

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Friday, 3 December 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 Sipiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Members of Staff:

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)

Visitors:

Mr Andre Vercueil
Ms Nelia Wolfaardt

Ms Anja Lareman
Mr Lotang'amwaki Mollel

Apologies

None

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 5 December 2025.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 5 December 2025.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 19 November 2025

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 19 November 2025 and resolved to approve them with amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest:

None

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

Nothing to report.

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.

Mr Andre Vercueil (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

The site is a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) consisting of a late 18th century farmhouse with 10m curtilate and a brandy distillery.

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. Monitoring and compliance

- a. The HWC permit requires regular monitoring and submission of progress reports.
- b. The document 'Schedule of Heritage Timing and Content Monitoring' dated 13 August 2025 sets out various requirements, including monthly site visits by the heritage practitioner. However, while it also refers to close and detailed supervision, we are not seeing evidence of that level of oversight in practice. The project architect also needs to provide clarity and unpack several practical issues related to site attendance and monitoring.
- c. Mr Vercueil (heritage consultant) noted that frequent monitoring is difficult due to the remote location resulting in site visits taking place only once a month.
- d. The contractor and owner record progress during the weeks in between.

- e. Mr Vercueil noted that it became evident that the owner and contractor have made changes on site without prior consultation with himself as the heritage consultant. This has resulted in deviations from approved specifications and raises concerns about non-compliance.
 - f. Reports 2 and 3 include descriptions of roof reconstruction up to near completion.
 - g. Report 3, amongst other, noted a deviation being the use of Portland cement where the use of lime only had been specified. The report also notes consultation with HWC whereby strict use of lime was recorded.
 - h. Report 4 notes that cement was being applied to soft clay brick regardless of the repeated 'no cement' directive, citing the lack of a ready supply of lime products in the area.
 - i. Report 5 describes the insertion of a concrete floor adjacent to historic soft clay brick walls. Concerns were expressed about the detail of the junction between inserted floor and walls, as rising damp into old walls can result from incorrect detailing.
 - j. Photos keyed to the approved plans will aid the clarity of the progress reports.
 - k. A formal close-out report must contain detailed descriptions of all aspects of the work to the roof and other parts of the historic structure. Roof reconstruction as described in interim reports are to be collated into a full description of work involving the roof. Photographs provided should include close-up details, for example showing the details of assembly.
 - l. The close-out report must provide clarity on the condition of historic fabric as found, describe all new materials that were introduced and provide motivation for reconstruction as opposed to restoration. All original fabric that remains is to be documented. All processes are to be clearly described and motivated.
2. Specification and Methodology
- a. It is important to note that the monitoring reports are separate from the specification and methodology document as they serve different purposes. This distinction must be maintained.
 - b. The Committee noted the reported difficulty in sourcing sun-baked bricks and recommended the procurement of suitable kiln fired clay bricks.
 - c. The critical factor is not necessarily the softness of the bricks themselves, but rather the softness of the mortar used between them.
 - d. Whether the work involves stone or brick, the key requirement is that the mortar must allow for movement and flexibility within the wall.
 - e. For this reason, the use of kiln fired bricks is acceptable if paired with a lime mortar or even a clay-lime mortar, which would be preferable.
 - f. This approach also has the advantage of allowing future distinction between original and new work once plaster is removed, as the differences would be more visible.
 - g. In summary, the priority should be the appropriate lime mortar and lime plaster composition rather than the specific softness or hardness of the brick.
 - h. An appropriate lime-based mix to stabilise reveals is also required (this referring to Report 4 noting that concrete was cast at the base of unstable reveals).
3. Proposed site inspection
- a. The Committee noted at the previous meeting that issuing a stop-work order or going to site was not possible.

- b. Hearing that construction work on site will be continuing into the builders' holiday and given concerns about non-compliance with the approved specifications and conditions of the permit, the committee resolved to conduct a site visit.

COMMENT:

Reference is made to the methodology statement titled 'Draft Emergency Repairs – Heritage Materials & Specification Report for Traditional Building Methodology and Materials', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and dated 22.08.2025, which was submitted as part of the Interim Report 1 as per the requirements of the HWC BELCom Permit dated 26.08.2025 and all subsequent reports:

1. Interim report 2: 'HWC Case No. HWC25031701SVB328 - Portion 1 (Wit Plaats) of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Klaarstroom, Prins Albert', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and dated August 2025
2. Interim report 3: 'HWC Case No. HWC25031701SVB328 - Portion 1 (Wit Plaats) of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Klaarstroom, Prins Albert', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and dated September 2025
3. Interim report 4: 'HWC Case No. HWC25031701SVB328 - Portion 1 (Wit Plaats) of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Klaarstroom, Prins Albert', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and date October 2025
4. Interim report 5: 'HWC Case No. HWC25031701SVB328 - Portion 1 (Wit Plaats) of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Klaarstroom, Prins Albert', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and dated November 2025

Response to concerns noted in Interim report (4) 26.10.2025:

1. Item 13: Methodology specifications for sunbaked bricks have not been strictly adhered to, as the project manager has not been able to source sunbaked bricks. However, the project manager and contractor have been urged to follow the methodology statement issued for the project.

The Committee noted the difficulty in obtaining sunbaked bricks and recommends that an alternative kiln fired hard brick could be used provided that the bedding mortars are either lime or lime/clay soft mortars (with no Portland cement added).

2. Item 25: Methodology specifications for lime plasters have not been strictly adhered to. There has been experimental use of splash-plaster coating to stabilize a portion of the sunbaked brick, while awaiting the delivery of the lime plaster to site.

This deviation is of great concern as the PPC cement layer applied to stabilize existing soft clay brick work contradicts the approved methodology and specification for traditional, compatible plaster to be applied. Refer to amongst other, items 8, 9 and 16 in the 'Draft Emergency Repairs – Heritage Materials & Specification Report for Traditional Building Methodology and Materials', prepared by André Vercueil Professional Architects and dated 22.08.2025,

Various premix lime plaster products are now available, and it is recommended to directly consult suppliers of such products. The use of traditional lime mortars, plasters and renders on this project is non-negotiable, whether one of the approved pre-mixes with no cement, or an on-site mix with no cement.

3. Item 34: The methodology for new openings in historic walls was not used in the case of the opening in the Eastern wall, due to the contractor not being able to sawcut such a thick opening

It was also noted in the interim report that a concrete edge was cast onto the base of the wall of the newly cut opening. The use of concrete utilizing PPC is of concern due to its incompatibility with traditional wall materials. The methodology statement must include a specification for lime-based options to provide stability to fragile wall edges.

4. General concerns to be addressed:
 - a. Updated specification and methodology report
 - b. Interim reports to contain amongst others:
 - i. Each item to be properly referenced and contextualised.
 - ii. Greater level of technical descriptions.
 - c. Roof structure detailed closeout report
 - d. Burra Charter Terminology and principles must be referenced in all reports
 - e. Working drawings to be updated to match an updated methodology and specification report, and this must be available from the contractor on site.
 - f. Monitoring time frames
 - g. Windows and doors reasons for replacement/ restoration
 - h. Concrete insertions
5. The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on 22-23 December 2025 (GJ, KDS and HB and HvdM joining in their own capacity).

SBr

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

For noting

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Portion 1 of the Farm Vrolykheid No. 177, Witplaats, Klaarstroom, Prince Albert

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

None

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Erf 2231, 165 Main Road, Paarl: MA HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ ERF 2231

Case No: HWC25100703CH1007

Ms Chane Herman introduced the case.

Ms Nelia Wolfaardt (architect) and Ms Anja Lareman (heritage consultant) were 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 inside the Paarl Special Character Protected Overlay Zone and immediately adjacent to the landmark Strooidak Church.
2. A Victorian house faces the street, with later structures located at the back of the site.
3. A mitigation agreement resulting from unauthorised work by a previous owner is in place and is now binding on the new owner. This application is for variations to the plans attached to the mitigation agreement.
4. The current submission shows significantly reduced detail compared to earlier versions.
5. Landscape drawing
 - a. The Committee noted that the landscape drawings presented appear to be at sketch or concept-level rather than detailed construction drawings. Clarification is required regarding which drawings are intended to be stamped off, as the landscape plan as submitted does not seem to meet the level of detail typically required for approval.
 - b. The Committee has no objection to the concept landscape proposal as presented.
6. Recent buildings to the rear of the site
 - a. The new ablution block is indicated only subtly (through faint colouring) and is not clearly identified as a new intervention.
 - b. The drawings to show and annotate the variations from the mitigation plans.
7. Victorian house and wall with gate
 - a. Previous descriptive information such as notes on floor finishes, gate materials and details and other specifications is now missing.
 - b. The room where the original timber floor had been removed is now to be repurposed as toilets. Section B-B shows a timber floor, but this is not described or annotated as new elements. The distinction between existing and new fabric is unclear.
 - c. Overall, the drawings do not in all instances highlight proposed variations from the mitigation plans, nor do they provide the level of detail expected for works to a heritage structure.
 - d. The proposal for the steel bar gate as shown on the west elevation at 1:100 scale appears acceptable at a conceptual level.

8. The Committee supports the landscape and gate proposals in principle but requires improved clarity and detail before any drawings can be stamped off.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve an addendum to the mitigation agreement dated 16 February 2024 as set out in the revised proposal with the following amendments as indicated on drawing numbered 25123-C-003 and 25123-C-002, revision C dated 27 November 2025 as prepared by Stone Projects and the landscape sketch plan prepared by L. Uys Consulting Architect as having met previous requirements subject to:

1. Detailed design drawing for the gate.
2. A consolidated set of plans to be submitted in one package with cross referencing between drawings where relevant, with drawing numbers and dates supplied with instance.

CH

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

12.1 None

13 STRUCTURES OLDER THAN 60 YEARS: SECTION 34 PERMIT FOR PARTIAL DEMOLITION/ALTERATIONS

13.1 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

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Mr Lotang'amwaki Mollel (applicant) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The property is a Grade 3C heritage structure, located within the Central City Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The Committee confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed works in principle.
3. In the past year, additional requirements have been issued concerning the cleaning and painting of various materials on the structure.
4. The applicant has submitted a Methodology Statement in response to the conditions issued as part of the further requirements. This submission is intended to address the technical concerns around treatment of the different façade materials.
5. The Committee noted that the application had previously been held over at the meeting of 19 November 2025.
6. The Committee supports the proposal, as the applicant has met the previously issued requirements.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the revised proposal as having met previous further requirements listed as the following:

1. Revised methodology report titled, "*Methodology Statement for Cleaning Marble, Granite & Bronze Window Casings, Paint System on Plaster & Concrete*", dated 3 December 2025, prepared by Evolve Habitats (Pty);
2. Design presentation titled, "*55 St George's*", dated 28 January 2025 and prepared by Inc-Solutions; and
3. Plascon paint specification titled "*St Georges Mall - Feature Wall For Mural*", dated 15 October 2024 and prepared by Plascon

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 11:50

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

28 January 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON_____

DATE_____

SECRETARY_____

DATE_____

APPROVED