

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Friday, 13 March 2026 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 Sphiwo Mavumengwana (SM)
Mr Shawn Johnston (SJ)
Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)
Ms Karin Dugmore-Strom (KDS)

Members of Staff:

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)

Visitors:

Mr Andre Vercueil
Ms Lucy Pool

Mr Stuart Burnett

Apologies

None

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 13 March 2026.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 13 March 2026.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 25 February 2026

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 25 February 2026 and resolved to approve them without amendments.

6. Disclosure of conflict of interest and acceptance of the code of conduct:

All Committee members have accepted the Code of Conduct and five confirmed that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose except the Chairperson, Ms Boise, for one item 11.1.

6.1 Recusals

- HB: item 11.1

7. Confidential Matters

None

8. Administrative Matters

8.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported on the outcomes of the following Appeals matters:

- Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank
- Erf 9998, 13 Adderley Street, Cape Town City Centre

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

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 discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee reviewed outstanding compliance matters from the previous meeting, focusing on whether to address specific technical queries immediately or await a comprehensive submission from the applicant. While earlier requirements called for a consolidated report, updated methodology, and confirmation of compliance, members agreed that certain minor issues could be addressed to help progress the long-delayed application.

2. Key discussions centred on the proposed kitchen tile floor, concrete slab construction, and retaining walls. While the tile finish itself raised no significant heritage concerns, the committee emphasized the importance of proper damp-proofing, noting the risk of rising damp where new concrete interfaces with historic soft sun-baked brick walls. It was agreed that, although mitigation measures may be in place, the property owner should be clearly informed of potential long-term moisture risks and maintenance implications.
3. The retaining walls were discussed in terms of both functionality and visual impact. At the rear, the focus was on effective water management, including drainage solutions. At the front, concerns were raised about the height and visual intrusion of new walls within the curtilage of the historic homestead. The committee recommended reducing wall heights where possible and introducing appropriate landscaping, including planting, to soften the visual impact and better integrate the development into its heritage context.
4. The heritage practitioner confirmed that a damp-proof membrane had been installed and that water diversion measures were in place. They also agreed to proposed improvements, including landscaping interventions and adjustments to wall heights. Additionally, it was confirmed that external timber elements would be treated in line with committee recommendations.
5. Given the technical complexity of the discussions, the Committee agreed to draft final comments and recommendations outside the meeting to ensure clarity and accuracy. These will be circulated to members for review, with the aim of finalizing guidance promptly and facilitating progress on the application.

COMMENT:

The Committee will provide comments by Tuesday, 17 March 2026.

SVMB

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

For noting

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

- Proposed Additions on Erf 497, 19 Cavalcade Road, Green Point

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 Proposed Additions on Erf 497, 19 Cavalcade Road, Green Point: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / GREEN POINT / ERF 497

Case No: 26961CN0106

HB recused herself from this item. The Committee nominated HvdM to chair this item.

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 6 March 2026. Please see attached SI1.

Ms Elize Mendelsohn (CoCT), Ms Heidi Boise (heritage consultant), Mr Stuart Burnett (Green Point Ratepayers Association) and Ms Lucy Pool (I&AP) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. A site inspection report was ~~then~~ presented, highlighting the building's significant architectural layering from the 18th C through to later periods, its high level of intactness, and its rarity within the broader Cape Town context.
2. The building was described as a well-preserved and valued heritage resource, with strong evidence of careful custodianship by current owners.
3. A key focus of discussion was the grading and significance of the building. While it is currently graded at a local level, the Committee expressed the view that its architectural integrity, rarity, and layered historical development may justify a higher grading, potentially at a provincial level.
4. The need for further research—particularly comparative architectural analysis and deeper exploration of social and historical context—was emphasized to support a more definitive assessment of significance.
5. The Committee also discussed proposed additions to the building, particularly a roof extension. While there was some openness to the concept of an additional layer, there was broad concern that the current design proposals, including mansard and alternative approaches, were not sufficiently sensitive to the building's heritage significance.
6. The Committee stressed that any intervention must be explicitly informed by the building's significance, with appropriate design principles and precedents guiding future proposals.
7. External factors, such as the potential acquisition of adjacent land, were acknowledged but deemed outside the Committee's mandate.
8. The Committee indicated that further requirements are necessary before a final decision can be made. These include strengthening the heritage statement, undertaking additional research to substantiate significance, and refining design indicators to ensure that any proposed interventions are appropriate, sensitive, and aligned with the building's heritage value.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

1. The design proposals as presented are not supported by the Committee as they negatively impact the heritage resource.
2. The Committee notes that the building is earlier than indicated in the heritage consultant's report (for further detail refer to the Committee site inspection report). The degree of intactness and architectural significance of its various period layers suggest that this building may be considerably more noteworthy than previously realised. This architectural significance along with social significance must be further explored in addressing the balance of the various types of significance that is typically associated with these properties. A broad desktop comparison of this property with others of similar provenance using existing databases covering the City Bowl and Newlands is required.
3. Consequently, the applicant is to revisit the heritage statement and heritage indicators for this property as the outcomes will influence the manner in which proposed extensions to this building would occur without unduly impacting the heritage significance of the property.
4. The discussion of the Committee in this matter raised several points of importance. The summary of this discussion is to be considered when the heritage reporting above is revisited.

CN

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 None

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 11:15

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

22 April 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON _____

DATE _____

SECRETARY _____

DATE _____