

**APPROVED MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE,
HERITAGE OFFICERS' MEETING
Held on Monday, 16 March 2026 at 08:30 via MS Teams**



1. Opening and Welcome

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

2. Attendance

Members

Ms. Stephanie Barnardt-Delport	Chairperson, Specialist Heritage Officer	SB
Ms. Corne Alexander	Specialist Heritage Officer	CN
Ms. Chane Herman	Specialist Heritage Officer	CH
Mr. Ruan Brand	Specialist Heritage Officer	RB
Ms. Chiara Singh	Heritage Officer	CSI
Ms. Sofia Briel (<i>left at 10:11</i>)	Heritage Officer	SVB
Ms. Xola Mlwandle	Heritage Officer	XM

Staff

Ms. Aneeqah Brown	Secretariat	AB
Ms. Yusrah Hoosain	I&APs group chat	YH
Ms. Waseefa Dhansay	Assistant Director	WD

Legal Advisor

None

Observers

None

Visitors

	Capacity	Item
Arina de Villiers		
Bridget O' Donoghue	practitioner	13.21
Christiaan Barnard		13.21
Clive Theunissen	Drakenstein Municipality	
Douglas Allen		
Dr G Furlan		
Frederik Lotter		14.30
Malcolm Fair	I&AP - residents	
Nick Smith		13.21
Robert Henderson		13.21
LCF		
Tanya Golding		
Warren Labuschagne		13.5
Tamara Drake		
Phillippa	WRRA	14.22
Ashwin Lewis		
Irene Bester		13.5
Elizabeth Stead		
Nazeema		

Jonathan Kaplan
David Halkett
Claire Abrahamse

14.13,14,15
14.23
14.36

3. **Apologies**

Ms. Nosiphiwo Tafeni
Emily Jane Vowles
Ms. Penelope Meyer

Back-up Secretariat
Heritage Officer
Deputy Director

NT
EJV
PM

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 Agenda**

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda of 16 March 2026 with the following additions:

- Item 12.1 has been added under Discussion of the Agenda.

CH moved to adopt the agenda and CN seconded.

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

6.1. The Committee resolved to approve the minutes of 9 March 2026. SVB moved to adopt the minutes and CSI seconded.

7. **Disclosure of conflict of interest**

7.1.

8. **Confidential matters**

None.

9. **Standing Items**

9.1. **Site inspections undertaken**

9.1.1 None

9.2 **Proposed Site Inspections**

9.2.1 13.21

9.3 **Site Inspection Reports**

9.3.1 Erf 1190, 149 Dorp Street, Stellenbosch

DISCUSSION:

- The site is a PHS within the historical core
- After received an email on 25 February 2026 from the municipality about unauthorised work taking place on the façade of the structure in question. The municipality initially sent out the building inspector that requested the work to stop as there was no permit for the proposed maintenance to the stoep (between 25 and 27 February). The work continued and municipality requested a joint inspection to issues a stop works and determine if there is any other work taking place.
- A joint site inspection was undertaken on the Tuesday, 3 March.
- A stop works was issued; discussion was had with the owner and the municipality official.
- The owner stopped the work on site and stated he was not aware of the maintenance requiring a permit.
- An email has been sent to the owner with instructions and guidance on how to make a minor works permit application for the remaining maintenance work. The work is not complete.
- **Since undertaking the site inspection, and drafting the report, the owner as the following requested:**

- The owner requested that the stop works order be lifted while the permit application is being prepared. He states that the work is necessary to improve waterproofing of the building, and that leaving the work incomplete may increase the risk of water damage, particularly due to recent rainfall.
- The owner further indicates that the work involves replacing the stoep surface with similar rustic terracotta tiles, maintaining the same aesthetic appearance as before, and argues that no structural or visual changes to the building are being made. He also suggests that the work may not constitute an “alteration” requiring a permit under Section 27(18) of the National Heritage Resources Act.
- The owner confirms that they are in the process of preparing the requested permit application, but requests permission to complete the waterproofing work in the interim to protect the building and ensure contractor availability.

RECOMMENDATION

Committee noted that an emergency must be submitted in order to consider lifting or partially lifting the stop works order.

9.3.2 Farm RE/28/468, 22/468, 12/468, RE/13/468, Lynedoch, Stellenbosch

DISCUSSION:

- Initial site inspection dated 3 October 2025, has been updated to include the investigation from 3 March 2026.
- The following was noted:
- HWC is still receiving several complaints about work taking place on various farms surrounding Lynedoch even after communicating with the environment officials.
- Farm RE/28/468:
- It was noted that no work was taking place on subject farm.
- Farm RE/13/468 and 22/468
- There was a large removal of vegetation on farm RE/13/468 and 22/468 and RE/13/468 – this may trigger a Section 38(1).
- Farm 27/468
- Opposite of the R310, farm 27/468 more vegetation clearance and earth moving equipment was noted. Speaking with the municipality official, this may be the worm farm. Portion is small and may not trigger a Section 38(1) of the NHRA.
- No other work was noted, a meeting with the municipality and the environmental official will be held in due course to determine the best way forward as many of these activities related to farming activities.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Municipality has been informed and awaiting the owners’ details to take the matter further.

9.4 Preparation for upcoming Committee meetings

9.4.1 Special IACom – 18 March 2026

9.4.2 HOMs – 23 March 2026

9.5 Tribunal Updates (Legal)

9.5.1 None

9.6 Interim and Close-Out Reports

9.6.1 Close-out Report: Erf 9672 Rhenish Complex, Market Street, Stellenbosch (CH)

Case No.: HWC23082308SJ0826

- HWC issued a S27 minor works permit on 13 September 2023 for maintenance and repairs.
- Graded PHS inside the historic core of Stellenbosch.
- The completed work included:

- Repairing the corner of the werf wall. Traditional bricks were not available therefore a soft jointing was applied.
- Structural repairs to the Toy Museum building removing incompatible plaster work (i.e., cement plaster) in specific areas to fix wall cracks. The walls were stabilized with lime wash, filled with lime putty before fixing a fiberglass mesh to the walls. Fiberglass mesh was used in place of metal wire mesh due to fibre glass ability to not rust. Lime wash paint was used to finish the wall renovation.
- Restoring the stoep at the back of the Toy Museum to keep stormwater off the external walls of the building.
- Painting of walls
- Repairing woodwork, varnishing doors, windows and ceiling.
- External maintenance work to the Tourism building. Internal work included painting, titling and plumbing repairs to the existing bathrooms.
- External repairs to the Leipolt House.
- Replacing the roof sheeting at the Georgian House.
- The report noted that following:
 - Existing thatch roofs were in good condition and therefore no intervention was required.
 - The roof of the Tourism Building was not carried out due to limited funding.
 - The slates on the Georgian building was to be replaced with IBR metal sheeting however due to budget, warehouse and manufacturing limitations, the use of natural slates was not feasible and the alternative used was nutec roof slates.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the close-out report titled "Heritage Report", dated February 2026, and prepared by Linares Architects, as having met the conditions of the HWC issued permit, dated 13 September 2023.

9.7 Incomplete Applications

9.7.1 Matters Arising: 13.24, 13.25

9.7.2 New Matters: 14.1, 14.3, 14.5, 14.6, 14.7, 14.8, 14.9, 14.10, 14.11, 14.12, 14.25, 14.26, 14.27, 14.28, 14.29, 14.37, 14.38,

9.8 Decisions taken under ASD delegation

9.8.1 Matters Arising: 13.3, 13.7, 13.8, 13.14, 13.16, 13.23, 13.27, 13.31, 13.32

9.8.2 New Matters: 14.4, 14.16, 14.21, 14.24

9.9 Referrals to Committees

9.9.1 Matters Arising:

9.9.2 New Matters:

9.10 Exemption Notice 9051 of 2025: NCW graded within CoCT

9.9.1 Matter Arising:

9.9.2 New Matters:

9.11 Archaeological Matters

9.11.1 Erf 282 (an unregistered portion of Erf 1291), Sandbaai, Hermanus, S38-Workplan (SB)

Case No: Na

DISCUSSION

- EIA has been granted for the subjected site and development.
- Appointment of archaeologist for monitoring has been provided.
- Previous permit dates to 12 April 2010, it was note in the condition that a more detailed assessment along with a site inspection by HWC needs to be undertaken. The site inspection portion of the requirements has previously been complied with, hence only the more detailed assessment is required.

- An archaeological workplan has been submitted to comply with this requirement.
- The workplan entails the monitoring of the construction excavation for the proposed De Zandt housing development.
- Proposed action: monitoring during exaction, sampling and collection were required.
- Repository: yes
- Case officers note that should human remains are uncovered, all work must cease immediately, and Heritage Western Cape must be notified. A separate permit application, including the required consultation process, will be required in terms of Section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act.

ENDORSEMENT

The Committee resolved to endorse the workplan report dated 3 March 2026, and prepared by Jonathan Kaplan, as per the recommendation in the AIA prepared by Jonthan Kaplan (Agency for Cultural Resource Management) date November 2009. On condition that:

1. If human remains or evidence of burials are uncovered, all work must cease immediately, and Heritage Western Cape must be notified. A separate Section 36 permit application, including the required consultation process, will be required in terms of Section 36 of the National Heritage Resources Act.

9.12 Illegal Works Database: Stop Works Orders issued

9.12.1 None

9.13 Permit deadline: Tuesday, 15 March 2026, COB

9.14 SAHRIS rollout feedback (RB)

- RB will be meeting with SAHRIS admin team today to discuss the way forward with:
 - The Hotfix list
 - S35/S36 webform drafting issues
 - Appeals webform issues
 - Cleaning up of pre-HWC launch cases on SAHRIS
- SAHRIS admin team are working with some of our conservation bodies already. Chiefly, Docomomo has a bulk upload template where they will align their inventory/interested properties with the template and once uploaded, we can simply refer to SAHRIS to see which sites DOCOMOMO wants to be consulted on.
- Tuesday, 31 March and Wednesday, 1 April must be kept open for impromptu/short notice video shoots in around the Cape Town area (WD to confirm which HOs this will impact for scheduling meetings on those days).
- JW has been consulted wrt getting S31 areas onto SAHRIS. He has identified some concerns/issues, but hopefully he can resolve them with the SAHRIS admin team.
- Internal training for officers and incoming Committee members to be confirmed.

10. Administrative Matters

10.1.

11. Monitoring by practitioner

11.1. None

12. Discussion of the Agenda

12.1. (Item 13.21) Erf 56442, 31 Upper Sidmouth Avenue, Bishopscourt, S34-Total Demolition (SVB)

MATTERS TO BE DISCUSSED

13. MATTERS ARISING

- 13.1. Erf 560, 17 Gillmore Hill Road, Tamboerskloof, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27114CH0120 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388450>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 8 March 2026..
- Graded IIIC inside HPO
- Proposal is to restore the facade, renovate the bathroom and kitchen, addition of a period correct bay window reusing the original sash windows and alterations to the existing gate to allow 2 vehicles.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports.
- CIBRA supports.

DECISION

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

CH

- 13.2. Erf 737, 5 Hope Street, Hermanus, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27578CH0227 / HWC25113013CH0227 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390111>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 6 March 2026.
- Graded IIIB inside HPO
- Proposal is to extend the existing garage, new pergola and internal alterations to the existing store room/outbuilding located at the rear of the property.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports.

DECISION

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

CH

- 13.3. Erf 976, 401 St Johns Road, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27218CH0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388751>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information received on 6 March 2026.
- Graded IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is for deviations to the previous approved work (HWC23080203AM0815). The work is currently in the final stages of construction. The deviations include:
 - A new soft roof over the additions at the rear.
 - Omitting a skylight.
 - A curved wall at the existing existing unisex bathroom.

- Omitting certain internal alterations that was previously approved.
- Omitting the third storey office addition at the rear.
- The work applied for has not started. The work underway on site is in accordance with the previous HWC approval.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CH

13.4. Farm 663, Meaker Road, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27279CH0219 / HWC25102307CH0219 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389777>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 9 March 2026.
- Not Graded however Drakenstein Municipality recommends a grading of IIIC. Structure is located within the Sonstraal Road Scenic Route Overlay Zone.
- Proposal is to renovate the farmhouse/second dwelling. The work includes internal alterations, raising the roof to accommodate a kitchen, dining/living room, bedroom, walk in closet and bathroom. All windows and doors will be replaced with aluminum.
- Work has not started.
- DHAC does not support the proposal and recommends the following:
 - The proposed gables to the new extension must be removed.
 - The replacement of all the existing windows and doors with aluminum is not supported.
 - A heritage statement must be provided for comment which assesses the significance of the heritage resource and the proposed alterations and additions.
- DHF supports provided that no work is undertaken on the main dwelling. The design of the proposed end gable should not replicate that of the main house and must be simplified.
- Paarl300 Foundation did not comment within 30 days. It is noted that the consultation period commenced on 22 October 2025 to which Paarl300 Foundation (on 22 October 2025) requested the drawings and photographs in order to provide comment. It then appears that the applicant only sent this information on 3 March 2026. The applicant confirmed that the photographs were sent last year and the photographs were resent in March 2026.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 16 March 2026.
- It was confirmed during the meeting that the Municipality would have to investigate their building plan archives and historic aerial imagery to ascertain whether the building is older than 60 years.
- The Municipality stated in the meeting that the werf is graded IIIA and retracted the IIIC grading as per the DHAC comment dated 14 November 2025.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Clarification of age on structures
2. Clarification of the proposal, the elevations on the plan must be coloured up accordingly to reflect all proposed work.

CH

13.5. Erf 39600, 10 & 12 Suid Street, Paarl, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No.: HWC25111911CH1121

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Warren Labuschagne, Irene Bester and Clive Theunissen were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 2 December 2025, 17 February 2026 and 10 March 2026.
- Graded IIIC outside the SCPAOZ of Paarl
- Proposal is to partially demolish a portion of the existing building at the rear, minor internal alterations, the addition of a refuse area, two screen walls and to construct a freestanding residential apartments block at the rear.
- Work has not started.
- Drakenstein Municipality supports.
- DHF provide comment on the development at the rear stating that although they do object to the development they strongly object to the current proposed multi-storey residential building. DHF has concerns with the height and built of the building in relation to its immediate context.
- Paarl300 Foundation does not support stating that they strongly disagree with the motivation statement that refers to the historic house being renovated to the highest standards. The building statement can be correctly refurbished which includes openings on the street facade.
- All I&APs have been invited to attend HOMs on 16 March 2026.
- Mr. Labuschagne confirmed in the meeting that the residential development was approved in 2022 and that the reference to unauthorized work pertains to a carport structure at the rear that was dismantled.
- The Municipality agreed that if the Section 34 permit were to be issued with the current plans, the permit must specify that it relates only to the structure older than 60 years.
- The Committee was of the opinion that a separate plan should be submitted that omits the residential apartment block at the rear to avoid confusion and further design revisions required at Municipal level.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. Revised plans reflecting only the work proposed on the structures older than 60 years.

CH

13.6. Erf 601, 8 Caledon Street, Stanford, S31-Additions & Alterations
Case No.: 27265CH0203 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388884>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 23 February, 3 March and 11 March 2026.
- Graded IIIB inside the declared Stanford Heritage Area.
- Proposal is to extend the existing dining room area, a new pool and internal alterations to an existing bathroom.
- Work has not started.
- OHAC supports
- SHC supports.

DECISION

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

13.7. Erf 1126, 2 Clarens Drive, Sea Point, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27585CN0228 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390123>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information requested for R4000 PoP, clarity on the plans and motivation which was received on 6 March.
- Grading: IIIC
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Completed
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: The works include reconfiguration of the 9th-floor roof storey to accommodate a splash pool, timber decking, pergola structures.
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - SFB did not comment in 30 days
- Heritage Considerations: The minor work undertaken to the roof space does not impact negatively on the limited level of significance property.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to issue a S51 letter as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

CN

13.8. Erf 234, 36 Glengriff Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions, Alterations & Partial Demolition
Case No: 27304CN0206 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389022>

CASE SUMMARY

- Outstanding information was requested for SFB comments - received on 5 March.
- Grading: IIIC/4 considered as NCW
- HPO: Outside
- Status of Work: Not started
- Previous Applications: None
- Proposal: Works include internal reconfiguration, minor window and door adjustments on secondary façades, demolition of later rear outbuildings, and the construction of a new rear veranda, elevated pool, staircase and associated storerooms, as well as a new boundary wall
- Consultation:
 - CoCT supports
 - SFA has no objections
 - SFB has no objection
- Heritage Considerations: The work is deemed not to be impacting on the heritage resource.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CN

13.9. Erf 301, 26 Loader Street, De Waterkant, S34-Deviation
Case No: 27332CN0210 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389123>

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- HOMs on 23 Feb placed the item under investigation: Annexures listed in the motivation to be included in the submission, windows to be coloured up correctly and clarity regarding omission of the recess on the right section of the south elevation, as well as clarity regarding the retention of the front door. The applicant submitted written comments stating that the annexures were not necessary for this submission, as they relate to the previous submission. The applicant further confirmed the retention of the recess to the right of the facade, the door and windows on the ground floor.
- Grading: IIIB according to the City Map Viewer. The applicant incorrectly notes the property to be graded IIIC in the motivation.
- HPO: Inside
- Status of Work: Started but not complete (internals demolished)
- Previous Applications: HWC25011610CN0117 - A Re-application of the 2020 lapsed approval. Unauthorised work took place - internals were demolished with the facade standing. BELCom on 16 April 2025 approved the application without changes
- Proposal: The application seeks amendments to the previously approved BELCom plans. The revised proposal retains the approved building envelope with a reduction in overall height but introduces new internal layouts and a reconfigured roof terrace, replacing the previously approved sauna and jacuzzi arrangement with a simplified terrace and pool design.
- Consultation:
- DWCA has no objection. Noting the comment letter is not dated.
- Heritage Considerations: The proposal is deemed substantially in accordance with the previous approval. Given that BELCom has previously approved the overall design approach and that the amendments do not introduce additional bulk, height or adverse streetscape impacts beyond what has already been supported, the heritage impacts are considered acceptable. Therefore, the application can be supported at HOMs without referral back to BELCom.

DECISION

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

CN

13.10. Erf 19641, 157 Kings Road, Brooklyn, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27492CSI0222 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389824>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 6 March for streetscape photos and clarification regarding CoCT comment.
- Work applied for has not started
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- Proposed work is for an extension to include a maid's quarters, internal alterations and reconfiguration, and a new boundary wall
- CoCT provided comment and support the application with the following recommendations: 1. The proposed skylight dormer mass and scale is overbearing in terms of its impact to the form and roofscape of the structure. It is therefore suggested that the skylight dormer be reduced in size or broken into two or more separate dormers. 2. The mature tree on the Kings Road interface is

retained.

DECISION

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

CSI

13.11. Farm 1589, 1475, 1404, 1530 and Portions 6 and 13 of Farm 491, Stellenbosch, S38(8)-NID
Case No:27207CSI0129 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388728>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received 5 March for confirmation of length of bridges. Applicant confirmed that the longest bridge will be 30m.
- Trigger: S38(1)(b) Construction of a bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length.
- Proposed development: Construction of new bridges and the upgrading of existing bridges
- Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural (Spier wine)
- Built environment: No historical structures will be impacted (Mon Villa)
- Visual impacts: IIIB cultural landscape, no impact anticipated.
- Archaeology: The screener report indicates low and high archaeological sensitivity because the site is within 2km of a PHS but the bridges will not impact the structure.
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is moderate

COMMENT

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

CSI

13.12. Erf 2159-RE, 71 Hout Street, Cape Town, S34 - Minor Works
Case No: 27551EJV0225 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390014>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 9 March 2026
- Graded IIIB
- Inside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to convert two windows into frameless doors

DECISION

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

EJV

13.13. Farm 646-RE, Kleinrivier, Stanford, S31 - Minor Works
Case No: 27579EJV0227 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390112>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding Information received on 9 March 2026
- Not Graded

- Inside HPO
- Work has been completed
- The proposal is to regularise unauthorised deviations to the approved plans permitted under case number HWC24082212EJV0715.
- During the construction process, certain window and door positions were adjusted and minor internal wall layout changes were implemented including retention of some marked for demolition. A deck extension was also installed beyond the veranda
- OHAC support

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.

EJV

13.14. Erf 3038, 34 Datis Street, De Zoete Inval, Paarl, S34-Minor Works Case No: 27562SB0226 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390047>

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: New pergola behind the north-east section of the house and behind the south side of the house; New pergola on the front steep area of the house; New garage and scullery / pantry (Datis Street side); Three bedrooms above existing former garage.
- Work starts: No
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- POA received on the 9 March 2026.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SB

13.15. Erf 355, 5 Bickley Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations Case No: 27130SB0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388496>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: extended ensuite, a relocated study, a guest toilet, and a walk-in closet that would require the rear portion will be enlarged.
- Work start: No
- Grade: 3C
- HPO: Inside
- Comments: CoCT supports
- outstanding information received on the 4 March 2026 - Sea Point For All Group (seapointforall@gmail.com) and Sea Point, Fresnaye & Bantry Bay Ratepayers & Residents Association (admin@sfb.org.za) comment required. - both did not comment within 30 days.

DECISION

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

SB

- 13.16. Erf 52561-Re, 25 Cook Street, Claremont, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27539SB0225 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389981>

CASE SUMMARY

- Proposal: New bathroom
- Work start: No
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- HO: Motivation states that the building is not older than 60 years but inside HPO – according to CoCT historical aerial imagery, building first appears in 1953 hence house older than 70 years.
- Outstanding information received 9 March 2026 - additional Streetscape photographs.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

SB

- 13.17. Erf 6397, 32 Church Street, Mossel Bay, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27431SB0216 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389517>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: A timber deck with a dining/living room above was constructed on the northern side. The proposal seeks to partially enclose the deck at ground level to extend the flatlet below. This includes creating a new opening in the existing stone wall to connect old and new spaces and raising an existing lower-level door opening.
- Work start: No
- Grade: not graded
- HPO: inside
- Comments: Heritage Mossel Bay supports but notes that the roof needs careful articulation.
- The municipality stamped the plans.
- Additional information received 4 March, the municipality have stamped the plans, plans have been coloured up to show the proposed work on the elevation. No work has started.

DECISION

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

SB

- 13.18. Kasteelberg Vredenberg, Vredenberg, S35-Dating**
Case No: HWC25102207SB0211

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed action: Dating of a sample, that will require a limited destructive sampling of one canid tooth by drilling a small hole (maximum 3 mm) into the root to extract approximately 30–50 mg of powdered material for dating and DNA analysis. The tooth will be photographed, weighed, and documented before and after sampling to ensure traceability.
- Work start: No
- Grade: PHS
- motivation: The research aims to generate genomic data to better understand the origins and

domestication of dogs, as well as human–animal relationships in prehistory. The site has been disturbed by mole activity, making conventional dating of surrounding layers unreliable. The small amount of material removed will not compromise the morphological or curatorial integrity of the specimen.

- methodology: A thin surface layer will first be removed to eliminate contamination. A small hole (3 mm) will then be drilled into the root to access the pulp cavity, from which 30–50 mg of powdered material will be collected for DNA extraction and sequencing. Non-destructive methods cannot currently produce ancient DNA of sufficient quality for genome-level analysis.
- Repository: yes

DECISION

The Committee resolved to approve the Section 35 permit application.

SB

13.19. RE Farm 794, Paardevlei, Somerset West, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 27164SB0126 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388592>

Item removed from agenda as previously resolved.

SB

13.20. Erf 1955, 1 Fort Wynyard Street, Green Point, S34-Minor Works
Case No: HWC25100805SVB2217

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item on behalf of Ms Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 01 December 2025.
- As such, this application was heard at HOMs on 09 December 2025 whereby the committee requested the following further requirements:
 1. The applicant must submit a written response to the objections received. This response must be prepared by a suitably qualified heritage practitioner. This response may include revised plans.
 2. This application, written response and/or revised plans must be circulated to the Green Point Ratepayer's & Residents Association, Docomomo-SA and the City of Cape Town's E&HM Branch for the 30-day consultation period and comments, or proof of consultation must be submitted to HWC.
- In fulfilment of the further requirements the applicant submitted a Docomomo-SA comment, GPRRA comment, CoCT comment and revised plan on 16 February and 09 March 2026.
- The property is graded IIIB and within the V&A PHA Proposed HPOZ.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for alterations and additions to the VD Clinic and Ward buildings within the City Hospital Block. The alteration and additions are to allow for the expansion & relocation of the pharmacy within the building envelope, partially renovate the ancillary building, additional storage space within the building envelope, a covered walkway and addressing scheduled maintenance issues.
- A NID for alterations and additions to the subject structures was reviewed HOMs on 06 October, whereby the committee resolved to issue a no trigger letter (26224SJ0925). The proposal before the committee today is in accordance with the plans submitted with this NID application.
- GPRRA did not object to the proposal in their initial and revised comments.
- Docomomo-SA objected to the lack of clear conservation approach applied to the alterations of these very significant buildings and raised specific concerns pertaining to this in their initial comment. In their revised comment Docomomo-SA acknowledged that the revisions have taken on broadly their concerns and comments where possible. They noted that the proposed alterations will still have a cumulative effect of loss of fabric and changes in layout, but they

accept that these changes are needed for continuity and improvement of the public clinic. They noted the applicant's willingness to allow Docomomo-SA to document the two buildings and ask that HWC include this as a requirement in their decision.

- The CoCT were not consulted during the first round of consultation, however during the second round they issued a comment of no objection.
- The applicant provided revised plans as part of the further requirements.

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

1. Docomomo-SA must be allowed 30 days to document the existing building on Erf 1955, and this document must be submitted to HWC by the applicant.

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

SVB

13.21. Erf 56442, 31 Upper Sidmouth Avenue, Bishopscourt, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 27491SVB0222 <https://sahris.org.za/node/389821>

Ms Sofia Briel introduced the item.

Bridget O'Donoghue, Hayley Geary, Tamara Drake, Christiaan Barnard, Nick Smith, Robert Henderson and Douglas Allen were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 06 March 2026.
- The property is graded IIIB and outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is to demolish the existing dwelling and outbuildings and to develop a new boutique hotel building with ancillary facilities (spa, meeting rooms, gym, pool, restaurant/bar). In order to achieve this, the property must be rezoned from SR1 to GR2 and consent must be granted for the use of the property as a hotel.
- A notification of intent to develop was reviewed by HOMs at the meeting of 20 October 2025 whereby the committee resolved that no further studies were required (27491SVB0222). However, the committee resolved to approve the following clause within the letter "The committee strongly advises that upon submission of the Section 34 application, that a fabric/material analysis be included with the Section 34 total demolition application."
- A heritage statement was submitted with this demolition application, as per this heritage statement the heritage consultant has assessed the building as being Not Conservation Worthy.
- CoCT do not support the proposal, for the following reasons. The existing resource has been graded by the City as 3B, has undergone changes and alterations but retains historic/authentic features, gables, chimneys, doors and windows, ironmongery and historic fabric. In the City's opinion the resource contains high to medium contextual levels of significance and medium levels of significance in terms of aesthetics, representivity and age. Although having undergone several alterations and modernisations the City is of the view that the original form and architectural qualities are very much evident. HRS is not in agreement with the Heritage Statement which assesses the resource as being Not Conservation Worthy. The evident heritage value of the resource is embedded in its considerable levels of local architecture, aesthetic and historical worth and in particular, its contextual significance within a diminished historic landscape where few of the earliest, large and small, buildings are still present. The City concludes by saying that a potential loss of such a heritage resource, which has boldly accommodated changes made to it yet retained its core values, within its threatened historic context cannot be supported by HRS.
- In addition to the objection from the City, objections were also received from 23 other parties namely: Bishopscourt Residents' Association; Nicholas Smith (attorney) (obo Bishopscourt Residents Association, Dr Bruce Mclvor, Dr. Gisella Furlan, and Mr. and Mrs. Alexander and Laura

Hadjidakis); Bruce MacRobert; Mrs Glenda Bell; Leela Moodley; Nicola Wood; Nicolette Waterford & Analjit Singh; Derek Caldicott; Leanne & Luke Barlow; David and Sinead Baker Nicola and Lewis Sparks; Gina & Karl Leinberger; Jonny & Christine Sieff; Kate and Rob Hersov; Melisa Smuts and Malcolm Fair; Nicola Gnodde; C.J. Frater; Laura Hadjidakis; Fiona Smith; Andrew Lancefield; Lauren Mandy; Claudia Neto; Lynne Hudson.

- These objections can be collectively summarized as follows. Objectors are of the view that the site contributes to a layered cultural and historical identity, has architectural value due to distinctive features that showcase Cape Revival style such as gables, chimney, original windows and is a strong well maintained architectural example of its period. Objectors point out a lack of attention paid to the historical significance, social and cultural significance beyond the architectural significance in the application. Objectors note that the building is one of the oldest buildings in Bishopscourt and demolition would negatively impact on the surrounding heritage context of Bishopscourt. It is also noted that the proposed replacement structure is incompatible with the residential character of the neighborhood and that demolition and reconstruction risk impacting the established vegetation which characterizes Bishopscourt and possible environmental degradation. Objections were made on the basis of a negative impact on the sense of community, and that it is unsustainable to demolish the building as opposed to restoration, extensions or adaptive reuse. Objectors also pointed out contradiction between the City's assessment of heritage significance and the practitioners and there is disagreement with the assessment done by the practitioner, specifically relating to intrinsic qualities, aesthetic and contextual value. Objectors also noted that the application is lacking in terms of inclusion of all relevant heritage indicator and in terms of an assessment of the heritage context and detailed contextual analysis, and that a "proper detailed analysis" of the streetscape is required. Multiple objectors took issue with not having sight of the replacement structure, and argued that Gees is applicable here, as there is in their view a heritage context, specifically referenced in the City's heritage statement which notes that the property contributes to the streetscape and area. Lastly objectors question whether S38 had been complied with; pointed out contradictions within the heritage statement; requested that HWC undertake a site inspection; noted that the proposal would create a precedent for demolition of other heritage resources in Bishopscourt; and maintained that the building should be sympathetically altered rather than demolished. There were also various objections that pertained to dust, noise, disruption, health consequences, safety, quality of life and various land use and planning issues.
- The heritage consultant's response to the CoCT objection is as follows: *"No site visit was completed by the CCT EHMB for this application. The CCT survey did not do the research or a site visit to determine this grading (as in the norm with the majority of CCT gradings). The significance of context is provided by the site's vegetation, and would be a Grade IIIC. This late Cape Dutch revival is not a good representation of the architectural style (refer Section 3). The original form of the building and the present architectural qualities differ to a great extent from the original building. Many of the suburbs original buildings are present, although they have been modernized with new layouts, windows and doors, verandahs etc. Otherwise they have been replaced with contemporary buildings, or multi residential unit developments. The core values of this building as a most likely stable block have not been retained in the residential use alterations over 50 years. The suburb is receiving a degree of development due to the willingness of owners to sell their properties and new owners to develop new contemporary houses or developers developing secure residential estates."*
- The heritage consultant's summarized response to remaining objections is as follows: *"Through research and inspection, the site is assessed to not have enough cultural significance to recommend a grading in terms of the NHRA Section 7. This assessment is based on the criteria contained in the NHRA. The building is not rare in Cape Town not a good example of the Cape Dutch revival style, having been added to the building in c 1958; Bishopscourt has few buildings of significance, and the civic or/ and the CCT should be encouraged to complete the survey (started by the CCT). Heritage resources, including trees and vegetation can then be well managed; The mature vegetation provides contextual value to the site and the context. This vegetation is proposed to remain; The rezoning of the site to permit the proposed development can be prevented if the proposal was reduced in size; The removal of the Title Deed restrictions on*

Bishopscourt erven occur to permit additional development. These examples such as the gated security complexes fit into the suburb and do not result in social impacts; The plans of the proposed building are included in the submission to HWC. These drawings were presented and shared with the civic and the adjacent neighbour in September 2025, and included in the Land Use Management application to the CCT (which has been advertised for comment). Therefore, the public has had the opportunity to view the proposed building.”

- The committee noted that some of the objections raised by interested and affected parties were not on heritage grounds and not immediately relevant to this application. However, the committee noted that the primary concern is whether the structure is a heritage resource and whether there is a heritage context.
- The committee assessed the context when the Notification of Intent to develop submission was before the committee and at the time the committee did not identify a heritage context. Similarly, the committee, did not identify a heritage context when assessing the current application and it was noted by the committee that the heritage context is not graded, and that the structure is setback and hidden from view and therefore would not contribute to any heritage context visually, should one have been identified. Furthermore, at the time of the NID submission the committee noted that any uncertainty regarding the significance of the structure itself would be dealt with under the Section 34 process.
- The Committee were in support of the request for an additional consultation period to allow interested and affected parties to comment on the final draft of the heritage statement.
- The committee questioned the significance of the structure. However, due to the objections raised by parties, specifically pertaining to the significance of the structure, the committee felt that an extended consultation period would be appropriate, to allow for further ventilation of concerns and to enable the committee to make an informed decision.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. As the applicant has provided written responses to the objections received, these, along with the most recent heritage report, must be circulated to all identified I&APs for a further 30-day consultation period.
2. The heritage report must be updated in line with the proof thereof, as well as incorporating any heritage relevant responses received.

SVB

13.22. Erf 21763, Lentegeur Hospital. Lentegeur, S38(1)-NID Case No: 27124XM0121 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388475>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 20 February 2026.
- The application is for approval for a Consent Use for Business Premises (Offices) on Erf 21763 to accommodate additional administrative office space. The proposed offices are not related to healthcare services and will operate independently of the existing hospital use, with no educational or instructional activities taking place on site.
- The site is not located within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone (HPOZ) and is not graded. Since the site has no buildings that have any heritage value, the proposed consent use application for the site will not have an impact on the heritage value of the property or surrounding area.
- Approximate Development Footprint: 27405mSquare meters (sqm)
- Current Zoning: Community 2
- Current Land Use: Public Hospital
- Predominant Land Use of Surrounding Properties: Residential
- Archeology: Low
- Paleontology: Low

- Identification of heritage resources and potential impacts: None
- No recommendation for an HIA and specialist studies
- The consultant recommended that no further heritage studies are required.
- Recommendation NFS

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

SDP required

XM

13.23. Erf 98035, 13 Prideaux Road, Rondebosch, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27230XM0130 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388778>

CASE SUMMARY

- The outstanding information was received on 20 February 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations for a new braai room.
- The work has not started.
- The property has not been graded yet the City proposed grading of Not Conservation Worthy
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The RCID have no objection to the above proposal.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.24. Erf 1176, 158 Milton Road, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: HWC25102115XM1027

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Company resolution or confirmation who the sole director of the company is, is required.

XM

13.25. Erf 1764, 21 Lourensford Road, Somerset West, S34-Minor Works

Case No: 27144XM0122 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388520>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Clarification required on the internal work (coloured up plan), SG diagram is required.

XM

13.26. Erf 4565, 16 Louie Street, Paarl, S34-Minor Works

Case No: HWC25071507XM1106

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- Outstanding information received on 24 February 2026.
- The application is for the installation of solar panels and water tanks to the existing dwelling.
- The work has not started
- Not Graded
- Within Paarl Special Character Area Overlay Zone
- Drakenstein Municipality has no objection
- The DHF has no objection

DECISION

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

XM

- 13.27. Erf 56791, 10 Angelina Avenue, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27184XM0127/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388654>

CASE SUMMARY

- The outstanding information was received on 24 February 2026
- The application is for internal alterations to the existing dwelling with new scullery added to the ground floor and new first floor bedroom suite added. Swimming pool and verandah added to the exterior of the property proposed.
- The work has not started.
- Graded IIIC
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- The UCRRA has no objection

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

- 13.28. Erf 96170, Unit 18 Dunkley Mews, 14 Wandel Street, Gardens, S27-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: HWC25090302XM0908

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 25 February 2026
- The application is for minor bathroom additions and alterations and some internal alterations to create a new laundry area.
- The work has been completed, no proposed new work
- Graded II
- Inside the HPO
- CoCT supports
- CIBRA supports

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

- 13.29. Erven 1237 and 21336, 3 & 5 Tulbagh Street, Strand, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27036XM0114/ <https://sahris.org.za/node/388277>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 06 March 2026
- The proposal is for an addition of a second storey to existing and divide into four units with four

flats with their own garages at the back on Heinecke Street. The ridge height of the terrace will be added in the roof space in order to allow for the continued use of the buildings for residential purposes, whilst also providing for additional single garages which are to gain access from Heinecke Street.

- Work has not started.
- Graded IIIA
- Outside HPO
- COCT supports
- Helderberg Renaissance Foundation supports

DECISION

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

XM

13.30. Erf 935, 30 Church Street, Wellington, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 26645XM1111/ <https://www.sahris.org.za/node/387051>

Ms Xola Mlwandle introduced the item.

DISCUSSION

- The outstanding information was received on 11 March 2026
- HOMs requested confirmation with the status of the work on site, applicant confirmed no work has started as they are waiting for approval.
- The application is for an addition of a carport and two additional internet kiosks to the existing FNB building.
- Work has not started.
- Graded IIIA
- Within the Wellington protected area
- Drakenstein municipality support
- DHF did not comment within 30 days

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Correct coloured up Plans indicating the proposal required

XM

13.31. Erf 1632, 9 Arum Road, Simons Town, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 26956XM0106 / <https://sahris.org.za/node/388115>

CASE SUMMARY

- The outstanding information was received on 11 March 2026.
- The application is for additions and alterations to the existing property for proposed new garage, pergola and boundary wall.
- Work has not started
- CoCT comment letter: The applicant has indicated that the required application to Heritage Western Cape (HWC) has been submitted. Please recirculate the case to HRS when the required HWC stamped plan and corresponding permit have been uploaded onto the case.
- Simons Town Historical Society has no objection.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

XM

13.32. Erf 11207, 47-2nd Crescent, Fish Hoek, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: HWC25091013XM0911

CASE SUMMARY

- The outstanding information was received on 10 March 2026.
- The proposal is for the rebuilding of the property after fire damage in the roof/loft area, including ground floor while at the same time undertook additions & alterations to the existing dwelling and existing outbuildings to create a second dwelling and domestic quarters.
- All Work has been completed as shown on plans.
- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- CoCT supports
- Fish Hoek Ratepayers and Residents Association have no objection.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to issue a S51 letter as the proposed work did not negatively impact the heritage resource.

XM

14. NEW MATTERS

14.1 Erf 1365, 9 Louis Trichart Street, Briza, Somerset West, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 27647CH0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390280>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs, SG diagram, CoCT comment, HRF comment and demolition plan is required.

CH

14.2 Erf 19861, 5 De Jongh Lane, Paarl, S27-Minor Works
Case No: 27596CH0302 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390156>

Ms Chane Herman introduced the item.

Clive Theunissen was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Grade II inside the SCPAOZ of Paarl
- Proposal is for maintenance work to the existing thatch roof.
- Work has not started.
- Previous application:
 - S34 permit (HWC25092207CH1027) for internal alterations.
- Case officer recommends approval.

DECISION

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

CH

- 14.3 Erf 586 15 Links Drive, Pinelands, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27617CH0303 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390212>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Streetscape photographs is required.

CH

- 14.4 Erf 67019-RE, 29 Silverlea Road, Wynberg, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27706CH0308 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390410>

CASE SUMMARY

- Graded IIIC outside HPO
- Proposal is to replace the roof riles, roof configuration to accommodate attic rooms, install roof lights and a dormer window that will be slightly higher than existing pitch, central dormer addition on the front facade side of the building, changing some windows to timber and aluminum, new screen wall and pergola along the western elevation, enlarging the existing patio on the eastern side and internal alterations.
- Work has not started.
- CoCT supports
- WRRRA did not comment within 30 days.
- Old Wynberg Village Society did not comment within 30 days

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

CH

- 14.5 Erf 90, 44 Main Road, Gansbaai, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27684CH0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390373>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Plans to be coloured up indicating the proposed shopfront alterations is required.

CH

- 14.6 Erf 208, 3b Quendon Road - Unit B, Sea Point, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27601CN0302 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390167>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Title deed, external photos and I&AP comments required.

CN

- 14.7 Erf 49055, 39 Ravenberg Avenue, Newlands, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27693CN0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390389>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Response to objections required.

CN

- 14.8** Erf 57398, 3 Talana Close, Claremont, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27594CN0302 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390150>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Internal photos and I&AP comments required
- CN
- 14.9** Erf 12092, 37 Nerina Avenue, Fish Hoek, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27626CSI0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390243>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Internal photos required.
- CSI
- 14.10** Erf 12623-RE, 6 Eden Road, Walmer Estate, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27600CSI0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390166>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
Conservation body comments, streetscape photos, annotated plans noting all the work that has been completed required.
- CSI
- 14.11** Erf 144, 12 Wynyard Street, Unit 4, Wynyard Mansions, Oranjezicht, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27677CSI0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390358>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
CoCT and CIBRA comments required.
- CSI
- 14.12** Erf 152832, 32 Beatty Avenue, Garden Village, Maitland, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27674CSI0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390353>
- OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:**
PoA, coloured up plan required.
- CSI
- 14.13** Farm 238-RE, Farm Welvanpas Bovlei Road, Bovlei Valley, Wellington, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27606CSI0303 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390172>
- Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.
- Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.
- DISCUSSION**
- Trigger: (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;
 - Proposed development: The proposed development entails the establishment of an agricultural olive cultivation block and installation of an agricultural irrigation system covering approximately 3.23 hectares
 - Current zoning/land-use: Agricultural
 - Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical structures - site is vacant
 - Visual impacts: No visual impacts expected
 - Archaeology: No archaeological resources were identified
 - Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map is unknown

COMMENT

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

CSI

14.14 Farm 249, off the R63, Murraysburg, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 27632CSI0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390255>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: N/A
- Proposed development: NEMA S24G application for the unlawful expansion of a cemetery. The cemetery has reached its capacity and expanded as an interim solution while a new site needs to be planned for and developed for the long term as part of a separate BAR process. The growth of the existing cemetery has also extended beyond the urban edge illustrated in the Murraysburg Spatial Development Framework (SDF).
- Current zoning/land-use: Agriculture / Cemetery
- Built environment: No historical structures were impacted due to the expansion.
- Visual impacts: No visual impacts noted due to the expansion.
- Archaeology: The archaeological sensitivity on the screener report is very high as the site is within 2km of a PHS
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is very high. According to the desktop PIA conducted for the next application, the palaeontologist did not have any specific concerns and recommended no mitigation.

FINAL COMMENT

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

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

14.15 Farm 249-RE, off the R63, Murraysburg S38(8)-NID

Case No: 27637CSI0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390262>

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the item.

Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Trigger: S38(1)(c) Any development or activity that will change the character of a site -, (i) exceeding 5 000m² in extent;; S38(1)(d) Rezoning of a site exceeding 10 000m² in extent.
- Proposed development: A new Murraysburg cemetery. Two potential sites have been proposed (Site A & Site B) for a new cemetery, with Site B being the preferred site alternative.
- Current zoning/land-use: Agriculture / Vacant
- Built environment: No impacts expected to any historical structures.
- Visual impacts: No visual impacts expected.
- Archaeology: The archaeological sensitivity on the screener report is very high as the site is within 2km of a PHS
- Palaeontology: Palaeo sensitivity on the SAHRIS palaeo map and screener report is very high. John

Almond provided a desktop PIA and site analysis concluding that there are no objections on palaeontological heritage grounds to authorisation to either of the two cemetery sites under consideration, and no marked preference for one or other site. Pending the discovery of significant unrecorded fossil sites before or during development, no further palaeontological heritage studies or mitigation are recommended for this project.

- Consultant has recommended HIA with AIA and PIA, however, the size of the site has since decreased from 20ha to 3ha and the consultant does not believe an HIA is now necessary thereby recommending NFS.

FINAL COMMENT

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

CSI

14.16 Erf 897, 1 Pear Lane, Constantia, S34 - Minor Works

Case No: 27608EJV0303 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390186>

CASE SUMMARY

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is to create a staff quarters within the existing building footprint via internal alterations to an existing bedroom, a new braai on the existing patio, and freestanding pool and deck elements in the garden alongside a new retaining wall.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

EJV

14.17 Farm 645-RE, Esterhof, Aandbloem and Watsonia Streets, Riebeek-Kasteel, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 27660EJV0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390322>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Graded IIIB
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d).
- The proposal is to extend the Esterhof residential estate outside of Riebeek-Kasteel with 490 Residential Zones, 3 Open Space Zones, 1 Community Zone, a Transport Zone, and a Cemetery. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Mao indicates low sensitivity. The site lies on the edge of Esterhof and is currently disused what fields. Kasteelberg can be seen to the southwest but due to the flatness of the area, views past Esterhof even to the nearby vineyards are curtailed and the site forms part of the overall rural agricultural setting of the Swartland but is not prominent or located near any sensitive heritage resources or scenic routes. The property is graded IIIB in the approved Swartland Rural Heritage Survey; however, the 1910 farmhouse is situated 2 km away from the residential expansion and is not visible from the site. The site falls within the urban edge and the density results in a natural and unobtrusive extension to the existing Esterhof density. An October 2025 AIA of the larger area (CTS Heritage) found no significant archaeological resources.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.18 Multiple Erven, Morrison Road, Eekhorning Street and Bitou Street, Great Brak River, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27665EJV0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390332>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(a).
- The proposal is to develop sewer infrastructure along Morrison road, Eekhorning Street and Bitou Street in Great Brak River inclusive of 3840m of new sewer pipelines. Historical background research did not reveal any significant heritage-related features within the study area. The majority of the proposed sewer infrastructure is located within the Morrison Road reserve, which has already been transformed through the presence of existing services infrastructure such as electrical lines, fiber connections, water pipelines, concrete walkways and concrete swale structures for stormwater management and therefore is unlikely to impact in situ heritage resources. Nilssen assessed the surrounding sites to have low archaeological sensitivity, with no indication of heritage resources. While the SAHRS Palaeo-Map indicates high sensitivity, the road reserve is extensively disturbed and transformed as supported by the established pattern of urban development, previous earthworks, and vegetation clearance within the sandy soils underlying the area. Expert opinion from Dr Peter Nilssen confirms that the fossil potential of these sands is poor, with shallow excavations expected to affect only the upper loose sands. These horizons are not anticipated to contain significant fossil heritage resources, given their low to marginal palaeontological sensitivity.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.19 Farm 1749 Portion 1, Bartholemeusklip, Hermon, S38(1)-NID
Case No: 27680EJV0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390363>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Inside the Upper Berg River Valley Cultural Landscape
- Work has not started
- Possibly triggers s38(1)(c)(i).
- The proposal is to introduce a single-storey agricultural shed to the farm alongside an existing shed. The broader context of the development area has high levels of cultural landscape heritage value. However, the area proposed for development is located downslope of the significant Elandsberg Nature Reserve PHS and an agricultural shed is typical of the agricultural context. While it is clear that there are high levels of heritage value in the immediate context of the area

proposed for development, no impact to heritage resources within the immediate or broader context is anticipated from the proposed development. Few archaeological impact assessments have been conducted in the area with few archaeological resources identified mostly along river gullies; therefore there are not likely to be significant archaeological resources impacted by the proposal as the site does not intersect such a gully. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates low sensitivity.

- Consultant recommends no further studies but confirmed via email that the additions of a shed alongside an existing shed does not introduce a change in character.

COMMENT

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

EJV

14.20

Erf 401, Caledon Street, Darling, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 27686EJV0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390377>

Corne Alexander introduced the item on behalf of Emily Jane Vowles.

DISCUSSION

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- Triggers s38(1)(c)(i) and (d).
- The proposal is for a mixed use and industrial development consisting of 50 plots for use as offices, data centres, warehousing, and other light industrial activities. The site is undeveloped grazing land and is surrounded by properties used for brick works, concrete works, industry, grazing, and a small solar plant. The SAHRIS Palaeo-Map indicates insignificant and unknown sensitivity. The map of relative archaeological and cultural heritage theme sensitivity indicates low sensitivity. No heritage resources were identified in a walkover survey of the site.
- Consultant recommends no further studies

FINAL COMMENT

The Committee resolved that no further studies are required, as heritage resources will not be impacted upon. HWC Chance Finds Procedure and Accidental Finds Protocol are to be included in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation.

EJV

14.21

Farm 87 Portion 1, C42 and C45 Section 2, Banghoek Private Game Reserve, Piketberg, S34-Additions & Alterations

Case No: 27707EJV0308 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390411>

CASE SUMMARY

- Not Graded
- Outside HPO
- Work has not started
- The proposal is for internal alterations to the existing cottage, the installation of a new thatch roof, fenestration changes, the addition of a braai area and pergola, and a new pool
- Consultation: The municipality referred the application to HWC

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

EJV

14.22 Erf 67397, 5 Lindley Road, Wynberg, S34-Total Demolition
Case No: 27699RB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390398>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Proof of consultation with WRA and plans showing the total demolition required.

RB

14.23 Multiple Farms and Farm Portions along the Hex River, off the N1, De Doorns, S38(8)-NID
Case No: 27698RB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390396>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item.

David Halket was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- S38(8) with DEA&DP as the authorising authority.
- Applicant claims that S38(1)(c)(ii) is triggered (change in character over three or more erven).
- Proposal is for Hex Valley Water Users Association (HVWUA) to install Bulk Bags at 9 strategic locations along the Hex River to create a series of groynes/berms to help manage river erosion and flooding damage.
- The Bulk Bags will involve filling with sediment and then the bag is installed in the hole where sediment was removed from to assist with stabilising that bank (in essence, creating a borrow pit and refilling the pit with the excavated material in bags for stabilisation).
- This area has a sensitive cultural landscape - the Hex River Valley Cultural Landscape identified by Winter and Oberholzer in 2014 and falls along an incredibly scenic section of the N1 (high experiential quality).
- The valley has a mix of palaeosensitivity, with the colluvial deposits (i.e., in the river) specifically having a green/moderate sensitivity.
- John Almond submitted a Palaeontological screener noting that there are no planned bedrock excavations and the sediments will essentially remain in situ/still have context, so no PIA is required.
- Although this area has a high archaeological sensitivity, with previous applications nearby (NID and HIA - 120730TS24 and NID 18050704SB0509E resulted in HWC requesting AIAs), the footprint is small and the sediments would be colluvially disturbed deposits in any case (i.e., archaeologically ex situ).
- Applicant recommends NFS.

COMMENT

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

RB

14.24 Erf 56317, 55 Eden Road, Claremont, S34-Minor Works
Case No: 27689RB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390384>

CASE SUMMARY

- Graded IIIC.
- Outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- Proposal is for an internal rearrangement by adding a bathroom beneath the staircase and installing two new windows in the master bedroom's bathroom.
- Minor works so comment are not required.

FOR NOTING

The application was dealt with under the ASD delegation under item 9.8. The ASD in consultation with the relevant specialist staff resolved to approve the application as the proposal does not negatively impact on heritage resources.

RB

- 14.25 Erf 58189, 58 Rosmead Avenue, Claremont, S34-Minor Works**
Case No: 27648RB0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390281>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION

Streetscape photographs and, as the work is not minor (involves an extension), comments from HVA and CoCT E&HM are required

RB

- 14.26 Erf 28148, 7 Forfar Road, Observatory, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 27616RB0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390210>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

S34 wrongly submitted as a S38.

RB

- 14.27 Erf 28499, 9 Glencaird Road, Mowbray, S34-Additions & Alterations**
Case No: 27605RB0204 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390171>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Trust resolution, RAMPAC comment, CoCT E&HM comment, streetscape images, external images showing streetfacing section's façade where the new door is proposed required.

RB

- 14.28 Erf 10110, 12, 5th Avenue, Fish Hoek, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition**
Case No: 27607SB0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390181>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

CoCT heritage comment is required

SB

- 14.29 Erf 2064, 57, 21st Avenue, Mossel Bay, S34-Maintenance and Repair, Restoration**
Case No: 27620SB0303 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390225>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Heritage Mossel Bay and municipality comment, more streetscape photographs that show the context.

SB

- 14.30 Erf 2085, 56 Beach Road, Strand, S34-Additions, Alterations, and/or Partial demolition**
Case No: 27650SB0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390299>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Frederik Lotter was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposal: internal renovations, demolishing existing structures (carport, storerooms) to replace with new garages and storage, and adding an en-suite and dressing room within the courtyard. The structures will encroach the Micheau Street building line by approximately 3 meters, similar to

- existing encroachments
- Work start: No
- Grade: Some heritage significance
- HPO: Outside
- Comments: HRF does not oppose the proposal but notes potential negative streetscape impacts and recommends reducing the perceived scale and improving alignment with neighbouring buildings.
- CoCT does not support the proposed three-storey development due to streetscape concerns but indicates that a sympathetically designed two-storey proposal could be supported.
- All parties were invited to the meeting to ventilate the objections.
- It was noted that the applicant did respond to the objections from City of Cape Town and HFR.
- Although the building has low individual heritage significance, it contributes to a consistent (though low significance) streetscape along Beach Road.
- However, the proposal steps back on the three storey, therefore keeping double storey on Beach Road.
- It was further noted that the site was zoned GR5, therefore in height restriction.
- Given the streetscape has been disrupted by existing high risers and other larger buildings in the area, the committee resolved to support the proposal.
- The Committee considered the proposed work within the broader streetscape of Beach Road beyond the fine grain residential buildings. The proposed design creates the perception of a double storey along the Beach Road frontage and the third storey has been carefully considered with the setback towards the rear. Although contemporary in design, the height and scale of the proposal responds sympathetically to the neighbouring residential buildings.

DECISION

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

SB

14.31 Erf 2706, Off the R315, Yzerfontein, S38(8)-NID

Case No: 276960SB306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390393>

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the item.

Jonathan Kaplan was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- Proposed: Residential housing development on Erf 2706 Yzerfontein comprising a 0.5ha filling station, 7ha retirement village, 20 residential erven (1.5ha), and 30 residential erven (2.3ha).
- Trigger: S38(1)(c) development exceeding 5 000m²; S38(1)(d) rezoning exceeding 10 000m².
- Other: NEMA, DEA&DP.
- Grade: Not graded
- HPO: Outside
- Heritage resource: Vacant agricultural land with no identified built heritage resources.
- Archaeology: According to the screener tool, there is a portion of very high sensitivity. Furthermore, burial was uncovered by HWC in 2022/3. Hence the potential archaeological concerns. The consultant notes that the area may contain shell middens, stone tools, pottery, and ostrich eggshell; potential impact rated high.
- Palaeontological: Located on Langebaan Formation calcrete with high palaeontological sensitivity according to SAHRIS.
- Visual/Cultural: None identified and to the east and south is urban development, visual concerns low.
- Consultant recommends: HIA including Archaeological Impact Assessment and Palaeontological Impact Assessment.

- Since there is reason to believe that heritage will be impacted by development.

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

SB

- 14.32 Portion 1 of Farm Vredenwerf 459, Off R44, Paarl, S38(1)-NID**
Case No: 27695SB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390391>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

POA and KM of the site is required.

SB

- 14.33 Portugeese Fontyn Farm 167, Off R45, Hopefield, S38(1)-HIA**
Case No: 27640SB0304 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390266>

HELD OVER

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 23 March 2026 due to provide case officer more time to investigate the documents.

SB

- 14.34 Various Farms and portion of Witdraai, Groot Oliphants, Kleine Zoute Rivier, Van, Farm Morning Star Melkbosstrand, S38(8)-HIA**
Case No: 27056SB0115 <https://sahris.org.za/node/388315>

HELD OVER

The application is held over to the Heritage Officers' Meeting (HOMs) on 23 March 2026 due to provide case officer more time to investigate the documents.

SB

- 14.35 Erf 207, 5 Voortrekker Road, Laaiplek, S34-Total Demolition**
Case No: 27661SVB0305 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390325>

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item on behalf of Ms Sofia Briel.

DISCUSSION

- The property is Not Graded and is outside of any HPO.
- Work has not started.
- The proposal is for total demolition of all structure on the site.
- Bergriver Municipality do not object to the proposal.
- Velddrif Heritage although not a registered conservation body with HWC were consulted and do not object to the proposal.

DECISION

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

SVB

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the item on behalf of Ms Sofia Briel.

Claire Abrahamse was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION

- The trigger is S38(1) (i) exceeding 5000m² in extent.
- The proposal is for construction of a new Mosque and as well as new educational and community facilities, together with the required administrative and auxiliary service spaces. This requires demolition of the current Imam's House dated 2003 as well as some 1982 structures, and substantial alterations of the 1958 hostel building. The building plans are accompanied by a landscape concept plan which identifies the existing trees and proposed removal, retention and transplanting of some of the trees on the site as well as new planting.
- As per the application no formally proclaimed heritage sites have been identified in the area, and most sites are graded NCW. However, the schools to either side of the site are graded IIIC.
- The site itself is graded IIIC/NCW, outside of any HPO and is currently zoned Community 1 (CO1).
- The statement of significance for the site reads: *"An important religious institute in the community. Some buildings date to 1958"*. However, according to the application, as the proposed development is looking to entrench the role of the site as a religious institute in the community, and as the only building older than 60 years on the site has no heritage significance, the applicant anticipates no impact to any graded properties in the vicinity.
- According to the applicant, the date palms on the site, do have some associational significance in principle. While these palms pre-dated the use of the site for the Madina Institute, when approaching the site perpendicularly, along 2nd Avenue, the "sentinel" role of the palms, which are on axis on the road, becomes apparent. The two street trees (Brazilian Peppers) do contribute to a small "avenue" along Veld Street in this area and are a tree with strong neighbourhood associations. The site does offer an area of mature tree canopy within the immediate context, although no particular trees hold notable significance. The applicant notes that the landscape plan indicates the intended transplanting of the palms or their replacement with fairly large specimens. At least one palm (be it transplanted, shifted, or a new palm) is intended to remain on axis along 2nd Avenue, continuing this axial role. The site does offer an area of mature tree canopy within the immediate context, but the landscape plan looks to preserve and reinforce the tree canopy along Veld Street. Given this, the applicant anticipated no impact in this regard.
- Furthermore, the applicant has not identified any townscape, socio-historical and cultural, visual, archaeology or palaeo or any other heritage impacts. The SAHRIS Palaeo Map indicates the sites palaeo-sensitivity as low.
- The heritage consultant recommends that no HIA is required. The consultant elaborates on this recommendation as follows: the site has a low grading, due to its community significance. It is not located within a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone. While there are some graded sites in the vicinity of the property in question, they will be unaffected by the proposed development on the subject site. The subject site's community and intangible heritage significance will likely be reinforced by the proposed development. The buildings to be altered have no heritage significance, and the landscape plan indicates the continuation of landscape features on the site. Therefore, the development of the site is not anticipated to have any heritage impact.

DECISION

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

- 14.37 Erf 69454-RE, 16 Perth Road, Wynberg, S34-Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27588SVB0302 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390128>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Company resolution, additional streetscapes and local authority comment required.

SVB

- 14.38 Erf 919-RE, 126 Constantia Main Road, Constantia, S34- Additions & Alterations
Case No: 27692SVB0306 <https://sahris.org.za/node/390388>

OUTSTANDING INFORMATION:

Coloured up to scale plan with dimensions, local municipality comments, balance of the application fee for completed work required.

SVB

15. Other Matters

16. Adoption of Resolutions and Decisions:

CH moves to adopt and RB seconds the adoption of resolutions and decisions of the meeting of 16 March 2026.

17. Closure: The chairperson, Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport, officially closed the meeting at 12:39

18. Date of next meeting: 23 March 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR: _____

SECRETARY: _____

Annexure A – HWC: Heritage Officers’ Meetings

Abbreviations

APHP - Association of Professional Heritage Practitioners	ASAPA - Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
AHP - Agulhas Heritage Society	ABHC - Associated Bibles Hoek Conservancy (Knysna)
BKCA - Bo-Kaap Civic Association	BELCOM - Built Environment and Landscapes Committee
BKYM - Bo-Kaap Youth Movement	CBCRA - Camps Bay Clifton Ratepayers Association
CIBRA - City Bowl Ratepayers & Residents Association	CSDBOA - Clifton-On-Sea & District Bungalow Owners Association
CoCT – City of Cape Town	CTHF - Cape Town Heritage Foundation
CTHT – Cape Town Heritage Trust	CRRRA - Constantia Ratepayers & Residents Associations
CRM - Cultural Resources Management	CMP – Conservation Management Plan
DRHCA - De Rust Heritage Conservation Association	DWCA - De Waterkant Civic Association
Docomomo South Africa	DHF - Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation
DHS -Durbanville Heritage Society	EMPr - Environmental Management Program
EHM – Environmental Heritage Management department	FHRA -Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association
FoBCA - Friends of Blaauwberg Conservation Area	FoCVGB - Friends of Constantia Valley Green Belts
FE - Friends of Elim	GBRM - Great Brak River Museum
GLCA - Greater Lynfræ Civic Association	GVHAG - Greater Vredehoek Heritage Action Group
GPRRA - Green Point Ratepayers & Residents Association	GCS - Greyton Conservation Society
HVA - Harfield Village Association	HRF - Helderberg Renaissance Foundation
HMB - Heritage Mossel Bay	HOMs - Heritage Officers Meeting
HVTA - Hex Valley Tourism Association	HPO – Heritage protects overlay.
HBRRA - Hout Bay & Ratepayers and Residents Association	
HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment	HWC – Heritage Western Cape
ILASA - Institute for Landscape Architecture in South Africa	IACom - Impact Assessment Committee
KBHA - Kalk Bay Historical Association	IGIC - Inventories, Gradings and Interpretations Committee
KBSJRR - Kalk bay-St James Ratepayers & Residents Association	KHS - Kommetjie Heritage Society
LKID - Lower Kenilworth Improvement District	MGHS - McGregor Heritage Society
MHCS - Muizenberg Historical Conservation Society	NHC - Napier Heritage & Conservation
NCW – Not Conservation Worthly	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 - Oudtshoorn 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	SHC - Stanford Conservation Trust & Stanford Heritage Committee
STHS - Simon's Town Historical Society	SIG - Stellenbosch Interest Group
SHF - Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation	SHA - Swellendam Heritage Association
SHCT - Stillbaai Heritage Conservation Trust	OWVS - Old Wynberg Village Society
GHT - George Heritage Trust	TVHF - Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation
RVRA - Rustenburg Valley Residents Association	UCRRA - Upper Claremont and Residents and Ratepayers Association
TRHCS - Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society	WERRA - Walmer Estate Ratepayers and Residents Association
VASSA - Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa	Ward 2 Forum
WUECAG - Walmer/University Estate Conservation Action Group	WCC - Whale Coast Conservation
WCAC - West Coast Aboriginal Council	WRA - Woodstock Residents Association
WAAC - Woodstock Aesthetic Advisory Committee	WECA - Wynberg East Civic Association
WHCS - Worcester Heritage & Conservation Society	
WRRRA - Wynberg Residents and Ratepayers Association	