

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via MS Teams
at 08H30 on Wednesday, 11 March 2026



1. **Opening and Welcome**

The Chair, Mr Frik Vermeulen, officially opened the meeting at 08:30 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 Penelope Meyer (PM)
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)
Mr Olwethu Dlova (OD)
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)
Ms Aneeqah Brown (AB)
Ms Sofia Vy Menell Briel (SVMB)
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)
Ms Chiara Singh (CS)
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)
Ms Chane Herman (CH)
Ms Corne Alexander (CA)
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)

Observers

None

Visitors

Mr Mike Scurr
Ms Naomi Roux
Ms Amazelle Lambrecht
Mr Rudolf Schrider
Mr Andrew September
Mr Henk Lourens
Mr Johan Swanepoel
Dr Jayson Orton
Ms Gemma Poretti
Mr Nicholas Wiltshire
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt
Ms Esther Johnston
Ms Lee-Ann Strydom
Ms Maurietta Stewart
Mr San Jourdan
Ms Elize Mendelsohn
Mr Luke Coughlan
Mr Ori Saban

Mr Lindelo Nzuzza
Mr Gordon Metz
Ms Lindelwa Mabuntane
Ms Ashleigh Florence-Brander
Mr Andre Baard
Mr Deon van Zyl
Ms Bridget O'Donoghue
Chief Kevin Maart
Ms Nazeema Duarte
Mr Chris Snelling
Mr David Bernstein
Ms Ina Shain
Mr Matthew Hirsch
Ms Nozipho Mjacu
Ms Sneha Jhupsee
Mr Bruce Wilson
Ms Nomfundo Mthembu
Ms Wendy Wilson

Mr Bert Johnson
Mr Piet Louw

Ms Edna Hime
Mr Kobus van Wyk

3. Apologies

None

3.1. Absent

None

4. Approval of the Agenda

4.1 Agenda dated 11 March 2026

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 11 March 2026 with minor changes.

5. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting

5.1 Minutes dated 18 February 2026

The Committee reviewed the minutes dated 18 February 2026 and resolved to approve them as circulated without amendments.

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

All committee members have accepted the Code of Conduct and confirmed that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

6.1 Recusal

- FV: item 10.5
- KS: items 13.1 and 16.4
- SW: item 10.5 and 16.4

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:

- Erf 45507, 11 Nursery Road, Rosebank
- Erf 574, 9 Trotter Street, Knysna
- Erf 9998, 13 Adderley Street, Cape Town City Centre

10. Standing Items

10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:

- Erf 1424, Tafelberg School, 353 Main Road, Sea Point
- Proposed Multi Storey Development, Erven 8504, 8505, 8513, Cnr Pontac, Nelson and Aspeling Streets, District Six
- Portion 45 of Farm 159, Meerendal, Durbanville

10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees

The Committee recommended the appointment of Mr John Wilson-Harris as specialist architect to serve on the Committee for the new term of IACom.

10.3 Discussion of the Agenda

For discussion.

10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections

None

10.5 Bergvliet, endorsement

FV and SW recused themselves for this item. The Committee nominated DS to chair this item.

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case.

ENDORSEMENT:

The Committee endorses the revised landscaping plan reference number 771471-THS-PLP-XX-XX-DR-LA-1001 Revision 4, prepared by Planning Partners and dated February 2026 as meeting the requirements of the Appeals Committee for additional vegetation and succession planting along the West and Southern boundaries of the property.

EJV

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 1424, Ellerslie/Tafelberg High School, 353 Main Road, Sea Point: NM HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / SEA POINT / ERF 1424

KS recused herself for this item.

Case No: HWC24020910EJV0218

Emily-Jane Vowles introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 6 March 2026. Please see attached S11.

Mr Mike Scurr (heritage consultant), Ms Katie Smuts (archaeologist from RSA), Mr Lindelo Nuza (architect from RSA), Ms Naomi Roux (social historian from RSA), Mr Gordon Metz (Sea Point Fresnaye Bantry Bay Residents and Ratepayers Association), Ms Amazelle Lambrecht (Department of Infrastructure), Ms Lindelwa Mabuntane (Department of Infrastructure), Mr Rudolf Schrider (Department of Infrastructure) and Ms Ashleigh Florence-Brander (urban designer) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. A site inspection was conducted by the Committee to assess the heritage significance of the property, particularly the historic school building, which was identified as the primary heritage resource, due to its architectural integrity and landmark value. Additional elements such as mature trees, the original axial entrance, the green forecourt, and historical site boundaries were also noted, reflecting the site's layered history and varied urban context.
2. The SFB Residents and Ratepayers Association confirmed that they have actively participated in the public participation process and was on record as fully supporting the inclusion of social and affordable housing in the development. Their concern however was the exclusion of the school building from the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). It was argued that this omission renders the HIA incomplete, limits the assessment of cumulative impacts, and compromises public participation. Concerns were also expressed about the lack of clarity on future planning, phasing, funding, and the overall integration of the site.
3. The heritage consultants responded that the HIA focuses on the development portions of the site, while the school will be addressed through a separate, future process. They emphasized that the site was considered holistically in principle and that the recommendations provided would guide future development, even though the school building was not assessed in detail. The Committee however highlighted that excluding the most significant heritage component undermines the ability to evaluate the site comprehensively.
4. The Committee acknowledged that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was comprehensive, well-structured, and technically sound when considered in isolation. However, concerns were raised that the underlying project brief was flawed, due to the exclusion of the school complex, the site's primary heritage resource. The Committee emphasized that the school building, its forecourt, and its visual connection to Main Road are of exceptional heritage value and should not be treated separately from the rest of the site. While the retention of the school and its forecourt was implied in the heritage

- informants, the incorporation of this component within the greater development was not adequately addressed in the Site Development Plan submitted for endorsement.
5. The separation of the site into different development components was questioned, with concerns that this approach undermines integrated planning. The Committee noted that without clarity on the future of the school site, it was difficult to assess urban design, spatial relationships, interfaces and long-term development implications. Concerns were also raised about potential funding challenges for restoring the school building and the risk of future development pressure on the remaining open space to subsidize these costs.
 6. The consultants maintained that the entire site was considered holistically through development guidelines and spatial indicators, including no-build areas, open space retention, and heritage-sensitive design principles.
 7. Provincial representatives added that Department of Infrastructure (DOI) was the custodian of the school building and Department of Social Development (DSD) was the allocated user. It was queried whether the use of the building was a heritage issue at this stage. It was added that the separate, future s27 heritage application for the refurbishment of the school building would be subject to public participation.
 8. The Committee however emphasised that a key “missing link” was a clear, integrated spatial framework for the entire site, including the DSD portion. This framework should consolidate existing guidelines and provide coherent direction for future development, without necessarily prescribing specific land uses. The focus should be on protecting heritage significance, defining development constraints, and ensuring alignment across all portions of the site. The Committee also raised concern about the current condition and deterioration of the school building, emphasizing the need for urgent maintenance, given the property’s status as a proclaimed Provincial Heritage Site (PHS). It was emphasised that the DOI was the custodian of the entire property, and that a restoration and maintenance strategy was required for the entire property, particularly the school building.
 9. Overall, while there was in principle support for the proposed new development and the proposed demolitions, endorsement of the development proposal remains contingent on addressing the lack of an integrated, site-wide spatial framework.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The report does not satisfy the requirements of S.38(3) of the NHRA, particularly sub sections (d) and (e), due to the lack of detailed spatial informants and recommendations for the future development of Tafelberg School Complex and the green space between the School and the Main Road. An integrated spatial development plan for the entire Provincial Heritage Site is required, irrespective of the separate user/ client base within the property ownership. The school complex cannot be treated in isolation.

The Committee resolved to request the following further requirements:

1. A spatial framework addressing the development parameters for the entirety of the site inclusive of the DSD Portion (Tafelberg School and its forecourt setting) to ensure the compatibility and sensitivity of future development including the heritage assessment thereof.
2. Should the school itself not be proposed for any immediate development within this HIA process, a Heritage Agreement must be entered into to ensure the continued maintenance and safeguarding of the heritage resources as required in terms of S.27 read with S.9(3)(a) of the NHRA.
3. The above-mentioned spatial framework is to be submitted to HWC in an updated HIA, subject to a further 30-day consultation period.

EJV

**13.2 Portion 45 of Farm 159, Westerdale Road, Meerendal, Durbanville: MA
HM / CAPE METROPOLITAN/ DURBANVILLE/MEERENDAL / PTN 45 OF FARM 159**

Case No: HWC23112104SB1124

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 5 March 2026. Please see attached SI2.

Mr Andrew September (CoCT), Mr Andre Baard (applicant), Mr Henk Lourens (Durbanville Heritage Society), Mr Deon van Zyl (I&AP) and Mr Johan Swanepoel (I&AP) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. A site inspection was conducted to assess the potential heritage impact of a proposed hall development within a semi-rural enclave characterized by large properties and a rural lifestyle setting. The site is located along the urban edge, with the proposed multipurpose hall positioned centrally on the property at a lower elevation, reducing its visual prominence. The existing dwelling on the site was confirmed to have no heritage significance.
2. The Committee found that the surrounding area, while possessing a consistent rural character, does not contain significant heritage resources that would be impacted by the proposed development. Although there was some discussion as to whether the broader landscape could be considered of contextual (Grade 3C) value, it was generally agreed that this grading was debatable.
3. Key concerns raised by members of the public related to land use, traffic, noise, scale, and operational impacts (e.g., events, amplified music, and activity levels). However, the Committee emphasized that these are planning and zoning considerations, rather than heritage issues, and should be addressed through the appropriate municipal planning processes.
4. The Committee concluded that the proposed development would have no impact on heritage resources, including the urban edge and any potential archaeological sensitivity. As a result, the application was supported from a heritage perspective, with no conditions or further heritage requirements imposed.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the S38(4) Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled "Portion 45 of Farm 159 Meerendal Farm, Durbanville Cape Town Western Cape", dated 21 November 2025, and prepared by Bridget O'Donoghue, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA).

The approval contained in this decision is valid for 5 years from the date of this decision. 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.

SB

**13.3 Proposed Multi Storey Development, Erven 8504, 8505, 8513, Cnr Pontac, Nelson and Aspeling Streets, District Six: MA
HM / CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN / DISTRICT SIX / ERVEN 8504-RE, 8505 AND 8513**

Case No: 16072505WD0810M

Ms Corne Alexander introduced the case.

The Committee reported back on the site inspection that was undertaken on 6 March 2026. Please see attached SI3.

Ms Bridget O'Donoghue (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee visited the site to better understand its relationship to the surrounding urban and heritage context. The site is graded 3C within a broader Grade 1 area (District Six), and the visit focused on assessing visual connections, scale transitions, and potential heritage impacts.
2. The findings highlighted that the site is located at a junction of contrasting urban conditions.
3. To the south are multi-storey commercial buildings, while to the west and north are lower-scale residential structures and a school. This creates a strong difference in scale and grain.
4. The streets surrounding the site particularly Nelson and Pontac Streets are characterized by inactive edges, including boundary walls and limited street-facing openings, contributing to a sense of poor surveillance and pedestrian unease. However, Nelson Street connects to a pedestrian bridge linking to upper District Six, suggesting that future activity and urban integration may increase.
5. From a design perspective, the Committee acknowledged improvements in the revised proposal, particularly in the corner component stepping down in height and attempting to respond to the urban context. However, concerns remained about the overall massing and height, especially along the interface with the finer-grained residential fabric.
6. The Committee emphasised that the proposal was still too monolithic, with insufficient stepping down in scale towards Pontac Street. A more meaningful transition was required, likely involving the removal or set-back of upper floors rather than minor, superficial adjustments. The Committee's previous requirements of 16 January 2019 did not only refer to the corner, but the entire northern facade.
7. In terms of heritage and archaeology, the site contains remnants of historical fabric (such as old building footings) linked to the broader history of District Six.
8. The Committee agreed that these hold cultural and social significance, and that simple monitoring would not be sufficient. Instead, a full archaeological excavation prior to construction was recommended, along with meaningful interpretation informed by those findings.
9. There was also strong support for including the local District Six community in shaping how this history is represented.
10. Overall, while the proposal showed progress, the Committee requires further refinement of massing and scale, along with clear archaeological conditions, before it can be supported.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee noted that while the revised proposal has responded to some degree to the concerns previously raised, the requirement that the proposed development be scaled down drastically in height and transition between The Boulevard building to a residentially scaled development on its street frontage, have not been met. Concern was raised that the block facing onto Pontac Street continued at an

inappropriate height which is the same as the height of the neighbouring building to the east and that and it should be reduced in height to the level of the corner building, i.e. by two storeys.

The architectural language of the corner block exacerbates verticality where it should attempt to reduce scale and revert to a finer grain of detailing.

The Committee requires more detailed information regarding the previous demolition approval and possible conditions attached, should such information be on record.

CA

**13.4 Erf 3488, 23 Dorian Close, Simon's Town: NM
HM / CAPE METROPOLITAN/ SIMON'S TOWN/ ERF 3488**

Case No: 18070629SB1213E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Kobus van Wyk (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee supported the proposed development, noting that the architectural approach is appropriate to its context.
2. It was observed that the site lies at the edge of Simon's Town, rather than within its historic core, and that the design responds well to its surroundings.
3. In particular, the development was seen as mediating between the existing harsh apartment blocks and the urban edge, helping to soften and improve the current visual environment.
4. The Committee agreed that the proposal represents a positive and desirable extension of the area, with no negative impact on heritage resources.
5. The Committee acknowledged that a visual impact assessment had been undertaken and found no significant heritage-related concerns. The heritage impact assessment (HIA) itself was regarded as thorough and well-prepared, with members expressing confidence in its findings.
6. The Committee also noted that earlier concerns about archaeological sensitivity had been addressed through additional specialist input, which concluded that the site does not present significant archaeological risk. As a result, previous higher sensitivity gradings were no longer considered applicable. However, it was recommended that a watching brief be maintained during initial earthworks as a precautionary measure.
7. It was confirmed that the application falls under Section 38(4) rather than Section 38(8), meaning that the Committee's decision constitutes a Record of Decision rather than a Final Comment within an environmental process.
8. Minor concerns were raised about outdated policy references and missing planning information in the report, but these were not considered sufficient to affect the overall conclusion.

RECORD OF DECISION:

The Committee resolved to approve the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled "Erf 3488 Simon's Town", dated 24 February 2026, and prepared by Corner Studio Architects/Heritage, as having met the provisions of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), subject to the following condition:

1. An archaeologist must monitor initial earthworks.

The approval contained in this decision is valid for 5 years from the date of this decision. 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

SB

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 Farm 63, Portion 1 of Farm 109, Farm 108-RE, Farm 287, Brandberg Wind Energy Facility, Laingsburg: MAHM / CENTRAL KAROO/ LAINGSBURG/ MULTIPLE FARMS

Case No: 25823CSI0806

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the case.

Dr Jayson Orton (heritage consultant) was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee considered the heritage impact of the proposed wind farm, focusing primarily on the visual and cultural landscape effects of the turbine layout. It was agreed that three specific turbines posed an unacceptable impact and must be removed as a firm requirement. This decision was clear and non-negotiable, forming the core of the Committee's heritage position on the proposal.
2. Further discussion centred on a second group of turbines identified as having a lesser, but still notable, impact.
3. The Committee emphasised that heritage decisions must be definitive rather than optional. However, a compromise was reached: these turbines would remain in the current layout, but if future technological advancements allow for a reduction in the number of turbines, they must be the first to be removed.
4. In addition, the Committee supported the imposition of a height restriction, limiting the maximum blade tip height of the remaining turbines to 240 metres. While this measure was expected to reduce visual impact, it was acknowledged that it does not fully mitigate the effect on the landscape. Nevertheless, it was accepted as a meaningful secondary condition.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the Supplementary HIA prepared by Asha Consulting dated 4 March 2026 as having met the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

It is recommended that the proposed Brandberg WEF be authorised, subject to the following recommendations which should be included as conditions of authorisation:

1. Turbines 47, 53 and 54 must be omitted from the approved layout to minimise the visual impact on the cultural landscape.
2. Should the project be able to accommodate fewer turbines at the time of construction, Turbines 37, 41, 46 and 52 must be omitted.
3. Turbines 37, 41, 46, 49 and 52 must be restricted to a maximum tip height of 240 m.
4. Unless it can be avoided during pre-construction micro-siting, test excavation must be carried out at waypoint 1396 prior to construction with further recommendations made thereafter.
5. No stones may be removed from any archaeological sites.
6. No-Go signage must be placed adjacent to the ruin at waypoint 362.
7. No-Go signage must be placed adjacent to the structures at Stofkraal at waypoints 391, 393, 396 and 397).
8. If available at the time of construction, an early warning system must be used to ensure that red aircraft navigation lights stay off at night until needed.
9. Signage on public roads must be of modest proportions.
10. The Fossil Chance Finds Procedure must be included in the project EMPr.
11. If any archaeological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area must be halted. The find must be reported to Heritage Western Cape and may require inspection by an archaeologist. Such heritage resources are the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved institution.

The endorsement contained in this comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended for good reasons 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.

CSI

**16.2 Portion 1 of Farm 189, Farm Uyekraal, Saldanha Bay: NM
HM/ WEST COAST/ SALDANHA BAY/ PORTION 1 OF FARM 189**

Case No: HWC24040313CSI0925

Ms Chiara Singh introduced the case.

Chief Kevin Maart was present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Ishaqua Cochoqua Heritage Conservation Body addressed the Committee and confirmed that a written submission had previously been made. They clarified that while the organisation supports renewable energy, their concern lies with significant omissions in the heritage assessment.
2. They argued that the report failed to adequately assess the indigenous cultural landscape, which includes intangible heritage such as ancestral grazing routes, memory paths, and seasonal movement patterns.
3. They further raised concerns about the lack of a conservation management plan for a historically significant site nearby, as well as insufficient paleontological mitigation measures. Importantly, they highlighted the absence of meaningful indigenous consultation and requested that the Committee withhold approval until a revised and more comprehensive heritage impact assessment is completed.

4. The Committee noted that while the report identified high paleontological sensitivity, the recommended “chance finds” procedure is standard practice unless there is clear evidence of likely impact. However, broader concerns were raised about the treatment of cultural landscapes, particularly in relation to Khoesan heritage, where intangible and poorly documented heritage makes assessment more complex and potentially incomplete.
5. The Committee observed that the assessment was heavily focused on archaeology while lacking consideration of broader factors such as land use, spatial planning frameworks, and the rapidly changing development context of the area, particularly around Saldanha Bay. Additional concerns were raised about the absence of detailed plans or a clear description of the proposed development, making it difficult to properly assess heritage impacts.
6. The Committee also highlighted gaps in the consultation process, noting that referenced heritage comments were not included or responded to within the report. The report merely stated that according to the Comments and Responses Report for the public participation exercise, no heritage-related comments were received from I&APs. Given these shortcomings, there was general agreement that the application is premature and that the heritage impact assessment was not compliant.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The report does not meet the requirements of S.38(3) of NHRA. The Committee awaits an integrated HIA which satisfies the requirements of the NHRA, including but not limited to public consultation and a clear description of proposed development.

CSi

**16.3 Portion 4 of Farm 6, Off the Main Road (Stompneus Bay), St Helena Bay: NM
HM/ WEST COAST/ SALDANHA BAY/ ST HELENA BAY/ PTN 4 OF FARM 6**

Case No: 26708SB1117

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Ms Gemma Poretti (heritage consultant) and Ms Nazeema Duarte (Saldanha Municipality) were present and took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. The Committee observed that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is limited in scope and largely functions as an Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) rather than a fully comprehensive HIA.
2. Concerns were raised about the report’s compliance with Section 38(3), particularly its lack of broader contextual analysis such as cultural landscape, land use, and spatial planning considerations.
3. Even though HWC’s NID response required that the HIA must have specific reference to archaeological impacts, an HIA must provide an overall assessment of the impacts on all heritage resources, which are not limited to the specific study/studies referenced.
4. The Committee however agreed with the report’s findings that there were no significant heritage resources on the site, raising the question whether an HIA was necessary in the first place. Given that the proposed development will not negatively impact heritage resources, the Committee supported endorsing the report on that basis.

FINAL COMMENT:

The Committee resolved to endorse the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), titled “Proposed Rezoning of a Portion of Portion 4 of Farm 6 to a Subdivisional Area to create a Mixed-Use Residential Development, Stompneus Baai, Western Cape Province”, dated February 2026 and prepared by CTS Heritage, as having met the provision of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), with specific reference to the following recommendations on page 41 of the report, as follows:

Implementation of the Chance Finds Fossil Procedure (Appendix 3) is required during all ground-disturbing activities.

- 1 Implementation of the Chance Finds Burial Procedure (Appendix 3) is required during all ground-disturbing activities. This is particularly important within the 500 m high sensitivity coastal zone and is essential in the immediate vicinity of Observation 002, the disturbed shell midden adjacent to Main Street.
- 2 Should any buried archaeological resources, 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.

The endorsement contained in this comment is valid for 5 years from the date of this comment. This period may be extended for good reasons 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.

SB

**16.4 Erf 438, of the R43, Stanford: MA
HM / OVERBERG / OVERSTRAND / STANFORD / ERF 438**

Case No: HWC24021419SB0219

KS and SW recused themselves from the Committee for this item.

Ms Stephanie Barnardt introduced the case.

Mr Nicholas Wiltshire (heritage consultant) and Ms Katie Smuts (I&AP) took part in the discussion.

DISCUSSION:

1. Amongst other things, the following was discussed: At the July 2025 IACom meeting, the Committee endorsed the HIA i.t.o. s38(3) of the NHRA and required that design development proceed largely in accordance with the Site Plan and Landscape Plan submitted. A reduction in the height of the double storey elements was required, to comply with the 4.5m wall-plate height and 6.8m total height, as per the Stanford Heritage Guidelines. Detailed plans were to be submitted for the Treehouse Lodge.
2. At the November 2025 IACom meeting, the detailed plans were tabled, but it was noted that public consultation was still required. The Committee also requested additional information on water supply and the impact of the development on the Stanford leiwater system.
3. In February 2026, a supplementary submission was submitted by CTS Heritage. The Committee confirmed that the applicant had responded to the water (leiwater) system concerns by submitting engineering information, confirming that there was no imminent threat posed to the Stanford water supply by the proposed development on Erf 438. While the water supply issue had been addressed as far as this application was concerned, general concerns were noted with regard to future municipal

supply, in light of urban expansion and a need for the Municipality to address this issue through policy. It was however considered to fall outside the purview of HWC.

4. The key concern that remained was the public participation process, which had not yet been completed.
5. The Committee noted that they had not received the actual public comments or a comprehensive comments-and-responses report. This made it impossible to determine whether any heritage-related concerns had been raised. As a result, the Committee emphasized that both the full set of public submissions and a clear summary must be provided, ensuring that heritage issues are properly identified and addressed.
6. Only once this information is available can the Committee make an informed decision on the detailed plans submitted.

FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:

The Committee still awaits the conclusion of public participation pertaining to heritage related issues that satisfies S.38(3)(e) of the NHRA and which must include both a summary of the comments and responses, and copies of the individual comments received.

SB

- 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 16:20

30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:

18 March 2026

MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:

CHAIR:

DATE:

SECRETARY:

DATE:

Approved