

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF  
HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,  
HERITAGE OFFICERS MEETING  
Held on Monday, 11<sup>th</sup> September at 08:00  
3rd Floor Boardroom, Protea Assurance Building**

---



**1. OPENING AND WELCOME**

The Chairperson, Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport officially opened the meeting at 08:30 and welcomed everyone present.

**2. ATTENDANCE**

**Members of Committee**

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport (SB) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Corne Nortje (CN) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Ayanda Mdludlu (AM) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Muneerah Solomon (MS) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJ) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Chane Herman (CH) (Heritage Officer)

**Members of Staff**

Ms Xola Mwandle (XM) (Secretary)  
Mr Yaseen Somodien (YS)(Admin)

**Legal Advisor**

**Visitors**

**Observers**

**3. Apologies**

Ms Khanyisile Bonile (KB) (Heritage Officer)  
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT) (Secretary)  
Ms. Naushina Rahim (NR) (Legal Advisor)  
Ms. Penelope Meyer (PM) (Legal Advisor)

**Absent**

None

**4. Approval of Agenda**

- 4.1 11<sup>th</sup> September 2023. The Committee resolved to approve the agenda with minor edits and Additions CH moves to adopt the agenda and CN seconds.

**5. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

- 5.1 The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 21<sup>st</sup> of August 2023 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

**5.2 Minutes dated 28 August 2023**

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 28<sup>th</sup> of August 2023 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

**5.3 Minutes dated 21 August 2023**

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 21<sup>th</sup> of August 2023 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

**5.4 Minutes dated 4 September 2023**

The Committee resolved to holdover the minutes 4<sup>th</sup> of September 2023 for approval on the next HOMs meeting of the 15<sup>th</sup> of September 2023.

**6. Disclosure of conflict of interest**

None

**7. Confidential matters**

None

**8. Standing Items**

None

**8.1. Site inspections Undertaken**

8.1.1 None

**8.2 Proposed Site Inspection**

**8.3 Site Inspection Reports**

8.3.1 None

**8.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings**

IACom committee meeting scheduled for 18<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

Appeal committee meeting scheduled for 13<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

HOMs committee meeting scheduled for 15<sup>th</sup> September 2023.

**8.5 Interim and Close out Reports**

8.5.1 Erf 66650, 1 Durban Road, Wynberg (CH)

- The Close out Report was submitted as a condition of a Section 27 emergency permit issued for maintenance and restoration on 23 August 2022.
- All work on site was completed on 31 July 2023.
- All work was done in accordance with the Section 27 Permit.
- The Committee resolved to endorse the close out report.

**8.6 Incomplete Applications**

**8.7 Archaeological Matters**

**8.8 Illegal Works Database (Stop works order)**

**9 Administrative Matters**

**9.1 Monitoring by practitioner: Rhenish Complex, Mark Street, Stellenbosch (Section 27: Minor Works) HWC23082308SJ0826**

- The committee endorsed the appointment of Adolfo Linares to monitor the proposed work.

**10 Discussion of the agenda**

**MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED**

**11. MATTERS ARISING**

**11.1 Proposed revised SDP for residential development on Erf 13182, Thokozani Street, Wellington, S38(4)-HIA**

**Case No:** 22042610NK0429E

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- IACOM on 23 August endorsed the HIA as having satisfied the requirements of S.38(3). The development may proceed subject to the removal of unit 1 and 2 and the retention of existing mature trees and other vegetation in this location. A revised SDP must be submitted to HOMS for approval
- The revised SDP and Landscape plan was submitted on 5 September with Unit 1 and 2 removed from the proposal
- Graded 3A

**DECISION**

HOMS reviewed the revised SDP and recommended endorsement.

This decision is to be read with the decision of the Impact Assessment Committee dated 29 August 2023 stating:

The Committee endorses the HIA, as having satisfied the requirements of S.38(3). The development may proceed subject to the removal of units 1 and 2, and the retention of existing mature trees and other vegetation in this location. The committee is of the opinion that these units intrude into the garden setting of the Werf. The heritage significance of the werf is based on its historical and architectural significance and its relationship with its garden setting.

The committee recommends the grading of the werf, and its garden setting should be IIIA.

The Committee endorses the mitigation measures outlined in the HIA report as follows:

1. Planning, Design and Development phase mitigation:
  - a. With respect to the construction activity, the following mitigation measure are recommended:
    - i. Designate the werf curtilage and garden as 'no-go areas' for site camp establishment, materials storage, stockpiling, dumping, to avoid and prevent damage or intrusion to these areas.
    - ii. Limit construction activity to within the hoarding areas, constructing on disturbed areas

only to minimize impact to visual amenity resources identified (e.g., werf curtilage and garden).

iii. Ensure post-construction repair and rehabilitation of the site, towards improvement of disturbed areas and areas degraded by the construction activity.

iv. Implement a construction phase environmental management plan (CEMP) to ensure ongoing management of environmental matters, including noise, dust, and erosion control.

2. Operational phase mitigation:

a. With respect to the operation phase, the following mitigation measure are recommended:

i. Maintain the werf curtilage and garden as 'no-go areas' for any further development and ensure that any activities or events held within these areas 'tread-lightly.'

ii. Planning and management to respond positively to visual/heritage considerations and design indicators, towards an appropriate fit and seamless integration into the landscape context.

iii. Architectural measures (form / scale / massing / materials / textures) to ensure visually recessive structures and to combat the cumulative effect of the aggregation of buildings and services.

iv. Landscape measures (screen planting / village green open space / view corridors) to anchor and settle the new buildings into the site and to 'dissolve' and 'diffuse' hard edges.

Avoid light pollution by reducing lighting to the minimum necessary. Lighting is to be carefully controlled and well-integrated into the design proposal and coordinated with signage. Light sources must be shielded to reduce light spillage. Up-lighting onto the outer sides of the buildings must be used sparingly. Shielded down-lights must be used on all open areas. Neon or unshielded bright security lights may not be used, only shielded security lighting may be used. With respect to boundary interface with adjacent farmstead areas, lighting may be permitted at entrance gateways only. These principles should be applicable as much to the common property within the development site as the individual erven; and should be applied to any lighting and signage relating to this development on the remainder of the farm, including the access roads.

vi. The line of trees along the approach avenue from the Vineyard smallholdings traffic circle to the access to the werf on Erf 13182 should be retained. Further tree planting could be planned and implemented to accommodate future senescence. Any upgraded road surface treatment (including verges and stormwater drainage systems) or infrastructure associated with this development but outside the boundaries of the development site should equally remain informal, in keeping with existing, incorporating where possible earth-swales for storm-water run-off rather than heavily engineered concrete channels and drains. Where practical, existing roadways should be utilized. Concrete kerbs and channels should be avoided. Avoid excessive earthworks / cut and fill or vegetation removal.

CN

## 11.2 Proposed on additions, alterations and partial demolition on Erf 957, 39 Lindenberg Avenue, Durbanville, S34-A&A

Case No: HWC23033110RG0426

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

### DISCUSSION

- Information received on 4 and 6 September 2023
- Graded 3C
- Falls outside HPOZ
- City supports
- Durbanville Heritage Society does not support

### FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

- More External Photos

- Confirmation if work has been completed

CN

**11.3 Proposed additions and alterations on Erf 1119 25 Audas Street, Somerset West. S34-A&A  
Case No: HWC23082307MS0826**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 7 September 2023.
- Graded NCW
- Falls outside HPOZ
- CoCT declines to comment.

**DECISION**

HWC cannot condone illegal work. Section 51 letter to be issued.

MS

**11.4 Proposed total demolition on Erf 1230, 14 Doig Road, Wetton. S34-Total Demolition  
Case No: HWC23080109MS0806**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 4 September 2023
- Graded NCW
- Falls HPOZ

**DECISION**

HWC cannot condone illegal work. Section 51 letter to be issued.

MS

**11.5 Proposed additions and alterations on Erf 179601, 13 Bushwood Road, Mowbray.S34-A&A  
Case No: HWC23070510MS0822**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 5 September 2023
- Graded IIIB
- Falls HPOZ
- CoCT supports the proposal.
- RAMPAC stamped the plans.

**DECISION**

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

- 11.6 Proposed additions and alterations on Erf 866, Unit 16, Creswell Court, 267 High Level Road, Sea Point. S34-A&A**  
**Case No: HWC23072808MS0806**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 21 August 2023.
- Graded NCW
- Falls outside HPOZ
- CoCT supports the proposal
- SFA and SFB supports the proposal

**DECISION**

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

- 11.7 Proposed new development on Multiple Erven, "Block 30" (part of the CCT Masterplan), 21 – 29 Mechau Street, Cape Town: S38(4)-NID**  
**Case No: HWC23060204SJ0822**

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Site is graded IIIB
- Falls within a proposed HPOZ
- Human Remains on Site - SB to inform SJ of John Gribble telecommunication
- Falls within City of Cape Town Masterplan
- Fireman's Arms presents a Socio-Historical significance
- 3 Design Options are presented

**DECISION**

The committee resolved that an HIA with the following specific studies are required: Archaeological Impact Assessment; Townscape Assessment; Built Environment Assessment; Visual Impact Assessment and Socio-historic Study.

- 11.8 Proposed alterations on Erf 1809, 1 Protea Court, 53 Exner Street, Vredehoek: S34-Minor Works**  
**Case No: HWC23082207SJ0826**

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 6 September 2023
- Graded IIIC
- Falls outside HPOZ

- CoCT supports the proposal

**DECISION**

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

SJ

**11.9 Proposed additions and alterations on Erf 63984, 45 Tennant Road, Kenilworth: S34-A&A  
Case No: HWC23080205SJ0830**

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on 4 September 2023
- Graded IIIB
- Falls outside HPOZ
- Internal works have already been carried
- Roof works are to be carried out

**DECISION**

HWC cannot condone illegal work. Section 51 letter to be issued.

SJ

**11.10 Proposed trenching on Erven 33091, 37474, 37475, 40930, 40932, 40931, 37189, 38784, 20516,**

**20520, Darwin Rd, Mostert St, Sarel van Deventer Rd, Stonewood Dr, Hexrivier Rd. Kraaifontein, S38(4) -NID**

**Case No: HWC23061909SB0826**

**DISCUSSION**

- Information received on the 8 September 2023.
- Site is in low palaeontological sensitive area
- No other heritage resource was noted on the site.
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

**12. NEW MATTERS**

**12.1 Proposed low density residential development on Erf 1058, off Whites Road, Hoekwil, Wilderness, George. S38(4)-NID**

**Case No: HWC23083106CH.**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The site is within an area of low paleontological sensitivity.
- The proposed development footprint has been impacted by farming activities such as ploughing, cultivation and grazing during the colonial period. No colonial period heritage resources were identified on record or on the property. Even though none were identified, if

present on the property, then isolated Stone Age pieces are considered to be of low heritage value and are Not Conservation Worthy.

- The proposed low-density development does not break the ridgeline and is in keeping with developments in the surroundings, which are barely visible in the distance. The scenic route or aesthetic value will not be negatively impacted by the proposed development.
- It is anticipated that the only heritage resources, though in disturbed context, that may be found on the property are isolated or very low-density scatters of Stone Age pieces (Grade IIC or Not Conservation Worthy).
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

CH

### **12.2 Proposed low-cost housing development on Erf 5453, 6758, 6752 & RE 5462, Overhills, Kleinmont.S38(8)-NID Case No: HWC23083110CHO**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- There are no provincial heritage sites located in close proximity to the proposed development extent. The existing structures present on site are mostly informal dwellings, but they are not expected to be older than 60 years.
- The primary resource in terms of heritage significance relates to the current sense of place, being that Overhills was established as a township. The sense of place will not be lost or detrimentally impacted as the proposed development will formalize the settlement and provide it with civil services, therefore improving the current state.
- The existing landscape has aesthetic characteristics relating to the mountain backdrop; however, it is not expected that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the aesthetic characteristics.
- Majority of the site falls within the low paleontologically sensitive area with a portion of the site within the high paleontologically sensitive area. The site has however been transformed by the removal of vegetation, hard landscaping, roads and structures.
- No impacts are anticipated on the cultural landscape, paleontological or archeological resources.
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

CH

### **12.3 Proposed solar farm and associated grid connection infrastructure on Farm 2, Murraysburg.S38(8)-NID Case No: HWC23082414CH0831**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- The NID is submitted for a solar energy facility (SEF) using fixed single axis or ground mounted tracking solar photovoltaic (PV) panels and an overhead powerline (OHPL) or “gridline” to connect with the National Grid.



- There are structures older than 60 years on the farm and surrounding farms, but none will be affected by the proposed project.
- The landscape has a strong character and associated aesthetic significance.
- The proposed development would be situated on relatively flat terrain and will result in the introduction of an industrial component to the site. Visual impacts are expected due to the proximity of the site to the N1 and R63 and the general aesthetic significance.
- Scattered artefacts do occur rarely in the study area. While these are of low significance, more significant sites, often dating to the Later Stone Age, can be found along rivers and on dolerite ridges of the wider landscape. Engravings can also occur on these ridges. Historical materials may also occur, but generally these are located within close proximity of the farmstead.
- Historical stone-walled sites related to herders might also occur on the ridges.
- One small stone-walled site is known to occur within the footprint and would be destroyed. Other sites in the area are expected to be of low significance.
- The study area is shown as being of very high paleontological sensitivity. There is a possibility that significant fossils could be disturbed during excavations on the site.
- Graves are not expected to be present, and none are known on the farm.
- The Committee is of the opinion that heritage resources will be impacted on.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved that an HIA, VIA, AIA and PIA is required.

CH

#### **12.4 Proposed enlargement of an existing dam on PTN 42 and PTN 34 of Farm 46 Buffelsrivier, Ward 25(Uniondale) George.S38(8)-NID Case No: HWC23081816CH0831**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- NID is submitted for the enlargement of an existing dam. The enlargement was completed in 2016.
- There is a historical river crossing / stone bridge on portion 42 of the Farm Buffelsrivier 46. The structure is not directly impacted by the dam and will not be impacted by operation of the dam.
- The entire site falls within the low and very high paleontologically sensitive area.
- The site is within a low archeologically sensitive area.
- No other impacts to heritage resources have been identified
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

CH

#### **12.5 Proposed subdivision and residential development on Portion of Farm Paapekuilfontein 281-RE, Struisbaai, S38(8) - NID Case No.: HWC23090406CH**

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

## DISCUSSION

- There are no structures older than 60 years of heritage significance on the site.
- The property is situated in close proximity to residential development across Marine Drive which forms part of a vulnerable coastal landscape, considered to be of conservation value and, also being on a scenic route, very high visual sensitivity.
- The impacts to buildings and structures are to be established.
- The visual and other impacts to the coastal landscape are to be established.
- The site is within an archeologically sensitive coastal zone. Archeological research suggests the Middle Stone Age (MSA) and Early Stone Age (ESA) tools occur locally. A large number of mainly Late Stone Age (LSA) sites have been recorded and are not only confined to the shoreline area.
- Well-preserved viswywers (tidal fish traps) also occur along this coastline.
- The impacts to archeology are to be established.
- According to SAHRIS, the site falls within the high paleontologically sensitive area which suggests a desktop study is required. The NID further states that based on the desktop study, it is likely that a field assessment will be done.
- The Committee notes the opinion received from a paleontologist, Mr. John Pether on 30 January 2023.
- The Committee is of the opinion that heritage resources will be impacted on.

## DECISION

The Committee resolved that an HIA, AIA, VIA and a desktop PIA is required.

CH

### 12.6 Proposed renewable energy facility on RE of Erf 551, off the R315, Darling, S38(8)-NID Case No: HWC23082908CN0831

Ms Corne Nortje introduced the item.

## INCOMPLETE APPLICATION

External and streetscape photographs, SG diagram and completed application form required.

CN

### 12.7 Proposed telecommunications base station on Erf 142724, 12 Charles Calvert Road, Charlesville Shopping Centre, Matroosfontein. S38(1)-NID

Case No: HWC23090104MS

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

## DISCUSSION

- Low palaeo sensitivity
- Built-up area
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

## DECISION

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

MS

**12.8 Proposed on development Erf 3495, Off Adelle Street, Struisbaai. S38(8)-NID  
Case No.: HWC23083108MS0904**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Rezone the property from agriculture to subdivisional area for approximately 72 single residential sites, a street and open spaces.
- No remaining association of historical or social significances.
- No structures older than 60 years of heritage significance on site.
- The site has a very high palaeo sensitivity.
- The Committee is of the opinion that heritage resources will be impacted on.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved that an HIA consisting of a VIA and PIA is required.

**MS**

**12.9 Proposed unauthorised vegetation clearing on Rem of Farm 242, Erfdeel, Ceres. S38(8)-NID  
Case No.: HWC23083001MS0830**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Low archaeological sensitivity.
- The site has an average high paleontological sensitivity. However, given the shallow nature of activity (ploughing with no deep excavation) there are no negative impact on any heritage resources.
- 2008 Decision for the resort development endorses no further studies.
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

**MS**

**12.10 Proposed housing development on PTN 62, Witteklip No 123, Vredenburg. S38(8)-NID  
Case No.: HWC23090106MS0905**

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Low/Zero palaeo sensitivity
- Several studies have been conducted on various portions of the Farm Witteklip 123, where mostly isolated scatters of Early, Middle and Later Stone Age tools and a few cultural remains (e. g. pottery) have been recorded.
- Occurs in a severely historically, transformed, and degraded context.
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

**MS**

**12.11 Proposed freestanding telecommunication base station Rem of PTN 1 of Farm 113 Grootfontein,**

**Laingsburg Road, Laingsburg. S38(8)-NID**

**Case No:** HWC23082406MS0829

Ms Muneerah Solomon introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- Moderate paleo sensitivity.
- No anticipated impact on heritage resources.
- The Committee is of the opinion that no heritage resources will be impacted on.

**DECISION**

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required.

MS

**12.12 Proposed Prospecting on PTN 1/150 Karoetjies Kop 105, Vredendal. S38(8)-HIA**

**Case No:** HWC23052608AM0529

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The committee acknowledges the Heritage Impact Assessment conducted by ASHA Consulting, dated July 2023, and the following key points:
- The paleontological specialist observed that while fossils, bones, and teeth are present in most formations, the discovery of buried fossils is unpredictable and relatively rare. The exception to this is the raised beach deposits, primarily composed of existing species, making them less sensitive in terms of preservation. Common fossils expected in the study area include tortoise bones, moles, marine shells, shark and other fish teeth, and shell casts. Mammal bones and teeth are rare and less likely to be encountered.
- The survey identified numerous significant archaeological sites within the development footprint. These sites were generally not found very close to the beach, with a few exceptions. Most of them were categorized as Grade IIIC, but there was one deeply stratified site located along the edge of the South River in the far south, which received a Grade IIIB classification.
- The maritime archaeology assessment revealed the potential presence of several shipwrecks in the area. However, due to limited information about most of them, the likelihood of encountering any of these wrecks is very low. While most wrecks are expected to be underwater, there is a slight possibility of discovering lifeboat debris or even the graves of drowned sailors on land.
- Considering the above findings, the anticipated impacts on heritage resources can be summarized as follows:
  - The paleontological specialist believes that significant impacts on fossils are unlikely due to the limited areas to be disturbed and the relative scarcity of buried fossils.
  - Archaeological sites may face potential impacts from excavation equipment, such as excavators or drill rigs. These impacts are expected to have low significance and can likely be avoided.
  - The committee unanimously agrees that the recommendations align with the findings and anticipated impacts. Additionally, it is noted that consultation has concluded on the 11th of July 2023. Despite no concerns or objections being raised, it should be mentioned that there are no registered conservation bodies in the area, which may account for the lack of objections.

**DECISION**

The Committee endorses the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting, dated 01 July 2023 as meeting the provisions of S38(3) and the following recommendations:

1. A Fossil Chance Finds Procedure must be incorporated in the EMP for the project and project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding fossil bones during prospecting;
2. The identified archaeologically sensitive areas (including the buffer zones) must be avoided as far as possible by all project activities;
3. If avoidance is not possible then an archaeologist must be consulted with regards to the need for mitigation. It may be feasible to work within some of the buffers but if archaeological material will be at risk then mitigation excavations must be carried out in advance of prospecting;
4. Project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding further Stone Age sites in between those recorded and, should any shell scatters be seen, these must be avoided;
5. Project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding buried wreckage debris or even graves related to shipwrecks;
6. No road widening may take place;
7. Existing tracks should be used for access as far as possible;
8. All prospecting sites must be rehabilitated; and
9. If any archaeological terrestrial or maritime material, fossils or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist or palaeontologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

SB

**12.13 Proposed Richwill Diamonds Prospecting on Farm Karoetjies Kop 105, Part of PTN 1/150 & Seaward Part of RE/150 Namaqualand, Matzikama.S38(8)-HIA  
Case No: HWC23052609AM0529**

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

**DISCUSSION**

- The committee acknowledges the Heritage Impact Assessment conducted by ASHA Consulting, dated July 2023, and the following key points:
- The paleontological specialist observed that while fossils, bones, and teeth are present in most formations, the discovery of buried fossils is unpredictable and relatively rare. The exception to this is the raised beach deposits, primarily composed of existing species, making them less sensitive in terms of preservation. Common fossils expected in the study area include tortoise bones, moles, marine shells, shark and other fish teeth, and shell casts. Mammal bones and teeth are rare and less likely to be encountered.
- The survey identified numerous significant archaeological sites within the development footprint. These sites were generally not found very close to the beach, with a few exceptions. Most of them were categorized as Grade IIC, but there was one deeply stratified site located along the edge of the South River in the far south, which received a Grade IIB classification.
- The maritime archaeology assessment revealed the potential presence of several shipwrecks in the area. However, due to limited information about most of them, the likelihood of encountering any of these wrecks is very low. While most wrecks are expected to be underwater, there is a slight possibility of discovering lifeboat debris or even the graves of drowned sailors on land.
- Considering the above findings, the anticipated impacts on heritage resources can be summarized as follows:
- The paleontological specialist believes that significant impacts on fossils are unlikely due to the limited areas to be disturbed and the relative scarcity of buried fossils.

- Archaeological sites may face potential impacts from excavation equipment, such as excavators or drill rigs. These impacts are expected to have low significance and can likely be avoided.
- The committee unanimously agrees that the recommendations align with the findings and anticipated impacts. Additionally, it is noted that consultation has concluded on the 11th of July 2023. Despite no concerns or objections being raised, it should be mentioned that there are no registered conservation bodies in the area, which may account for the lack of objections.

#### **DECISION**

The Committee endorses the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by ASHA Consulting, dated 01 July 2023 as meeting the provisions of S38(3) and the following recommendations:

1. A Fossil Chance Finds Procedure must be incorporated in the EMPr for the project and project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding fossil bones during prospecting;
2. The identified archaeologically sensitive areas (including the buffer zones) must be avoided as far as possible by all project activities;
3. If avoidance is not possible then an archaeologist must be consulted with regards to the need for mitigation. It may be feasible to work within some of the buffers but if archaeological material will be at risk then mitigation excavations must be carried out in advance of prospecting;
4. Project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding further Stone Age sites in between those recorded and, should any shell scatters be seen, these must be avoided;
5. Project staff must be made aware of the possibility of finding buried wreckage debris or even graves related to shipwrecks;
6. No road widening may take place;
7. Existing tracks should be used for access as far as possible;
8. All prospecting sites must be rehabilitated; and
9. If any archaeological terrestrial or maritime material, fossils or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area should be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist or palaeontologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

**SB**

#### **12.14 Proposed RE PTN 28 Welmoed Farm 468, Stellenbosch.S38(8)-HIA**

**Case No:** HWC23040509AM0411

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

#### **DISCUSSION**

- The committee noted that the HIA is a phase 1
- A NID application resulted in the Record of Decision (10 May 2023) request for a Heritage Impact Assessment that included specifically an Archaeological Impact Assessment and a Visual Impact Assessment.
- According to the Stellenbosch Heritage Inventory the site is situated in Grade IIIB Cultural Landscape along a Grade IIIA, Scenic Route (Baden Powell Drive)
- Although SIG didn't give clear object or support in their comment, it was noted that they had several concerns.
- It was noted that Stellenbosch Municipality objected to the proposed development as the context it is not recommended for such developed a medium to high-density.

**HELD OVER:**

Referred to IACOM- 18 September 2023

**SB**

**13. OTHER MATTERS**

**14. ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND DECISIONS**

MS moves and CH seconds.

**15. CLOSURE 10:05**

**16. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**15 September 2023**

**Chairperson.....**

**Secretariat: .....**

**Annexure A – HWC Heritage Officer 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 Lynfrae Civic Association

**GPRRA** - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association

**HVA**- Harfield Village Association

**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

**ASAPA** - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists

**ABHC** - Associated Bibbeys 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** - Heldeberg Renaissance Foundation

**HOMs** - Heritage Officers Meeting

**HPO** – Heritage protect 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

**NEMA** - National Environmental Management Act (No. 107 of 1998) **NHRA** - National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25) of 1999  
**NID** - Notification of Intent to Develop **NRA** - Newlands Residents Association  
**NCOA** - Noetzie Conservancy Owners Association **OCA** - Observatory Civic Association  
**OH** - Oudshoorn Heritage **OHAC** - Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee  
**Paarl300** Foundation **PPP** - Public Participation Process  
**PRRA** - Pinelands Ratepayers & Residents Association **PHCT** - Pniel Heritage And Cultural Trust  
**PACF** - Prince Albert Cultural Foundation **RMCA** - Rosebank and Mowbray Planning & Architectural Committee  
**SAHRA** - South African Heritage Resources Agency **SAHRIS** - South African Heritage Resources Information System  
**SRHS** - Salt River Heritage Society **SPFA** - Sea Point For All Group  
**SFB** - Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association  
**SvdSF** - Simon van der Stel Foundation Cape Town  
**STHS** - Simon's Town Historical Society **SHC** - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee  
**SHF** - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation **SIG** - Stellenbosch Interest Group  
**SHCT** - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust **SHA** - Swellendam Heritage Association  
**GHT** - George Heritage Trust **OWVS** - Old Wynberg Village Society  
**RVRA** - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association **TVHF** - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation  
**TRHCS** - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society **UCRRA** - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association  
**VASSA** - Vernaclar Architecture Society of South Africa **WERRA** - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association  
**WUECAG** - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group Ward 2 Forum  
**WCAC** - West Coast Aboriginal Council **WCC** - Whale Coast Conservation  
**WAAC** - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee **WRA** - Woodstock Residents Association  
**WHCS** - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society **WECA** - Wynberg East Civic Association  
**WRRRA** - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association