

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 26 May 2025 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Chairperson (Specialist Heritage Officer)	SB
Ms. Corne Nortje	Heritage Officer	CN
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Sofia Briel	Heritage Officer	SVB
Ms. Chane Herman	Heritage Officer	CH

Staff

Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Yusrah Hoosain	Intern (I&AP Group)	YH
Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	Secretariat (back up)	NT
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD

Legal Advisor

Observers

SJ		
Ms. Sneha Jhupsee	Specialist Heritage Officer	SJ

Visitors

Mr Adrian Janssen	Owner	Item 13.28
Mr David Pike	Architect	Item 13.6
Mr Henne Le Roux	owner	Item 13.2
Mr Yunus Karriem	WECA	Item 13.26
Mr Clive Theunissen	Drakenstein Municipality	Drakenstein items
Ms Lenize Grobler	Conservation Body	Item 13.17
Ms Carmen Ann Wessels	Architect	Item 13.20
Ms Nicolene Visser	Administrator	Item 13.20
Mr Ron Martin	heritage consultant	Item 13.18
Rudolf Coetzee	architect	Item 13.25
Mr Jonathan Kaplan	archaeologist	Item 14.14
Mr Stuart Hermansen	heritage consultant	Item 14.13
Mr Mike Scurr	heritage consultant	Item 14.39
Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka	Drakenstein Municipality	Drakenstein Items

3. Apologies

Ms. Chiara Singh
Emily Jane Vowles

Xola Mlwandle

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 26 May 2025 with minor changes and additions. CN moved to adopt the agenda and SVB seconded.

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1. The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 19 May 2025. Held over to HOMs on 2 June 2025.

7. Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

8. Confidential matters

None.

9. Standing Items

9.1. Site inspections undertaken

9.1.1. RE of Farm Welvanpas 238, Bovlei Road, Wellington (CN)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 22 May 2025.

9.1.2. Farm 1270 Portion 3, Doolhof Wine Estate, Bovlei Road, Wellington (EJV)

FOR NOTING

The Committee notes the site inspection that was undertaken on 22 May 2025.

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

9.2.1 None

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 RE of Farm Welvanpas 238, Bovlei Road, Wellington (CN)

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 23 May 2025 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

- The site inspection tabled at HOMS on 26 May 2025.
- The site inspection report tabled at HOMS on 26 May 2025.
- HWC awaits the submission of the respective applications.

9.3.2 9.3.2 Farm 1270 Portion 3, Doolhof Wine Estate, Bovlei Road, Wellington (EJV)

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 22 May 2025 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection and report to be noted at HOMs on 26 May 2025.
2. Since there is no reason to believe that the proposed solar panel installation on Farm 1270 Portion 3, Doolhof Wine Estate, Bovlei Road, Wellington will impact on heritage resources, no further action under Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) is required.
3. Should any heritage resources, including evidence of graves and human burials, archaeological material and paleontological material be discovered during the execution of the activities above, all works must be stopped immediately, and Heritage Western Cape must be notified without delay.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

- 9.4.1 HOMs 2 June 2025
- 9.4.2 Council 3 June 2025
- 9.4.3 Appeals 4 June 2025
- 9.4.4 IGIC 5 June 2025

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

- 9.5.1 None

9.6 Interim and Close out Reports

- 9.6.1 Farm 837/510, Blaauwklippen, S34, Minor Works (RB)
Case No: HWC24070317CSI0711

DISCUSSION

- The Committee noted the minor works have been completed as per the HWC issued minor works permit dated 25 July 2024.
- The Committee noted the concerns raised by the project heritage consultant in that there are delays at municipal approval level that, heading into the winter, might result in damage to the heritage resource.
- The Committee noted the installation of two skylights and the bricking up of a door that were not on the originally approved plans and agreed with the heritage consultant that there were no impacts to heritage resources and that the revised plans including these changes can be stamped.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled “NHRA S.34 RESCUE RESTORATION OF THE BLAAUWKLIPPEN WERF, FARM 837/510 STELLENBOSCH. S.34 MINOR WORKS CASE HWC 2407 0317 CS 10711 WORKS MONITORING REPORT #05: CLOSE OUT REPORT” dated 11 April 2025, and prepared by Graham Jacobs, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 25 July 2024.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

- 9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.31.
- 9.7.2 New Matters: 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.4, 14.8, 14.11, 14.12, 14.15, 14.16, 14.17, 14.18, 14.20, 14.21, 14.26, 14.29, 14.31, 14.33, 14.37, 14.40, 14.35, 14.36

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegations

- 9.8.1 Matters Arising: 13.3(CH), 13.8 (CN), 13.12(CSI) 13.28, 13.29 (XM)
- 9.8.2 New Matters: 14.19(CN), 14.38(SVB)

WD – The above cases have been reviewed and approved as the interventions do not impact a heritage resource.

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025 – NCW graded within CoCT

- 9.9.1 Matter Arising: None
- 9.9.2 New Matters: 14.7 (CH), 14.9 (CH), 14.19 (CN), 14.24 (EJV), 14.42 (SVB), 14.43(SVB)

9.10 Archaeological Matters

- 9.10.1** Farm 114/56 Oudemuragie Farm, De Rust (SB)

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

- 9.11.1** None

9.12 Permit deadline:

- 9.12.1** 27 May 2025 at 16h00

10 Administrative Matters

10.1 Erf 4651-RE, Grand Parade, 17 Darling Street, Cape Town City Centre (SVB)

- HOMs approved this application on 06 May 2025 with the following conditions (HWC25041503SVB0424):
 - The prototype structures must be removed within 18 months of this permit being issued.
- The applicant and heritage consultant Emmylou Bailey has come back to me and queried why the following conditions from her heritage report have not been included in the permit:
 - “Archaeological monitoring by a qualified professional archaeologist of all excavation for the stall footholds due to the archaeological sensitivity of the site.”
 - “If any human remains are found, work in the immediate vicinity is to stop, SAPS Accidental Finds Protocol is to be followed, and Heritage Western Cape to be notified immediately.”
 - “Should any archaeological material be uncovered or exposed during excavations, HWC should be notified immediately and all development work on site (preconstruction included) should be halted until these finds are investigated by HWC”

COMMENT

1. The conditions of the Section 27 MWP report are not enforceable as they have not been agreed to by the committee.
2. It is clear from the Section 27 MWP report provided that the site has strong archaeological significance. However as noted in the Section 27 MWP report “The site has been completely paved with brick and tar reducing archaeological visibility on site to zero, however as negligible excavation is required for the temporary structures’ footholds, this does not impact the findings required for this report.”
3. The temporary structure will be fixed to the ground with minor but permanent footing placements. The diagram of the footings provided with this application and stamped by HWC, show the footings to be constructed of a metal base, set into a concrete pad with galvanised steel legs embedded in concrete. The diagram shows the steel legs protruding 200mm below the ground, some additional depth will be required for the metal base and concrete. However, the total depth appears to be relatively shallow, and each footing covers a small surface area.
4. The committee understood the structure to be temporary, and the archaeological

concerns would be something factored within the formal submission once determined.

5. Further review of archaeological mitigation will be undertaken once the applicant submits an application for the features to be permanent. Until such time the only conditions in terms of the NHRA are those as contained in the permit issued.

10.2 Erf 87114-RE, 181 Main Road, Muizenberg Train Station, Muizenberg (CN)

- Ratification of HOMs' email support, dated Tuesday, 20 May 2025 of the recommendations of the Muizenberg Train Station Site Inspection Report, as listed below:
- HWC Council to issue a Compulsory Repair order in terms of S45(1)(b) of the NHRA with specific reference to:
 1. Appropriate painting of the building
 2. Electrical works to be upgraded, within the scope of interventions factoring heritage resources.
 3. The roof to undertake like for like repairs including the tiles, soffits / fascia and gutters
 4. Balustrades to be restored with like for like
 5. Signal cabin to be restored as like for like
 6. "Tuck Shop" to be restored as like for like
 7. Signage to be restored and appropriately designed, respecting the heritage significance of the building
- The above is to be submitted to HWC in terms of a Section 27 application of the NHRA within 18 months of the order. PRASA is to appoint a suitably qualified heritage practitioner to undertake the submission process. The practitioner is to be approved by HWC.
- PRASA is to appoint a suitably qualified heritage practitioner to undertake a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the PHS and the surrounding ancillary buildings of the train station properties.

COMMENT

The committee resolved to support the recommendations of the Muizenberg Train Station Site Inspection Report.

10.3 Erf 5789, 34 Jan Van Riebeeck Street, Wellington (HWC24072501SB0726) (SB)

- The application was approved by the BELCom committee the 18 September 2024.
- A permit was granted dated 26 September 2024
- The applicant has since amended the plans, instead of conventional building materials, , the applicant plans to use lightweight steel construction.
- The footprint has not changed, but there has been a material change.
- Comparing both plans - mostly identical in layout, content, and specifications. However, it is noted that "25mm T&G floor on lightweight steel floor specified by engineer" vs stamped version "25mm T&G floor on 76x228 joists @ 600c/c tied to brick wall via Teco brackets and rawlbolts other end tied to I-beam specified by engineer"

COMMENT

The proposed changes on plan 1084 Rev A prepared by Andre Carsten Architecture as general in accordance with the permit dated 26 September 2024.

10.4 Welvanpas Farm, Farm 238-RE, Bovlei Road, Wellington (CH)

- Emergency application submitted in terms of s34 for the stabilization and repairs to the north east corner/wall of the cellar building on Welvanpas Farm in Wellington.
- Methodology includes:
 - Removing loose brick and prep for re-use;
 - Re-built the corner with available bricks and use soft NFX bricks for remaining brickwork;
 - Reinforce the wall with Ref496 mesh and plaster over; and
 - Use of lime mortar, lime plater and lime wash the walls.
- Not graded outside HPO.

FOR NOTING

S34 emergency permit issued on Friday, 23 May 2025 under the ASD delegations. The permit was issued on condition that the work be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with heritage experience, Mr. Johannes Malherbe and that a close out report, compiled by Mr. Johannes Malherbe, be submitted to HWC within 30 days or practical completion.

11 **Monitoring by practitioner**

11.10 None

12 **Discussion of the agenda**

12.1 Item 14.18 Erf 775-RE, 469 Main Road, Paarl, S27-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25042411CN0513

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Updated external and internal photos to provide an accurate reflection of the site. No internal photos were provided – CN requested OI and consultant replied and asked why this must be supplied, as the photos attached to the application were of the buildings being built at the time I sent the application and the positions of where the gas cages were going to be.
- Grading: II
- HPO: Inside
- Status of work: Completed
- Proposal: For a gas installation on the new buildings on the property.
- Consultation:
 - DHAC has no objection
 - DHF has no objection
 - Paarl 300 does not support and state that they cannot comment on work already completed without a permit.
- Heritage Considerations: I don't deem the gas installation to have an impact on the PHS.
- Other considerations: This application cannot be considered yet, as BELCOM revoked the 1st application's permit and the second application was for the new buildings, which is still unapproved, due to the previous permit being revoked. BELCOM also recommended charges to be laid. The 1st application had unauthorised work; the second application also had unauthorised work along with a stop works order that was issued. And now this application for work that has also been completed. The owners have submitted an Appeal for the recent BELCOM decision, and the matter will be tabled in June. This will technically also be the second S51 issued for the property and to the same owners.

- Ongoing matter

12.2 Item 13.22, N1 Roadway, Worcester, S38(8)-HIA

Case No: HWC23110822SB1120

DISCUSSION

- The Committee discussed that there was no PPP for this HIA, but it was understood that the PPP will form part of the larger EIA process.
- The Committee noted concerns about the potential lack of a SHS but was in agreement that the complexity of the application would likely be better dealt with by IACom.

APPROVED

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 142, Carosini Street, Laaiplek, Velddrif, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: HWC24082721CH0828

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 20 May 2025
- Proposal is to demolish the existing dwelling and outbuilding on site.
- Work has not started.
- Bergrivier Municipality did not comment within 30 days.
- Velddrif Heritage Foundation supports.

DECISION

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

CH

13.2 Erf 2423, 10 Elba Street, Paarl, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25022605CH0304

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Mr Clive Theunissen and Mr Henne Le Roux were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Further requirements received on 16 May 2025.
- Not graded inside the SCPAOZ of Paarl.
- Proposal is for internal alterations, an addition the garage and the addition of a braai.
- Work has not started.
- Drakenstein Municipality supports on condition that the addition above the garage be set back by 2.5m and that the new roof profile be hipped.
- Paarl300 Foundation supports.
- DHF does not support the new garage addition and alterations. DHF states that the infill facade should be set back 300mm from the dwellings facade and the new roof should be hipped.
- The motivation initially stated that the existing facade cannot be set back by 300mm.
- HOMs further requirements on 30 March 2025:
The loft addition above the garage is to be set back a minimum of 1500mm.
- Applicant submitted revised drawings and stated that the client has requested HWC to consider the set back of 0.9m instead of 1.5m. The client stated that the setback of 1.5m will affect the size of the upstairs bedroom and bathroom.

DECISION

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

13.3 Erf 3968, 6 Cecil Rhodes Avenue, Epping, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC24101112CH1015

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 17 May 2025.
- Graded NCW outside HPO.
- Proposal is to extend the garage, the addition of a bathroom, kitchen and internal alterations.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT noted the structure as NCW and stated that a s34 application must be submitted to HWC.

FOR NOTING

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

CH

13.4 Erf 48977, 19 Evergreen Avenue, Newlands, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25040708CH0416

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 13 May and 21 May 2025.
- Graded potential IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal alterations, the addition of a pyjama lounge, bedroom, en-suite and balcony on the first floor and alterations to fenestration.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports.
- NRA supports.
- Applicant consulted NCID and NRA responded with a comment of support.

DECISION

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

CH

13.5 Erf 7016, 10 Bo Faure Street, Paarl, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25050711CH0509

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 15 May and 19 May 2025.
- Graded IIIC outside the SCPAOZ of Paarl.
- Proposal is for a new roof structure to serve as a verandah as well as internal alterations.
- Work has started. The roof has already been built.

- The Municipality is aware of the work that has commenced, and the owner received a fine for the unauthorized work.
- Drakenstein Municipality supports.
- DHF supports.
- Paarl300 Foundation does not support because the work has started/ has been completed without a permit.

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.

CH

13.6 Erf 116120, 36C Burg Street - Namaqua House, Cape Town City Centre, S34-Mitigation Agreement Case No: HWC25031401CN0506

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

Mr David Pike was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Background:
 - HOMS on 7 October 2024 issued a permit for Minor Works to the balconies with conditions of monitoring, a close out report and a mitigation agreement.
 - The COR was endorsed by HOMS on 26 November 2024.
 - The Mitigation Statement was heard under Admin at HOMS on 4 March 2025 and
 1. The committee resolved that the owners must enter into a mitigation agreement with HWC.
 2. The committee is satisfied with the mitigation statement that was submitted. A formal application must be submitted for the proposed mitigation works and once the application is deemed complete, it will likely be referred to BELCom due to the requirement of their expertise.
- Mitigation Agreement received on 20 May:
 - The mitigation statement is deemed to be in order, as the work for mitigation is listed in the agreement as Annexure A relating to the Mitigation Statement for unauthorised changes within the building dated 19 Feb 2025 and Annexure B relating to the Heritage Statement for the unauthorised Burg Street pergola dated 26 August 2024.
 - The mitigation statement's assessment of external & internal work to Namaqua House – "Most of the external & internal work that has been done to the building over the years are either assumed to be authorised and authorised except for the Burg Street pergola that was constructed without approval for HWC and subject to a stop works order dated 18 April 2024.
- Mitigation Application for the Pergola:
 - Grading: IIIA
 - HPO: Inside
 - Status of work: The unauthorised pergola has been completed, and the proposed mitigation work has not started.
 - Proposal: to alter the existing Pergola to integrate it to Namaqua House and its surrounds by the following methods:
 - 1. Demolish the rear 1,2m portion of the Pergola that is attached to Namaqua House and support it with the pillars currently attached to the

building.

- 2. Paint the pergola structure a Dove Grey so that it disappears into the background and is not as discordant as its present white colour is.
- 3. To clad the top of the Pergola with timber cladding, detailed to elegantly integrate with the original Namaqua House, as indicated on the attached Plans and Elevations, whilst borrowing details from the Namaqua House building. The timberwork will be naturally sealed.
- 4. The Property Management Branch of the City of Cape Town, represented by Johan de Goede, has agreed to this rectification and has signed the Power of Attorney Form to allow this application to be submitted to HWC for processing.
- 5. This rectification intervention, the consultant believes, will allow the structure to remain (in its altered state) and positively contribute to Namaqua House and its environs.

○ Consultation:

- CoCT notes that the unauthorised pergola structure on the appearance, fabric and setting of the highly significant Namaqua House is unfortunate. The City is supportive of the proposed rectification work to mitigate these impacts. The City further recommends that consideration should also be given to the edge treatment of the seating area, which currently appears to be in the form of rustic-looking ad hoc cladding and unpainted timber palisade sections. Effort should be made to visually tie this in with the new pergola elements in either colour or style.
- CIBRA does not support and state that:
 - 1. A free-standing structure away from the main building is preferable
 - Applicant response: The Rectification Proposal detaches the existing unauthorised Pergola structure from the Namaqua House Building as indicated in the various plans attached to this application.
 - 2. The current proposal appears to rely on the main building for its lateral support and stability, and it is unclear how the free-standing structure will deal with this issue.
 - Applicant response: The Temporary Building Permit Conditions for this structure have been inserted on Page 3 below and require the sign off of a professionally registered Structural Engineer (Clauses 17 & 18).
 - 3. The vertical structural elements of the proposed structure fail to relate to the architectural rhythm of the historic building, and its horizontal lines likewise fail to respond to any references on the historic elevation.
 - 4. The proposed facade appliques to what is a commercial metal pergola structure are cumbersome, and their rustic expression is out of character with this Art-Deco/Cape Mediterranean building. This applies equally to the newly introduced projecting top rafters.
 - 5. The proposal to adapt a commercial prefabricated system to this significant and sensitive context remains aesthetically unacceptable, and the applicant should rather invest in a well-considered and appropriately custom-designed structure that complements the building in an appropriate manner.

- Applicant response to points 3, 4 & 5: The Rectification Proposal is based on the premise that the existing Unauthorised Pergola is a temporary structure which will be removed upon termination of the lease from City of Cape Town and that the Rectification Proposal is a temporary measure for the duration of the lease. It is important to note that the seating area covered by this unauthorised Pergola is the leased by a tenant (Mesopotamia Restaurant) of one of the Section Owners of Namaqua House and is not part of the Body Corporate nor Section Owners of the building. The temporary nature of this arrangement prompted the reasoning to rectify the existing unauthorised Pergola to an acceptable design rather than install a completely new design.
- 6. We support the H+EM comments regarding the edging elements for the seating area
 - Applicant response: We await further comment from the Heritage Western Cape Committees on this point please.
- Applicant further responses to CIBRA:
 - 1. The City of Cape Town Property Managements Branch, the custodians of this street space, have noted their no-objection to this Rectification Proposal on Page 4 below.
 - 2. We also note that the CoCT E&HM is supportive of the Rectification Proposal, with a recommendation for the consideration of the edge treatment of the seating area (referenced in Point 4 above).
- Heritage considerations: The proposed pergola will be detached from the building and will become a free-standing temporary structure. HWC will become de funct, as the pergola will no longer touch old fabric. Does the design mitigate the negative impacts, probably. Does it solve the visual impact, I don't think so. Do we want detail in the proposal about how the boreholes and sections of the wall will be repaired?

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom on 25 June 2025 due to the negative comments received by CIBRA and due to the controversial nature of the site.

CN

13.7 Erf 159255, 10 Mark Street, Claremont, S34-Additions, Alterations & Partial Demolition Case No: HWC25040807CN0415

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for a Company Resolution, UCRRA comments and motivation which was received on 28 April and 20 May 2025.
- Grading: 3C/4 on CoCT Map Viewer. Considered NCW.
- HPO: Proposed Claremont Village HPO
- Status of work: Not started
- Proposal: To move the facade to create a driveway with a carport, alteration to a bedroom and a swimming pool.

- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports and notes that HWC has acknowledged heritage value in past and recent decisions in the area.
 - UCRRA concurs with the City's grading of IIIC. UCRRA supports the proposed internal work, work to the rear, work to the boundary wall, work to the street facing building wall but objects to the proposed 'add on' or extension to the beam of No 10 to the northern boundary (Figure 6 in their comment) and stating that it will in UCRRA's view negatively impact on the 'working' of these two cottages as a collective unit, and the contextual value of the site, streetscape and thus area.
- Heritage considerations: No impacts to the heritage resource nor the streetscape. It's a proposed HPO, and HWC might have recognised significance in the street for other applications, however, I see no impact still to the streetscape.

DECISION

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

CN

13.8 Erf 806, 6 Krom Street, Montagu, S34- Additions & Alterations Case No: HWC25032801CN0417

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for a completed application form and MHA comments, which was received on 12 and 21 May 2025.
- Grading: Ungraded according to Desktop Langberg Heritage Survey 2013
- HPO: Outside but Proposed HPO according to Desktop Langberg Heritage Survey 2013
- Status of work: Not started
- Proposal: The proposal is for a for extensions to the sides and rear and include changes to doors and windows.
- Consultation:
 - Langeberg Municipality notes the proposals and states a permit is required from HWC.
 - MHA has no objections
- Heritage considerations: The buildings seem to have low significance, and the proposal will not negatively impact the heritage resource.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8.

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

13.9 Erven 2001, 14701, 14703, and 19201, Louis Fourie Road, Mossel Bay, S38(8)-NID
Case No: HWC25041113CN0422

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for the correct POP and received on 20 May
- S38(1) trigger(s): S38(1)(a), S38(1)(a)(i), S38(1)(a)(ii), S38(1)(d) and NEMA
- Properties: Combined approx. 18ha in extent, with a current land use of a hardware store on one of the properties, the rest is undeveloped land and a zoning of Business and Vacant. The surrounding land uses are residential from the north to south and west retail and light industrial activities
- Proposal: For a Mixed-Use Development that will include social housing as part of the Mossel Bay Housing Pipeline and SDF. The development will include Community, Business, Transport and Open Space Zonings.
- Heritage resources:
 - Palaeo-sensitivity: Orange which is indicated on SAHRIS as High. Screening tool also indicates High sensitivity
 - Archaeo-sensitivity: The archaeological sensitivity according to the screening report is very high, and features are that its within 2km from a Grade II heritage site.
 - Other: The consultant has listed no other heritage resources that will be impacted.
- Consultant recommendation: NFS (EAP)
- Heritage Considerations: Given the high sensitivities of archaeo and palaeo resources, the development is likely to impact on these heritage resources. I do not believe there are other heritage resources that will be impacted.
- Number of earthworks to be undertaken and to be cautious a PIA is requested.

INTERIM COMMENT

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

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment

CN

13.10 Erven 2667, 2686 & 2687, 1-3 Dagbreek Lane, Grootbrak Rivier, S38(8)-NID
Case No: HWC24100808CN0422

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for the correct POP and received on 20 May 2025
- S38(1) trigger(s): S38(1)(a), S38(1)(a)(i), S38(1)(a)(ii), S38(1)(d) and NEMA
- Properties: Combined measure approx. 1.4ha in extent, with current land uses being vacant, open space and a community hall. Zonings are Open Space 2 and Community Zone 2. The surrounding land uses are single residential dwellings and vacant properties to the north
- Proposal: The development is for social housing and social facilities as part of the Mossel Bay Housing Pipeline and SDF. The development will include 25 freehold properties, a

clinic, private open space for a sports centre and a public open space. The existing community hall to remain.

- Heritage resources:
 - Buildings: The building on site will not be impacted. There are not other building heritage resources according to the applicant.
 - Palaeo-sensitivity: According to the Paleo-sensitivity map, the northern portion of the site has been mapped red (very high) meaning field assessment and protocol required. The site is, however, heavily transformed and unlikely to support any sensitive resources.
 - Archaeo-sensitivity: Applicant listed no resources.
 - Other: The consultant has listed no other heritage resources that will be impacted.
- Consultant recommendation: NFS (EAP)
- Heritage Considerations: Although the development is in the very high palaeo area, the proposals will not likely have deep foundations, and the development is considered infill development on previously disturbed properties. Scattered archaeological finds are likely, but impacts are considered nil to low.

FINAL COMMENT

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

CN

13.11 Erven 9231, 9232-RE, 9233, 9234, 9442-RE, 15675 & 16096, Marlin Street, Mossel Bay, S38(8)-NID Case No: HWC25041112CN0422

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was for the correct POP and received on 20 May
- S38(1) trigger(s): S38(1)(a), S38(1)(a)(i), S38(1)(a)(ii), S38(1)(d) and NEMA
- Properties: Combined measure approx. 15ha in extent, with current land uses being public street and vacant. The zonings are a mix of Utility Zone, Undetermined Zone, Open Space 1, Business Zone 1, General Residential 1, Open Space 1 and Transport 2. The surrounding land uses include vacant properties, schools, place of worship, apartment buildings and single residential dwellings.
- Proposal: The development is for social housing in various alternatives, urban agriculture and private Open Space as part of the Mossel Bay Housing Pipeline and SDF. The development will include 26 group housing properties, 288 apartments, private and public streets, as well as private open space and public open space.
- Heritage resources:
 - Buildings: All existing buildings remain. There are no other heritage resources that will be impacted.
 - Palaeo-sensitivity: Based on the Paleo-sensitivity map, the northern part of the site is mapped "clear" where minimum a desktop study is required, the southern portion is mapped as orange, desktop study required. Based on the transformation of the property, it is not anticipated that any palaeontological resources will be found.
 - Archaeo-sensitivity: None listed by the applicant

- Other: The consultant has listed no other heritage resources that will be impacted.
- Consultant recommendation: NFS (EAP)
- Heritage Considerations: The site has been previously developed and is considered heavily disturbed. The development is also considered infill development. Scattered archaeo finds are likely, but impacts are considered nil to low. Archaeo sensitivity is low according to the screening report.

FINAL COMMENT

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

CN

13.12 Erf 3151, 7 Libertas Street, Pinelands, S34 – Additions & Alterations **Case No: HWC25050901CSI0512**

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 14 and 16 May 2025.
- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to the current dwelling and regularisation of the covered braai area.
- CoCT supports.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8.

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CSI

13.13 Erf 48545-RE, 36A Main Street, Newlands, S34 – Deviation **Case No: HWC25050503CSI0502**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item o.b.o CSI

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 15 May 2025.
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Proposed deviations according to the applicant are for roof sheeting behind the parapet walls, dining room extension to the north side - rear garden, alley walkway from the garage to the rear garden, internal changes to bathrooms upstairs, sunroom opening into the lounge.
- NRA provided comment and support the application.
 - CoCT provided supports the proposal and provided reasons for support:
 1. The architectural language, scale and massing used take into account the context of the received environment.

2. The proposal has been sufficiently setback to adequately mitigate any negative impact on the existing heritage resource.

DECISION

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

CSI

13.14 Erf 116-RE, 1 Meadow Road, Wetton, S34 - Total Demolition **Case No: HWC25040804EJV0424**

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 7, 16, and 19 May
- Ungraded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for the total demolition of the structure on site for single residential development
- CoCT support

DECISION

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

EJV

13.15 Erven 1742, 1783, The Vines, 8 Long Street, Constantia, S38(4) - NID **Case No: HWC25042407EJV0423**

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 8 and 19 May
- Ungraded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to consolidate and subdivide the site. No structural/infrastructural development is proposed at this time. Erf 1783 is vacant and used informally as a dog park while Erf 1742 has been occupied by a school since 1998. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low sensitivity.
- Consultant recommends no further studies.

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA. A letter of no trigger to be issued.

EJV

13.16 Erven 2395, 525, Franshoek Road, Durbanville Hills, S38(4) - NID
Case No: HWC25042408EJV0423

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 8 and 16 May
- Ungraded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to consolidate the two erven. No structural/infrastructural development is proposed at this time. The site is vacant and is used informally as a park. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low sensitivity.
- Consultant recommends no further studies.

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA. A letter of no trigger to be issued.

EJV

13.17 Farm 1270, Portion 3, Doolhof Wine Estate, Wellington, S38(4) - NID
Case No: HWC25050710EJV0512

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV

Ms Lenize Grobler and Mr Zwelibanzi Shiceka were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- HOMs on 19 May resolved to hold this matter over subject to a site inspection. The site inspection was conducted on 22 May and the findings and recommendations detailed in the associated site inspection report tabled at HOMs on 26 May 2025.
- Ungraded
- Inside Proposed HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- Previous application HWC24030526SB0307 for a solar panel installation on Farm 1270-RE was responded to with NFS. The glamping structures on the site were approved with NFS under case number 22042216AM0422E.
- The proposal is to extend the existing solar panel installation on Farm 1270-RE onto Farm 1270/3. In terms of heritage, the site falls within the proposed Bovlei HPO and along the Bovlei historical scenic route. The homestead on the adjacent Farm 1270-RE has a proposed grade of IIIB (Drakenstein Heritage Survey 2013). The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low 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

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

Case No: HWC24101108CN1014

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Mr Ron Martin was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal is Rezoning from community 1 to General Residential 2 for privatized residential estate (60 apartments, 6 duplex houses unite. There is no alternative for this proposal.
Currently owned by the Anglican Church.
Land is used and vacant but was previously used by the church as cemetery. The graves were formally deconsecrated during 2017, when under a permit from SAHRA in 2017 the graves exhumed.
The cemetery was formally commissioned in 1867 and the last burial took place in 1951. Decommissioned in 2017.
Topographically: the site is general flat with a very gentle gradient and covered in disturbed vegetation.
The site faced constant invasions and damage, leading to poor conditions for rescue archaeology. It was also waterlogged, making it likely that not all remains were recovered. The report recommends strict archaeological monitoring at the expense on the developer during excavations. If graves or human remains are found, work must stop and the heritage authority must be notified.
Background:
The larger area where the site is located was likely occupied by Khoekhoe groups like the Gorinhaiqua, Amaqua/Gorinhaicona, Gorachoqua, and Cochoqua as part of their semi-nomadic lifestyle before European settlers arrived in 1652. The HIA unpacks historical encounters of the Portugues, Dutch with the first Nations and the land used for gracing, cattle, landownership ownership, boundaries setup, war and conflict. The erf in question is further unpack in the HIA, noting that Erf 33030 lies within an area historically significant for being among the first sites of colonial land grants under the VOC Decree of 1656. Black and Elsieskraal Rivers, known for their rich grazing potential and as traditional Khoikhoi camping grounds. Despite a lack of tangible remains of conflict, the landscape carries a deep history of displacement and transformation. By the early 18th century, land tenure evolved with the introduction of Freehold Title, Loan Farms, and the Quitrent System, resulting in hundreds more farms. After the British occupation in 1806, the Trek-boer system further reshaped the demographic and agricultural landscape. Erf 33030 was formally donated in 1880 by Thomas Tregidga to the Anglican Diocese of Cape Town for use as a private burial ground, although burials had already begun by 1867. Originally serving the Anglican population of the Cape Flats, the Black River Cemetery later expanded due to the 1918 Spanish Flu pandemic to accommodate burials from several Anglican parishes, including St Paul's, St George's, St James (Black River), and St Mark's (Athlone).
The cemetery is closely linked to the Black River community, which emerged near the current Rondebosch area and grew significantly from the 1920s. This community of predominantly coloured and Malay families was later displaced during apartheid under the Group Areas Act, with much of the area, including homes, destroyed or redeveloped (e.g., for the M5 freeway). Despite this, fragments of the original street grid and a few homes remain. Historian Uma Dhupelia-Mesthrie highlights the erasure of Black River

from Cape Town's memory, emphasizing the community's overlooked history and the failure of land restitution efforts.

As part of heritage mitigation, a symbolic reparation is proposed: setting aside part of Erf 33030 for a memorial, developed in consultation with affected families and stakeholders.

The site a cemetery is further unpacked in the HIA, written records note 2313 burials but only 1617 burial shafts were noted (shortfall in explained in the HIA stating some might be buried in other cemeteries when this one became full.) Furthermore, the burial was of many old people and slaves.

The 2019 HIA had a number of recommendations – page 30 to 31, not all these conditions were met although this developer cannot be held liable for all these, there has been conditions such as the distribution of the 2019 and this report to the community and the memorisation on site will be carried forth by this developer.

Consultation:

Black River Interest group, Western Cape First National Collective Trust and Goringhaqua Council had no real objection to the development but requested memorialization of the Khoe

Grade:

The consultant suggested that grade of 3C, I do not agree with this, given the findings of this HIA I would suggest that 3A. If not higher given the importance of site historical.

Recommendation: Page 37

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 11 June due to Archaeological and Social sensitive of the site.

SB

13.19 Erf 2109, 8 Patriot Street, Hoog en Droog, Paarl, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25031110SB0307

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work has not started, proposed new scullery, internal alteration and enclosing of existing stoep and new braai.
- requested info: internal photographs and possible additional streetscapes - was received on the 21 May
- Some of the streetscape look like Google streetscape but there are some that are clearly not

DECISION

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

SB

13.20 Farm 572-RE, Alto Wine Estate, Stellenbosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC24091917SJ0926

Sneha Jhupsee introduced the item.

Ms Nicolene Visser and Ms Carmen-Ann Wessels were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- NHRA Trigger: Structure older than 60 years old
- Additional Information: Built in 1919.
- Previous applications:
 - HWC24121108CN0113 (04.01.25): A&A Outbuilding converted into farm offices.
 - HWC24091917SJ0926 (28.10.24): A&A Existing Cellar
 - 22091603SB0915E (02.11.22): MW Paint
 - 21121408CN1215E (S38(8) - 16.02.22): HIA requested but not submitted.
- The work has not started.
- The werf is graded IIIB and is within the Helderberg Historic Enclave (proposed II) & Annandale Scenic Route on the Stellenbosch Heritage Register.
- Proposal is for the removal of the later garages and additions to the original structure on the back (east) of the house, and on the side (south). New elements to be introduced are an addition with garage and guest room, new swimming pool and small open sided pool house, a stoep on south of house, and a new portion of werf wall. Internally, the Manor House is to be reconfigured for modern use with the removal of some walls, adjustments to internal circulation, closing of large openings at the ensuite, laundry, and kitchen, shopfitting and a new braai fireplace in the lounge area. The garden will receive a pool deck and braai pergola area.
- Consultation:
 - SMCAC: no comment received within 30-day commenting period.
 - SIG: Generally support the proposal but commented that the gables of the new garages (north east and south east elevations) should not replicate the holbol gables of the existing manor house; gables should take a triangular form, in keeping with the architectural style observed in various outbuildings on the property and to indicate that it is an addition/layer of our era.
 - SHF: no comment received within 30-day commenting period.
- HOMs 23.04.25: FURTHER REQUIREMENTS: The Committee requests the new garage gables be an iteration of the simpler style gables found on more recent structures on the farm. The design is to be revised to reflect a triangular gable.
- Further Requirements received on 14 May:
- HOMs 19.05.25 (CN): HELD OVER: CN recommends matter to be held over, as FR could not be assessed in time for HOMS.

DECISION

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

SJ

13.21 Erf 474, 7 Cranberry Crescent, Camps Bay, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25040702RB0416

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 19 May 2025.
- Graded IIIC/NCW on City Maps.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.

- Proposal is for total demolition.
- CoCT did not respond to comment within 30 days.
- CBCRA did not respond to comment within 30 days.

DECISION

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

RB

13.22 N1 Roadway, Worcester, S38(8)-HIA Case No: HWC23110822SB1120

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- NID RECAP:
- Proposed 10,5km upgrade of the N1, near Worcester, specifically to result in a 120kmph design speed limit in this section as well as other upgrades such making it an undivided two-lane road, with a 30m average road reserve.
- Archaeology: Several archaeological resources could be impacted such as ESA material in situ in undisturbed segments. A number of sites have been recorded within Glen Heatlie Farm.
- Palaeontology: unknown
- Visual: low but could impacted the scenic route.
- Built environment: Tweefontein Padstal, Uivlucht Guest House could be impacted.
- Consultant recommends Heritage Impact Assessment - AIA, PIA, Architecture
- DEC 2023 - RECORD OF DECISION:
- The committee resolved that an HIA with AIA, PIA, built environment study and socio-historical study and VIA on Cultural landscape are required.
- HIA summary:
- New DEA&DP application, so this is currently outside of any specific commenting deadline.
- Four route options have been proposed.
- A consolidation of 6 independent studies is as follows:
- Heritage resources identified:
- 1) Broader Cultural Landscape graded IIIA with two PHSs (Clean Heatlie and Uitvlugt Homesteads).
- 2) Immediate Route Context has several IIIA farmsteads and farmlands, along with several NWC structures.
- 3) Archaeologically, many ESA artefacts near the south-western end of the study area, which would be affected by all four route options.
- Uitvlugt PHS could not be analysed due to access restrictions and Route Option 2 passes through the Uitvlugt farmstead which might have unknown historical archaeological significance.
- As such, AIA supports all Route Options except for Route 2 and has proposed mitigation measures for the ESA artefacts.
- 4) Palaeontological, only a desktop study was conducted. It found a High (Peninsula Formation), Moderate (mantling superficial sediments and alluvium), Low (Malmesbury Group) as well as Zero (Cape Granite Suite) sensitivities.
- Mainly trace fossils are found in the Peninsula Formation and as such, a Chance Finds

Protocol should serve as sufficient mitigation for potential Palaeo impacts.

- 5) Visually, several indicators were used with the main indicators being the topography of the valley and the experiential nature of driving on the N1.
- Option 4 is identified as the best option as it responds best to the contextual cultural landscape informants.
- However, this option specifically claims the top speed for a section to be 100kmph, which is against the goal of the development.
- 6) Social study, essentially found that the direct businesses along the route would be negatively impacts (loss of vineyards, buildings, access, etc.) Some can be relocated, and some cannot. Specifically, four business were identified as likely having to close down.
- Detours during construction will also lead to higher costs for some business. As such, the best option is to reduce the geometric design for about 1.5-1.8km of road from 120kmph to 100kmph. As such Options 1 and 4 are considered the least impactful, but ultimately all options will have a larger impact.
- PPP:
- Will be run as part of the EIA (so this HIA can be interpreted as a phased approach).
- Although noting the SIA had interviews with 20 people.
- Recommendations in the HIA:
- 1) This HIA be endorsed by HWC as meeting the requirements contained in the Response to the NID, dated 13 December 2023.
- 2) The statement of significances and the heritage and visual design indicators proposed in the report be accepted.
- 3) The specialist reports and contents: Archaeological, Paleontological, Visual, Built Environment and Social reports are approved.
- 4) Recommended route Option 4 with mitigations measures:
- a) Revised road is designed on the Voordenberg Farm to omit the elevation of the road above the farmstead (around Kleinberg se Draai). The road alignments have been based on a vehicle speed of 120 km/hr. It is recommended that the road speed is reduced to R 100 km/hr. around this corner so that the road position can be revised. There are many instances where the road speed is reduced along the national roads due to topography, natural features settlements etc. The retention of the landform is assessed as more important than the retention of the farmstead.
- b) The northern section of Route 4 before the entry to the Hex River Pass could be aligned to Option 1 in order to reduce the loss of vineyards. The Option 1 slip road in close proximity to the two cottages (183/4 RE) must be carefully designed to not impact the setting of these two cottages. Access to these two cottages must be retained.
- c) The residences adjacent to de Wet Station (Twee Fonteinen 319/40 and 319/82) require safe access and buffer from the N1 in terms of noise and lighting impacts.
- d) SANRAL should investigate the option of establishing a vegetated berm along the section of the N1 located adjacent to farmstead on Seekoeigat Farm. The Landscape Architect should be required to design a suitable vegetated buffer between the road and Seekoeigat Farm.
- e) The need for establishing vegetated berms for other properties should also be investigated depending on the final alignment.
- 5) Archaeology:
- a) Commission an archaeologist to carry out required mitigation well in advance of construction (preferably 6 months).
- b) Carry out required archaeological mitigation along the track at waypoints 4726 and 4729-4736 and surrounding area. This should be done during the dry season.

- c) Inform staff to be vigilant and carry out inspections of new excavations
- d) Reporting chance finds as early as possible to HWC or an archaeologist, protect in situ and stop work in immediate area.
- 6) Palaeontology
 - a) If fossil remains or trace fossils are discovered, either on the surface or exposed by excavations, the Chance Find Protocol must be implemented by the ECO/site manager. These discoveries ought to be protected (if possible, in situ). The ECO/site manager must report to SAHRA so that a palaeontologist can carry out mitigation (collection and recording). The chance find protocol to be included into the CEMP.
- 7) Visual
 - a) The thorough implementation, maintenance, and management of detailed landscape plans prepared by suitably qualified landscape architects with experience in cultural landscape and road infrastructure projects must be included with the detailed engineering drawings and plan submissions to ensure that the cultural landscape quality is retained.
 - b) Ensure that existing trees are retained as far as is possible reinforce or replace traditional patterns of planting where appropriate with suitable species.
 - c) Maintain trees in a healthy growing condition, and not needlessly destroyed by new development. Ensure continuity of the rural landscape with replacement of trees where retention of existing trees is not possible.
- 8) Built Environment
 - a) The following structures are recommended for demolition:
 - • Residence on WC Dept Agriculture offices (Farm 267)
 - • At least 2 dwellings, large shed and outbuildings (Vredelus) (Tweefontein 319/31)
 - • Potjie Geplant / Rooi Hond nursery (Meirings Berg 309/01)
 - • Tweefontein farmstall and associated residence (Tweefontein 319/98)
 - • Semi-detached farm workers' dwellings De Wet Cellar (Meirings Berg 309/2)
 - • Farm workers' dwelling (within 5 m of proposed service road) and undercover parking and farmyard
 - • Seekoeigat farm (Glen Heatlie 183/4)
 - b) The buildings that are recommended for retention are:
 - • All structures within the Voordenberg farmstead (Tweefontein 319/50) (the demolition of any structures on the historic farmstead should be discussed with the recommended revision of Option 4 on Kleinberg se Draai. - noting that the engineers have supplied a motivation letter to demolish some of these buildings still to retain that 120kmph speed at Kleinberg se Draai.
 - • Cottage with Eucalyptus trees and the stone cottage on Glen Heatlie 183/4/RE (east of the Option 1 slip road).
 - • Cottages adjacent to the railway line next to De Wets Cellars (Twee Fontainen 319/40 and Twee Fontainen 319/82).
- 9) Access and mobility
 - a) SANRAL should establish and underpass on Seekoeigat Farm to enable access to sections of the property and houses that are cut off from the farm by the project. The location of the underpass should be discussed with
 - b) Access should be provided for the houses located at the De Wet station residential node.
 - c) Provision should be made for a taxi facility on the service road in the vicinity of the Tweefontein Farm Stall. This location would enable taxis to access De Doorns via the N1 north lane and Worcester via the service road.

- 10) Sense of place
- a) Aim to retain the gateway experience around the Kleinberg se Draai, potentially with new vegetation and the recommended revision of the road infrastructure on this corner section.
- b) Disturbances associated with the construction of the N1 project, including the interchanges and service roads, should be rehabilitated and landscaping plans should be implemented.
- c) SANRAL should investigate the option of establishing a vegetated berm along the section of the N1 located adjacent to farmstead on Seekoeigat Farm (i.e. on the one side of the road).
- d) The need for establishing vegetated berms for other properties should also be investigated depending on the final alignment.
- 11) Social
- a) Properties and business that are affected by the project in terms of loss of land and impact on businesses should be fully compensated for their losses.
- b) Refer detail mitigation recommendations in Section 12.2.3 (CEMP)
- c) Loss of access to N1 and passing traffic
 - • Affected business owners should be compensated for financial losses associated with loss of direct access to N1 on their business.
 - • In the case of the Rooi Hond Nursery (nursery, restaurant and play area) (Meiringsberg 309/1) compensation should include the costs of establishing a new facility, including purchase of site and development of facilities, and the transfer of plants and materials to the new facility (if a new facility is established).
 - • The affected landowners should be provided with information on the compensation process and timing. Negotiations with affected business owners should commence as soon as possible and be completed before construction phase commences.
 - • The valuation and compensation process should:
 - • Be fair and transparent.
 - • Include the option of an independent valuation if requested. The costs of the independent valuation should be covered by the SANRAL.
- d) Increased flood risk for Orange Grove and Seekoeigat Farms
 - • SANRAL should assess the potential risk of flooding based on the findings of the study undertaken by ASP Technology (2024).
 - • Ensure that bridge design clearances can accommodate severe flood events.
 - • Ensure that areas under the bridges are inspected and cleared before the start of the winter rainy season and after flood events.
- 11) Construction Phase Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)
- a) Implement a construction phase Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure on-going management of social and visual environmental matters. The recommended detailed mitigation measures should be outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the Construction Phase.
- b) Ensure that areas under bridges are maintained and cleared of debris on a regular basis.
- The Committee discussed the complicated nature of the HIA consisting of six independent studies.
- The Committee expressed concerns that the SIA might not be a full SHS.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application IACom on 11 June 2025 due to the expertise of IACom being required.

RB

13.23 Erf 15821, 96 Durban Street, Worcester, S34 - Partial Demolition, Alterations & Additions Case No: HWC25031306SVB0319

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 16 April and 15 May.
- The property's grading is unknown, and it is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The building sustained significant damaged from a fire, the date of which was not provided by the applicant. The roof is entirely gone and the internal building appears to be in a severe state of disrepair. From google maps and the images provided the building appears to have been previously and possibly currently being used as a car dealership and parts shop. The proposal is to demolish a number of internal walls and construct a new internal structure comprising of brick columns with steel beams. The proposal is also to brick up a number of doors and windows mostly at the rear of the property, as well as replace existing windows with doors in certain places and install a new staircase to the attic space. The proposal is also to install a new roof and replace one of the doors on the street façade with a wider door.
- Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society support the proposal with the condition that all doors on the façade must be of the same scale and housing. No wider doors are supported. Committee to note that the proposal does include the addition of a wider door on the street facing façade in place of the previous narrower door.
- Breede River Valley Municipality note that they agree with the recommendation of the Heritage Committee.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Heritage statement assessing the significance of the building and the impacts of the proposal on the building. Heritage statement compiled by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner must be submitted to HWC within 60 days. The above must be circulated to I&APs for the 30-day consultation period and comments or proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.
2. Applicant to respond to the conservation body comment and justify the widening of the door on the street facing facade.
3. Emergency application is recommended by HOMs for stabilisation and protection of the heritage resource given the current condition of the building.

SVB

13.24 Erf 17633, 34 Main Road, Fish Hoek, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25032501SVB0325

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- This application heard at HOMs on 08 April who requested the following further requirements "applicant to submit a revised plan which only highlights the proposed work". Further requirements were submitted on 21 May 2025.
- The property is ungraded and outside of any HPO. However, the City notes the grading as NCW in their comment for the previous application on this site.
- The work as applied for has not started.
- The proposal is for new on-site parking bays and associated building work which includes a mountable curb and various 2m vibracrete walls, which are essentially garden walls, on the Carlton Roadside of the property. The proposal also includes removal of the unauthorized covered portico, and existing vibracrete garden walls, bricking up an unauthorized window in building 03 and fire and ventilation requirements.
- HWC issued a S51 letter on 25 June 2024 for unauthorized alterations to the property (HWC24042302SB0409).
- The applicant initially requested that this application be dealt with as a deviation from the S51 letter previously issued, however HOMs advised that this would not be possible and should be treated as a new application. Given this the application should only include new proposed work and none of the previous unauthorized work as it has already been dealt with under the S51 process.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.25 Erf 4283-RE, Cnr Mill, Church and Bird Street, Stellenbosch, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25042417SVB0429

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 14 May.
- The property is graded IIIC and within the Stellenbosch Historic Core.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for a new entrance door as well as a new internal wall, removal of signage, screens and exposed services. The proposal is also for timber panels and cladding to be fitted to the existing columns to the entrance, new signage to the sidewalk and streetscape. I deem this minor works, however SIG noted in their comment that they do not deem it minor works. Either way all I&APs have been consulted.
- Stellenbosch Municipality Conservation Advisory Committee approve of the proposal on condition that a permit from HWC and stamped plans be obtained.
- SHF did not respond.
- SIG revised their initial comment after further consultation. They noted the following recommendations and objections in revised comment: (2) The single door giving entrance to the stair lobby should be central within its panel and preferably be a double

door. (3) The small windowpanes in shop 6 and shop 5 as illustrated in the elevation drawings are unrelated to the larger panels used in shop fronts for 1 to 4. The door panes of shops 2 and 3 are particularly out of character, although these small panes already exist here is an opportunity to create a greater unity of design across the western façade and replace all windows with single shopfront panes. (4) Changes should also be carried out on the Meulplein and Bird Street facades so that the architecture may be read as a unit."

- I&APs have been invited to HOMs 26 May. Stellenbosch Municipality has noted that they cannot attend.
- The applicant's response to the revised comment received from SIG are as follows:
 - (1) The SIG does not agree that the application qualifies as Minor Works, as changes will be made to the façade within the historical core. We note this concern and will await further feedback from HWC.
 - (2) The SIG recommends that the entrance door to the stair lobby be centered within its panel and preferably be a double door. We acknowledge this comment. Unfortunately, due to the internal layout of the lobby, staircase, and landings, repositioning the existing door would not be possible.
 - (3) The SIG notes that the small windowpanes in shops 5 and 6 differ from the larger panes used in shops 1 to 4. The door panes of shops 2 and 3 are also considered out of character. While these small panes currently exist, this may be an opportunity to achieve a more unified design along the western façade by replacing them with single shopfront panes. → We acknowledge this observation. However, replacing all the existing windowpanes falls outside the scope of the current project. This can be considered for discussion with the client for possible future consideration.
 - (4) Meulplein and Bird Street Facades: The SIG suggests that similar changes be made to the Meulplein and Bird Street facades to present a unified architectural expression. We acknowledge this suggestion. These changes are also beyond the current project scope. It can be considered for discussion with the client for possible future consideration

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Applicant to clarify whether the doors in shopfronts 2 and 3 are existing or proposed.

SVB

13.26 Erf 92012, 66 Broad Road, Wynberg, S34-Total Demolition Case No: HW25031124SVB0313

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Mr Yunus Karriem was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 24 and 25 April, 12 and 19 May.
- This application was heard at HOMs on 19 May.
- The committee resolved to hold the application over to allow parties an opportunity to participate in the meeting.
- The property is graded IIIB and within the proposed Wynberg East PHA HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for total demolition of all structures on site.
- CoCT do not support the proposal and note the following: The City's management guide for 3B resources states that they should be conserved, remedial action applied to

enhance the resource and historical fabric should be retained. Considering the intrinsic and contextual significance of the dwelling, the proposed total demolition would not comply with the City's management guidelines and would result in the loss of the heritage resource and its contribution to the streetscape.

- WECA does not support the application due to its high grading and intact architectural features warranting its retention.
- I&APs have been invited to this meeting.
- The applicant response to objections and gave further reasons for the demolition, which can be summarized as follows: The house is dilapidated and undermaintained due to extensive damage caused over the years and relating to electrical and water damage. Damage includes roof leaks and rotting timber; the damage is hazardous; it is not cost effective to replace the water damaged roof and flooring; the floor and insulation do not meet the minimum standards in terms of energy efficient; restoration and maintenance of the existing building far exceeds redevelopment of the site; the registered owner now has the opportunity to renew the site for future generations in a safe and controlled manner; the building's considered to be a huge liability for the owner and cannot merely be thought to maintain the architectural feature while the inside is a rotting severely damaged dwelling.

DECISION

The Committee is supportive of the proposed total demolition as there is insufficient heritage significance to warrant retention of the structure with the following conditions:

1. The CoCT and the WECA have acknowledged the context of the site to be of local heritage significance. As such, heritage design informants are to be submitted to the WECA for comment and thereafter to the CoCT for approval prior to the demolition of the existing structure.

SVB

13.27 Erven 691 & 697, 221 Beach Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works Case No: HWC25042906SVB0430

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 11 and 14 May.
- This application was heard at HOMs on 19 May. The committee resolved to request the following further requirements: "All previous HWC approvals including building plans and permits."
- These further requirements were submitted by the applicant on 21 May.
- The property is graded IIIA and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The applicant noted that HWC approved the window replacements on the front façade facing Beach Road in 2021. The client has intended to ultimately replace all windows to achieve the same functionality, appearance and life span. The proposal is also to replace the existing door and fanlight from the conference room into the passage and to replace the existing balustrade of a balcony on the eastern facade with a new balustrade made from painted galvanized mild steel.
- There have been 6 applications excluding this application for various alterations and additions to the building since 2019. None of these approvals had conditions attached to them.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.28 Erf 1357, 1 Main Street, Greyton, S34 - Additions & Alterations Case No: HWC24102902XM1030

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 01 May and 17 May 2025.
- The property is ungraded in the Greyton Heritage Inventory Survey Report of 2016, however main street has been identified as a grade IIIC significant streetscape in the same heritage survey.
- The property is outside of any HPO.
- The proposal is for minor internal alterations and replacement and repair of old windows.
- Work has started. The work that has started is highlighted on the revise plan provided and is limited to internal alterations to openings.
- Theewaterskloof municipality referred the application to HWC.
- Greyton Heritage Society noted that their only concerns are “the new windows to replace old on the South-West elevation, as they are of and horizontal format instead of a more traditional vertical aspect. This elevation is seen from Main Road as well as Buitekant St. Currently this is being shielded by a fence.”
- The following further requirements were requested from the applicant:
 - A response to GCS's concern regarding the SW elevation windows
 - The revised plans clearly indicating work has started.
 - Streetscape photos
- These further requirements were provided by the applicant on 17 May.
- In summary the applicant's response to GCS's comment is as follows: They chose the swartland 'victorian look' mock sash double unit windows to mimic the windows on the north-west façade, which has 4 double-up mock sash windows as well as 2 single mock sash windows. The proposed windows consist of 2 sub-units that are individually vertically oriented, that when combined into a double unit result in a horizontally oriented element.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8.

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.29 Erf 481, 22 Avenue Marina, Bantry Bay, S34-Total Demolition Case No: HWC25012802XM0129

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item o.b.o XM.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 16 May 2025.

- The property is graded IIIC building outside of any HPO.
- The proposal is for a demolition of the property to make way for a new residential development.
- The building is a freestanding building on two levels with a garage and a study at the lower level and the main residence upstairs. The building has very little cultural significance, but it is indicated that the building as a structure which has some intact elements such as windows, chimney, roof tiles and form with a large garden full of matured trees. It further states that the building, which is a good example with intact elements, is part of the early to mid-20th century development of Fresnaye and it has a good interface with the street, and it contributes to the streetscape and the area.
- The context consists largely of modern single, double or triple storey buildings. Along avenue Marina from the intersection with Kloofnek road, it is only the subject property the heavily altered adjacent property and two other buildings across the road that are older than 60 years. The transformation of this part of the suburb has effectively been completed and any built heritage relic of note to be used as an informer for future development, is completely absent.
- HRMS comment: The house has been graded as a IIIC local heritage resources as it is not considered to be intrinsically significant yet has been recognized for its contextual value. However, as the immediate neighbourhood had already been transformed by the construction of many contemporary structures, the loss of this house will not impact negatively on the immediate neighbourhood. The application for the demolition of the structure on the subject property is therefore supported.
- SFA comment: Although the IIIC graded property does retain some heritage features, it is not deemed conservation worthy. Retention of a single IIIC graded property within this context is not supported. Almost the entire street front of Ave Marina has been redeveloped, showcasing large contemporary dwellings. Sea Point for All has no objection to the proposal.
- SFB did not provide comment within the 30-day commenting period.

DECISION

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

XM

13.30 Erf 4929, 1 Drommedaris Street, Paarl, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25011701XM1121

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item o.b.o XM.

Mr Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 17 April and 16 May 2025.
- The property is ungraded and located outside the Paarl Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone.
- The proposal is for the store building without a roof to be demolished as the structures is unsafe and may cause harm if they fall over. The property was operational as a wine tasting and wine maturation and distributor. In 2024 it was sold on auction. Most of the buildings have been stripped of the maturation tanks and valuable assets. In the process of removing these assets much damage was done

to the existing premises. Removal of roofs and facades was part of the process.

- Work has not started.
- Paarl 300 supports
- Drakenstein Heritage Foundation has no objection
- Drakenstein municipality has no objection

DECISION

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

13.31 Erf 3936, 6 Upper Faure Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25030504XM0422

XM

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Ownership details, response to the Drakenstein Municipality comments and coloured up elevations required.

XM

APPROVED

14. NEW MATTERS

- 14.1 Erf 188, 8 Frere Road, Sea Point, S34 - Additions & Alterations**
Case No: HWC25051505CSI0516

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Application form required.

CSI

- 14.2 Erf 277, 74 Forrest Way, Glencairn, S34 - Additions & Alterations**
Case No: HWC25050606CSI0519

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Title deed, locality map, SG diagram, streetscapes, CoCT comment, Simon's Town Historical Society Comment required.

CSI

- 14.3 Erf 2398, 8 Rozenburg Street, Paarl, S34 - Additions & Alterations**
Case No: HWC25052503CSI0516

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Drakenstein Municipality and Paarl300 Foundation comments required.

CSI

- 14.4 Erf 88216, 2 Carisbrooke Street, St James Mansions, Muizenberg, S34 - Minor Works**
Case No: HWC25050505CSI0415

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Coloured up plans, coloured photographs, body corporate resolution, streetscape photographs and internal photographs.

CSI

- 14.5 Farm 585-RE, Farm Uitspanskraal, Heidelberg, S38(8) - NID**
Case No: HWC25051308CSI0514

HELD OVER

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 2 June 2025 due to case officer input required.

CSI

- 14.6 DR 1713, De Rust, S38(8) – NID**
Case ID: 25168CSI0000 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/380094>

HELD OVER

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 2 June 2025 due to case officer input required.

CSI

14.7 Erf 1051, 12 Willesden Road, Camps Bay, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25041510CH0513

COMMENT

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

CH

14.8 Erf 1510-RE, 22 Beach Road, Unit 602, Mouille Point, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25050612CH0515

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Both owners' details and signatures to be included on the application form, external photographs and streetscape photographs.

CH

14.9 Erf 1990, 99 Ocean View Drive, Green Point, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25050601CH0515

COMMENT

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

CH

14.10 Erf 2756, 33 Van Der Riet Street, Oudtshoorn

Case No: HWC25051501CH0515

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Not graded outside HPO
- Proposal is for internal alterations, the addition of a braai, bathrooms and storeroom to the existing garage.
- Work is complete
- Heritage Oudtshoorn supports.
- Oudtshoorn Municipality supports

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.

CH

14.11 Erf 371, 26 Braemar Road, Green Point, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25051209CH0515

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Motivation letter, photographs of unauthorized work, additional streetscape photographs, query the two objections as per the email dated 8 May 2025, previous HWC approval, Company Resolution for LM Oberhofer or PA Oberhofer.

CH

14.12 Erf 258, 25 High Level Road, Green Point, S34-Total Demolition

Case No: HWC25050801CH0515

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Demolition plan, additional streetscape photographs, confirmation if GPRRA provided additional comment on the demolition.

CH

14.13 Erf 2230-RE, 169 Main Road, Paarl, S27-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25050507CH0514

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

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

DISCUSSION

- PHS inside the SCPAOZ of Paarl
- Proposal is for internal alterations (closing up some doorways and widening existing doorways and reconfiguring the existing kitchen and bathrooms), removing the terrazzo staircase at the rear of the building and modifying the existing staircase to gain access to the back stoep, enclosing part of the back stoep to create a lounge and a new low front boundary wall.
- Work has not started.

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

14.14 Farm 91, Off the N2, about 20kms northwest of Riversdale, Riversdale, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 25186CH0517 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/380589>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

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

DISCUSSION

- Unauthorized clearing of natural vegetation for the cultivation of avocado, pear, and orchards on two pieces of land, as well as the illegal construction of an 900m³ earth dam near the adjacent watercourse on Farm 91, in Riversdale.
- Historically, the site has been used for agricultural purposes (dryland and wheat grazing). Heritage resources identified:
- Stone tools - impact is n/a to this application, but Early Stone Age (ESA) tools have been recorded in agricultural land among alluvial gravels in the Riversdale area (Webley & Orton 2009; Kaplan 2023). The heritage screener indicated that the site is within a low archaeologically sensitivity area.
- Fossils - In terms of impacts, according to Bamford (attached), although the palaeosensitivity of the study area is shown to be very high, this would only apply to the underlying rocks. The farming activities is only on the surface soils and not the bedrock.

Therefore, it is highly unlikely that any fossils have been damaged. 'As far as the paleontological heritage is concerned, the S24G application should be granted' (Bamford 2025)

- A palaeontological comment was provided by Prof. Marion Bamford. The comment states that the project lies in the Gydo Formation (Ceres Subgroup, Bokkeveld Group, Cape Supergroup) but is covered with soil and either indigenous vegetation or crops. The rocks of this formation, when unweathered, sometimes contain a diverse shelly invertebrate biota that includes trilobites, molluscs and brachiopods, in the shallow marine settings, or fossil plants such as lycopods in the terrestrial settings (Almond and Pether, 2008; Thamm and Johnson, 2006). Soils, however, do not preserve fossils because they are weathered sediments with organic matter. The recommendation palaeontological recommendation reads as follows: Although the palaeosensitivity is shown to be very high (Figs 3-6), this would only apply to the underlying rocks. The farming activities is only on the surface soils and not the bedrock. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that any fossils have been damaged. As far as the paleontological heritage is concerned, the S24G application should be granted.

FINAL COMMENT

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

- | | | |
|--------------|---|----|
| | | CH |
| 14.15 | Erf 1443, 24 Piet Retief Street, Porterville, S34-Minor Works
Case No: CN0515 | |
| | OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:
POP, Title Deed, Locality Plan, All photos and SG diagram required. | |
| | | CN |
| 14.16 | Erf 3735, via Frank Street, Porterville, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: CN0515 | |
| | OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:
POP, Title Deed, Locality Plan, Internal and streetscape photos, Bergriver Municipality comments and SG diagram required | |
| | | CN |
| 14.17 | Erf 4421, 20 Kromrivier Road, Stellenbosch, S34-A&A&Partial Demolition
Case No: CN0516 | |
| | OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:
POP and SG diagram required. | |
| | | CN |
| 14.18 | Erf 775-RE, 469 Main Road, Paarl, S27-Minor Works
Case No: HWC25042411CN0513 | |
| | OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:
Internal photos required. | |
| | | CN |

14.19 Erf 815-RE, 23 Murray Street, Swellendam, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25051403CN0514

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Plan indicating work that has started required.
- Grading: Not listed in the Swellendam Prelim Heritage Survey
- HPO: Outside
- Status of work: The majority of the work has been completed, as per email confirmation from the applicant.
- Proposal: For an extension of the outbuilding along with its restoration.
- Consultation:
- Swellendam Aesthetics Advisory Committee supports
- Swellendam Heritage Association has no objection
- Heritage considerations: The building seems to have little to no heritage significance and the proposal will not impact.

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.

CN

14.20 Erf 901 24 Cabrierre Street, Franschhoek, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25051201CN0513

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Locality Plan, more internal and external photos, streetscape photos, Municipality and SIG comments required.

CN

14.21 Erven 121 & 1948, 19 Forest Drive, Pinelands, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25051309CN0519

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Correctly coloured up plans, Locality Plan, CoCT & PRRA comments required.

CN

14.22 Portion 7 of Farm Klip Banks Kloof 17, via Unnamed Road, Proteem, Bredasdorp, S38(8)-NID

SAHRIS Case ID 25166CN2519 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/380092>

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(1) trigger(s): S38(1)(c)(i), S38(1)(d) & NEMA
- Decision making authority: 24G at DEADP
- Property: Measures approx. 3.5ha in extent, with a current land use of Agriculture and Industrial uses. Zoning is single residential. The surrounding land uses are agri-processing, Crop storage, agricultural activities, school, church and residential.
- Proposal: For the construction of the SSK Silo Complex and proposed construction of

additional eight (8) Silo's and associated infrastructure.

- Heritage resources:
 - Palaeo-sensitivity: The Screening Tool report indicates the area as having a medium sensitivity to Palaeontology resources. It is recommended that the HWC Fossil Finds Procedure form part of the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) and be kept on site. No expected impact as the site in its entirety has already been developed.
 - Archaeo-sensitivity: The screening tool report indicated archaeological sensitivity to be low.
 - Summary of impacts: No other resources listed by the applicant. It is not anticipated that the development will impact upon any heritage resources as the property was subject to Anthropological activities prior to commencement of the Silo Complex. The Botanist confirmed that the site was in poor condition prior to construction of the Silo Complex.
- Consultant recommendation: NFS
- Heritage Considerations: The town is very small with some buildings building older than 60 years. No scenic routes, no cultural landscapes. Property has been previous disturbed. No impacts to resources anticipated.

FINAL COMMENT

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

CN

14.23 Erf 1060, 52 Buitekring Road, Dalsig, Stellenbosch, S34 - Additions & Alterations **Case No: HWC25051504EJV0516**

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV.

DISCUSSION

- Ungraded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Unauthorised work on the property was regularised under case number HWC25012807CH0212 earlier this year.
- The proposal is for the significant renovation of the property to include an extension to the ground floor footprint and an additional storey.
- SHF did not respond in 30 days; the municipality did not respond in 30 days; SIG do not object

DECISION

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

EJV

14.24 Erf 1114, 35 Avenue Des Huguenots, Fresnaye, S34 - Partial Demolition; Restoration
Case No: HWC25050805EJV0516

COMMENT

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA

EJV

14.25 Erf 299, 19 Brunswick Road, Tamboerskloof, S34 - Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25051511EJV0516

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB
- Inside Upper Table Valley HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to extend the rear of the property to enlarge the family room, accommodate a utility room, bathroom, and shed.
- CIBRA Support; CoCT support

DECISION

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

EJV

14.26 Farm 1341, Goede Rust, Roggeland Road, Dal Josaphat, Paarl, S27 - Maintenance
Case No: HWC25051301EJV0513

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

DHF Comment; MOA between HWC and SAHRA to be signed in order for HWC review.

EJV

14.27 Farm 129 Portion 23, Wolvedans, Groot Brak River, Mossel Bay, S38(8) - NID
Case ID: 25146EJV0513 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/379893>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item o.b.o EJV.

DISCUSSION

- Ungraded
- HPO status unknown
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and NEMA.
- The proposal is to install two solar PV array sites and two solar MV stations and ancillary infrastructure on a vacant farm portion to serve the adjacent Grootbrak Waste Water Treatment Works facility. The facility was constructed in the mid 1990s on agricultural land that had been worked since the colonial period up until recently with the installation of an earth dam on the north of the property and earthmoving activities on the south portion. In terms of archaeology, ESA and MSA lithics have been known to occur in the surrounding landscape but are considered IIIC or NCW due to low densities,

temporal mixing, and lack of associational material. The relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity screener indicates low sensitivity and a site inspection was undertaken to confirm. The map of relative palaeontology theme sensitivity screener indicates very high sensitivity; however, Prof. Pether notes that the site is underlain by the Kirkwood Formation covered by colluvium and windblown sands considered to be of low fossil potential. An alert for the uncovering of fossil wood during the installation of cabling must be included in the EMP to ensure it is correctly conserved for later deposition at a museum (The Albany Museum is recommended) with consultation from Drs Bamford and Prevec. In terms of visual impact, the field of solar panels will have a relatively low vertical aspect and will be partially screened by topography, existing vegetation, and the surrounding developments. The proposal does present a change in character to the site but is consistent with the surrounding land uses as a combination of agricultural, industrial, and infrastructural.

- Consultant recommends no further studies but that an alert for the uncovering of fossil wood must be included in the Environmental Authorisation and/or the Environmental Management Program (EMP) for the construction phase of project.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and an alert for the uncovering of fossil wood during the construction phase of the project must be included in the EMP and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.28 Erf 2255, 6 van Oudtshoorn Street, Robertson, S34-Extension Case No: HWC25051510RB0516

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Property is graded NCW.
- Not within any HPO.
- S34-extension application.
- HWC issued the permit and plans on 24 May 2022 (22042607TZ0429E) for the extension of the Robertson hospital.
- So this has been submitted within the 3-year period.
- The S34 application follows on from a S38 NID application, to which HWC issued NFS on 3 March 2022 (21111801AM0127E).
- Noting no internals are provided (but it is a large hospital), it is a WCG owner property (so no title deed).

DECISION

The committee resolved to approve the permit extension application by provision of a new permit in place of previous permit dated 24 May 2022.

RB

14.29 Erf 6054, 58 Spencer Street, Goodwood, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: RB0516

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

POP and local authority comment required.

RB

14.30 Erven RE/1412 & 3264, off the R322, Heidelberg, S38(8)-NID

Case No: HWC25051502RB0516

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DMRE as the authorising authority.
- Triggers S38(1)(c)(i).
- Proposal is for the expansion of mining areas on the property.
- HWC had a cryptic final comment on the original mining application in 2021, stating that the HIA both meets and does not meet the requirements of S38(3).
- From a reading of the discussion, it appears as though the then APM Committee was satisfied with the PIA but not the HIA as a whole (specifically referring to the lack of engagement with archaeological aspects).
- Nevertheless, it appears as though the mining right was granted, and the area has been subject to mining for a few years.
- This proposal is now to expand this area.
- Based on the findings of the previous HIA, the applicant state that:
- 1) Landscape is already affected by the current mining and this expansion would not result in further impacts, especially as it will be rehabilitated later.
- There are no known cultural landscape resources or scenic routes in the area.
- 2) Archaeologically, the expectation would be ESA/MSA scatters and nothing consolidated and there are no known historical buildings.
- 3) Paleontologically, the Kirkwood formation (Uitenhage Group) that informs the high palaeosensitivity, has yielded several variety of interesting fossils outside of the Heidelberg-Riversdale basin.
- In 2014, and in 2020 site visits for the mining right area, no fossils were recorded and there is an assumption that the kaolinisation has weathered any near surface fossils.
- No fossils have been recorded during the current mining operations, but the applicant has indicated to include the Chance Finds Protocol in their EMPr.

FINAL COMMENT

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

RB

14.31 Erven 336, 337, & Remainder of Portion 78 of the Farm Hansmoeskraal No 202, Le Grand Estate, George, S38(8)-NID

Case No: RB0515

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Completed S38 application form and POP required.

RB

14.32 Portion 837 of Farm Blaauw Klip No 510, off the R44, Stellenbosch, S34-Minor Works
Case No: HWC25051506RB0515

Application withdrawn by applicant

RB

14.33 Portion of Remainder 1 of Farm Kliprand No 471, off Doringboom street, Vanrhynsdorp, S38(8)-NID
Case No: RB0515

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

POP with correct reference number required.

RB

14.34 RE 5338, Off the N2, Swellendam, S38(8)-HIA
Case No: HWC24022107SB0222

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Location: Bontebok National Park, near Swellendam
- Proposed: swimming pool, ablution/shower/change area, parking, fencing, infrastructure for water and waste management, and enhanced public facilities. These proposal is said to improve the visitors experience and safety while adding ablutions and parking.
- Background/NID level: AIA & PIA
- Grade:
- HPO:
- Heritage resource:
- Archaeology: Field assessment found a small number of Stone Age artifacts (Early Stone Age core, Middle Stone Age flake, cortex chunk) in quartzite. No evidence of pre-colonial occupation or settlement. A 120m long sandstone rock line was noted, but no cultural remains or structures were found. These resources were graded as ""Not Conservation Worthy."" No graves noted either. No mitigation or monitoring is required, but if human remains are uncovered, they must be reported and not disturbed.
- Palaeontology: The site is on Quaternary river terrace gravels of unknown palaeosensitivity. The sediments are reworked and mixed by river action, making intact fossils unlikely and of limited scientific value if found. No mitigation or monitoring is required but HWC Fossil Chance Find Protocol should be included in the Environmental Management Plan.
- Built: no old buildings or ruins except for picnic site infrastructure.
- Visual/Cultural: the park is part of the Cape Floristic Region, a World Heritage Site, but would not be impacted by the set development.
- No objection to the proposal
- Recommendation: page 22:

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee has resolved to endorse the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), dated August 2024, and prepared by ACRM as having met the provision of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), with specific reference to the following

recommendations on page 22:

Archaeology

- No further mitigation is required.
- No monitoring is required during construction phase excavations.
- If any graves, or buried human remains are uncovered during construction excavations,
- these must be immediately reported to the archaeologist (J Kaplan 0823210172) [and HWC to be contact]. Burials must not be disturbed until inspected by the archaeologist.

Palaeontology

- 1. The Fossil Chance Find Protocol must be added to the EMP (Bamford 2024).

The above recommendations must be included in the Environmental Management Plan for the project, and must be monitored by the Environmental Control Officer

SB

**14.35 Farm RE/222, Hazendal (Haasendal) Estate, Bottelary Road, Stellenbosch, S27-Minor Works
Case No: HWC25051307SB0514**

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Streetscape is required.

SB

**14.36 Farm RE/222, Hazendal (Haasendal) Estate, Bottelary Road, Stellenbosch,
S27- Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25051204SB0513**

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Streetscape and proof of consultation is required.

SB

**14.37 Erf 1056-RE, Virgin Active Building, Green Point Park, 54 Helen Suzman Boulevard, Green Point
S27-Additions & Alterations
Case No: SVB0516**

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Local Authority comments / Local Municipality comments, Registered conservation body comment, and HWC reference number required.

SVB

**14.38 Erf 123235, 11 Skutter Square, Windermere, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25031802SVB0513**

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 20 May.
- The property is graded NCW and is outside of any HPO. To note that the reference number reflects 18 March as the submission date, prior to the NCW exemption notice.
- Work has started. Work commenced at the rear of the property and the structure was completed up to window height, however the City of Cape Town sewer department requested that it be demolished due to its location over the main midblock sewer line. Given this, all unauthorized work is proposed to be demolished to make way for the new proposed work, which has not yet commenced.
- The proposal is for construction of a second dwelling at the rear of the property as well

as a carport on the northern boundary. The proposal is also for various internal alterations to the existing dwelling as well as an addition on the western side to accommodate a third bedroom and kitchen and a new veranda to be added to the eastern street facing facade.

- CoCT support the proposal.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8.

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SVB

14.39 Erf 1357, 2 Drostdy Street, Stellenbosch, S27-Minor Work Case No: HWC25051404SVB0514

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Mr Mike Scurr was present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- The property is a PHS and within the Stellenbosch Historic Core.
- Work as applied for has not started.
- In late 2024 the applicant was approached to provide guidance on the state of the roof at the Moederkerk and to provide a quote for appointment to oversee this. The discussion centred around options for replacing of the roof, costing, approval processes etc. The appointment was not finalised at the time and held over to January.
- On 27 January 2025 a windstorm caused the toppling of an oak tree in the garden area to the south. This caused severed but limited damage.
- HWC were notified of this by email and temporary protection was allowed. The applicant was advised to submit an emergency works application as soon as possible, this was in January of this year.
- Due to imminent summer rains and the precarious nature of the damage, immediate protection clearance was done to ensure no further damage resulted. This includes the following temporary emergency work: Removal of the tree branches and trunk; Clearance of debris; Patching of gaps in the roof; Clearance of debris from the box gutter; Protective waterproofing over porous, soft bricks in the now exposed parapet. According to the applicant all of this has been recorded and photographed, as noted with HWC.
- The applicant noted that reroofing will likely happen in 2026.
- The current proposal is for immediate protective works necessary to ensure no leaks occur over the upcoming rainy season to end of 2025. These are interim measure and involve overcoating/ layering over only to provide water proofing. The applicant notes that it is accepted that this is an interim 6 month to 18-month measure and that it will result in a further patchy appearance similar to the existing patched state. The following is planned now and is the subject of this Minor Works Application. The proposed interim works are to: Apply bitumen primer to slates; Lay on torch on water-proofing membrane; Uniflash side and head wall counter flashing; Ensuring that the damaged parapet is watertight. The proposed final works are part of this application are repair of damaged werf walls in the garden areas, using lime mortar, pure lime plaster and limewash; Relaying the paving; Rebuilding the destroyed modern bench walls as is.

- The heritage practitioner recommended that a Minor Works Permit be issued in respect of the interim protective works and repairs proposed in this report. The work is to be undertaken with the oversight of a heritage architect. A close out report is to be submitted and included in the Church records.

DECISION

The Committee is supportive of the proposed interventions as per the report prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff dated 21 May 2025 on page 20 and 21 with the following conditions:

1. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Rennie Scurr Adendorff to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Rennie Scurr Adendorff, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.
3. Application for the replacement of the roof must be submitted to HWC within 12 months.

SVB

14.40 Erf 177011, 20 Lochiel Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: HWC25041511SVB0513

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Response to objections is required.

SVB

14.41 Erf 2152, 18 Beulah Terrace, Oranjezicht, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: HWC25050712SVB0514

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The property is ungraded and outside of any HPO. However, CoCT note the grading as potential IIIC in their comment.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for the addition of a second storey across part of the existing ground storey. This addition is to be clad in nutec in contrast the existing roof which appears to be fibre cement tiles.
- On 23 June a permit was issued for an extensive addition to the street facing side of the building, however this appears not to have been acted on (22051602SJ0610E).
- CoCT support the proposal.
- CIBRA reluctantly supports the proposal. And note the following: The existing well-contained house has a consistent and unpretentious design, not unpleasant. Although there is no heritage value, the proposed design does not have the same quality of design as the existing house. It therefore looks alien within the structural and aesthetic roofing composition. The new proposal is intentionally not integrated; hence the box option has been employed. Dormer windows not shown on roof/site plan.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.42 Erf 54284-RE, 2 Paton Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25050907SVB0519

COMMENT

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

SVB

14.43 Erf 57104, 48 Roseville Road, Claremont, S34-Additions
Case No: HWC25051206SVB0513

COMMENT

As per the Provincial Notice 9051 of 2025 regarding NCW structures within the City of Cape Town Metropolitan, the application is exempt from the need to obtain a permit in terms of Section 34 of the NHRA.

SVB

14.44 Erven 354 & 42, Farm RE/185, 3/185, 34/185, 33/185, 13/185, RE/4/185 & 59/185, Rheenendal Bulk Water Supply, Knysna, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 25194SVB0518 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/380628>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

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

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length.,
- Trigger: S38(1)(c)(ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof
- The proposal is to update the Rheenendal Water Supply Project. The existing water treatment works is located on the northern edge of the Rheenendal settlement. The water supply system connects to this from the east and west, transversing a large area. On the western side it connects to a submersible pump quite a way out of Rheenendal. On the eastern side it connects to 6 borehole drilling sites dispersed amongst the agricultural area on the outskirts of Rheenendal. The Knysna Municipality intends to upgrade the Rheenendal Bulk Water Supply. The bulk water supply works requires refurbishment/upgrading due to certain equipment/infrastructure not performing adequately and in some instances degradation. The proposed upgrading/refurbishment works will be undertaken in phases (3 Phases). This Project (only) focuses on Phase 1, which includes the following Scope of Works: Repair existing weir; upgrades to raw water sumps; reintroduce a roadway along a small track path located past the raw water sump and grade and re-gravel the roadway to the existing pumphouse; installation of new air and non-return valves installed at existing bulk water pumping main; construction of six possible bore holes and associated pumping mains; de-sludge the raw water balancing dam; and it is proposed to demolish some of the old raw water storage tanks that are no longer in operation and install a 250m³ tank that will be utilised temporarily during the desludging of the raw water balancing dam. To note that the proposed pipelines will traverse a large area of land around Rheenendal.
- Rheenendal is outside of any of the Urban Conservation Areas of Heritage Precincts of Knysna.

- The palaeontology theme sensitivity on the DFFE map is noted as low for most of the site, excluding a small portion on the eastern most side which is noted as high.
- A request for exemption of any PIA was submitted along with this application. The request for exemption was prepared by the Palaeobotanist Prof Marion Bamford. Prof Bamford notes that the project lies on part of the Saldania Belt which do not preserve any fossils for various reasons. Furthermore, the area is disturbed from the vegetation and existing agricultural development, it is therefore very unlikely that any fossils would occur in the project footprint, non the less a Chance Find Protocol should be added to the EMPr, with the only suggestion being to look out for trace fossils from the younger rocks to the east.
- The archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity in the screening report is noted as low for the whole site and surrounding areas.
- Specialist assessments identified in the screening report and relevant to the heritage process: Landscape/Visual Impact Assessment, Archaeological and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, Palaeontology Impact Assessment and Socio-Economic Assessment.
- Consultant recommendation: Anticipated impacts on heritage resources: Low. No HIA required.

FINAL COMMENT

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

SVB

14 Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions

RB moves to adopt and CN seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 26 May 2025.

15 Closure

The chairperson, Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport, officially closed the meeting at 2:08

16 Date of next meeting: 2 June 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY:

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners

AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society

BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association

BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement

CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers ' & Residents Association

CoCT – City of Cape Town

CTHT – Cape Town Heritage Trust

CRM - Cultural Resources Management

DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association

Docomomo South Africa

DHS -Durbanville Heritage Society

EHM – Environmental Heritage Management department

FoBCA- Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area

FE - Friends of Elim

GLCA- Greater Lynfræ Civic Association

GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association

HVA- Harfield Village Association

HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay

HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association

HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association

HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment

ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa

KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association

KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association

LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District

MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society

NCW – Not Conservation Worthy

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

NID - Notification of Intent to Develop

NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association

OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage

Paarl300 Foundation

PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association

PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation

SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency

SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society

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

SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town

STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society

SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation

SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust

GHT - George Heritage Trust

RVRA- Rustenburg Valley Residents Association

TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society

VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa

WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group

WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council

WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee

WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society

WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists

ABHC - Associated Bibbeys Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)

BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee

CBCRA -Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association

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

CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation

CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations

CMP – Conservation Management Plan

DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association

DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation

EMPr - Environmental Management Program

FHRA -Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association

FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts

GBRM - Great Brak River Museum

GVHAG- Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group

GCS - Greyton Conservation Society

HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation

HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting

HPO – Heritage protects overlay.

HWC – Heritage Western Cape

IACom - Impact Assessment Committee

IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee

KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society

MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society

NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation

NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body

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

NRA - Newlands Residents Association

OCA - Observatory Civic Association

OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee

PPP - Public Participation Process

PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust

RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee

SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System

SPFA - Sea Point for All Group

SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee

SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group

SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association

OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society

TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation

UCRRA- Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association

WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association

Ward 2 Forum

WCC - Whale Coast Conservation

WRA - Woodstock Residents Association

WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association