

**DECISION TAKEN BY EMAIL  
HERITAGE WESTERN CAPE APPEALS COMMITTEE  
dated 16<sup>th</sup> May 2022 via email**



9.2 **Proposed Alterations and Additions on Boschendal Cellar Building, OFF R310, Dwars River Valley Farm10, 167 Stellenbosch  
HM/CAPE WINELANDS/ STELLENBOSCH / BOSCHENDAL /PORTION 10 OF FARM167**

**FURTHER REQUIREMENTS:**

**The proposed development impacts not only on the historic werf itself, but on the broader farm context as an iconic historic farmstead in the Dwars River Valley.**

The principle of upgrading and expanding its commercial and tourism facilities in order to sustain its conservation and semi-public use is supported from a heritage management perspective, however, the appropriate siting, scale, massing, form and design of new development is informed by heritage indicators approved in 2013 which are still binding.

While the professional team and BELCom have considered the proposed development over a number of iterations, the following heritage design indicators have been overlooked:

**New building development should be visually discrete from the R310 scenic corridor, primary werf and its main approach route.**

The proposed development is visible from the entrance gate to the werf and for a section of the length of the werf.

Further requirement: The proposed development should be set back from the western edge so that it is not visible from the werf.

**Retain the spatial dominance of the primary werf and hierarchy of subsidiary spaces.**

The werf is not a set stage, a centrepiece, it is read and experienced 'in the round'. The homestead, for example, is not a façade facing the werf, but a complete building that offers a number of spatial experiences.

Similarly, when viewed from the ornamental/vegetable garden (which is an inserted layer in the landscape postdating the werf's active period), the pitched roof of the proposed development is visually dominant and it becomes the primary building, and the Wine Cellar cannot be 'read' so that, as one of the buildings that constitute the werf, it does not feature as an element in the eastern precinct. The adaptive re-use of recent times in the site's history has left the wine cellar "stylised" into a restaurant use. The Committee noted that the eastern precinct was originally more likely experienced by slaves and workers than owners and visitors and that the additional axis introduced by the invented formal potager garden has complicated the original Cape Dutch landscape to build form relationship.

Further requirement: The pitched roof should be removed so that at least the 'silhouette' of the Wine Cellar remains and serves to outline the edge of the historical werf.

**New development should not erode its agricultural frame and visual-spatial relationship with the Dwars River.**

The number of architectural screens within the proposed development impact directly on the visual/spatial relationship from the Wine Cellar across the landscape towards the Dwars River.

Further requirement: The interior spaces should be less retail orientated and more focused on views through and from the Wine Cellar towards the Dwars River. Clear motivation for the need for each layer of screening should be provided, testing its necessity against this indicator.

**New buildings should not contrast or compete with the historical buildings in terms of scale, massing, form and architectural treatment. They should be complementary but unmistakably contemporary. They should be background buildings, as unobtrusive and recessive as possible.** [This last sentence was omitted from the recent S27 application and has serious design ramifications.]

The proposed development has a number of architectural elements: *inter alia* glazed roof, pitched roof, flat roof, steel pergola, glazed screens, masonry, timber screens, resulting in a building that is far from unobtrusive and recessive. Apart from the pitched roof, which is visually invasive as described above, the proposed development does not take its cues from its *genius loci* but is rather an assemblage of architectural elements compiled from any number of buildings in any number of locations, reflecting current stylistic trends rather than the *genius loci* of this historic werf.

Further requirement: The proposed development is to be redesigned to be more unobtrusive and recessive, and to take architectural cues from the historic werf. While it is noted that the design has progressed and much time has been spent on it, the Committee is of the opinion that there is merit in exploring a new strategy, removing the kitchen and understorey and thus being able to design something more recessive.

**The roof silhouette (pitched or flat parapet roof) must be as unobtrusive as possible, particularly in reflecting the horizontality of the landscape.**

As described above, the pitched roof is visually invasive.

Further requirement: An alternative roof form should be explored that does not present itself as visually invasive.

**Extensions should be limited to the existing footprint**

The veranda of the proposed development extends beyond the existing footprint.

Further requirement: The design should be revised so that no built form extends beyond the existing footprint.

**CHAIRPERSON**                      **DATE** 16 May 2022

**CHAIRPERSON** \_\_\_\_\_ *K. Dumbrell* \_\_\_\_\_ **DATE** 8 June 2022

**SECRETARY**\_\_\_\_\_

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, circular scribble with a vertical line through it.

**DATE**\_8 June 2022\_\_\_\_\_