

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 20 July 2026 at 08:00 via MS Teams**

1. Opening and Welcome

The Chairperson, Stephanie Barnardt, officially opened the meeting at 08:00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	SB
Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM
Ms. Sofia Briel... <i>left @10:43</i>	Heritage Officer	SVB
Emily Jane Vowles... <i>left @15:15</i>	Specialist Heritage Officer	EJV
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI

Staff

Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD
Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Chloe Petrus	I&APs	CP
Ms. Jwalene Lekama	Administrative Intern	JL
Mr. Olwethu Dlova <i>joined @10:15</i>	Backup Secretariat	OD

Legal Advisor

Ms. Penelope Meyer <i>joined @8:30</i>	Deputy Director	PM
--	-----------------	-----------

Observers

Yunus Ogier	Heritage Officer	YO
-------------	------------------	-----------

Visitors

	Capacity	Item
Mr. Aubrey Matthews	Observer	14.29
Mr. Breyten Free	Architect	13.4
Mr. Chris Schoeman	Consultant	13.4
Mr Nicolas Lightbody	Owner	13.4
Mr Zachary Carstens	Observer	13.4
Mr. Nick Smith	Representing the objector	13.5
Ms. Joné Krös	Applicant	14.40
Mr. Clive Theunissen	Drakenstein Municipality	(Drakenstein matters)
Prof. Walter Peters	Heritage Practitioner	13.24
Mr. Barrie Gasson	Kalk Bay Historical Association; Kalk Bay and St James Ratepayers & Residents Association	13.24
Mr Ebrahim Sallie	Better Mount Chief	13.2
Mr. Byron Nichles	Owner	13.6
Ms. Pamela Ndlovela	Architect	13.20

Ms. Cillie Malan	Architect	13.24
Mr. Neil Morrison	Owner	13.24
Mrs. Carol Morrison	Owner	13.24
Ms. Victoria Delacour	Architect	14.47
Ms. Quahnita Sammie	Consultant	13.5
Mr. Andrew Berman	Owner	13.6
Ms. Nazeema Duarte	Saldanha Bay Municipality	13.4
Ms. Christine Havenga	Applicant	13.6
Mr. Coen Nienaber	Applicant	13.16
Ms Ellen Aucamp	on behalf of Owner	14.5
Mr Jonathan Kaplan	Consultant	13.32
Mr. Ashley Lillie	Consultant	14.5
Prof. Ronnie Donalds	Consultant	13.38
Ms. Tama Lembani	Architect	14.34
Ms. Tanja Kruger	Architect	14.32
Mr Wayne Roos	Observer	(all items)

3. Apologies

Ms Aneeqah Brown

Secretariat

AB

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 the Agenda

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 20 July 2026 with the following additions:

CSI moved to adopt the agenda and CN seconded.

6. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting

6.1. The Committee resolved to approve the previous minutes of 6 July 2026 with minor edits. XM moved to adopt the approval of the minutes and CN seconded.

7. Disclosure of Conflict of Interest

7.1. None.

8. Confidential Matters

8.1. None.

9. Standing Items

9.1. Site Inspections Undertaken

9.1.1 None

9.2 Proposed Site Inspections

9.2.1 None.

9.3 Site Inspection Reports

9.3.1 Erven 153-RE, 151-RE & 318, Sea Point Pavillion and Swimming Pool, Beach Road, Sea Point (CSI)

DISCUSSION

- The site inspection report was held over to incorporate further considerations as discussed.

- The site inspection was undertaken by Heritage Western Cape officials and the City of Cape Town representatives to assess the heritage significance of the Sea Point Pavilion and Swimming Pool, evaluate proposed redevelopment works, and identify maintenance activities that may qualify for exemption under the NHRA.
- The pavilion is a Grade IIIA heritage resource of high historical, architectural, social and contextual significance. It is a prominent landmark along the Sea Point Promenade and has served as a public recreational facility for over a century.
- The proposed redevelopment includes refurbishment of the pool precinct, relocation of the pump room, construction of a new entrance and restaurant, infrastructure upgrades, improved accessibility, and associated landscaping works.
- The inspection found the pools, pavilion and surrounding facilities to be generally well maintained, with only minor repairs required. Although the existing pump infrastructure is outdated, the overall heritage character and recreational function of the site remain intact.
- The Committee discussed that there is materiality on site that requires greater consideration in the exemptions section. The Terrazzo elements, the timber elements, and the face brick of the pavilion and wings need specific attention in the exemptions section as they cannot be treated lightly and any proposal that may affect this materiality should require a full s34 application.

COMMENT

The Committee notes the contents of the site inspection report dated 7 June 2026 and endorses the recommendations of the report, as follows:

1. The site inspection and report to be noted at HOMs on 20 July 2026.
2. The redevelopment of the site is subject to HWC approval. All development proposals must be submitted to HWC.
3. The exemptions & application requirements as detailed in the site inspection report to be endorsed by HOMs and subject to a Heritage Agreement.

9.4 Preparation for Upcoming Committee Meetings

- 9.4.1** IACom – 22 July 2026
- 9.4.2** BELCom – 29 July 2026
- 9.4.3** HOMs – 3 August 2026

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

- 9.5.1** None

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

- 9.6.1** None.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

- 9.7.1** Matters Arising: 13.18, 13.33
- 9.7.2** New Matters: 14.3, 14.4, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9, 14.12, 14.13, 14.14, 14.15, 14.17, 14.26, 14.27, 14.28, 14.29, 14.31, 14.35, 14.36, 14.37, 14.38, 14.39, 14.43, 14.44, 14.45, 14.46, 14.48, 14.49, 14.50, 14.52, 14.53, 14.54, 14.55, 14.56,

9.8 Decisions Taken Under ASD delegation

- 9.8.1** Matters Arising: None
- 9.8.2** New Matters: None

9.9 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW Graded Within the CoCT

- 9.9.1** Matter Arising: None.
- 9.9.2** New Matters: None.

9.10 Archaeological Matters

- 9.10.1** Erven 2662 & 15653, Cathedral & Memorium Street, George, S36 – GPR Survey
Case No.: HWC26042901SB0408

DISCUSSION

- A Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey was carried out to check for unmarked graves in the planned development area. The work included a review of existing information, aerial photos, a geological assessment, and a GPR survey covering six blocks and three exploratory lines. The team used a 350 MHz GPR system with GNSS positioning and analysed the data to look for underground features that might suggest graves. The report notes several factors that made the survey difficult, such as clay-rich soils, wet ground after heavy rain, standing water, concrete, coarse gravel, and surface interference. These conditions reduced how well the radar could detect underground features. When the team tested the equipment over known graves, the results were weak and unclear, showing how challenging the conditions were. In Survey Blocks 1, 2, 3, and 5, no signs of unmarked graves were found. Any anomalies in these areas were linked to natural soil layers, rocks, tree roots, surface objects, plants, or survey artefacts. In Blocks 4 and 6, the team found underground features that were likely remains of old buildings, foundations, trenches, building rubble, or concrete, not graves. The report concludes that no evidence of unmarked graves was found in the surveyed areas, but the results should be viewed in light of the survey's limitations.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the report titled "Ground Penetrating Radar survey to assess the possible presence of graves at Erven 2662 and 15653, Cathedral and Memorium Street, George, Western Cape Province", dated 14 May 2026, and prepared by PGS Heritage, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 4 May 2026 (HWC26042901SB0408)

9.11 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders Issued

9.11.1 None.

9.12 Permit Deadline: Close of business Tuesday, 21 July.

9.13 SAHRIS Rollout Feedback:

RB has returned from leave and needs to check in with the SAHRIS admin team to confirm the migration of the S35/S36 webform from stage to live and the launch date with the ASD. Specifics will be provided at the next HOMs.

A Built Environment checklist is the next urgent task.

A SAHRIS engagement is planned for Friday the 7th of August. Specifics will be communicated in due course.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1. Erf 361, Riebeeck Kasteel (RB)

DISCUSSION

- HWC was contacted in June regarding works occurring at Erf 361.
- The structure on that Erf is only barely older than 60 years and is a modernist Church building that was not graded in the Swartland Survey as it was not yet older than 60 years (foundation stone is dated 1959).
- Swartland Municipality approved the works in terms of the NBR but no NHRA applications were lodged with HWC.
- HWC asked the owner to stop the work via e-mail.
- HWC has now been contacted by RSA to find out if HWC would be open to processing the regularisation application via Section 34 instead of Section 38 as although there is a trigger in terms of Section 38 as four years ago three erven were subdivided RSA believes that Section 34 is the better mechanism with which to resolve this application.
- The Committee debated the situation but also noted that if there is a Section 38(1) trigger, then this must be submitted for compliance with the NHRA.
- The applicant can be advised that they can proceed with a Section 34 application while the Section 38(1) NID is submitted, in order to conduct the relevant consultation, but the applicant

must note that the Section 34 application would be put on hold if the Further Studies are requested as a result of the Section 38(1) NID and that these studies can address the requirements of any other legislation via Section 38(10).

COMMENT

The Committee resolved that Section 38(1)(c)(ii) is triggered and a Section 38(1) NID must be submitted. Should No Further Studies be applicable in terms of Section 38(2), then a Section 34(1) permit application must be submitted and if Further Studies are requested in terms of Section 38(2) then the relevant legislative requirements of Section 38 are applicable.

10.2. Erf 476, 13 Church Street, Prince Albert (XM)

Case No.: 19111803LB1128E

DISCUSSION

- The applicant has submitted as-built drawings for record purposes, advising that the majority of the works approved under the 2020 HWC permit were not undertaken. The Municipality has requested that the drawings must be submitted to HWC and that HWC must provide a letter acknowledging receipt for record purposes, as the property is currently being transferred to a new owner.
- It is proposed that HWC issue a letter confirming receipt of the documentation, noting that the work undertaken is substantially in accordance with the approved permit and that no further action by HWC is required. Requesting the committee's advise to confirm whether this approach is acceptable or the owner should submit a Section 34 application.

COMMENT

The Committee resolved to approve the as-built plans as per the drawings numbered WD01-WD4 Rev 1, dated 23 May 2026, and prepared by W. Freysen as being substantially in accordance with the previous HWC approval dated 5 March 2020.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1. Erf 3346-RE, Tokai Manor House, Tokai, S27 – Minor Work

Case No: 28716EJV0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399356>

DISCUSSION

- On 15 June 2026 HOMs resolved to approve the application to replace the existing distribution boards within the Tokai Manor House and in the Annex to the north, as well as their connection to the incoming mains supply on condition that:
 4. The exact position and routing of all services must be agreed with a heritage consultant prior to installation.
 5. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified practitioner with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Katie Smuts to monitor the proposed work.
 6. A close-out report, inclusive of a Certificate of Electrical Compliance, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.
- On 6 July 2026, HWC were provided the CV and appointment letter for Mike Scurr of RSA to assist Katie Smuts in the monitoring brief.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the appointment of Mike Scurr to monitor the proposed work in compliance with the Section 27 permit issued on 18 June 2026.

11.2. UitKoms Farm 348/1, Bo-Swaarmoed Road, Ceres, S34 – Additions and Alteration

Case No: 28841SB0611 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402473>

DISCUSSION

- On 6 July 2026 HOMs resolved to approve the application on condition:
 1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate heritage experience to oversee the proposed work and to submit a close out report within 30 days

practical completion.

2.HWC is to be provided with the details of the consultant and their CV confirming suitability to oversee the work.

3.A letter of appointment to be signed by the applicant and consultant.

- The applicant has provided an updated POA that confirms that Malherbe en Rust Argiteker (Pty) Ltd has been appointed to undertake the architectural work associated with the submission.
- A detailed CV and AHP membership certificate was also provided which is signed.
- The above fulfils the condition 1 to 3

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. The work must be monitored by a suitably qualified architect with heritage experience. The committee endorsed the appointment of Malherbe en Rust Argiteker (Pty) Ltd to monitor the proposed work.
2. A close-out report, compiled by Malherbe en Rust Argiteker (Pty) Ltd, must be submitted to HWC within 30 days of practical completion.

12. Discussion of the Agenda

12.1. Item 13.4 Erf 120, 1 Bree Street, Langebaan, S34 – Additions and Alterations

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

DISCUSSION

- On 23 February 2026 HOMs resolved to issue further requirements for the applicant to respond to the objections received anonymously and for all parties to be invited to HOMs. The further requirements have been met.
- The Committee confirmed that criminal charges or a mitigation agreement would not be appropriate given the limited heritage value of the property and its context.
- The Committee resolved to hear the item under 13.4 on the agenda.

12.2. Item 13.23 Erf 9013, 29 Morgenster Avenue, Somerset West, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: 28422SVB0506 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397674>

DISCUSSION

- The matter was heard at HOMs on 25 May 2026 where the committee referred the application to BELCom due to *"due to complexities arising from the associated S38(4) application (HWC24092511CSI1610) for the same property."* The matter was then heard at BELCom on 24 June 2026 where the committee resolved to *"The Committee agreed to hold this matter over for input by HWC's legal advisor."* After further consultation with HWC's legal advisor it was determined that the best course of action would be to place the matter back on the HOMs agenda for re-consideration by the HOMs the committee.
- On Friday 17 July 2026 HWC received information considered to be an objection and an indication of work having commenced on site.
- This matter was discussed by the committee with input from the legal adviser and it was decided that the matter be held over in order to investigate the information received on 17 July 2026.

12.3. Item 13.20 Erf 4507-RE, 85 St Georges Mall, Cape Town City Centre, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: HWC25090310SVB1121

DISCUSSION

- In 2019, HWC approved a similar proposal for internal alterations to upgrade the hotel. The proposal included a different internal layout of new walls; however the proposed work was all internal (19012512TZ1007E). The approved work was never carried out, and the permit has since lapsed.
- In 2021 HWC approved an application for Minor Works (21012513KB0609E).

- On 13 August 2025 IACom endorsed an HIA for development of this property and the neighbouring two properties, Erven 4508 and 4509 (HWC24010803SJ0108)
- The tenants of the property, with the permission of the property owners have now submitted an application for approval of a similar proposal to the one approved in 2019.
- The matter was discussed by the committee, and the committee determined that they had all the information that they needed to process the application.

12.4. Item 14.36 Erf 147880, 109 Harrington Street, District Six, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 29055SVB0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405398>

DISCUSSION

- The application for substantial alterations to a PHS, was submitted in terms of Section 38(1) of the NHRA. However, the case officer has not been able to identify a trigger in terms of Section 38(1) for the proposal (referred to as option 3 in the submission). Given this, the case officer requested input from the committee as to whether there is a Section 38(1) trigger or whether the proposal should rather be submitted in terms of Section 27. Furthermore, the case officer requested input from the committee regarding correct procedure to follow, should the committee determine that the proposal should rather be submitted in terms of Section 27.
- This matter was discussed by the committee, and the committee determined the proposal (referred to as option 3 in the submission) does not trigger Section 38(1) of the NHRA. Further, the committee resolved that the application (Case No 29055SVB0623) is withdrawn and a new application should be submitted to Heritage Western Cape in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA.

12.5. Item 14.18 Erf 878, Fontein Street, Riebeeck Kasteel, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: 26941CSI0105 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388095>

- The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 22 July 2026 due to the visual mitigation recommendations and overall contentious nature of the development.

12.6. Item 14.24 Farm 1341, Bo-Dal Road, Dal Josaphat, Paarl, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: HWC25110302EJV1113 / 26666EJV1113 <https://sahris.org.za/node/387146>

- The Committee resolved to refer the item to IACom on 19 August 2026 due to the objections and mitigation measures requiring consideration.

12.7. Item 13.19 Farm 10 Badfontein Farms, Megora Solar PV facility, Near Murraysburg, Murraysburg, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: 26432SB1017 <https://sahris.org.za/node/386259>

- Committee need clarification on the process, date and payment which was provided. Committee resolved to hear the HIA.

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

13.1 Erf 3085, 21 Peak Drive, Pinelands, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28436CSI0507 <https://sahris.org.za/node/39772>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 9 June for signed PoA and internal photos.
- Previous approval: 18120701WD1213E
- Work applied for has been completed
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for regularisation of external shower, dining space, swimming pool, and new fireplace and chimney. The applicant noted that the plans have previously been approved, but

when the clients built, they reduced the extent of the work at the back of the house but kept with the approved style so that the alteration/extension perfectly fits with the existing house. There are two CoCT stamps for 2019 and 2020 but no HWC stamps. The previously approved plan had a different dining room/lounge layout compared to the plans for regularisation.

- CoCT provided comment and support the application
- PRRA stamped the plans with no objection

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.

CSI

- 13.2 Portion 16 of Farm 386, off Goudini Weg, Wyzersdrift, S38(8) – NID**
Case No: 28344CSI0430 <https://sahris.org.za/node/397350>
Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 6 June for PoA and company resolution
- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site
- Proposed development: Construction of a 30-metre high monopole telecommunications mast with a base station housing associated infrastructure to improve the strength of the network signal transmission and coverage in and around the Worcester area. The base station will have a footprint of 100m²
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: The Phil Susan Saal building is a historical building that is present on the site which is part of the rich history of the area. The proposed site was historical utilised purely for agricultural purposes, with some previous presence of the Breede Alluvium Fynbos vegetation type. The proposed site was then converted and developed as the years went on.
- Visual impacts: The footprint of the base station is fairly small and the height of the tower will be comparable to the surrounding powerlines, powerlines are usually about 10m in height, this will be 30m.
- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources noted, sensitivity is low according to the screener report
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is low

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA in terms of Section 38(1). A letter of no trigger to be issued.

CSI

- 13.3 Portion 4 of Farm 45, Farm Duiker Kranse, off the R381, Beaufort West, S38(8) – NID**
Case No: 28489CSI0511 <https://sahris.org.za/node/398019>
Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 19 June for PoP confirmation
- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -
- Proposed development: Establishment of a quarry covering 4.94ha
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural / Vacant
- Visual impacts: None expected. The site is situated inland off the R381 and would not be visible from this route.

- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources noted.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is insignificant.

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 must be included in any form of EMP and/or potential Environmental Authorisation.

CSI

13.4

Erf 120, 1 Bree Street, Langebaan, S34 – Additions and Alterations

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

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Breyten Free (Architect), Chris Schoeman (Heritage Consultant), Nicholas Lightbody (Owner), Zachary Carstens (Observer), Nick Smith (On behalf of the objector), Nazeema Duarte (Saldanha Bay Municipality) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Further Requirements received on 2 July 2026 inclusive of a response to the objections and all parties being invited to HOMs to ventilate the matter.
- Grading Unknown
- Outside HPO
- Work has started. What remains to be completed is the roof deck, glass balustrades, and staircase to the roof deck.
- The proposal is the conversion of approved flat roof to an accessible roof terrace and internal alterations and shopfittings.
- Previous applications HWC24091132EJV0912 and HWC25081307EJV0814 for Minor Works on the property were both approved and in both instances work commenced without a permit
- The SBM defer to the authority of HWC. Objections were received on the following bases:
 - Significant construction in excess of the original plans has already taken place.
 - The front gable facade being completely changed. The whole roofline has visibly 'gone'. Walls abutting the Dutch gable have been constructed on either side of the gable, the width of the building.
 - The owner clearly has no regard for the need to obtain prior permission. Building work continues daily on the illegal roof terrace.
 - The objector is of the opinion that there was nothing contentious with the original plans; however, this is not what's been constructed.
 - The illegal building work has resulted in the utter degradation of heritage character.
 - Simply leaving a gable incongruously in the middle of a rowdy roof terrace bar, which will be blocked from the street view by seating and safety balustrades and removing the protected characteristic of the heritage roofline and gable in its classic form should surely not be permitted. It would be akin to suggesting that Big Ben in London, the Eiffel Tower in Paris or the Statue of Liberty in New York could simply be surrounded by a bar, the original structure being barely visible from street view, yet all would be "just fine".
 - This fine gable, in relief against the traditional roof line, is one of a handful of remaining heritage assets that folk in Langebaan treasure. It's part of the essence of our town centre. Our own heritage. A heritage that needs reinstating urgently.
 - The unauthorised work is in breach of the 4m height rule for new development in proximity to the Langebaan Waterfront.
 - Beyond the heritage violation, the conversion of a non-trafficable roof into an entertainment deck constitutes a material change in land use that negatively impacts the privacy rights of the neighbouring properties and the historic character of the precinct.
 - It is requested the HWC issue a Stop Works Order against the owner/developer and lay criminal charges for the contravention of Section 34(1) read with Section 51 of the NHRA

- In response to the objections: The building has been extensively altered, expanded and modernised over the years and little remains of the original structure. Apart from the gable, all that is left of the original building are the white-painted roof rafters and the corrugated iron roof sheets. The gable will still be retained, and the proposed glass balustrades will allow for more visibility from the street than previous revisions of the building. There are precedents for leisure decks in the immediate area of Bree Street, at 8 Bree Street and the Breeze Restaurant & Wine Bar a little way further south. The proposed alterations will not exceed existing roof heights of surrounding buildings. It is recommended that the application for the proposed alterations as contained in the attached plans be approved.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today.
- The concerns regarding height breaches and privacy rights cannot be considered within the remit of the NHRA and must be considered by the Municipality. The Case Officer thanked the objectors for these comments but confirm that they are not heritage-related. The Committee confirmed during admin that criminal charges or a mitigation agreement would not be appropriate given the limited heritage value of the property and its context. Regarding the unauthorised work, the Committee supported issuing a Section 51 Letter. The National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) does not make provision for the condonation of illegal work. Undertaking work without a permit constitutes a criminal offence in terms of section 51(1)c of the same Act. The applicant is advised to note that this matter has been recorded for future reference and should any further illegal work be undertaken, HWC will consider laying charges.
- Nick Smith on behalf of the objectors requested that s51 be applied for the work completed but that the work ongoing be referred to BELCom given the objections.
- The Committee responded that s51 would be utilised to 'regularise' the work completed and the work ongoing and would not run concurrent to another s34 application for the work not yet completed. S51 would therefore conclude the matter.
- Mr. Smith noted that he does not believe that s51 can be applied ('elasticised') where work remains to be completed and suggests that s51 be applied for the completed work, but that s34 be pursued for the ongoing work and ventilated by BELCom.
- The Committee confirmed that the structure is not a heritage resource. It does not demonstrate intactness nor rarity. The Cape Dutch Revival gable is being retained and maintains the architectural character of the structure while remaining visible from the street due to the provision of a glass balustrade. The context lacks congruency or rarity and has not been negatively impacted by the proposal and unauthorised work. The character of the area referred to in the objection is an experiential quality but has not been established on heritage grounds and cannot be demonstrated in terms of architectural merit or the built environment, archaeological or palaeontological sensitivities, or visual qualities that would be impacted by the proposal. While there may be character, this has not been demonstrated as heritage character and this objection is therefore not lodged on heritage-grounds.

HELD OVER

The Committee resolved to hold the matter over to the next HOMs meeting on 3 August 2026 in order to obtain legal opinion.

EJV

13.5

Erven 306-RE and 682-RE, Wildvoëlvlei West, Kommetjie Road, Kommetjie, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 28970EJV0617 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404803>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Quahnita Samie (Applicant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 4 July 2026
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO, adjacent to the Cape Peninsula Cultural Landscape
- Work has not started

- Triggers s38(1)(a).
- The proposal is to expand the Wildevoëlvlei Treated Effluent network with a pipeline of 1509m in length along Kommetjie Road, a route already heavily disturbed by existing underground services including stormwater, water, electrical, and telecom services. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates high and low sensitivity; however, the route has already been disturbed. The pipeline installation results in no visual, built, or landscape impacts
- Consultant recommends no further studies

DECISION

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

EJV

13.6

Erf 921-RE, 122 Main Road, Constantia, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: 28858EJV0604 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402762>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

Christine Havenga (Applicant) and Andrew Berman (Owner) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 8 July 2026
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to demolish the dwelling, known as Hoheneiche, and outbuildings on site. Erf 921 has been subdivided into Erf 921-RE and Erf 14874 which have been registered at the Surveyor General but have not yet been registered at the deeds office. They measure 3842m² and 3943m² in extent respectively. The current structure and outbuildings straddle the two erven and thus demolition is sought as the new owner seeks to build new dwelling houses on the newly created erven. The applicant is of the belief that there is therefore no s38(1)(c)(i) or (ii) trigger. While the intention for the redevelopment of the site is not stated, it can be assumed from the report that it involves residential densification in the form of an estate or complex. Brief indicators are provided by the applicant.
- The CRRA have no objection. CoCT object on the following bases: Architectural significance: The building represents a relatively intact and modest example of the Art & Crafts period and some detailing characteristic of the period. Contextual significance: The building contributes significantly to the sense of place and identity of the cultural landscape of Constantia. Rarity: The building represents an increasingly rare building type. While the building has undergone some alterations and additions, these do not fundamentally compromise its ability to convey its heritage significance. The essential character-defining elements remain intact and legible. Demolition would result in the total and irreversible loss of this heritage resource. Unlike alterations or additions, which may be assessed for their degree of impact, demolition represents complete destruction of the heritage significance. The application documentation do not provide justification for demolition. HRS encourages the development of the site albeit not to the detriment of the conservation-worthy house and believes sensitive adaptive re-use and alterations have not been fully explored. Parkscape support the following undertaking on the placement of the buildings: 'The placement of the buildings has also been informed by the existing mature trees and natural vegetation on the site. Existing trees will be retained wherever possible, and the positioning of the structures has been planned to minimize disturbance to the natural landscape and preserve the green character of the property'. They note differences of opinion on the heritage value and architectural qualities of the building intended for demolition. They have no further comment to make, other than to state their interest in the treed landscape of the site and the need to respect the broader cultural landscape of the valley.

- In response to the City of Cape Town comment, the applicant states that the dwelling and outbuildings are an example of an unremarkable mid-twentieth century suburban house. While the dwelling with its later additions is considered an architectural pastiche, it could be graded as IIIC based on it being older than 60 years and part of the mid-20th century densification of Constantia. It is considered a period example with some Arts and Crafts elements present but is not an authentic example of this style. It is not considered a particularly good example of an Arts and Crafts house. The use of reinforced concrete and machine-made joinery and flooring are at odds with the Arts and Crafts ethos of natural materials and handcrafted work. The interior spaces are generic and have no Arts and Crafts spatial qualities. The house is a hybrid and is not authentic and is of minor architectural significance. It should, however, be noted that the house is in no way visible from Constantia Main Road. It is only the green edge and modest gates of the subject site that contribute to the Constantia Main Road context. The character of this area along Constantia Main Road is also in transition with no prevailing structural typology. Various subdivisions, additional dwelling units and higher density residential developments have been approved. This is in line with the spatial vision of the City of Cape Town's Spatial Policies for the area which supports contextually appropriate densification in this area. Although it would theoretically be possible to adapt and reuse the dwelling house, there is no reason from a heritage/architectural significance point to do so. The changing character of the area and the socio economic advantages of providing additional residential opportunities within the urban edge in this highly sought after area exceed any limited significance the existing building may have. The position of the existing structures on the site makes it difficult and not viable to develop additional dwellings on the site while maintaining the mature tree rich setting and large undeveloped portions of the erf which is considered the main heritage resource.
- All parties were invited to HOMs today
- The Committee discussed that the nature of properties in this area of Constantia with heavily treed boundaries and high boundary walls means structures are often quite site-specific rather than contributing to the public realm. Therefore demolition could not negatively impact contextual character. The Committee therefore need to assess the structure on its intrinsic merits. There are clear and legible arts and crafts elements (regardless of it being possibly pastiche) but the applicant identifies the erosion of these elements with incompatible interventions resulting in a structure that is no longer a good example of its type/time. This is strongly contested by the CoCT who consider total demolition an unjustifiable loss of what they deem to be a heritage resource worthy of retention and adaptive reuse.
- Andrew Berman confirmed that the arts & crafts elements are pastiche and not a product of this architectural period.
- The Committee discussed a possible s38(1) trigger as the subdivision has not yet been registered at the deeds office and the site therefore exceeds 5000m2. The Consultant confirmed that three dwelling units on the site are being proposed across the two subdivisions and therefore no change in character is being demonstrated. The Committee confirmed that no NID is required.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom on 26 August 2026 due to the objection received.

EJV

13.7

Farm 705, Spice Route, De Leeuwenjacht, Paarl, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 28906EJV0610 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404034>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 3 July 2026
- IIIC Graded Werf
- Outside the Special Character Protected Overlay Zone of Paarl
- Work has not started

- Following unauthorised work on multiple structures older than 60-years, a Heritage Agreement was entered into to regularise these offences, mitigate the offences, and establish a penalty fee. An addendum to the agreement was then issued following further unauthorised work to the Santa Anna building. The proposal is for alterations to the Santa Anna structure to replace a window with a door, brick-up an interior wall, and install a glass sliding door.
- The Municipality identified the proposal as being minor works and as such no further consultation was undertaken

DECISION

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

EJV

13.8 Erf 514, 52 High Level Road, Green Point, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28890EJV0609 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402957>

Emily Jane Vowles introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 13 July 2026
- Graded IIIC
- Inside Proposed Somerset Road HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for a new verandah and external staircase, internal alterations, and new palisade fencing
- GPRRA have no objection. CoCT support.

DECISION

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

EJV

13.9 Erf 46225, 20 Mount Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28410RB0506 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397655>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Further Requirements submitted 18 June 2026.
- Graded IIIC.
- Inside the Westerford HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is to add an extra storey, making internal alterations, and to add a pool (freestanding and not a trigger).
- NCID commented as follows:
- *"We note the location of this Grade IIIC structure mid-block in the Westerford HPOZ with no street interaction.*
- *The Westerford HPOZ has fairly dense grain of mainly Victorian and early 20th century housing.*
- *Appropriate building forms and finishes should relate to the characteristic historic cottage typologies, i.e. pitched roofs with painted masonry walls.*
- *This upper floor addition introduces uncommon materials (Nutec cladding) as well as a lower pitched roof (30degrees) than what is characteristic (35degrees minimum).*
- *Furthermore, the height of the upper floor relative to the lower floor presents as unproportional, with the long facade as bulky.*
- *Although located in the centre of the block, it is likely that this addition will be visible due to its height.*

- *Exploring a lower wall plate and steeper roof pitch may allow the proposals to settle more comfortably into the block."*
- CoCT E&HM commented as follows:
- *"It has been noted by HRS during the LUMS process that although the proposed external Nutec cladding is not common to the immediate area, the proposed building form and scale is.*
- *If paint colour is sensitive to the immediate area the proposal will not have a negative impact on the character or significance of the HPOZ.*
- *Furthermore, the dwelling is positioned away from the street however still contributes to the overall character of the HPOZ.*
- *The additional storey is considered somewhat in keeping as it replicates certain elements (e.g. sash windows and shutters) found on the ground floor which, in principle, will not impact the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties.*
- *HRS has no objection to the proposal."*
- On 18 May 2026 HOMS issued the following Further Requirements:
- The applicant must submit a written response to the NCID comment motivating for approval of the proposal on heritage grounds and/or submit revised plans in response to the NCID comment.
- The response provided is as follows:
- *"We acknowledge the comments raised regarding the proposed upper floor addition and its relationship to the prevailing character of the Westerford HPOZ.*
- *In response, the design intent has been to interpret the established Victorian and early 20th century cottage typologies in a contemporary manner, rather than replicate them directly. While we note the reference to pitched roofs and painted masonry as characteristic elements, the proposal seeks to maintain compatibility with the surrounding grain through overall scale, roof form, and massing rather than strict material replication.*
- *Regarding the use of Nutec cladding, this material has been selected for its durability, lightweight properties, and clean finish. It is intended to be visually recessive and will be treated in a muted, painted tone to ensure it does not detract from the broader architectural context. It is also consistent with contemporary interventions where differentiation between original and new fabric is required in heritage practice.*
- *With respect to the roof pitch, the proposed 30-degree pitch has been carefully considered in relation to internal spatial requirements and the integration of the upper addition within the existing structure. While slightly lower than the typical 35-degree reference, it remains a pitched roof form and maintains the overall rhythm of surrounding roofscapes. The design avoids creating excessive bulk at roof level through proportioning.*
- *On the issue of perceived bulk and proportionality of the upper floor, it is noted that the upper floor does not step back from the primary edges of the lower floor. However, the overall massing has been carefully considered to ensure it remains visually coherent within the context of the existing building and surrounding grain. The property's mid-block location and substantial setback of approximately ±30m from the street boundary further reduce direct visibility from the public realm, meaning the addition will be largely read in the context of surrounding built form and vegetation, which helps to moderate its perceived impact."*
- The Committee deemed the response as appropriate to motivate, that there will be no heritage impacts, especially with how set back this specific property is from the Westerford HPOZ streetscape (i.e., the structure is a IIIC and impacts to its heritage value are minimal, and the impacts to the streetscape have been motivated for in terms of the design revisions, which again are minimal).

DECISION

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

RB

Case No: 28804RB0602 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/401402>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 1 July 2026.
- Not graded (although CoCT E&HM comment suggests IIIC due to contribution to a grouping and streetscape).
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for extending the rear to create an attached second dwelling and for a new fence at the front.
- CoCT E&HM provided a comment of support.

DECISION

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

RB

13.11 Erf 7440, 27 Flambeau Street, Paarl, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: 28721RB0526 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399367>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 1 July 2026.
- Not graded.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Proposal is for total demolition of all structures on site.
- DHAC, Paarl 300, and DHF offered comments of no objection.

DECISION

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

RB

13.12 Erf 83268, 14 Lake Road, Frogmore Estate, Retreat, S34 – Total Demolition

Case No: 28068RB0407 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/395664>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 2 July 2026.
- IIIC, but note that it forms part of a cluster according to the CoCT E&H comment.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for total demolition.
- CoCT E&HM object stating that the proposed total demolition does not align with good heritage practice nor the City's Environmental Strategy.
- They instead recommend disposal of the City owned asset subject to the retention of the existing building.
- The property was acquired by the City as part of a road widening project for the widening of Steenberg Road.
- Further externals/streetscapes have been provided.
- The Committee noted the building as degraded and as a heritage resource, nor as a cluster, worthy of retention, with the CoCT E&HM comment hinting more at a good practice method as opposed to arguing for retention based on heritage grounds.

DECISION

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

RB

- 13.13 Erven 41636 (formerly Erven 41632, 41633, & 41634) and 44371 (Ptn of Erf 41636) (formerly Ptn 2 of Farm Ronwe 849, Ptn 1-RE of Farm Lustigan Annex 852, & Ptn 4-RE [Ptn of Ptn 2] of Farm Lustigan Annex 852), Zanddrift Lifestyle Estate Main Village, Wemmershoek Road, Paarl, S34 – Total Demolition**

Case No: 28805RB0602 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/401815>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received 14 July 2026.
- Four 'clusters' of structures are proposed for total demolition.
- These structures fall inside the 'historic core' as per the 2015 IACom Final Comment on the redevelopment of the site:
 - "3.1 The main farm complex
 - 3.2 The vineyards proposed to be retained
 - 3.3 The farm employee cottage complex."
- The attached report notes the structures as being NCW and recommends other structures being entered into the Provincial Register:
- I.e., the wine cellar and events buildings, a dwelling, and the farm office (all constructed by Italian POWs).
- The structure clusters proposed for total demolition (which include grading from the IACom endorsed HIA) are as follows:
 - Main Farmhouse (constructed between 1953-1968, so there is a chance it is not covered by S34 (graded NCW))
 - The workshop extension behind the farm admin offices (suspected to have been added around the 1990s) (graded IIIB)
 - The children's play area extending off the old cellar building (most of this structure was added after the 2015 endorsed HIA but the wine cellar complex to which this is attached was completed in 1946 (graded IIIA)).
- Various utility structures and braai area (again, constructed between 1953-1968, so there is a chance they are not covered by S34 (graded NCW))
- Paarl 300 supported.
- DHF offered a comment of no objection but asked that material be reused.
- DHAC did not respond to request for comment within 30 days.
- In the meeting DHAC noted that they did submit a comment asking for material to be reused/used in the restoration of more significant properties.
- The Committee noted that reusing materials would be preferred but this will not be enforced via the permit as conditions.

DECISION

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

RB

- 13.14 RE Portion 2 of Farm, 349 Elandsfontein, Malmesbury, S35 – Destructive Sampling**

Case No: HWC26180602RB0602

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 18 June 2026.
- Proposal is for minimal invasive sampling of 57 *Proboscidae* teeth (i.e., Elephant) from the Elandsfontein PHS archaeological site, excavated by David Braun for stable isotope analysis to reconstruct diet and environmental conditions.
- Each sample will result in about 10mg of enamel powder along the growth axis of the teeth being removed.
- The selected samples are either large enough to make them easily identifiable/to be studied further or of such poor quality in preservation due to weathering that this sampling will at least reveal some information.
- Iziko provided a letter of support noting that the specimens will all be 3D scanned beforehand so there is no loss of surface information with the proposed sampling.
- The Aikonese Cochoqua Khoi Tribal Council HWC registered Conservation Body provided a letter of support further noting that they appreciate the collaborative approach to heritage and requested observation during the process.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

RB

13.15 Erven 4339 and 909, 30 Caledon Street, Bodorp, George, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 27814SB0313 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/391363>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: New roof and windows.
Work statues: Not started (previous work that was completed-stoep not part of this application)
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: Municipality odd snip showing support, Simon van der Stel foundation support
- Outstanding information received 23 March 2026- streetscape photographs .
- The structure is on Erf 4339 (main proposal and the only trigger to S34) while the pool is on Erf 909. Furthermore, the applicant notes that the limited space, it is not possible to take better external however welcomes anyone to come to site.
- Additional information received on 29 June 2026 that included comment from George municipality that stated that proposed re-roofing of the flatlet is supported in principle. However, the application cannot be approved in its current form because an existing covered stoep, which was constructed without approval, has not been included in the application. The application must be revised to include the stoep, confirm its approval status, update the plans to accurately reflect all existing structures and services, and then be resubmitted for further consideration.
- The applicant has responded to the municipality and stated that owner has not yet responded about the previous approved plans (the stoep) and the municipality may not have the latest plans on record. This application is only for the new proposed work.
- Additional information was received on the 1 July 2026 that included George Heritage Comment, they informed the applicant that a full application is required as the structure are older than 60 they do not provide a comment
- The current application is limited to replacement of the windows and roof. As the municipality supports these works and the building is not a graded heritage resource, the proposal is supported. Any unauthorised work should be dealt with through a separate Section 34 application once it has been established whether the work occurred after the building became older than 60 years. Given the confusion surrounding the application, all relevant parties have been invited to comment.
- Members previously noted that the proposal appeared to constitute a full Section 34 application requiring consultation with the George Heritage Trust and the municipality. Concerns were raised

regarding the proposed new pitched roof, the need to include both Erven 909-RE and 4339. Given the requirements have been met, the committee resolved to support the application.

DECISION

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

SB

13.16 Erven 2662 and 15653, Cathedral and Memorium Street, George, S36(3) – Ground Truthing

Case No: HWC260520SB0408

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Coen Nienabar (applicant) was present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- HOMs approved the Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey dated at the HOMs meeting of 28 April 2026 with the following conditions (permit dated 4 May 2026-HWC26042901SB0408):
 1. Ground truthing (test excavation) is to be applied for in a separate process following the results of the GPR survey in terms of Section 36 of the NHRA.
- As per the decision in May, a new application submitted for ground truthing has been submitted.
- At the HOMs meeting of the 6 July the committee deemed the application incomplete and required the following information: Provide landowner consent for the proposed ground truthing, repository agreement with Iziko Museums, Clarify whether the public participation included the ground-truthing works and confirm whether the ground truthing forms part of the associated Heritage Impact Assessment and provide SAHRIS reference is required.
- Additional information received 16 July that included Landowner consent, GTH has support the ground truthing, George Museum support, George Municipality have not provide a comment since 6 February 2026.
- Iziko repository agreement has been obtained and signed.
- The applicant confirmed that “the conducted GPR survey and the proposed ground truthing are aimed at informing the HIA in terms of the identification and mapping of heritage resources in the area affected, as was required by the HWC Response to the NID for the development issued on 11 November 2025 (Ref: HM / GARDEN ROUTE / GEORGE / ERVEN 2662 AND 15663; Case no: 26527EJV1029), which is currently being conducted.”
- The previous permit report (HWC26042901SB0408, dated 4 May 2026) was included for committee consideration as it is linked to the current application.
- Members generally supported limited ground truthing due to the inconclusive GPR results. It was noted that the consultation period with the municipality had not yet reached 30 days and municipal comments are still outstanding. The committee also noted that no archaeological material or human remains should be recovered; if encountered, work must stop, with excavated material to be used for backfilling.
- A new permit application has been submitted with the required application form, photographs and proof of payment. All previous HOMs requirements have been addressed. The proposal is supported in principle, and all relevant parties have been invited to the meeting for discussion.
- No objections was raised in the meeting and clarification around the proposed action and intent of the permit, it was not that burials will not be removed but once and if uncovered then the burial will be recorded and backfilled.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 36 permit application.

SB

13.17 Erf 26324, 14 Ash Street, Observatory, S34 – Additions and Alterations

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

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: Maintenance and repairs that includes repainting, roof sheeting replacement (where rusted), repairing gutters, timber windows, and plaster.
- Work statuses: Not started
- Grade: IIIB
- HPO: Inside
- Comments: none was submitted as minor but not minor works(submitted).
- Additional information was received on the 19 March that included OCA comments of no objection and confirmation that the work has not started.
- Applicant confirmed on the 24 June that they have not received a comment from CoCT. Only the internal memorandum has been provided that required additional information. Additional information received 6 July that included the CoCT comment of supported on condition that the existing timber ceilings be retained (if not already removed) and existing timber sash windows be retained. Later email indicated that existing timber ceilings will be retained and not replaced. This is noted revised set of drawings.
- The application was previously incomplete due to outstanding comments from the City of Cape Town (CoCT) Environmental Heritage Management (EHM), uncertainty regarding the extent of maintenance work already undertaken, and the need for outstanding information to be uploaded to SAHRIS. Members clarified that the available EHM memorandum was not an official comment and that formal CoCT EHM comments were required.
- Members confirmed that the revised CoCT EHM comments and updated plans had been submitted, all previous requirements had been addressed, given that there will be no negative impact to heritage resource based on the revised proposal.

DECISION

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

SB

- 13.18 Erf 6784, 86 Meyer Street, George, Eastern Extension, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28387SB0405 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397585>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

George municipality heritage department comment required.

SB

- 13.19 Farm 10 Badfontein Farms, Megora Solar PV facility, Near Murraysburg, Murraysberg, S38(8) – HIA**
Case No: 26432SB1017 <https://sahris.org.za/node/386259>
Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Megora PV Combined Projects HIA assesses the heritage impacts of developing four solar PV facilities (Megora PV 1A, 1B, 1C, and 2, each 90-170 MW), a 132 kV overhead power line (EGI 2), substations, BESS, roads, and infrastructure on 859 ha of the Remainder of Farm Badfontein No. 10 near Murraysburg (not Beaufort West), Western Cape. The sites lie in the Beaufort West REDZ (REDZ 11), with current extensive grazing/agricultural use and generally low heritage significance, outside Heritage Protection Overlay zones.
- Zone: Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ) – Beaufort West area.
- Location: Near Beaufort West.
- Current use: Primarily agricultural (extensive farming/grazing).
- Grade: Generally low heritage significance (no high-grade resources identified).
- HPO: Outside

- DFFE as decision authority – HWC needs to provide a comment as soon as possible as comment period closed on 8 April.
- Constraints:
 - Located within a REDZ (strategic development area) – REDZ 11 zone
 - Visual sensitivity (tourism receptors).
 - Large-scale footprint (cumulative impacts with other RE projects).
- Anticipated Impacts on Heritage Resources:
 - Archaeology:

Archaeological findings across the project areas are sparse and of low significance (Grade 3C or ungradable). Identified resources include ephemeral Later Stone Age (LSA) artefact scatters, isolated stone cairns (likely historical farm markers), a grindstone, and minor stone features. These resources are of low heritage value and can be avoided or mitigated.
 - Palaeontological:

The study area is underlain by formations with generally high palaeontological sensitivity (Teekloof and Balfour Formations); however, no fossil occurrences were identified within the development footprints, despite fossiliferous outcrops in the broader area. Impacts are therefore considered unlikely, subject to the implementation of a chance finds protocol.
 - Visual:

The development will introduce large-scale infrastructure (PV arrays up to ± 4.5 m in height and substations up to ± 18 m), resulting in moderate, negative, long-term visual impacts at a local scale. This will alter the existing Karoo pastoral landscape character; however, the area is already undergoing a transition towards an industrial renewable energy landscape within a Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ).
 - Built:

No significant built heritage resources occur within the project footprints. Nearby historical structures and farm infrastructure are located outside of the impact areas and will not be affected.
 - Cultural:

The broader cultural landscape is characterised as a lightly utilised, evolving rural landscape with moderate visual sensitivity. While the development will alter landscape character, this change is consistent with ongoing renewable energy development in the region. Impacts are considered low to moderate and mitigable.
 - Graves and Burials (if needed to include):

Two farm cemeteries (Grade 3A, high local significance) occur within the wider study area but are located outside the project footprints and will not be impacted.
 - Alternatives:
 - Multiple layout iterations undertaken to avoid CBAs and sensitive features.
 - Site selection within REDZ supports strategic avoidance.
 - Consultant recommend:

Proceed with development subject to mitigation measures; impacts acceptable and no fatal flaws identified.

PPP: Public Participation Process undertaken as part of BAR (implied).

EIA/NEMA status: 30 days period for state and I&AP commenting period.
 - Public Participation

As required by the NEMA, the Megora Cluster draft BA reports, including the HIAs, will be subject to a formal 30-day public comment period. As part of that process, the HIAs and other relevant EIA documentation will be submitted to HWC, the relevant statutory heritage commenting body under the NEMA, for comment. The HIAs will also be submitted to the relevant local and regional municipalities, and any other stakeholders or interested and affected parties with an interest in heritage resources in the area. Any heritage-related comments received during the public participation exercise will be considered and addressed in the final HIAs.
- HOMs provided a interim comment on 20 April 2026 – “INTERIM COMMENT The Committee notes that the S38(8) HIA, titled “Combined Heritage Impact Assessment Report for the Proposed

Development of The Megora 1a, 1b, 1c and 2 Solar PV Facilities, The Megora Egi 2 Between Pv 2 And 1a, And Associated Infrastructure, On Remainder Of the Farm Badfontein No.10, Near Murraysburg”, dated 14 April 2026, and prepared by TerraMare Archaeology. The final integrated HIA that complies with S38(3) must be submitted to HWC upon completion of the public participation process. “

- The updated HIA dated 28 June 2026
- The report states that the draft BA Reports, including the Combined HIA and individual HIAs, were circulated during a **30-day public participation period from 6 March to 8 April 2026**. The documentation was submitted to HWC, municipalities, and interested and affected parties.
- The only heritage-related comments received during the public participation process were from Heritage Western Cape (HWC).
- This final integrated HIA together with the final individual project HIAs and the Comments and Responses Reports through the SAHRIS case in order to satisfy HWC's requirement. There were no other heritage objections, concerns, or specialist comments recorded.
- The overall development has been divided into separate HIAs because the solar facilities and associated powerline infrastructure have different owners, impacts, and statutory approval requirements. The consultant requested that the HOMs comment letter clearly indicate whether the comments apply collectively to all five linked projects or provide project-specific comments where necessary. The committee requested in April a combined HIA with integrated comment. A final combined HIA was submitted for committee review.
- The committee noted that although the final HIA was submitted after the public participation period had closed, this was a procedural matter, and the decision-making authority is waiting for the comment from HWC. The archaeological, palaeontological and visual impact assessments were considered acceptable, however the committee required more time to review the HIA and its findings and recommendations.

INTERIM COMMENT

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 3 August 2026 to provide the Committee with additional time to review the recommendations and findings of the HIA.

SB

13.20 Erf 4507-RE, 85 St Georges Mall, Cape Town City Centre, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: HWC25090310SVB1121

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 15 January and 07 July 2026.
- Grading: The property is graded IIIA.
- HPO: Within the Central City HPOZ.
- Status of work/completeness: not started.
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for internal alterations to the ground, second, third and eight floors, to upgrade the existing hotel.
- Previous approvals/decisions (if applicable):
 - In 2019, HWC approved a similar proposal for internal alterations to upgrade the hotel. The proposal included a different internal layout of new walls; however, the proposed work was all internal (19012512TZ1007E). The approved work was never carried out, and the permit has since lapsed.
 - In 2021 HWC approved an application for Minor Works (21012513KB0609E).
 - On 13 August 2025 HWC's IACom endorsed an HIA for development of this property and the neighbouring two properties, Erven 4508 and 4509 (HWC24010803SJ0108)
 - The tenants of the property, with the permission of the property owners have now submitted an application for approval of a similar proposal to the one approved in 2019.
- Consultation (if applicable):

- Despite being minor works, the CoCT were consulted and support the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.21 Erf 484-RE, 5 Church Street, Prince Albert, S27 – Additions

Case No: 28927SVB0615 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404532>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- This matter was heard at the HOMs meeting of 06 July 2026, whereby the committee resolved to request the following further requirements:
 - 1. Applicant to provide previously approved building plans confirming that the building referred to as 'the Annex' was constructed in 1990.
- In response to the request for further requirements the applicant has provided evidence that structure referred to as 'the Annex' was constructed in 1990.
- Grading: II (<https://www.sahris.org.za/node/39571>)
- HPO: outside of any HPO.
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started.
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for three new gardens walls, which touch the existing building and a new portion of boundary wall connected to these garden walls.
- Consultation:
 - Despite being submitted as minor works PACF were consulted and do not support the proposal as high solid masonry walls have a negative visual impact on the fragile historical fabric and streetscape and are not appropriate in a small town like Prince Albert where there is no historical precedent for such walls. An alternative acceptable solution would be a steel palisade fence concealed by planting, i.e. a "green" wall, and an extension of the existing hedge.
- All I&APs have been invited to today's meeting.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.22 Erf 708, 9 Main Road, Bonnievale, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28914SVB0615 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404238>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 02 July 2026.
- Grading: Not Graded
- HPO: outside of any HPO
- Status of work/completeness: work has started but has not been completed
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for an extension to the building to accommodate a storage area as well as increasing the height of the existing roof and various internal and external alterations.
- Consultation:
 - Langeberg Municipality do not object to the proposal.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. The applicant must submit revised plans that identify the unauthorized work that has been carried out to the property without prior approval from Heritage Western Cape. The plans must clearly distinguish between the unauthorized work and the proposed work.

SVB

13.23 Erf 9013, 29 Morgenster Avenue, Somerset West, S34 – Total Demolition
Case No: 28422SVB0506 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397674>

HELD OVER

The matter has been held over due to information considered to be an objection and an indication of work having commenced on site that requires investigation.

SVB

13.24 Erven 88335, 88336, 163448 & 163449, 9-11 Rodwell Road, St James, S34 – Additions & Alterations
Case No: 28895SVB0610 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/403895>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Prof Walter Peters (Applicant) was present and took part in the discussion

Barrie Gasson (Kalk Bay Historical Association and the Kalk Bay and St James Ratepayers & Residents Association) was present and took part in the discussion.

Cillie Malan (Architect) was present and took part in the discussion.

Neil Morrison & Carol Morrison (Owner) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 01 July 2026.
- Grading: IIIA.
- HPO: within Muiz St James Kalk B HPOZ.
- Status of work/completeness: according to the form work has not started, the images provided indicate that work has started, and according to the applicant a previous individual undertook unapproved and unfinished interventions. The applicant was asked to provide plans detailing the unauthorized work, however given that the work was done by the previous owner, and given that there are no historic building plans at the CoCT that could assist the applicant in producing this plan, they have not been able to provide this fully. The applicant has been able to detail the unauthorized work that has taken place in the lower ground storey, however on inspection of photographs of the site, it is clear that this is not the full extent of the unauthorized work.
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is to complete the unfinished interventions started by a previous owner, as well as to restore and conserve the building and for additions and alterations. The unauthorized work that the applicant has been able to identify is the addition of two new walls in the lower ground storey, one of which is proposed to be demolished and the other is to be retained and extended. The proposal is for a large addition to the Mosselle-Road side of the building, which is on the north-western side of the site, as well as a smaller addition to the Rodwell-Road side of the building, which is on the south-eastern side of the site. The proposal is also for alterations to the existing structure, including new flooring and finishes, insulation & boarding, replacement of some doors and windows.
- Previous approvals/decisions:
 - HWC received an application for the subject property in 2021 (21120216CH1206E). HWC undertook a site inspection on 25 February 2022. As far as can be determined from HWC records the application was last tabled at HOMs on 28 February 2022. At this meeting the committee noted that "CoCT informed HWC of the illegal work on 15 February 2022. A stop works order was issued for illegal internal alterations.". The Further Requirements requested by the committee at this meeting were "1. Heritage statement assessing the impact on the heritage resources and impact on work undertaken on site including any possible mitigation measures. 2. Kalk Bay, St James Residents and Ratepayers Association and Kalk Bay Historical Society and CoCT comments required.". As far as HWC record show the further requirements from the 28 February 2022 meeting were never met and the proposal was never approved.

- Consultation:
 - CoCT support the proposal on condition that "if so required, HWC will request any detail drawings/sections as deemed necessary and condition the permit with a requirement that an Architect/Heritage Practitioner oversee the work on site as well as provide HWC with a close out report".
 - Barrie Gasson obo both the Kalk Bay Historical Association and the Kalk Bay and St James Ratepayers & Residents Association support aspects of the proposal but had recommendations regarding the design approach of contrasting new with old, as well as the design of the roof and they requested revised plans showing the revision to the roof and the parking platforms.
- All I&APs have been invited to today's meeting.
- Heritage (or any other considerations):
 - CoCT Statement of Significance: *"Unusual very intact 1920 substantial house in a prominent position. The house is associated with various notable local families and contributes significantly to the rich architectural and historical character of the area."*

COMMENT

The Committee is supportive of the proposed interventions. For Heritage Western Cape (HWC) to issue a permit, the following is required:

1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate heritage experience to oversee the proposed work and to submit a close out report within 30 days practical completion.
2. A letter of appointment to be signed by the applicant and consultant.

Once the above has been fulfilled, HWC will provide the required permit.

SVB

13.25 Erven 94635 & 94634-RE, 4 & 4A Eaton Road, Gardens, S34 – Alterations
Case No: 28884SVB0615 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402875>
 Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 13 July 2026.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: within the Upper Table Valley HPOZ
- Status of work/completeness: work has started according to the application form, however the applicant has confirmed via email that *"My client wasn't aware of the processes to be followed and has removed the tiling and fittings in the kitchen and bathroom, removed a steel window at the back of the property and stripped the carpets."*
- Brief proposal description: The completed work is removal of the tiling and fittings in the kitchen and bathroom, removal of a steel window at the back of the property and the carpets have been stripped. The proposed work is for minor alterations to the building as well as the boundary wall.
- Consultation:
 - CIBRA support the proposal.
 - CoCT support the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

13.26 Erf 1246-RE, 20 Vester Street, Paarl, S34 – Total Demolition
Case No: 28312XM0424 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396510>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Internal photographs of the structures proposed for demolition and demolition plan is required.

XM

- 13.27 Erf 1300-RE, 16 St Johns Road, Sea Point, Cape Town, S34 – Total Demolition**
Case No: 28267XM0421 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/396275>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 02 July 2026.
- The application is for proposed demolition of the existing three - storey building older than 60 years.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO, the property is not located within a designated/proposed HPOZ
- CoCT supports with the following conditions:
- RECOMMENDATIONS – Demolition works should be carefully undertaken to avoid damage to adjacent structures or properties. – Any original fabric revealed during demolition (e.g., covered windows, decorative elements) should be documented and salvaged.
- SFA and SFB did not provide comment within 30 days

DECISION

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

XM

- 13.28 Erf 245, 17 Clare Street, Gardens, Vredehoek, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: Case No: 28899XM0609 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402785>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 09 July 2026.
- The application is for cosmetic upgrades and minor internal works required to accommodate the proposed wellness spa. No structural alterations or changes to the existing character of the building are proposed
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO

DECISION

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

XM

- 13.29 Erf 51601, 34 Hamilton Road, Claremont, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28720XM0525 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/399364>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 08 July 2026.
- The application is for regularization of plan for work completed by previous owner as the property is under new ownership.
- Work has been completed (regularization)
- Not Graded- City graded NCW
- Outside HPO

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.

XM

- 13.30 Erf 1293, 10 Pinehurst Road, Constantia, S34 – Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28431XM0507 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397710>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Conservation body comments, more internal and external images required.

XM

- 13.31 Erf 1155, 14 Danks Court – Section 14, 22 Albert Road, Tamboerskloof, S34 – Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 28874XM0608 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402803>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 14 July 2026.
- The application is for alterations for the enclosure of the existing balcony to create a larger and more functional lounge area.
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CIBRA supports

DECISION

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

XM

- 13.32 Farms 327-RE, 327 Portion 1, 316-RE, 316 Portion 1, 316 Portion 3, 322-RE, 324-RE, 430-RE, and 323 Portion 1, Driefontein, Doorn Plaat, Nooitgedacht, Long Acres, and Koele Fontein, Ceres, S38(8) – HIA**
Case No: 26631CSI1110 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/387011>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The application relates to a realigned 132 kV overhead distribution line (SPVR9) associated with the approved Gydo Renewable Energy Project near Ceres. The original powerline route (SPVR6) had already formed part of an approved HIA and Environmental Authorisation process, but a landowner withdrew consent for the line to cross their property. As a result, a new route alignment (SPVR9) is proposed. The new line will be approximately 14.3 km long and connect the approved solar facility (SPVR8) to the Eskom Witzenberg Substation.
- Previously HOMS resolved to the following: Interim Comment
- The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Archaeological Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment
3. Visual Impact Assessment

The HIA assessed archaeological resources, palaeontological resources, cultural landscape impacts, visual impacts, graves and built environment impacts

Archaeology Findings

- No archaeological sites were identified along the proposed SPVR9 route, stone age archaeological resources were recorded during the 2025 field survey and several known rock art sites exist in the broader Koue Bokkeveld region, but these are outside the study area and will not be impacted.
- Heritage Feature Identified
- A stone-built kraal (Site 305 / Waypoint 503), previously identified during earlier heritage studies, lies approximately 20 m north of the proposed line, and 150 m from the nearest pylon.
- The report concludes that the structure will not be directly impacted and that there is no archaeological mitigation required. Site 305 must be designated a No-Go Area. And a 25 m buffer around the kraal should be included in the EMP.
- Palaeontology
- Specialist Comment
- Professor Marion Bamford assessed the palaeontological impacts.
- Both SPVR6 and SPVR9 traverse highly sensitive geological formations.
- Much of the affected area has already been disturbed by agriculture, roads, and existing infrastructure.
- SPVR6 remains the preferred route from a palaeontological perspective. However, SPVR9 is considered acceptable. A recommendation for a Fossil Find Procedure must form part of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).
- Visual and Cultural Landscape Impacts
- The report identifies the visual impact on the cultural landscape as the primary heritage concern.
- The route traverses:
 - Agricultural landscapes, mountain plateau environments, areas with high scenic value, landscapes associated with eco-tourism and recreation. The upper mountain plateau is described as: highly scenic, largely undeveloped and having low visual absorption capacity, also vulnerable to visual intrusion.
- Specialist Comment
- Landscape architect Antoinette de Beer found that:
 - The overall visual intrusion of SPVR9 would be High-Moderate.
 - The mountain plateau section is the most visually sensitive component.
 - Visual impacts would be noticeable from elevated viewpoints and recreational areas.
- The specialist supports the route subject to mitigation measures and makes the following recommendations:
 - Avoiding ridgelines and skylines where possible, following natural contours, using topographic screening, careful micro-siting of monopoles, using slender monopoles instead of lattice towers, using matte, non-reflective finishes, rehabilitation of disturbed areas using indigenous fynbos vegetation.
- Graves
- No graves or cemeteries were identified during the field assessment.
- Built Environment
- No direct impacts on the built environment are anticipated.
- Public Participation / External Comments
- Comments Received:
- CapeNature objects to the proposed SPVR9 powerline alignment on biodiversity grounds. Concerns relate to the route traversing Critically Endangered vegetation, the Mountain Catchment Area, potential impacts on protected areas, erosion risks, habitat disturbance, creation of access tracks, and the preference for the previously authorised powerline alignment. CapeNature requests that alternative routes be investigated. The applicant acknowledges these concerns but maintains that vegetation clearing will be limited, erosion impacts are expected to be minimal, specialist studies have addressed the biodiversity concerns, and the Basic Assessment process should continue to allow all competent authorities to consider the proposal. CapeNature's objection to the alignment remains.

- Department of Infrastructure: Road Planning has no objection in principle to the proposal, subject to conditions relating to a Construction Impact Assessment, the establishment of baseline road conditions, and the conclusion of a road maintenance agreement prior to construction. The applicant has noted and accepted these requirements.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the item to IACom on 19 August 2026 due to the objections and visual impact concerns.

XM

13.33 Erf 8606, 24 Astra Avenue, Goodwood, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28575XM0515 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/398593>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Conveyancer letter is required.

XM

13.34 Erf 165754, 5 Upper Montrose Terrace, Montrose Road, Newlands, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28919XM0611 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404510>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 09 July 2026.
- The application is for internal alterations to the dwelling to allow for a more open plan layout in the living areas. the new owner also wishes to place on record previous unauthorized work to the doors & windows on the north west elevation.
- Work has been completed (regularization)
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The Newlands Community Improvement District has no objection

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 per the HWC Notice issued on 24 October 2024.

XM

13.35 Erf 2524, 27 Marsh Street, Mossel Bay, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 28822CN0603 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/402422>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Internal and streetscape photos received on 8 July 2026.
- Grading: IIIC on previous permit but noted as IIIB by Mossel Bay Heritage in 2023 comment
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC23112701CN1127 - Approved - enclose the veranda with frameless glass and internal alterations.
- Proposal: Enlargement of a bathroom with another room.

DECISION

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

CN

13.36 Erf 46719, 78 Albion Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28904CN0609 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404023>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: POA, CoCT comment and External photos received on 29 June & 14 July 2026.
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For the construction of a double-volume addition containing a dining room at ground-floor level and a home gym at first-floor level, accessed via a spiral staircase. The work also includes new skylights, internal alterations to the existing bathroom and kitchen, and associated external works including a new fence.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - GLCA has no objection

DECISION

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

CN

13.37 Erf 785, 2 Clydebank Road, Green Point, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28961CN0615 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404779>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information was requested for a motivation - received on 7 July 2026.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: 17032309ZK0424E
- Proposal: Includes the reopening of the original front stoep, demolition of unsympathetic rear additions, replacement of the existing clay tile roof with S-profile corrugated sheeting, construction of a new covered terrace with polycarbonate roofing, internal alterations including a new staircase and study, replacement of rear doors and windows with stacking doors/windows, and the addition of a pergola
- Consultation:
 - CoCT did not comment in 30 days
 - GPRRA has no objection

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.

CN

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Ronnie Donaldson & Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Application Background:
 - HOMs on 1 December 2025 requested an HIA with a townscape assessment, visual assessment on the cultural landscape and for any relevant and associated HIAs and findings in the past to be included and referenced in the HIA.
 - The case was referred to IACom by HOMs on 13 April 2026.
 - IACom on 20 May 2026 issued an interim comment stating that the HIA does not meet requirements of S.38(3) as the transitional role of the site between urban and rural landscape has not been sufficiently addressed, including the provision of a soft green interface with the agricultural land holdings to the north. This concern relates specifically to portion 2, 3, and 4 of the development while Committee has no objections to portion 1 of the proposed development. The revised HIA to be made available to I&APs upon resubmission of the HIA to HWC.
- IACom on 17 June 2026 issued further requirements: The Committee resolved that the HIA does not meet the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA for the following reasons:
 - The HIA Report must be consistent with the latest proposal drawing, with a detailed description of the northern interface.
 - The Landscape Guidelines document dated 11-07-2025 must be updated to be consistent with, and include the updated Landscape Sketch Plan drawing, dated 02-06-2026.
 - Cross sections of the northern interface area must be provided.
 - Updated submission to be submitted to HWC to be tabled at HOMS for a Final Comment
- Proposal is for a mixed used development comprising of 4 portions. A school is proposed on portion 1 (0.65ha - this is an expansion of the currently applied development of school which is in the process of HIA – SAHRIS case 25722. Portion 2 will consist of housing units (8.5ha). Portion 3 will consist of apartments (0.7ha). Portion 4 will be mixed use. The site will also be subdivided and rezoned.
- The current land use is agricultural and a temporary school. The farm is no longer used for agricultural purposes. The site is within the urban edge of Paarl according to the Drakenstein SDF (2022 -2027) and is earmarked for urban infill development. The site is location within the proposed Paarl Heritage Overlay Zone (HPO) and within a proposed grade II cultural landscape.
- Previous applications:
 - (1) A S38(8) NID (22070706CN0707E) was tabled at HOMs on 18 July 2022 for the proposed mixed-use development. HOMs resolved to request an HIA with a AIA, BEA and VIA on the CL. Note that this HIA was not submitted as the consultant passed away and the proposal changed. The previously requested HIA was queried with the applicant, and he responded stating that the scope (extent) and context (now located within the urban edge) is different to the 2022 application. This case has been withdrawn.
 - (2) A S38(1)-NID application for a proposed school. HOMs requested a HIA with a VIA. HIA was tabled at HOMs on 10 November 2025 (case no.: 383596CN1030; <https://sahris.org.za/node/383596>) to rezone the site from Agriculture Zone to Community Use Zone and for the development of a school. The matter was heard at IACom on 3 December 2025 whereby IACom issued further requirements: 1. The site development plan, landscape plan and HIA report including visual impact must incorporate the entire development site, and all phases of development shall be submitted to HWC. The revised HIA must include the draft local spatial development framework. The revised HIA must undergo the required public consultation. 2. A separate Heritage Agreement proposal for the temporary school facility must be submitted to HWC. The Heritage Agreement was submitted and referred to IACom, as work had started to the temporary school. On 21 January 2026, IACom issued a comment stating that the Committee approved the temporary school development as shown on the site development plan set drawings. This must be formalised

through heritage agreement between the applicant and HWC, such agreement to be valid for 5 years from the date of the heritage agreement. This approval is for the temporary school facility only and the broader development proposal is subject to a full HIA process for the permanent school and another for the larger mixed-used development on the farm. In March 2026, HWC granted permission in the form of a signed heritage agreement between the parties for the temporary school structures (containers) to be reallocated to another site on the same farm. Once the Heritage Agreement was approved, the NID was withdrawn on 23 March 2026.

- HIA findings:
 - Townscape Assessment (prepared by authors of the HIA): The July study continues to assess urban morphology and spatial growth but shifts its terminology significantly. It concludes that the proposal is morphologically compatible but not identical to Paarl North, introducing a new "post-agrarian" urban layer. Instead of the previously argued "hard urban edge," the analysis now supports a "clear building line built-environment edge" complemented by a "softer transitional edge zone" (a conservation/open-space corridor) to resolve the transition between urban and non-urban forms.
 - Visual Impact Assessment on Cultural Landscape: The VIA (prepared by ARLA and Antoinette de Beer) remains central. Sensitive areas include the Berg River floodplain, Paarl Mountain, and the cultivated landscape. Receptors include the St. Pieter's Roche werf (PHS), scenic routes (Main Road/R45, Malmesbury Road), and local schools. The July HIA refines the significance, noting the overall impact is moderate, reducing to low-to-moderate with mitigation. It identifies only one receptor (the residential area abutting the high-density zone) as having moderate-high exposure.
 - Landscape Guidelines: The HIA now references Issue C (dated 03.07.2026) of the Landscape Guidelines. These guidelines explicitly integrate a continuous green corridor on the northern boundary with specific setbacks varying from 30m to 35m and 50m. The design follows "living street" and woonerf principles to create human-scale social spaces rather than traditional traffic corridors.
 - A Desktop Archaeological Study: Relying on the 2022 ACRM study, the findings remain that the area is not an archaeologically sensitive landscape. However, the July HIA adds a specific recommendation for a "watching brief" during construction to address unexpected finds, which is a standard heritage management practice not emphasized in the previous summary.
- Heritage Indicators (Section 9.2):
 - Respect the historic werf site's visual legacy from the Main Road.
 - Heritage-responsive design: Avoid urbanising treatments in design and infrastructure
 - Reinforce the hierarchy of the historic werf
 - Integrate landscape design as heritage infrastructure
 - Building form, massing, and roofscape
 - Townscape design
- Mitigation Measures (Section 11):
 - Alignment with Local Spatial Development Framework (LSDF)
 - Dealing with development inside the urban edge as urban infill area
 - Focus on retaining the experiential and contextual values
 - Balancing of cultural landscape value and urban development
 - Shaping the cultural landscape by a continuous chain of interactions across horizontal layers and through successive vertical layers
 - Concluding recommendations based on indicators
- The HIA recommends the following (pages 12 and 110):
 1. Endorses this report as having met the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA
 2. In terms of Section 38(8) of the NHRA, supports the proposed Development Plan subject to the mitigation measures set out in Sections 9.2 and 11 in the report
- I&AP comments:
 - DHAC notes that the werf is considered a proposed grade II heritage resource. DHAC does not support the residential development from a heritage point of view further stating that the following must be provided:

- The applicant must consult HWC regarding Section 38 of the NHRA and the response to HWC must be provided.
- The alignment and structure of the proposed boulevard extension has not been confirmed and remains uncertain.
- This alignment and arrangement must be confirmed.
- Clarity must be provided regarding the future use of the original werf and any proposed alterations or development.
- The density and scale of the development must be reduced and graded towards the northern and eastern boundaries.
- Appropriate landscape buffers must be introduced towards the northern and eastern boundaries to assist with transition from the urban to the rural environment.
- All landscaping must continue the planting patterns of the rural landscape.
- The internal landscaping must incorporate tree lines to break up the development and assist with the transition towards the rural environment.
- Avoid suburban or urban typologies in terms of the proposed gate houses, boundary conditions and built form edges.
- A permeable fence must be introduced along all visible boundaries.
- A detailed landscaping plan and landscape maintenance plan must be provided at building plan stage for approval.
- DHF supports.
- Paarl 300 Foundation did not object to the previous application for the school's spot rezoning but provided no comment on the current large-scale development
- IACOM FR submitted 8 July 2026:
 1. The HIA Report consistency and description of the northern interface:
 - a. The HIA has been updated to reflect the "Final SDP" of June 2026 (drawing no. SB-SPR-100, Revision 3, dated 2 June 2026, as prepared by Studio Biome). The HIA explicitly describes the northern interface as a "continuous green corridor" and "soft transition as urban fringe". Section 8.7 (pages 75–79) is dedicated to the rural-urban interface, detailing three possible scenarios and justifying Option 2 (Conservation/open-space corridor) as the preferred method to resolve the transition between urban and agricultural land. The report specifies that setbacks now vary from 30m to 35m and 50m (adjacent to high-density units).
 2. The Landscape Guidelines document dated 11-07-2025 must be updated to be consistent with, and include the updated Landscape Sketch Plan drawing, dated 02-06-2026.
 - a. The guidelines have been updated from Issue B (July 2025) to Issue C (July 2026) to ensure consistency with the Revised SDP dated 2 June 2026. These guidelines now formally incorporate the "Perimeter Green Corridor" as a binding design element and include the specific updated drawings and sections required
 3. Cross sections of the northern interface area must be provided.
 - a. Both the Final HIA dated 5 July 2026 (page 86, figure 57) and Appendix E: Landscape Guidelines - Issue C (Page 26, Appendix A) now provide "Schematic Sections through the Living Street Zone, Linear Park and Neighbouring Farm Interface" for both the East and West portions of the boundary. These sections illustrate the spatial relationship between the private yards, the shared green "Living Street" (10m–16m), the "Linear Park," and the "Neighbouring Farm".
- Inconsistencies identified in July 2026 HIA:
 - Hard Edge terminology – The main body of the HIA was updated to argue for soft transition as the urban fringe, however in the Recommendations (Section 12, page 110 – last paragraph) notes that "the proposed development does not introduce a soft, transitional or diluted morphology, but instead consolidates development within a clearly defined urban form". Page 81 and 100 also argues against soft transition: The introduction of a soft or diluted edge, characterised by fragmented buffers, scattered low-density development, or pseudo-rural subdivisions, would produce a zone of morphological ambiguity, neither legibly urban nor recognisably agricultural."

- The executive summary states that the previous proposal included 424 residential erven which was revised to 399 residential erven. However, on page 48 it's stated that Portion 2 as accommodating approx. 449 residential erven.

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the S38(8) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled "APPLICATION FOR A PROPOSED MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT ON REMAINDER OF ERF NO. 8709, PAARL, WESTERN CAPE Heritage Impact Assessment", dated 5 July 2026, and prepared by Anja Lareman and Ronnie Donaldson for Lareman Architects, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), with specific reference to the following recommendations on pages 108-110:

- Indicator-based recommendations (binding conditions)
 1. Indicator 1: Secures the historic werf's contribution to Paarl's historic scenic route and preserves long-established visual relationships
 - i. A landscape buffer along the Main Road/R45 scenic route must be retained and implemented as a condition of approval. This buffer must:
 - a. Remain predominantly unbuilt (sport facility of the school permitted though)
 - b. Be planted with indigenous and contextually appropriate tree species
 - c. Reinforce the visual dominance of the treed entrance avenue and werf setting
 - ii. No new buildings may:
 - a. Break the skyline behind the historic werf's outbuildings when viewed from Main Road.
 - b. Compete visually with the Victorian villa or farmhouse complex
 2. Indicator 2: Avoid urbanising treatments in design and infrastructure to control suburbanisation of the cultural landscape and protect night-time rural character:
 - i. All perimeter treatments facing Main Road, i.e. the werf, must:
 - a. Exclude plastered or solid boundary walls
 - b. Use rural fencing typologies (split pole, post-and-rail, agricultural mesh, or planted hedges)
 - c. Maintain visual permeability of the werf
 - ii. Lighting must be controlled through a Lighting Management Plan, requiring:
 - a. Low-level, downward-directed luminaires
 - b. Maximum pole height of 1.1 m in heritage-sensitive zones
 - c. No floodlighting of buildings or landscape features near the werf or scenic routes
 3. Indicator 3: Reinforce the hierarchy of the historic werf
 - i. The historic werf must remain a clearly defined and consolidated heritage precinct, retaining its physical and visual legibility as the structuring core of the former farm. This approach is further reinforced by, and aligned with, the development framework of the neighbouring property in this regard.
 4. Indicator 4: Integrate landscape design as heritage infrastructure
 - i. Landscape must be the primary mediator between old and new layers and is essential to maintaining cultural landscape continuity. The approved landscape plan must be treated as heritage infrastructure, not cosmetic landscaping. Key requirements include:
 - d. Retention and reinforcement of historic tree alignments
 - a. Indigenous planting along buffers, corridors, and parks
 - b. Screening of parking areas through berms and tree planting
 - c. Integration of stormwater systems as visible, legible landscape elements
 - d. Green buffer strips between neighbouring farm and proposed development varying in size from 30m to 35m to 50m.
 5. Indicator 5: Building form, massing, and roofscape
 - i. Building massing must be articulated and broken down, particularly in higher density components, to avoid monolithic forms. Roofscape controls must include:
 - a. Muted, non-reflective materials
 - b. Heights that remain visually subordinate to the werf's outbuildings when viewed from heritage-sensitive viewpoints

- c. Step-down massing toward heritage edges
- 6. Indicator 6: Townscape design and living streets
 - i. Human-scaled townscape design embeds heritage logic into everyday lived experience, mitigating the scale of change. The approved layout must implement woonerf and living street principles as binding design requirements, including:
 - a. Pedestrian priority
 - b. Narrowed carriageways
 - c. On-street planting and seating
 - d. Reduced vehicular speeds
 - ii. Typical suburban layouts must be avoided in favour of:
 - a. Varied building-street relationships
 - b. Fine-grained neighbourhood character
 - c. Streets functioning as social spaces rather than traffic corridors
- 7. Cultural landscape management recommendations
 - i. Development beyond the werf will inevitably transform former agricultural land. This does not equate to cultural landscape erasure, provided:
 - a. The werf remains visually dominant
 - b. Key view corridors are preserved
 - c. The transition from rural to urban is clearly articulated through a building line edge
- 8. Clear building line-built environment edge
 - i. Morphological clarity is preferable to diluted “soft edge” sprawl in heritage-sensitive contexts. The adoption of a clear building line-built environment edge is supported, as it:
 - a. Prevents creeping suburbanisation into agricultural land
 - b. Maintains spatial clarity
 - c. Protects remaining rural landscapes beyond the urban edge
- Other recommendations:
 - 9. The Final SDP of June 2026 drawing no. SB-SPR-100, Revision 3, dated 2 June 2026, as prepared by Studio Biome, as well as the mitigation measures as set out in the report in sections 9.2 and 11.
 - 10. The Landscape Guideline Document drawing no SB-SPR-GU-0001, dated 3 July 2026, as prepared by Studio Biome.

The endorsement contained in this final comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended on good reason being shown and at the discretion of HWC, provided that application for extension must be made prior to the effluxion of the 5-year period.

CN

- 13.39 Portion 2 of Farm Vredenburg 691, 18 Winery Road, Stellenbosch, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 28198CH0415 <https://sahris.org.za/node/396087>
 Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 29 April, 31 May & 29 June 2026: Stellenbosch Municipality comment, SHF comment, POP with reference number and streetscape/contextual photographs.
- Stellenbosch Heritage Inventory and Conservation Management Plan 2019: Not graded, IIIB landscape unit
- Proposal is for minor alterations to non-historically sensitive areas, partial demolition of a later addition and the construction of two new bedrooms.
- Work has not started.
- Stellenbosch Municipality did not comment in 30 days.
- SIG supports.
- SHF has no objection

DECISION

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

CN

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 1804, 34 Thom Street, Paarl, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29058CN0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405406>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Mr. Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Proposals correctly indicated on plan received on 8 July.
- Grading: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For a new double garage with a first-floor flatlet and balcony, internal reconfiguration of the house, enclosure of the existing stoep to create an office, and the addition of a covered rear stoep. The proposal also includes new windows and doors, alterations to existing openings, a new driveway and entrance gate, a pitched gable roof to the new first-floor addition, and palisade boundary fence on top of a low wall.
- Consultation:
 - DHAC objects and state that the garage and addition must be setback in line with the existing house, the 1st floor lean-to-roof must be replaced with a hipped roof and the ClearVu fencing must be replaced with palisade fencing.
 - Paarl 300 supported and notes in their opinion that the apartment on the front of the garage is missing something. (south elevation looks blunt).
 - DHF has no objection to the proposal but notes that the application documentation was of a poor standard, making it difficult to assess. The submission lacked adequate photographs, including complete building elevations and a full streetscape view, requiring reliance on Google Street View. DHF also noted an inconsistency between the west elevation and the ground floor plan, where a new dining room window is shown on the elevation but not on the plan.
- Heritage Considerations: The applicant has addressed some of the concerns raised during consultation by replacing the proposed ClearVu fence with a palisade fence and revising the first-floor roof from a lean-to to a pitched gable roof. However, the garage and first-floor addition remain forward of the existing building line, and the roof was not revised to a hipped form as requested by DHAC. Notwithstanding these outstanding matters, the proposed gable roof provides a more articulated appearance than the original design, and the contemporary addition is considered compatible with the low heritage significance of the property and its surrounding context. DHF comment regarding the window on the west elevation has been addressed - the window has been removed.
- All parties were invited to today's meeting.

DECISION

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

CN

14.2 Erf 19861, 5 De Jonghs Street, Paarl, S27 – Minor Works

Case No: 29001CN0618 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404897>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.
Mr. Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: II
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications:
- HWC25092207CH1027 - Internal alterations, partial demolition, boundary fence and rezoning. Approved with Close Out Report. Permit dated 25.11.25.
- 27596CH0302 - Maintenance to the thatch roof, Approved, Permit dated 18.03.26.
- Proposal: For the installation of a frameless glass security door fixed to the external reveal of the existing front entrance door. The existing timber entrance door will be retained.
- Drakenstein Municipality noted concern regarding the piece-meal approach to applications but note that they will review these proposals once building plans are submitted to the Municipality.
- Future applications must therefore form part of a consolidated proposal that clearly identifies all completed, approved and proposed work on the property, enabling HWC to assess the cumulative impact on the Provincial Heritage Site.

COMMENT

The Committee is supportive of the proposed interventions. For Heritage Western Cape (HWC) to issue a permit, the following is required:

1. The applicant must appoint a suitably qualified consultant with the appropriate heritage experience to oversee the proposed work and to submit a close out report within 30 days practical completion.
 2. HWC is to be provided with the details of the consultant and their CV confirming suitability to oversee the work
 3. A letter of appointment to be signed by the applicant and consultant
- Once the above has been fulfilled, HWC will provide the required permit.

CN

14.3 Erf 237, 22 Berg Street, Elim, S27 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29027CN0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405076>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Locality Plan on SAHRIS, Elim Mission Station Overseers Council comments, Motivation on heritage grounds, plan indicating work that has started/been completed, removal of incorrect previous application listed required.

CN

14.4 Erf 2507, 75 Merriman Street, George, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28989CN0618 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404864>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Confirmation that GHT was consulted and all proposals to be coloured up on the plan required

CN

14.5 Erf 266-RE, 1 Surf Road, Sea Point, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29040CN0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405104>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

Mr. Ashley Lillie (applicant & consultant) & Ellen Aucamp (representative of the owner) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information: Correctly coloured up plan required
- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: HWC23112317SJ1127: refurbishment of whole building & replacing lost elements, Approved with a close-out report, Permit dated 4 Dec.
- Proposal: For amendments to the previously approved alterations and additions for refurbishment to Avalon Apartments, comprising a revised ground floor parking layout with tandem garages, reconfigured entrance lobby and caretaker/staff apartment, replacement of existing timber garage doors, windows and doors with black aluminium units matching the original design, reinstatement of original open balconies through the removal of later balcony enclosures, reinstatement of original canvas awnings and blocked-up openings, replacement of boundary fencing, localised internal reconfigurations including new sliding doors and removal of nib walls, and associated façade restoration works to better reflect the building's original architectural character.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports after considerable interaction with the applicant and recommends that an archival photographic record of the existing internal configuration is completed prior to any structural or fit-out works affecting the lift core zone.
 - CTHF, SFA, & SFB did not comment in 30 days.
 - Docomomo-SA objects to the proposal. While supporting the building's proposed Grade IIIB grading and acknowledging that an extension may be appropriate, it considers the proposal overly invasive, resulting in the loss of much of the original building fabric and authenticity. It raises concern that the cumulative alterations, including the internal reconfiguration, new lift, relocated stairwell, rear extension and penthouse addition, leave only the building's outer shell intact. Docomomo-SA further objects to design elements that introduce an Art Deco character, such as the vertical stair tower, curved walls and circular windows, arguing that these detract from the building's Early Modern significance. It recommends that the design be revised to better retain the original architectural character and fabric, requests that the Surf Street balconies remain open, the triangular window be reinstated, the building retain a light colour palette, and that it be afforded the opportunity to document the building before works commence.
- Response to objections:
 - The comment from Docomomo raised various concerns, some of which have been addressed thorough the process of interacting with E&HM, which has initially expressed similar concerns. Docomomo also recommended that some possibilities be considered and various of these are now reflected in the amended drawings.
- Heritage considerations: The revised proposal addresses a number of Docomomo-SA's detailed design recommendations, including the reinstatement of the triangular window, reopening of enclosed balconies, removal of the circular feature window, retention of a light external finish, refinement of the rear addition, and provision for photographic documentation prior to construction. The revised design also incorporates amendments requested by the City to reduce the visual impact of the vertical stair/lift element. However, Docomomo's principal objection regarding the cumulative loss of original fabric, the extent of internal reconfiguration, and the perceived shift away from the building's Early Modern architectural character remains unresolved, as the amended proposal was not recirculated to Docomomo and no revised comment withdrawing or modifying its objection was received.
- The Committee noted that Docomomo-SA may not have undertaken a site inspection and that its objection remained unresolved. The applicant was advised to engage with Docomomo-SA and facilitate a site inspection before the next BELCom meeting. As HOMs did not have the delegation to determine the matter while the heritage objection remained, the application was referred to BELCom. Should Docomomo-SA revise or withdraw its objection, the application may be reconsidered by HOMs.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to BELCom on 26 August 2026 due to objections raised on heritage grounds.

CN

- 14.6 Erf 284, 1 Van Riebeeck Street, Ladismith, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: 29010CN0619 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404920>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA to be signed by both owners, all proposals to be coloured up on the plan, more internal and external photos and streetscape photos required.

CN

- 14.7 Erf 594, 4 Commissioner Street, Wellington, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29075CN0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405490>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Motivation on heritage grounds and plan to include a drawing number and date required

CN

- 14.8 Erf 7730, 16 Jan Hofmeyer Square, Paarl, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: 29070CN0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405455>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Motivation on heritage grounds and plan to include a drawing number and date required

CN

- 14.9 Erf 83724, 12 Victoria Road, Retreat, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29068CN0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405434>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

PoP with reference number required

CN

- 14.10 Erven 1196-RE & 1197 (consolidated unregistered Erf 13857), 68 Bain Street, Wellington, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29024CN0620 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405071>
Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: For the construction of a covered entertainment area with a built-in braai, a covered storage area, installation of solar panels with associated inverter and battery system.
- Consultation:
 - DHAC no objection
 - Paarl 300 does not support and state that they cannot comment on work already started or completed without a permit.
 - DHF cannot comment on work that has been completed without a permit. The committee would have supported the proposal had the application been submitted to it before any work commenced.
- WHF does not condone illegal building work but has no objections

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.

CN

14.11 Erf 1124, 4 Stemmet Road, Eastcliff, Hermanus, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 29034CSI0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405091>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Previous approval: 28237CH0420 - New hipped roof with metal finish in matt black, new stoep and pergola to the north and west, internal alterations, installing aluminum windows and doors and restore the oregon pine floors.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the demolition and reconstruction of two internal walls which were deemed to be unstable by a structural engineer
- OHAC 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

14.12 Erf 1130, 43 Sarel Cilliers Street, Strand, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29059CSI0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405416>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

CoCT comment, confirmation of the status of work (boundary wall, internal work appears to have started) required.

CSI

14.13 Erf 149639, 18 Kloof Street, Gardens, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29050CSI0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405131>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

CIBRA comment, streetscapes required.

CSI

14.14 Erf 19664, 91 Da Gama Sreet, Brooklyn, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29064CSI0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405427>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

PoA, photo images to be provided in separate pdf documents clearly labeled internal, external, streetscapes, outstanding R4000 balance for unauthorised work required. Admin to confirm payment reference can be linked back to application.

CSI

14.15 Erf 4661, 8 3rd Avenue, Kleinmond, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 29018CSI0619 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404945>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Company resolution required.

CSI

14.16 Erf 650, 8, Sleepy Hollow Lane, Noordhoek, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29017CSI0619 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404944>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for the selective demolition of parts of the existing dwelling, including the northern and southern outbuildings, to restore and enhance the original form and legibility of the two historic barn structures. New bedroom wings will be added to the north and south, with the northern wing connected by a glazed link and the southern wing carefully positioned below the existing pediment openings and concealed behind parapet walls to minimise visual impact. Limited internal alterations and roof repairs will improve functionality while retaining the building's heritage character, after which it will serve as the property's Second Dwelling. A new Primary Dwelling, with an associated garage and swimming pool, will be constructed on the southern portion of the site, while the existing cottage outbuilding will be retained and adapted for use as a home office. A new Third Dwelling, also with a garage and swimming pool, will be developed on the north-western portion of the property. Vehicular access to both the Primary and Second Dwellings will be provided via the existing, slightly widened carriageway crossing. The applicant noted that the Committee should look at the plan submitted under Additional Submissions as it includes amendments to the plan which was originally submitted. The amendments include: The addition of one column to the ground storey verandah; the internal reconfiguration of the first storey bedrooms and bathrooms; a revised roof line over the entrance hall; and the adoption of sash-style fenestration on all dwellings, in place of the previously proposed side-hung windows. The opening sizes remain unchanged from the drawings previously submitted.
- CoCT provided comment and support the application stating that HRS believes that due to the nature of the proposed work, the original core of the resource remains almost intact, additions have 'obscured' the readability of the core albeit still recognisable as such. The proposed alterations and additions will not have a negative impact on the associated levels of significance of the resource and as such are supported.
- Noordhoek Ratepayers Association provided comment and support the application noting that the proposed works to the original historic core are limited and that, although the property has been altered over time, the original structure remains clearly identifiable. The Association considers the proposed additions to be sympathetic to the existing building and unlikely to negatively affect its heritage significance, character, or contribution to the streetscape. However, the Association emphasises that issues relating to the south-western boundary outbuilding, including its height, planning departures, and statutory approvals, must still be resolved through the appropriate processes. Its support for the heritage application does not extend to any outstanding planning non-compliances associated with the outbuilding.

DECISION

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

CSI

14.17 Erf 809 218, Ocean View Drive, Fresnaye, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29031CSI0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405085>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Comments from SFA, SFBRA required.

CSI

14.18 Erf 878, Fontein Street, Riebeek Kasteel, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: 26941CSI0105 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388095>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- NID summary: The NID was heard at HOMS on 19 January 2026 whereby the Committee resolved to request an HIA with Archaeological Impact Assessment, Townscape Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment.
- Previous case: 20030413SB0603E - IACom issued a detailed final comment in which they concluded the following, ""Section 38(8) provides for the approval of a development by DEADP as the consenting authority, as part of a NEMA process, "provided that the consenting authority must ensure that the evaluation fulfils the requirements of the relevant heritage resources authority in terms of subsection (3), and any comments and recommendations of the relevant heritage resources authority with regard to such development have been taken into account prior to the granting of the consent." The HIA only complies with 1 of the 7 provisions of Section 38(3) of the NHRA, and it is noted that until the issues as identified above are addressed, the HIA is incomplete and fatally flawed, and the Committee is not in a position to endorse it. The Committee request that DEADP, as the consenting authority, engage with HWC, as the commenting heritage resources authority, on this matter before taking a decision on the Final BAR, as required i.t.o. the Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) between DEADP and HWC.""
- Proposed development: The proposed development on Erf 878, Riebeek Kasteel, comprises a mixed-use residential neighbourhood intended to function as an extension of the historic town while responding to the site's topography, landscape character and heritage context. The 12.15-hectare site is located between Church Street (R311) and Fontein Street and is currently vacant apart from a historic well structure, having previously been used for agricultural purposes and more recently for grazing. The development seeks to provide a range of residential, commercial and community-oriented opportunities on land that is no longer used for agriculture, while creating new employment, business and tourism opportunities.
- Visual impacts: The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), prepared by New World Associates, evaluates the potential visual effects of the proposed development on Erf 878, Riebeek Kasteel. The assessment identifies the site's prominent location along the R311, where it is highly visible from key sections of the scenic route, while noting that it is only minimally visible from within the historic town due to the street layout, surrounding development and topography. The site comprises a lower northern portion and an elevated southern portion and is currently characterised as undeveloped former agricultural land with remnants of renosterveld vegetation. Although the surrounding landscape has high scenic, heritage and townscape value, views of the site are constrained from many directions by ridgelines, existing land uses and the historic street grid. The VIA concludes that the proposed development is likely to result in a moderate to high visual impact, as it introduces a substantial change to the existing landscape and visual environment. The assessment recognises that the project represents a significant land use change within a visually sensitive setting and identifies several factors that contribute to its visual significance, including its location adjacent to a scenic route, the area's strong sense of place, its heritage and tourism value, and the presence of important views and ridgelines. The report recommends a range of mitigation measures to reduce visual impacts, including refinement of the site development plan, contextually appropriate architectural design, comprehensive landscape planting, protection of existing vegetation and trees, careful treatment of open spaces and boundary fencing, the use of subdued natural colour palettes, and the implementation of a long-term visual management and maintenance programme. These measures are intended to ensure that the development integrates more successfully with the historic townscape and surrounding cultural landscape.
- Archaeology: The wider Riebeek Valley and Kasteelberg area has a rich archaeological record, with previously documented Early, Middle and Later Stone Age artefacts, including stone tools, as well as Khoi and San rock art in shelters and overhangs on the slopes of Kasteelberg. Archaeological research also suggests that the surrounding landscape formed part of a seasonal Khoi transhumance route prior to colonial settlement. In contrast, the field assessment of the project site identified only a small number of Early and Middle Stone Age stone flakes and chunks, all of which occurred in a severely disturbed and degraded context within gravel roads or historically cultivated areas. No formally retouched stone tools, evidence of human occupation or settlement, or graves were recorded on the site. A single fragment of a late 19th- to early 20th-century blue-

and-white glazed floor tile was also recovered from the disturbed surface deposits. Given the extensive historical transformation of the site through agricultural activities, the archaeological remains were assessed as Not Conservation Worthy, and the proposed development is expected to have a very low impact on archaeological heritage resources.

- Public Participation Process: The 2026 public participation process was undertaken by Lornay Environmental Consulting and included extensive engagement with the Riebeek Valley Ratepayers Association (RVRA), the local civic body registered with Heritage Western Cape. Discussions between the developer, their specialist team, and the RVRA commenced in August 2025 and continued through a series of meetings until May 2026. The process was guided by formal correspondence outlining the RVRA's concerns regarding the original proposal and the changes required to achieve support. Following constructive engagement and revisions to the proposal, the RVRA expressed its support for the revised mixed-use development, subject to engineering and infrastructure matters identified in a separate specialist report. The RVRA further noted that its support does not prevent individual residents from submitting objections in their personal capacity.
- The HOMs Committee took an email decision on 14 July 2026 to refer the matter to IACom in order for the matter to be placed on the agenda for the IACom meeting on 22 July 2026.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 22 July 2026 due to the visual mitigation recommendations and overall contentious nature of the development.

CSI

14.19 Erf 88555, 10 Pentrich Road, St James, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29079CSI0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405731>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to the existing deck at main bedroom with roof, new pergola and braai, new entertainment room separate from the main house, guest toilet, laundry and store, and internal alterations.
- KBSJRRRA required clarification regarding the entertainment room but provided no objection to the proposal.
- CoCT provided comment identifying no negative impact of the proposed work and have supported the application.

DECISION

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

CSI

14.20 Erf 88564 & 88550, 98 Pentrich Road, St James, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29078CSI0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405730>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Not Graded
- Inside HPO
- Proposed work is for the existing short boundary wall, which currently has a palisade fence above the stepped heights, be retained. The palisade is to be removed to allow planting in its place. New

stone wall built 1m back behind current line of wall. The existing tree currently in front of the palisade is to be retained and additional planting of shrubs along the street edge is proposed. It is proposed that a new 1.8m stone wall to match existing and topped coping is built 1m back from the current wall position. This will allow the steps to remain open and airy while providing the house owners the required privacy. The erf bounding this portion has little privacy from the public steps and the owners seek to improve both security and privacy by altering the boundary wall as shown. The boundary wall is part of 10 Pentrich Road but the City of Cape Town are the owners of the boundary wall hence two applications had to be made for the alterations to the boundary wall.

- KBSJRRRA required clarification regarding the entertainment room but provided no objection to the proposal.
- CoCT provided comment stating that the proposed new stone wall towards the Pentrich Road steps has been revised so as to impact as little as possible on the existing stone wall. HRS believes that the current proposal sufficiently serves to retain the historic nature and character of the existing stone wall and is therefore supportive thereof.

DECISION

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

CSI

14.21 Farm 92, Steenbokfontein Farm, Steenbokfontein Cave, Lambert's Bay, S35 – Dating

Case No: HWC25111405CSI0414

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Work applied for has not started
- Proposed research is for radiocarbon dating of three charcoal samples from Steenbokfontein Cave.
- Purpose of research: The dates acquired from the destructive analysis and dating will refine the chronological resolution of Steenbokfontein Cave during the mid-Holocene era. The samples being dated are from three distinct archaeological layers.
- Dating sample: 'Orange Sand Below Mantis (OSBM)' from square I3 (1.25g), 'Ash Mantis II' from square J3 (1.03g), and 'Grey Stuff' from square J3 (6.5g). Each sample represents 0.5% of the total charcoal weight from each layer.
- The West Coast Aboriginal Council did not provide comment within 30 days.
- Iziko provided a letter of approval for the destructive analysis of the three charcoal samples.

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

CSI

14.22 Farm 762-RE, off the R44, Klappmuts, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 29065CSI0624 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405430>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent
- Proposed development: The construction of a new guest house intended to provide short-term visitor accommodation within the existing rural/farm context, with a specific focus on accessible tourism and inclusive accommodation for guests with disabilities. The building will accommodate five guest bedrooms, with a maximum occupancy of ten guests, calculated at two persons per bedroom. Associated facilities include a breakfast room and reception area, kitchen and laundry, swimming pool, massage room, and pool store/pump room. The approximate floor area of the main building, including the breakfast room, reception, kitchen and laundry, is 366.2m².
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
- Built environment: The structures on site were built in the late 1970s according to the applicant.

- Visual impacts: The proposed dwelling will be single storey and have Cape Dutch architectural style and influence. The trees on site will provide adequate screening from the R44.
- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources, the site is agricultural in nature.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is low

COMMENT

The proposal does not trigger the NHRA in terms of Section 38(1). A letter of no trigger to be issued.

CSI

14.23 Portion 1 of Farm 722, Farm Woest Arabie, off the R43 Caledon, S38(8) – NID

Case No: 29021CSI0619 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404956>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent
- Proposed development: A low-impact eco-tourism accommodation facility comprising of 20 self-contained, single-storey accommodation suites (approximately 207 m² each, excluding patios) arranged in a curved linear formation around a central lifestyle and eco centre, which will provide guest lounges, dining, a gymnasium, indoor swimming pool, spa, and reception facilities. Covered walkways connect the suites to the central building. Supporting infrastructure includes a private off-grid sewage package plant, an existing on-site borehole water supply, Eskom electricity supplemented by solar power, and on-site solid waste management. Vehicular access will be via an upgraded existing jeep track connecting to the R43.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural Zone 1 / Vacant
- Visual impacts: There are warehouses/storage facilities on the neighbouring farms but the general area appears to be largely underdeveloped. The site is not located along a scenic route, however, the cultural landscape will change through the introduction of this development. Although the accommodation units are single-storey and arranged in a curved configuration, the cumulative footprint of 20 suites together with the central Lifestyle and Eco Centre would create a noticeable change in the visual character of the area.
- Archaeology: No identifiable archaeological resources, the land is agricultural in nature.
- Palaeontology: Sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is very high. The consultant has not provided a screener stating the potential impact of the development on palaeo resources.

INTERIM COMMENT

The Committee resolved to require a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) which complies with S38 (3) of the NHRA, and which includes the following:

1. Visual Impact Assessment
2. Palaeontological Impact Assessment

CSI

14.24 Farm 1341, Bo-Dal Road, Dal Josaphat, Paarl, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: HWC25110302EJV1113 / 26666EJV1113 <https://sahris.org.za/node/387146>

CASE SUMMARY

- HOMs in November 2025 resolved to request an HIA with VIA, AIA, and Socio-Historical Study for the proposal to develop a solar photo voltaic facility across the northern (Section A) and southern (Section B) sections of the site inclusive of Battery Energy Storage System, substation, powerline, access roads, temporary offices and storage areas, and security fencing. The proposal also seeks to restore the structure in ruin for adaptive reuse and the creation of a public museum.
- In terms of archaeology:
 - 2017 and 2025 surveys revealed large numbers of ESA artefacts with a particular concentration in the south-western corner of the site (Section B) and a smaller concentration in the north-eastern part of the site outside of the development footprint graded IIIB and IIIC respectively. The artefacts included at least five cleavers which are generally very rarely seen compared to

handaxes and approximately fifty handaxes. The density of handaxes here is the highest seen by the archaeologist in the region and the scatter appears to be quite extensive. While the larger artefacts, like handaxes, were most visible, it is very likely that many smaller artefacts occur beneath the grass. No historical artefacts were identified outside of the vicinity of remnant historical structures which are a proposed IIIC. These structures are intended for restoration with the possibility that further historical archaeology is unearthed. Unmarked graves beyond the cemetery are not expected to occur given the hard substrate in the southwest and the historical ploughing of the land to the northeast, but would be afforded a provisional IIIA grading.

- In terms of palaeontology:
 - The bedrock underlying the site consists of Malmesbury Group shales and schists. A major fault zone or tectonic discontinuity is inferred to trend from north to south. West of this fault zone the bedrock is the Moorreesburg Formation, to the east is the Porterville Formation. These formations consist mainly of shales and muddy, deep-water sandstones. The Malmesbury Group formations may potentially include fossils. However, fossil preservation does not seem favourable in the deformed and metamorphosed terranes of the South-Western Cape. The alluvium cover may include fossil material distributed in ephemeral drainages and slopewash deposits. However, the palaeontological sensitivity of the alluvial/colluvial cover is rated as low.
- In terms of visual impact:
 - The Dal Josaphat Valley is a broad agricultural basin framed by the Hawequa and Klein Drakenstein mountains to the east and the Berg River to the west. It retains the historic geometry of farm layouts, tree-lined fields, and whitewashed werf clusters that characterises the Cape Winelands cultural landscape. Although the Dal Josaphat farmstead has fallen into disrepair, its ensemble of gabled buildings and mature trees remains legible and anchored within its historic curtilage. The proposed development occupies degraded farmland to the south of the werf, presently characterised by fallow fields and rural vegetation.
 - From a heritage and landscape perspective, the proposal presents a dual opportunity: to rehabilitate the historic werf through restoration and curtilage management, and to demonstrate how renewable energy infrastructure can be visually integrated within a continuing cultural landscape. The 50 m heritage buffer around the werf ensures that the historic core remains visually dominant and experientially distinct. Landscape rehabilitation, together with the proposed restoration of the werf complex, will reintroduce visual order and coherence to a currently neglected portion of the valley. No significant cumulative effects are expected, and the proposal is consistent with the productive rural character of the Dal Josaphat basin and introduces a contemporary productive layer within the valley while restoring the historic landscape structure on which its significance depends. Ultimately, the solar arrays will be visible primarily within the mid-field of the valley floor, where they will read as horizontal, ordered patterns consistent with agricultural imagery. View corridors linking the werf to the mountains remain unobstructed. Receptor sensitivity is highest for heritage and residential observers, moderate for road users, and low for distant viewpoints. The overall landscape sensitivity is rated Medium to High, warranting continued application of design mitigation, heritage buffers, and vegetation reinforcement to ensure visual harmony and scenic containment. The assessment finds that visual and aesthetic effects are manageable and reversible, provided the recommended mitigation measures are implemented.
- In terms of the cultural landscape:
 - The site does not fall within a REDZ but is inside the Central Electricity Grid Infrastructure (EGI) corridor. It occupies an urban, peri-urban, and rural condition. The landscape has two distinct character zones: firstly, the lower valley with the collection of historical werfs strung out in a linear pattern in relation to Bo-Dal Road on the urban fringe of Paarl overlooking the lands to the north, and secondly the middle valley with the semicircular route connecting various historic farmsteads facing west. The surrounding landscape to the south, west and northwest has rapidly developed in recent years to become a high density urban landscape. The integrity of the landscape has been compromised by the encroachment of urban development and peri-urban activities along the northern, southern and western edges, in addition to the blurring of a clear transition between the developed edge of Paarl and its rural landscape qualities. The

receiving environment thus offers both sensitivity and resilience: it is capable of accommodating contextually integrated new uses provided that such uses reinforce, rather than disrupt, its visual coherence and heritage relationships. It can therefore be considered a continuing vernacular cultural landscape.

- In terms of socio-historical significance:
 - The site is assessed to have historic, architectural, aesthetic, contextual, social, scientific, spiritual, linguistic, landmark and technological significances. Dal Josafat is a biblical reference to a place of divine reckoning and judgement and, while once the original name for the farm, has come to be applied to the entire region or landscape. The farm was first granted to Peter Beuk in 1693, the first farm in the area granted east of the Berg River. The farm hosts three historic farmsteads: Goede Rust, Non-Pareille and Roggeland, which exemplify the Cape rural vernacular tradition and are described by Fransen as “a priceless row of three closely adjoining historic farm complexes”. A historic cemetery dating as late as the 1860s is located west of the four homesteads and is attributed to the Hugo family with the most recent burial taking place in 1995.
 - Apart from its many fine historic farm complexes, Dal Josafat is known as one of the cradles of the Afrikaans language. The Dal Josafat School on Kleine Metje was founded in 1847, and provided an early education to many later leading figures of the Afrikaans language movement. The Hugenote Gedenkskool on Kleinbosch, opened 1883, is one of the key institutions on the history of Afrikaans as medium of instruction.
 - The valley was later subject to the Group Areas Act, becoming home to the Coloured households evicted from declared white areas in Paarl during the 1960s. By the end of that decade Dal Josafat was considered ‘the only solution’ to formally provide for a future local Coloured township development following strong objections to its establishment elsewhere. However, it was later feared that the development of additional housing opportunities in Dal Josafat would lead to an untenable racial imbalance and its significance as the cradle of the Afrikaans language movement also soon emerged as a significant concern to the broader regional White population, and so this proposal was never actioned. In 1979, Goede Rust, Non-Pareille and Roggeland were de-proclaimed and ‘lifted’ out of the Coloured Scheme for consolidation and transferal in ownership to the Republic of South Africa. This paved the way for the site’s proclamation as a National Monument in 1985 and its restoration. Ownership was transferred to the NMC in 1986 and later to SAHRIA with the promulgation of the NHRA.
- In terms of the assessment of impacts:
 - The highly significant structures within the Farmstead precinct, certain of which are in extremely derelict condition, have an opportunity to being restored and maintained by the applicant.
 - The recommended buffers between the PVSEF infrastructure and the Homestead precinct and cemetery ensures the immediate setting of these heritage resources remains.
 - The PVSEF is a light industrial infrastructure project, and that can be removed when the project is decommissioned in approximately 20 years.
 - The proposal is the only in the site context. Therefore, there is no cumulative impact on the site context.
 - The application is an opportunity for the management and maintenance of an extremely vulnerable site and its reinvigoration
- In terms of public participation:
 - The Paarl 300 Foundation supports
 - The Drakenstein Heritage Foundation objects to the proposal given the significance of the Dal Josafat Cultural Overlay Zone and NHS. They do, however, support the restoration of the historic homesteads on site.
 - The Drakenstein Municipality objects on the following bases:
 - A CMP is required
 - Impacts on the proposed HPO and cultural landscape have not been thoroughly interrogated
 - Site suitability is a concern and the extent of the proposal is unprecedented
 - Visual impact has not been adequately demonstrated and interrogated
 - Alternatives been adequately considered

- Curtilage and edge conditions details are insufficient and a landscape masterplan required
 - Proposed demolitions are unclear and the restorations unresolved
- The applicant responds from pages 228 to 231 of the HIA and concludes on pages 234 and 236 with their recommendations.

REFERRAL

The Committee resolved to refer the application to IACom on 19 August 2026 due to the objections and mitigation measures requiring consideration.

EJV

14.25 Erf 17493, 26 Sardinia Drive, Capri, Fish Hoek, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29002SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/404898>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: The proposal comprises substantial alterations and additions to the existing main and second dwellings, including internal reconfigurations and extensions, as well as the construction of a new detached third dwelling with associated covered areas and ancillary works.
- Work statues: not started.
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: outside
- Comments: CoCT support, Sunnysdale Ratepayers association support.
- Since there is no reason to believe the proposal will have a negative impact.

DECISION

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

SB

14.26 Erf 12501, 28 Milan Road, Woodstock, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29015SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/404941>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

More streetscape, comments from Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association and Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group required.

SB

14.27 Erf 1023, 60 Oostelike Road, Oudtshoorn, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29032SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/405087>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Internal photographs and more streetscape photographs are required.

SB

14.28 Remainder 1070 La Luc Estate, 64 Dirkie Uys Street, Franschhoek, S34 – Total demolition

Case No: 28996SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/404885>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

The original comments or emails. Demolition plan is required.

SB

14.29 Erf 6310 and Erf 6311, 35-37 Japonica Street, Macassar, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 29022SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/404957>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

POA, subdelegating documents, and site photographs required.

SB

- 14.30 Erf 4928, 14 10th Avenue, Voelklip, Hermanus, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29052SB0629 <https://sahris.org.za/node/405143>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee comments

SB

- 14.31 Erf 171 28 Main Road, Robertson, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: 29073SB0629 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405469>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Sub delegation document and company resolution, Langeberg municipality comment , Streetscape photographs, pop is required.

SB

- 14.32 Erf 1973, 7 Voortrek Street, Swellendam, S27 – Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 29080SB0629 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405733>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Tanja Kruger (Architect) was present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: reconstruction of the historic gateway to the Dutch Reformed Church Rectory in Swellendam, which was severely damaged when a large tree fell onto it during the storm of 11 May 2026.
- Rebuilding the damaged gate column using materials and finishes that match the original (locally sourced quarry stone, lime plaster and acrylic paint).
- Reconstructing the brick archway to replicate its original appearance using lime plaster and acrylic paint.
- Reinstalling the existing hardwood gate and original ironmongery, which were salvaged and remain intact.
- Reinstalling the historic "National Monument" sign in its original location using historic photographs as reference in the report – page 3.
- Work statues: not started.
- Grade: II
- HPO: Outside
- The application was submitted as a restoration involving like-for-like repairs and is considered minor in nature. The applicant was requested to provide the consultation comments referred to in the application. Members were asked to verify the Power of Attorney and title deed, as these are in formal Afrikaans. No plans were submitted, as the application is supported by a methodology report, which will require stamping.
- The committee was satisfied with the proof of ownership and the methodology report, finding it sufficiently detailed.
- Since there is no reason to believe that the proposal will have a negative impact of the resource.

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.

SB

- 14.33 Erf 1094, 8 Stemmet Street, Eastcliff, Hermanus, S34 – Minor Works**

Case No: 29053SB0629 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405145>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

OHAC comment required.

SB

14.34 Erf 9553, 9 Victoria Street, Paarl, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29061SB0629 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405419>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the item.

Tama Lembani (Architect) was present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: room extension, garage extension, and a new home gym. No demolition are planned and the proposals are located to the rear/side of the property.
- Work statues: not started
- Grade: IIIC
- HPO: Inside Special Character Protected Area Overlay Zone.
- Comments: DHF and Municipality have no objections, and Paarl300 support.
- Since there is no reason to believe that proposal will have a negative impact.

DECISION

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

SB

14.35 Erf 308, Corner of Vista Street and Main Street, St Helena Bay, S38(8) – HIA

Case No: 22061314SB0819E

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Confirmation about the NEAM process, confirmation if all parties have bene provide opportunity including that mention in municipality comment.

SB

14.36 Erf 147880, 109 Harrington Street, District Six, S38(1) – NID

Case No: 29055SVB0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405398>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Clarity regarding S38 trigger, Clear and legible screening tool or palaeo-sensitivity map, up to date Title Deed, recent internal, external and streetscape/contextual photographs and proof of payment with correct reference number required.

SVB

14.37 Erf 159, Morton Street, Standford, S27 – Minor Works

Case No: 29082SVB0626 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405738>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Power of attorney, resolution and correctly coloured up plans required.

SVB

14.38 14.38. Erf 168828, 67 Long Street, Cape Town City Centre, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 29067SVB0626 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405432>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscapes/contextual images and proof of payment of S51 fee required.

SVB

14.39 Erf 185, 16 Church Street, Plettenberg Bay, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 29047SVB0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405122>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Proof of consultation with local authority required.

SVB

14.40 Erf 25939, 3 Scott Road, Observatory, S34 – Minor Works

Case No: 29062SVB0626 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405421>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Joné Krös (applicant) was present and took part in the discussion

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: within Upper Observatory HPOZ
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for construction of additional internal walls in a portion of the building. The changes are largely internal, with the exception of one new aluminium window and door to match the existing style.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.41 Erf 369, 15 Vesperdene Road, Green Point, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 29020SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404954>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIC/NCW
- HPO: within Somerset Road PHA proposed HPOZ
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for extensive alterations and the addition of a second storey.
- Consultation:
 - GPRRA do not object to the proposal.
 - CoCT support the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

14.42 Erf 52835, 11 Parry Road, Claremont, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 29033SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405089>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Grading: IIIB
- HPO: outside of any HPO
- Status of work/completeness: work has not started
- Brief proposal description: The proposal is for an addition to the building on the north-western side, as well as minor alterations to doors and windows of the existing dwelling.

- Consultation:
 - CoCT support the proposal.
 - GLCA do not object to the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

- 14.43 Erf 8435-RE, 41 Victoria Street, George, S34 – Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 29023SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404964>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Plans with elevations coloured up correctly required.

SVB

- 14.44 Erf 938-RE, 10 Pentz Street, Bo-Kaap, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: 29025SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405072>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

External photographs, local authority comments and registered conservation body comments required.

SVB

- 14.45 Farm 237, 78 Church/Kerk Straat, Elim, S34 – Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 29036SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405100>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Internal photographs required.

SVB

- 14.46 Farm 237, 19 New/Nuwe Street, Elim, S34 – Addition**
Case No: 29039SVB0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405103>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Resolution, local authority comment and registered conservation body comment required.

SVB

- 14.47 Erf 96950, 12 Dumbarton Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Minor Works**
Case No: 29066XM0626 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405431>
Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.
 Victoria de la Cour

DISCUSSION

- The application is for minor deviations from approved in September 2024 permit No HWC24080126XM0813.
- The deviations include Alteration of the street-facing (east) façade by changing the approved window configuration.
- Changing the lean-to roof to a parapet wall, altering the external appearance.
- Removal of the original chimney and construction of a replacement chimney in a different location.
- Replacement of approved timber windows with aluminium windows on the north façade.
- Changes to window positions and door locations due to internal layout revisions.

- Changes to the west façade window configuration and additional alterations to kitchen/scullery windows.
- Internal layout changes, including relocating a bathroom and creating a new opening between the lounge and kitchen.
- Work has been completed- regularization
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- City comment states that no comment required from the City due to the proposal being minor works.

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.

- 14.48 Erf 2631, 122 8th Street, Voeklip, Hermanus, S34 – Total Demolition**
Case No: 29054XM0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405397>

XM

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Power of Attorney, Locality Map, SG Diagram, Motivation required.

- 14.49 Erf 56057, 20 Talana Road, Claremont, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29044XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405115>

XM

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Internal & Streetscape photographs required.

- 14.50 Erf 5830, 23 President Street, Oakdale, Belville, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29077XM0626 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405729>

XM

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Local municipality comments required.

- 14.51 Erf 1160, 24 Buxton Avenue, Gardens, S34 – Additions and Alterations**
Case No: 29013XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404927>

XM

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Application is for additions and alterations for internal alterations primarily focused on restoration. This includes the demolition of rear kitchen and addition of new steel conservatory structure to the rear of the building. Existing windows, doors, eaves, gutters, balconies and other external architectural elements will remain in place. In the event that they need to be replaced, they will be replaced with like-for-like replacements. Circular window from Southern Elevation will be salvaged and re-installed on the Northern Elevation.
- Work has not started
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- CoCT supports
- CIBRA supports

DECISION

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

XM

14.52 Erf 2893, 3 Dreyer Riad, Kommetjie, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29011XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404922>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Both owners to sign the POA, Local municipality and Conservation body comments
Annotated Internal, External/ elevations & Streetscape photographs, Proof of Payment required.

XM

14.53 Erf 4949, 3 Musson Street, Eastcliff, Hermanus, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29063XM0623 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405422>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Locality Map, Motivation, Streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.54 Erf 28208, 5 Dodds Road, Observatory, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28999XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404892>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Power of Attorney, Company Resolution Letter, Streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.55 Erf 95934, 6 Roelad Street, City Bowl, Cape Town, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 29030XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/405082>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Locality Map, Local municipality and Conservation body comments, streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.56 Erf 47529, 9 Heseldon Road, Rondebosch, S34 – Additions and Alterations

Case No: 28998XM0622 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/404891>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Local municipality comments, Streetscape photographs required.

XM

14.57 Erf 8051, 47 New Street, Somerset West, S34 – Additions & Alterations

Case No: 28343XM0430 <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/397345>

Ms. Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

- Outstanding information received on 01 July 2026
- The application is for additions and alterations for renovations to the existing building including; internal demolition to create more space, door removal, brick up window and plaster and paint.
- Work has not started
- The building has not been graded
- Outside HPO
- The City declines its opportunity to comment on this case from a heritage point of view and requests that HWC accepts and without the City's comment.
- The HRF supports

DECISION

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

13. Other Matters**14. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:**

CSI moves to adopt and RB seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 20 July 2026.

15. Closure: The chairperson, Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport, officially closed the meeting at 16:00**16. Date of next meeting:** 3 August 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

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

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners
AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society
BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association
BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement
CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers ' & Residents Association
CoCT – City of Cape Town
CTHT – Cape Town Heritage Trust
CRM - Cultural Resources Management
DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association
Docomomo South Africa
DHS -Durbanville Heritage Society
EHM – Environmental Heritage Management department
FoBCA - Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area
FE - Friends of Elim
GLCA- Greater Lynfræe Civic Association
GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association
HVA- Harfield Village Association

ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
ABHC - Associated Bibbys Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)
BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee
CBCRA -Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association
CSDBOA - Clifton-On-Sea & District Bungalow Owners Association
CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation
CRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations
CMP – Conservation Management Plan
DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association
DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation
EMPr - Environmental Management Program
FHRA -Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association
FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts
GBRM - Great Brak River Museum
GVHAG- Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group
GCS - Greyton Conservation Society
HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation

HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay
HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association
HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association
HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment
ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa
KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association
KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association
LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District
MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society
NCW – Not Conservation Worthy
NEMA - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998)
NID - Notification of Intent to Develop
NCOA - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association
OH - Oudtshoorn Heritage
Paarl300 Foundation
PRRA - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association
PACF - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation
SAHRA - South African Heritage Resources Agency
SRHS - Salt River Heritage Society
SFB - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association
SvDSF - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town
STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society
SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation
SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust
GHT - George Heritage Trust
RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association
TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society
VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa
WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group
WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council
WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee
WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society
WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association

HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting
HPO – Heritage protects overlay.

HWC – Heritage Western Cape
IACom - Impact Assessment Committee
IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee
KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society
MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society
NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation
NASDB - Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development body
NHRA - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999
NRA - Newlands Residents Association
OCA - Observatory Civic Association
OHAC - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee
PPP - Public Participation Process
PHCT - Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust
RMCA - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee
SAHRIS - South African Heritage Resources Information System
SPFA - Sea Point for All Group

SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee
SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group
SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association
OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society
TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation
UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association
WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association
 Ward 2 Forum
WCC - Whale Coast Conservation
WRA - Woodstock Residents Association
WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association