

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 19 November 2025 via MS
Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

The Chair, Ms Heidi Boise, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Committee Members:

Ms Heidi Boise (HB) (Chair)
Ms Helene van der Merwe (HvdM)
Mr Siphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS)

Members of Staff:

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Ms Yusrah Hoosain (YH)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)

Visitors:

Mr Richard Summers
Ms Sarah Winter
Mr Kevin Cummins
Mr Shreea Maharaj
Mr Chris Snelling
Mr Malaki Filliano
Dr Bill Harding
Mr Nic Smith
Mr Tyrone Erleigh
Ms Adelaide Combrink
Mr Christos Simos

Mr John Wilson-Harris
Ms Celine Oates
Ms Laura Milandri
Ms Nelia Wolfaardt
Ms Elizabeth Stead
Ms Ntombi Nkoane
Mr Eben Barnard
Mr Kobus van Wyk
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Mr Johan Cornelius

Apologies

Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 19 November 2025.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 19 November 2025.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 15 October 2025

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 15 October 2025 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest:

None

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the following Appeals matter:

- Proposed development on Portion 38 of Farm 510, Jamestown, Stellenbosch

8.2 Report back on Stop Works Orders and Charges:

Nothing to report.

8.3 Formal Protection of Buildings refused for Demolition

Nothing to report.

8.4 Compulsory Repair Orders follow up

For noting.

9. Standing Items

9.1 Report back on Close-Out Reports

9.1.1 Portion 1 of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Witplaats, Klaarstroom, Prince Albert: MA HM / CENTRAL KAROO / PRINCE ALBERT / PORTION 1 (WIT PLAATS) OF THE FARM VROLYKHEID NO. 177

Case No: HWC25031701SVB0328

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

No parties were present for this item.

HELD OVER:

The matter is held over and will be tabled at the next BELCom meeting scheduled for 5 December 2025.

SBr

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

HB and SM provided feedback on the Council meeting held on 4 November 2025. HWC committees' term was extended to January 2026. A Workshop has been proposed for BELCom members as a conclusion of the present committee's term, in order to compile notes that can be useful for future committees and to contribute to HWC's institutional knowledge. BELCom Chair to canvas team for suggestions for an agenda.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

- Erf 3035, 51 Bryant Street, Bo-Kaap
- Erf 4595, 55 St Georges Mall, SS Union Castle Building, Cape Town

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Erf 9998, 13 Adderley Street, Cape Town City Centre

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Erf 889, 54 Kloofnek Road, Tamboerskloof

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Farm 744-Re, Marquee, Vergelegen Estate, Lourensford Road, Somerset West: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SOMERSET WEST / FARM 744-RE

Case No: HWC24092613SJ0927

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Mr Richard Summers (Vergelegen Heritage Oversight Committee), Mr John Wilson-Harris (Vergelegen Heritage Oversight Committee) and Ms Sarah Winter (Vergelegen Heritage Oversight Committee) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site is recognized as a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) and is located outside the boundaries of a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. An application was submitted to HWC in October 2024 for a framed glass marquee that had already been installed within the historic core area of the Vergelegen Estate without a heritage permit having been granted. This application is here below referred to as 'the proposal'.
3. The City of Cape Town has indicated its support for the proposal, subject to certain conditions.
4. The Helderberg Renaissance Foundation (HRF) supports the proposal in principle, while also providing several comments for consideration.
5. Vergelegen Heritage Oversight Committee (HOC) expressed its in-principle support for the proposal (HOC Interim Comment, 12 August 2024).
6. A BELCom Decision dated 4 March 2025 listed requirements amongst which is a requirement that a policy proposal be submitted to guide the implementation of future temporary structures on the Vergelegen Estate.
7. A document titled 'Landscape and Visual Assessment for the Introduction of Temporary Structures on the Vergelegen Heritage site' (LVA), prepared by Bernard Oberholzer and Quinton Lawson and dated August 2025 has been submitted for consideration by HWC. This document is referred to as 'the policy proposal' here below.
8. It was noted that the temporary marquee structure remains in place and remains an unauthorized structure.
9. The HOC noted that:
 - a. the marquee site, associated heritage impact risks and constraints near the historic core are being evaluated;
 - b. although the marquee's placement may not be ideal, it is accepted that its continued presence for some time is recommended for generating the revenue needed to sustain Vergelegen's long-term heritage resource management;
 - c. for these reasons the HOC can find no compelling reason for its temporary relocation.
10. The HOC proposed that
 - a. the marquee be allowed to remain for a finite period, ideally up to three years, due to financial and management constraints.

- b. future hospitality expansion at Vergelegen must be guided by a carefully mapped understanding of heritage constraints and opportunities to avoid repeating past issues with temporary structures.
- 11. The Committee observed that small, seasonal pop-up structures generally pose lesser impact, whereas larger, longer-term temporary structures require careful site selection and assessment particularly where additional infrastructure, such as service infrastructure, may be required.
- 12. The Committee suggested enhancing the visual analysis of August 2025 by adding photographs from key viewpoints in the historic core toward the proposed sites to illustrate how larger structures would appear in the landscape and how they might be screened to mitigate any visual intrusion.
- 13. It was noted that while floor area is important as a measure of impact within the landscape, the location, height, bulk, materials, colour and overall visual integration of a structure, all together determine how well a structure would blend into the landscape.
- 14. It was noted that while the HOC's work towards integration of a temporary structures policy into the CMP is heading in the right direction, concerns remain about -
 - a. Automatic exemptions in terms of there being no requirement for the HOC/owner to submit applications to HWC for new work or alterations are not supported,
 - b. All proposals must continue to be reviewed by HWC, and
 - c. A business plan which provides clearer justification of how Vergelegen will achieve long-term heritage-aligned financial viability is required.
- 15. Further requirements include:
 - a. Expanded descriptions of the LVA's types A, B and C structures in terms of materiality, height and bulk, especially so for proposed larger type C structures.
 - b. Listing the type of activities that may be hosted at Vergelegen and that would require installation of temporary structures, including a list of types of activities that will not be allowable.
 - c. The CMP for Vergelegen must be updated by integration of an updated and approved policy document before any agreements or approvals for temporary structures can be finalized between HWC and the HOC.

RECORD OF DECISION:

- 1. The Committee noted that the Marquee is an unauthorised structure as the extension granted in the previous decision until October 2025 has expired.
- 2. The document Landscape and Visual Assessment for the Introduction of Temporary Structures on the Vergelegen Heritage Site prepared by Bernard Oberholzer and Quinton Lawson and dated August 2025 does not comply with the requirements laid out in the Record of Decision (RoD) dated 4 March 2025.
- 3. A compliant document to be submitted within 6 months of the date of written notification of this decision.

SJ

**11.2 Erf 2231, 165 Main Road, Paarl: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ ERF 2231**

Case No: HWC25100703CH1007

Ms Chane Herman introduced the case.

Ms Nelia Wolfaardt (architect) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site is a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) and is located within the Special Character Area of Paarl, and is situated immediately adjacent to the Strooidak Church, a site of high heritage importance.
2. Unauthorised work undertaken in 2023 triggered an application to HWC followed by approval of building proposals. A revised building proposal reflecting certain deviations from the previously approved plan has now been submitted by the new owner of the property.
3. Interested and affected parties (I&APs) commented on the revised proposal and noted as follows:
 - a. The Drakenstein Municipality did not support the proposal and required changes to the façade of the large steel shed (proposed coffee shop) as well as a submission for signage.
 - b. Drakenstein Heritage Foundation (DHF) supported the proposal subject to amendments to the coffee shop fenestration.
 - c. Paarl 300 Foundation supported the proposal.
 - d. The amendments as required by I&APs were implemented prior to submission to HWC.
4. The Committee acknowledged improvements to the proposal, including the removal of the glass box element and a more restrained façade treatment.
5. The Committee expressed concern that the courtyard's landscape treatment appeared to include excessive hard paving and minimal planting, contrary to previous requests for softening with planting and shading. It was recommended that the applicant refer to the previously approved landscape plan to guide planting distribution, and to consider replacing selective paved areas with a gravel layer as opposed to solid paving.
6. It was noted that details for structures shown on the landscape plan including any pergolas, must be provided and must also be shown on the corresponding building plans and elevations.
7. The Committee emphasised the proposed steel entrance gate to the parking area must be assessed primarily in relation to the Victorian house and the surrounding streetscape. The gate design should achieve an appropriate balance between the surrounding heritage streetscape and the new buildings: buildings are set back from the street and not a dominant feature as viewed from the street. Detail drawings for the entrance gate are required submission to BELCom.
8. The Committee was informed that when comparing the previously approved drawings with the current submission, that the carport pergolas remain and a small canopy at the coffee shop entrance is no longer proposed.

9. The Committee noted that the mitigation agreement remains binding on successors in title, and that any approved revised drawings can be incorporated as an addendum once all requirements HWC requirements have been met.
10. The Committee emphasized that all intended works, together with any works already completed must be illustrated on a single, consolidated set of plans.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. Revised drawings including the landscape design plan to be submitted and must show all the proposed work as required by the owner.
2. A detailed design drawing of the gate taking into account the balance between the existing Victorian house and the new buildings to the rear to be submitted.

CH

12. STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR TOTAL DEMOLITION

**12.1 Erf 97983, 8 Kings Street, Newlands: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / NEWLANDS / ERF 97983**

Case No: HWC25090328SVB0908

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The property is graded Grade IIIC and is located within the proposed Newlands Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The City of Cape Town supported the proposal.
3. The Newlands Ratepayers Association strongly discourages the proposed street-facing garage and raised concern regarding the scale of the upper floor extension, noting that the intervention would negatively impact the terrace streetscape.
4. The Committee found that the contextual pictures and visual material submitted were deemed insufficient to adequately convey the property's relationship within terrace house assembly.
5. The Committee emphasised that a core guiding principle for a terrace typology is that any intervention at a unit level of an individual unit must be capable to be replicated across other units without compromising aesthetic integrity or heritage significance of the collective. The proposal therefore cannot be evaluated in isolation.
6. The Committee required additional contextual information be provided to demonstrate how the proposed alterations would align with the rest of the terrace and streetscape, informed by heritage indicators prepared by a heritage consultant familiar with the area.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate architectural heritage experience to oversee the proposed work.
2. HWC is to be provided with the details of the consultant and their CV to support their suitability to oversee the work.

3. The submitted CV includes similar projects undertaken and similar contexts.
4. A letter of appointment to be submitted to HWC.
5. A heritage statement is to be submitted to include the following:
 - a. Statement of significance.
 - b. An analysis of the streetscape of both sides of Kings Street.
 - c. Heritage indicators to be provided.
 - d. The proposed interventions to be placed within the streetscape and 3D studies e.g. photomontages to be provided.
6. The above must be circulated to I&APs for 30 days consultation period and comments for proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.

SBr

**12.2 Erf 7691-Re, 14 Lewes Street, Somerset West: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SOMERSET WEST / ERF 7691-RE**

Case No: HWC25072403SJ1013

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant), Dr Bill Harding (I&APs) and Mr Kevin Cummins (I&APs) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site is ungraded and located outside a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The City of Cape Town requested that the potential historical significance of the house be further investigated. This request has been addressed in the submitted heritage report.
3. The Helderberg Renaissance Foundation (HRF) supported the proposal.
4. Other Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs), mainly neighbours and members of the local community submitted multiple objections largely relating to social history and local associative values of the site, particularly its earlier agricultural context and associations with horse breeding activities.
5. The house, known as 'Blue Waters', is a mid-20th century double storey thatched farmhouse described by one neighbour in a letter of objection as a 'vernacular continuation of the Arts & Crafts ethos'. Although many windows have been replaced with standard modern items, some original fenestration and joinery elements remain.
6. The heritage report concludes that the house is 'not a good example' and assesses the site's cultural significance as 'not conservation worthy'.
7. The Committee noted and appreciated the level of detail in the application. Based on presentations made to the meeting and in the heritage report, the Committee found no compelling argument for intrinsic heritage value warranting retention of the existing house.
8. Concerns were raised in the meeting by I&APs regarding perceived shortcomings of the advertising process. These questions were addressed by HWC staff during the meeting.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the total demolition as there is no heritage significance to warrant retention.

SJ

13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS**13.1 Erf 3035, 51 Bryant Street, Bo-Kaap: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / BO-KAAP / ERF 3035**

Case No: HWC25062412SJ0625

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Mr Johan Cornelius (heritage consultant), Mr Tyrone Erleigh (attorney representing the applicant) and Mr Nic Smith (architect) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site graded Grade IIIC and is located in the Central City Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. A permit for redevelopment of the site was issued by HWC in November 2022.
3. At that time, the building had already deteriorated significantly, having lost its roof. Due to ongoing legal processes, the permit was not acted upon, and the structures have fallen into greater dereliction since then. Restoration of the façade is a key concern for protection of the heritage character of Bryant Street.
4. Further requirements were issued by the Committee at the BELCom meeting of 22 August 2025.
5. On 15 October 2025, the matter was held over pending legal representations submitted on behalf of the owner and the recent submission of a permit extension request for the original Record of Decision (RoD) issued in 2022. Clarification was required regarding the applicant's intentions, as the permit extension cannot be considered while a deviation application remains open before BELCom.
6. The Committee was advised that, in terms of Regulation 71, the 2022 permit was automatically suspended upon appeal and only resumed once confirmed by the Minister's Tribunal in June 2023. Accordingly, the three-year permit validity period runs from that date and is relevant to the extension request.
7. The applicant's representative sought clarification that the Minister's Appeal Committee's demolition decision is *functus officio* and therefore cannot be revisited or conditioned. On this basis, BELCom would only need to address the outstanding conditions of approval, rather than re-engage in any debate about the regarding demolition.
8. The Committee disagreed that the demolition decision is separable, noting that the permit including its conditions and associated design requirements must be considered as an integrated whole. The presence of multiple overlapping applications has created procedural complexity, leaving the full 2022 permit still before BELCom.

9. The applicant's representative reiterated that demolition has been authorised and is *functus officio*, and the only matter before BELCom is the request to replace the approved 15-bedroom design with the City-approved 9-bedroom layout, arguing that requiring a new full heritage application would be contrary to legislative intent, procedurally inefficient, and inconsistent with the applicant's right to a reasonable administrative process.
10. The applicant's representative further clarified that the 2022 demolition permit remains valid and following appeals, all demolition-related conditions accepted and unchanged, the sole amendment sought is reflect the City-required reduction from 15 to 9 bedrooms.
11. The applicant's representative emphasised that, in terms of policy, internal alterations to a new structure within "an approved for demolition footprint" fall under the City's planning authority. Prior heritage approvals by BELCom, the Appeal Committee, and the Minister's Tribunal had already addressed the relevant heritage considerations.
12. The applicant's representative noted that the Minister's Tribunal, in two separate rulings, reaffirmed the demolition decision (except for the façade), citing the deteriorated, unsalvageable condition of the rear and internal building fabric, which has no remaining heritage value.
13. The applicant's representative maintained that under the *functus officio* doctrine, the demolition decision is final and cannot be reopened, and that the only the current proposal is a minimal internal amendment with the reduction of bedrooms from 15 to 9 does not alter the building envelope, streetscape, or historic façade, and aligns with both heritage and municipal planning legislation.
14. The Committee acknowledged that the demolition has been previously approved by multiple authorities, but noted that, procedurally it may be cleaner for the applicant to submit a new application. The Committee requested the applicant's view on how the updated application should be considering in light of outstanding further requirements.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application as indicated on drawings numbered 2120 00_001 Rev B; 2120 20_201 Rev B; 2120 20_202 Rev B; 2120 21_201 Rev B; 2120 22_201 Rev A, dated 11 December 2024 and prepared by Objek Architecture-Interiors-Design on condition that:

1. The proposed re-use of the material of the historic stone plinth be reapplied in using similar techniques and expressed as a plinth, not as cladding.
2. The detailing of the street facing façade be retained and restored with special attention to existing plaster mouldings and patterns.
3. Lime plaster and renders be used on all historic clay fabric.
4. The project be monitored by an architect with heritage experience and that a closeout report be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

SJ

**13.2 Erf 889, 54 Kloofnek Road, Tamboerskloof: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / TAMBOERSKLOOF / ERF 889**

Case No: HWC25090804SVB0909

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 23 October 2025.

Mr Malaki Filliano (architect) and Ms Adelaide Combrink (CoCT) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The property is graded Grade IIIC and is located within the Upper Table Valley Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. A proposal has been submitted for extensive demolition of the existing late 19th century house and construction of a large upper storey addition.
3. The City of Cape Town submitted an objection to the proposal.
4. CIBRA supported the proposal.
5. The Committee noted that the proposal does not respond adequately to the context of Kloof Nek Road.
6. Particular concern was expressed by the Committee regarding extensive loss of historic fabric, form and footprint, including the removal of the original front door and remaining original sash windows, as well as the proposed oversized roof. These interventions were considered likely to diminish both intrinsic significance of the building and its positive contribution to the streetscape.
7. The Committee recommended that the applicant explore an adaptive reuse approach that retains the existing historic footprint and roof form (especially the street facing aspect) rather than demolishing everything behind the façade, to ensure better integration of new development within the existing framework.
8. The Committee advised that the applicant engage a heritage consultant to develop a more contextually sensitive design approach/design indicators, to ensuring that elements such as the existing roofscape typology, the rear platform and the garage are integrated cohesively into the proposal. This should include other heritage considerations, especially those related to the broader contextual setting on both sides of the street, and of varied vantage points along the sloping Kloof Nek

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate architectural heritage experience, to oversee the proposed interventions.
2. HWC is to be provided with details of the consultant and their CV supporting suitability to oversee the work.
3. The submitted CV to include similar projects and similar contexts.
4. A letter of appointment to be submitted to HWC.
5. A heritage statement is to be submitted to include the following:

- a. Statement of significance
 - b. An analysis of the streetscape of both sides of Kloof Nek Road and Leeukop Road.
 - c. Heritage indicators to be provided.
 - d. The proposed interventions to be placed within the streetscape and 3D studies e.g. photomontages to be provided.
6. The City's HPOZ guidelines and comments made by CoCT EHM are to be taken into account.
 7. The above must be circulated to I&APs for 30 days consultation period and comments for proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.

SBr

13.3 Proposed Alterations and Partial Demolition on Erven 31328 & 31329, 3 & 3A Hermitage Road, Rosebank: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ROSEBANK / ERVEN 31328 AND 31329

Case No: HWC25013103CN0212

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

Mr Christos Simos (architect) and Mr Kobus van Wyk (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The site is graded Grade IIIB and contains the 1894 Victorian villa, 'The Boltons', designed by architect William Adamson to be his own residence. A small, more recent cottage is also present on the site and is graded Not Conservation Worthy.
2. The Victorian villa has remained largely intact until unauthorised work was undertaken resulting in extensive internal remodelling as well as the surrounding grounds.
3. The Committee noted that due to the extent of unauthorised work and non-compliance with the HWC Stop Works order, BELCom required the applicant to prepare and implement a formal Heritage Maintenance Plan. This is to protect the building's heritage significance, ensure legislative compliance, and provide a sustainable long-term framework for upkeep, including technical guidance, heritage-specific considerations, documentation requirements, approvals processes, and ongoing review mechanisms.
4. The Committee expressed satisfaction (with certain reservations) regarding the thoroughness of the submitted Heritage Maintenance Management Plan, which forms part of further requirements towards preparation of a Heritage Mitigation Agreement.
5. It was noted that the extensive impervious surfacing introduced around the house would benefit from future mitigation measures including softened surfaces and appropriate planting, to reinstate and support the heritage character of the site's setting.
6. The Committee highlighted potential risks associated with installing showers over old timber floors, including sagging, water penetration, and structural movement, which may only become evident once damage has progressed. Similar concerns were raised regarding water ingress into walls which can manifest slowly over time and will require careful monitoring and appropriate support measures.

COMMENT:

1. The Committee resolved to support the Heritage Maintenance Management Plan, Revision 1, as prepared by Kobus van Wyk dated 26 October 2025. The mitigation agreement may be entered between the owner and HWC.
2. Appropriate hard landscaping along with softening of landscaping to be considered to allow sufficient drainage and run off away from the structure, and to ensure the integrity of the landscape of the site.
3. The concerns regarding the shower installed above existing timber floors must be assessed on the top and bottom, at regular intervals. This is to be included in the mitigation agreement.

CA

13.4 Erf 178928 (previously Erven 11121 & 11120), 78 Albert Road, Woodstock: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / WOODSTOCK / ERF 178928

Case No: HWC25091007SVB1028

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the case.

Ms Laura Milandri (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The property is graded Grade IIIC on the City of Cape Town's EGIS Viewer and is located within the Albert Road Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. A seven-storey apartment development for this site was previously approved by HWC's Impact Assessment Committee in 2019, although that permit has since expired. The same proposal now incorporating minor improvements, including additional architectural articulation to previously blank walls (inserting a glass block pattern into these walls) has now been submitted in line with the recommendations from previous process.
3. The City of Cape Town supported the proposal and the re-issue of the Section 34 permit.
4. The Woodstock Residents Association supported affordable family-sized accommodation but opposes permanent Airbnb and other short-term rentals.
5. The Committee noted that previous medium-rise developments in Woodstock may have contributed to gentrification, negatively impacted long term residents through overshadowing and reduced access, and failed to adequately address social housing and the area's social history considerations, yet these developments are now being used as precedent for additional high-rise developments.
6. It was further noted that amidst ongoing demographic changes and intensified development pressure in Woodstock, some areas remain at risk of decline, highlighting the need to balance development with the protection of local context and social character.
7. The Committee discussed the appropriateness of scale, articulation, and social responsiveness, noting the importance of design measures that mitigate height impacts, activate the street, and support social sustainability.
8. The Committee is generally supportive of the proposal as aligned with appropriate development for this area, noting in particular:

- a. The height is the main concern, particularly regarding shadowing and street-level impact.
- b. Globally, six stories are considered ideal for balancing density with sunlight, human scale, and streetscape comfort.
- c. Active street edges are essential to support urban vitality.
- d. Well-articulated facades improve visual interest and reinforce streetscape quality.
- e. The proposed includes a mix of one and two bed apartments suitable for families, with no micro apartments.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the application indicated on drawing numbered Mun_01 Rev E, Mun01 Rev E, Mun_03 Rev E, Mun_04 Rev E, Mun_06 Rev E, Mun_05 Rev I, Mun_09 Rev E, Mun_10 Rev E, Mun_12 Rev H, TWON_01 Rev F, dated 21 & 22 June 2024, 07 August 2024, and 18 & 30 September 2025 and prepared by WILH+CO as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SBr

13.5 Erf 9998, 13 Adderley Street, Cape Town City Centre: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CITY CENTRE / ERF 9998

Case No: HWC24101603SVB1030

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Thursday, 15 January 2026 at 11:00 (HB, HvdM, SJ, GJ and KDS). Due to the heritage significance of the site and the assessment required in order to review the proposal, a report back will be provided at the BELCom meeting on 28 January 2026.

SBr

13.6 Erf 4595, 55 St Georges Mall, SS Union Castle Building, Cape Town: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / CAPE TOWN CBD / ERF 4595

Case No: HWC24110609CSI1112

HELD OVER:

The matter is held over and will be tabled at the next BELCom meeting scheduled for 5 December 2025 to obtain specialist comment on the proposed methodology.

SJ

14 HERITAGE AREAS: SECTION 31 CONSENT APPLICATIONS

14.1 None

15 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 29 PERMIT

15.1 None

16 PROVINCIAL PROTECTION: SECTION 28 REFUSAL

16.1 None

17 HERITAGE REGISTER: SECTION 30 PROCESS

17.1 None

18 PUBLIC MONUMENTS & MEMORIALS: SECTION 37 PROCESS

18.1 None

19 REQUESTS FOR OPINION/ADVICE

19.1 None

20 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

20.1 None

21. NON-COMPLIANCE

21.1 None

22. OTHER

22.1 None

22. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS

The Committee resolved to adopt the resolutions and decisions as minuted.

23. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 16:20

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

5 December 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____