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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The primary purpose of this report is to provide the required historical, spatial and contextual information in order to assist Heritage Western Cape’s BELCom to assess the application for a permit in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA to alter the historic homestead (now known as once more as Fleurbaix) situated on Remainder Portion 6 of the farm Fleurbaai number 1040 in Stellenbosch.

A key outcome of this report is not only the assessment of the proposed work to the historic homestead, but an overall appraisal and assessment of the heritage significance of the core area of the farm and to make recommendations for any further detailed studies required or to suggest further work which should be undertaken in order to recover significance. A key concern expressed by the HWC official during an initial site visit in late 2013 (when the unauthorised landscaping works became apparent) was that the already completed works could diminish the Grade II heritage status. The report contextualises the work done in 2013 and makes recommendations for remedial work.

As the site is a PHS the approval process for any maintenance, alteration or renovation works therefore needs to be in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA with a permit to be issued by Heritage Western Cape.

There are several threats to the integrity of the historic siting of the homestead complex within the broader cultural landscape, viz:

- encroaching development of the Technopark, de Zalze Golf estate etc
- general suburban sprawl
- planned developments on the SAPO (SA Plant Organisation) portion 7 of the subdivided portion of Fleurbaix farm immediately to the rear/ south of the site.
- Uncoordinated landscaping within the back werf space
- over-formalising of the landscaping on the garden area to the north

The mapping analysis identifies key persistent patterns evident on site

- tree-lined linear axial road running alongside and past main house and flanking outbuildings
- quadrangle arrangement parallel to the Eerste River
- location of buildings at each corner of this back “werf” area
- axial connection and view across landscape to river
- subsidiary side outbuildings have end gables only
- dominant main house with central gable

Evolution and meaning of the built environment in the landscape

Despite extraordinarily complex transfers of land between the Roux’s during the 19th century, this land and the buildings thereon have marked significance in the landscape as remnants of agricultural production and domestic occupation from the late 18th century. Characteristics of the landscape depicted in 1863 that social, cultural landscape and built environment significances are:

- The orthogonal arrangement of buildings and extension of the homestead and outbuildings as they were depicted in 1814
- The watercourses to the east and west of the land, the east one of which is still visible in the landscape,
- The public road lying to the south of the homestead buildings and linking this land to the adjacent land.

The history of the complex in the second half of the twentieth century presents particular challenges in assessing significance in terms of the NHRA now.

Overall, the complex still retains balance, harmony and a relationship to the land. Despite the somewhat heavy-handed restoration in the 1980s, original material and layering does persist. The buildings and context have been assessed and graded:

- Grade IIIB is proposed for the wine cellar.
- A Grade IIIB is proposed for the slave quarters.
- The more ordinary and extensively altered barn/ store building is proposed as a Grade IIIC
- The modern office block is upgradable/ intrusive.
- The manager’s house outside the werf area is ungradable.
- The historic main house is proposed as Grade IIIA, rather than grade II, for enumerated reasons.
- The overall composition, already in evidence by c1800, still retains its core composition and relationship to the wider landscape and to the buildings within it, and this therefore still warrants Grade II status.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Broad Conservation Approach: A progressive conservation strategy is to be adopted to avoid the perpetuation of an old-school type of "historical restoration" since that cannot be supported in terms of current heritage practice, either locally or internationally. The principles embodied in, inter alia, the Burra Charter, are to be established and followed.

Action regarding work previously undertaken to date on site without a Permit from HWC (No further action by HWC is recommended provided these steps are put in place/acted on)

- **Landscaping to previously planted areas**: a heritage-informed, integrated landscaping assessment and mitigation report is to be prepared, in conjunction with the heritage architect, and submitted to BELCom for approval before any further work on the landscaping takes place. This report is to take cognisance of the proposed grade II area and surrounding vulnerabilities and threats.

- **Certain gates have been erected**: the detailing of these gates is considered inappropriate in the context and alternate designs/modifications are to be incorporated in the above integrated landscaping report.

- **Internal renovations were completed to the "Slave Quarters"/outbuilding**: A heritage architect is to compile a detailed measured drawing including historic fabric assessment. This is to identify the irregular work done in 1989 and 2012, as well as ad-hoc alterations by SAPO over the previous decades. A set of recommendations in terms of any mitigation/remedial work to recover significance is required to be submitted to BELCom for approval.

- **Following the vacating by the tenant in the wine cellar earlier in 2014, internal office dry wall partitions have been removed, exposing the extensive carving up of the building done in the 1980s/1990s**: The removal of the drywall is not certainly not problematic, but it does expose the significant destruction previously caused on opening up the main dividing wall to create a large conference venue (see image at the end of Annexure v). A heritage architect is to compile a detailed assessment report of the wijnhuis fabric and set out a heritage framework for the appropriate modification and future usage of this space.

- **The rebuilding of the manager's house (outside the werf area and with full local authority approval) was completed at the end of 2013 – within the PHS area**: A set of guidelines to control "expansion" of the house (ie stoeps, pergolas, ad-hoc accretions over time etc) and spilling out into the surrounding area is required. The previously identified detailed heritage informed landscape plan should also assess planting and screening so that this building does not visually intrude when seen from the back werf area.

The Proposed Phase 1 alteration work to the main house is assessed in the next section of this report, but at the broader scale, the following steps and procedures are recommended as a way forward to inform future work and heritage management at Fleurbaix:

**Slave history** on the farm is to be researched and written into the record as part of the history of the farm.

A **fabric maintenance plan** is to be put in place to ensure correct procedures with regard to maintenance and upgrading of the historic fabric.

The main house should ideally be occupied as a residence and conservation measures put in place which pay due regard to the significance of this house and its key anchoring role in the cultural landscape. Detailed **conservation method statements** are to be prepared due to the high significance, despite a Grade II status not being proposed.

The boundary of the PHS needs to be clarified in terms of the neighbouring property on the south side and measures put in place to mitigate development there.

**The modern office building** should be demolished – an application in terms of Section 27 needs to be made. A heritage informed design and landscape study is to be commissioned for this area before firm plans are put in place as to whether a structure or building is appropriate in this location.

A detailed heritage-informed **built environment and landscape development framework plan** should be drawn up, approved and implemented. This is important for the back-werf area as well as the primary area to the front/North.

The significant and extended Roux family history in the farming operation is characteristic of successful Stellenbosch wine farmers over time and gaps in knowledge and further **historical research** should be done to round out the study.

A historical archaeologist should undertake detailed studies in parallel with these items as required, as well as with specific items on the main house.
PHASE 1 WORK ASSESSMENT

The first phase work, the alteration of the homestead, is to facilitate its transformation as the residence for the owner and his family. The work essentially re-establishes the homestead as a private residence and is summarised as follows:

Conclusion and Recommendation

The following recommendations are made:

- A heritage architect is required to oversee the work, provide interim reports to HWC and submit a close-out report to HWC. Any on-site modifications or adjustments requiring HWC approval are to be submitted to HWC in terms of S.27 by the Heritage Architect.

- A structural engineer with demonstrated heritage experience is required to oversee the work. The name and CV of the engineer of the engineer is to be submitted to HWC for approval.

- A historical archaeologist is required to be appointed to assess the loft stair area to inform the detailing and monitor the excavation works.

- A historical archaeologist is required to assess (together with the heritage architect) the early form of the rear chimney, assuming this existed, or whether this was added along with the gable in 1989, in order to inform final detailing of the agterkamer / back gable elevation for final submission and approval before any modification is done.

- The proposed alterations should be approved in principle by HWC, subject to the provision of detailed drawings and design resolutions as noted. These further detailed drawings will be submitted to HWC for final approval.
SECTION 1

1. Purpose of the Report

The primary purpose of this report is to provide the required historical, spatial and contextual information in order to assist Heritage Western Cape’s BELCom to assess the application for a permit in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA to alter the historic homestead (now known as once more as Fleurbaix) situated on Remainder portion 6 of the farm Fleurbaai number 1040 in Stellenbosch.

The homestead, together with the outbuildings and a portion of the land was declared a National Monument in 1977.

However, the complex history of the farm has led to many decisions being taken over time which have led to compromises in the spatial layout due to the development of adjacent farm buildings, encroaching suburbia and the subdivision of the farm area itself. More recently, certain landscaping and other alteration works have taken place on Fleurbaix without following due process, which has led to the commissioning of Mike Scurr of Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects as Heritage Practitioner to compile the Section 27 application and assess the overall development on the farm.

A key outcome of this report is therefore not only the assessment of the proposed work to the historic homestead, but an overall appraisal and assessment of the heritage significance of the core area of the farm and to make recommendations for any further detailed studies required or to suggest further work which should be undertaken in order to recover significance. A key concern expressed by the HWC official during an initial site visit in late 2013 when the unauthorised landscaping works became apparent was that the already completed works could diminish the Grade II heritage status. The report contextualises the work done in 2013 and makes recommendations for remedial work.

2. Legal Requirement

Fleurbaix, situated to the south of the Eerste River, falls outside of the Grade I Cultural Landscape Area (which includes Ida’s Valley, Simonsberg Forest Reserve, Dwars River Valley and Groot Drakenstein Simondium) and therefore comment from SAHRA is not required.

Portion 2 of the farm Fleurbaai 1040 was declared a National Monument in terms of the National Monuments Act no 28 of 1969 on the 4 March 1977 – “the historic Fleurbaai homestead at Stellenbosch, with the manor-house, stone cattle kraal, wine cellar, slave quarters and fowl-house thereon, to be a national monument.” The declaration noted “the manor-house dates from approximately 1768 and, together with the outbuildings forms an important Cape Dutch architectural complex.”

The National Monument declared area of Fleurbaix became a Provincial Heritage Site in terms of Section 58 of the NHRA, as is the case with all sites previously declared National Monuments. As a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS), Fleurbaix is formally protected under Section 27 of the NHRA which states that “No person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, alter, remove from its original position, subdivide or change the planning status of any heritage site without a permit issued by the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of such site”.

![Fig.1NMC declared area (blue) on current google Earth image and 1965 SG diagram](image_url)

The approval process for any maintenance, alteration or renovation works therefore needs to be in terms of Section 27 of the NHRA with a permit to be issued by Heritage Western Cape\(^1\).

\(^1\) Early meetings with HWC officials at the outset of the commission did discuss whether the application would be assessed in terms of Section 38 or 27 of the Act. The record of the early interaction is contained in the Process Report tabled with BELCom in December 2013.
Furthermore a reassessment of heritage significance in terms of the current Act requires a broader assessment of heritage across the site. This report therefore also assesses the wider landscape linkages over the farm in order to suggest a grading in terms of the NHRA.

Fig.2 PHS (1977 NMC declared area) on 1973 aerial photo

An overlay of the PHS area on an aerial photograph of the era demonstrates that the identified "important architectural complex" while more than simply the buildings and werf, was also rather crudely tied to site survey points. Wider significance and linkages were not considered. This aspect is now considered as part of the reassessment of significance in this report, both in terms of the NHRA and due to the changed cadastral boundary and other developments on the site.

3. Methodology

The research has included:
- extensive deeds office searches
- map and historic image search at the National Archives in Cape Town and NGI – Mowbray.
- detailed site inspections and recordings
- review of available literature

Due to the importance of the landscape, and the recent, unauthorised changes that have been made to the landscaping, a specialist, independent landscaping assessment report by Gibbs Saint Pol Landscape Architect was commissioned to further inform the interpretation. The initial report compiled in August 2014 is included.

4. Limitations

The recent (2013) unauthorised work to the landscaping and internally in the "slave quarters' has meant that the author (as the Heritage Practitioner and unconnected with the work undertaken without a permit) has not been able to view the site independently of the recent alterations.

The very extensive restoration work undertaken by Dirk Visser in the late 1980s had a major effect on the buildings and the landscaping. Visser’s own archival record of the work on Fleurbaix has not been located. However, due to the extensive information on file at SAHRA, this is not seen as a compromising factor.

The deeds research had uncovered missing information and links worthy of further research. However, this has not had an effect on the current assessment.

An historical archaeologist has not been called on to input into the process thus far since. Areas requiring archaeological input in the next stage are noted.

5. Statement of Independence

Mike Scurr of Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects, acting in the capacity as Heritage Practitioner, has no ties to the owner of the property or to any of the professionals on the project.

6. Background to the Application

As the process was legalised and formalised late in 2013, meetings were held with HWC officials. The HWC official drawn into early discussions undertook "an urgent site visit to issue a stop works
order, albeit that (some) work has already been completed.” The CEO of HWC was copied into all correspondence, along with other case officers at HWC, Architect Ivan Flint and this author.

Following further meetings the following was agreed:
A Stop-works order was not issued, since the landscaping was complete and as there was a process of consultation with Mike Scurr as heritage practitioner now on board.

HWC had been unable to gain any clarity from Stellenbosch Municipality on the (largely internal) works done to the Slave Quarters. (This work was not approved by or submitted to HWC). The assessment of the unauthorised work is included in this Section 27 application.

Similarly, the fully approved works for the manager’s cottage completed late 2013 underway was approved by the local authority without any HWC input.

6.1 Work undertaken to date on site
- No work has been undertaken to the main house/ manor-house - the subject of this application now.
- Landscaping to previously planted areas was done in 2013.
- Certain gates have been erected.
- Internal renovations were completed to the “Slave Quarters”/ outbuilding.
- Following the vacating by the tenant in the wine cellar earlier in 2014, internal office dry wall partitions have been removed, exposing the extensive carving up of the building done in the 1980s/ 1990s.
- The rebuilding of the manager’s house (outside the werf area and with full local authority approval) was completed at the end of 2013.

The client is aware of the errors in this process and has put in place steps to ensure proper heritage management practice is followed going forward.

6.2 The Current Application

The current application is for alterations internally and in the attic space of the main house, along with certain external renovation works.

6.3 Future Phasing and Work

The report identifies further detailed studies and suggests certain remedial work to the recently completed areas which should form part of remedial action on the farm. HWC comment is required for these items as permits cannot be issued for completed work. This in turn will inform future phasing. At this stage, the likely phasing is as follows:

- Phase 1 – homestead alterations and renovation (2014/2015) as primary residence for the family of the owner.
- Phase 2 – wine cellar building upgrade. A programme for this building (until recently a conference facility) is still to be defined and will be subject to land use restrictions. Usage as a library or similar has been mooted.
- Phase 3 – demolition of the now vacant and intrusive office building.
- Phase 4 – development of a screening pavilion or other lightweight pavilion type structure on the site of the present office building.
- Phase 5 – redevelopment/ re-purposing of the 16 houses no longer used as farm worker’s accommodation.
Development phases 2, 3 and 4 will all require separate Section 27 applications to HWC in due course, though the phase 1 of this report does set out suggested indicators in this respect.

The already renovated Slave Quarters is intended to serve as family/guest accommodation – the suggested remedial work here must be assessed in detail, reported on and a separate follow up Section 27 application made to HWC for any mitigation work required.

Likewise, identified landscape mitigation requires a separate Section 27 application.

The barn/store on the south east corner of the back werf is used as a farm store and garage and will continue to be used for this purpose. No work is foreseen here at this stage.

7. Property Description and Location

The farm lies immediately to the south of the Eerste River and is situated roughly halfway between the R310 and R44 routes into Stellenbosch.

Fig. 4 Fleurbaix location – Google Earth image.

The 1966 diagram (Portion 2 of the farm Fleurbaai 1040) shows the extent of the farm at this time, roughly rectangular and with the Eerste River as the northern boundary. The arrangement of the key buildings and roadway can be seen.

Fig. 5: Cancelled 1966 SG diagram.
Fig. 6: SG Diagram Portion 6 Farm 1040 – January 2011 reflects the sub-divided Portion 7 in the south corner

Waterfall Trust, the current owners, purchased the Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai 1040 on 18th December 2011 from Servagro Trading Proprietary Ltd (a subsidiary of Capespan) - (see Annexure i – Title deed).

The present farm boundary configuration is the result of several complex consolidations and subdivisions that have been undertaken in recent years (not by Waterfall Trust) seemingly with little regard for any heritage considerations. The present boundary to the south omits the heritage core buildings but retains the SAPO experimental farm shed/ light industrial buildings running parallel to the Fleurbaix buildings.

The irregularly-shaped subdivided Portion 7 – owned by the SAPO Trust (Upstars Trade 22) which has a plant improvement facility on Fleurbaai farm – is shown bounded in red. A significant amount of development (to support the experimental farm) has taken place on this adjacent portion of land since the 1990s. The subdivisions and transfers appear to have followed process, though it is unclear from documentation uncovered to date what, if any, heritage considerations have been considered as part of the process. It is also clear that the PHS extended – even if by default - to the southern boundary at the time, effectively also encompassing a section of portion 7. The impact of this aspect should be clarified.

There are various ongoing legal issues between the two land owners (Waterfall Trust and SAPO). While these matters are not specifically related to this Section 27 application they do have some relevance to the overall heritage significance of the site.
These legal challenges relate to disputed access rights across the site (which would cut off the historic interface with the river), the development of office buildings on Portion 7 (being sited very close to the heritage core this would further erode the pattern of the historic farm and the relationship of buildings to land) and related environmental concerns and the request by the owner of Remainder Portion 6 for an EIA and public participation process to investigate contamination of the water source and the environmental impacts of proposed development on the adjacent farm.

The road line along the newly created boundary alongside the sheds has been fenced and planted – to some extent mitigating the farm-industrial complex to the south. This aspect is to be developed further in detailed landscape studies.

Threats posed by development and changed land sub-divisions

There are several threats to the integrity of the historic siting of the homestead complex within the broader cultural landscape, viz:

- encroaching development of the Technopark, de Zalze Golf estate etc
- general suburban sprawl
- planned developments on the SAPO (SA Plant Organisation) portion 7 of the subdivided portion of Fleurbaix farm immediately to the rear/south of the site.
- uncoordinated landscaping within the back werf space
- over-formalising of the landscaping on the garden area to the north

Fig. 8: Topographic maps 1935 (left) and 2000 (right) show the impact of urban sprawl and loss of rural character

Fig. 9: View from back of main house, looking south to office building and Portion 7 buildings beyond
The inappropriate formal landscape patterns (c1990s?) is now removed (2014).

Fig. 10: Roadway directly behind the barn and line of screening on portion 7.
8. Mapping Analysis

The pattern development timeline on the following page at the werf-scale illustrates the key developments and changes to the cultural landscape, primarily over the course of the 20th century.

Persistent patterns evident on site

- tree-lined linear axial road running alongside and past main house and flanking outbuildings
- quadrangle arrangement parallel to the Eerste River
- location of buildings at each corner of this back "werf" area
- axial connection and view across landscape to river
- subsidiary side outbuildings have end gables only
- dominant main house with central gable

Fig 11: 1938 aerial image

The timeline of the development of the core (overleaf) confirms the following key changes:

1863

- T-form of house likely at this time
- rectilinear arrangement of buildings an early established pattern

1938

- pattern persists to the twentieth century
- axial connection to Eerste River to the North
- informal desire lines/ pathways
- back werf not fully enclosed
- barn-store has L-extension
- wine cellar evident
- no back gable on main house
- strong NE-SW road line

1973

- homestead complex appears to have become more of an island in the broader context
- axial link to house cut-off/ rerouted
- roadway along dam formed
- later extension to wine cellar to south

1999

- post resporation – werk becomes more enclosed and formalised
- back werf formal planting lines and paving
- extensive development of sheds etc to the rear
- barn-store extensions removed

2014

- axial link reestablished in a formal manner
- formal garden on NE
- planting in werf
- further development on rear property
- access roads further formalised
1863 Title Deed extract – note T-form indicated and rectilinear layout of buildings and kraal as an early established pattern

1938
1953
1966
1973
1999
2010
2014 Google Earth

Fig 12: Pattern development timeline: Werf Scale
9. Heritage and Cultural Significance of the Site and Structures thereon

9.1 Historical Background

The importance of the relationship of the farm pattern to the East-West flowing Eerste River is clear from the earliest maps.

Fleurbaai forms part of a pattern of linear development of farms and settlements along the Eerste river corridor, including Fleurbaai (granted in 1695) along with the nearby Welmoed (1690), Spier (1692), de Groote Zalze (1695), Libertas (1693) and Blaauklip (1690). Snelling notes:

The earliest portions of land granted to the early settlers, (free burghers) were almost without exception located along the river courses of the Cape starting with the first grants along the Liesbeek valley in 1657. The land grants were for one purpose only; farming to provide produce for the profit driven Dutch East India Company, passing ship trade and the growing settlement of Cape Town. Although settlers had established in the Stellenbosch region earlier, Stellenbosch was officially founded in 1679, and by 1685 most of the earlier farms along the Eerste River had been founded.

Snelling (2008:8) – Unpublished Phase 1 HIA In regard to a proposed Wine and Tourist Centre located on the Remainder of the Farm Audacia No 537, Stellenbosch, known as The Estates.

This text is taken from the 2004 version of Fransen’s published research but mostly reflects the earlier notes circa 1975 – ie it updates the text to reflect the late 1980s restoration by Visser, but still retains the note that there is no back gable, which was in fact added during the Visser work c1989.

Fransen (2004:233) notes the following with regard to Fleurbaai:

This farm was granted in 1695 to Pierre le Fèbre, a Huguenot, and a surgeon by profession. It is called after the town of Fleurbaix in Picardie. The farm was over 44 morgen in size. The house is said to date from 1768; whether it does or not, the end-gables and the front-gable were added in 1800, when Paul Roux was owner. In 1801 Roux married Elisabeth Storm (the young girl in the ‘Storm painting’ in Stellenbosch Museum). The front-gable is of a transitional type, with holbol characteristics as well as a small pediment; the end-gables also have pediments, and rather unusual undulating outlines. There is no back gable, which supports the theory that the front- and end-gables are later additions. The plan of the house, too, points to it having grown in stages. It is H-shaped, but a wall (with an 18th-century wall-cupboard flanked by doors) separates a voorhuis (deeper than the adjoining rooms) from the agterkamer. This is something one expects of a house that was once T-shaped. Also its back wings are 1m wider than the front wings. There is a flat-roofed addition to the right-hand back wing. Most original ceilings and many doors survive, but the external woodwork at the back is c1840, and in front c1870. The house has since been expertly restored by D Visser, who inserted casements in front and also at the back, though
leaving two 1840 sashes below the (new) pedimented holbol gable copied from the end-gables.

Flanking the house, placed slightly forward, are outbuildings still with iron roofs and plain holbol end-gables. Another outbuilding at the back delimits the large werf, though there are no werf walls. Near the homestead is a well-preserved fowl run (much like that of nearby Libertas) with nesting places for geese and ducks.

There is a question mark around the c1870 date ascribed by Fransen to the west extension. As the Elliot image (one of two similar ones located) illustrates, the wing was not built by the time the photo was taken – c1900/1905. Therefore an early twentieth extension date for this work seems more likely – possibly 1920 as reported anecdotally by van Zyl or slightly earlier5 (1998:3).

5Van Zyl compiled a SU research report, based on interviews with inter alia Dirk Visser.
Walton (1985:84-87)\(^6\) includes a section on Fleurbaai and much detail on the fowl-run. He notes that it had been subjected to several changes in construction and use. Of interest is his plan of the stairway up to the loft in the narrow passage. Walton suggests that the small room under the stair may have been used to house fowls for fattening (Walton 1985:85). The stair and door to the loft were removed during the 1989 Visser restoration for SAPO – for reasons unknown, but perhaps the absence of the stair on the Elliot image (fig 18) informed Visser. It is not yet known whether an earlier/ original loft stair existed and had been removed (perhaps when the roof was converted to corrugated iron in the 19th century. This aspect is to be the subject of detailed investigation together with an historical archaeologist as the proposal now is to reinstate this loft stair.

The (extant) barrel vaulted nesting places in section A are typical, whereas those in the central section (B) are noted by Walton as unique (stepped detail) and not found in any other Cape fowl run seen during the course of his research. He also posits that the central section may have been a pigsty prior to being converted to a fowl-run which may account for the different detailing.

---

\(^6\)James Walton’s Cape Dovecots and Fowl Runs includes roughly the same historical overview as Fransen/ Fransen and Cook, but notes (1984/5) that the old buildings were somewhat neglected and in urgent need of preservation, perhaps reflecting that the maintenance of the historic buildings was not a priority of SAPO.
9.2 Evolution & Meaning of the Landscape & Built Structures (compiled by Sally Titlestad)

Background and Brief

The aim of the research was to reveal understandings of the divisions and consolidations of this landholding with particular focus on the evolution and meaning of the place and its historical buildings and structures.

Methodology

In late 2013 a search of the erf registers in the Deeds Office was conducted, available original grants drawn, and an attempt to reconcile the current landholding to its evolution was undertaken from these. As a result of several conundrums, missing Deeds office records and unanswered questions, a second phase of research was undertaken to attempt find all of the associated property, and to trace the original grant in relation to its evolution. This search was begun by Teun Baartman (Baartman, 2014) and completed in May 2014. Erf registers, Deeds, surveyors diagrams and archival documentary and mapping sources have been used. The search has not been exhaustively conducted because of the level of complication encountered (serious erf register errors combined with complex land transfers between extended family members over at least four generations and a century). The social history of the Roux family has not been traced, but is essential to richer understandings of the relationships of the various role players, particularly the various Paul Roux.

There is sufficient information available to inform understandings, but the research process has simultaneously revealed broader questions that should be researched to further inform meanings associated to the cultural landscape and the rich representivity of Fleurbaai.

Findings

Current landholding

Fleurbaai, (also referred to as Fleurbaaij and Fleurbaix over time), portion 6 of erf 1040 as it is currently known, is the result of a particularly complex series of grants, consolidations and subdivisions over a period of approximately 150 years. The extended land expanded and contracted under the ownership of the Roux family (descendants of Paul Roux) between 1784 and the 1940s, with at least four generations being directly involved with farming this and adjoining land to the east and the west (Libertas, Vredenburg and Vlottenburg) in the 19th century. The subdivisions and transfers were frequently linked to financial failure and subsequent family interventions, transferring the land to alternate family members and sons (see appendix for details).
Unusually, the only remaining significance of the original land grant of 1695 is that the farm retained its name over time – ‘Fleurbaai’. The original cadastral landholding had lost its coherence by the 1730s, and regained coherence in a much larger and more significant place in the 19th century, which included quitrent grants and parts of Vredenburg and Vlottenburg.

Fleurbaai has an extremely complex and opaque history with some questions about its transitions over time remaining unknown.

The Deeds office notations and correspondence reinforces gaps in transfer and inexplicable transfers, some double registered to differing owners of the extended landholding at the same time.

What can be traced and understood

The farm was first granted in freehold title in 1695 as a landholding of 44 morgen 474 square roods, with a surveyors diagram attached (see above grant 107/1695). A condition of the original grant, which was commonplace, was that the owner allows a common wagon road next to his fields (Baartman, 2014, p. 1). An identifying feature of the land was that it abutted the south bank of the Eerste River.

The farm was sold as a whole in 1701, 1702 and 1708 (see Appendix). By 1732 the farm had been divided in half, with half of the farm being inherited by the wife of the owner, Jan Cloete (CA MOOC 8/5.52). Cloete’s widow, Geertruij Pretorius, sold the land (portion 2) in 1736 to Pieter van der Byl’s widow, Hester teWinkel. The 1736 diagram depicts the northeast half of the original grant.

The locations of buildings and outbuildings are not depicted on the surveyors diagrams attached to the early Deeds of transfer, but buildings are mentioned.

Deeds of transfer for the landholding are not traceable between 1736 and 1784, when half of the original grant was transferred with adjoining land. The buildings and structures mentioned in the early grants are untraceable, but buildings established on the immediately adjoining piece of land are traceable to that period.

The next diagrammatic depiction of the land is in 1863. The 1863 formulation of land (93 morgen+), while surprising, reflects a number of changes that are summarised below, and can be traced as indicated in the appended summary table of land transfers.

---

7 SF 107 of 1695, a grant to Pierre Lefebre of 44 morgen 474 sqm
By 1784 Paul Roux Snr\(^6\) had acquired at least half of the original Fleurbaai land, as it had been depicted in 1736.

In 1806 Jacobus Roux (at other times referred to as Paul Jacobus), srn, gifted the farm Fleurbaai (cited as part of Vredenberg) to his son, Paul, at no cost to him or to his son, confirmed by the fiscal at the Castle of Good Hope. This was implemented in Deed in 1842 (being 33 morgen 454.5sq
freehold of the place Fleurbaai) along with the transfer of quitrent land adjacent.

During the early part of the 19\(^{th}\) century Paul Roux, srn acquired numerous pieces of quitrent land adjacent, and by the time transfer of the land took place, he owned Vredenberg, Vlottenburg, Fleurbaai and his brother, JP Roux owned Libertas.

In 1813 Paul Roux requested a piece of Quitrent land, which was surveyed in 1814 and granted in 1818. Paul Roux Jacobus’ son (i.e. Paul Roux junior) was granted 161 morgen, 484.5 sq
quitrent land adjacent to Fleurbaai\(^9\) on condition that public roads remain open. The land granted was located with the Helderberg to the South, contiguous with the property of P Roux Senior and wasteland to the west, and Libertas to the east. Two diagrams are used to depict the land. The quitrent grant diagram was replaced in 1959. This is comparable with the east part of an 1883 surveyor’s diagram.

The 1814 diagram depicts a homestead (marked as such), flanked by a pair of outbuildings, immediately south of the land that had been transferred to Paul Roux in 1784 (the original grant), and for which he was now applying as he had been farming it.

In addition, in 1814 the land north of the Eersteriver was granted to Paul Roux Senior\(^10\). This grant was described as 358 morgen 474 sq
, bounded to the north by the farm of widow Marais and the outspan place near Stellenbosch town (‘dorp’), East to the farm of Jac’ (Jacobus) Roux, Jac’s son, south to the Eerste river and the farm of Roux, and west to the untamed veld and the farm of A van der Byl. Two portions were divided off in 1824 and transferred to Paul Roux junior, and the remainder became Vlottenburg.

The total landholding was in excess of 519 morgen, or approximately 445 hectares (over a thousand acres).

\(^6\) There are at least 4 generations of men all called Paul Roux and owners of this land, referred to in the Title Deeds. The family links and details have not been researched, but the generations are referred to as senior, junior and grandson for the sake of the clarity of the document. Where a statement of inferred age related status is made, it is taken from the Deed.

\(^9\) SQ 4.43, December 1818

\(^10\) SQ 4.3, 13 March 1818, surveyed 1814

In 1863 half of the land was transferred to Paul Roux’s son on condition that the older Paul Roux retain use of 2 bedrooms, half of the silverware and the kitchen, half of the stable and cellar, and Related portions of land to the west had by then been absorbed into Vredenburg and Vlottenburg.

---

\[^{11}\] SG 879 of 1895, attached to deed of transfer (see appendix for details).
water on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The nature of the agreement indicates an unwilling alliance, although the son also took over the debt of the father. These conditions were renounced in 1872, when the father had settled elsewhere.

The Deed identifies the land as three portions of land – 14 (+) morgen freehold transferred to Roux in 1842, plus 79 (+) and 93 (+) morgen quitrent land.

Roux Junior (by then referred to as senior in documents) was placed under curatorship by his brother JP (living at Libertas) until his son reached 21 years of age in 1883, at which time he took over as curator of his father’s affairs. Shortly thereafter Paul Ryk Roux junior (aged 21) was part of a liquidation process declaring the older Roux bankrupt. The distribution accounts indicate that the remaining land was bought by Paul Ryk Roux (Paul Roux, grandson) and Andries Roux. The deeds for this transfer were unavailable (deed book missing) at the time of research.

By 1888 – the surveyors diagram below, the extended Roux brothers owned Vredenberg, Vlottenberg, Fleurbaai and Libertas, among other lands.

Paul Ryk Roux (grandson) and his partner went into liquidation and the farm was sold out of the proceeds in 1892. JP Roux brothers, trading together purchased the land. In 1895 they sold 72 morgen of the land back to Paul Ryk Roux. Some re-consolidation took place, a subdivision was added to Libertas, and the farms continued to be productively used by the extended family.

A complex set of transactions across the, by then, farms of Vredenburg, Vlottenburg, Fleurbaai and Libertas, continued to take place.

During the 20th century the land subdivisions and transfers were complex, but summarised, a Brink who was a member of the extended family received Fleurbaai and after 1944 subdivided and sold virtually all of the Fleurbaai land to the South African government (SAPO), in portions, then consolidated into erf 1040. This measured 116 morgen 445 sqr, or approximately 247 acres.

Additional information

After the outbreak of phylloxera in the late 1880s, many farmers declared bankruptcy across the Cape. The introduction of deciduous fruit and the transformation of many farms from wine to deciduous fruit farms took place in the first half of the 20th century. It is possible that these farms followed that example. The informants for the sale of this land to the South African government and the establishment of an experimental farm on the land are echoed by the example of farms in the Drakenstein Valley. This could be further researched.
Evolution and meaning of the built environment in the landscape

Despite extraordinarily complex transfers of land between the Roux’s during the 19th century, this land and the buildings thereon have marked significance in the landscape as remnants of agricultural production and domestic occupation from the late 18th century. The 1863 diagram depicts the significances of the landscape well, and is used as illustration.

Characteristics of the landscape depicted in 1863 that remain in existence and have social, cultural landscape and built environment significances are:

9. The orthogonal arrangement of buildings and extension of the homestead and outbuildings as they were depicted in 1814,
10. The watercourses (marked ‘old watercourse’ on the 1863 diagram) to the east and west of the land, the east one of which is still visible in the landscape,
11. The public road lying to the south of the homestead buildings and linking this land to the adjacent land,

The relative rarity of the family relationships and the maintenance of the farms within the family for over a century and a half should be further researched (Genealogy Institute of South Africa, 2004) (Harris, 2006) (Pama, 1983).

What was not able to be confirmed:

From 1903 half of the extended landholding was transferred from a Brink back to one of the Roux family (TD dated 23.3.1903), and the exchange of land between Brink and the Roux’s suggests that this may have been extended family. The landholding had minor subdivisions, but the greater portion of half of the land was transferred by Brink to Fleurbaai Pty Ltd in the 1940s. The later Deeds could not be found in the Deeds office, and it is therefore not possible to extrapolate from them.

A study conducted in the late 20th century confirmed the growth of the homestead from a ‘T’ to an ‘H’ shaped home, cited by Fransen, with the extensions taking place at different times (van Zyl, 1998).

The Google earth image alongside indicates some of the remaining built structures and natural landscape features described above.

Tracing the evolution of the extended farming and agro-industrial structures has not been possible with the limited Deeds search conducted.
Understanding the findings, despite limitations of research

Fleurbaai was central to and is representative of the growth of agricultural production, particularly viniculture in the area during the late 18th and particularly the 19th century. The social history of the Roux family as Huguenot settlers in the 18th century (the first Paul Roux was spiritual leader of the Huguenots settling at the Cape) and their development and loss of wealth, with associated fluctuations, mirrors many wine farmers over the period. Fleurbaai’s homestead and flanking outbuildings, the growth of the werf, and the location of this as the major Homestead in the vast Roux family landholdings throughout the 19th century is borne out by archival documentation.

The spatial and relational links between Fleurbaai and Libertas are evidenced by the access road to Fleurbaai leading from Libertas as early as 1814, with a driveway entrance accessing the front (North) of Fleurbaai. The road passing by the south of the werf allowed the development of utility and outbuildings closer to the road and may explain the extension of the werf to the south of the homestead.

There has been a loss of cultural landscape and land-use context in the 20th century through change of ownership and the subsequent subdivision and development of the land between Fleurbaai and Libertas. The vulnerability of the werf may have partly informed its declaration as a National Monument in 1977. Changes of understanding of historical and heritage significance have allowed a reconsideration of the meanings and significance of the farm, its spatial arrangements and contextual location. Early research findings indicate that there is a rich array of material relating to the farm and its role in the landscape and that this should be further researched.

Recommendations:

This research challenges understandings of the significance of Fleurbaai held in 1977 when it was declared a National Monument (now a Provincial Heritage site). The significant and extended family farming operation is characteristic of successful Stellenbosch wine farmers over time.

The significance of the changes to this land and its buildings post the devastation of the Cape wine industry may require further research.

The social history of the Roux family would contribute significant understandings to the meaning of Fleurbaai. The informants for the sale and use as an experimental farm by the South African government since the 1940s would contribute understanding of the more recent history as well as informing understandings of the vulnerabilities of the landscape and buildings in the future.

9.3 Twentieth Century Restoration work

A full copy of the three project files on record at SAHRA have been made by the author and kept on file for reference. The files provide an insight into development on the farm from the late 1960s through to 1990. The restoration work by Visser appears to have been highly controversial, not the least because work was done illegally without submitting plans. Hastily compiled photo surveys and background research compiled by Munnik Visser Black Fish and Partners are included in the file as well (and are the source of the 1980s images in this report since Visser archival material has not been found to date).

Key points of relevance now:

- There appear to have been attempts to proclaim the site from the late 1960s onwards.
- The 1970 diagram for the declaration proposal included all the buildings but only a narrow strip of land around them - a quadrangle 158m x 97m x 89m.
- At this stage, the property was in the ownership of the state and was being used for a “virus research organisation”.
- Public works objected to the proclamation in 1970 drawings on file show planned facilities within the werf, so conflicting ideas for the property may lie at the heart of this decision.
- Permission was granted in 1975 for the demolition of a shed and the erection of a steel shed.
- By 1976, file notes indicate the deteriorating conditions of the buildings and requests to get the buildings proclaimed – which occurred in March 1977.
- The NMC inscription records that no back gable existed, and that the house at the time, with its c1860 sash windows on the façade and corrugated iron roof, still retained a considerable degree of its original character. The importance of the outbuildings was noted at the same time.
- Letters on file from 1983 indicate that well-known Stellenbosch architect JB Collins was commissioned to do work at Fleurbaai but the NMC pointed out flaws in “the restoration planning”. Specific comments to Collins are recorded in a file note dated 24 October 1983.
- A flurry of letters between the architect, Public Works and the Dept of Community Development ensured – the Dept requested the NMC not to convey written instructions to consultants as “appears to have been done in respect of Cape town Newlands house and Stellenbosch: Fleurbaai homestead”. (1983/11/11)
- The matter seems to have been set aside and there is no further record of Collins’ involvement at Fleurbaai.
- In 1986, the owner of neighbouring Libertas is recorded as having spoken to officials at NMC expressing concern regarding the state of the buildings at Fleurbaai.
• Dirk Visser of Munnik Visser Black Fish and Partners then appears to have been appointed by SAPO by 1988 to do the work.
• The work appears to have gone ahead by Visser without approval – a letter from Visser to the NMC in March 1989, when the work was nearing completion, states “we shall greatly appreciate it if you will permit the outstanding work to be completed and ask your Board to withdraw the court interdict”. An undertaking was made to rectify any work needed after the opening ceremony.
• A short summary report was submitted by Dirk Visser on the same date – attached as an appendix to this report for completeness.
• A special plans committee meeting followed and requested changes, further information, records etc. It is assumed the matter was resolved as there is no further correspondence on file. (A 1990 request to install air-conditioning units was made, implying that the due process was followed thereafter).
• An article in Die Burger (Martiens van Baard – 6 June 1990) records the opening of the SAPO offices at Fleurbaix as having taken place that week.

The SU student report (van Zyl 1998) was partly based on interviews with Dirk Visser and this also throws some light on the decisions taken at the time.

• A west gable on the house as also completely rebuilt during the work as it had been damaged in a storm (van Zyl 1988:17).
• Visser reportedly also contemplated removing the c1920 extension.
• The reasons for the addition of the back gable appear to be vague – and partly based on a desire to remove the loft stair adjacent to the fowl-house which was not present in the Elliot image. No evidence is presented by Visser that a gable ever existed here.
• The retention of the two back gable c1840 sashes complete with internal shutters was noted, despite the “restoration” of the facade windows and reverting to an earlier casement typology.
• The reason for retaining the corrugated iron on the two flanking buildings appears to have been primarily financial, rather than a desire to intervene lightly and retain layers of fabric.
• Poplar beams were used for the reconstruction of the roof to the main house.

9.4 Fabric record and analysis

An extensive set of 2013/2014 images has been recorded, with a selection attached as appendix v to this report. Key images which underscore the present assets and opportunities on the property and which underscore the heritage significance and contribute to the grading recommendation are extracted on the following pages.

The history of the complex in the second half of the twentieth century presents particular challenges in assessing significance in terms of the NHRA now.

Overall, the complex still retains balance, harmony and a relationship to the land. Despite the somewhat heavy-handed restoration in the 1980s (though this too is reflective of an attitude very prevalent at that time and certainly not unique to Fleurbaix), original material and layering does persist. These factors are taken into account in the assessment of grading in this report.

Fig 32. Front gable, Fleurbaix 2014.

---

12One of the more unfortunate effects of the back gable and loft door addition is the ladder stair added to access the loft which sits rather crudely on the back facade – see image 49. Overall, the removal of the side gable stair appears to have been ill-considered – hence the application to reinstate this now.
9.3 Twentieth Century Restoration work - All images ex SAHRA - file 92/084/26
39 Wine cellar/ Wijn-huis c 1988 prior to alteration work. Main pitched roof extension was retained (with a large interleading opening created in the dividing wall). The low al-dak roof was removed/ altered with screening walls remaining.

42 Barn/ stores with shed extensions demolished during renovation work.

40 Wijnhuis c1988 pre-renovation looking west.

43 Rebuilding/ renovation of store building to rear of werf c1988

41 Wijnhuis seen during renovation work


All images ex SAHRA - file 9/2/084/26
45. The so called “slave quarters” flanks the Main House/ Homestead on the north eastern side of the entrance road. The roof has corrugated iron sheeting – apparently costs were one reason that this (and also the wine cellar roof) was not replaced with thatch during the Dirk Visser 1989 restoration. This building is extensively altered internally.

46. Main entrance axis road running alongside the slave quarters, homestead and wijnhuis.


48. Fleurbaix main gable – gable dates to c1800. In the 1989 restoration, the raised walls and corrugated iron was replaced with a thatch roof with traditional detailing.

49. View of Homestead from the north across newly landscaped garden area.

50. Back/ south elevation: Visser created a back gable – there is no evidence that a gable existed here previously. The loft door replaced the stairwell on the east gable demolished by Visser – ostensibly because this did not show on the Elliot images. The two c1840 sliding sash windows were retained on the rear facade.

9.4 2014 Fabric Record and Description
51
Interior view of voorkamer – the alignment of the beams corroborates an earlier T-shaped house.

52
c1989 thatch roof construction.

53
Wijnhuis on north west side of homestead. The corrugated iron roof was also retained by Visser. This building is extensively altered internally.

54
Rear store/ garage outbuilding – the roof was replaced and the walls extensively repaired during the 1989 restoration.

55
Kraal – newly landscaped and turned into a vegetable garden.

56
c1979 office building on south side of back werf.
9.5 Landscape analysis

Gibbs Saint Pol Landscape Architects Report

In order to assess the landscape (both the historic patterns as well as recently altered elements) an independent specialist report by Gibbs Saint Pol Landscape Architects was commissioned.

The initial report is as follows: (See original letter attached - Annexure vi)

We have considered the Fleurbaix ‘werf’ complex within its rural context as a cultural landscape in order to derive a statement of significance with respect to heritage value.

Although the farm is greatly reduced in size, and notwithstanding the intrusive industrial buildings immediately behind the werf on the subdivided land (additional screen planting is suggested to mitigate against this visual intrusion), Fleurbaix still enjoys a rural ambiance within its agricultural context. This context (which includes vineyards, farm dams and avenues) must be protected against suburbanization in order to safeguard the meaning of the farmstead. (Inasmuch as the homestead is supported by the outbuildings forming the ‘werf’, the werf is supported by its vineyards and agricultural lands forming the farmstead). Having reviewed the development of the werf over time and comparing the current form to similar Cape Winelands farm complexes, the following is evident: whereas certain elements of the Cape vernacular (such as thatched buildings, gabled architecture, the clustering of buildings around a farmyard or ‘werf’, lime-washed ‘werf’ walls connecting werf buildings, etc), are common to many farm estates; each farmstead has a unique layout or ‘composition’ and character, and relates in its own particular way to its geographic context. The integrity and uniqueness of the werf ‘diagram’ in context is thus fundamental to its cultural landscape heritage significance.

Understanding the relationship between elements and the manner in which these combine to form balanced patterns within a broader landscape gives a sense of order and meaning to the composition – and should inform contemporary intervention into the historic precinct. Moreover, the clarity of the werf diagram needs to be protected against uncontrolled proliferation of infill and addition, to maintain the integrity and balance of the composition. The Fleurbaix werf complex forms a linear quadrangle, parallel to the Eerste River; with the gabled manor house (or homestead) centralized and flanked by two secondary buildings (the ‘wijnhuis’ occupying the western corner and the ‘slave lodge’ occupying the northern corner). These three buildings are aligned in the same plane and face onto the tree-lined avenue running parallel to the werf. (This is the former access road). The (now walled) ‘werf’ extends behind this row with an additional ‘shed’ building occupying the eastern corner, and a former kraal (now vegetable garden) occupying the southern corner.

A much later ‘office building’ is situated between the shed and kraal. It should be noted that the farmstead buildings are linear rectangular forms, arranged parallel to the proportions of the werf, reinforcing the spatial gesture. Extending from the gable of the homestead building is an axial pathway, perpendicular to the werf, which connects the farmstead to the Eerste River. This has been replanted as an avenue. By virtue of its central position and elaborate entrance gable, the homestead is clearly intended to dominate the composition. The flanking buildings have only end gables, and are balanced about the central axis running through the homestead gable.

As yet recent landscape intervention within the werf has been limited to tree planting (the appropriateness of this pattern needs further investigation) and the introduction of a vegetable and herb garden into the former kraal space. Any further intervention (including proposed terracing) should not be allowed to sub-divide the space, but should seek to maintain the sense of linearity, simplicity and spatial continuity. Should terracing be required, ‘soft’ lawn embankments would be preferable to vertical retaining walls. No additional ‘werf’ walls should be introduced into this space.

Recent landscape interventions below the werf include dry-packed stone walls, contemporary pergola structures and sculptures, rose garden and orchard plantations; as well as new plastered and painted masonry ‘werf’ walls and circular ponds. As new interventions should not attempt to mimic historic patterns (as this compromises the integrity of the historic complex), the dry-packed stone walls and steel pergola elements are not inappropriate in their materiality, however the layout of the pattern is somewhat self-referential, and does not relate architecturally to the existing buildings of the werf. Some of the structures appear over-designed and somewhat heavy-handed. The new reflection pond interrupts the perpendicular axis to the river, and is also self-referential in form. The new gateways seem exaggerated and overly elaborate in proportion. The new ‘werf’ walls below the orchard and flanking the access road seem to compromise the balance of the werf composition (especially when viewed from the river), and introduce visually dominant foreground elements which detract from the prominence of the homestead.

Some lost opportunities include lack of celebration of crossing water and lack of visual termination of the perpendicular avenue (for example – simple gate posts would anchor the vista). No heavy infrastructure or road engineering should be considered within the 1:50 year floodline of the Eerste River, and only low-order pathways or farm access roadways should be allowed.

In summary, Fleurbaix has significance as a cultural landscape by virtue of the relationship between the buildings of the werf to the werf space collectively forming the werf complex; the relationship
between this werf complex and its surrounding farmland, and the connection between the werf complex to the Eerste River. Certain contemporary interventions have clouded the clarity for the werf diagram to a certain degree, but are not irreparable, and can be mitigated. To this end a further landscape study should be undertaken, flowing from which detailed recommendations for integrating the contemporary installations congruently into the historic complex can be developed.

(Gibbs Saint Pol – August 2014)

9.6 Identification of Heritage Resources

- The Homestead / main house – the original T-shaped dwelling can be traced from the ceiling beams. The gables and H-extension most likely date from c1800. Adaptation to sliding sashes took place c1840 (rear façade) and modification of the front façade fenestration c1870. A side wing extension was built c1920. The overall restoration by Visser in 1989 added a back gable, removed the front façade sash windows and reinstated earlier casement typology (matching the old casements on the rear facade). The present form is therefore a layered hybrid, and the twentieth century work reflects the ethos of the time. Mostly importantly, the context, hierarchy, siting and outlook of the house remains undiminished. The main house is a key heritage resource on the site.
- The much altered wijnhuis and slave quarters have been significantly altered internally. They retain the later corrugated roof form and function as contributing outbuildings which have not been over-restored. Their anchoring role in the overall composition makes them key heritage resources on the site.
- The fowl-run is a typical example of its kind, but also possesses unique details, and its placement alongside the main house as part of the overall farm ensemble makes it a key heritage resource.

Other heritage resources:

- The overall rectangular form of the rear werf, despite being over-formalised in the twentieth century
- The open ground and connection between house and river
- The axial, tree lines entrance road running parallel and setting up the line of the three front buildings
- Kraal enclosure completing the one corner of the werf
- The much altered barn/ store/ garage is an anchoring building on the south east corner of the werf
- The primary heritage resource is the overall rural ensemble of the buildings, werf and connection to the landscape.

10. Assessment of Significance and Suggested Grading

The NHRA (1999) requires the identification and mapping of all heritage resources and an assessment of the significance of such resources in terms of the heritage assessment criteria set out in the Act.

A portion of Fleurbaai farm and the key structures thereon was proclaimed a National Monument in 1977. Therefore, under current legislation the site is determined to be a Provincial Heritage Site (PHS) - Grade II. The Gazette indicated the extent of the site as follows:

“the historic Fleurbaai homestead at Stellenbosch, with the manor-house, stone cattle kraal, wine cellar, slave quarters and fowl-house thereon, to be a national monument.”

HWC’s Short Guide to and Policy Statement on Grading indicates that Grade II sites are so special that they need to be given a status beyond being granted recognition by being entered in the heritage register, but are not of outstanding national significance. They may be rare examples of their kind, or otherwise be highly representative of a type. They may be connected to an event or figure of provincial/regional significance. They may fall under national or provincial themes (2012: 5 – 6).

The reassessment of significance at Fleurbaix takes into account several complicating factors:

- The seemingly high-handed approach to heritage during the twentieth century by the previous (quasi-government) owners
- The maverick approach to restoration by Dirk Visser and the undertaking of work without permits or, it would appear, in depth research.
- Certain landscaping upgrades and internal alterations to one building undertaken without permit by the current owner have also raised questions around possible loss of significance.

The buildings have been assessed individually and collectively and take the above into consideration. The survey summary sheets are included on the following pages and a summary of suggested grading compiled thereafter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>&quot;Slave Quarters&quot;</th>
<th>FARM BUILDING NO</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE</td>
<td>Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040</td>
<td>ERF</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHITECT/S:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>c1800?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGINAL USE:</td>
<td>Farm outbuilding</td>
<td>CURRENT USE</td>
<td>Accommodation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARITY:</th>
<th>ARCHITECTURAL:</th>
<th>Medium – compromised by alterations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTIVITY:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>SOCIO-HISTORICAL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENCE:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL:</td>
<td>High – key component of layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRITY:</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETIC:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>SLAVERY:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLIC</td>
<td>CULTURAL:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATIONAL:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>INTRINSIC:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ARCHAEOLOGICAL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE ANALYSIS

#### SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION

The so-called "slave-quarters" forms part of the axial alignment of buildings along the entrance road dating at least the earliest part of the 19th century. Architecturally a typical long outbuilding with end gables only. Thatch roof removed at some point and the eaves walling was raised. Corrugated iron configuration kept during 1989 restoration work. Used by SAPO and with cold rooms etc. Interior altered in 2012 – new kitchen, bathrooms, interior décor etc.

#### MAJOR ALTERATION/S:

- Roof early 20thC?
- Restoration work in 1989 and more recent interior upgrade.

#### DATE/S:

- 1989
- 2012

#### PHYSICAL CONDITION:

Good.

#### STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

The building is a representative example of a Cape farm outbuilding flanking the main house. The linear pattern and the landscape relationship make it a core component of the whole ensemble.

#### PROPOSED GRADING

**IIIB**

The retention of the corrugated iron roof allows for an integrated but historically varied material and detail expression to be integrated. An opportunity exists for exploring the history of the farm and family via the as yet un-researched slave history of the farm. Sensitive interior expression/interpretation is suggested.

A detailed fabric survey report is to be compiled to make recommendations to HWC BELCom for mitigation measures in terms of interior alterations. A maintenance plan is to be put in place. Slave history on the farm is to be researched.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

**LEGEND:** National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
**NAME**  
Fleurbaix / Main house

**FARM BUILDING NO**  
2

**PHYSICAL ADDRESS:**  
Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

**ARCHITECT/S:**  
unknown

**ORIGINAL USE:**  
Homestead

**CURRENT USE:**  
Vacated/ to be residential

**APPLICATION LEGISLATION**  

**OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:**  
x

**PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:**  
x

**HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:**  
GAZETTE 4 March 1977

**TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS:**  
S.27  x  S.34  x  S.38.1  x

**RARITY:**  
ARCHITECTURAL: Medium-High

**REPRESENTIVITY:**  
SOCIO-HISTORICAL: High

**EXCELLENCE:**  
ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL: High

**INTEGRITY:**  
SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL: Low

**AESTHETIC:**  
SLAVERY: Medium (unknown)

**SYMBOLIC:**  
CULTURAL: Medium-High

**ASSOCIATIONAL:**  
INTRINSIC: Medium-High

**AGE:**  
ARCHAEOLOGICAL: Unknown

**HERITAGE ANALYSIS**

**SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION**  
H-shaped, originally T-shaped house with central transitional gable. Later side gables and an added rear gable in 1989. Later sliding sashes were removed in 1988 excepting two on the rear (gable) facade. House has a historic visual axial link across the landscape to the river.

**MAJOR ALTERATION/S:**  

**DATE/S:**  
1800-1989

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:**  
(see measured plans in annexure vi)

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**  
The house and farm date to the earliest pattern of settlements along the Eerste River. As such, a higher grading is suggested. A lower grade is proposed due to problems resulting from govt. ownership in the 20thC and certain questionable interventions by Visser in 1989. NB Roux family association right up to 1940s.

**PROPOSED GRADING**  
IIIA

**OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS:**  
Opportunity exists for recovering significance lost though years of usage as office building. Visser’s removal of attic stair should be reconsidered in light of unsatisfactory back gable and werf interface. Sensitive upgrading and conservation required.

**RECOMMENDATION:**  
The house should be occupied as a residence and conservation measures put in place which pay due regard to the significance of this house and its key anchoring role in the cultural landscape. Detailed conservation method statements and details to be prepared due to its high significance, despite Gr II status not proposed.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

**LEGEND**: National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
### NAME
Wine cellar/ Wijnhuis

### FARM BUILDING NO
3

### PHYSICAL ADDRESS:
Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

### ARCHITECT/S:
unknown

### ORIGINAL USE:
Farm outbuilding/ cellar

### CURRENT USE:
Conference centre/ now vacant

### APPLICATION LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:</th>
<th>PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:</th>
<th>HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>4 March 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:
S.27 x S.34 S.38.1 x

### ARCHITECT/S:
unknown

### DATE:
C1800?

### OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:
x

### PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:
x

### HERITAGE Overlay Zone:
4 March 1977

### TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS:
S.27 x S.34 S.38.1 x

### RARITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHITECTURAL:</th>
<th>High – compromised by 20thC alts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### REPRESENTIVITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIO-HISTORICAL:</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EXCELLENCE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL:</th>
<th>High – key component of ensemble</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### INTEGRITY:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### AESTHETIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLAVERY:</th>
<th>Medium (unknown)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### SYMBOLIC:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL:</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### ASSOCIATIONAL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTRINSIC:</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### AGE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARCHAELOGICAL:</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### HERITAGE ANALYSIS

**SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION**
The so-called wijnhuis’ forms part of the axial alignment of buildings along the entrance road dating at least the earliest part of the 19th century. Architecturally a typical long outbuilding with end gables only. Thatch roof removed at some point and the eaves walling was raised. Corrugated iron configuration kept during 1989 restoration work. Rear additions in 20thC compromised interior and back werf elevation/ integration

**MAJOR ALTERATION/S:**
Af-dak extension built reported in 1925. A major second parallel wing to the rear was added by 1953

**DATE/S:**
c1925 by 1953

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:**
Good. Interior compromised by use as conference centre. Restored’. Renovated in 1989. (see measured plans in annexure vii)

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**
The building is a representative example of a Cape farm outbuilding flanking the main house. The linear pattern and the landscape relationship make it a core component of the whole ensemble.

**PROPOSED GRADING**
IIIB

**OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS:**
The next phase re-visioning of the wijnhuis and the finding of a suitable use present an opportunity for inventive reuse and recovery of significance lost through internal changes and opening up the space.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
A detailed fabric assessment report and conservation framework is to be compiled prior to plans for the upgrade of this building being set in motion.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

**LEGEND:** National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
**NAME**  
Barn – Garage / store

**FARM BUILDING NO**  
5

**PHYSICAL ADDRESS:**  
Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

**ARCHITECT/S:**  
unknown

**ORIGINAL USE:**  
Farm building

**CURRENT USE:**  
Vehicle garage and store

**APPLICATION LEGISLATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:</th>
<th>x</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:</td>
<td>Gazette 4 March 1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARCHITECT/S:** unknown

**DATE:** By 1863

**OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:** x

**PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:** x

**HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:** Gazette 4 March 1977

**APPLICATION LEGISLATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS*:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.27 x S.34 S.38.1 x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HERITAGE VALUES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARITY: ARCHITECTURAL:</th>
<th>Medium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTIVITY: SOCI-HISTORICAL:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENCE: ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL:</td>
<td>Medium – supporting building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRITY: SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETIC: SLAVERY:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLIC CULTURAL:</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATIONAL INTRINSIC:</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE: ARCHAEOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**HERITAGE ANALYSIS**

**SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION**

A simple long barn building with modern scissors trusses and corrugated iron. Large buttresses on north side, south side flanked by service road and fence. Older yard walls remain. Simple holbol end gables.

**MAJOR ALTERATION/S:**

The barn was extensively altered and rebuilt during the most recent renovation work by Visser.

**DATE/S:** 1988/9

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:** Good

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

Though extensively rebuilt in the 80s, the building remains a simple background building on the farm. Its location and form are a key component of the spatial layout.

**PROPOSED GRADING**

IIIC

**OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS:**

Further development on property immediately behind.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The building should be maintained and put to good use. The boundary of the PHS needs to be resolved in terms of the neighbouring property sand measures put in place to mitigate development there.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

**LEGEND:** National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Office building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FARM BUILDING NO</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHYSICAL ADDRESS:** Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

**ARCHITECT/S:** Unknown

**ORIGINAL USE:** SAPO offices

**CURRENT USE:** Vacant

**APPLICATION LEGISLATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:</th>
<th>PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GAZETTE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| S.27 | S.34 | S.38.1 | x |

**HERITAGE VALUES**

Rarity: Architectural: None

Representivity: Socio-Historical: None

Excellence: Environmental/Contextual: None

Integrity: Scientific/Technological: None (plant research by default)

Aesthetic: Slavery: None

Symbolic: Cultural: None

Associational: Intrinsic: None

Age: Archæological: None

**HERITAGE ANALYSIS**

**SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION**

The modern office building was built shortly after the NMC declaration within the declared area. The low pitched run-of-the-ill construction is nondescript at best.

**MAJOR ALTERATION/S:** None

**DATE/S:** -

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:** Good

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**

The building is atypical, intrusive and without any merit.

**UNGRADEABLE**

Opportunity exists for demolition and recovery of significance of the rear werf. The impact of the development behind suggests a simple, pavilion type structure or other landscape mechanism may be needed to order the space and screen the SAPO buildings to the south.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The building should be demolished – an application in terms of Section 27 needs to be made. A heritage informed landscape and design study is to be commissioned for this area before firm plans are put in place.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

LEGEND: National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
### NAME
Manager's house

### FARM BUILDING NO
6

### PHYSICAL ADDRESS:
Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

### ARCHITECT/S:
Flint Associates

### ORIGINAL USE:
Previous house on same site

### CURRENT USE:
Farm manager accommodation

### APPLICATION LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:</th>
<th>PREV. NATIONAL MONUMENT:</th>
<th>GAZETTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.27</td>
<td>x S.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARITY:</th>
<th>ARCHITECTURAL:</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTIVITY:</td>
<td>SOCI-HISTORICAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENCE:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRITY:</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETIC:</td>
<td>SLAVERY:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLIC:</td>
<td>CULTURAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATIONAL:</td>
<td>INTRINSIC:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td>ARCHAEOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE ANALYSIS

#### SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION
This modern but historically styled house was built in 2013 on the site of a demolished twentieth century house. The plans were approved by the local authority without reference to a heritage/Section 27 process. The building is set back form the main line and in mostly visually non-intrusive. The referential detailing is considered not appropriate in a context of great significance such as this.

#### MAJOR ALTERATION/S:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE/S:</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### PHYSICAL CONDITION:
Very good/ new

#### STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:

| Ungradeable |

#### PROPOSED GRADING OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS:
Opportunity exists for mitigation of visual impact through planting and screening.

#### RECOMMENDATION:
A set of guidelines to control “expansion” of the house and spilling out into the surrounding area is required. A detailed heritage informed landscape plan is required to be drawn up and implemented, and is to include this area.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

LEGEND: National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
### NAME
Fleurbaix Core Area & Surrounds

### FARM BUILDING NO
n/a

### PHYSICAL ADDRESS:
Remainder Portion 6 of the Farm Fleurbaai number 1040

### ERF
- 

### ARCHITECT/S:

### ORIGINAL USE:
farm

### CURRENT USE:
farm

### APPLICATION LEGISLATION

### OLDER THAN 60 YEARS:
- x

### HERITAGE OVERLAY ZONE:
- GAZETTE 4 March 1977

### HERITAGE VALUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RARITY:</th>
<th>ARCHITECTURAL:</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REPRESENTIVITY:</td>
<td>SOCIO-HISTORICAL:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCELLENCE:</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL/CONTEXTUAL:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRITY:</td>
<td>SCIENTIFIC/TECHNOLOGICAL:</td>
<td>Low-Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESTHETIC:</td>
<td>SLAVERY:</td>
<td>Medium (unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMBOLIC</td>
<td>CULTURAL:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATIONAL:</td>
<td>INTRINSIC:</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE:</td>
<td>ARCHAELOGICAL:</td>
<td>Medium (unknown)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HERITAGE ANALYSIS

**SITE & STRUCTURE DESCRIPTION**
Representative and significant core buildings, rectilinear “werf” area, tree-lined road and axial link to Eerste River. Part of broader pattern of development along the river to the south of Stellenbosch.

**MAJOR ALTERATION/S:**
Continual over time.

**PHYSICAL CONDITION:**
Good

**STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE:**
The farm and its development pattern reflect the layout of the earliest grants along the Eerste River. The site as a whole has high significance due to the social history of the Roux family as Huguenot settlers in the 18th century, as well as links to Libertas etc.

**PROPOSED GRADING**
II (and buffer area IIIA ) refer to proposed grading map

**OPPORTUNITIES & THREATS:**
Encroaching developments around the farm. Gentrification within. Inappropriate details, plants, materials, forms and references. An opportunity exists to regain significance based on understandings of heritage and landscape significances.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
A detailed heritage-informed built environment and landscape development framework plan should be drawn up, approved and implemented.

*Compulsory confirmation of all Title Deed Restrictions required.

**LEGEND:** National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANCE & SUGGESTED GRADING

- The PHS includes all the buildings on site, and also extends across the now sub-divided portion to the South. The impact of this subdivision on the PHS area is unclear at this stage.

- The survey finds that PHS status is too high for the buildings on the site, primarily due to the extent of changes, adaptations and reconstruction that has taken place, primarily during the ownership and usage by SAPO in the latter part of the last century.

The following gradings are therefore proposed:

- A Grade IIIIB is proposed for the wine cellar.
- A Grade IIIIB is proposed for the slave quarters.
- The more ordinary and extensively altered barn/store building is proposed as a Grade IIIC.
- The modern office block is upgradable/intrusive.
- The manager’s house outside the werf area is ungradable.
- The historic main house is proposed as Grade IIIA, rather than grade II, for the following reasons:
  - the front facade fenestration is essentially a 1989 reconstruction. Reverting to the earlier casement type windows involved extensive alteration to the main facade and loss of layering in terms of contemporary heritage practice and philosophy.
  - the entire roof was rebuilt to earlier thatch roof detailing at the same time.
  - the back gable was added in 1989 and is entirely new.
  - the ordinary c1920 wing, though set back from the main house without visually intruding, is intrinsically not significant enough to be part of a grade II building.
  - the interior detailing by and large is somewhat pedestrian and generic, due to successive restoration approaches that did not imbue the space with a clarity which allows the patina of age and nuances of detailing to be evident.

Notwithstanding these reservations, there is much extremely significant fabric still extant, and worthy of conservation of high order, especially given the attendant high social and cultural significance.

- Despite concerns at a detail and nuanced level, the overall composition, already in evidence by c1800, still retains its core composition and relationship to the wider landscape and to the buildings within it, and this therefore still warrants Grade II status. There is erosion of character within the werf space, but this can be mitigated, and the recognition of the PHS/Grade II status will assist in putting proper guidelines into place.

- A redrawn proposed Grade II area is indicated on fig 57.
- This includes the entire werf and the access road, but excludes the sub-divided area (obviously) and the rather arbitrary 1977 declared area to the north.
- The threats and vulnerabilities in the wider landscape are noted, as is the Raison d’être for the siting and layout of the farm in a linear manner facing the Eerste River. Therefore the remainder of the farm area to the Eerste River is suggested to be Grade IIIA, as a buffer zone to the Grade II core area. There is insufficient intrinsic heritage significance to suggest extending the previous PHS further over the farm area.

![Proposed Grading Map in Terms of the NHRA](image-url)
11. Conclusions and Recommendations

11.1 Broad Conservation Approach: A progressive conservation strategy is to be adopted to avoid the perpetuation of an old-school type of “historical restoration” since that cannot be supported in terms of current heritage practice, either locally or internationally. The principles embodied in, inter alia, the Burra Charter, are to be established and followed.

11.2 Action regarding work previously undertaken to date on site without a Permit from HWC
(No further action by HWC is recommended provided these steps are put in place/ acted on)

- **Landscaping to previously planted areas**: a heritage informed, integrated landscaping assessment and mitigation report is to be prepared, in conjunction with the heritage architect, and submitted to BELCom for approval before any further work on the landscaping takes place. This report is to take cognisance of the proposed grade II area and surrounding vulnerabilities and threats. (See 11.8)

- **Certain gates have been erected**: the detailing of these gates is considered inappropriate in the context and alternate designs/ modifications are to be incorporated in the above integrated landscaping report.

- **Internal renovations were completed to the “Slave Quarters”/ outbuilding**: A heritage architect is to compile a detailed measured drawing including historic fabric assessment. This is to identify the irregular work done in 1989 and 2012, as well as ad-hoc alterations by SAPO over the previous decades. A set of recommendations in terms of any mitigation/ remedial work to recover significance is required to be submitted to BELCom for approval.

- **Following the vacating by the tenant in the wine cellar earlier in 2014, internal office dry wall partitions have been removed, exposing the extensive carving up of the building done in the 1980s/ 1990s**: The removal of the drywall is not certainly not problematic, but it does expose the significant destruction previously caused on opening up the main dividing wall to create a large conference venue (see image at the end of Annexure v). A heritage architect is to compile a detailed assessment report of the wijhuis fabric and set out a heritage framework for the appropriate modification and future usage of this space

- **The rebuilding of the manager’s house (outside the werf area and with full local authority approval) was completed at the end of 2013 – within the PHS area**: A set of guidelines to control “expansion” of the house (i.e., stoeps, pergolas, ad-hoc accretions over time etc) and spilling out into the surrounding area is required. The previously identified detailed heritage informed landscape plan should also assess planting and screening so that this building does not visually intrude when seen from the back werf area.

The Proposed Phase 1 alteration work to the main house is assessed in the next section of this report, but at the broader scale, the following steps and procedures are recommended as a way forward to inform future work and heritage management at Fleurbaix:

- **11.3 Slave history** on the farm is to be researched and written into the record as part of the history of the farm.

- **11.4 A fabric maintenance plan** is to be put in place to ensure correct procedures with regard to maintenance and upgrading of the historic fabric.

- **11.5 The main house should ideally be occupied as a residence and conservation measures put in place which pay due regard to the significance of this house and its key anchoring role in the cultural landscape. Detailed conservation method statements are to be prepared due to the high significance, despite a Grade II status not being proposed**

- **11.6 The boundary of the PHS needs to be clarified in terms of the neighbouring property on the south side and measures put in place to mitigate development there**.

- **11.7 The modern office building** should be demolished – an application in terms of Section 27 needs to be made. A heritage informed design and landscape study is to be commissioned for this area before firm plans are put in place as to whether a structure or building is appropriate in this location.

- **11.8 A detailed heritage-informed built environment and landscape development framework plan should be drawn up, approved and implemented. This is important for the back-werf area as well as the primary area to the front/ North**.

- **11.9 The significant and extended Roux family history in the farming operation is characteristic of successful Stellenbosch wine farmers over time and gaps in knowledge and further historical research should be done to round out the study**.

- **11.10 A historical archaeologist should undertake detailed studies in parallel with these items as required, as well as with specific items on the main house**.

---

13 That is, one which attempts to recreate a former age and which strips away substantial layers of later fabric, and which may attempt to recreate an authentic earlier form, but in the process loses much fabric, invents detailing, and results in something which at best represents design by analogy and at worst, an historical pastiche.
12. **Phase 1 Work: Historic Homestead**

A list of Flint Associates drawings included in this HWC submission is attached at the end of this document. (A copy of the drawings is bound as a separate document) and the existing plans are included as Annexure vi in this volume.

### 12.1 Overview of Proposal

Waterfall Trust purchased the farm in 2012. SAPO, the previous tenant vacated the homestead early in 2014 after having used the building as offices. The first phase work, the alteration of the homestead, is to facilitate its transformation as the residence for the owner and his family. The work essentially re-establishes the homestead as a private residence and is summarised as follows:

- The removal of the kitchen units and walling in the 1920 wing to create a master bedroom.
- The addition of a third doorway in the centre of the north façade of the 1920 (master bedroom wing).
- The building of a pergola leading off this master bedroom.
- New planter, gate and fountain on the bedroom terrace.
- Renovation of the WCs 19th century (in the in-filled west courtyard) as a new bathroom, guest WC and wine store.
- Inserting scullery/ kitchen utility room into the existing room off the agterkamer.
- Modifying doorway in the passage to separate the master suite.
- Inserting low-impact free standing kitchen units (wash stand with prep bowl and free standing electric stove) in the agterkamer space to facilitate a family eat-in kitchen-dining space.
- Interior fit out of the west front room as a library – including new fireplace and chimney.
- Repaving voorstoep and steps.
- New fittings in existing bathroom on east side.
- New pergola to courtyard on east side.
- Removal of external ladder stair on back gable.
- New internal timber staircase in family room.
- Reinstatement of 1989 removed masonry stairs leading up to reinstated west gable loft door, as removed in the Visser era.

### 12.2 Interaction with heritage architect/ heritage practitioner

Various meetings and discussions have been held between the architect Ivan Flint and the heritage practitioner/ heritage architect Mike Scurr. While the broad principle has been supported, guidelines and various adjustments to the design have been suggested and incorporated in the layouts presented now. These include:

- The simplification of the master bedroom suite and the omission of an inner skin with security sliding screens.
- The retention of the back facade 19thC openings and fireplace and not opening up the external facade here.
- The minimal-impact fitting out of the agterkamer space to house a family dining/ kitchen prep area.
- A low impact, steel/ timber floor insertion system for the attic bedroom area to avoid concrete slabs.
- The low visibility positioning of roof-lights.
- The omission of the existing diamond shaped hearth window on the rear facade.

### 12.3 Assessment

- **Building of a rear paved apron**
- **New attic floor over the existing floor, leaving existing beam and ceiling intact**
- **10x new dormer attic windows on inward facing slopes**
- **New bedroom and living room family accommodation in attic**
- **Removal of the fire-hose enclosure on the rear façade**
- **Modification of (1989 era) trusses with diagonal chords to accommodate head room – in lieu of shifting hanebalk up and strengthening truss**

---

14 Similar to the solution devised by Henry Fagan and Partners with Mike Scurr and approved for Klein Constantia in 2013.
• The building of a pergola leading off this master bedroom: An afdak/covering was removed by Visser in 1988. The addition of the pergola is supported, but the detailing of the heavy brick moulded piers needs further testing in order not to compete with the existing building.

• New planter, gate and fountain on the bedroom terrace: supported – subject to detail design. The elements should be as simple and minimal as possible and not be over-formalised.

• Renovation of the WCs (in the 19thC in-filled west courtyard) as a new bathroom, guest WC and wine store – Supported. The WCs that exist are suited for office usage. Detail design layout required for approval.

• Inserting scullery/kitchen utility room into the existing room off the agterkamer. Minimal intervention supported – details of pipe runs etc to be provided.

• Modifying doorway in the passage to separate the master suite. Supported – subject to detail design.

• Inserting low-impact free standing kitchen units (wash stand with prep bowl and free standing electric stove) in the agterkamer space to facilitate a family eat-in kitchen-dining space. Minimal intervention supported – details of pipe runs etc to be provided.

• Interior fit out of the west front room as a library – including new fireplace and chimney. Joinery and chimney supported, but detail should be kept free of historic stylistic reference and avoid confusing history. Details to be provided.

• Repaving voorstoep and steps: Supported, subject to detail design

• New fittings in existing bathroom on east side. Supported, subject to detail design

• New pergola to courtyard on east side. Supported – pergola previously existed here (see Elliot). The pergola beams must not be built into the wall, neat, custom brackets to be detailed and approved.

• Removal of external ladder stair on back gable. Supported.

• New internal timber staircase in family room. Position and concept supported. Detail to be provided for approval.

• Reinstatement of 1989 removed masonry stairs leading up to reinstated west gable loft door, as removed in the Visser era. Supported, subject to detail design and archaeological comment and interaction.

• Building of a rear paved apron. Not supported at this stage – subject to landscaping input and broader consideration of back werf area as a whole.

• New attic floor over the existing floor, leaving existing beam and ceiling intact. Supported, subject to structural engineers input and verification of loading, non-damage to ceiling structure etc. Final detail to be submitted for approval.

• 10x new dormer attic windows on inward facing slopes. Supported. No windows to be allowed on any outward faces of roof. Final details and sizes to be shown on working drawing.

• New bedroom and living room family accommodation in attic. Supported. Working drawings and finishes to be submitted for approval.

• Removal of the fire-hose enclosure on the rear façade. Supported. Fire protection of thatch roof to be checked/put in place.

• Modification of (1989 era) trusses with diagonal chords to accommodate head room – in lieu of shifting hanebalk up and strengthening truss. Supported, subject to structural engineers input and verification of loading, non-damage to ceiling structure etc. Final detail to be submitted for approval.

The following are also to be provided for final approval by HWC prior to implantation:

• Services layouts
• Finishes specifications
• Security measures
• Ceiling detail in loft – extent of thatch is to be maximised.
Conclusion and Recommendation

14.1 A heritage architect is required to oversee the work, provide interim reports to HWC and submit a close-out report to HWC. Any on-site modifications or adjustments requiring HWC approval are to be submitted to HWC in terms of S.27 by the Heritage Architect.

14.2 A structural engineer with demonstrated heritage experience is required to oversee the work. The name and cv of the engineer is to be submitted to HWC for approval.

14.3 A historical archaeologist is required to be appointed to assess the loft stair area to inform the detailing and monitor the excavation works.

14.4 A historical archaeologist is required to assess (together with the heritage architect) the early form of the rear chimney, if this existed, or whether this was added along with the gable in 1989, in order to inform final detailing of the agterkamer / back gable elevation for final submission and approval before any modification to the loft door is done. Back gable door / window opportunity to be investigated and the detail approved.

14.5 The proposed alterations should be approved in principle by HWC, subject to the provision of detailed drawings and design resolutions as noted in 12.3 above. These further detailed drawings will be submitted to HWC for final approval.
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ANNEXURES

Annexure i Copy of Title Deed
III. AS REGARDS the whole of the property on Diagram SG No. 4560/2010:-

A. SUBJECT TO a Notarial Deed of Servitude No. K07/2011S dated 14 September 2011 being a restriction of Rezoning for Development together with ancillary rights, as will more fully appear from the Notarial Deed in favour of:

Portion 7 (a Portion of Portion 6) of the Farm Fleurbaaì No 1040,
Situated in the Stellenbosch Municipality,
Division Stellenbosch,
Province of the Western Cape.
Measuring 3,6552 (three comma six five five two) hectares
Held by Deed of Transfer No T54396/2011.

B. SUBJECT TO a Servitude Furrow, 3 (three) metres wide, the centre line of which is represented by the curvilinear line x y, as shown on Diagram SG No. 4560/2010 in favour of the following property, namely:

PORTION 7 (A PORTION OF) PORTION 6) OF THE FARM FLEURBAAI NR 1040
Situated in the Stellenbosch Municipality
Division Stellenbosch
Province of the Western Cape.
Measuring 3,6552 (three comma six five five two) hectares
Held by Deed of Transfer No T54396/2011.

C. FURTHER SUBJECT TO a Servitude Furrow, 2 (two) metres wide, of which the line x y represents the South Western Boundary, as shown on Diagram SG No. 4560/2010 in favour of the following property, namely:

PORTION 7 (A PORTION OF) PORTION 6) OF THE FARM FLEURBAAI NR 1040
Situated in the Stellenbosch Municipality
Division Stellenbosch
Province of the Western Cape.

Measuring 3,6552 (three comma six five five two) hectares
Held by Deed of Transfer No T54396/2011.

D. FURTHER SUBJECT to a Servitude Road Area, measuring 127 (One Hundred and Twenty Seven) square metres in extent, represented by the figures in as shown on Diagram SG No. 4560/2010 in favour of the following property, namely:

PORTION 7 (A PORTION OF) PORTION 6) OF THE FARM FLEURBAAI NR 1040
Situated in the Stellenbosch Municipality
Division Stellenbosch
Province of the Western Cape
Measuring 3,6552 (three comma six five five two) hectares
Held by Deed of Transfer No T54396/2011.

E. ENTITLED TO a Servitude Furrow, 1 (one) meter wide, the centre line of which is represented by the curvilinear line x y, as shown on Diagram SG No. 4561/2010 annexed to Deed of Transfer No. T. 54396/2011, over favour of the following property, namely:

PORTION 7 (A PORTION OF) PORTION 6) OF THE FARM FLEURBAAI NR 1040
Situated in the Stellenbosch Municipality
Division Stellenbosch
Province of the Western Cape.
Measuring 3,6552 (three comma six five five two) hectares
Held by Deed of Transfer No T54396/2011.

F. The above-mentioned servitudes contained in Paragraph B, C, D and E are subject to following ancillary rights and obligations:

a. The obligation and costs to maintain the respective servitudes above-mentioned in paragraph B, C, D and E shall be for the joint account of the owners of the Servient and Dominant in equal proportions between the two aforesaid properties.

b. The Dominant Owner and Servient Owner, as the case may be, respectively indemnify each other against any damage caused to any of the above-mentioned servitude areas and attributed to the negligence or wilful act or omission of either the Dominant Owner or the Servient Owner.
or its contractors, employees, invitees or visitors, such Party shall pay for
the total costs of repair of the servitude area in question in such an event.
For the avoidance of doubt, the aforesaid obligation does not include
repairs occasioned by normal wear and tear.

c. The Dominant Owner and the Servient Owner, as the case may be,
respectively shall have the right of reasonable access to the Servient
Tenement in question for purposes of maintaining the respective
servitude areas from time to time.

G. The servitudes in above-mentioned Paragraphs B, C, D and E together with the
ancillary rights and obligations contained in Paragraph F will be binding in
perpetuity on the successors in title of the owners of the Servient Tenement and
the Dominant Tenement respectively.

WHEREFORE the Appraiser, renouncing all the right and title the said

SERVAGRO TRADING PROPRIETARY LIMITED

herself had to the premises, did in consequence also acknowledge it to be entirely
dispossessed of, and dispossessed to, the same; and that, by virtue of these presents, the
said

Trustees for the time being of the WATERFALL TRUST

its successors in title or assigns, now are and henceforth shall be entitled thereto,
conformably to local customs; the State, however, reserving its rights, and finally
acknowledging that the purchase price is the amount of R 26,000,000.00 (TWENTY
NINE MILLION RAND).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I, the said Registrar, together with the appearer, have
subscribed to these presents, and have caused the seal of office to be affixed thereto.

THUS DONE AND EXECUTED at the Office of the Registrar of Deeds Western
Cape, at Cape Town on 18 NOVEMBER 2016

Signature of Registrar q.q.
In my presence

REGISTRAR OF DEEDS
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### Annexure iv: TABLE OF PROPERTY TRANSFERS AND LAND EVOLUTION - Fleur Baai and portions of associated property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (dmy)</th>
<th>Reference &amp; Extent</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Jul 1695</td>
<td>SG Dgm No 9/1695</td>
<td>44 Morgen 474 sqa</td>
<td>Referred to in ERF as Fleur Baai No 378 deed No 1/107 VOC Pieter Leveber</td>
<td>Land used by VOC, Grant made by Governor Simon van der Stel. To Pieter Leveber. Name used in grant is Fleur Baay. The parcel of land was surveyed on 12 Oct 1694 Note on document states &quot;for subdivisions of this diagram see outline Stel SV 493&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oct 1701</td>
<td>TD 107</td>
<td>44 Morgen 474 sqa</td>
<td>Referred to in ERF as Fleur Baai No 378 deed No 1/107 Pieter Leveber Johannes Six</td>
<td>States with buildings and all that belongs to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Dec 1702</td>
<td>TD 279</td>
<td>44 Morgen 474 sqa</td>
<td>ERF as Fleur Baai No 378 deed No 279 Johannes Six Frans Hendriks de Raad and Jan Sanders van Upelshoude in equal portions</td>
<td>The neighbours were listed as - to the WSW as Hendrik Alberts, ENE GerritvanderByl, SSE to the hoogte of the land of Nicolas Kleef, NNW to the river and the lands of Hendrik Alberts and GerritvanderByl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Jan 1708</td>
<td>TD 711</td>
<td>44 Morgen 474 sqa</td>
<td>Referred to in ERF as Fleur Baai No 378 deed No 129 Frans Hendriks de Raad and Jan Sanders van Upelshoude Aletta Vermeulen</td>
<td>At some point between these dates, the land was bought by Jan Cloeten. In 1732, he then leaves his widow, GeertruijPretorious &quot;half of the farm in Stellenbosch, at the Eerste River, named Fleur Baaij&quot; (CA MOOC8/5.52). She is the next person registered to have sold that land in the ERF. This parcel of land comprises the NE section as per diagram 7/1736. What happened to the SW section is currently unknown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 31 Jan 1708 and 9 Nov 1736</td>
<td>TD 2344 Diagram 7/1736 Portion 2 and marked A</td>
<td>22 morgen 237sqa</td>
<td>Referred to in ERF as Fleur Baai No 378 deed No 166 Portion 1 G Pretorious Hester teWinkel, widow of Pieter van der Byl</td>
<td>Note on the side of the Deed reads &quot; Portion 2 with the above diagram coloured pink and marked A represents 11 morgen and 190sqr which have been included with the extent about to be transferred in favour of P.R. Roux, deducted 28 July 1863. Note 1. The surveyor was E Cochius. Note 2. The van der Byls may have owned the adjoining farm land (Libertas). Note 3. There is a note after the above entry which states: &quot;Purchaser/Sellers searched cannot trace any further transactions in regards to the remainder of this property as requested in entry No 4. It would appear that at least 2 portions have however been deducted from the remainder as per entry 4 and have been included in the: a. see Stellenbosch Freeholds volume 5/24 Farm 377 b. Farm 389. These deductions are however not reflected in renumbering schedule for Stellenbosch D/C but it is shown on their copy of the diagram of the farm Fleur Baai. This matter will have to be investigated by SGO and necessary adjustments made. NB In view of the above, double registration appears to have taken place in respect of the 2 portions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Oct 1784 or 1786</td>
<td>Farm 380 21/1806</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sited in the transfer deed of 1842. This is new information and has not been researched.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug or Sep? 1786</td>
<td>T163</td>
<td>3 morgen 68sqr</td>
<td>Sited in the transfer deed of 1842. This is new information and has not been researched.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Dec 1818</td>
<td>SQ 4.43</td>
<td>14 morgen 256sqr freehold</td>
<td>79 morgen 334sqr Quitrent Fleurbaay</td>
<td>From Payment slip 7882 dated 7 Jul 1863 – “Received £45 from Paul Ryk Roux being the 3% of the purchase price of certain 2 pieces of land with the buildings situated thereon as part of the place Fleurbaay granted to Paul Roux on 15 December 1818.” and sold to Paul Roux on 1 May 1863 for the sum of £1500 – see entry for 16 July 1863.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (dmy)</th>
<th>Reference &amp;dm</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Erf number and name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Dec 1818</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>149 morgen 430sqr</td>
<td>Farm 379/1</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 July 1824</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 74</td>
<td>113 morgen 44sqr</td>
<td>Farm 390 Consolidated Vlottenberg Annex</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Roux Junior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Jun 1825</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 101</td>
<td>6 morgen 127sqr</td>
<td>Portion 1 of Farm 390</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Andreas Christoffer van der Byl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Jun 1825</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 4231</td>
<td>106 morgen 517sqr</td>
<td>The remainder of Farm 390 Vlottenburg</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Aug 1831</td>
<td>Vol 9 folio 27</td>
<td>70 morgen 175sqr</td>
<td>Farm 388 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Jacobus Petrus Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Nov 1842</td>
<td>Deed 185</td>
<td>75 morgen 303sqr</td>
<td>Fleurbaai part of the place called Vredenburg</td>
<td>Widow of Paul Jacobus Roux</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>&quot;With a piece of freehold and a piece of perpetual Quitrent with the buildings thereon, adjoining thereto measuring 75 morgen 303sqr 22' of freehold and 161 morgen 448sqr 72' of perpetual quitrent land&quot; Bought for £1,250 Note. Deed refers to previous deeds and diagrams of 1736, 5 Sep 1806 and 15 Dec 1818. Conditions of previous deeds stand. There is a mortgage bond Deed 186 that Paul Roux takes from Maria Jacoba van den Berg, the widow of William Octaviuos Atkinson, for £450 against Fleurbaai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jul 1861</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 430</td>
<td>32 morgen 105sqr</td>
<td>Farm 388 Vredenburg but noted as a portion of Farm 389 Vredenburg</td>
<td>John Paul Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>This plot of land is to the North of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Jul 1861</td>
<td>Farm 389 Deed 430</td>
<td>115 morgen 518sqr</td>
<td>Farm 389 Vredenburg</td>
<td>J. C. Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>Comprises: Portion 2 from Vlottenburg 387 – 77 morgen 215sqr 115.2' Portion 1 from Vredenberg 388 – 6 morgen 197sqr. Portion 1 from Vredenberg 383 – 32 morgen 105sqr 100.8'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jul 1863</td>
<td>7822 Deed 44</td>
<td>14 morgen 256sqr</td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai ERF puts the date as 3 Aug 1863</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux (son of Paul Roux)</td>
<td>&quot;a part of the farm Fleur Baai transferred to me (Paul Roux) on 22 November 1842 – dimensions 14 morgen 256sqr freehold and 79 morgen 334sqr Quitrent (together totalling 93morgen 593sqr) as per diagram in the Surveyors office date 1 May 1863. There is also an agreement dated 1 May 1863 that as long as Paul Roux lives, he “may occupy 2 bedrooms and a dining room, and that he has half of the kitchen silverware plus part of the outbuildings and stable, also the other half (of the farm) will keep full rights to water on Tuesday and Friday and it will be allowed to run freely over the above mentioned farm and canal as it is now&quot;. On the 22 July 1863, Paul Ryk Roux takes out a mortgage” for a debt he has taken over” in the sum of £750 from the Reverend Gerhard Terlinden. On the 23 July 1863, Paul Roux acknowledges that his son Paul Ryk Roux is taking over his mortgaged debt to the Reverend Gerhard Terlinden on “2 certain pieces of land with the buildings thereon being part of the farm Fleur Baay” The document is witnessed by J. A. Roux and E. C. Roux On the diagrams included with documents in 7882, the land to the South is shown as Government Land and the Farm Number 380 is shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Jul 1863</td>
<td>Deed 44</td>
<td>68 morgen 284sqr</td>
<td>Farm 379/1 Portion 1</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>Amalgamated into Farm 380. This information is from the ERF register and uses the same deed number as above. The deed number is 7822.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 July 1869</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 432</td>
<td>38 morgen 69sqr</td>
<td>Farm 388</td>
<td>John Paul Roux (deceased)</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux</td>
<td>This plot of land is to the North of the river.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dmy)</td>
<td>Reference &amp; dgm</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Erf number and name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 July 1872</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>Paul Roux appeared before the Notary Public Paul de Villiers in Cape Town on 15 July 1872 and &quot;renounces all and whatsoever right, title and interest had in and to certain 3 bedrooms, half of the kitchen and wine cellar and to a part of the outbuildings and stables belonging to Mr. Paul Ryk Roux referred to in the conditions of sale bearing the date 1 May 1863&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Nov 1882</td>
<td>CA CSC 2/6/1/88</td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>By court order dated 20 Nov 1882, Jacobus Petrus Roux of Libertas is appointed curator of Paul Ryke Roux Senior of Fleurbaai as the son, Paul ryk Roux Junior is under the age of 21 (born 18 Dec 1861).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Jan 1883</td>
<td>CA CSC 2/6/1/88</td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai</td>
<td>Paul Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Junior is appointed curator of his father who is still certified as incapable of running his affairs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Feb 1883</td>
<td>CA MOIB 2/1666</td>
<td>“Approximately 180 morgen”</td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Senior</td>
<td>Numerous creditors</td>
<td>Insolvency sale of the property of Paul RykRox Senior authorised by his son Paul Ryk Roux Junior and listed as: Immovable property - £2750. Movable and stock - £942. = £3692. Debts total £4394, 13 shillings and 10 pence giving a deficit of £702, 13 shillings and 10 pence. The Farm is listed as Fleurbaai with an area of about 180 morgen and with an outstanding mortgage of £1650.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 May 1883</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fleurbaai</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Senior</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Jr. and Johannes Andreas Roux</td>
<td>This deed book is missing and the information is solely from the ERF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Sep 1883</td>
<td>Diagram of the comnonage of the Town of Stellenbosch No 1006</td>
<td></td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Senior and Johannes Andreas Roux</td>
<td></td>
<td>This diagram shows the farms of Fleurbaai, Vredenburg and Vlottenberg along with others to the South and East of the Eerste River. The farm of Libertas which was to the East of Fleurbaai is not shown for some reason.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nov 1883</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736  Deed 253</td>
<td>14 morgen 256sqr freehold 79 morgen 334sqr Quitrent</td>
<td>Insolvent Estate and R P Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux and Johannes Andres Roux</td>
<td>This deed book is missing and the information is solely from the ERF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nov 1883</td>
<td>Deed 253</td>
<td>81 morgen 146 sq</td>
<td>Insolvent Estate and R P Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux and Johannes Andres Roux</td>
<td>This deed book is missing and the information is solely from the ERF.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Jan 1892</td>
<td>Deed 44</td>
<td>Fleurbaai</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux Junior and Johannes Andreas Roux</td>
<td></td>
<td>Document is a declaration that Fleurbaai was a joint asset of the firm they ran as partners called J. A. Roux.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Jan 1892</td>
<td>Deed 44</td>
<td>14 morgen 256sqr freehold 79 morgen 334sqr Quitrent 11 Morgen 47sqr freehold 82 morgen 114sqr Quitrent</td>
<td>Farm 380 Fleur Baai and Farm Vredenburg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux and Jacobus Petrus Roux trading as the firm J P Roux</td>
<td>Petrus Jacobus Roux acting as the sole trustee of the insolvent estate of Paul Ryk Roux and Johannes Andreas Roux carrying on business at Fleurbaai as J. A. Roux, “transferred a certain piece of land with buildings being part of the farm Fleurbaai” to Paul Jacobus Roux and Jacobus Petrus Roux (sons of the late Jacobus Paul Roux and trading as the firm J. P. Roux) as per the diagram of 3 Aug 1863. The power of attorney attached to this deed allows the appearer to additionally transfer “part of the place called Vredenburg…” measuring 11morgen 47sqr freehold and 82 morgen 114sqr quitrent for the sum of £1800.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sep 1895</td>
<td>Deed 5318</td>
<td>72 morgen 486sqr Comprising 13 Portion 1 of the farm Fleurbaai”</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux and Jacobus Petrus</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>The deed states “originally transferred to Paul Ryk Roux Senior on 31 Aug 1863” Bought for £2000.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dmy)</td>
<td>Reference &amp;dgm</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Erf number and name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Sep 1895</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 5319</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr</td>
<td>Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 378/1</td>
<td>The Firm of J P Roux</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Dec 1897</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 11459</td>
<td>38 morgen 69sqr 96.2</td>
<td>Farm 388 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Dec 1897</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 11460</td>
<td>38 morgen 69sqr 96.2</td>
<td>Farm 388 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux</td>
<td>Cornelios Pieter Roux</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Feb 1898</td>
<td>Deed 643</td>
<td>5 morgen 37sqr</td>
<td>380/1/1 Farm 380</td>
<td>Paul Ryk Roux</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux and Jacobus Petrus Roux trading as the firm J P Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Nov 1899</td>
<td>Farm 389 Deed 430</td>
<td>115 morgen 518.5sqr</td>
<td>Farm 389 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Johann Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>Jacobus Petrus Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Jul 1901</td>
<td>Deed 5454</td>
<td>21 morgen 105sqr</td>
<td>380/1 Fleurbaai remainder</td>
<td>Estate of the Late J. P. Roux</td>
<td>Jacobus Paul Roux</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information from this point onwards is from the erf registers, unverified. Should this require verification, further research will be required.

<p>| 9 Jun 1902 | Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 4462 | Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr | Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 | Paul Ryk Roux | Jacobus Petrus Roux | This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry below but share the same deed number. |
| 9 Jun 1902 | Deed 4462 | Shown as remainder 67 morgen 449sqr | Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 remainder | Paul Ryk Roux | Jacobus Petrus Roux | This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry above but share the same deed number. |
| 23 Mar 1903 | Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 3880 | Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr | Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 378/1 | Jacobus Petrus Roux | Thomas Fredrik Brink | This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry below but share the same deed number. |
| 23 Mar 1903 | Deed 3880 | Shown as remainder 67 morgen 449sqr | Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 remainder | Jacobus Petrus Roux | Thomas Fredrik Brink | This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry above but share the same deed number. |
| 24 Sep 1904 | Farm 390 Deed 10981 | Lot 399 - 69sqr Lot 400 – 64sqr | Lots 399 and 400 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg | Paul Jacobus Roux Junior | Elizabeth Bremer (widow) | |
| 24 Sep 1904 | Farm 390 Deed 10982 | Lot 401 - 69sqr Lot 402 – 64sqr | Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg | Paul Jacobus Roux Junior | Johannes Gustav Paur? | |
| 29 Sep 1904 | Farm 390 Deed 10983 | Lot 440 - 168sqr Lot 443 – 70sqr | Lots 440 and 443 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg | Paul Jacobus Roux Junior | Cornelius Nicholas Swart | |
| 24 Sep 1904 | Farm 390 Deed 11692 | Lot 379 - 138sqr Lot 382 – 138sqr | Lots 379 and 382 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg | Paul Jacobus Roux Junior | Hector LouwBys | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Reference &amp; dgm</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Erf number and name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Mar 1904 – must be an error, should be 1905</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 2659</td>
<td>128sqr</td>
<td>28 Mar 1904 – must be an error, should be 1905</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Sydney Doble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Aug 1905</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 7234</td>
<td>Lot 1307 - 97sqr &amp; Lot 1308 – 89sqr</td>
<td>Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Joseph Seratzy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Aug 1905</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 8126</td>
<td>Lot 1309 - 202sqr &amp; Lot 1312 – 20sqr</td>
<td>Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Marais und Santagen?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Nov 1905</td>
<td>Farm 390 Deed 11272</td>
<td>Lot 658A - 70sqr &amp; Lot 665A – 89sqr</td>
<td>Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Colonial Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Sep 1906</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 8587</td>
<td>Lot 1309 - 202sqr &amp; Lot 1312 – 20sqr</td>
<td>Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Colonial Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Oct 1935</td>
<td>Farm 380/1 Deed 9218</td>
<td>21 morgen 105sqr</td>
<td>28 Oct 1935</td>
<td>Jacobus Petrus Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Nov 1941</td>
<td>Farm 380/1 Deed 12505</td>
<td>Lot 1309 - 105sqr</td>
<td>26 Nov 1941</td>
<td>Jacobus Petrus Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Harold Roux</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Mar 1942</td>
<td>Farm 389/1 Deed 2979</td>
<td>Lots 401 and 402 of Farm 390 Vlottenberg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Roux Junior</td>
<td>Colonial Government</td>
<td>Colonial Government</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Dec 1942</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 2980</td>
<td>18.9588 morgen</td>
<td>Farm 389 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Paul Jacobus Petrus Roux</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Roux</td>
<td>Note. The area shown should have been divided in half but this is not reflected in the ERF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date (dmy)</td>
<td>Reference &amp;dgm</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Erf number and name</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Deed 15356</td>
<td>69sqr</td>
<td>Vredenburg</td>
<td>Harold Roux</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr 1944</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 4724</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr</td>
<td>Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 378/1/1</td>
<td>Estate of Thomas Fredrik Brink</td>
<td>AdriaanHesse Brink</td>
<td>Bond 19/117 This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry below but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Apr 1944</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 4724</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 67 morgen 449sqr</td>
<td>Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 remainder</td>
<td>Estate of Thomas Fredrik Brink</td>
<td>AdriaanHesse Brink</td>
<td>This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry above but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Oct 1956</td>
<td>Farm 380/1 Deed 14625</td>
<td>21 morgen 105sqr</td>
<td>380/1 Fleurbaai remainder</td>
<td>Estate of the late AnariesChristoffer van Byl Blake</td>
<td>Robert Gerhardus Blake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mar 1965</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 6758</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr</td>
<td>Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 378/1/1</td>
<td>AdriaanHesse Brink</td>
<td>Fleurbaai (Endoms) Bipert White Group</td>
<td>C90/127. This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry below but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Mar 1965</td>
<td>Deed 6758</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 67 morgen 449sqr</td>
<td>Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 remainder</td>
<td>AdriaanHesse Brink</td>
<td>Fleurbaai (Endoms) Bipert White Group</td>
<td>C90/127. This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry above but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb 1966</td>
<td>Dgm No 7/1736 Deed 2011</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 11 morgen 47sqr</td>
<td>Portion 1 of Farm Fleur Baai No 378/1/1</td>
<td>SVT</td>
<td>Fleurbaai (Endoms) Bipert White Group</td>
<td>Folio 1040/1. This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry below but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Feb 1966</td>
<td>Deed 2011</td>
<td>Shown as remainder 67 morgen 449sqr</td>
<td>Farm Fleur Baai No 380/1/1 remainder</td>
<td>SVT</td>
<td>Fleurbaai (Endoms) Bipert White Group</td>
<td>Folio 1040/1. This information is from the ERF register and a different farm number to the entry above but share the same deed number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Nov 1973</td>
<td>Farm 388 Deed 36614</td>
<td>32.644Ha</td>
<td>Farm 388 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Tielsman Johannes Heethling</td>
<td>VredenburgBoerderyBelange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Oct 1974</td>
<td>Farm 389/1 Deed 35983</td>
<td>84.7141Ha</td>
<td>Farm 389/1 Vredenburg</td>
<td>Johan Wilhelm Roux</td>
<td>GoedvertrouBioerdery (Eindoms) Beperk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annexure v
Fabric survey – Collated Image Sheets
Landscaping
N-E garden area (2012 work)
Intrusive modern gates (2013)
"Slave Quarters"- renovated internally in 2012 – cold rooms etc removed and guest/ staff accommodation created.
Main house
Main house interior
Wijnhuis
Dry-walls removed 2014 to expose earlier opening up of main walls.
Store/ garages

New managers house -2013

Office building
Annexure vi: Measured Plans Homestead and Wijn-huis
Annexure vii: Measured plans Wine Cellar
Gibbs Saint Pol - Cultural Landscape Statement of Significance

A much later “office building” is situated between the shed and kraal. It should be noted that the farmstead buildings are linear rectangular forms, arranged parallel to the proportions of the werf, reinforcing the spatial gesture. Extending from the gable of the homestead building is an axial pathway, perpendicular to the werf, which connects the farmstead to the Eerste River. This has been replanted as an avenue. By virtue of its central position and elaborate entrance gable, the homestead is clearly intended to dominate the composition. The flanking buildings have only end gables, and are balanced about the central axis running through the homestead gable.

As yet recent landscape intervention within the werf has been limited to tree planting (the appropriateness of this pattern needs further investigation) and the introduction of a vegetable and herb garden into the former kraal space. Any further intervention (including proposed terracing) should not be allowed to sub-divide the space, but should seek to maintain the sense of linearity, simplicity and spatial contiguity. Should terracing be required, “soft” lawn embankments would be preferable to vertical retaining walls. No additional “werf” walls should be introduced into this space. Recent landscape interventions below the werf include dry-packed stone walls, contemporary pergola structures and sculptures, rose gardens and orchard plantations; as well as new plastered and painted marble “werf” walls and circular ponds. As new interventions should not attempt to mimic historic patterns (as this compromises the integrity of the historic complex), the dry-packed stone walls and steel pergola elements are not inappropriate in their materiality, however the layout of the pattern is somewhat self-referential, and does not relate architecturally to the existing buildings of the werf. Some of the structures appear over-designed and somewhat heavy-handed. The new reflection pond interrupts the perpendicular axis to the river, and is also self-referential in form. The new gateways seem exaggerated and overly elaborate in proportion. The new “werf” walls below the orchard and flanking the access road seem to compromise the balance of the werf composition (especially when viewed from the river), and introduce visually dominant foreground elements which detract from the prominence of the homestead.

Some lost opportunities include lack of celebration of crossing water and lack of visual termination of the perpendicular avenue (for example - simple gate posts would anchor the vista). No heavy infrastructure or road engineering should be considered within the 1:30 year floodline of the Eerste River, and only low-order pathways or farm access roads should be allowed.

In summary, Fleurbaai has significance as a cultural landscape by virtue of the relationship between the buildings of the werf to the werf space collectively forming the werf complex; the relationship between this werf complex and its surrounding farmland, and the connection between the werf complex to the Eerste River.

Certain contemporary interventions have clouded the clarity for the werf diagram to a certain degree, but are not irreparable, and can be mitigated. To this end a further landscape study should be undertaken, flowing from which detailed recommendations for integrating the contemporary installations congruently into the historic complex can be developed. We trust this information is in order.

Sincerely with thanks,

[Signature]

David Gibbs PlArch (SA) # 20128

Mark Saint Pol PlArch (SA) # 20201
Annexure ix: MunnikVisser Black Fish & Partners: Dirk Visser report dated 8 March 1989
Wynkelder - Blok 3:

Die ou wynkelder is omstreeks 1925 vergroot met 'n aanbou aan sy suidekant. Die opdrag was om konferensiefasilité by die werv te voorval vir +/- 200 persone. Hierdie fasiliteit moet ook dien as onthaalruimte. Hierdie dubbelle gebou bied die minste plek waar so 'n fasiliteit voorval kan word. Die muur tussen die ou kelder en die 1925 bou is dus gedeeltelik verwys om 'n groot ruim te skep op twee vloervlakke. Hierlangs is 'n dienekamer linge en die res van die ou kelder dien as ontvangs en portaal. Uiterlik is die gebou volledig gerestaurerer behalwe dat die dak sink is, nie riu nie. Die nuwe pleister gewel Dengemnetjie van 1925 is behou.

Blok 4:

Ons het streng aanbevel dat hierdie gebou gesluit moet word aangesien ons glo dit nooit op hierdie plek gebou was geweest het nie. SAPU het eers die akkommodasie nodig en die gebou sal behou bly vir die voorvalbare toekoms.

Seun - Blok 5:

Hierdie gebou word aangepas om te dien as kantoorruimte. Waaier aan is dit van houts toelat gearstuur en met die egewens gebou en van eise style op die helling en hoogte van die oorspronklike riet dak voorval. Aangesien dit in 'n huis voorst wou stand was in twee hale teen die Hoorn tuur aangebring oorheurlik aan die van die Suid-Oostelike gewel van die huis. Toegang tot die werkruim wat aan die suidekant en buitekant die historiese werv.

TEGGEN

Die plat dak aanbouing teen die oostelike wervmuur word verwys as die suur muur waar dit reeds ingesleg was. Die poorte is die Westerlike wervmuur wat verkool was en nou weer op die oorspronklike spotter in die lig van fondamentrestoratie wat ondergronds gevind is. Binne die kraal sal met storting van dakkies aangebring word vir onderdak partying. Hierdie sal niet van hout sigbaar wees nie. Die hoenderhek word gerestaurer, maar die smaak van die oures word weer as waar 'n paar hoenders daar aan te bou nie. 'n Bespuitende formule tuin word voor die voorhuis tussen die twee toegangspoort aanplante.

Die use

MONNIK VISSER BLACKFISH & PARTNERS

3183M2/2V/cv
Annexure x: Record of consultation with Interested and Affected Parties

To follow
SEPARATE VOLUME:

Flint Associates – Drawing: Proposed Alterations to Homestead (Phase 1 work)

Latest Flint Associates drawings for HWC Submission received (2014-08-14)

L1.01 Overall estate/ site plan
L1.02 Historic Werf plan
L1.03 Roof plan
L1.04 Ground storey (with library 104)
L1.05 Attic Storey
L1.06 NE & SW Elevations
L1.07 NW & SE Elevations
L1.08 Sections A-A and F-F
L1.09 Sections B-B and E-E
L1.10 Sections C-C and D-D
L4.16 East Courtyard - Plan
L4.17 East Courtyard - East facing elevation
L4.18 East Courtyard - Section A-A
L4.19 East Courtyard - Location Photo's
L4.20 Library - Plan
L4.21 Library - Elevations
L4.22 Library - Location photo's
L4.23 Cross sections
L4.24 Attic Stair - plan and elevation
L4.25 Attic Stair - location photo's
L4.26 West Terrace - Plan
L4.27 West Terrace - Elevation A Facing South
L4.28 West Terrace - Elevation B Facing West
L4.29 West Terrace - Location Photo's
L4.30 Agterkamer - Layouts
L4.31 Agterkamer - Location and precedent