

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of the Impact Assessment Committee (IACOM)  
of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) held via MS Teams  
at 08H30 on Wednesday, 18 March 2026



1. **Opening and Welcome**

The Chair, Mr Dave Saunders, officially opened the meeting at 08:35 and welcomed everyone present.

2. **Attendance**

**Members**

Mr Cahlan Williams (CW)  
Mr John Wilson-Harris (JWH)  
Mr Dave Saunders (DS)  
Mr Frik Vermeulen (FV)  
Mr Chefferino Fortuin (CF)  
Dr Antonia Malan (AM)

**Additional Members**

Ms Jenna Lavin (JL)  
Ms Emmylou Bailey (EB)

**Observers**

None

**Visitors**

Ms Ute Kuhlmann  
Ms Corlea Viljoen  
Mr Tauriq Jenkins  
Ms Samantha Keen  
Adv Rod Solomons  
Mr Philip Rosenthal  
Ms Georgie Ravenscroft  
Ms Ruth Howard  
Ms Tameron Paulse  
Ms Lisa Del Grande  
Ms Karen White  
Mr John Buys  
Chief Zenzile Khoisan  
Mr Faiez Evans  
Ms Cindy Postlethwayt  
Mr Caylin Roubain  
Ms Jeanne Goodall  
Mr Reg Kuen

**Staff**

Ms Penelope Meyer (PM)  
Mr Ruan Brand (RB)  
Ms Chane Herman (CH)  
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)  
Ms Waseefa Dhansay (WD)  
Ms Xola Mlwandle (XM)  
Ms Sofia Vy Menell Briel (SVMB)  
Ms Chiara Singh (CS)  
Ms Colette Scheermeyer (CS)  
Emily-Jane Vowles (EJV)  
Ms Stephanie Barnardt (SB)  
Ms Yusrah Hoosain (YH)  
Ms Cecilene Muller (CM)

Mr Dan Nesar  
Ms Kelly Novukile Mansfield  
Ms Cindy Woodman  
Cllr Riad Davids  
Ms Sally Mathews  
Mr Kobus Meiring  
Mr Jim Hislop  
Ms Sneha Jhupsee  
Mr Chris Snelling  
Mr David Whitelaw  
Ms Nomfundo Mthembu  
Ms Wendy Wilson  
Mr Ron Martin  
Ms Helen May  
Ms Mida Kirova  
Mr Trevor Thorold  
Mr Ello Weezi  
Ms Juliette Souchon

Ms Maja Leutner  
Ms Amozelle Lambrechts  
Ms Andrea van Tonder  
Ms Berendine Irrgang

Ms Katie Smuts  
Mr Marc Torok  
Mr Nigel Burls  
Prince Louis Arendse

**3. Apologies**

Mr Olwethu Dlova  
Mr Graham Jacobs

**3.1. Absent**

None

**4. Approval of the Agenda**

**4.1 Agenda dated 18 March 2026**

The Committee resolved to approve the agenda dated 18 March 2026 with minor changes.

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

**5.1 Minutes dated 11 March 2026**

To be held over to 15 April 2026.

**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**

None

**7. Confidential Matters**

7.1 None.

**8. Appointments**

None

**9 Administrative Matters**

**9.1 Outcome of the Appeals and Tribunal Committees**

None

**10. Standing Items**

**10.1 Site Inspections/Virtual Assessments undertaken:**

None

**10.2 Report back from Council and other Committees**

None

**10.3 Discussion of the Agenda**

For discussion.

**10.4 Potential/proposed Site Inspections**

None

**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 Alexandra Road, Oude Molen Eco Village, proposed redevelopment, Pinelands:MA  
HM/ CAPE TOWN METROPOLITAN/ PINELANDS/ ERF 26439**

**Case No:** 21022615SB0330E

Ms Stephanie Barnardt-Delport introduced the case.

Ms Postlethwayt was asked if all interested and affected parties had been identified and that they were provided with all the necessary information to participate in the meeting. Ms Postlethwayt confirmed that after the last IACOM meeting, a very wide I&AP list, which came from the original Two Rivers Urban Park LSDF, had been compiled. Everybody received a notice and all had access to the information on the website. All of this is stipulated in the Heritage Impact Assessment.

Ms Ute Kuhlmann, Ms Corlea Viljoen, Adv Rod Solomons, Ms Samantha Keen, Mr Philip Rosenthal, Mr Caylin Roubain, Ms Cindy Postlethwayt, Mr John Buys, Ms Georgie Ravenscroft, Ms Ruth Howard, Ms Tameron Paulse, Ms Lisa Del Grande, Ms Karen White, Chief Zenzile Khoisan, Mr Faiez Evans and Mr Tauriq Jenkins were present and took part in the discussion. Each of the registered parties were offered 5 minutes to present their case. In many instances, additional time was afforded to ensure that all parties had enough time to make representation.

**I&AP DISCUSSION:**

Amongst other things, the following was discussed:

1. Robin Trust, which provides dementia care and training, has been in operation on the property for 35 years and would be displaced by the proposed development. They are currently operating under a lease agreement.

2. Gaia Waldorf School has been in operation on the property for 25 years and the school community feels that they should also be included in references to 'living heritage'. Gaia Waldorf School is also operating under some kind of lease agreement.
3. Mr Tauriq Jenkins asked the Heritage Practitioner if she had received his 309-page document which also contained a host of oral interviews. Ms Postlethwayt confirmed that they have been included in the comments. The issue of the heritage status of the site and the fact that there was a nomination for Provincial Heritage status which was in the process of being considered was raised. In Mr Jenkins's opinion, Heritage Western Cape should dismiss the development application as it poses an irreversible threat to the identified intangible cultural heritage, as was argued at length.
4. The Oude Molen stables and horse riding play an important role – educational and therapeutic. The proposal provides no plan for retention or relocation.
5. Oude Molen Eco-Village Tenants Association stated that the tenants at OMV are custodians of living heritage. It is a unique and irreplaceable heritage resource. It is a longstanding post-apartheid living heritage community whose practices meet the full UNESCO criteria for intangible cultural and living heritage. There is community recognition and there is a deep connection to place at Oude Molen Eco Village. This community has been systematically excluded, dismissed or misrepresented in the revised HIA. The whole process requires an independent living HIA and large-scale commercial redevelopment needs to be halted, pending a proper heritage process.
6. Ms Howard raised concern about approval being granted for an open-ended development framework, with a basket of rights, which fragments the site. Cumulative impacts cannot be assessed if detailed proposals are only to be assessed later.
7. The adjacent Maitland Garden Village accommodates a large number of backyard dwellings. A dignified social housing proposal is required for the release of land at OMV.
8. KZN Department of Co-operative Governance & Traditional Affairs expressed support for the memorialization of King Cetshwayo, who was imprisoned on this site and has associational significance to the Zulu Nation. The site was noted to have potential as an attraction and for visitors to access the site.
9. The Gorinhaiqua Cultural Council has been involved with cultural practices and ceremonies on the site for 30 years. Development was supported, but proper memorialization is required.
10. Homestead precinct impact, especially when new buildings will form a backdrop to this building.
11. The site needs to be linked to other sites within the Western Cape, and to a bigger narrative around the history of national resistance.
12. The Goringhaicona Traditional Khoena Royal Kingdom rejected the development proposal.

#### **COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:**

Ms Waseefa Dhansay read Mr Graham Jacobs' comments on the record:

1. The crucial qualities of this site, with its special bucolic characteristics, that the Committee reviewed during the previous proposals, still remain under threat. This may well be an evolving cultural landscape, but it is undeniable that its remnant rural characteristics are made all the more special by being in such close proximity to a major urban centre. These attributes are more than simply vestiges of rural quality; they are part of a hybrid whole that is arguably more than the sum of its parts. There is no reason why these remnants cannot be retained as well as providing a precedent in the site's transformation. The Paarl Farms is a case in point. This is a landscape where both significant urban and rural realms co-exist, making it arguably unique in the country.
2. The OMV is therefore a hybrid of both rural and urban elements. Consequently, there was disagreement with the heritage practitioner's contention that the site cannot fulfill either definition,

i.e. as rural or semi-rural. There are also plenty of European examples of such hybrid semi-rural landscapes – but not many that are so close to a major city as is the case here.

3. While the site can accommodate further development, sympathetic landscaping that focuses on retaining these vestiges of rural quality should play a vital ongoing role in ensuring that this does indeed occur. This is especially relevant in the area surrounding the historic homestead, the bulk of development backing onto it and the spatial interface with the Liesbeek River parkland. It is the very retention of the site's residual rural qualities that imparts spatial cohesion and identity. That would include maximal retention of its existing plantings of trees and the planting patterns of new trees.
4. The site does not lack a clear identity – at least not in spatial terms. Its surviving rural/bucolic qualities are what makes the OMV special. As quoted from the VIA, these are important place-making informants that should seek to strengthen that identity. These are regarded as heritage resources notwithstanding the heritage consultant's contentions to the contrary.
5. Given the critical role that landscaping will play in this project, and notwithstanding that this is a package of plans process it was noted that that key details of the landscaping needed to be provided up-front, particularly the treatment of road edges, interfaces between road edges and planted areas, types of surfaces to be used and how tree planting patterns and other vegetation are envisaged. More particulars were also required of how the curtilage of the old homestead will be defined in terms of landscaping. The quality of the landscaping not only knits the entire development together but will impart it with a significant part of its future identity.
6. The number of trees that would appear to be lost or displaced in the course of the proposed development was a cause for concern.
7. There were also questions regarding the change in level between the western edge of the site and the Black River corridor. Although the report refers to this edge being softened through bermed landscape forms and shaded parklets, this concept does not come across in the sections provided in Figure 22 p41, nor the manner in which tree plantings are conveyed in Figure 21, p40. What appears to still be a strong line formed by this transition and reinforced by what appear to be linear plantings of trees is also questioned. A far less formal arrangement of trees comprising varying tree types and canopy sizes would assist in projecting a more rustic quality along this edge.
8. The transition in the proposed building massing is still too severe along the western edge of the site and the Black River corridor, as well as along the northern interface with the Maitland Garden Village. The superimpositions of building massings around the historic core are also questioned.
9. Also questioned was the superimposition of building massing around the historic homestead, especially where new buildings will form a backdrop to this building. On Figure 11, p23 in the supplementary HIA report, the development still appears over-bulked, especially along its edges – when viewed towards its northern and western ends.
10. For the aforementioned reasons, concerns remained regarding the proposals in their current form, as well as questions regarding certain aspects that need to be addressed up front, notwithstanding that this development is proposed to be conducted according to a package of plans process.
11. The Committee commented that living heritage and intangible heritage are not necessarily the same.
12. It was suggested to assess the site using a cultural landscape approach to include all heritage layers.
13. It was noted that research and specialist input on the living heritage layer are not yet complete. Living heritage was present at the site and should not be dismissed.
14. Wider social impacts were also raised, including social housing on a historically exclusionary site.
15. Tension existed between heritage considerations and a dense housing development.

With regard to the Living Heritage Assessment, the following was noted: In line with the NHRA's recognition of living heritage (including "skills and techniques"), the UNESCO Convention on Intangible

Cultural Heritage and the City of Cape Town’s cultural landscape and intangible heritage policies, it was recommended that a dedicated Living Heritage Assessment be commissioned for Oude Molen. This should complement, not duplicate, the existing HIA and focus specifically on the practices, skills and community relationships that may constitute living heritage on the site.

1. Define scope and method upfront.
  - a. Adopt the NHRA and UNESCO definitions of living/intangible heritage (including traditional craftsmanship, knowledge and practices concerning nature, and social practices).
  - b. Treat Oude Molen explicitly as a potential cultural landscape, where land use patterns, practices and social relationships form part of the heritage significance.
2. Identify communities of practice and place-based activities.
  - a. Map and describe the main communities of practice on site (e.g. craft and repair workshops, small-scale farming and food gardens, horse-related practices, eco enterprises, education and community programmes).
  - b. Record who practices these, where they are located, how they interrelate, and how they depend on the specific spatial layout and land use pattern of Oude Molen.
3. Assess continuity, transmission and recognition.
  - a. Document duration and continuity of key practices on the site (years present, generational links, movement from earlier phases such as Valkenberg, etc.).
  - b. Identify modes of transmission (apprenticeships, informal training, youth work, workshops).
  - c. Gather evidence of community recognition (interviews and statements from practitioners and Neighbours) that these practices form part of “what Oude Molen is” and contribute to a sense of identity and place.
4. Evaluate significance against NHRA / UNESCO criteria.
  - a. Evaluate each major practice/network against NHRA “living heritage” (skills and techniques, traditions, rituals, popular memory) and UNESCO’s criteria of being community recognised, transmitted over time and continuously recreated in response to environment and history.
  - b. Situate these findings within the cultural landscape perspective: how the practices, together with the physical environment, create a distinctive semi-rural eco village character.
5. Provide clear planning and design guidance.
  - a. Identify which practices and communities of practice warrant conservation as living heritage within the redevelopment process.
  - b. Recommend spatial and land use conditions (e.g. types of space, layout, interfaces, zoning conditions, tenure approaches) necessary to allow those practices and skills to continue on site and outline how these can be reflected at Precinct Plan and SDP level.
  - c. Indicate where change or relocation would critically undermine living heritage values, and where more flexible adaptation is compatible with continued practice.
6. Engagement and reporting.
  - a. Be led by a practitioner with demonstrated experience in living/intangible heritage and cultural landscape assessment, working with local community structures and tenant representatives.
  - b. Produce a report that can be appended to the HIA and referenced in subsequent planning and design stages, with a summary of key living heritage attributes and explicit recommendations for integration into the development framework

The Committee referred to their Further Requirements, previously issued at the IACom meeting of 14 May 2025. These included: “(1) The intangible heritage/living heritage has not been sufficiently investigated including how that significance translates tangibly, with reference to S.3.3 of the NHRA.”

The following is required in order to address the concerns previously made by the Committee:

1. A Living Heritage Assessment for Oude Molen must be compiled in line with the National Heritage Resources Act's recognition of living heritage, the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage and the City of Cape Town's cultural landscape and intangible heritage policies. This must complement, not duplicate, the existing HIA and focus specifically on the practices, skills and community relationships that may constitute living heritage on the site. The findings of this study must inform you of the spatial layout of the proposed development framework and the precinct plan. The intangible heritage/living heritage has not been sufficiently investigated including how that significance translates tangibly, with reference to S3(3) of the NHRA.
2. The above information must be compiled in a revised integrated HIA that complies with Section 38(3) and is subject to a further 30-day consultation period which includes all identified interested and affected parties (including all parties making representation at IACom meeting 18 March 2026)
3. In summary, the Committee noted that Oude Molen Village should be understood as a complex, layered cultural landscape whose value lies not only in its built fabric, but in its living practices, spatial character, and hybrid rural-urban identity.
4. A central concern is that the current heritage assessment does not go far enough in recognising and interrogating the site's potential living (intangible) heritage. The Village hosts a longstanding cluster of activities, craft production, workshops, small-scale agriculture, ecological practices, and community-oriented programmes, that have developed over time in a site-specific and interconnected way. These are not merely generic commercial uses, but may represent embedded skills, knowledge systems, and social practices tied to place, continuity, and community identity. Both national policy and international frameworks emphasise that such practices should be properly identified through specialist study before being dismissed or overlooked.
5. At the same time, the site's spatial and environmental qualities are highlighted as equally significant. Oude Molen Village is described as a rare hybrid landscape where remnant rural or bucolic characteristics coexist with an urban context. This proximity to the city enhances its distinctiveness, creating a setting that is more than the sum of its parts. These rural qualities expressed through vegetation, tree patterns, open space, and relationships to surrounding natural systems are seen as key to the site's identity and cohesion, rather than incidental or expendable features.
6. OMV should not be treated as a blank slate for redevelopment. Its value lies in the interrelationship between people, practices, and place, and future interventions must be shaped by a deeper understanding of these dynamics to avoid eroding the very qualities that make the site significant.
7. A dedicated Living Heritage assessment is therefore required to determine which activities demonstrate continuity, intergenerational transmission, and recognised community value, and how these can be sustained through redevelopment.

There was also a need for a more sensitive, informed, and integrated approach that:

- a. Retains and reinforces the site's rural-urban hybridity,
- b. Uses landscaping as a primary structuring tool for identity and cohesion,
- c. Responds carefully to existing spatial patterns and ecological features, and
- d. Ensures that any identified living heritage practices are meaningfully accommodated and sustained.

It was noted that filling gaps in HIA may result in spatial changes, particularly regarding interfaces, intangible heritage, and memorialisation. Some key areas of the landscape may already be compromised, highlighting the need to focus on remaining significant spaces.

The purpose of the living heritage study was to enable informed alternatives and compromises in site planning.

Intangible and living heritage on this site must be addressed and cannot be dismissed. The Committee is not opposed to development but emphasizes the need for proper memorialization and interface management.

The Committee commended the quality of the HIA and specialist studies that were undertaken.

The Committee also acknowledged that the project, particularly the provision of affordable housing, would yield significant socio-economic benefits, but these could only be fully assessed and weighed against heritage impacts, as contemplated in S38(3)(d) of the NHRA when the heritage resources and impacts had been fully understood.

While there was in-principle support for many aspects of the proposed new development, endorsement of the HIA and development proposal remains contingent on identifying all heritage resources, including living heritage.

Given the view of the Committee that living heritage had still not been adequately identified and assessed, and that the assessment of impacts, the consideration of alternatives and mitigation is therefore still incomplete, it was concluded that the report still does not meet the requirements of section 38(3) of the NHRA.

The Committee communicated their further requirements. The heritage consultant however advised that she had been instructed by her client to request a Decision. The Committee accordingly made the following decision:

**DECISION**

The application is not approved.

The development as proposed cannot be considered, as the Heritage Impact Assessment does not meet the requirements of Section 38(3) of the NHRA.

**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** None

**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 15:12

**30. DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

**15 April 2026**

**MINUTES APPROVED AND SIGNED BY:**

**CHAIR:**

**DATE:**

**SECRETARY:**

**DATE:**