

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING  
Held on Monday, 9 February 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



**1. Opening and Welcome**

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

**2. Attendance**

**Members**

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

**Staff**

|                      |                     |           |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| Ms. Aneeqah Brown    | Secretariat         | <b>AB</b> |
| Ms. Yusrah Hoosain   | I&APs group chat    | <b>YH</b> |
| Ms. Waseefa Dhansay  | Assistant Director  | <b>WD</b> |
| Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni | Back-up Secretariat | <b>NT</b> |

**Legal Advisor**

|                    |                 |           |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Ms. Penelope Meyer | Deputy Director | <b>PM</b> |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------|

**Observers**

**Visitors**

Clive Theunissen  
Heidi Boise  
Corlie Smart  
Zirkea Leach  
Hans Spielthener  
Bert Johnson  
Zach Botha  
Prof Walters Peters  
Jonathan Reader  
Heidi McAllister  
Ursula Rigby  
Jonathan Kaplan  
Corlie Smart  
Willie-John Van Niekerk  
Henk Lourens  
Cindy Postlethwayt

**Capacity**

Drakenstein Municipality  
Heritage Practitioner  
  
  
  
  
Architect  
Heritage Practitioner  
Owner  
  
  
  
Durbanville Heritage Society

**Item**

Drakenstein items  
13.3  
14.41  
13.14  
13.14  
13.14  
13.14  
13.14  
13.14  
13.14  
13.20  
14.6  
14.25  
14.41  
14.41  
14.47  
14.48

3. **Apologies**

**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 9 February 2026 with the following additions:  
EJV 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 2 February 2026. CN moved to adopt the minutes and CSI seconded.

7. **Disclosure of conflict of interest**

None.

8. **Confidential matters**

None.

9. **Standing Items**

9.1. **Site inspections undertaken**

9.1.1. Erf 13777, 21 Queen Park Avenue, Salt River (CH)

9.1.2. Erf 387, 1 Dunrobin Road, Sea Point (XM)

9.1.3. Erf 354-RE, Anglo-boer War Blockhouse, Uniondale (RB & SVB)

- The site inspection was undertaken on 03 February 2026, by Sofia Briel, Ruan Brand and Waseefa Dhansay.
- The Anglo-boer War blockhouse PHS was inspected along with 2 of the other 3 known forts surrounding Uniondale.
- In addition to inspection of the forts, the team undertook brief inspections of the exterior of 7 other PHSs in Uniondale namely the two PHS at 26 and 28 Victoria Roads; the Old Residency at 6 Victoria Road; the Watermill; the Old Congregational Church Complex; the Old Dutch Reformed Church; and the All Saints Church.
- The conditions of many of the PHSs in Uniondale are poor. It is clear that the PHSs require attention.
- The team also undertook a more thorough external and internal inspection of the NG Kerk, however after investigation it is still unconfirmed whether this building is a declared PHS, which is surprising given its significance. It is one of the more significant buildings in Uniondale. The structure is also in noticeably good condition, in contrast to some of the PHSs in the town.
- The team also noted the significance of the Prins Alfred Pass which leads into Uniondale from the south; however, it is also unconfirmed whether this pass is a declared PHS, also surprising given its obvious significance. At 68,5 km it is the longest (publicly accessible) gravel mountain pass in South Africa by a considerable margin, as well as being the second oldest unaltered pass still in use. It is well maintained and potentially a good precedent for management of other passes.
- The findings of the Anglo-boer War Blockhouse inspection and inspection of the other significant sites in Uniondale will be documented in the APP site inspection report.

9.1.4. DR1609 & DR1625, Rondevlei Midden Sedgefield (RB)

- The site inspection was undertaken on 02 February 2026, by Ruan Brand, Sofia Briel, and Waseefa Dhansay.
- HWC issued a permit for the emergency sampling of a midden discovered during road upgrades in November 2024.

- The work is essentially completed, with findings showing the midden to be around 8ka based on three radiocarbon dates.
- The DOI have contacted HWC to establish plans for future maintenance of the site as a special gabion wall was constructed to conserve the exposed section of this midden and the close out report remains in draft between the appointed archaeologist and the DOI.
- The inspection noted a few concerns with the way that the gabion wall was incorporated into the surrounds but there is some potential for establishing signage on site.
- The midden seems to extend into two surrounding properties which creates an issue with listing the site on the register, as per the HWC emergency permit conditions.
- The site inspection report and recommendations will be tabled at HOMS on 16 February 2026.

## **9.2 Proposed Site Inspections**

None.

## **9.3 Site Inspection Reports**

**9.3.1** Erf 13777, 21 Queen Park Avenue, Salt River (CH)

**9.3.2** Erf 387, 1 Dunrobin Road, Sea Point

## **9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings**

**9.4.1** Appeals- 11 February 2026

## **9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)**

**9.5.1**

## **9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports**

**9.6.1** Erf 96170, Dunkley Mews, Sections 1-19, Units 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26 and 28, 14 Wandel Street, Gardens (CH)  
Case No.: HWC23101105CH1026

### **DISCUSSION**

- HWC issued a S27 minor works permit on 12 February 2025 for repairs to the northern façade wall. The work included repairing cracks by inserting helical pins between the division walls and the façade wall and painting the walls, windows and roof. A revised set of drawings was endorsed on 24 March 2025 which indicted additional helical pins being inserted from within the building due to additional cracks and for the reinforcement of the façade.
- A compulsory repair order was issued on 4 June 2025 due to the owner of section 1 to 3 (units 12, 14 and 16) not complying with the HWC approval.
- The Close Out Report is submitted to fulfil the requirements of the HWC permit.
- The report noted the following:
  - All work was carried out in accordance with the HWC approved scope of work.
  - Additional work undertaken included reinforcing the small decorative 'gables' on top of the parapet wall and partially clearing the service lane behind the units and courtyards.
  - The report noted 'difficulties and incomplete work' that is largely outside of the HWC approved scope of work.
  - The report noted areas of work still to be addressed and may or may not require HWC approval.

### **ENDORSEMENT**

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled "Heritage Close-Out Report", dated January 2026, and prepared by Steven Boers of Architects Boers Associates, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 12 February 2025.

## **9.6.2 Erf 173714-Re, East Quay Building, East Quay, Clock Tower Precinct, V&A Waterfront (EJV)**

**Case No.:** HWC25100104SJ1003

### **DISCUSSION**

- On 13 October 2025 HOMs resolved to approve the MW application for the retrofitting of the East Quay Building subject to the submission of a close-out report.
- To ensure compliance, provide a record of heritage related methodologies, and track and record any minor deviations which have no impact on heritage resources, the heritage practitioner has proposed the submission of interim reports.
- Report 01 has been submitted and details the onsite exploratory work undertaken so far and the resultant findings. This includes the assessment and potential reuse of the suspended timber floors in the concierge space, removal and assessment of the ground floor timber columns for dry rot, removal of the plasterwork to expose the brickwork, stain sampling on the sanded timber of the first floor, ongoing investigation of the removal of an additional portion of the central spinal teak beam which was deemed to be too impactful and will therefore necessitate alternative solutions for the service routes, investigating the extension of the suspended re-used teak beams on the first floor, investigation of changes to the roof truss structure above the concierge from reworked Oregon to steel (should the heritage practitioner, HWC, and CoCT deem it appropriate once resolved), investigating ways in which to reuse the first floor Oregon posts/columns should the post-and-beam detail proposal no longer be possible or desirable, investigation of potential replacements for the damaged terrazzo wall and floor surfaces in the mid-century semicircular stair structure, investigation of finishing details to the treads and risers of the interior stair substructure, investigation of the alternative surface beds, ramps, and planting on the exterior ground floor entrance terrace, setting the parameters for the windows and plastering of the lift housing of the exterior second floor terrace, alterations to the external southwest window in building B, supporting of the sagging timber trusses in building B, and the safe-keeping of a safe door and ca. 1900 wedge nails and cast iron bolts removed for potential reuse.
- None of the work undertaken has deviated significantly from the HWC approved plans nor has it had a negative impact on heritage resources.

### **COMMENT**

The Committee noted the interim report titled “Monthly Report 01 - Heritage”, dated December 2025, and prepared by Ursula Rigby, as adhering to the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 15 October 2025.

The Committee resolved to request the following:

1. All minor deviations considered to not have a negative impact on heritage resources are to be reflected on a final drawing set and assessed by the appointed Heritage Practitioner for submission alongside the close-out report within 30-days of practical completion.

## **9.7 Incomplete Applications**

**9.7.1** Matters Arising: 13.19

**9.7.2** New Matters: 14.7, 14.9, 14.10, 14.14, 14.16, 14.18, 14.21, 14.22, 14.28, 14.29, 14.30, 14.32, 14.34, 14.39, 14.44, 14.45, 14.46, 14.50, 14.51, 14.52, 14.53, 14.58 and 14.59

## **9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation**

**9.8.1** Matters Arising: 13.1, 13.2, 13.4, 13.7, 13.10, 13.13, 13.15, 13.16

**9.8.2** New Matters: 14.1, 14.2, 14.3, 14.8, 14.12, 14.13, 14.15, 14.17, 14.20, 14.33, 14.40 and 14.43

## **9.9 Referrals to Committees**

**9.9.1** Matters Arising: 13.8 (IACom)

**9.9.2** New Matters: 14.38 (IACom)

**9.10 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT**

**9.9.1** Matter Arising: None

**9.9.2** New Matters: None

**9.11 Archaeological Matters**

**9.11.1** None

**9.12 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued**

None.

**9.13 Permit deadline:**

10 February 2026 COB

**9.14 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)**

- SAHRIS usage training will be in office on 17 February 2026. It is critical for all admin staff and heritage officers to attend this training as it informs the changes that our operations are going through with the SAHRIS transitions (e.g., answering public queries, dealing with PAIA requests, confirming case officer for a case, etc.)
- There has been movement in the comms and marketing side, with the S38 NID application procedure/guideline doc being finalised by the external agency and progress being made in terms of the planned film shoots for the marketing of HWC's SAHRIS transition.
- 27 February is the webinar for built environment applications.
- RB will touch base with the SAHRIS team this week to confirm the progress of certain backend tasks and to provide more thorough feedback at HOMS on 16 February 2026.

**10. Administrative Matters**

**10.1. Erf 3795, 9 Rosmead Avenue, Gardens (EJV)**

**Case No:** HWC25110604EJV1110

**DISCUSSION**

- Property details: Graded IIIB; Inside HPO
- Application History: The application HWC25110604EJV1110 was submitted in November 2025 for as-built deviations from the approved plans HWC24022006CSI0328 and HWC25020620SJ0307 as well as newly proposed ads& alts. The entire proposal included as-built internal divisions in the approved basement, like-for-like rebuilding of a portion of boundary wall and the addition of a proposed carport. The carport did not touch the historic fabric of the property as the boundary wall was rebuilt according to August 2025 street view images and is therefore not older than 60 years. The remaining work was as-built. CIBRA Supported; CoCT Supported. A S51 Letter was issued on the 25th of November 2025.
- Current enquiry: On the 3rd of February 2026, the applicant sent through a new set of plans indicating further as-built deviations. They include raising of the boundary wall along the street facing façade and extension of a minor portion of roof by 900mm over a parapet wall raised 650mm to the rear of the property. As noted previously, the boundary wall was rebuilt according to August 2025 street view images and is therefore not older than 60 years, so our only concern is the rear roof extension.
- HOMs agreed that the deviation is substantially in accordance with the plans reviewed by HOMs and the revised plans can be backdated to the date of the S51 Letter

**10.2. Farm Portion 197 etc., Sandkraal, Thembaletu, George (EJV)**

**DISCUSSION**

**Case No:** 25613EJV0707 <https://sahris.org.za/node/383223>

- Application History: On 28 July 2025 HOMs resolved to request an HIA with AIA for the proposed introduction of additional agricultural activity and ancillary relocation of pig stalls, installation of fencing, paving, irrigation systems and boreholes on Farm 197 Portions 0; 5; 16; 21; 51; 52; 61; 62; 12; 79; 204, Sandkraal, Thembaletu, George

- Current enquiry: The layout has since been significantly revised and confined to only Portion 60 of Farm Portion 197. This plot already contains built structures and is directly adjacent to an existing settlement, and is surrounded by land previously cultivated or already disturbed. The original project screening is therefore no longer relevant and the HIA therefore no longer necessary.
- HOMs agreed that the applicant is to withdraw the present NID and submit a new one based on the revised scope and extent should s38(1) still be triggered.

### **10.3. Bergrivier Municipality, Environmental Management Framework (SB)**

**Case No:** Na

#### **DISCUSSION**

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

#### **HELD OVER**

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 16 February 2026 to give committee time to review the EMF.

### **10.4. Various farms along R328, Mossel Bay (SB)**

**Case No:** HWC22110201AM1102

#### **DISCUSSION**

- HOMs provided a final comment on 6 March 2023, endorsing the HIA prepared by ASHA Consulting (Pty) dated 20 January 2023 as meeting the requirements of the S.38(3) of the NHRA.
- There has been an amended to the pipeline, the amendment relates to the rerouting of an approximately 1–1.15 km section of the Sonskynvallei to Brandwacht potable water pipeline, necessitated by landowner concerns identified prior to construction.
- The original project was supported by a specialist palaeontological assessment prepared by Prof. Marion Bamford (19 January 2023), which identified no significant palaeontological constraints. Heritage Western Cape issued a final approval comment on 7 March 2023.
- Following consultation with HWC in December 2025, a site visit to the amended pipeline route was undertaken by Dr Peter Nilssen on 12 January 2026. No archaeological material was identified along the amended alignment. Heritage structures occur in the vicinity of the Brandwag hamlet, including a road bridge over the Brandwag River that predates 1938; however, the amended pipeline will be

located within the existing road reserve and will connect to an existing pipeline beneath the bridge. As such, no physical impact to the bridge or adjacent built heritage is anticipated.

- In terms of palaeontology, the amended route traverses the same geological formations as the originally approved alignment. The existing palaeontological assessment therefore remains applicable, as confirmed by Prof. Marion Bamford, and no additional palaeontological impacts are anticipated.
- Consultant conclusion:  
The amended pipeline route will not result in any new or significant impacts on heritage resources. The only additional heritage feature identified—the Brandwag River bridge—is not considered to be of significant heritage value and will not be physically impacted by the proposed works. It is therefore recommended that Heritage Western Cape approve the amendment, subject to the previous final comment dated 7 March 2023 remaining applicable.

#### **COMMENT**

The amendment is noted in the letter prepared by ASHA Consulting dated 21 January, the amended pipeline will not have negative impact to heritage and generally in accordance with the previous approval (HWC22110201AM1102) and final comment dated 7 March 2023.

#### **11. Monitoring by practitioner**

#### **12. Discussion of the Agenda**

### **MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED**

#### **13. MATTERS ARISING**

##### **13.1 Erf 2420, 57 Hospital Road, Somerset West, S34-Minor Works**

Case No: 27117CN0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388455>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding information was requested for POA, Company Resolution, Coloured up plans, all photos and SG diagram – received on 29 Jan
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: 111104NN04 & 120607RN05E
- Proposal: For altering the roof structure to replace the thatch with Romano tiles.
- Heritage Considerations: The heritage resource has limited significance and not within a noteworthy context. No 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.

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

**13.2 Erf 323, 24 Lincoln Way, Meadowridge, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27090CN0119 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388385>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

**CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding Information was requested for CoCT comment and streetscape photos - received on 30 Jan
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: Removal and replacement of the existing roof and substructure due to structural issues. The roof height will remain the same, with a slight extension to improve internal space utilisation and new concrete tiles. Extensions to the both sides, Internal alterations to also proposed to scullery, bedroom en suite and outbuilding.
- Consultation:
- CoCT supports
- Heritage Considerations: Limited heritage significance in dwelling and context, no 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 approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

**13.3 Erf 497, 19 Cavalcade Road, Green Point, S27- Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 26961CN0106 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388120>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Heidi Boise was present and took part in the discussion.

**DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding information was for Response to objections raised which were received on 28 Jan
- Grading: Formal grade II, Map Viewer grading of IIIB & II. The applicant argues that the PHS is more appropriately understood as a Grade IIIA and not IIIB heritage resource of high local importance, integral to the cultural landscape of Upper Green Point, and warranting conservation at the municipal level. I can agree in terms of the property's significance relates mainly architectural and contextual, with strong local streetscape value consistent with Grade IIIA, however the building retains exceptional integrity, early date and landmark value, which historically justified provincial recognition. The City supports the IIIA grading - with the in-depth level of research done in the heritage report, the local grading assigned to it should be adjusted as suggested.
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 120203ZS07 - Minor alterations focused on rationalising kitchen and service areas to the rear of the property.
- Proposal: For an extension of the roof to create an additional floor accommodating a studio and office. A new staircase is also proposed. Option 1, the preferred option (resulting in the lowest heritage impact), proposes a recessive mansard roof addition set behind the parapet and chimney line, largely concealed from public view and designed to remain subordinate to

the historic structure. Option 2 allows for a more visible clerestory element and would require stricter mitigation to limit visual impact. The staircase also has two options.

- Heritage Indicators from the Heritage Statement: The heritage indicators require that the single-storey Georgian homestead remain the dominant element, with any additions clearly secondary, recessive and largely concealed from public views. Key features such as the symmetrical façade, chimneys, parapet, stoep, axial garden and mature trees must be retained. New work must preserve streetscape character and key sightlines, maintain the property's locus role on Cavalcade Road, and avoid visual dominance. A mansard roof form is identified as the preferred approach for the additional floor. All interventions must be reversible, clearly legible as contemporary, and designed to minimise impact on historic fabric.
- Consultation:
- CoCT does not support and state that the proposal of the second level & staircase will potentially impact on the significance of the existing house, as it is one of the very few (or even the only one by now) remaining authentic 19th century houses in the area. The City in general endorses the heritage indicators but notes the Mansard roof and reversibility as a concern. According to the City, the preferred option would be not to add a second storey at all, with the high degree of intactness and authenticity of the existing heritage resource, citing key conservation principles of the BURRA Charter. The City concludes by stating that the proposal to insert a Mansard roof represents an architecturally inappropriate and heritage-insensitive intervention that: 1. Introduces an historically inauthentic element foreign to Cape Georgian architecture, 2. Creates visually awkward and disproportionate massing and 3. Violates fundamental Burra Charter principles regarding compatibility and cultural significance. The City recommends that alternative options be considered before an upper level, including a single-storey side extension or use of the adjacent City-owned erf. Any new work must respect the single-storey Georgian character, informed by relevant local precedents.
- GPRRA supports the property to proposed grading of IIIA but objects to both proposed roof extensions, stating they do not adequately respect the historic building's architectural hierarchy. GPRRA recommends exploring alternative accommodation options on the adjacent City-owned erf instead of adding an upper level.
- Response to objections:
- CoCT: Concerns regarding vertical expansion and architectural hierarchy were explicitly tested through the structured Heritage Impact Assessment in Section 10, undertaken in accordance with Section 38(3) of the NHRA. These comments informed the identification of key heritage sensitivities, the comparative evaluation of Options 1 and 2, and the cautious framing of the recommendations set out in Section 11.
- GPRRA: Concerns regarding the impact of a second storey on architectural hierarchy and spatial composition were addressed through the impact-based evaluation in Section 10. The suggestion that alternative accommodation be explored off the historic structure, including on adjacent City-owned Erf 496, is noted. It is recorded in Section 9.3 that the owners have repeatedly engaged the City regarding Erf 496 without receiving clarity on its availability, demonstrating good-faith custodianship.
- Heritage Considerations: The property is a formally protected Grade II Provincial Heritage Site and a rare, highly intact 19th-century Georgian homestead whose significance lies in its single-storey form, roofscape, symmetry and landmark streetscape role. While recent research supports a revised Grade IIIA local grading, this does not reduce the obligation to conserve a resource of exceptional integrity and authenticity. The proposed roof extensions introduce a second storey that alters the original architectural hierarchy and roof form, which are fundamental to the building's significance. Although Option 1 seeks to minimise visual impact, both options introduce a mansard roof form that is historically inauthentic to Cape Georgian architecture and risk visual dominance and loss of authenticity. Concerns are raised regarding reversibility, as the insertion of an upper level and staircase would require substantial intervention into historic fabric. In terms of the Burra Charter, the high degree of intactness sets a high threshold for change, and the proposal is not considered the least

intrusive means of achieving additional accommodation. Alternative options, including single-storey additions or development on the adjacent erf, would better respect the building's heritage significance.

- All I&APs have been invited to the meeting today.

#### **REFERRAL**

The Committee resolved to refer the matter to BELCom on 25 February due to HOMs not having delegation to resolve the matter.

CN

#### **13.4 Erf 70524, 1 Gabriel Road, Plumstead, S34-Minor Works** **Case No: 27029CN0114 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388266>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding information was requested for SG Diagram, external and streetscape photos - received on 3 Feb
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Started but not complete
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: The completed work include 1. Bricking up an existing internal opening to subdivide an existing commercial unit into two lettable units. 2. Creating a new internal opening between the kitchen and an adjacent room to improve circulation and functional use. Proposed work: replace street-facing window with glazed double door in existing opening.
- Consultation:
- CoCT states no comment required as proposal is considered Minor Works.
- Heritage Considerations: No impact to a building with limited heritage significance. More than half the work has been completed.

#### **FOR NOTING**

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

The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to issue a S51 letter as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

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

CN

#### **13.5 Erven 1549 and 1552, 99 Hibernia Street, George, S34-Minor Works** **Case No: 27028CN0114 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388265>**

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding information was requested for Streetscape photos - received on 30 Jan.
- Grading: IIIB, as noted in the 2019 application.
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: 19090601TZ0927E approved for Minor Works.
- Proposal: For internal alterations, reconfiguration and maintenance and repairs.
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the IIIB heritage resource.

- Consultation: SVDSF notes the building to be not graded and support the proposals.

#### **DECISION**

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

**CN**

### **13.6 Erf 1735, End and Bergsig Streets, Sandbaai, S38(1) - NID**

**Case No:** 27141EJV0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388517>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding Information received on 30 January 2026
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d).
- The proposal is to rezone the site for the development of flats, townhouses, parking, and open spaces within a residential portion of Sandbaai, immediately south of the Whale Coast Mall. A NID was submitted and approved with no further studies in 2023 under case number HWC23061408AM0718 but the development has since been refined with the input of the municipality and community to ensure it integrates more seamlessly into the existing urban fabric by introducing a new massing proposal. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates a combination of low and high palaeo sensitivity.
- Photographs appear to indicate ads&alts occurring on site, this was addressed with the applicant who confirmed that the two dwellings in question were built in 1992 as per the approved plans provided.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

#### **DECISION**

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

**EJV**

### **13.7 Erf 180806, 29 Elgin Road, Sybrandpark, S34 - Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27063EJV0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388325>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding Information received on 30 January 2026
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Work has started as per Revision B of the plans and includes the new boundary treatment
- The proposal is for new boundary treatment, a new braai, staircase, and internal alterations
- CoCT support

#### **FOR NOTING**

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

**EJV**

### 13.8 Farm 16 Portion 1 etc., Tyger Hoek and Driehoekfontein, Nelspoort, S38(8) - HIA

Case No: 26438EJV1017 <https://sahris.org.za/node/386271>

#### CASE SUMMARY

- Not Outstanding Information received on 29 January 2026
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- HOMs in November 2025 resolved to request an HIA with AIA, PIA, and VIA for the proposed development of the Aria Phase 1 Wind Energy Facility to provide electricity to Eskom via the Renewable Energy Independent Power Producers Procurement Programme (REIPPPP).
- The 12 400ha WEF inclusive of up to 53 turbines and associated surface and subsurface infrastructure is located 33km from Nelspoort. The site falls within a REDZ and is located in close proximity to other existing and proposed power facilities. The larger area is utilised for pasture as it is too arid for crop production, and the site is dominated by Karoo shrubland. This area has an archaeological record that spans hundreds of thousands of years, with sites such as stone tool scatters typically occurring near dolerite outcrops as well as over 400 examples of petroglyphs in the immediate Nelspoort area. A high number of quarried stone artefacts predominantly from the Middle Stone Age period were found during survey of the site, a find consistent with observations on neighbouring farms. These artefacts are particularly visible in deflated open sites. As anticipated, a significant number of rock art sites and engravings were identified during the field assessment. Associated high sensitivity areas have been mapped for exclusion from the development. As expected, there is a clear association between the location of significant heritage resources and dolerite outcrops. Settled occupation of the region and the subsequent changes to the landscape followed over 100 years after the arrival of settlers in 1652 and this is also visible in the archaeological record. The area became a frontier, while settled agriculture, water management, and extensive sheep grazing profoundly changed the landscape. However, the werfs within the WEF area are generally avoided by the layout, and those considered to have high local levels of value have been afforded a no development buffer. Examples of historic stone walling, kraals, and hunting hides were also noted and they have sufficient cultural value to warrant conservation. As such, development buffers are recommended around these sites. A possible burial ground was identified and has been mapped for exclusion from the development layout. The site forms part of an intact cultural landscape representative of the Central Plateau of the Great Karoo possessing heritage value for historical, aesthetic, architectural, social and scientific reasons due to the presence of notable towns and settlements, farmsteads, water systems, mountain ridges and peaks, movement routes, and 20th century communications and electrical infrastructure. The current focus on renewable energies is set to transform the landscape on a scale reminiscent of that which resulted from the introduction of wool production. The area proposed for the WEF development is located more than 20km from Three Sisters, and from Murraysberg, and approximately 10km from the N1 and 15km from the R65. As such, no impact is anticipated to the sense of place associated with these historic towns and transport routes. Additionally, the visibility of the WEF is largely shielded from the view by a series of low koppies and hills that encircle the development area. The VIA identified the landscape as being typical of a Karoo or 'platteland' landscape. The predominant land use in the area (agricultural activity) has transformed the natural landscape thereby influencing the overall visual character of the study area. Although there are no towns or built-up areas in the study area, the landscape has been further transformed by the presence of prominent anthropogenic elements which include the N1 national route and high voltage electrical infrastructure. The transformation of the landscape is an important factor in this context, as the introduction of the proposed WEF and associated infrastructure would result in less visual contrast with the other anthropogenic elements already present. Visual impacts on the cultural landscape in the area around the proposed development would be reduced by the fact that the area is relatively remote and there are therefore very few sensitive visual receptors. In addition, although the elements of the

proposed WEF would be visible from the N1 national route, the section of this route that traverses the study area does not form part of a designated scenic route. A further consideration is the fact that a number of WEFs have been developed or are likely to be developed across the Karoo, and as such it is conceivable that WEFs and their associated infrastructure may in the future become an integral part of the typical Karoo cultural landscape. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates insignificant to very high sensitivity for the project area due to being underlain by the Teekloof Formation, Adelaide Subgroup, Beaufort Group and Jurassic Dolerite and Quarternary sands. The Teekloof Formation is especially fossiliferous. While Almond noted a low palaeosensitivity for a development south of the subject site due to poor preservation, a PIA was still undertaken. Several fossil sites were documented during the assessment, including numerous ex-situ trace fossils found in the northeastern part of the study area. Despite the high palaeontological sensitivity of the area, the proposed Aria WEF development is considered acceptable, provided that stringent mitigation measures are implemented. Lavin develops three zones of development across the site: 1. "No go" areas; 2. "Tread lightly" areas; and 3. Developable areas suitable for infrastructure

- In terms of public participation: The HIA was circulated to the municipality and Simon v.d. Stel foundation by CTS Heritage, neither of whom responded. The DBAR PPP was undertaken by SLR Consulting and no heritage-related concerns were raised apart from the assurance of mitigation measures as proposed in the HIA being implemented
- The consultant concludes the HIA titled "Proposed Development of the Aria Phase 1 WEF near Nelspoort in the Western Cape" dated August 2025 and updated November 2025 with recommendations on page 102 as follows: There is no objection to the proposed development from a heritage perspective on condition that:
  - The recommended buffers identified in Table 5.1 are adhered to
  - A number of turbines positioned in sensitive areas are recommended for relocation - Turbines 23, 29 and 35
  - All internal roads should be rehabilitated to 7m wide except in areas where turning circles need to be accounted for and abnormal load vehicle requirements taken into consideration
  - All of the proposed new internal roads align as far as possible with existing roads on site to limit the engineering and major infrastructure works required within the mountain and koppies
  - All the new proposed internal roads are reversible far as possible
  - Substation Option 1 and OHL Option 1 are preferred
  - A number of the proposed turbines are located within or in close proximity to the mapped dolerite outcrops which have higher sensitivity for impacts to significant archaeological heritage as noted above. Additional care must be taken for turbines located within the dolerite outcrops and archaeological monitoring is recommended for all construction work located within the dolerite outcrops. Footnote: Archaeological monitoring includes a pre-construction walkdown to record and conserve any significant archaeological heritage resources as well as on-site monitoring of all excavation activities within the dolerite outcrops
  - No construction may occur within 10 metres of any fossil sites discovered during the current survey. Although no vertebrate fossils were recovered, the area with trace fossils might also contain vertebrate remains.
  - Chance Fossil Finds Protocol is recommended at the exposed bedrocks, particularly those of the Teekloof Formation. Areas like these have a high potential to yield fossils.
  - Should any buried archaeological resources or human remains or burials be uncovered during the course of development activities, work must cease in the vicinity of these finds. Heritage Western Cape (HWC) must be contacted immediately in order to determine an appropriate way forward.

## REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 18 February due to the mitigation measures required for consideration.

**13.9 Erf 299, 98 St Georges Street, Simons Town, S34-Alteration & Additions**

**Case No:** HWC24012306SB1023

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Work completed, minor internal works that included new brew area, new kitchen, cold room. External work includes wood and glass panels slides.
- Grade 3C
- HPO: Inside
- Previous S51 (18031525LB0524E) 28.5.2019
- Additional information received on 26 January – CoCT support the proposal and confirmation from applicant that work is completed.

**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.

**SB**

**13.10 Erf 636, 17 Oliver Road, Esplanade Apartments, Flat 301, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27094SB0119 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388391>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**CASE SUMMARY:**

- Proposal: refurbishing an existing apartment in a building -minor works.
- Work start: no
- Grade: 3C
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: CoCT supports
- Additional information received 2 February - new POA.

**FOR NOTING**

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

**SB**

**13.11 Erf 832, 427 Main Road, Paarl, S34-Additions, Alterations, and Partial demolition**

**Case No:** 27079SB0116 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388357>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Proposal: corrugated roof sheets, sandal roof light, flooring other small internal works.
- Work start: no
- Grade: 3B
- HPO: inside
- Comments: DHF does not object but notes that the roof overhang visible in the photographs and requested clarification when that was constructed. Municipality has no objection. Paarl300 support.
- Additional information received 29 January, previous plans. Applicant confirmed that the overhangs are existing.

**DECISION**

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

SB

**13.12 Remainder of Portion 92, Farm Palmiet Rivier no. 319, Off the N2, Grabouw, S38(8)-NID**  
**Case No: 26273SB1001 <https://sahris.org.za/node/385623>**

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Matter was previously heard at HOMs committee 13 October 2025, homs requested HIA Palaeontological Impact Assessment, Visual Impact Assessment AND Cultural Landscape Assessment studies.
- Additional information was provided on 8 January 2026, a request for Exemption of any Palaeontological Impact Assessment from Prof Marion Bamford (Palaeosciences Centre, Wits University)
- Summary of the letter:
- The proposed development includes two filling stations with associated access roads, aprons, fuel pumps, retail facilities, and underground fuel storage tanks. The sites are located on long-cultivated agricultural land currently used for orchards, with direct access from the existing N2 highway.
- Geologically, the sites are underlain by Devonian-age formations of the Bidouw Subgroup (Bokkeveld Group, Cape Supergroup), including the Wupperthal and Waaboomberg Formations. While these formations may theoretically contain trace fossils, published research (Almond & Pether 2008; Penn-Clarke 2019) confirms that fossils in the Wupperthal Formation are exceedingly rare. The sites have been extensively disturbed by decades of cultivation, further reducing the likelihood of fossil preservation.
- The SAHRIS palaeosensitivity map indicates the area as having unknown (white/clear) palaeosensitivity. Given the low likelihood of encountering palaeontological material, Prof Bamford concludes that no further palaeontological studies are warranted. However, a chance finds protocol is recommended, whereby Heritage Western Cape must be notified should fossils be encountered during excavation, and any material must be assessed and removed by a professional palaeontologist.

**COMMENT**

HOMs committee notes the letter prepared by Prof Marion Bamford dated 1 December 2025 and endorses the findings however this should be incorporated in the final HIA. HWC waits the submission of the HIA that complies with section 38(3) of the NHRA.

SB

**13.13 Erf 3648, 41 De Villiers Street, Strand, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No: 27006SVB0112 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388221>**

**CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding information received on 26 and 28 January 2026.
- The property is not graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is to construct a new boundary wall, alterations to the existing garage to convert it into staff quarters and to extend the existing storeroom to create a second storeroom.
- The CoCT declined its opportunity to comment on this case from a heritage point of view as they note that there is no heritage value evident.
- Helderberg Renaissance Foundation did not respond.

## FOR NOTING

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

SVB

### 13.14 Erf 13777, 21 Queens Park Avenue, Salt River, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: 26947CH0105 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388105>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Zach Botha(architect), Prof Peters (practitioner) and Jonathan Reader (owner) were present and took part in the discussion.

## DISCUSSION

### HOMS timelines:

- 26 February 2026: Held over for I&APs to be invited to HOMS.
- 2 February 2026 - Held over for a site inspection and for the applicant to provide the heritage design indicators. Site inspection was conducted on 4 February 2026 at 10:00am.
- Graded potential IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is to demolish the saw-tooth roofed building, retain the modernist cubical building and its integration with a redevelopment for affordable housing. The cubical building will be repurposed and linked at the third level of the new by way of an open bridge with steel balustrades.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT did not comment within 30 days.
- SHS did not comment within 30 days.
- WRA supports the proposal for refurbishment and affordable housing however has concerns with the height of the tower stating that although 30m is permitted under the zoning scheme, the 10-storey replacement structure will negatively impact the existing heritage resources. WRA suggests an 8-storey building with ""step down"" heights similar to other MU2 developments along Albert Road.
- WAAC did not comment within 30 days however a comment was provided on 1 February 2026. WAAC does not support the proposal until an acceptable design is put forward. WAAC noted the long history of industrial and brickwork buildings in Woodstock and Salt River and stated that the block massing and verticality of the proposal is not sensitive to the neighbourhood. Some shaping to the upper 3-4 storeys should be explored. WAAC also agrees with the comments made by WRA regarding the height and scale of the proposal. Further comment was provided regarding the development looming over the existing cubical and surrounding residential buildings and the effect of the south east wind through the area and particularly how the U-shape of the development will funnel wind directly in the middle of the development/ courtyard. WAAC does not support micro apartments in the greater Woodstock and Salt River area. Other comments were related to increased traffic and the lack of greening/landscaping.
- I&AP at no. 14/24 Queens Park Avenue does not support the proposal stating that the development appears to be a simple monolithic block that does not reflect the character, scale or architectural language of the suburb. The design in its current form represent an intrusive visual presence rather than a sensitive infill development.
- I&AP (Mr. Jacques Smith) does not support the proposal stating that the site contributes to the significant historical textile precinct and the visual and contextual character of Queens Park Avenue. The development is inappropriate in scale, form, massing and architectural language. The development will negatively impact surrounding heritage resources in the area such as Queen Park Studios, the Rex Truform buildings and other industrial-era structures. Other areas of concern include height, materiality, proportion and industrial architectural

language.

- I&AP (Mr. Max Voigt) posed a question to the applicant regarding a statement made in the heritage report.
- Queens Gate Body Corporate does not support the demolition and redevelopment noting the value of the sawtooth-roofed building in Queens Park Avenue and providing context on how other buildings in the area have been repurposed in a sensitive way to maintain and celebrate the cultural heritage and history of Salt River. Concerns were raised regarding traffic and infrastructure strain; loss of views, amenities and increase of noise; the 30m height being incompatible with the character of the area and inadequate assessment and failure to consider alternatives. In addition, the comment states that the demolition of the saw-tooth roofed structure will erode the visual and cultural continuity of the precinct.
- Six additional comments were received from I&APs (Ms. Gayle Lazarus, Ms. Lisa Vieira, Mr. Brett Haupt, Palmerston Rd, Mr. Julian Brookstone and Mr. Niel Claasens) who objected to the demolition and/or redevelopment for the same reasons as stated above i.e., loss of heritage, traffic, impacting heritage character, infrastructure constraints, massing, height and scale.
- The report notes that cubical building should serve to mitigate the transition between the neighbouring lower scaled residential buildings and the tall block.
- The applicant responded to the objections stating the following, amongst others:
  - The precinct is not unified in heritage character i.e., there are a few tall isolated landmark buildings, a scatter of sawtooth and barrel-vaulted buildings, rows of detached residential houses and blocks of 3 to 4 storeys of various uses - the character is heterogenous and not in a declared HPO.
  - The proposed development accommodates some 37 parking pays in the semi-basement.
  - The quest is to fit an affordable residential accommodation in a well-located area while responding appropriately to the character of the existing precinct. Building vertically allows for more residential units on a smaller footprint and thereby maximizing land use efficiently.
  - The proposed tall building would face north-west and because of that geographic reality, it cannot overshadow Hare's Crescent. If it did, the 100m distance and setting in the foreground of the three to four storey Queenspark Studios building should provide an effective visual podium for the tower and mitigate the bulk.
  - The bulk of the tower is punctuated by vertical recessions, at intervals not markedly different from the scale of Victorian houses on Hare's Crescent. The tower is also stepped in acknowledgement of the street incline.
  - The facade treatment is composed of units of domestic scale, different from e.g. the aesthetics of an office block and reflects the prevailing street pattern.
  - With regards to the Herringbone building, referred to by WRA, the proposed building is by the same development team, of similar massing and materiality.
- The following indicators have been used to inform the design of the replacement structure:
- Height: The area contains few taller buildings. The indicator references to various tall buildings in the context that vary between 6 to 8 stories noting that these buildings are dispersed, a characteristic the new building would uphold. Although the 8-storey height is long established since the 1960s, the 2025 developmental rights of the City allows for a 30m height. In addition, the altitude should not negatively impact the surrounding built character which consists of a low and medium rise character.
- Scale & massing: Queens Park Avenue consists of 3 and 4 storey buildings, mainly office and light industrial in use, but which provide a height threshold the new building should acknowledge as a podium and setback.
- The residential context: Specifically, the Hare's Crescent, southward on Queens Park Avenue and Balfour Street consists of detached single and double storey domestic buildings. A tall building would provide a backdrop, and due to the north-west orientation of the site, not deprive anyone of the beneficial influence of the sun. The façade articulation should acknowledge the units of domestic houses, preferably the vertical recessions and by adopting compatible material palettes.

- The light industrial, hotel and retail context: This part lies south-east of the subject site, an area with buildings mixed in age and use, and includes the 4-storey Brickfield Park office block, the afore mentioned Eastgate and Double Tree Hilton hotel, as well as the repurposed sawtooth development known as Brickfield Canvas, an office and tech campus (Kiarin Naidoo). Most of these buildings are of medium rise, which significantly reduces the impact of a taller building, and as it will be read in silhouette there might be an opportunity for a skyline profile.
- The applicant (Prof Peters) recommends that the application be tabled at BELCom.
- HOMs conducted a site inspection on 4 February 2026 to observe the site in relation to the context. The following was noted at the site inspection:
  - There is no descriptive heritage context.
  - The streetscape of Queens Park Avenue is predominantly medium rise i.e., the 3 to 4 storied structure towards lower portion of Queens Park Avenue and predominantly residential structures towards the upper end of Queens Park Avenue.
  - The existing cubical building creates a threshold or buffer between the residential and industrial/commercial uses.
  - The 4.5 m setback of the proposed tower will allow the lower portions of the street-facing façade to continue along the street line uninterrupted, thereby reducing the perceived bulk of the structure.
  - In terms of materiality and colour palettes used in the context—specifically along the lower portion of Queens Park Avenue—the use of face brick and neutral tones was noted on site and has been incorporated into the proposed design. Further design cues were taken from the Herrington building which is also a development constructed by the same project team.
  - Queens Park Avenue is an inclined road, and the proposed development will be stepped at the ninth storey as one approaches the site from the Rex Trueform intersection. It is questioned whether stepping is also required on the southeast elevation to mitigate the monolithic perception of the tower and soften the interface with residential structures to the south.
  - The existing 3- to 4-storey structures opposite the site will create a buffer between the proposed development and the single-storey residential houses along Hare's Crescent, which face Queens Park Avenue. Due to these structures being visible from Hare's Crescent, the proposed tower may appear as a background building.

#### **DECISION**

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

CH

#### **13.15 Erf 374, 22 Union Road, Milnerton, S34 - Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27092CSI0119 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388389>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding information received 30 January for clarification if all work has been completed.
- Work applied for has been completed
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the enclosure of the carport and new scullery. Previously completed work by the old owners includes covered porch, store, and passageway.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application

#### **FOR NOTING**

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

impact on heritage resources.

CSI

**13.16 Erf 495, 8 Sir Lowry Road, Gordon's Bay, S34 – Minor Works**

**Case No:** 27057CSI0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388316>

**CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding information received 4 February for Clear PoA, additional internal and external photos, outstanding payment.
- Work applied for has been completed
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Completed work is for the installation of a fireplace with chimney and toilet

**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.

CSI

**13.17 Erf 58244, 46 Harfield Road, Claremont, S34 – Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 26990CSI0112 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388190>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding information received 4 February for the PoA
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for a new en-suite and internal alterations
- CoCT provided comment and support the application

**DECISION**

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

CSI

**13.18 Erf 846-RE, 10 Bellair Road, Vredehoek, S34 – Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** HWC25092909CSI1023

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Outstanding information received 2 and 4 February for CoCT, CIBRA comment, plans showing as-built pergola, and response to objections
- Work applied for has started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for regularising the pergola over the existing balcony, balcony extension, and new garage
- CoCT do not support the proposal stating that all internal changes and to the rear of the site is supported as the loss of historical fabric will be minimal. Design development is acknowledged and supported. The current proposal will, however, still result in the loss of

significant fabric associated with the façade, including the open stoep of the house. These features and elements, associated with the architectural era of the house, should be retained. The new proposed garage, albeit aesthetically pleasing, is not supported as it will obscure the façade and detract from the streetscape of Bellair road.

- CIBRA do not support the proposal stating that the garage completely wrecks the intact facade of the house. They suggest continuing the sliding gates as per the neighbour's design with a central pedestrian gate. To give more depth to the parking, the low stoep walls between the pillars of the wider part could be removed and the pillar bases properly detailed. This is preferable in symmetry with the neighbour's stoep wall.
- Applicant response to CoCT: Part of the stoep, a column, and the original front door will be retained. This creates a lovely porch, similar to the original albeit smaller. The neighbour's street facing windows have already been replaced with aluminium thereby the historic fabric of the combined facade has already been degraded. A sliding gate will not satisfy the client's requirements whereby a garage provides safety for vehicles and acts as a workshop space to maintain the property. The design proposes a vegetated roof as well as a planted front court thus the whole footprint of the front garden will be planted albeit on different levels. The neighbouring property has a new owner who also wants to include the addition of a small garage and if the design of the current proposal is mirrored it could create a harmonious effect with the small garages on either side and the timber slatted fence with the original stoep behind. We still believe the proposed design to be the very best adaptation of the property for modern city living. The aesthetically pleasing, historically sensitive, landscaped design will provide a much needed improvement on the current streetscape. Past precedent shows that local owners tend to adjust their properties in detrimental ways due to the fear of bureaucratic processes of getting approval for much needed security upgrades to historical properties.
- Applicant response to CIBRA: Great care was taken to provide a minimal size garage with detailing and planting that will undoubtedly enhance the current streetscape of Bellair Road between this property and Derry Road. The street is rife with badly considered gates, fences, walls, and garage additions. The sliding gate with pedestrian entrance will not work as the current entrance to the stoep is located on the neighbour's side. 12 Bellair Road has a new owner and the pedestrian gate no longer exists. The client requires a garage for safety - for the garaging of his vehicle and mountain bike - and as a workshop space. The comment regarding the the low stoep walls between the pillars of the wider part which could be removed and the pillar bases properly detailed is noted.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today

#### **DECISION**

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

CSI

#### **13.19 Erf 16222, 51 Addison Road, Salt River, S34 -Minor Works**

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

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION**

POA required.

XM

### 13.20 Erf 387, 1 Dunrobin Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27093XM0119/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388390>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

Heidi McAllister was present and took part in the discussion.

#### DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for formalizing the boundary walls, adding an additional storey to the existing structure, enlarging the existing garage to accommodate two cars, minor internal layout renovations. Creating a new garden courtyard at the back.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside the Sea Point HPO
- CoCT comment: While the current proposal is not considered ideal (this would have meant the reinstatement of the original house without the imitation revival gable) a compromise had been reached. The proposed scale, forms and
- finishes are compatible with the surrounding fabric. The forward jutting gables on the first floor is somewhat
- contrived, yet is small enough in scale to be considered acceptable. Therefore, this application is supported.
- SFB Rate Payers & Residents Association comment: SFB is of the view that the proposed alterations are, for the most part acceptable. However, the proposed bland, unmodulated addition to the South-West Elevation, unlike that of
- the North-West Elevation, is poorly conceived and designed and is insensitive to the heritage context. SFB offers an objection to the application pending a review and redesign of the South West Elevation.
- Sea Point for All comment: I is of the opinion that the proposal does not succeed within this HPOZ
- context due to the following reasons:
  - The 1950's Cape Revival gable seems detached from the proposed design. It is not properly integrated with the new design as there is no pitched roof connecting it with the rest of the building (the original roofscape is totally altered due to the proposed removal of the entire original hipped roof).
  - The proposal includes the addition of a stoep that will extend forward beyond the original stoep line. This is not supported as the front stoep line should not project further than the outside line of the original bay window. The latter was traditionally the furthest projection on the facade (thereby creating a rhythm in the street as the other houses were houses were treated the same. This feature is still legible within Dunrobin St).
  - The demolition of the original facade wall, moving the wall and the front door forward, thereby creating a much narrower new added-on veranda, ignores the rhythm and uniformity described above.
  - The scale and detailing of the two proposed pitched roofs are not in keeping with typical roof eaves of this house and that of surrounding buildings.
  - These pitched roofs appear overwhelming due to their height in comparison with the height of the gable.
  - The cantilevered overhanging elements are very visible on Mutley Rd and are out of context.
- Sea Point for All is strongly of the opinion that the original facade line, the position of the front door, size of the veranda as well as the gable-and-projecting-bay-window feature
- should be retained. The proposed double storey section must be integrated with this original
- design, retaining a roofscape that is less intrusive and conforms to the already established
- heritage precedent.
- Sea Point for All was made aware of the comment received from City of Cape Town EHM.

- Although we have no objection to the remodelling of the interiors and the addition of a
- second storey, such proposals cannot be permitted if it has a negative impact on the HPOZ
- streetscape. This IIIC property should retain its contributing status.
- The applicant has provided a response to both objections

#### **DECISION**

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

**XM**

#### **13.21 Erf 6369, 21 Old Stellenbosch Road, Somerset West, S34-Minor Works** **Case No: HWC25111403XM1117**

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- The outstanding information was received on the 28.02.2026
- The proposal is for additions and alterations to convert the existing balcony into a sunroom and there for a ramp for the disabled.
- Work has started.
- Not Graded, not within HPO

#### **DECISION**

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

**XM**

### **14. NEW MATTERS**

#### **14.1 Erf 1027, 49 Musson Street, Hermanus, S34- Additions & Alterations** **Case No: 27128CH0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388488>**

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Not graded outside HPO
- Proposal is to renovate the existing structure and demolish 85% of the main dwelling.
- Work has not started
- OHAC supports.

#### **FOR NOTING**

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

**CH**

#### **14.2 Erf 11972, 72 Regent Street, Woodstock, S34- Additions & Alterations** **Case No: 27213CH0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388746>**

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Graded IIIC outside HPO (within a proposed HPO)
- Proposal is to repurpose the existing garage on site as a studio unit. A door is proposed to the eastern side to provide access into the new studio area. The changes will not be visible from the street.
- Work has not started.
- 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.

CH

**14.3 Erf 1552, 43 Mossel River Drive, Kwaaiwater, Hermanus, S34-Total Demolition**  
Case No: 27182CH0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388649>

#### CASE SUMMARY

- Not graded outside HPO.
- Proposal is to demolish the existing structure on site.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports.

#### FOR NOTING

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

CH

**14.4 Erf 25780, 47 Dane Street, Observatory, S34- Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27219CH0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388753>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

#### DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC inside HPO.
- Proposal is to convert the roof space into a loft area with the addition of dormer windows projecting towards the street facing facade as well as towards the rear.
- Work has started. The flooring and bathroom in the loft have already been completed. The construction of the internal staircase has started but still requires the installation of balustrades. The dormer window frames have started.
- CoCT supports
- OCA 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.

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

CH

**14.5 Erf 433, 49 Longmarket Street, Stanford, S31- Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27142CH0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388518>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

#### DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIC inside the declared Stanford Heritage Area
- Proposal is for an addition of a conservatory to the side of the building and a new boundary wall.

- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports
- SHC did not comment within 30 days.

#### DECISION

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

CH

#### 14.6 Erf 55307-RE, 34 Vineyard Road, Claremont, S34- Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27173CH0126 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388611>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Ursula Rigby was present and took part in the discussion.

#### DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIA outside HPO
  - Proposal is to restore the old thatch building for its use as a restaurant/ coffee shop and the addition of a two storied commercial structure on the rear portion of the site. The old well will be retained.
  - Work has not started.
  - Previous applications:
    - 1) S34 emergency permit for repair work was issued in May 2020 (case no. unknown). This work was not carried out and the permits have subsequently lapsed.
    - 2) S34 A&A permit for new work at the rear was issued on 27 January 2021 (BELCom approval - 20101305SM101E). The BELCom decision stated the following "The Committee resolved to approve the application as not negatively impacting heritage significance in as far as the NHRA affords this Committee jurisdiction. Given the historical significance of the property, the Committee strongly recommends that the well on the site be thematically if not spatially linked and its presence acknowledged in a manner that contributes and reinforces the significance and interpretation of the property as a whole".
    - 3) The BELCom decision was appealed and the appeal was dismissed on 21 April 2021 and the decision of BELCom was upheld.
    - 4) An appeal was lodged to the MEC Tribunal on 7 and 9 June 2021 who issued a directive to HWC on 11 August 2021 stating that new conceptual designs must be forwarded to BELCom for comment. The HWC Comment on the Directive (18 November 2021) favoured a preferred alternative referred to the 'commercial alternative' because this enabled stronger spatial links with the historic building. Tribunal had no concerns with the new structure being contemporary however stated that it should present a neutral backdrop to the historic building. Some concerns were raised at the time around the rectilinear massing of the roofline although some members of Tribunal did not have any concerns with the roofline. The MEC Ruling (11 March 2022) upheld the Appellants Appeal
    - 5) S34 MW permit to repair the thatched roof (HWC25090303CN1024).
  - Note: Three permit applications were submitted between 2019 and 2020, yet no work has been carried out on the existing Old Thatch structure since June 2019 or even since 2017 when the previous owners purchased the site.
  - The drawings have been revised in response to initial comments and site engagements between the various I&APs
- Latest comments:
- CoCT supports stating that the revised proposal stating that the new proposal (in terms of scale, building typology, form, height, architectural articulation, proximity to the thatched cottage and relative relationship to neighbouring buildings within the context) has sufficient merit and mitigation.

- UCRRA supports the proposal in terms of the reduction in height of the new structure, the revised roof of the new structure and it not having a low impact on the Old Thatch building, the onsite well being conserved, improvements to the roof form/design, setbacks to the southern neighbour and planting of trees on site to reduce the impact on the Old Thatch building, Ingle Road streetscape and the townscape. There is a concern with the proximity of the structure to the Old Thatch building and lack of breathing space which was raised for HWC to review.
- VASSA did not comment within 30 days.
- CTHF stated that they are unable to comment on the application.
- A neighbour (Mr. Justin Vollenhoven) provided comment regarding the 4.5m height from the boundary line in Quiet and Ingle Street stating that there will be a 1m boundary clearance from his boundary wall and new trees will be planted to ensure privacy on his property. The comment further states that ""The height would be staggered at 5.1m thereafter 6m to mitigate the view from my property & balcony"". The applicant responded to this stating that all comments have been carefully considered and the development proposal has been revised. There was a request for updated comment however no responses were provided.

#### **DECISION**

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

1. A close-out report, compiled by a suitably qualified heritage consultant, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

CH

#### **14.7 Erf 560, 17 Gilmore Hill Road, Tamboerskloof, S34- Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27114CH0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388450>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Additional external photographs, streetscape photographs, POA, CoCT comment and CIBRA comment.

CH

#### **14.8 Erf 809, 4 Ravenraig Road, Green Point, S34-Total Demolition**

**Case No:** 27113CH1020 / HWC25091903CH0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388442>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Graded potential IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is to demolish the existing structures on site.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports and strongly recommends that the remaining historic door frame be salvaged and recycled.
- GPRRA supports.
- CTHF supports the demolition however states that because site is adjacent to the HPOZ conditions must be imposed on the replacement structure.
- The applicant's letter to HWC notes the following - ""While in close proximity to the Green Point HPOZ, Erf 809 does not appear to warrant any conditions being imposed in respect of a replacement structure on the site. The only reasonable conclusion to be derived when considering the HPOZ boundary in this specific location instance is that no need was seen to ensure that control be exercised over the property to protect heritage resources should any redevelopment of the property be
- considered

## 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

- 14.9 Erf 976, 401 St Johns Road, Sea Point, S34 – Minor Works**  
Case No: 27218CH0129 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388751>

## OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs and confirmation if any of the work applied for has started.

CH

- 14.10 Erf 1558-RE, 8 Strangman Street, Strand, S34- Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27158CN0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388560>

## OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photos, CoCT and HRF comments required

CN

- 14.11 Erf 192, 557 Main Road, Paarl, S34-Minor Works**  
Case No: 27163CN0126 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388578>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

## DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Inside special character protected area overlay zone of Paarl
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For maintenance and repairs that include fixing all surface cracks and repainting the building, fix the roof cladding and repaint the entire roof, asbestos rainwater goods to be removed and replaced with aluminium gutters and PVC down pipes, timber windows and doors to be repaired and maintained, existing timber fascia boards and timber soffit boards to be sanded, fixed and repainted.
- Consultation:
  - Paarl 300 supports
  - DHF has no objection
  - Heritage Considerations: Positive impact to the IIIB heritage resources.

## DECISION

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

CN

- 14.12 Erf 2093, 5 2nd Avenue, Paarl, S34- Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27104CN0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388421>

## CASE SUMMARY

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started

- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For an extension to the rear, changes to windows on the side and a new boundary wall.
- Consultation:
- DHAC has no objection
- Paarl 300 supports
- DHF has no objection
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the heritage resources, grading can be seen as IIIC

#### **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**

#### **14.13 Erf 2163, 32 Porter Street, Porterville, S34- Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27106CN0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388425>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: Repair and partial reconstruction of the Hassim Building, including rebuilding unstable wall sections, inserting new structural elements, constructing a new low-pitched hip roof, and reconstructing the mezzanine floor. It also includes detaching later additions, subdividing existing buildings into smaller retail units, and constructing new complementary retail buildings along Porter Street and the site corner.
- Consultation:
- Bergriver Municipality supports
- Heritage Considerations: The proposed works are sensitive to the heritage resource and focus on repair, structural stabilisation and compatible additions, ensuring the continued retention and legibility of the historic building. The proposal will not negatively impact the heritage significance of the resource and is considered appropriate and acceptable.

#### **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**

#### **14.14 Erf 220, 16 Van Der Stel Street, Tulbagh, S34-Minor Works**

**Case No:** 27153CN0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388548>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Company Resolution and correct plan required.

**CN**

#### **14.15 Erf 252-RE, 20 Dirkie Uys Street, Malmesbury, S34- Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27146CN0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388522>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Outstanding information was requested for Trust Resolution, Streetscape photos and confirmation that the outbuilding is older than 60 years required – received on 4 Feb.

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For extensions to the outbuilding. The proposals do not touch the main dwelling
- Consultation:
  - Swartland Municipality supports
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the IIIC 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

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

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Streetscape photos and response to the objection required.

CN

- 14.17 Erf 51869-RE, 8 Lee Road, Claremont, S34- Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27181CN0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388648>

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For internal reconfiguration, two extensions to the front and rear, a new staircase and a first-floor extension, as well as the replacement of a carport and boundary wall
- Consultation:
  - CoCT supports
- Heritage Considerations: No impacts to the IIIC 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

- 14.18 Erf 71, 12 Barry Street Robertson, S34- Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27175CN0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388627>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Internal & external photos and Municipal comment required.

CN

**14.19 Erf 8938, 7A Du Toit Street, Paarl, S34 – Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27111CN0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388438>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: HWC24101804CN1022 - internal alterations
- Proposal: Internal alterations to the main house and conversion of garage into a single living unit
- Consultation:
- DHAC has no objection
- DHF cannot comment on work that has been started or completed. Had the DHF received the application before work started, the committee would not have objected to the proposal.
- Paarl 300 cannot comment on work already started or completed without a permit, but have no objections and will not be appealing.
- Heritage Considerations: The completed work will not impact the little to no significance of the site.

**COMMENT**

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

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

CN

**14.20 Erf 129, 3 Faraday Way Meadowridge, S34 – Minor Works**

**Case No:** 27140CSI0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388516>

**CASE SUMMARY**

- Work applied for has started
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the completion of the braai room and a new en-suite. Construction had began under the previous owners but work is yet to be completed
- CoCT provided comment stating that a minor works application must be made 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.

CSI

**14.21 Erf 21, 15 Glengariff Road, Park Lane, Unit 5, Green Point, S34 – Minor Works**

**Case No:** 27193CSI0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388682>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Streetscape photographs required.

CSI

- 14.22 Erf 21, 15 Glengariff Road, Park Lane, Unit 8, Green Point, S34 – Minor Works**  
Case No: 27191CSI0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388676>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Streetscape photographs required.

CSI

- 14.23 Erf 32820, Willow Road, Stikland, S38(1) - NID**  
Case No: 27154CSI0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388552>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length.
- Proposed development: Proposed trenching and directional drilling to install 11kV cables. The proposed trenching will be 1 m deep and 1 m wide.
- Current zoning/land-use: Transport 2: Public Road and Public Parking / Public Road Reserve
- Built environment: No historical buildings are expected to be impacted by the trenching and drilling.
- Visual impacts: None expected - within a road reserve
- Archaeology: No archaeological resources were identified
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is low

**FINAL DECISION**

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

CSI

- 14.24 Erven 456-3465, 3504-3507 and 4967, Makou Street, Sedgefield, S38(1) - NID**  
Case No: 27203CSI0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388715>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (i) exceeding 5 000m<sup>2</sup> in extent;; (ii) involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions thereof;; S38(1)(d) Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m<sup>2</sup> in extent.
- Proposed development: The development proposal comprises of a Checkers Supermarket, a Coffee Shop/ Restaurant and a variety of other retail shops along with a parking area and a Checkers Bulk Store area
- Current zoning/land-use: General Residential Zone I, Business Zone I, Business Zone III, Transport Zone III / Vacant Land
- Built environment: No impacts to historical structures expected
- Visual impacts: The proposal is located within the existing demarcated Urban Edge of Sedgefield and is consistent with the applicable spatial planning policies. The site is therefore earmarked for infill development within an urban area and is considered an extension of the existing neighbouring Aviemore security development to the east. The site is a brownfield site as the road and services have already been established on site. The Main Service Road of Sedgefield is located directly to the south, with the N2 directly to the south of this road. The railway is located directly to the North of the site.
- Archaeology: An archaeological shell midden deposit was identified at the SE edge of Rondevlei (2024) approximately 9km west of the site. No heritage resources exist on or next

to the site. The site was previously disturbed and developed by the installation of bulk services for the existing approved mix use development.

- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is moderate however no impacts to palaeo resources are anticipated considering the brownfields nature of the site.

#### **FINAL DECISION**

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

CSI

#### **14.25 Farm 1103, Farm Kalbaskraal, off the N7, Atlantis, S38(8) - NID**

**Case No:** 27198CSI0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388696>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Trigger: S38(1)(a) Construction of a road, wall, powerline, pipeline, canal or other similar form of linear development or barrier over 300m in length.; S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (i) exceeding 5 000m2 in extent; S38(1)(d) Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m2 in extent.
- Proposed development: Construction of a high speed, private racetrack (or auto-drome) with associated infrastructure.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agriculture / Vacant
- Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical structures.
- Visual impacts: Site is located just off the N7, but considering the flatness of the proposed development there will be minimal visual impact. Surrounding land-use is agricultural.
- Archaeology: The archaeological sensitivity is low according to the screener report. No significant archaeological resources were recorded during a walk down survey of the proposed development site conducted by Jonathan Kaplan of ACRM on the 22nd of January 2026. A few isolated quartz chunks, and chips/small flakes (waypoint 418) were encountered in a heavily trampled area alongside the fence line, about 50m south of the Swartrivier
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is low. Professor Bamford provided a letter in which she states that fossils do not preserve in soils and there are no outcrops in the area from where fossils might have eroded because the site is surrounded by non-fossiliferous granites.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

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

CSI

#### **14.26 Farm 1589, 1475, 1404, 1530 and Portions 6 and 13 of Farm Number 491, off Annandale Road, Stellenbosch, S38(8) - NID**

**Case No:** 27207CSI0129

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Trigger: S38(1)(b) Construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length.
- Proposed development: Construction of new bridges and the upgrading of existing bridges
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural (Spier wine)
- Built environment: No historical structures will be impacted (Mon Villa)
- Visual impacts: IIIB cultural landscape, no impact anticipated.
- Archaeology: The screener report indicates low and high archaeological sensitivity because

the site is within 2km of a PHS but the bridges will not impact the structure.

- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is moderate

#### **HELD OVER**

Case officer to investigate the trigger.

CSI

#### **14.27 Portion 104 of Farm 216, Farm Uitzicht Knysna S38(8) - NID**

Case No: 27170CSI0126 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388600>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Trigger: N/A
- Proposed development: Establishment of a low-impact, private family-use eco-camping facility with 5 Eco-Use Areas (EUAs) distributed across the southern portion of the property. Each EUA will accommodate up to 3–4 small platform structures, including sleeping areas, ablution, and kitchen decks. The facility is exclusively intended for use by members of the Lovemore family and their direct guests. There will be no public access or commercial overnight tourism component. The size of the site is 1172sqm.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural Zone 1 / Consent Use for Camping Facilities
- Built environment: No impacts expected to historical structures
- Visual impacts: Fairly small camping units, not much of an impact.
- Archaeology: The screener report indicates low archaeological sensitivity
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is unknown. The screener report indicates medium sensitivity.

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

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

CSI

#### **14.28 Portion 2 of Farm 1576 off Kleinbosch Road, Paarl, S34 - Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27112CSI0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388439>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

DHAC comment, streetscape photos.

CSI

#### **14.29 Farm 55-RE, Vryheid Farm, Klipheuwel Road, Cape Farms, S38(4) - NID**

Case No: 27210CSI0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388740>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Site photos, CoCT PoA required.

CSI

#### **14.30 Erf 120, 1 Bree Street, Langebaan, S34 – Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27214EJV0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388747>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Comments required

EJV

**14.31 Erf 3171, Unit 8, 8 Newport Street, Gardens, S34 - Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27123EJV0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388474>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Graded IIIC/NCW
- Inside Upper Table Valley HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for internal alterations to accommodate a new living room and bathroom and external fenestration changes and paving work
- CIBRA support; CoCT support

**DECISION**

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

EJV

**14.32 Erf 70921, 13 Thirlmere Road, Plumstead, S34 - Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27155EJV0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388553>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

PoA; streetscapes required

EJV

**14.33 Erf 87346, 9 Vlei Road, Muizenberg, S34 - Additions & Alterations**  
**Case No:** 27131EJV0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388499>

**CASE SUMMARY**

- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to extend the footprint of the structure with a ground storey flatlet addition
- CoCT support; MHCS have no objection

**FOR NOTING**

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

EJV

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

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

PoA; PoP; internals; streetscapes; Heritage Mossel Bay comment; Municipality comment on heritage-grounds; elevations required

EJV

**14.35 Farm 1064 Portion 1, Klein La Provence, Franschhoek, S38(1) - NID**  
**Case No:** 27206EJV0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388723>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Klein La Provence Farm House is graded IIIA
- Inside the Franschhoek Valley IIIA Landscape Unit
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a).
- The proposal is for the urgent development of a fence around all four sides of Klein la Provence including an access gate for safety and security reasons. The fence will be placed along the Franschhoek Tram line and set back from the R45 scenic route. The proposed fence is minimal and lightweight in nature, and fits in with existing similar fence infrastructure present around adjacent properties within the Franschhoek Valley. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates low to moderate sensitivity
- Consultant recommends no further studies

**DECISION**

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

**EJV**

**14.36 Farm 216 Portion 45, Uitzicht, Brenton On Lake, Knysna, S38(8) - NID**  
**Case No:** 27174EJV0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388623>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s3891(a); (c)(i); and (d).
- The proposal is to rezone and develop the property to allow for 14 freehold single residential erven, 3 conservation areas, 1 private open space area, and a private street for all internal roads following the existing roads on the property. The site was previously home to 5 units 4 of which were destroyed in the 2017 fires. The larger farm Uitzicht, and subsequently Belvidere, has a rich history associated to early colonial figures such as George Rex and the Duthie Family. The farm has been subdivided multiple times, and most subdivisions now focus on the conservation of Knysna Sand Fynbos. In terms of archaeology, Halkett and Nilssen observed very sparse ESA and MSA scatters and no trace of prehistoric or historic archaeological resources respectively on other portions of the farm Uitzicht. Nilssen notes that the area around the lake does not contain any suitable protein resources, in the form of marine shellfish, for prehistoric hunter-gatherers. Changes in the level of the lake during the maximum high of the mid-Holocene sea level during the prehistoric past would have impacted coastal settlements. Archaeological sites are more likely to be located on the coast or at a higher elevation, rather than along the shores of the lake. In terms of visual impact, a visual statement was produced by VRM Africa. It concludes that due to the lower density of the proposed development, and the positive alignment with Knysna Municipality planning, no further visual impact assessment would be required, but only if the proposed mitigations can be incorporated into the preferred layout plan as tabulated on pages 17 and 18 of the report. The consultant confirmed via email that those recommendations as related to sense of place have been incorporated into the SDP while those relating to architectural guidelines will be applied at a later development stage and be conditional of the environmental authorisation.

The current farm portion is inside of the urban edge and identified as a transitional zone in the MSDF. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates unknown sensitivity

- Consultant recommends no further studies

#### **FINAL COMMENT**

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

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

**EJV**

#### **14.37 Farm 741-RE, Newberry House Montessori School, Lourensford Wine Estate, Somerset West, S38(1) – NID**

**Case No:** 27180EJV0127 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388647>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Not Graded
- Inside the Lourensford, Somerset West Cultural Landscape
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to establish sports fields, a temporary canopy structure, and small lavatory building adjacent to the existing Newberry House Montessori School. The area allocated for the sport field are on vacant, disused agricultural land that has no structures and no known heritage significance. The low-scale development footprint introduces minimal visual impact or earthmoving activities. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low and moderate sensitivity
- Consultant recommends no further studies

#### **DECISION**

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

**EJV**

#### **14.38 Farm 841-RE; Portion 6 of Farm 841, Loewenstein Farm, Fraaigelegen, Paarl, S38(8) - HIA**

**Case No:** HWC24101405EJV1016

#### **CASE SUMMARY**

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- HOMs on 4 November 2024 requested an HIA with VIA for the proposed rezoning and redevelopment of the property
- This is inclusive of a strip of commercial development along the R301 interface, commercial development along Kliprug Road, and single residential development of 531 erven on the remainder of the site. The commercial development will include offices in 4 double storey blocks setback from the R301 and screened by planting and a central green space. Smaller single storey blocks are proposed along Kliprug. The residential development has been divided into pockets allowing for phased development of single residential dwellings (no architectural guidelines are yet available) of a maximum of two storeys with an internal road network and green spaces to ensure screening and softening of the built landscape. The site is currently utilised as a strawberry farm with ancillary structures (dwellings, cottages, packing sheds, propagation tunnels, work yards) of no heritage significance in terms of architectural

value. Although the property has its origins in an historic land grant there is no tangible evidence of pre-colonial or colonial heritage and it would seem the farm was only actively farms from the 1960s. Heritage resources within the vicinity includes the school north-east of the site graded IIIC, the De Hoop werf south-east of the site which is a proposed Grade II and not visible from the site and vice versa, and the Hartebeeskraal werf north-east of the site grade IIIA that is similarly not visible from the site and vice versa. The site does fall along the R301 scenic drive. The value of this scenic drive is stated as the predominance of views eastwards from the R301 to the vineyards with embedded homesteads on the lower slopes and the rugged wilderness quality of the upper slopes as character forming element/aspect and states that there are no views of any significance in a westerly direction, across the Berg River plain. The landscape to the west of the R301 between the R301 and the Berg River south to of the N1 has little to offer in terms of scenic quality, being relatively flat and characterised by dispersed modern residential estates, areas of uncultivated land, with some vineyards and orchards, and areas under tunnels such as on the site in question. The area is also undergoing rapid conversion to urban uses with an approved hospital site immediately adjacent and likely to be visually intrusive. The site itself has been indicated for urban development in terms of the MSDF.

- The VIA was prepared by ARLA Consulting. The VIA identified the following receptors (i.e. from where the site is visible): The R301 road and view corridor, the cultivated landscape and neighbouring farmsteads and the surrounding contemporary residential estates. None of these receptors the consultant believes are to be regarded as of heritage significance, based on their analysis of the landscape and status of the R301 scenic route. The VIA concludes that the development is considered compatible with the existing land character subject to mitigation, and ultimately the visual impact is deemed to be moderate, has local impact, with medium intensity over the medium term.
- In terms of public participation: The DHF does not object to the development in principle, as it is in line with the SDF, but objects to the excessive density, bulk and height of the commercial buildings proposed alongside the R301 scenic route, as shown in both Figure 23: Preferred development plan and Figure 24: Alternative development option. These buildings should be set back appropriately to soften the visual impact on the scenic route, despite the suggested visual mitigation measures proposed in the Draft VIA. Paarl 300 supported with the following comment: The committee requested that the office blocks and apartments not be higher than two floors and should be set back far enough from the major roads with green areas around to mitigate impact on the rural environment. DHAC support on conditions that:
  - The indicators as outlined in the Heritage Impact Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment, must be adhered to;
  - All buildings along the R301 and Kliprug Road must be limited to a height of two stories;
  - A consistent landscape setback must be continued along Kliprug Road;
  - All mitigating landscaping must be consistent with the landscape character of the area;
  - Detailed site development plans, site sections and elevations and landscaping plans must be submitted before building plan stage; and
  - Response of HWC to the HIA and VIA must be provided at building plan stage
- Consultant responds to all comments on pages 48 and 49 of the HIA.
- The Consultant concludes the HIA titled "Remainder Farm 841 and Portion 6 of Farm 841, Fraaigelegen, Paarl: Proposed mixed-use development Heritage Impact Assessment" prepared by Lize Malan dated January 2026 with recommendations on page 62 which read as follows: It is recommended that HWC:
  - Accepts this HIA as having met the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.
  - Endorses the findings of the HIA and the draft VIA.
  - Endorses the development parameters as set out in Section 15.2 (should read 14.2) above as the minimum requirement for a revised SDP and sanctions the Drakenstein Municipality to decide on whether or not deviations from the SDP presented in this HIA should be referred back to HWC for consideration.
  - Requires that architectural guidelines that addresses the aspects set out in Section 15.1 (should read 14.1) above and a complete landscaping plan be submitted to the Drakenstein

Municipality for approval, before building plan approval may be granted.

#### **REFERRAL**

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 18 February due to the objections received and the mitigation measures required for consideration.

**EJV**

#### **14.39 Erf 143, 72 Moll street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27205SB0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388722>

#### **OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Comment from Municipality, completed work to be marked up on the plans, confirmation that the work is complete (evident in the photographs) and additional payment is required.

**SB**

#### **14.40 Erf 158530, 5 Pitt Street, Plumstead, S34-Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27161SB0124 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388563>

#### **CASE SUMMARY:**

- Proposal: New Garage Building added to property. Conversion of roof space into a Loft Bedroom & Bathroom. Converting an existing bathroom on Ground Floor into two bathrooms.
- Work start: No
- Grade: some heritage value
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: CoCT support
- HO: Suggest grade 3C as there is some periodic element and fabric remaining however the proposal will not negatively impact these, hence support

#### **FOR NOTING**

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

**SB**

#### **14.41 Erf 16518, 56 York Street, George, S34 – Total Demolition**

Case No: 27136SB0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388510>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Corlie Smart and Willie-John Van Niekerk were present and took part in the discussion.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Proposal: Total demolition
- Work start: No
- Grade: Previously recorded as Grade IIIB (2016 survey); reassessed and corrected to Not Conservation-Worthy.
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: The George Heritage Trust objects to the proposed demolition, stating that the building is one of the remaining heritage structures in the immediate area and that its removal would result in a loss of local historic fabric. They further raise concern regarding a mature yellowwood tree on the site and suggest that the development should explore incorporating the existing structure sensitively. The George Municipality supports the demolition.

- The objections raised by the George Heritage Trust are noted; however, they are not supported by the heritage significance assessment. The building has undergone extensive unsympathetic alterations between 1958 and 1987, resulting in the loss of architectural integrity, legibility, and heritage value. Very little original fabric remains in a meaningful context.
- The structure is located outside a heritage protection overlay and within an area assessed as lacking conservation value; it therefore does not qualify for local contextual (Grade IIIC) significance. The previously recorded Grade IIIB classification is not supported and is corrected to Not Conservation-Worthy, in line with IGIC guidance that grading must be reassessed at application stage.
- Concerns regarding the yellowwood tree fall outside the scope of heritage legislation and are regulated under municipal by-laws and environmental legislation. On heritage grounds, no objection is raised to the proposed demolition.
- All I&APs have been invited to the meeting

#### **DECISION**

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

**SB**

#### **14.42 Erf 17, Eerste Tol, Bainskloof Pass R301, Wellington, S34-Additions & Alterations**

**Case No:** 27217SB0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388750>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Proposal: Demolition of internal wall to reconfigure the open space to convert into student accommodation for camps or field trips (adjacent building is already used for that). Proposal includes new ablution, relocating of kitchen, new braai, repairs and maintenance – doors and windows, and replacement of septic tank. The new addition to the rear will potentially have solar panels.
- Work start: No
- Grade: potentially PHS – can't find the gazette notice to confirm. Municipality notes proposed grade 2 (There is a CMP by Henry Akiman – cannot find the gazette in the pack that was at council either) – has been uploaded to the file for reference.
- HPO: Proposed HPO
- Comments: The municipality has no objection, however, note on the "Clearvu" fence, this is not on the plans, the current fence is chicken wire fence, I don't see this having negative impact but there is PHS boundary that should be considered. Cape Nature is close to this house. Solar panels are potential and on the new portion – will not have negative impact. Agree with the municipality and discussing the application with Cape Nature and municipality environmental fire department – homes can request these comments prior to consideration as there are number of resource we should consider their safety. PHS and graves will not be impacted.

#### **DECISION**

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

**SB**

**14.43 Erf 259, 179 Church Street, Oudtshoorn, S34 - Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27192SB0128 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388680>

**CASE SUMMARY:**

- Proposal: upgrading and extension on a small section of the property, klip-lock sheets, plaster and painting were required and wooden parisle.
- Work start: no
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: Heritage Oudtshoorn erfenis committee support, municipality support.

**FOR NOTING**

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

SB

**14.44 Erf 26324, 14 Ash Street, Observatory, S34 - Maintenance and an addition to the existing**

Case No: 27150SB0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388541>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

OCA, CoCT comments require and confirmation if work has starts and updated plans to reflect this, is required.

SB

**14.45 Erf 355, 5 Bickley Road Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations**

Case No: 27130SB0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388496>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Sea Point For All Group (seapointforall@gmail.com) and Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association (admin@sfb.org.za) comment required.

SB

**14.46 Erf 72130, 20 Churchill Road, Plumstead, S34-Minor Works**

Case No: 27139SB0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388515>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

CoCT comments, contextual/street photographs required.

SB

**14.47 Portion 2 of Farm 130, Off the M58, Durbanville, S38(1)-NID**

Case No: 27212SB0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388744>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Henk Lourens was present and took part in the discussion.

**DISCUSSION**

- Proposed: Consent use on Farm 130 Portion 2, Durbanville to allow tourist facilities (restaurant).
- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site
- Other: None
- Grade: IIIC
- HPO: Outside

- Heritage resource: within cultural landscape.
- No other resources were noted in the application. On the CoCT survey no statement of significance was available, only a grade 3C within cultural landscape.
- Archaeology: There is a possibility of isolated archaeological material but there is not enough available information. Potentially low impact.
- Palaeontological: Low sensitive according to SAHRIS.
- Visual/Cultural: Proposal is not clear, if no new structure is proposed, then the impact is low.
- Consultant recommends: NFS
- The proposal will not change the character of the site, hence no trigger.

#### **COMMENT**

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

**SB**

#### **14.48 Stellenbosch Farm 794-RE, off WR Quinan Boulevard, Paardevlei, Somerset West, S38(1)-NID Case No: 27164SB0126 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388592>**

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Cindy Postlethwayt was present and took part in the discussion.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- Proposed: Amendment of an approved subdivision plan and rezoning to subdivide Portion 4 of Stellenbosch Farm 794-RE and rezone it to Open Space 2 to form part of a conservation corridor linked to the Paardevlei vlei.
- Trigger: Section 38(1)(d) – Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m<sup>2</sup> in extent.
- Other: None
- Previous case: 130807GT06 (HIA)
- Grade: Site not graded and no heritage resources located within the proposed development footprint. The broader Paardevlei cultural landscape contains heritage resources; however, these fall outside the proposed portion.
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: Broader Paardevlei cultural landscape and associated historic industrial precinct (Power Station and Glycerine Refinery), located outside the proposed development footprint.
- Archaeology: Previous archaeological assessments undertaken for the broader Paardevlei site. No archaeological resources identified within the proposed portion. No impact anticipated.
- Palaeontological: According to SAHRIS, moderate sensitivity but according to the supporting document. Consultant no palaeontological resources identified. No impact anticipated.
- Visual/Cultural: The proposal supports the conservation and rehabilitation of open space forming part of the ecological and heritage landscape associated with the Paardevlei vlei. No negative heritage or visual impacts anticipated.
- Consultant recommends: No HIA or further specialist heritage studies required. The proposal aligns with established heritage indicators and conservation planning for the site.
- HO: The proposed subdivision and rezoning will create a conservation corridor forming part of the Paardevlei vlei open space system. The development footprint is vacant and does not contain heritage resources. Heritage significant buildings associated with the Paardevlei industrial precinct are located outside the proposed portion and will not be impacted. The proposal supports long-term conservation of the cultural landscape and is consistent with previous heritage assessments and planning for the site.

## DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve S38(4) the revised SDP as per the report prepared by Cindy Postlethwayt as being substantially in accordance with the previous HWC approval in 2014 of the HIA prepared by C. Snelling (HWC Case number: 130807GT06).

SB

**14.49 Erf 15465, 9 Portland Road, Salt River, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27127XM0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388480>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

## DISCUSSION

- The proposal is for additions and alterations for a new 1st floor addition to building with new staircase at existing ground floor kitchen / dining area.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- The site falls within the Salt River HPOZ
- CoCT did not managed to comment within the 30 day comment period. The applicant to proceed with
- application to HWC without a formal comment from the City.
- The Salt River Heritage Society supports the application
- Recommend: approval

## DECISION

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

XM

**14.50 Erf 172917, 3 Amhurst Avenue, Newlands, S34-Minor Works**  
Case No: 27157XM0123 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388559>

## OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Consultation comments: Local municipality and Conservation bodies in the area

XM

**14.51 Erf 1764, 21 Lourensford Road, Somerset West, S34-Minor Works**  
Case No: 27144XM0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388520>

## OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Power of attorney

Consultation comments: Local municipality and Conservation body

XM

**14.52 Erf 176419, 42 Cecil Road, Salt River, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27143XM0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388519>

## OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Motivation, POP with outstanding amount. Annotated Streetscape photographs

XM

**14.53 Erf 56143, 2 Alma Road, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27109XM0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388428>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**  
Annotated Internal photographs

**XM**

**14.54 Erf 109, 13 Lincoln Way, Meadowridge, S34-Minor Works**  
Case No:27160XM0124/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388562>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The application is for additions and alterations for interior alteration including doors relocated and dry walling erected for room division and a window removed and replaced with 2 new windows.
- Work has started
- The site is Not Graded
- The site does not fall within the HPOZ
- Recommend: approval

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**  
Plans indicating what work is complete and what must still be completed.

**XM**

**14.55 Erf 157613, 155 Loop Street, Cape Town - S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27169XM0126/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388599>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The proposal is for additions and alterations on existing property including shoplifting. To create the new classrooms, the existing staircase was removed, and a new passageway was created
- connecting to the existing emergency exit. The new passageway is made with shopfronts to allow for an open feel to the classrooms and an interconnectedness between them. The existing bathroom was renovated in place,
- allowing for an improved layout that provides more privacy off the common passageway. The existing office is used as a venue for English and French language classes as well as a French cultural centre.
- Work has been completed (regularization)
- Graded IIIC, within the HPO
- Recommend: S51 letter to be issued

**COMMENT**

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

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

**XM**

- 14.56 Erf 173664, 80 Roodebloem Road, Woodstock, S34-Minor Works**  
Case No:27208XM0129/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388732>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The proposal is for additions and alterations for the erection of a carport & bedouin to provide weather protection.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC, within the HPO
- Recommend: approval

**DECISION**

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

**XM**

- 14.57 Erf 48828, 61 Newlands Avenue, Newlands, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27159XM0124/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388561>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Streetscape photographs

Consultation comments: Local municipality

**XM**

- 14.58 Erf 56791, 10 Angelina Avenue, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**  
Case No: 27184XM0127/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388654>

**OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**

Consultation comments: Local municipality and Conservation bodies

**XM**

**15. Other Matters**

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

EJV moves to adopt and CN seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 9 February 2026.

**17. Closure:** The chairperson, Ms Chane Herman, officially closed the meeting at 11:49

**18. Date of next meeting:** 16 February 2026

**MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:**

**CHAIR:** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECRETARY:** \_\_\_\_\_

## **Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers' Meetings**

### **Abbreviations**

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