flaws identified.
 - PPP: Public Participation Process undertaken as part of BAR (implied).
 - EIA/NEMA status: 30 days period for state and I&AP commenting period.
 - “Public Participation
 - As required by the NEMA, the Megora Cluster draft BA reports, including the HIAs, will be subject to a formal 30-day public comment period. As part of that process, the HIAs and other relevant EIA documentation will be submitted to HWC, the relevant statutory heritage commenting body under the NEMA, for comment. The HIAs will also be submitted to the relevant local and regional municipalities, and any other stakeholders or interested and affected parties with an interest in heritage resources in the area. Any heritage-related comments received during the public participation exercise will be considered and addressed in the final HIAs.
 - The committee noted that project has been broken up into various HIA, as project is split because different parts (solar plants and power lines) have different owners, impacts, and legal requirements, hence each needs its own approval, even though they are linked. The consultant has asked that comment letter you indicate will be provided by HOMs clearly indicates a) that the comments made apply to all five projects collectively, or b) includes project-specific sections if comments vary between the five projects. This is to ensure that the letter can be used in the Comment and Responses Report for each of the individual projects.
 - Further notes that the project is at draft BAR.
 - The committee concluded that the proposed renewable energy development falls within a designated REDZ and is located in an area of generally low heritage significance, with no high-grade resources identified. The HIA finds that potential impacts on archaeological, palaeontological, visual, and cultural b being low to moderate and can be adequately mitigated. Given the absence of fatal flaws and the strategic nature of the site, the application is supported, subject to the submission of the final HIA upon completion and implementation of recommended mitigation measures.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee notes that the S38(8) HIA, titled “Combined Heritage Impact Assessment Report for the Proposed Development of The Megora 1a, 1b, 1c and 2 Solar PV Facilities, The Megora Egi 2 Between Pv 2 And 1a, And Associated Infrastructure, On Remainder Of the Farm Badfontein No.10, Near Murraysburg”, dated 14 April 2026, and prepared by TerraMare Archaeology. The final integrated HIA that complies with S38(3) must be submitted to HWC upon completion of the public participation process.

13.22 Erf 2542, 95 Merriman Street, George, S34-Maintenance and Repair
Case No: 27949SB0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394550>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: replacing tiled roof with metal sheet, paint inside and outside, replace broken windows.
- Work start: no
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: na as minor works but committee can decide due to the material of the roof is changing.
- Additional information received 13 Apr 2026 that includes streetscape photographs and updated method statement with photographs showing the work proposed.

FOR NOTING

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

SB

13.23 Erf 313, 4 Cupido Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27970SB0325 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395357>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Updated Title deed or proof of ownership required.

SB

13.24 RE/13, RE/1/13, 1/14, Roam WEF, Off N12, Prince Albert, S38(8)-HIA
Case No: 25301SB0529 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/381757>

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 20 May 2026 as the WEF is located outside of a REDZ and visual and palaeontological impacts have been identified.

SB

13.25 Erf 52605, 15 Thomson Road, Claremont, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition
Case No: 27824SB0313 <https://sahris.org.za/node/391483>

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: new double garage
- Work start: No
- Grade: 3C
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: CoCT stamped the plans
- HO: double garage and contemporary structures in the area, do not see this having a negative impact.
- Additional information received 8 April 2026 that includes Greater Lynfræe Civic Association has no objection and CoCT support.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as

- 13.26 Erf 1409, Unit 3, Section 23, Ellerton Mansions, 1A Glengariff Road, Three Anchor Bay, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27913SVB0323 <https://sahris.org.za/node/393888>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 13 April 2026.
- The property is graded IIIC and within the Sea Point HPOZ.
- Work is complete.
- The completed work is new internal joinery and fittings in the kitchen and bathroom, closing up a single door leading on to the balcony and installation of a new aluminium framed glass sliding-folding door leading onto the balcony.

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.

SVB

- 13.27 Erf 253, 9 Tinley Street, Barrydale, S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 27953SVB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394575>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 10 April 2026.
- The property is not graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for total demolition of the garage structure and construction of a new garage in its place.
- Swellendam Local Municipality did not respond.
- Swellendam Heritage Association has no objection to the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

- 13.28 Erf 258, 4 Avenue De Longueville, Fresnaye, S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 27944SVB0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394304>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Nick Smith, Johan Cornelius and Doron Goldberg were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The property is graded IIIC and outside of any HPO.
- This application was tabled at the Heritage Officers' Meeting on 13 April; however, it was held over pending a site inspection.

- Members of the HOMs committee undertook an inspection of the site and surrounds on 16 April 2026.
- The property is graded IIIC and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for total demolition of all structures on the site.
- The CoCT heritage survey refers to the property as having *"some intact elements such as its windows, and form. Has large mature boundary trees" and that it "Is part of the early to mid 20th century development of Fresnaye. Is a fairly good architectural example. Interface with the street can be improved. High boundary and vegetated boundary limits contribution to streetscape."*
- CoCT support the proposal.
- Sea Point for All did not submit a comment.
- SFB did not submit a comment.
- Nicholas Smith Attorneys representing 6 individuals objected to the proposal. The committee has had site of the objections, however in summary the objectors argue that:
 - The streetscape itself in Avenue de Longueville and Norman Grove embodies a distinctive heritage character when the individual heritage resources there are considered collectively, and in their proper context.
 - The properties situated in the Avenue de Longueville streetscape (with one exception) are significant both as individually graded heritage resources, and collectively.
 - The structure appears to be the second-oldest structure in the streetscape.
 - There are gaps in the contextual analysis of the report.
 - And there is insufficient information regarding the replacement structure with reference to the Gees judgement.
 - The objectors also note that it is incumbent upon HWC to assess the character of the streetscape and whether this particular part of Avenue de Longueville should be preserved as a heritage resource. They request that HWC undertake a site visit and for the right to make oral representations when this application is tabled.
- The applicant's response to objections can be summarized as follows:
 - Despite reference to the building being the second oldest structure in that particular street, the heritage integrity of the building has been destroyed by the 1955 and 1970 alterations.
 - The area within which the subject property is situated does not have a coherent heritage character.
 - The Todeschini and Japha report that led to the designation of urban conservation areas on the Atlantic Seaboard recognised that Fresnaye could not be appropriately formally protected or managed as an area warranting conservation.
 - Fresnaye is currently in a phase of transition.
 - The street has not been graded by the City of Cape Town nor is this within either a heritage protection overlay zone, or a proposed heritage protection overlay zone.
 - The applicant concludes that having regard to the subject structure itself and the context in which the subject property is situated, there is no rational justification for the imposition of any conditions for the replacement structure and would amount to an unjustified and arbitrary deprivation of property rights.
- All I&APs were invited to today's meeting.
- The site inspection report was flighted. The findings of the site inspection report, undertaken on 16 April, was summarized in the meeting as follows:
 - Heritage Western Cape officials including myself, Corne Alexander, Stephanie Bardard, Chane Herman, Xola Mlwandle, Chiara Singh and Emily-Jane Vowles were met on site by Garth Hamilton.
 - The interior, exterior and context were inspected with particular attention to the context given the grading and the nature of the objections.
 - In terms of the intrinsic significance of the structure. The interior of the structure located on Erf 258, Fresnaye was observed to be modernised with little to no original Victorian

features and the exterior of the structure has compromised by the 1950 and 1970 alterations, with minimal remaining original Victorian features.

- In terms of contextual significance of the structure. The site was observed to be characterised by high blank boundary walls and mature vegetation, blocking view of the structure from two of the three streets.
- In terms of the context. The portion of Avenue De Longueville Avenue (between Avenue Disandt and Ave Normandie) was observed to be heterogenous, with buildings of varying forms and character. The quality of the street interfaces along this portion of street varies significantly. Along Avenue De Longueville Avenue the most significant contributors to the streetscape are the IIIB graded resources on Erven 264 and 265. The other IIIB graded resources Erven 269 and 242 are not clearly visible from the street, lessening their contribution to the streetscape. The other structures along the street either have high walls or minimal aesthetic or architectural value.
- The properties immediately adjacent to the subject property along Avenue Normandie contain NCW structures. There are some IIIC and IIIB graded structures further along this street, however the streetscape is broken up by modern structures, which was observed to create an overall impression of a transformed streetscape.
- The recommendation of the report is for the site inspection as well as the site inspection report to be noted at this meeting.
- HWCs legal representative has advised that HOMs does not have delegation to resolve the matter. Given that a valid objection has been raised on heritage grounds, the matter must be referred to BELCom.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the matter to BELCom on 27 May 2026 due to delegations.

SVB

13.29 Erf 47773-RE, 91 Sandown Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 27966SVB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395348>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Bruce Burmeister and Pete Da Silva were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 8, 9 and 13 April 2026.
- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO. However, the city proposes a grading of IIIC/NCW in their comment.
- Work has started but has not been completed. Work has halted on site.
- The proposal is for extensive alterations to the existing dwelling as well as the addition of two new garages at the front of the property and a covered patio at the rear.
- CoCT support the proposal.
- RCID note that there are no heritage aspects to the existing house, and the house has been altered numerous times over the years, however they do have concern with the proposed double garage on the street boundary that in their words "is a solid wall which has no interface with the street at all". They further note that Sandown Road is an important artery in Rondebosch and interface with the street is important. They strongly recommend that the designer orientate this garage to face the street or advise how they intend to mitigate the solid wall as the application in its current form cannot be supported. They are concerned that the project has started already.
- The applicant has amended the drawings in response to RCID's comment and included a 200mm deep recess on the facade with the facebrick finish to match the material used elsewhere in the project to create a better interface with the street. The applicant notes that the owner is opposed to orientating the garage to the road mainly from a security point of view as this would

provide easy access to the garage from outside the property, as well as the concern of reversing out of the garage directly onto a busy road.

- All I&APs were invited to today's meeting.

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.

SVB

13.30 Erf 54613-RE, Herschel School, 21 Herschel Road, Claremont, S34-Additions, Alterations & Partial Demolition

Case No: 27955SVB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394726>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Claire Abrahamse was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 09 April 2026.
- The property is graded IIIB and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for additions and alterations to the existing school buildings to accommodate a new Science and Technology Centre, an underground car parking area, to improve circulation and to convert the spaces currently used for the boarding school into a new art wing.
- CoCT support the proposal.
- UCRRA support the proposal in principle. However, in terms of setback from Herschel Road and the treescape, they raise the following comments and queries: they have concern with the setback of the new structure from Herschel Road, which then also impacts the "breathing room" to the renovated Mary Jagger Hall. They ask whether there is any scope in the design to improve the setback of the new structure from Herschel Road.
- Docomomo-SA had the following comment. They note that if total demolition of the Arts Block is unavoidable, they support that the existing timber is salvaged and assessed for reuse in the new building or other alterations/additions on campus. They also request the opportunity to document the Arts Block before any alterations and/or demolitions take place.
- The Ward Councillor was consulted but did not comment.
- Applicant's response to the UCRRA comments and queries is as follows. The architects noted that they have already stepped this facade of the building back by 5m, which is 2m more than the By-Law's setback requirement. Having looked at the design of that edge again, they noted that they cannot squeeze that edge any more, as it will make the Tech teaching venues on ground floor too small. The heritage consultant notes that the elevational treatment of the building along Herschel Road has been cognisant of, and sensitive to, the prevalent landscape and treescape patterns, which it enforces. While the proposed building is set closer to the street than the current Arts Block, this has been mitigated through the treatment of this facade with angled trellises, on which plants will be grown, but which also "dematerialises" the facade to an extent, creating a lighter visual edge to the campus than the current structure provides.
- All I&APs were invited to today's meeting.

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. Ms. Claire Abrahamse must document the Arts Block on Erf 54613-RE, Claremont prior to any alterations and/or additions being undertaken to the building.
2. The aforementioned document must be submitted to HWC.

SVB

13.31 Erf 86, Wild Almond Hedge, 22B Klaasens Road, Bishopscourt, S27-Additions & Additions
Case No: HWC25081917SVB1104

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 11 March, 09 April and 13 April 2026.
- The property is a PHS and is outside of any HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for installation of a fence and gate to control access to the area.
- CoCT support the proposal with the following conditions:
 - Endorsed by Heritage Western Cape in terms of impact on the significance of the PHS by means of the required Section 27 Permit.
 - Due process be followed and authorisation received for the proposed 'fencing off'.
- FoCVGB were consulted and support the proposal.
- UCRRA were consulted but note that the site fall outside of their area of interest.
- The CoCT Grading Notes states *"Some controversy regarding link with vRiebeeck as the hedge was abandoned after 3 years, Sleigh (1999) maintains that the plantings are incorrectly associated with vRiebeeck."*
- The CoCT Statement of Significance states *"Wild Almond hedge associated with Jan van Riebeeck. Also marks the route of one of the oldest roads. Environmental significance as a grouping of significant indigenous trees."*

DECISION

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

SVB

13.32 Erf 1713, 135-143 Beach Road, Mouille Point, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27671XM0305 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/390348>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 14 April 2026.04.16
- The proposal is for Internal renovations and replacement of existing windows for new to body corporate requirements. Building in of new en suite shower room to master bedroom. Renovations to existing bathroom and new open plan kitchen.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO

DECISION

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

XM

13.33 Erf 78930, 22 Mile End Road, Diep River, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27971XM0326 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395370>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 14 April 2026.
- The proposal is for additions the existing garage/outbuilding will be extended and staff room altered. Second and third dwelling units are also proposed on this site.
- Work has not started
- Not Graded- city graded NCW
- Outside HPO
- Recommend: approval

DECISION

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

XM

13.34 Erf 29116, 5 Montreal Road, Mowbray, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27799XM0312 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/391326>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information received on 01 April 2026. Proposed additions and alterations for Proposed existing internal two walls to be removed
- Work has started not been completed
- Graded IIIC/4, outside HPO
- Recommend: S51 letter to be issued

DECISION

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

XM

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erven 10596, 10597 and 170937, 68, 74 and 76 Strand Street, Woodstock, S38-NID

Case No: 28045CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395602>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(1) trigger - site larger than 5000sqm and development involving 3 or more erven.
- Proposal is to consolidate three erven, demolish the existing structures on site and to develop a residential-led mixed-use development. The replacement structure will include a basement level, ground floor retail space and residential apartments above rising to approximately 10 storeys. The development footprint will be approximately 1300sqm
- According to the NID, the development is aligned with the mixed use 2 zoning and responds to ongoing densification and intensification of the Woodstock area.
- Departures in terms of heights, bulk and building lines will be addressed through the relevant land use planning applications.
- The existing structures on site are graded NCW outside of a HPO

- In terms of historical overview with particular reference to Strand Street - it forms part of the historic urban grid and reflects the layered and incremental development typical of Woodstock. Many properties in the area have been adapted, extended, or redeveloped over time, resulting in a heterogeneous urban fabric. While some older structures remain, much of the original built fabric has been altered or replaced in parts of the area. The subject properties reflect this pattern of change. 68 Strand Street dates to before 1934 and has been significantly altered over time resulting in a loss of its original form and character. 74 and 76 Strand Street are of more recent origin and represent later phases of development.
- The immediate context of the site is mixed-use in nature, with a combination of residential units, commercial premises, and light industrial activities.
- No heritage resources have been identified that would be impacted by the proposed development.
- The heritage practitioner recommends NFS

DECISION

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

CH

14.2 Erf 1298, 323 Main Road, Hermanus, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: 28061CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395642>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded outside HPO
- Proposal is to remove internal walls to create an open plan living space, extend the two south facing bedrooms, extend the south facing terrace, create an attic storage space and create north and south facing terraces and alterations to windows and doors.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC provided comment suggesting that the new arched door and window heads be horizontal to accord with the existing structures openings.

DECISION

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

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.

CH

14.3 Erf 154159, 5 Broadway Avenue, Newlands, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: 28028CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395541>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is to remove a wall to combine two bedrooms, reorientation of the roof of the garage to fall to the street and to construct a first-floor loft space.
- Work has not started.
- Previous application:
 - S51 letter issued on 25 June 2024 for unauthorized garage, timber deck and boundary wall.

- CoCT supports
- NCID provided a comment questioning whether it is appropriate to use the rather ill-proportioned remaining Cape Revival-inspired gable to set the tone for the other gables and suggest the new gables may be more appropriate as simpler forms without embellishment.

DECISION

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

CH

14.4 Erf 1908-RE, 35 Mann Street, George, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: 28033CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395559>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded outside HPO. Applicant recommends a grading of NCW.
- Proposal is to construct a new garage on the north western side of the main house, new braai on south eastern side of the house and to demolish the second dwelling.
- Work has not started.
- George Municipality did not comment within 30 days.
- GHT did not comment within 30 days.
- SvdS Foundation supports the proposed work however is concerned with the large single garage door that may visually overshadow the main how and therefore suggests that consideration be given to reduce the visual impact by making use of two doors.

DECISION

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

CH

14.5 Erf 50210, 3 Stirling Road, Newlands, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: 28027CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395538>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA authorizing the applicant to sign on behalf of the owners and for the POA to be signed by both Owners required.

CH

14.6 Portion 232 of Farm Onverwacht 159, Riverside, Volmoed, Oudtshoorn, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: 28051CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395627>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company Resolution authorizing Mr. J. Swart to sign on behalf of Villa Palms Boerdery CC

CH

14.7 Welvanpas Farm RE/238, Bovlei Road, Paarl, S34-Minor Works Case No: 28053CH0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395629>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded however is a proposed grade II
- Proposal is for deviations from the previous approved plans.
- The deviations include:
 - Internal alterations to the stables building;
 - New reinforced retaining wall, division walls and epoxy floors instead of stone in the Coach House.
 - Stable partitions under lean-to and additional trough for water at the Cattle Kraal.
 - New stable portions, additional internal columns, additional buttress walls to match existing, concrete floor finish instead of stone and additional opening in a wall for a new door at the Goat Kraal.
- Work has not started.
- Previous applications:
 - S34 permit issued on 22 May 2025 for emergency repairs to the cellar building (HWC250522112CH0522)
 - S34 permit issued on 15 July 2025 for restoration and alterations (HWC25060404SJ0627)
 - S34 permit issued on 2 June 2025 for restoration, alterations and additions to the coach house.
 - Comment was issued on 1 July 2025 endorsing the proposed way forward on the Farm in terms of S34 and S38.

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 a suitably qualified heritage consultant, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

CH

14.8

Erf 1488, 14 Mount Nelson Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28031CN0331 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395555>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: The proposal comprises internal alterations, including the removal of non-loadbearing walls, reconfiguration of living spaces and bathrooms as well as a storage in the roof, along with minor external additions such as timber decking and new boundary fencing.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - SFB did not comment in 30 days.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposals are acceptable and do not impact on the heritage resource nor the HPO.

DECISION

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

CN

14.9 Erf 1783, Cnr Napier & Montagu Streets, George, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: 28000CN0329 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395449>

Outstanding information:

Company Resolution, correct SG diagram, external photos and George Mun comments required.

CN

14.10 Erf 18348, 22 Beer Street, George - RC Primary School, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28001CN0329 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395450>

Outstanding information:

Church Resolution, internal photos, legible plan and motivation required

CN

14.11 Erf 3289, Distillery Road, Wellington - Railway Hotel, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 28014CN0330 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395481>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Lenize Gerber and Clive Theunissen joined in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC25110720CH1110 - S51 MW for windows on 1st floor and main ground floor door. 27237SVB0131 - Approved MW for timber windows to aluminium and internal alterations to allow for a coffee shop.
- Proposal: For replacing the existing timber entrance doors and windows with aluminium double doors, side lights, and a top window within the existing openings, retaining the current lintel and plaster detailing. The works also include the creation of a lobby area and repainting of the existing façade.
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the IIIC heritage resource nor the streetscape.
- Clive Theunissen noted that no formal comment has yet been issued, as the application was only recently reviewed and additional information has been requested. He indicated that the work appears to have already been completed without approval, and that further work on site is ongoing. He added that there may be more happening on the site than is currently reflected in the application and suggested that HWC should conduct a site inspection to better understand the full extent of the works.
- Lenize Gerber supported the concerns raised regarding the work already being completed on site and noted that the development appears to be nearing completion and is already being advertised. She highlighted that the round windows, which formed part of the Art Deco façade, have been removed, despite a letter having been issued instructing that they be reinstated. She indicated that work is continuing without permission and supported the need for the matter to be further investigated.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

Case officer to investigate the work currently underway on site and undertake a site inspection along with the municipality.

CN

- 14.12 Erf 4423, 11b Retief Street, Piketberg, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27923CN0323 <https://sahris.org.za/node/393949>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Registered SG diagram, Streetscape photos and confirmation if work has started required.

CN

- 14.13 Erf 8992, 5 First Avenue, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28042CN0401 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395594>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC24101506CN1022 - S51 for internal changes, new garage and alterations to the rear.
- Proposal: For extensive alterations and additions that include the demolition of various later lean-to additions (garage/store, rear kitchen/entertainment/patio area, and northern bedroom extension) and removal of the existing tiled roof to be replaced with new corrugated sheeting. The proposal introduces internal reconfigurations to improve circulation, the addition of one new bedroom and additional bathrooms, construction of a new double garage positioned close to the street boundary but set back behind the existing boundary wall.
- Consultation:
- DHAC has no objection
- Paarl 300 supports
- DHF strongly objects to the proposed location of the new double garage due to it will negatively impacting the East (front/street) Elevation, the historic streetscape, and it may set a negative precedent in the street. The garage must be setback from the Eastern facade as much as possible, but if not possible, the committee will support the position of the current garage (on site). The committee will not have any objections to the addition of a carport/pergola in front of the existing garage, similar to the one(s) found across the street. No structures will be supported that encroaches on the Eastern/front facade in the way that the proposed double garage will. The committee has no objection to the other proposed alterations and additions shown.
- Applicant response to DHF objection: The applicant argues that the proposed garage is consistent with the existing streetscape, where similar street-facing garages already occur within the immediate area, establishing a clear precedent. The garage is set back behind the existing boundary wall and designed to remain visually subordinate through its low parapet form and integrated architectural treatment. It is further motivated that an enclosed garage is functionally necessary for security and storage, and that consolidating this into a single structure avoids future ad hoc additions
- Heritage Considerations: The proposal removes unsympathetic later additions and rationalises the built form, enhancing the legibility of the historic core. The internal reconfiguration and additions are appropriate for a grade IIC resource and do not negatively impact heritage significance. The proposed garage is set back behind the boundary wall and designed to be visually recessive, with similar typologies present in the surrounding context.

DECISION

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

CN

14.14 Erf 1259, 24 Kloof Nek Road, Tamboerskloof, S34 - Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28021CSI0330 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395513>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Signed PoA, CIBRA comment not uploaded, additional streetscapes, outstanding payment required.

CSI

14.15 Erf 178545, 12 Beach Road, Woodstock, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 28043CSI0401 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395597>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for sheeted roof covering over existing concrete roof

DECISION

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

CSI

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

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

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

CoCT and GPRRA comment required.

CSI

14.17 Erf 791 117 Baron van Reede Street, Oudtshoorn, S34 - Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28072CSI0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395694>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has been completed
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Completed work is for stoep additions
- Oudtshoorn Municipality provided comment noting the Oudtshoorn Heritage comment
- Oudtshoorn Heritage provided comment stating that they do not condone unauthorised work.

COMMENT

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

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

CSI

14.18 Farm 103 & Farm 208-RE, Farm Klipfontein, Aurora, Bergrivier, S38(1) - NID
Case No: 28084CSI0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395768>

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., (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
- Proposed development: Two HDPE-lined brine ponds, each with a floor area of approximately 3 553.73 m² and a combined area of 7 544.62 m² including embankments, as well as an approximately 3 km-long, 110 mm diameter uPVC PN6 brine pipeline to be installed within existing road reserves and extending from the future wastewater treatment works to the brine ponds.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical buildings
- Visual impacts: None expected as the work is for the installation of ponds and pipelines
- Archaeology: The archaeological sensitivity according to the screener report is high due to sections of the proposed pipeline being located within 2km of a Grade II Heritage Site. No archaeological impacts expected as the land is agricultural in nature
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is low. The sensitivity on the screener report is high, however, only a small section of the proposed project area of impact is flagged with such high sensitivity, and the remaining majority of the proposed site has a low sensitivity.

FINAL DECISION

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

CSI

14.19 Portion 4-RE of Farm 120, Farm Waai Kraal, off the N1, Beaufort West, S38(8) - NID
Case No: 28083CSI0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395762>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
- Proposed development: Application for a mining permit. The proposed mining footprint will be 4.9 ha and will be developed over an area that has been partially disturbed by adjacent mining activities. The mining method will make use of blasting in order to loosen the hard rock; the material will then be loaded and hauled to the crushing plant where it will be screened to various sized stockpiles. The aggregate will be stockpiled until it is transported from site using tipper trucks. All mining related activities will be contained within the approved mining permit boundaries.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: None, the land is vacant and there are no historical structures which will be impacted.
- Visual impacts: The Karoo landscape is widely regarded as having aesthetic significance. However, the mining land use has already been established on this farm and this new mine is thus considered an appropriate land use for the proposed mine site. Given the adjacent small dolerite mine, the proposed land use for this new site is deemed appropriate.
- Archaeology: A large number of historical rock engravings occur on a hill some 1.5 km southeast of the study area. They will not be affected by the proposed mine. No archaeology was found in the study area during the site inspection.
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity according to the SAHRIS palaeo map is very high and a portion of the site falls into the very high sensitivity area. Dr John Almond previously inspected the area for

the adjacent existing mine and found that the sediments marked as being very highly sensitive did not preserve any fossils. A small section of the present site is shown as very highly sensitive on the SAHRIS palaeo map (the rest is rated zero sensitivity) but, on the basis of his previous inspection and the lack of fossiliferous country rocks in the western profile of the adjacent mine, Dr Almond sees no need for any further palaeontological study here.

- The consultant recommends NFS

FINAL COMMENT

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

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

CSI

- 14.20** **Portion 71 of Farm 158 Farm Goree, Wenzile Avenue, Ashton, S38(8) - NID**
Case No: 28004CSI0329 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395457>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Clarification regarding any pipelines or irrigation required.

CSI

- 14.21** **Erf 1214, 1 Pickle Street, Strand, S34 – Additions & Alterations; Partial Demolition**
Case No: 28047EJV0401 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395611>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIA
- Outside HPO
- Work has started. This includes very limited unauthorised work undertaken to repair some of the weather damage to one of the gable walls using appropriate lime-based materials as indicated on the revised plan set submitted
- Following fire damage, the proposal is to undertake additions and alterations to the structure for use as a coffee shop, and to demolish the later additions to the rear. The concept is to restore the façade of the cottage based on an understanding of what the building may have looked like originally, to retain the gable walls largely as is, and to signal the recent intervention with contemporary fittings at the back. While graded IIIA due to the Rudner 1991 survey that identified the structure as having been the former Magistrates Court, this identification is inaccurate. Pienaar's The history of The Strand in South Africa (2024) indicates that the first magistrate's court in the Strand was housed in a building in Main Road in 1949. Before then the magistrate from Stellenbosch held sittings in a hall in Somerset West every second week. The consultant is of the opinion that IIIB is the highest grading applicable to the site. The consultant recommends approval of the application on condition of monitoring and a close-out report submitted by Graham Jacobs. Mr. Jacobs CV and confirmation of appointment has been provided.
- Neither the City of Cape Town nor the HRF responded in 30-days.

COMMENT

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

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

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

EJV

14.22 Erf 3536, 5 Gys Smalberger, Mossel Bay, S34 - Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25221406EJV0408 / 28093EJV0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395817>

CASE SUMMARY

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to convert the property into a guesthouse through the addition of a first floor and roof terrace while retaining the original south façade, stoep, and stone walls
- Heritage Mossel Bay support and the Heritage and Aesthetic Committee stamped the plans with approval

FOR NOTING

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

EJV

14.23 Farm 438, Brakfontein Estate, Citrusdal, S38(8) - NID

Case No: 28070EJV0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395691>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a) and (c)(i) and NEMA.
- The proposal is to construct and operate a solar PV facility and battery energy storage system on the farm directly adjacent to an existing industrial/agricultural facility inclusive of large warehouse-type structures which will have solar panels installed on their rooftops in addition to the existing solar panels already installed. The site was once a rooibos field but has not been cultivated for more than 5-years. Brakfontein Estate is one of the earliest commercial citrus farms in the Olifants River Valley. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates very high sensitivity; however, a PIA was undertaken by Marion Bamford which concludes that while the site lies on the potentially very highly sensitive Voorstehoek Formation, the land has been cleared and ploughed in the past so is very disturbed and no fossils would remain on the surface. They might occur below the soils, therefore, a Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPR. The map of relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity indicates low sensitivity and a walkover survey revealed deep sand, animal burrowing, and archaeological sterility.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

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

HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPR and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.24 Farm 941-RE, Blaauw Blomme Kloof, Slent Road, Malmesbury, S38(1) - NID

Case No: 28088EJV0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395798>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Inside the Agterpaarl/ Paardeberg Cultural Landscape
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to develop a Biogas Facility to convert biomass into agricultural and industrial products. The site has been used as a construction site for Eskom and Provincial Roads for years and has no heritage resources on it or in its vicinity. The proposed site is surrounded by agricultural land and, while not vacant, contains only a small werf and ancillary structures that are distant enough from the facility so as not to be materially impacted. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates low and moderate 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

14.25 Farm 324, Matjiesrivier Nature Reserve, Cederberg, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 28011EJV0330 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395472>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for the limited repair and restoration of the Suurberg Building, Langhuis, Rupert House, Office and the Conservation Officer's House within the Matjiesrivier Nature Reserve World Heritage Site. Only the most important aspects of maintenance to secure the buildings against further deterioration from weather will be undertaken. This work primarily includes crack and roof repair and/or rethatching and repainting.
- The consultant recommends that work be monitored by a suitably qualified heritage architect. The CV & Appointment Letter for Gabriel Fagan Architects has been provided.

DECISION

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

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

EJV

14.26 Erf 45878, 11 Linkoping Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27937RB0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394261>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Clarity on scope of completed work as the verandah appears constructed on images, plans showing all proposed work as coloured up (the proposed doors) and what is already completed (potentially the verandah), better streetscape images required.

RB

14.27 Erf 57980. 18 Rutland Street, Claremont, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27936RB0324 <https://sahris.org.za/node/394207>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

POP required.

RB

14.28 RE Farm Vruchtbaar No 248, Bodal Road, Wellington, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28019RB0330 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395510>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed Grade II according to the 2012 Drakenstein Heritage Survey although the attached report motivates for IIIA for all structures as well as the werf.
- Within the proposed Bovlei Heritage Overlay Zone.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to strip away some of the modern layering on the homestead building, to return it to a more authentic design, whilst making it functional for modern living
- DHAC, DHF, and Paarl 300 supported.

DECISION

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

RB

14.29 Erf 18091, Off R304, Newinbosch Farm (formerly Cloetesdal), Stellenbosch, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: 28034RB0331 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395565>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

After confirming with the ASD, the provided emergency motivation is not based on heritage grounds and consultation with SHF, SIG, and Stellenbosch Municipality's Heritage Section is required.

RB

14.30 Erf 67984-RE, 11 Salisbury Road, Kenilworth, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28056RB0402 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395634>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB.
- Inside the proposed Kenilworth PHA.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for minor internal alterations.
- Despite qualifying as minor works, applicant received comment and CoCT E&HM supports.

DECISION

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

RB

- 14.31 Erf 83268, 14 Lake Road, Frogmore Estate, Retreat, S34 – Total Demolition**
Case No: 28068RB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395664>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Confirmation that HWC can accept the incorrect reference on the POP, CoCT E&HM comment, and heritage motivation required.

RB

- 14.32 Portion 37 Farm Twee Fontein No 368, Ceres, S38(8) – NID**
Case No: 28075RB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395714>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DFFE as the authorising authority according to the applicant (I believe it is DEA&DP).
- S38(1)(c) triggered.
- Proposal is for formalising the current informal pig farming operations on site with a new admin block, water tanks, and wastewater management (and some goat farming) as a formal piggery in line with a 2020/21 PESI with the Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural Development (DALRRD).
- The applicant has not identified any heritage resources and advocates for NFS.
- Paleosensitivity is red/very high but the proposal will not result in deep earthworks.
- The piggery has been running for many years informally, so any surface archaeology would already be disturbed.
- The R46 and general Ceres valley is an incredibly beautiful scenic route, but is not formally acknowledged, nor would this proposal result in an impacting character change to that scenery/experiential quality.

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.

RB

- 14.33 RE Erf 2002, Betty's Bay, S38(8) – NID**
Case No: 28050RB0402 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395619>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

The heritage screening that has been provided based on the DFFE National Screening tool, is inadequate for assessing potential heritage impacts, especially in terms of archaeology, and as such, an adequate heritage screening, specifically consisting of screening of whether an archaeological impact assessment is required, is required, for the application to be considered complete.

RB

14.34 Portion 5 of Farm Doornekraal 830, Off the R302, Malmesbury, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27992SB0327 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395434>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Extension of existing sand mine (72.15 ha) on Portion 5 of Farm Doornekraal No. 830, Malmesbury
- Trigger: Section 38(1)(c) – development exceeding 5 000m²
- Other: NEMA, MPRDA, SPLUMA
- Grade: Not graded and no heritage resources identified.
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: None identified on site
- Archaeology: Given the nature of the site, used for agricultural purposes, unlikely to impact.
- Palaeontological: Low sensitivity; given the nature of the proposal, unlikely to impact.
- Visual/Cultural: According to the application none noted not mention. This is a very large expansion. I am on the fence about visual these mines can have negative impact on the landscape. Need committees input here, leaning towards NFS with chance finds.
- Consultant recommends: NFS
- The committee notes that the site is visible from R302, however the expansion will not introduce too negative of an additional impact given as this is already an element of the landscape. The only sensitive receptor is the R302, there are no other value-laden attributes of the landscape that may be impacted visually by the mine expansion.

FINAL COMMENT

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

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

SB

14.35 Erf 1068, 166 St George's Street, Simon's Town, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28066SB0407 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395656>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: maintenance work that includes replacement of missing slates with fiber cement slates to match, replace roof sheets with Victorian profile. The repairs to the porch include removing rotten wood and paint with wood sealer. Other proposed work include gutter repairs, fascias, rafters, ceiling, walls, skirting, tiles, cupboards and flooring – the repairs are like for like or closes to match.
- Work start: no
- Grade: 3A
- HPO: Inside
- Since there is no reason to believe that heritage will be impact by proposed work.

DECISION

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

SB

- 14.36** Erf 7653, 21 Aurora Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28026SB0331 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395535>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
POA and additional fee is required.
- SB**
- 14.37** Erf 1176, 8 Mill Street, Caledon, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28095SB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395819>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Whale Coast Conservation comment is required.
- SB**
- 14.38** Bantamsklip Nuclear Plan on Farm Hagelkraal 318 Portion 0 and 1, Farm Buffel Jagt 309 Portion 2, 3, Farm Buffel Jagt 311 Portion 0, Farm Luipaards Poort 310 Portion 0, Farm 338, Portion 0, Off R317, Pearly Beach, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 28092SB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395816>
- HELD OVER**
The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) when informed by the applicant.
- SB**
- 14.39** Erf 10461, 24 Marais Road, Hout Bay, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 28079SB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395753>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Site photographs
- SB**
- 14.40** Erf 3007, Corner Aristea-Azalia and Baobab Street, Greenville Garden City, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 28036SB0401 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395571>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
POA and site photographs
- SB**
- 14.41** Erf 10097, 38 Blinde Street, District Six, S34-Alterations
Case No: 28048SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395613>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
External and streetscapes photographs, local authority comments, and registered conservation body comment required.
- SVB**
- 14.42** Erf 168334, 52 Lion Street, Bo-Kaap, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28010SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395470>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
POA, Title deed, and outstanding registered conservation body comment required.
- SVB**

14.43 Erf 2188, 8 Fritz Sonnenberg Road, Green Point, S27-Minor Works
Case No: 28062SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395644>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Local authority comment and registered conservation body comment required.

SVB

14.44 Erf 3184, 22 Meyer Street, George, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28087SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395789>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 15 April 2026.
- The property is not graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for demolition of the freestanding garage structure the addition of a new carport, new boundary wall and garden walls as well as minor internal and external alterations.
- Simon Van Der Stel Foundation support the proposal.
- George Municipality did not respond to the request for comment.
- George Heritage Trust support the proposal however they require that any new dwelling constructed on the rear portion of the property be designed with sensitivity to the heritage character of both the streetscape and the property as a whole, they note that this should be considered a non-negotiable condition of approval.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.45 Erf 31888, Section 3 Jock De Villiers, 376 Main Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28078SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395750>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 15 April 2026.
- The property is graded IIIB (as per previous permit) and is within the Paarl Special Character Protection Overlay Zone (SCPOZ)
- Work has been completed.
- The completed work are changes to the reception desk layout, new drywalling partitions, new sliding door to existing opening, new kitchen fittings and existing opening to be enclosed with drywall partitioning.

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.

SVB

14.46 Erf 52246, 5 Eastry Road, Claremont, S34-Additions
Case No: 28090SVB0408 <https://sahris.org.za/node/395806>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

SG Diagram, trust resolution, locality plan, streetscape images and POP required.

SVB

14.47 Erf 14076, 100 Chamberlain Street, Woodstock, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27981XM0327 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395409>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Conservation body and local municipality comments required.

XM

14.48 Erf 5601, 11 Union Street, Strand, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 28077XM0407 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395739>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Proof of Payment, SG Diagram, Both owners to sign Power of Attorney, Annotated Internal images required.

XM

14.49 Erf 111, 131 Victoria Road, Camps Bay, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 28064XM0407 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395651>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

Kobus van Wyk was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The application is for Demolition of an existing structure with a view of the redevelopment of the site with a residential apartment block.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The CBCRA comment- CBCRA-Heritage is strongly opposed to the demolition of this residence. In opposing the demolition application, CBCRA notes that the changes to the original building are minimal and limited to changes of fenestration from wood to metal frames. Further, less than half the area of erf 111 is developed; the site lends itself to a unique opportunity to increase the density while restoring a structure and landscape of cultural significance.
- Applicant's response: The response states that the objections do not adequately consider the current condition, integrity, and context of the building. While the street-facing façade shows limited alteration, the structure has undergone extensive internal changes, including the removal of original fabric and unsympathetic additions. As a result, the building has lost its authenticity and ability to convey heritage significance. The property is graded IIIC, indicating contextual rather than intrinsic significance. However, even this contextual value has been diminished due to significant changes in the surrounding urban environment, resulting in a fragmented and incoherent streetscape.
- The response concludes that there is no compelling heritage justification for retention, and that demolition would not result in a meaningful loss of heritage value. Instead, it presents an opportunity for appropriate redevelopment in line with the current urban context.

DECISION

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

XM

- 14.50 Erf 94, 2 Searle Street, George S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 28086XM0408 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395785>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for the total demolition of the property to build a new structure.
- Work has not started
- Not graded
- George Heritage Trust has no objection
- George municipality did not comment within 30 days

DECISION

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

XM

- 14.51 Erf 84804, 27 Westlake Drive, Westlake, S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 27987XM0327 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395427>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs required.

XM

- 14.52 Erf 99, 18 Forest Drive, Pinelands, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28020XM0330 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395512>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal photographs required

XM

- 14.53 Erf 50618, 9 Ranelagh Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28012XM0330 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395475>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Both owners to sign Power of Attorney, Conservation body and local municipality comments required.

XM

15. Other Matters

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

EJV moves to adopt and CN seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 20 April 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Ms Chane Herman, officially closed the meeting at 13H55

18. Date of next meeting: 27 April 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

APPROVED

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners	ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society	ABHC - Associated Bibles Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)
BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association	BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee
BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement	CBCRA - Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association
CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers & Residents Association	CSDBOA - Clifton-On-Sea & District Bungalow Owners Association
CoCT - City of Cape Town	CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation
CTHT - Cape Town Heritage Trust	CRRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations
CRM - Cultural Resources Management	CMP - Conservation Management Plan
DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association	DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association
Docomomo South Africa	DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation
DHS - Durbanville Heritage Society	EMPr - Environmental Management Program
EHM - Environmental Heritage Management department	FHRA - Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association
FoBCA - Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area	FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts
FE - Friends of Elim	GBRM - Great Brak River Museum
GLCA - Greater Lynfræ Civic Association	GVHAG - Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group
GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association	GCS - Greyton Conservation Society
HVA - Harfield Village Association	HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation
HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay	HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting
HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association	HPO - Heritage protects overlay.
HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association	
HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment	HWC - Heritage Western Cape
ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa	IACom - Impact Assessment Committee
KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association	IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee
KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association	KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society
LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District	MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society
MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society	NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation
NCW - Not Conservation Worthly	NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body
NEMA - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)	NHRA - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999
NID - Notification of Intent to Develop	NRA - Newlands Residents Association
NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association	OCA - Observatory Civic Association
OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage	OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee
Paarl300 Foundation	PPP - Public Participation Process
PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association	PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust
PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation	RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee
SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency	SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System
SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society	SPFA - Sea Point for All Group
SFB - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association	
SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town	
STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society	SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee
SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation	SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group
SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust	SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association
GHT - George Heritage Trust	OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society
RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association	TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation
TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society	UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association
VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa	WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association
WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group	Ward 2 Forum
WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council	WCC - Whale Coast Conservation
WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee	WRA - Woodstock Residents Association
WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society	WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association
WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association	