

**Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via MS Teams
at 09H00 on Wednesday, 10 September 2025**



1. Opening and Welcome

NOTE: Due to the Chairperson, Mr. David Gibbs, having resigned as a member of IACom, Ms Waseefa Dhansay presided over the election of an Acting Chairperson in terms of the rule 12(5) of the Rules of Order and Conduct at Meetings of HWC. The Committee elected Mr Dave Saunders to chair the meeting.

The Acting Chair, Mr Dave Saunders, officially opened the meeting at 09:00 and welcomed everyone present.

2. Attendance

Members

Mr Cahlan Williams (CW)
Dr Antonia Malan (AM)
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)
Ms Sarah Winter (SW)
Ms Katie Smuts (KS)
Mr John Wilson-Harris (JWH)
Mr Chefferino Fortuin (CF)
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)

Staff

Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CSc)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Nosiphiwo Tafeni (NT)
Ms Sneha Jhupsee (SJh)
Ms Sofia Vy Menell Briel (SVMB)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CS)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)

Observers

None

Visitors

Mr Alvin Roon
Ms Lana Iffley
Mr Ron Martin
Ms Annemarie Hurter
Mr Oyleng Majiet
Mr Tauriq Jenkins
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Ms Jenna Lavin
Mr Bradley van Sitters
Ms Emmylou Bailey
Ms Caroline Jamal
Ms Jane Visser

Mr Erick Senekal
Mr N Jamal
Mr Zenzile Khoisan
Mr Marwan Slamdien
Ms Louisa Hutten
Mr Chris Snelling
Mr Dupre Lombaard
Ms Nina van Wilgen
Mr Handre De La Rey
Mr Greg Stephen
Ms Alastair Thorns
Mr Simon Birch

Ms Heidi Newton-King
Ms Renato Graca
Ms Katherine Robinson
Ms Aloysius Horniman
Mr Adriaan Neethling
Dr Antonieta Jerardino
Mr Jonathan Kaplan

Mr Marlon De Wee
Ms Vanessa Axt
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Mr Kobus Pienaar
Mr Mornay Herling
Ms Aqeelah Carrim

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 10 September 2025

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 10 September 2025 with minor changes.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 13 August 2025

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 13 August 2025 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

6. Disclosure of Interest and acceptance of the code of conduct

None

7. Confidential Matters

7.1 None.

8. Appointments

None

9 Administrative Matters

9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees

PM reported back on the following Appeals matters:

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

9.2 Meeting Item Folders

For noting

9.3 Allocation of time for items

For noting.

9.4 Appointment of IACom Chair

The Committee recommended that Council appoints Mr Frik Vermeulen as IACom Chair and Ms Sarah Winter as deputy chair for the remainder of the Committee's term of office.

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken: None

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees Nothing to report.

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda For discussion.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

- Erven 322-Re, 326-Re, 327, 328 and 329-Re, 19, 21, 23 Bickley Road, Sea Point
- Erf 2742, 4G Wine Estate, Dassenberg Road, Franschhoek

MATTERS DISCUSSED

11. SECTION 38(2) RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP (NID)

11.1 None

12. SECTION 38(1): INTERIM COMMENT

12.1 None

13. SECTION 38(4) RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

13.1 Erf 33030, Cressy Road, Garlandale: MA HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / GARLANDALE/ERF 33030

Case No: HWC24101108XM0304

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Ron Martin (heritage consultant), Mr Tauriq Jenkins (Save our Sacred Lands), Mr Marwan Slamdien (Asrin Property Developers), Mr N Jamal (Black River Interest Group), Ms Louisa Hutten (heritage consultant), Mr Greg Stephen (First Indigenous Nation of Southern Africa) and Ms Caroline Jamal (Black River Interest Group), were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that the updated AIA/HIA is inadequate, as it largely summarized Mary Patrick's report instead of providing a systematic, contextual mapping and progression of understanding, lacked sufficient archaeological follow-through, failed to critically analyze rather than merely affirm expert opinion, and missed opportunities for broader community and social engagement.

- The Committee was informed that the interim comment requirements were addressed by mapping the site's continuous use as an Anglican cemetery since the mid-1800s, with key dates of establishment and formalization, while the original HIA also demonstrated the site's evolution within the broader changing landscape, from the Rondebosch Commonage to the post-emancipation Black River community.
- The Committee was informed that pages 24–29 of the AIA/HIA, along with the accompanying maps and detailed quadrant descriptions in the three reports submitted to HWC, already provide exhaustive site-specific information on the evolution and burial findings, leading to disagreement with claims that specialized mapping or further contextualization is lacking.
- The Committee clarified that what was expected was a single, consolidated and integrated HIA, rather than scattered reports or summaries. Ms Patrick's permit report and Ms Hutten's review, do not comply with the minimum standards for an archaeological impact assessment report.
- Given the complexity and controversy of the matter, the Committee emphasized the need to properly follow process by analyzing and consolidating all documentation into a single coherent HIA report that fully addresses the requirements of Section 38(3) and interrogates the issues in order to inform and guide decision-making.
- The community objected to the ongoing 'desecration' of the Black River Cemetery, stressing exclusion from proper consultation (especially due to inaccessible online meetings), perceived conflicts of interest in heritage reporting, broken assurances from the Anglican Church, and the need to preserve the cemetery as a protected heritage site for descendants to honour their dead.
- The I&APs requested that Mr Martin, as the heritage consultant, provide comprehensive exhumation, cremation, and columbarium records - including receipts - to verify numbers and ensure the impact assessment is complete and credible.
- The Committee noted the I&APs' concerns about public participation, emphasizing that despite two rounds already held, it must be ensured that all known interested and affected parties are properly notified and engaged. This is to include engagement with key stakeholders (e.g. District Six Museum).
- The Committee proposed that a comprehensive AIA/HIA to be circulated to all interested and affected parties, inviting submission of any additional stakeholders, and requiring that responses to their comments and objections be compiled and presented to Heritage Western Cape once the consultation process is complete.
- An updated AIA, incorporating a mapping overlay of the site's historical uses and analysis and recommendations related to archaeological resource management, must be compiled into a revised integrated HIA compliant with Section 38(3) and subjected to a further 14-day consultation period with all identified interested and affected parties, including those added at the current meeting.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee's requirements, as dated 24 June 2025 have not been met.

1. A revised AIA is to analyze the heritage implications of previous archaeological reports and excavations and derive archaeological indicators and mitigation relevant to the current submission. It must include the mapping information from the existing reports and any further relevant overlays.
2. The above information must be compiled in a revised, integrated HIA that complies with Section 38(3) and is subject to a further 14-day consultation period, which includes all identified interested and affected parties (including all parties who made representations at the IACom meeting on 10 September 2025).

SB

**13.2 Erven 322-Re, 326-Re, 327, 328 and 329-Re, 19, 21, 23 Bickley Road, Sea Point: NM
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERVEN 322-RE, 326-RE, 327, 328, 329-RE**

Case No: HWC24080801SJ0821

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Friday, 26 September 2025 at 11:00 (SW, DS, JWH, FV and CW).

SJ

**13.3 Erven 381, 384-Re, 385 and Ptn of 386-Re, 2 & 4 Mill Street, The Lenox and Lincoln House, Oranjezicht: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / ORANJEZICHT / ERVEN 381, 384-RE, 385 AND A PORTION OF ERF 386-RE**

Case No: HWC23042606CN0522

KS recused herself and logged off from MS Teams.

Ms Sneha Jhupsee introduced the case.

Ms Jane Visser (architect), Mr Simon Birch (architect) and Mr Chris Snelling (heritage consultant) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted that IACom issued a record of decision on 24 July 2024 endorsing the HIA by Cindy Postlethwayt and Chris Snelling with three conditions, including HWC approval of partial demolition of structures over 60 years old, and that final plans - reflecting minor revisions from consultation and design adjustments for fire safety, elevations, rooflines, and tree protection - have now been submitted for endorsement as substantially in accordance with the prior approval.
- It was proposed that the Committee endorse the current submission as being generally in accordance with the previous approved submission.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the revised SDP in terms of Section 38(4) as per the drawing set Revision A: 1.01; 1.02; 2.02; 2.03; 2.04; 2.05; 2.06; 2.07; 13.01; 3.01; 3.02; 3.03; 3.04; 3.09; 3.09, dated 12 August 2025, and prepared by Jane Visser Architects as being substantially in accordance with the previous HWC approval dated 14 August 2024.

SJ

14 SECTION 38(8) NEMA RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP

14.1 None

15 SECTION 38(8) NEMA INTERIM COMMENTS

15.1 None

16 SECTION 38(8) NEMA FINAL COMMENTS ON ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

**16.1 Portion 28 of Welmoed Farm 468, Lynedoch Village, Off R310, Stellenbosch: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH / PORTION 28 OF FARM 468**

Case No: HWC23040509AM0411

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Emmylou Bailey (heritage consultant), Ms Katherine Robinson (Stellenbosch Municipality) Ms Nina van Sitters (Lynedoch Eco Village), Mr Dupre Lombaard (EAP), and Ms Heidi Newton-King (Spier) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the amended development proposal which consists of a reduced development footprint.
- Meaningful dialogue with Eco Village Community has been undertaken by the project team.
- The Committee reviewed the revised Phase 2 HIA for the Lynedoch Urban Core Node, noting its findings that the proposed development now covers only 10% of the site, maintains moderate but manageable cultural and visual impacts, incorporates previous recommendations, and aligns with IACom's requirements to reduce impacts on the cultural landscape, though no further wider public consultation has been undertaken.
- However, the Phase 2 submission does not fully comply with the requirements of Section 38 (3) given the absence of sufficient detailed information and heritage assessment thereof.
- While the significant reduction in the development footprint was seen as positive, the Committee sought clarification on three points; (a) the lack of a SDP in the submission, (b) whether registered conservation bodies and I&APs were properly notified despite the claim by the project team that no further consultation was required, and (c) the assumption that the remaining agricultural land would not be subdivided as part of the development intent and would be protected as agricultural land.
- The Committee emphasized that the submission does not constitute a proper SDP, as it lacks the detailed information required to guide and manage development, and therefore cannot be considered for final comment in its current form. Particular attention must be paid to the protection of the remainder of the site as part of the greater agricultural cultural landscape.
- The Committee noted that while a SDP is still required, it is important to provide guidance and endorse the general direction of the revised design, signaling support for the approach taken so far.
- The Committee expressed in-principle support for the development's footprint while requesting clarification that the surrounding agricultural land will not be subdivided and noting that further assessment is needed to ensure compliance with heritage indicators.
- The applicants noted that the current proposal aligns with a previously supported alternative in the 2019 Municipal Development Framework, and requested the Committee's comments on the submission, while acknowledging that it will still undergo the NEMA process and municipal review.
- The Committee noted that a full public participation process is still required, and the current discussion seeks preliminary feedback on a further developed alternative that all interested and affected parties have already seen.

- The document presents a more developed version of a previously shared alternative, and the applicants are seeking favorable comments from the Committee to guide further progress.
- The Committee emphasized that without a complete development submission to assess, they cannot provide full support, and that the HIA must return to HWC for proper evaluation, leaving it to the heritage practitioners to reassess and redevelop the proposal in accordance with prior heritage related design parameters.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee resolved that the HIA does not meet the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA for the following reasons and requires the following to be addressed:

1. The HIA does not contain a site development plan which will guide and direct the ongoing management of heritage resources in a responsible manner.
2. The Committee therefore requires a site development plan set including a breakdown of land uses, subdivision pattern, massing and height controls.
3. The Committee requires clarity on the future use and protection of the agricultural land, making up the remainder of the site.

SB

**16.2 Erf 2742, 4G Wine Estate, Dassenberg Road, Franschhoek: NM
HM/ CAPE WINELANDS / STELLENBOSCH/ FRANSCHHOEK / ERF 2742**

Case No: HWC24100305EJV1015

HELD OVER:

The Committee resolved to undertake a site inspection on Friday, 26 September 2025 (SW, DS, JWH, FV and CW).

EJV

**16.3 Erf 279, Clanwilliam: MA
HM/ WEST COAST / CEDERBERG / CLANWILLIAM / ERF 279**

Case No: HWC24051407EJV0618

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case.

Ms Jenna Lavin (heritage consultant), Mr Adriaan Neethling (Cederberg Municipality), Mr Mornay Herling were present and took part in the discussion.

SW recused herself from this item and joined the heritage consultant.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Section 38(8) HIA for the Clanwilliam rezoning and subdivision, prepared by Ms Lavin of CTS Heritage, found that while the site is suitable for medium- to high-density residential development aligned with the MSDP and visual impacts are manageable, the previous HIA did not adequately address cultural landscape significance, remaining built fabric, and heritage indicators, requiring a revised integrated HIA with public consultation and adherence to detailed design, open space retention, and chance-find procedures.
- The Committee expressed the opinion that the revised documentation represents a significant improvement, adequately addresses heritage and open space considerations, meets the requested requirements, and supports the urgent community need, and they indicated readiness to endorse the proposal as it stands.
- The Committee clarified that while they recommend open space between the Cedarville and Park St. precincts, the municipality does not support this, and if the recommendation cannot be implemented, the alternative is to retain the existing 1940s subdivided urban area without further subdivision.
- The land between the Cedarville and Park Street precincts has high heritage value because it highlights the relationship between these historic areas, and therefore, from a heritage perspective, it is important that this portion remains as open space.
- The municipality, represented by Adriaan Neethling, emphasized support for residential development in Clanwilliam within existing land use rights, arguing that it provides needed housing while retaining some open space, addresses community use of the area, and offers safer access and services, and therefore does not support retaining the entire area as open space
- The municipality is recommending that only the small northern “knob” portion of the development area remain as public open space.
- The municipality remains concerned that simply retaining open space will not meet community needs, citing current misuse, maintenance challenges, and economic constraints, and emphasized the need for a revised layout that balances housing provision with functional, well-managed open space, potentially supported through landscaping and NGO funding.
- The Committee noted that the diagram should reflect the compromise: the two large urban areas remain green as open space, while other urban areas may be developed, but the underlying subdivision pattern must remain unchanged, and indicated willingness to support this approach.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the S38(8) Heritage Impact Assessment prepared by CTS Heritage, dated August 2025 with recommendations on page 81:

1. Open space (erven 279 and 1422) is to be retained as public open space in the area indicated between the Park Street precinct and the Sederville precinct in order to retain a remnant of the Clanwilliam commonage, and to provide these significant historic precincts and remnant historic built fabric with sufficient breathing space. The remainder of the historical pattern of the subdivision as identified in a revised subdivision plan must be submitted to HWC HOMs for endorsement.
2. Due to the position of the proposed development between two areas that have been identified as having heritage value, additional design detail be submitted to HWC for approval as a condition of a positive comment on this HIA. The architecture of the proposed development should adhere to the Guidelines included as Appendix 3.
3. The attached Chance Fossil Finds Procedure is implemented for the duration of construction activities
4. Should any buried archaeological resources or human remains, or burials be uncovered during the course of development activities, work must cease in the vicinity of these finds. Heritage Western Cape (HWC) must be contacted immediately in order to determine an appropriate way forward

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

EJV

**16.4 Farm 1259; Erven 583; 1613; 1751; 1752; 1753, Paternoster Waterfront, Paternoster: MA
HM/ WEST COAST / SALDANHA BAY / PATERNOSTER / FARM 1259; ERVEN 586, 1613, 1751, 1752, 1753**

Case No: HWC24050209EJV0516

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case.

Mr Jonathan Kaplan, Mr Alvin Room, Dr Antonieta Jerardino and Mr Christian Schoeman were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The HIA has a number of fundamental gaps in the heritage assessment, as previously raised by the Committee.
- These gaps include an adequate assessment of the cultural landscape, detailed site analysis and a clear heritage management attitude to existing built fabric including reasons for the retention of existing buildings.
- There are gaps in the archaeological assessment including the integration of detailed archaeological mapping and recommended measures including test excavations.
- The HIA needs to follow an integrated heritage management approach to the identification of no-go and possible development zones from a townscape, landscape, visual and archaeological perspective. This approach must include the formulation of heritage-related design indicators to ensure a sense of fit with the heritage context.
- Design interventions need to respect the townscape and shoreline.
- Municipal support and consultation with First Nations was noted.
- Dr. Jerardino explained that she prepared a written submission to clarify why more test pits and radiocarbon dating were necessary. She noted there had not been much receptivity during earlier discussions, hence she decided to set out her reasoning in writing. She sent it to the case officer, expecting that staff would decide whether to forward it to the consultants preparing the HIA.
- The Committee noted that while additional archaeological information by Dr Jerardino was supplied, it was submitted independently to HWC and not integrated into the revised AIA or HIA, raising concerns about its consideration in the heritage assessment process by all parties.
- The Committee concluded that the HIA does not meet previous IACom requirements, as it focuses on individual buildings rather than providing a consolidated, spatialized assessment of the cultural landscape, its character, and carrying capacity for new development.
- It was pointed out that the HIA contains an unexplained leap from current structures to proposed tourist accommodation, raising concerns about the cultural landscape and the rationale for new development.
- The Committee noted that the HIA fundamentally lacks a holistic spatial and cultural landscape assessment of the site, including its carrying capacity and broader significance, warning that focusing

only on existing building footprints risks piecemeal approvals that could compromise the site's heritage value.

- Although additional work has been done since the previous submission, it has not focused on the key heritage issues, and the Committee recommended that the heritage consultant or applicant engage a heritage specialist (with spatial and cultural landscape expertise) to consolidate the information from a cultural landscape perspective to satisfy prior requirements and inform appropriate heritage-guided interventions.
- The Committee emphasized that the HIA must follow a sequential process - from cultural landscape analysis, to design guidelines and informants/indicators, to a clearly justified proposal - and that all relevant specialist input, including independent archaeological reports, must be formally addressed.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved that the HIA does not satisfy the requirement of S.38 (3) of NHRA for the following reasons:

1. The cultural landscape components of the HIA have not been adequately assessed in terms of spatial assessment of the receiving physical environment. This would include the prominent location of the site, contributing to the character and historical layering and origins of the settlement of Paternoster, its pre-colonial heritage and role in the development of the West Coast fishing industry. The outcome of the cultural landscape assessment requires the clear spatialisation of heritage issues involving the input of expertise in this field of heritage assessment.
2. The absence of heritage expertise in this regard has resulted in this requirement not been addressed. Furthermore, the lack of the provision of heritage indicators has resulted in an ill-informed development proposal for the entire site.
3. Site analysis and assessment of the existing industrial structures and landscape have not been provided as called for.
4. A sound motivation for the retention or reuse of all industrial buildings and structures on the property has not been provided as previously required.
5. A motivation for all new proposed buildings, with particular reference to the dominant building morphology of historical Paternoster and how it has evolved and yet retains its sense of place within a natural coastal setting, has not been provided as previously required.
6. The identification of no-go development zones and identification of appropriate zoning to ensure adequate protection has not been addressed.
7. Recent work on the archaeology of the Paternoster cultural landscape is not fully mapped in detail and assessed, with indicators related to archaeological resource mitigation and management related to the proposed development.

EJV

**16.5 N1 Roadway, Worcester: MA
HM / CAPE WINELANDS / BREEDE VALLEY / WORCESTER / N1 ROADWAY, MULTIPLE FARMS AND
ERVEN**

Case No: HWC23110822SB1120

Mr Ruan Brand introduced the case.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant) and Mr Aloysius Horniman (EFG Engineers) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

- The Committee noted the applicant's response to the Interim Comment of 11 June 2025, including the outcomes of public participation, the motivation regarding road speed restrictions, the Social Historical Study, and contextual information on the broader road upgrade programme, and considered whether these adequately addressed the Committee's previous requirements.
- The Committee recalled its primary concern regarding the road design speed and potential over-engineering impacts on the environment, noted SANRAL's strong motivation against a reduced speed, and queried whether pursuing a lesser speed restriction remains viable or whether this option has effectively been closed.
- The Committee noted that, particularly at point C, consideration be given to reducing the design speed so that the road alignment can follow the natural topography and avoid unnecessary removal of landform, noting that although SANRAL's principle is 120 km/h throughout the N1, certain sections such as the Hex River Pass are already reduced to 100 km/h or lower.
- It was also noted that it is not feasible to maintain 120 km/h along the entire N1, as demonstrated in sections such as the Huguenot Tunnel and Worcester where lower speeds are already required for safety, and therefore resolved to stand firm on its recommendation that the design speed at point C be reduced to reflect the topography and heritage context.
- The Committee endorsed the final recommendations of the HIA and supporting specialist studies, acknowledging their detailed mitigation measures as a balanced reconciliation of engineering, visual, and cultural landscape concerns.
- The Committee was informed that there is a distinction between design speed and posted speed. The road must be designed to freeway standards at 120 km/h for geometric and capacity reasons (curves, cross-section, median width, etc.), but once built, specific sections can be posted at lower limits (e.g. 80 or 100 km/h) in response to local context or sensitivity, as is already the case on sections past the tunnel. This distinction explains how compromises can be made in sensitive areas without altering the freeway design standard.
- The Committee was informed by Mr Horniman that the N1 forms part of a national freeway system intended to maintain a consistent cross-section from Cape Town to Beaufort West, designed to accommodate freight and heavy vehicles. It was explained that while the design speed informs the geometric standards, the land requirement (50m road reserve) remains fixed under national freeway standards. In this case, the standard reserve has already been reduced from 80m to 50m with special permission due to the sensitivity of the area, meaning this 10 km section is already a reduced standard road.
- The Committee was also informed by Mr Horniman that the section through Worcester has already been designed and will be upgraded to remove all at-grade intersections and traffic signals. Overpasses will be provided so that vehicles traveling east to west can proceed without stopping. The upgrade will include a concrete median barrier, two lanes in each direction, and an interchange at the Ceres turn-off.
- The Committee expressed concern that SANRAL appears to be pursuing its long-term vision with little regard for heritage considerations, noting that while the project reflects broader mobility objectives, it is disturbing from the perspective of protecting long-term cultural and historical values."
- The Committee noted that this section of the N1 represents a significant threshold experience entering the Western Cape. They emphasized that interdepartmental coordination is needed to ensure that mobility objectives do not override the experiential quality for tourists and passengers, particularly where the road transitions from a sensitive topographical area into Worcester. The Committee

highlighted that there is no indication from SANRAL that implementing HIA recommendations would compromise public transport or logistics operations.

- Unlike previous projects with established coordination through the Department of Infrastructure (DOI), there is no equivalent relationship for this section of the N1. The Committee emphasized that Heritage Western Cape's (HWC) role must be clearly articulated in the final comment, and that the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) requires that DEADP must consult HWC to ensure heritage conditions are met. The members stressed that HWC's involvement is essential, and that no decisions should override heritage considerations without consultation.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the S38(8) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), , dated 14 April 2025, and prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue, with supporting Visual Impact Assessment, Palaeontological Impact Assessment, Archaeological Impact Assessment and Social Impact Assessment, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), with specific reference to the following recommendations on pages 220-223:

1. The statement of significances and the heritage and visual design indicators proposed in the report be accepted.
2. The specialist reports and contents: Archeological, Paleontological, Visual, Built Environment and Social reports are approved.
3. **Recommended Route Option 4 and the following mitigation measures are required in order to address the negative impact on the significant cultural landscape and associated heritage resources:**
 - a. Revised road is designed on the Voordenberg Farm to omit the elevation of the road above the farmstead (around Kleinberg se Draai). The road alignments have been based on a vehicle speed of 120 km/hr. It is recommended that the road speed is reduced to R 100 km/hr. around this corner so that the road position can be revised. There are many instances where the road speed is reduced along the national roads due to topography, natural features settlements etc. The retention pf the landform is assessed as more important that the retention of the farmstead;
 - b. The northern section of Route 4 before the entry to the Hex River Pass could be aligned to Option 1 in order to reduce the loss of vineyards. The Option 1 slip road in close proximity to the two cottages (183/4 RE) must be carefully designed to not impact the setting of these two cottages. Access to these two cottages must be retained.
 - c. The residences adjacent to de Wet Station (Twee Fonteinen 319/40 and 319/82) require safe access and buffer from the N1 in terms of noise and lighting impacts.
 - d. SANRAL must investigate the option of establishing a vegetated berm along the section of the N1 located adjacent to farmstead on Seekoeigat Farm. The Landscape Architect must be required to design a suitable vegetated buffer between the road and Seekoeigat Farm;
 - e. The need for establishing vegetated berms for other properties must also be investigated depending on the final alignment.
4. **Archaeology**
 - a. Commission an archaeologist to carry out required mitigation well in advance of construction (preferably 6 months).
 - b. Carry out required archaeological mitigation along the track at waypoints 4726 and 4729-4736 and surrounding area. This should be done during the dry season.
 - c. Inform staff to be vigilant and carry out inspections of new excavations
 - d. Reporting chance finds as early as possible to HWC or an archaeologist, protect in situ and stop work in immediate area.
5. **Palaeontology**

- a. If fossil remains or trace fossils are discovered during any phase of construction, either on the surface or exposed by excavations, the Chance Find Protocol must be implemented by the ECO/site manager. These discoveries must be protected (if possible, *in situ*). The ECO/site manager must report to HWC so that a palaeontologist can carry out mitigation (collection and recording). The chance find protocol to be included into the CEMP.
- 6. Visual**
 - a. The thorough implementation, maintenance, and management of detailed landscape plans prepared by suitably qualified landscape architects with experience in cultural landscape and road infrastructure projects must be included with the detailed engineering drawings and plan submissions to ensure that the cultural landscape quality is retained.
 - b. Ensure that existing trees are retained as far as is possible and reinforce or replace traditional patterns of planting where appropriate with suitable species.
 - c. Maintain trees in a healthy growing condition, and not allow to be needlessly destroyed by new development. Ensure continuity of the rural landscape with replacement of trees where retention of existing trees is not possible.
- 7. Built Environment**
 - a. The following structures are recommended for demolition:
 - Residence on WC Dept Agriculture offices (Farm 267)
 - At least 2 dwellings, large shed and outbuildings (Vredelus) (Tweefontein 319/31)
 - Potjie Geplant / Rooi Hond nursery (Meirings Berg 309/01)
 - Tweefontein farmstall and associated residence (Tweefontein 319/98) • Semi-detached farm workers' dwellings De Wet Cellar (Meirings Berg 309/2)
 - Farm workers' dwelling (within 5 m of proposed service road) and undercover parking and farmyard
 - Seekoeigat farm (Glen Heatlie 183/4)
 - b. The buildings that are recommended for retention are:
 - All structures within the Voordenberg farmstead (Tweefontein 319/50) (the demolition of any structures on the historic farmstead must be discussed with the recommended revision of Option 4 on Kleinberg se Draai.
 - Cottage with Eucalyptus trees and the stone cottage on Glen Heatlie 183/4/RE (east of the Option 1 slip road)
 - Cottages adjacent to the railway line next to De Wets Cellars (Twee Fontein 319/40 and Twee Fontein 319/82)
- 8. Access and mobility**
 - a. SANRAL must establish and underpass on Seekoeigat Farm to enable access to sections of the property and houses that are cut off from the farm by the project. The location of the underpass should be discussed with the owner of Seekoeigat Farm. The underpass would also enable farm workers to cross the N1.
 - b. Access must be provided for the houses located at the De Wet station residential node.
 - c. Provision must be made for a taxi facility on the service road in the vicinity of the Tweefontein Farm Stall. This location would enable taxis to access De Doorns via the N1 north lane and Worcester via the service road.
- 9. Sense of place**
 - a. Aim to retain the gateway experience around the Kleinberg se Draai, potentially with new vegetation and the recommended revision of the road infrastructure on this corner section.
 - b. Disturbances associated with the construction of the N1 project, including the interchanges and service roads, must be rehabilitated and landscaping plans should be implemented.

- c. SANRAL must investigate the option of establishing a vegetated berm along the section of the N1 located adjacent to farmstead on Seekoeigat Farm (i.e. on the one side of the road).
- d. The need for establishing vegetated berms for other properties must also be investigated depending on the final alignment.

10. Construction Phase Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

- a. Implement a construction phase Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to ensure on-going management of social and visual environmental matters. The detailed mitigation measures must be outlined in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the Construction Phase.

RB

17	SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN RESPONSES TO NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP
17.1	None
18	SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN INTERIM COMMENT
18.1	None
19	SECTION 38(8) MPA ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL COMMENT
19.1	None
20	SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP
20.1	None
21	SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION INTERIM COMMENT
21.1	None
22	SECTION 38(8) OTHER LEGISLATION FINAL COMMENT
22.1	None
23.	SECTION 27 PROVINCIAL HERITAGE SITES
23.1	None
24.	SECTION 47 CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANS
24.1	None
25.	ADVICE
25.1	None
26.	SECTION 42 HERITAGE AGREEMENTS
26.1	None
27.	OTHER
27.1	None

28. Adoption of decisions and resolutions

The Committee agreed to adopt the decisions and resolutions as recorded above.

29. CLOSURE:

The meeting adjourned at 15:50

30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

8 October 2025

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR:



DATE: 8 October 2025

SECRETARY:

p.p Aneeqah Brown
Digitally signed by Aneeqah Brown
Date: 2025.10.08 16:51:35 +0200

DATE: