

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of Heritage Western Cape
Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom)
Commenced at 08:30 and held on Wednesday, 17 September 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)

Members of Staff:

Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CSi)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Sofia Briel (SBr)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Yusrah Hoosain (YH)

Visitors:

Mr Clive Theunissen
Mr Kobus van Wyk

Mr Christos Simon
Ms Charlotte Chamberlain

Apologies

Mr Graham Jacobs (GJ)

Absent

None

4. Approval of Agenda

4.1 Dated 17 September 2025.

The Committee approved the agenda dated 17 September 2025.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

5.1 BELCom Minutes dated 22 August 2025

The Committee resolved to approve the minutes at the next BELCom meeting.

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 matters:

- Proposed Additions and Alterations on Erf 1397, Bonne Esperance Boutique Guest House, 19 Van Riebeeck Street, 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

None

9.2 Report back on HWC Council Meetings

Nothing to report.

9.3 Discussion of agenda

Noted

9.4 Proposed Site Inspections

- Erf 45516, 3 Nursery Road, Rosebank
- Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank

9.5 Site Inspections Undertaken

None

10. Appointments

None

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES: SECTION 27 PERMIT APPLICATIONS

11.1 None

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

12.1 Erf 45516, 3 Nursery Road, Rosebank: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ROSEBANK / ERF 45516

Case No: HWC25080109CN0804

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Thursday, 2 October 2025 at 11:00 (HB, HvdM, GJ and KDS).

SBr

12.2 Erf 5573, 52 Jan Van Riebeeck Drive, Paarl: NM HM/ CAPE WINELANDS/ DRAKENSTEIN/ PAARL/ ERF 5573

Case No: HWC24080116CSI0306

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the case.

Mr Clive Theunissen (Drakenstein Municipality) was present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee noted that the structure is currently ungraded, has a suggested grading of 3C from Drakenstein Heritage Advisory Committee (DHAC), and is located outside any Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
2. The Committee noted that the application was heard at the HOMS meeting on 4 August 2025, at which stage further requirements were requested.
3. DHAC, Paarl 300 and the Drakenstein Heritage Foundation (DHF) submitted comments objecting to the proposed demolition.
4. The Committee was informed that the building has remained vacant and has deteriorated over the last few years and that little has been done to address its condition.
5. The Committee acknowledged the need for Heritage Western Cape to provide guidance on how to proceed.
6. The Committee queried whether alternative uses for the building such as community outreach or other municipal functions had been considered.
7. The Drakenstein Municipality Engineering Department provided a response to the objections, as they are inclined toward demolition due to maintenance and funding challenges.
8. It is the view of DHAC that the buildings could be reinstated, repaired, and repurposed. However, funding is often a limiting factor, and one potential solution is to release the site to the public to enable private funding for adaptive reuse, such as residential flats.

Consideration would also need to be given to the portion of land released to ensure viable development, including parking and other site requirements.

9. BELCom noted that it would have been preferable for the Drakenstein Municipality Engineering Department, which submitted the demolition application, to be present at the meeting. Concern was expressed regarding the absence of parts of the municipality, which made it difficult to fully consider all perspectives on the proposed demolition.
10. It was noted that the heritage reporting provided was prepared in the context of addressing prior illegal works, rather than specifically to inform consideration of the matter at hand, being the proposed demolition of the building. Refer - Heritage Report prepared by Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects (RSA), April 2019.
11. It was noted that the building is a key landmark within the urban environment, with significance extending beyond its physical fabric to include social and intangible heritage values, including historical associations with forced removals and past ownership and use. The RSA study highlighted these aspects, emphasizing that heritage value is not limited only to concentrations of heritage buildings. The building's architectural elements, such as the double-storey colonnade, contribute to place-making and urban character. It was further noted that the building could potentially be saved, with repair and adaptive reuse options available, and that the current market valuation may not reflect its heritage significance. Consideration should also be given to existing and potential future uses, including mechanisms to ensure heritage protection through sale and/or development conditions.
12. The Committee acknowledged the cultural and historical significance of the building, particularly its association with forced removals and the social memory of the community. It was noted that demolition would further erase these important historical moments and that such sites represent key aspects of place-making and communal heritage, which should be recognized and celebrated.
13. The Committee noted concerns regarding the rationale for demolition, highlighting that the structural issues identified, including foundation settlement and deep cracks, could potentially be repaired. It was further noted that issues such as cable theft do not constitute sufficient grounds for demolition. The Committee emphasized the importance of retaining and restoring the heritage fabric and expressed that the building should be repurposed to protect both its tangible and intangible heritage. The Committee recommended exploring ways to promote and commemorate the intangible heritage linked to the site while preserving the physical structure.
14. BELCom members noted their opposition to the demolition of the building. It was highlighted that the 2019 heritage report refers to an historical under-representation of diverse histories. The site offers an opportunity for strong place-making on Main Street as well as recovery of heritage significance.
15. The Committee emphasized that the building should be restored and integrated into a purpose that serves the Paarl community. It was further noted that the absence of the engineering department limited discussion on their motivations, which were not seen to adequately address heritage considerations.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to refuse the application for total demolition.

CSI

**12.3 Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ROSEBANK / ERF 45507**

Case No: HWC25012412XM0729

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Thursday, 2 October 2025 at 11:45 (HB, HvdM, GJ and KDS).

XM

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

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

Case No: HWC25013103CN0212

Ms Chane Herman introduced the case.

Mr Kobus van Wyk (heritage consultant), Mr Christos Simos (architect) and Ms Charlotte Chamberlain (Rosebank and Mowbray Planning and Architectural Committee - RAMPAC) were present and took part in the discussions.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. No 3A is graded 3B and contains a Victorian villa dating to 1894 and described as a 'very good architectural example'.
2. No 3 is noted as Not Conservation Worthy and contains a small cottage not older than 60 years.
3. The site is located within a proposed Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ).
4. HWC officials issued a stop works order on 23 January 2025, and the City of Cape Town issued three stop works orders; however, the work continued despite these orders.
5. The architect and consultants advised the owner to adhere to stop works orders while authorities, including the police, also intervened. However, the owner persisted, citing financial and project progress pressures.
6. This application therefore pertains to unauthorized work as all alteration work has already been completed.
7. The Committee stated that it cannot support the unauthorized work undertaken nor the applicant's consistent disregard for the City of Cape Town and Heritage Western Cape directives.
8. The City of Cape Town's Environment and Heritage Management comments state that the heritage significance of the resource has been drastically impacted due to the severity and extent of the unauthorized work.
9. RAMPAC did not provide comment initially.

10. The case was initially presented at HOMS on 19 May 2025. A Heritage Statement was required to address the unauthorized work and present proposals for mitigation.
11. The Committee acknowledged that focus of discussion should be on proposed mitigation measures as presented in the Heritage Statement .
12. The Committee expressed support for implementation of the proposed mitigation measures and for the owner to enter into a heritage agreement with Heritage Western Cape with one member dissenting and supported outright refusal of the application due the stop works orders the applicant violated.
13. A management plan is to be prepared before a heritage agreement can be drawn up.
14. The Committee noted that the heritage resource required much more careful heritage-based assessment and planning prior to any construction commencing.
15. BELCom expressed concern that support of a mitigation plan in this context could set a negative precedent, effectively rewarding disregard for heritage legislation.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

HWC cannot condone illegal work. The applicant is to enter into a mitigation agreement once the proposed management plan has been submitted to and approved by BELCom.

CH

13.2 Partial Demolition & Redevelopment of Erf 1061-RE, 12 Main Road, Hout Bay: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / HOUT BAY / ERF 1061 REMAINDER

Case No: HWC24091804EJV0818

The matter was withdrawn from the agenda.

EJV

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 10:40

24 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

15 October 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIRPERSON_____

DATE_____

SECRETARY_____

DATE_____