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INTRODUCTION & SUMMARY - Purpose of the Report
This report draws heavily on the Heritage Significance Report that accompanied the Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) application to Heritage Western Cape, as required under Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).

The Response to the Notification of Intent to Develop (RNID), dated the 24th August 2015, called for an HIA, “assessing the impacts on the heritage resources which have been identified” (see Annexure A). Presumably, the RNID refers to those heritage resources identified in the NID itself, as well as the accompanying Heritage Significance Report. The RNID also called for an integrated set of recommendations to be formulated.

The heritage aspects of the site have been addressed with the City Officials, in particular Ms. Harriet Clift, from the earliest stages of the project. As a result, an extensive amount of work had already been undertaken related to the potential heritage significance of the site – particularly its archaeological significance – prior to the submission of the RNID. In informal discussions with the heritage officers, the following was established:

1. The primary concern was one of built environment and contextual response of the new development to the surrounding, HPOZ context. This provided a quandary for the project team, as the application at this stage is for rezoning and subdivision only, and not the development of the site. It may be that the developers choose to sell on the individual erven for the new owners to develop. Therefore, the only way around this was to develop design guidelines for the new scheme, which could be “sold on” with the individual erven.

2. Secondly, although Claire Abrahamse prepared the NID document, in this particular scheme she is acting Urban Designer, and so formulated the design guidelines. She also compiled the bulk of this report, which stems from the heritage report she prepared to accompany the NID. Therefore, it was discussed with the Acting Director of HWC that, in order to maintain independence, a separate heritage professional should assess the report prepared by Ms. Abrahamse, and their independent conclusion and recommendation should form the primary assessment. This would then be considered to be sufficiently independent. Mr. Michael Scurr (Professional Architect and Heritage Specialist) was approached, and agreed to review the documentation prepared by Ms. Abrahamse (Sections 1 to 5 of this report) and submit his own assessment of heritage impacts as Section 6.

This report outlines and documents that process, as well as noting the history of the site, describing the heritage significance of the site (including the contextual significance of the HPOZ), and outlining design guidelines that have been developed in order to ensure a sensitive response to the context.

The proposed plan of subdivision (including rezoning, see page 13) has been extensively advertised to neighbours, ratepayers and in the press. The comments of the Ratepayers and the Heritage Branch of the City of Cape Town are attached as Annexure F.
1) PROPERTY LOCATION, DESCRIPTION AND BRIEF HISTORY OF THE WIDER SITE

Erf 28176 is located in the Southern Suburbs of Cape Town, and measures 6947 (Six Thousand Nine Hundred and Forty Seven) square metres. The size of the erf was the trigger for the submission of a NID. The property is situated in the suburb of Mowbray, on the corner of Molenvliet and Strubens Roads, while the N2 runs immediately to the south of the site at a lower level. The Liesbeek River runs a few hundred metres to the east of the site, with the historic Coornhoop farmstead located between the subject site and the river.

The site is currently used for two bowling greens and a club house for the Jagger’s Bowling Club, who are also the owners of the land. The bowling club membership has diminished in recent years and the members no longer have need for two bowling greens, hence their intention to subdivide the site and to rezone the smaller green in order to allow for the development of housing on this portion, with the intention that this development might financially sustain the club in the decades to come. See Figure 1.1 and 1.2: locality plan and site plan.

In terms of the history of the site, it formed part of the land that Governor Jan van Riebeeck granted along the Liesbeek River between February 1657 and February 1658 to fourteen freeburgers, for them to farm and thus supplement the produce harvested from the Company’s Gardens to supply the ships rounding the Cape en route to the East.

Because of conflict with the Khoi, who had used this land for seasonal grazing for centuries prior, van Riebeeck was forced to build a row of little forts, or redoubts, along the Liesbeek River to protect the settlers. He decided to locate one of these forts at Coornhoop and, bearing in mind that the free burghers were expected to devote time to the growing of wheat, called it “Fort Coornhoop”. See Figure 1.3.

On 9th July, 1657, the Commander personally selected the site for the fort. Workmen were transferred from the Fort of Good Hope and building commenced at the end of the month. The fort, which measured 5 metres square, was built of brick on stone foundations and had a wooden barricade at the top. By the end of September it had been completed, and Corporal Hendrik van Surwerden and trooper Elbert Dirkz van Eninerick were ordered to man it. When war was declared against the Khoi in May 1659, instructions were given that in case of danger, women and children were to take refuge in Coornhoop. See Figure 1.4.

The fort was abandoned as early as 1661, and the farm Coornhoop, “with everything that has been built upon it”, was granted on 2nd March 1664, in quitrent-tenure to M. Coninck. In the following year Coninck sold it to Tielman Hendrix, who was killed by Khoi pastoralists in 1673. After that the land changed hands frequently. When it came into the possession of Servaes van Breda in 1797, the old H-shaped house (of which only the back portion survives) as well as the dovecot and the adjoining wine-cellar must already have been very old. It was probably Van Breda who added several gables to the buildings and made the farmstead into one of the finest in the peninsula. See Figure 1.5. During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as suburbanisation occurred in the area, the farm became more and more neglected and one building after the other was demolished. See Figure 1.6.

In 1890, the portion of land behind the farm werf, including the subject site, was subdivided off from the main Coornhoop land, and was sold to mining magnate Harry Strubens. In 1920, Strubens sold the subject site on to industrialist and Member of Parliament, John William Jagger, who established a sports ground on the subject site. The use has continued to the present day, although in 1980 the land was sold to the Jaggers Bowling Club and the condition that the land be used only for recreation was removed (see title deed).

The site, and the neighbouring Coornhoop werf, were significantly impacted by the construction of the Settlers’ Way/N2 highway in the 1960s. Only the dovecot with its front elevation survived from the original farm, and this dovecot, which is unique in Cape architecture and the purest example in terms of its classical proportions, was proclaimed as a monument in 1966 (see Gazette attached).

Therefore, the subject site is not subject to any formal heritage protection as part of this process, having been subdivided off from the Coornhoop werf site many years prior to the National Monument Proclamation of the dovecot.
FIGURE 1.1 - Locality Plan

Legend:
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- Semi-Private Buildings
- Private Green Space
- Public Green Space
- Primary Routes
- Secondary Routes
- Potential Pedestrian Links
- Jammer Shuttle Routes & Stoops
- Recreational Parks
- Pedestrian Subways
- 3 Minute Walking Radius (400m)
- UCT Facilities

1. Mowbray Town Hall
2. Mowbray Baptist Church
3. Mowbray Church
4. St Peter’s Church
5. Mowbray Methodist Hospital
6. Mowbray Presbyterian Church
7. Theresiahlu Secondary School
8. Public Pool
9. Groote Schuur
10. The Church of Jesus Christ
11. Observatory Preparatory School
12. Observatory Community Centre & Facilities
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FIGURE 1.2 - Site Plan
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FIGURE 1.2B - Site Panoramas

View of the bowling green and clubhouse, to be retained by the Jaggers Bowling Club as their practice ground.

View towards the east from the wall between the two bowling greens, showing surrounding houses. A glimpse of the back elevation of Coornhoop can be seen to the centre of the photograph.
View of the bowling green to be subdivided off, from the east (top) and the west (bottom).
FIGURE 1.3 - Fortifications c1661, from Dan Sleigh (pg 128).

FIGURE 1.4 - Drawing of Coornhoop Fort, by Mervyn Emms.

FIGURE 1.5A - Early photograph of the Coornhoop werf.

FIGURE 1.5B - Reconstruction of the Coorhoop werf (Hislop, 2014).
FIGURE 1.6 - Analysis of the Development of the Site from 1889 until 2000.

1889
The Southern Railway line to Malmesbury is already built (via Malmesbury). The eastern side of the railway line remains relatively rural with Koomhoo, Westco & Malmesbury remaining as agricultural homesteads. On the western side of the railway, urbanisation has begun, indicated by the seeming densification along Main Road and the formalisation of some streets. The waterway running north of the site is still exposed.

1. Main Road to Simmons Farm
2. Mowbray Train Station
3. Informal roads
4. Exposed waterway from Groot’s Peak to the Linsbeck River
5. Koomhoo Homestead
6. Westco Homestead
7. Malmesbury Homestead
8. Linsbeck River

1035
Urbanisation along the Main Road continues with the erection of prominent, civic structures such as the Mowbray Town Hall and Mowbray Public School (just after the turn of the century). Many more roads have been formalised and the waterway along the northern boundary of the site has now been diverted underground into a storm water culvert. On this eastern side of the railway, rapid urbanisation has taken place with the development of several row houses (namely Baker’s Row) and single-storey free standing houses. The agricultural use of the land is diminishing.

1. Mowbray Town Hall
2. Mowbray Public School
3. Mowbray Presbyterian Church
4. Baker’s Row Houses
5. Free Standing Single Storey Dwellings
6. Coorhoo Homestead
7. Westco Homestead
8. Malmesbury Homestead
9. Linsbeck River
FIGURE 1.6 - Analysis of the Development of the Site from 1889 until 2000.

**EARLY 1960’s**

Besides further densification on both the east and west sides of the railway line, the prominent changes of the 60’s were decidedly infrastructural. A new key artery into the centre of Cape Town, the N2 (Settler’s Road) was built, which now forms the southern boundary of the site in question. In conjunction with this, was the development of Liebenberg Parkway, an important roadway designed to service the increasing suburbanisation on the eastern side of the railway. Furthermore, large sections of the Liebenberg River were canalised.

1. N2 Settler’s Way (a portion of Baker’s new houses were demolished)
2. Liebenberg Parkway
3. Liebenberg River
4. Jaggars Bowling Club
5. Coenraad Homestead
6. Wentor Homestead
7. Holroyd Homestead

**2000 ONWARDS**

All roadways are now established and the Mowbray Transport interchange is underway with taxi rank, bus terminus and train station. Most residential development on the eastern side of the railway remains with only slight alteration and green densification. On the western side of the railway free residential establishments remain, with increased commercial, educational and civic amenities.

1. Mowbray Transport Interchange
2. CPIT Mowbray Campus
3. Denneker College
4. Public Pool
5. Coenraad Homestead
6. Wentor Homestead
7. Melonrood Homestead
8. Liebenberg River
2) DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL:
The intention is to subdivide the subject site into two portions: the larger section will include the bowling green closest to Molenvliet Road, the clubhouse, the parking area and the borehole, water tank and maintenance sheds. It will measure 3961 square metres in extent.

The smaller section will consist of the second bowling green, which is closest to Settlers’ Way. The smaller section shall be subdivided into 12 residential plots and one private road. These portions shall be rezoned from Community Zone (CO1) to Single Residential (SR1) to allow for the proposed development.

The proposed area of the 12 new residential erven is comparable with numerous of the surrounding properties, both abutting the subject site and across the street from it. The average area of each new erf shall be 200 square metres, and a semi-detached/closely spaced housing typology shall be utilized in order to conform to the character and grain of the existing residential fabric.

Access to the 12 houses shall be taken via Strubens Road, with a private road running through the middle of the site. Each erf will have its own off-street parking.

Further, the area is well serviced and the subject site will be able to make use of existing infrastructure. The civil engineer has confirmed that the services in Strubens Road are at a sufficient depth to allow for drainage and other trenching to occur within the private road, and therefore no service runs will be required across the remaining portion of the site (the remaining bowling green).

See Figure 2.1: drawing indicating the proposed subdivision of the smaller portion of land into 12 plots and a private road.
3) DESCRIPTION OF THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDS

A) Historical Significance of the Site as part of Coornhoop Farm, and its later Subdivision and Suburbanisation

The subject site was once part of the historic Coornhoop farm. Coornhoop is one of the oldest land grants in South Africa. It was first granted in 1661 to Thielman Hendricks as part of the VoC’s project to grant 14 freeburghers land along the Liesbeek River in order to supplement the produce the Company’s Garden was growing to supply Dutch ships en route to the East.

Coornhoop was named for the large grain store the VoC had erected on the farm, which at the time stretched roughly from Durban Road in Mowbray to Station Road in Observatory, and between the Liesbeek River and the present Main Road (Hislop, 2014: 18).

Both Hislop and Robinson note that the freeburger farms were part of a contested frontier between the land the Dutch had claimed, and the land the Khoi had been seasonally grazing for millennia. As a result, there were many skirmishes between the farmers and the Khoi during the first years of settlement (from 1657) and so the VoC decided to build a redoubt, or fort, overlooking the fields of Coornhoop and the other Liesbeek farms (Hislop, 2014: 28).

Emms notes that in 1657 van Riebeeck selected a site for this redoubt, on a small hill situated on the Rosebank side of what is now Durban Road - “roughly on the site of the present Mowbray Nursing Home” (Emms, 2010: 25-26). As part of his mapping of the historic fortifications of the First Frontier War between the Dutch settlers and the Khoi, Dan Sleigh also locates the Coornhoop Redoubt in this area (see figure 3.A.1, adapted from Sleigh, 1982).

Hislop notes that “the redoubt was built of stone and bricks, about five metres square, and had two storeys, so anyone standing on the top wooden platform could see from the sea all the way to van Riebeeck’s farm Boscheuvel (now Bishopscourt). Protective measures included an overhanging parapet with two cannons, which had been taken from the ship Maria in 1658” (2015: 28, see figure 3.A.2).

The history of the transfer of the Coorhoop farm and its subdivision has been extensively documented by Fransen (2004), Hislop (2014) and others, and does not require repeating here, save to say that by the early 1800s the farm werf had been transformed from a collection of fairly crude settler structures into a fine complex, with 15 gables on its numerous outbuildings, and with a two storeyed dovecot that echoed the architectural detailing of the finest Cape Town townhouses of the day, and formed a central axis, flanked by two simpler barn structures (Fransen, Hislop - see figure 3.A.3).

The significance of the dovecot was recognised in the December 1966 National Monument declaration of the structure. It must be noted that none of the other historic buildings on the property enjoy National Monument protection (see a copy of the declaration, annexed to this report - Annexure B).

The pressures of suburbanisation meant that by the end of the 19th Century, farming had largely ceased along this section of the Liesbeek, including at Cornhoop. Mining magnate Harry Strubens purchased Coornhoop and neighbouring Westoe and Molenvliet in 1890, and he went on to demolish part of the old Cornhoop farmhouse and to reuse some of the timber at his house, Strubenholm, now UCT’s College of Music (Hislop, 2014: 20). Strubens Road was named after him, and he also commissioned Sir Herbert Baker to design the Victorian rowhouses on the western side of that street.

In 1920, the subject site, which had been subdivided off from the main Cornhoop werf as part of the 1890 transfer to Strubens, was transferred to John William Jagger, a local businessman and politician. Born in Britain, Jagger migrated to South Africa in 1883, setting up an importation business in 1886 with Albin Fleming and eventually expanding this to the Transvaal after the discovery of gold there. Later the two men began building factories and manufacturing goods themselves, and J.W. Jagger & Co became a large and profitable enterprise with branches across South Africa and also in Britain, Europe and the US. Jagger was active in public life as part of various South African chambers of commerce, and also funded and promoted various educational initiatives. Jagger served as an MP from 1910 until 1929 when he retired, and was a particularly active proponent of Union of South Africa (The Olive Schreiner Letters Online, https://www.oliveschreiner.org/vre?view=personae&entry=249).
He established a **sports ground and clubhouse on the subject site in 1922**, creating a condition in the title deed that limited the use of the land to sports and recreation only. This condition has since been removed (see title deed annexed to this report).

The usual pattern of subdivision followed, and the extent of Coornhoop was much reduced. In 1959 the southern part of the land of the core Coornhoop farmstead and the subject site (already subdivided off) was deduced in order to make way for Settlers’ Way highway. Luckily, the Simon van der Stel Foundation intervened at Coornhoop and purchased what remained of the farm werf, but tragically they could not save two historic barns from demolition in order to make way for the highway. One of these barns was the original, 1657 VoC corn store.

On the subject site, the Jaggers’ Bowling Club took transfer of the property in 1980, and have owned it ever since (see title deed annexed to this report - Annexure C).

It should be noted that the subject site has never been part of any National Monument declaration related to the Coornhoop property, as its subdivision from the main farm predates the heritage protection of the werf by some 76 years.

Therefore, the heritage significance of the site is largely historical and associational, mainly due to being historically associated with the Coornhoop Farm, and with the influential business men Harry Strubens and John William Jagger.

### B) Archaeological Significance of the Site, and its History as a Sporting Venue

The significance of J.W. Jagger has been discussed above, and it was he who established a sports ground on the subject site in 1922. Very few historical reports have been uncovered related to the Jaggers sports ground, but the 1945 aerial photography indicates a square-shaped marking on the site, as well as markings of what is clearly a soccer pitch.

When discussing this historic photography with the City Of Cape Town Heritage Section Archaeologists, Ms. Harriet Clift and Mr. Troy Smuts, the possibility of the shape being a tracing of the old Coornhoop Redoubt was raised. The alternate possibility was that the shape represented the markings of a baseball diamond. Both possibilities were explored in detail prior to the submission of the NID to HWC, and a summary of each exploration is included below.

- **The Archaeological Exploration of the Site as the Location of the Coornhoop Redoubt.**

Despite the fact that Emms and Sleigh both locate the old Coornhoop Redoubt at the current Mowbray Maternity Hospital site, it was suggested by Clift and Smuts that Jaco Boshoff at Iziko should be approached, together with UCT archaeology students, in order to undertake a survey of the site using a magnetometer, and thus either confirm or rule out the existence of the foundations of a fort below the current surface level.

This was duly done on the 10th September 2014, although the results were inconclusive, with Dr. Boshoff noting: “I include a contour map of the survey. It was somewhat inconclusive. You will see that the centre of the field was pretty blank - it could have something to do with the crushed glass that was laid below the grass when the green was constructed. This could block the magnetic signal. On the edges you can see the disturbances caused by the power line on one side and the big steel tank on the other side”.

See figure 3.B.1, 3.B.2, 3.B.3 and 3.B.4 for the images generated by Dr. Boshoff’s data.

The data was then sent on to Mr. Paul Cavalier at the Department of Archaeology and Department of Electrical Engineering at UCT for further
analysis, and he noted: “I did some treatment here, to see only the small variations (signal above 25000 nT only to get rid of big interferences), and see if they correspond to some kind of magnetic source. So far I don’t see anything identifiable.

There seems to be a slightly stronger area in the middle (that I flagged in a picture), if it corresponds to the co-ordinates of the clearer area of the aerial pictures there might be some correlation, but as you say its pretty much inconclusive.”

See figure 3.B.5 and 3.B.6 for the diagrams that resulted from this further analysis.

The correspondence related to the archaeological significance of the site is included as an annexure to this report (see Annexure D).

In conclusion, the archaeological analysis of the site was inconclusive.

- The Historical Exploration of the Site as a Location for Baseball and Softball in the Mid-20th Century

The standard dimensions of a baseball and softball pitch were determined, and scaled onto the 1945 aerial photograph. Through this exercise, it appeared extremely viable that the markings are as a result of a baseball diamond on the site, which is further iterated by the fact that the grounds have historically been used for recreational purposes (see Figure 3.B.7).

Research was undertaken into the history of baseball in Cape Town, and specifically at Mowbray, and evidence of two baseball teams originating in Mowbray around the time the aerial photograph was taken (The Dynamos & The Mowbraves) was uncovered, and further reference made to practices held at the Suburban Rugby Union Mowbray Fields (no address or precise location could be ascertained). Another reference was made to practices held at grounds adjacent to a UCT property in Rosebank. Aerial photography of the same series (1945) was uncovered for this location, and a comparison made between the different field markings (see figure 3.B.8). It seems clear that the two photographs show identical field markings, and it should again be noted that they are part of the same 1945 flight series and are shown at the same scale. What this may allude to is the presence of a baseball- and softball-playing community within the area, and the fact that numerous recreational facilities may have been located in the vicinity.

Lastly, members of the Western Province Baseball Association were contacted regarding any historical knowledge among the older members of a baseball and softball pitch on the site in the 1940s. One of the members, Brian Lombard, who is over 80 years of age, responded and said; “That was the old Jaggers Field, still in place when I was a kid. I know that it was used for baseball, I think by Clyde [baseball team] initially”. Mr. Lombard grew up in the Mowbray area (see the email correspondence attached as an annexure to this report - Annexure E).

Based on the above, it seems that sufficient evidence has been provided to conclude that the markings are far more likely to be of a baseball or softball pitch, and not of the historic Coornhoop Redoubt. Therefore, the archaeological significance of the site should be considered to be consistent with that of all the surrounding properties. Monitoring of any bulk earthworks by an archaeologist should be undertaken, as a precaution.
C) Contextual Significance of the Environs of the Site

The site is located on the very edge of the Observatory Heritage Protection Overlay Zone, which on the eastern side of the railway line extends from Collingwood Road to Settlers’ Way (Figure 3.C.1).

In general, the area is characterised by middle-income suburban residential fabric of various ages, dating from c1902 to c2000. Generally, all houses are no taller than two stories, and many are semi-detached. All of the early 20th Century building fabric has some kind of stoep element that addresses the street edge, as well as a small garden with established shrubbery and trees, while the more modern development is sadly lacking in this type of architectural articulation (3.C.2 and 3.C.3). There is little in the way of street trees or planting patterns in the area, and the roads are quite wide (3.C.4).

The protected and historically significant structures in the vicinity of the site are indicated on the diagram, Figure 3.C.5. Aside from the National Monument/Provincial Heritage Sites at Coornhoop, Westoe and Molenvliet, the most significant structures are the c1902 Victorian Villas designed by Sir Herbert Baker for Harry Strubens (3.C.6 and 3.C.7).

These buildings form a unique and consistent streetscape on one side of Strubens Road, and are remarkably intact. There is no doubt that they would be considered worthy of a Grade IIIA heritage grading. All other buildings would variously be considered Grade IIIC, or ungradable.

The site itself, as an open space, is a unique element within the surroundings, but its proposed development into a series of fine grained residential plots is not foreign to the general character of the area, and so should be seen to be an appropriate proposal within the HPOZ. The guidelines that follow have been developed in order to try and ensure coherence between the new development and the existing residential fabric surrounding the site.
FIGURE 3.A.1 - Map of the 1661 Fortifications overlaid onto contemporary aerial photography.
FIGURE 3.A.1 - Map of Dan Sleigh’s line of fortifications in the Cape, scaled over the current alignment of river and roads.
FIGURE 3.A.1 - Map of Mervyn Emms' line of fortifications in the Cape, scaled over the current alignment of river and roads.
FIGURE 3.A.2 - Drawing of Coornhoop Fort, by Mervyn Emms.

FIGURE 3.A.3 - Dovecot at Coornhoop, which is a NM (J. Szymanowski, Wikicommons).

FIGURE 3.B.1 - Contour Map of the site, showing points at which readings were taken and resultant disturbances (J. Boshoff).
FIGURE 3.B.2 - Contour Map of the site, showing magnetic disturbances that were recorded (J. Boshoff).

FIGURE 3.B.3 - The same data with 3D projection (J. Boshoff).

FIGURE 3.B.4 - The red fields indicate the disturbances due to the location of the overhead powerlines and the metal water storage tank (J. Boshoff).
Baseball diamond at the Western Province Showgrounds, now the UCT astroturf, taken as part of the 1945 aerial photographic series of the area. Welgelegen can be seen to the left of the field.

Baseball diamond at the Jaggers fields, orientated slightly off north to show similarity with the image above.

This photograph was taken as part of the same 1945 aerial photographic series and is therefore to scale with the above image.

FIGURE 3.B.5 and 3.B.6 - The same data analysed at a more detailed level (P. Cavalier).

FIGURE 3.B.8 - Comparison between the baseball diamond at Welgelegen and the one at Jaggers, both c 1945.
FIGURE 3.B.7 - Scaled baseball diamond, drawing up in AutoCAD and scaled onto the 1945 aerial photography.
FIGURE 3.C.1 - Heritage Protection Overlay Zone, with the site indicated in purple.

FIGURE 3.C.2 - The historic houses in the vicinity have a positive relationship with the street edge.

FIGURE 3.C.3 - The modern town houses along the eastern boundary of the subject site lack this architectural refinement.
Historic farmstead axes now roughly mirrored in street layout

FIGURE 3.C.5 - HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE VICINITY OF THE SITE.

LEGEND
- Declared heritage buildings in Mowbray
- Buildings with heritage value in Mowbray
- Historic farmstead axes now roughly mirrored in street layout

1. Windermere Homestead
2. Moorfield Homestead
3. Courmaroo Homestead
4. Sir Herbert Baker Victorian Row Houses
5. Mowbray Presbyterian Church
6. Late Victorian Row Houses (circa 1887)
7. Mowbray Public School
8. Mowbray Station
9. Mowbray Town Hall erected 1900 by Tull of Tully and Wolters
10. Mowbray Hotel

Axis of Courmaroo’s driveway pedestrian aligned with Devil’s Peak
Courmaroo pedestrian path
Historic farmstead axes now roughly mirrored in street layout
FIGURE 3.C.4 - The streets surrounding the site, for instance Strubens Road (above), are quite wide and well serviced.

FIGURE 3.C.5 - Plans and elevations of the houses in Strubens Road, as produced by Bakers’ office.

FIGURE 3.C.7 - View of the houses today (Google Streetview).
View of the edge of the site and of Settlers Way from the Strubens Road Bridge.

View of the edge of a typical Herbert Baker Victorian Rowhouse from Strubens Road.

Views of the Victorian Row Houses along Strubens Road, directly opposite the site.
View of the Victorian Row Houses along Strubens Road, directly opposite the site.

View of the Victorian Row Houses along Strubens Road, on the opposite side of the bridge.
Clockwise from top left: View of the street interface of the Baker houses along Strubens Road; c1920s detached houses in Forfar Road, adjacent to Westoe farmhouse; c1930 house on the corner of Strubens and Westoe Road; and c1920 house in Forfar Road.

All of the houses have pitched roofs, predominantly with end-gables, a stoep element, a small front garden and low and transparent boundary treatment.
View of the c1930s houses along Molenvliet Road, directly opposite the site.

View of the late 20th century housing development to the south of the site.
INTRODUCTION AND INTENT
The main purpose of these guidelines is to control the architectural character of the houses around Strubens Road in order to establish a coherent character within the area, that responds sensitively to its heritage environs.

These guidelines have also been developed in response to a “Response to the Notification of Intent to Develop” submitted to Heritage Western Cape, which required that “an evaluation of the proposed development on heritage resources is required”. Because the application is for subdivision and rezoning only, the only reasonable means of evaluating any heritage impact is through the establishment of design guidelines for the scheme.

These guidelines look to clearly set out the architectural language of the development in order to set up a framework for the design of the buildings, as well as for alterations and additions, going forward. They are not intended to stifle creative responses to the site, but rather to ensure a coherent urban design, streetscape and architectural response to the historic Observatory area.

These guidelines are divided into the following sections:

URBAN DESIGN/ENVELOPE CONTROLS
1. Size of the Dwelling
2. Building Lines/Setback Lines
3. Height Restrictions
4. Building Widths

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS AND CONTROLS
5. Building Form
6. Building Platforms and Stoeps
7. Roofs
8. Dormer Windows and Roof Lights
9. Exterior Walls and Plasterwork
10. Windows
11. Shutters
12. Doors
13. Garages
14. Stoeps
15. Chimneys
16. Boundary Walls, Gates and Boundary Treatments
17. Landscaping
18. Colours
19. Miscellaneous and General

It must be noted that these design guidelines have been established with the Zoning Scheme parameters for SR1 in mind, and the design guidelines conform to the provisions of the Zoning Scheme and the By-Law, and should be interpreted as always being within the zoning constraints.

APPROACH IN PRINCIPLE
The simple double-pitched roof and gabled architectural language of the modest houses that exist around the site has influenced the primary forms of the new structures. The buildings are stand-alone, with setbacks between them, but should nevertheless have a visual coherence that helps define their character as a whole. Importantly, the stoep and landscaping/boundary/street edge treatment of the new development must respond to the general themes apparent in the immediate vicinity.

Therefore, these guidelines should be made binding to all the erven making up the Development. In terms of the interpretation of these guidelines, and any unforeseen aspects, a Home Owners’ Association will be appointed to govern the aesthetic control of the erven making up this Development going forward, and will be required to grant consent to any building plans before their submission to the City of Cape Town.
These guidelines may be subject to periodic revision as deemed necessary, and subject to the approval of the Home Owners Association.

**URBAN DESIGN CONTROLS**
The proposed new zoning for all of the erven is single residential 1.

1. **Size of the Dwelling**
   1.1 Only **one residential dwelling** per erf is permitted.
   1.2 The floor factor of each erf shall be 1. This translates to maximum floor space values of:
      - Portion 1: 198m$^2$
      - Portion 2: 191m$^2$
      - Portion 3: 192m$^2$
      - Portion 4: 192m$^2$
      - Portion 5: 191m$^2$
      - Portion 6: 243m$^2$
      - Portion 7: 281m$^2$
      - Portion 8: 199m$^2$
      - Portion 9: 208m$^2$
      - Portion 10: 198m$^2$
      - Portion 11: 184m$^2$
      - Portion 12: 188m$^2$

2. **Building Lines/Setback Lines**
   2.1 The building lines for the various erven are illustrated in the adjacent diagram.

   2.2 For portions 1, 2, 11 and 12, the street setback lines should be considered build-to lines.

3. **Height Restrictions**
   3.1 In terms of the Municipal By-Law, the height restriction to the wall plate is 8m, while the height restriction to the roof apex is 10m.
   3.2 However, the Herbert Baker designed row houses in Strubens Road have been carefully reviewed, and the eave height for single storey buildings must be 4,7m, while the apex height of the roof must be 7,4m.
   3.3 For double storey buildings, the eave height must be 5,7m, while the apex height of the roof must be 8,4m.
   3.4 For buildings that are single storey, a room-in-the-roof arrangement is permissible.
   3.5 All heights are to be measured from the base level/NGL.
   3.6 The maximum height of any lean-to abutment is 3,5m, measured from the top of plinth.
   3.7 The heights of buildings on portions 1, 2, 11 and 12 must be the same.

4. **Building Widths**
   4.1 Overall width of gable walls must be minimum 4,6m and maximum 6,5m.
   4.2 Return gable ends to book-end stoep areas must be 4,6m in width. Only one street-facing return end gable is permitted per portion, and portions 1, 2, 11 and 12 must have a street-facing return end gable.
   4.3 Abutments and stoeps must be minimum 2m wide and maximum 4,5m wide.
   4.4 Freestanding buildings (garages and carports) must be minimum 3m wide and maximum 6,2m wide.

The red lines in this diagram indicate the applicable zoning setbacks, while the orange areas are subject to the “60% rule”.
ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS AND CONTROLS
The following controls must be adhered to:

5. Building Form

5.1 Each new dwelling must consist of a core building, with a double-pitched roof, and must have one abutment, namely an open stoep, with a mono-pitched, lean-to roof. Additional, enclosed abutments may be accommodated.

5.2 The plan of each core building should generally conform to one of three “letter of the alphabet” plans, namely I, L or U. See adjacent diagram. The front section of the core building may have a front-facing return gable as part of a hipped “stoepkamer” or book-end to a stoep area.

5.3 Core buildings must have double pitched roofs.

5.4 Extensions to the core building must be rectangular in form and built perpendicular to the core building.

5.5 Abutments to the core building must be rectangular in form and built either perpendicular or parallel to the core building.

6. Building Platforms and Stoeps

6.1 The site slopes gently and very slightly from the west to the east.

6.2 Each structure must have a plinth level 540mm (3 steps) above the natural ground level. Stoeps should be at this level.

6.3 Internal ground floor split-levels may be entertained in specific circumstances, but the plinth level should still be marked on the exterior of the building at 540mm above natural ground level.

6.4 The 540mm plinth level should be taken from the mean natural level of the site, and must be applied continuously around the structure (i.e. it should not step with the slope).

6.5 A scored plaster line must mark the 540mm plinth line, with textured plaster below and smooth plaster above.

Diagrams indicating the U-shaped, L-shaped and I-shaped core building arrangements encouraged in the Strubens Mews development.
7. Roofs

7.1 Only double-pitched roofs will be permitted on the core buildings.

7.2 The roof pitch must be 40 degrees.

7.3 Double-pitched roofs must be symmetrical over the core building.

7.4 Roofs over the core building must have flush or clipped eaves with facia boards. A maximum eave overhang of 100mm shall be permitted.

7.5 No parapet gable end walls will be permitted.

7.6 An abutment must have a roof gradient of 10 degrees. It must be of the same colour and roofing material as the double-pitched roof over the core building.

7.7 In the instance of garages, the roof must have a gradient of 10 degrees. It must be of the same colour and roofing material as the double-pitched roof over the core building. It must be behind a parapet wall on at least three sides.

7.8 Abutment roofs must have flush or clipped eaves with facia boards. A maximum eave overhang of 100mm shall be permitted.

7.9 The use of polycarbonate sheeting is prohibited.

7.10 The use of shade-cloth is prohibited.

7.11 All roofing material must be corrugated Victorian S-profile metal or aluminium roof sheeting pre-painted “Colourbond” finish in sheeting colour “Cape Charcoal”.

7.12 All guttering and rainwater goods must be seamless ‘Watertite’ aluminium or similar standard profile Ogee gutters with round downpipes. PVC rainwater goods shall not be allowed. All rainwater goods to be white.

7.13 Facias and bargeboards must be 220mm deep hardwood sections, and must be painted white.
Diagrams indicating some of the variations possible within the design guidelines.
8. Dormer Windows and Roof Lights
   8.1 All roof windows and dormer windows are subject to prior aesthetic approval.
   8.2 A maximum of four window openings (i.e. total count of roof lights and dormer windows) are permitted per core, double pitched roof area.
   8.3 Only vertically proportioned windows (maximum 1m by 1.5m) with flat, clear glazing will be permitted.
   8.4 Only Velux-type roof windows be permitted.
   8.5 The position of any roof window or dormer window must correspond to the distribution of windows on the associated façade of the building.

9. Exterior Walls and Plasterwork
   9.1 All exterior walls, windowsills, plinths and other elements must be plastered with a smooth wood trowelled finish, and painted.
   9.2 All openings should receive a 120mm wide plaster banding around the edges, which must be painted white.
   9.3 All sills to be projecting brick-on-edge (see detail), to be smooth plastered and painted white.
   9.4 A 120mm white-painted plaster band must be articulated at plinth level (540mm above natural ground level).
   9.5 Thickened walls may be used below the building plinth line.
   9.6 Textured plaster must be used below the building plinth line.
   9.7 No plaster quoining, decorative plaster mouldings or rustication is permitted. However, a 300mm wide simple, white-painted plaster band is permitted on the corners of any projecting, gabled “stoepkamer”-type projecting element (i.e. this must occur for portions 1, 2, 11 and 12, but can also be used on the other portions, subject to the particular design resolutions for each portion).
   9.8 Face brick, any kind of timber or mock-timber cladding, bagged walling or painted exterior brickwork, Nutec-type “shiplap” cladding, any stone or mock-stone cladding, and any pigmented plasters are prohibited.

10. Windows
   10.1 All windows must be vertically proportioned (i.e. the length of the opening must exceed its width, by a ratio of at least 2:1).
   10.2 All windows must be vertically sliding or top-hung units, with a horizontal fixed frame element across the centre of the window opening.
   10.3 All windows to be aluminium-framed or timber-framed.
   10.4 All timber-framed elements to be painted white.
   10.5 All aluminium-framed elements to be powder-coated white or charcoal grey.
   10.6 All glazing to be clear.
   10.7 The proportion, style and materiality of windows must be consistent throughout the building, and must not be mixed (i.e. all windows must be timber-framed or aluminium-framed). Windows must be of the same “family”, where even if different sizes are utilized; they must have the same relative ratios.
   10.8 Windows should be placed within the façade to ensure a continuous lintel height, and should be arranged in two’s or three’s to create a rhythmic pattern of openings. Windows on an upper level, or windows set into the roof, should correspond to create a regular distribution of openings across the façade and roofscape (see D. Dormer Windows and Roof lights).
   10.9 Windows should not be positioned at a corner of any building. A minimum 2m set in from any corner must be adhered to.
   10.10 A general ratio of 2:1 must be used for all windows, or the closest available standard sizes (i.e. windows of 1800mm ht x 900mm width and 1200mm ht x 600mm width).
   10.11 No PVC window frames, steel window frames, natural or bronze anodised aluminium frames, horizontally-proportioned"
openings, “Winblok” or similar pre-cast concrete windows or glass blocks will be permitted.

10.12 Oddly shaped windows, leaded or decorative glazing effects and framing etc. may only be permitted at the discretion of the Home Owners Association.

10.13 Only internal, “ClearVue” burglar bars are permitted.

11. Shutters

11.1 External shutters are encouraged on all windows, but must be utilised on windows position within any projecting, gabled “stoepkamer”-type projecting element (i.e. this must occur for portions 1, 2, 11 and 12, but can also be used on the other portions, subject to the particular design resolutions for each portion).

11.2 Shutters should be louvred timber, and white-painted, or epoxy/powder-coated aluminium in white or charcoal grey to match the frame.

11.3 Shutter widths must be in harmony with and correspond with the windows they cover.

11.4 The colour of the shutters must match that of the windows frame over which they close.

11.5 No fake/mock shutters will be permitted.

11.6 Should external shutters be applied to doors, the same restrictions shall apply.

12. Doors

12.1 Front doors must face Strubens Road or the internal street, and must be of hardwood timber with a glazed fanlight above, to a total height of 2.5m (top of fanlight frame). Front doors may have raised and/or fielded panels.

12.2 Front doors may be painted white or black. No aluminium doors are permitted.

12.3 Windows and doors cannot be combined, but must be separate elements within the façade.

12.4 Glazed double doors and folding/stacking doors are permitted, with the condition that they be placed behind a covered stoep or pergola element no narrower than 2m.

12.5 All doors must be vertically proportioned (i.e. the length of the opening must exceed its width).

12.6 All doors must be side-hung units, and can have a horizontal fixed frame element across the opening at a height of 900mm to centrelime.

12.7 Doors leading from the kitchen area and garage area may be stable doors.

12.8 All doors to be aluminium-framed or timber-framed. As above, front doors must be timber framed.

12.9 All timber-framed elements to be painted white.

12.10 All aluminium-framed elements to be powder-coated white or charcoal grey.

12.11 All glazing to be clear.

12.12 The proportion, style and materiality of doors must be consistent throughout the building, and must not be mixed (i.e. all doors must be timber-framed or aluminium-framed). Doors must be of the same “family”, where even if different sizes are utilized; they must have the same relative ratios.

12.13 Doors should be placed within the façade to ensure a continuous lintel height.

12.14 Doors must not be positioned at a corner of any building. A minimum 2m set in from any corner must be adhered to.

12.15 No PVC doorframes, steel door frames, natural or bronze anodised aluminium frames, horizontally proportioned openings, ornate or carved doors or glass blocks will be permitted.
13. Garages
13.1 Garages cannot face onto any public street, but instead must be accessed directly off the internal street.
13.2 Garage door openings may only be for single garage doors. Where a double garage is required, the façade may comprise two single doors separated by a 450mm brick column.
13.3 A maximum garage area for 2 cars is allowable.
13.4 Garage doors may be timber or aluminium, and must be white in colour. Any patterning on the doors is limited to horizontal banding. Raised panelling, glass insets and any other decorative elements are prohibited.
13.5 All garage door openings should receive 120mm wide plaster banding around the edges, which must be painted white.
13.6 Any garage façade must be set back from the street edge by a minimum of 1m.

14. Stoep
14.1 Street-facing stoeps (Strubens Road or the internal, private road) must be covered with a lean-to roof at a prescribed pitch of 10 degrees. The roofing material must match that of the core building in type and colour. It must be single-storey in height, and abut the façade of the core building at a height of 3m from the top of the stoep (i.e. 3,54m from NGL).
14.2 Street-facing stoeps must be 2m wide.
14.3 Stoeps located on the private side of each portion may be covered with a lean-to roof at a prescribed pitch of 10 degrees, or with an open timber pergola structure.
14.4 Private stoeps must be a minimum of 2m wide, and can be a maximum of 5m wide.
14.5 Only frameless glass enclosures may be utilised to enclose stoep areas.
14.6 The support structure for a stoep or pergola must consist of either PAR 114 x 114mm hardwood posts, or 100mm x 100m square galvanised steel posts, or 100mm diameter galvanised steel posts. All posts to be painted white.
14.7 Posts can extend to the stoep floor, or can be positioned atop a plastered masonry column base 340mm x 340mm and 850mm in height. Where a low wall is required to edge the stoep, this should be of 230mm width and 850mm height, plastered and painted, and centred on the larger masonry column bases. In these instances, a timber handrail, 69 x 69mm, may be spanned between columns a further 100mm above the top of the wall. Stoep walls are to receive a white-painted plaster coping.
14.8 Rafters must be of timber and must be minimum PAR 69 x 144mm, with a shaped end as per the attached detail. Support beams across the front of the stoep/pergola elements must be 220mm in depth, and painted white.
14.9 All external metalwork must be galvanized, and all pergola or stoep structures must be painted white.
14.10 No pre-cast concrete columns, solid infill panels of any material, stainless steel cabling, balustrades fixed in a criss-cross pattern, corner-brackets, or similar mock “broekie-lace” elements are permitted on stoeps/pergolas.
14.11 No balconies are permitted.

15. Chimneys
15.1 Only plastered and painted, rectilinear chimneys are permitted.
15.2 Chimneys must be painted to match the main dwelling in colour.
15.3 Chimneys must have a white-painted coping detail and 120mm plaster band below, all painted white.
15.4 Masonry chimneys must be taken to a height of 1m above the ridge height of the associated roof, after which an exposed steel flue may protrude for a further height of 1m.
15.5 Exposed fire-cement chimneys, entirely exposed steel flues, and fixed or rotating metal cowls are prohibited.

16. Boundary Walls, Gates and Boundary Treatments

For the purposes of this document, a shared boundary is a boundary between two properties, a street boundary faces either Strubens Road or the private road, a rear boundary faces the highway and townhouses to the east, and a northern boundary faces the Bowling Green to the north.

16.1 Low boundary walls are important historical elements within the surrounding streetscape, and thus new street-facing boundary walls must not exceed 1,2m in height. A further 600mm of metal railing is permitted above this, as are 340 x 340mm solid masonry posts at 2,5m intervals, as well as at the corners of the different portions. The masonry sections of the wall must be smooth plastered and painted and have the standard coping detail. The coping must be painted white.

16.2 Shared boundary walls can be of solid masonry to a height of 1,8m. They can include 340 x 340mm solid masonry posts at 2,5m intervals, as well as at the corners of the different portions. The masonry sections of the wall must be smooth plastered and painted and have the standard coping detail. The coping must be painted white.

16.3 The rear boundary walls can be of solid masonry to a height of 2,1m. They can include 340 x 340mm solid masonry posts at 2,5m intervals, as well as at the corners of the different portions. The masonry sections of the wall must be smooth plastered and painted and have the standard coping detail. The coping must be painted white.

16.4 The northern boundary walls must not exceed 1,2m in height. A further 900mm of metal railing is permitted above this, as are 340 x 340mm solid masonry posts at 2,5m intervals, as well as at the corners of the different portions. The masonry sections of the wall must be smooth plastered and painted and have the standard coping detail. The coping must be painted white.

16.5 All steel railing must be galvanized and painted white.

16.6 All gates must be made of painted steel, conform to the prescribed detailed gate, and must be painted white. Gates must no be higher than the adjoining walls. Gates must be “bookended” by 340 x 340mm solid masonry posts. The masonry posts must be smooth plastered and painted and have the standard coping detail. The coping must be painted white. Street numbers, letter boxes and house names must be mounted on the left-hand post, when viewed from the street.

16.7 House numbers and letters must be made up of characters no larger than 150mm high and 100mm wide. The permitted style of lettering is Arial Bold. The characters must be made of metal and white in colour. They must be placed horizontally.

16.8 Letter boxes must be metal and white in colour, and must be mounted on the right-hand post, when viewed from the street.

16.9 Every street-facing boundary must have one pedestrian gate set within its length.

16.10 Prefabricated walling systems, face brick, natural stone walls or stone-clad walls, sheet material, wire meshing, gum poles and barbed wire are prohibited walling materials.

16.11 5-strand electrical fencing is permitted above the wall heights prescribed, but must utilize black support brackets.

17. Landscaping

19.1 Just as boundary walls are characteristic of the area, the small front garden area between the boundary wall and the house itself is a characteristic feature, which both lends privacy to the houses and helps to contribute a sense of greenery to the streets.

19.2 The plants species suggested are to be taken as a broad guideline, as they meet meet the requirements of being indigenous, water-wise and low-maintenance species, that also proliferate naturally and are propagated by division. This will allow the gardens to “fill out” over time.

19.3 Street trees at 10m intervals must be planted and maintained along the internal street frontage of portions 8, 9, 10 and 12.
Axonometric view of a typical street-facing boundary wall, as per the design guidelines.

Elevation of a typical street-facing boundary wall, showing number and letter box placement.

Copings to be made of brick-on-edge to 8° angle, and plastered all round.

Chimneys, parapet walls etc. to be variations on this detail. Projecting section to be painted white (from 10 x 15m raked joint to top of wall).

Coping and edging details.
Sectional view of a typical street-facing boundary wall along Strubens Road, extending through the stoep and showing landscaping, as per the design guidelines.

Inset indicates the standard rafter end-detail that must be applied to all stoeps.
19.4 Exterior lighting should be sensitively positioned and not directed in such a way that it could have a negative impact on the surrounding houses, both within and outside the development.

19.5 Exterior lighting should shine downwards, or be of the hooded/lidded type.

19.6 Security lighting must not shine into adjacent properties and must be activated by movement sensors.

19.7 All exterior light fittings must be within the “family” of approved landscape lights.

18. Colours
The Observatory area, and in particular the Strubens Road row houses, are characterised by a range of different colours. Therefore, these design guidelines do not seek to be too prescriptive in terms of colour scheme, with the following restrictions:

18.1 All roof sheeting must be pre-painted “Colourbond” finish in sheeting colour “Cape Charcoal”.

18.2 All flush or clipped eaves and facia boards must be painted white.

18.3 All rainwater goods to be white.

18.4 All openings should receive a 120mm wide plaster banding around the edges, which must be painted white.

18.5 All sills to be projecting brick-on-edge (see detail), to be smooth plastered and painted white.

18.6 A 120mm wide painted plaster band must be articulated at plinth level (540mm above natural ground level).

18.7 A 300mm wide simple, white-painted plaster band is permitted on the corners of any projecting, return-gabled “stoepkamer”-type projecting element (i.e. this must occur for portions 1, 2, 11 and 12, but can also be used on the other portions, subject to the particular design resolutions for each portion).

18.8 All timber-framed door and window elements to be painted white.

18.9 All aluminium-framed door and window elements to be powder-coated white or charcoal grey.

18.10 Shutters should be louvred timber, and white-painted, or epoxy/powder-coated aluminium in white or charcoal grey to match the frame.

18.11 Front doors may be painted white or black. No aluminium doors are permitted.

18.12 Garage doors may be timber or aluminium, and must be white in colour. Any patterning on the doors is limited to horizontal banding.

18.13 All garage door openings should receive 120mm wide plaster banding around the edges, which must be painted white.

18.14 The structure for a stoep or pergola must be painted white.

18.15 Stoep walls are to receive a white-painted plaster coping. All stoep handrails or balustrades are to be painted white.

18.16 Stoep rafters must be of timber with a shaped end as per the attached detail. Support beams across the front of the stoep/pergola elements must be 220mm in depth, and all stoep timberwork must be painted white.

18.17 All external metalwork must be galvanized, and all pergola or stoep structures must be painted white.

18.18 Chimneys must have a white-painted coping detail and 120mm plaster band below, all painted white.

18.19 The coping of any boundary wall must be painted white.

18.20 All steel railing must be galvanized and painted white.

18.21 All gates must be made of painted galvanized mild steel and must be painted white.
18.22 House numbers and letters must be made of metal and white in colour.

18.23 Letterboxes must be metal and white in colour.

18.24 All white trimmings to be Plascon Micatex “Silver Bird” E27-1. All metalwork and timberwork to be Plascon Velvaglo enamel paint in pure white.

18.25 For all other walled surfaces, each landowner is free to select their own colour, but only one additional colour is permitted per property, and must be consistently used across all external walls of the dwelling, the garage, boundary walls, abutments and so on.

19. Miscellaneous and General

19.1 All television aerials and satellite dishes should not be visible from the street or adjoining properties, and should rather be located in the side alleys between buildings.

19.2 All telephone and electrical cable reticulation on the property must be underground.

19.3 Material and plastic awnings are prohibited.

19.4 Solar thermal systems must be of the evacuated tube, PV or similar approved type. The solar tank (hot water cylinder) must always be installed inside the roof void, and the panels must be mounted perpendicular to and directly against the roof sheeting. Any associated frame or fittings must be powder coated to match the roof-sheeting colour.

19.5 No “Porta Pools” or similar pools above ground level are permitted. The position, colour and design of all swimming pools is subject to final approval by the Home Owners Association.

19.6 No sewerage, venting or other plumbing/water pipes may be visible from the street edge. All such piping is to be painted to match the adjacent masonry wall.

19.7 All gas cylinders, refuse bins, compost piles and clotheslines must be screened from the street edge and from neighbour’s properties, either within walled drying yards or within the garage structures.

19.8 If air-conditioning and related elements (ducts, grilles, condensers etc.) are to be incorporated, these must be designed so as to not be visible on the external façade of the building, from any adjacent property or the street. Condenser units may not be mounted higher than 1,2m from the adjacent natural ground level, and should ideally be at ground level. No window-mounted air-conditioning units are permitted.

19.9 No garden sheds, tool sheds, wendy houses or similar structures are permitted, unless approved by the Home Owners Association.

19.10 Separate staff quarters are not permitted, and must be accommodated within the main structure and under the same roof (core structure or abutment).

19.11 Dog kennels, water tanks and covered facilities for boats, caravans and trailers may not be visible from the street edges (Strubens Road or the internal, private road).
“Landscape Palette” of typical plants permitted by the guidelines. The bulk of planting should conform to these indigenous species.


Agapanthus. Flowering December to April (late summer). Indigenous, hardy, water-wise.

Dianthus Grandiflora. Flowering multiple times per year, often after rain. Indigenous, hardy, water-wise.


Chaparral aethiopica. (Cobra Lily). Flowering in winter, from April to June. Indigenous, hardy, water-wise.


Plumbago auriculata. Flowering from November to May. Indigenous, hardy, water-wise. Also in white.

Agapanthus. Flowering December to April (late summer). Indigenous, hardy, water-wise.

Urban Designer’s impression of how the scheme may look, as one possible interpretation of the guidelines.
5) DISCUSSION OF THE HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE SITE

It is clear that the subject site has historical and associational significance as part of the historic Coornhoop grant, being in close proximity to the remaining fragments of the Coornhoop werf.

The potential location of the old Coornhoop Redoubt on the site has been discussed above, and extensively researched with input from some of the most qualified archaeologists in the city. After extensive analysis, the results are inconclusive, and when assessed against the other research undertaken (Emms, Sleigh, scaled drawings of baseball diamonds, contemporary aerial photography and correspondence with older WP Baseball Association members from the area), it seems unlikely that the Redoubt is located on the site. Therefore, the proposed development is not anticipated to have any notable or heightened archaeological significance, or impact on archaeological resources, but archaeological monitoring of any bulk excavations is recommended as a precautionary measure.

The site has associational significance with two of the most wealthy and influential men at the Cape at the turn of the 20th Century - first the mining magnate Harry Strubens, and later the industrialist and Member of Parliament J.W. Jagger. Both of these men left their physical mark on the site and its immediate surrounds - Strubens through the construction of the very fine Herbert Baker-designed rowhouses along one side of the road that bears his name, and Jaggers through the creation of the sports ground, which the land has been used as from 1922 until the present time.

As discussed above, the Jaggers Bowling Club is a private sports facility, but regardless of this it does contribute to creating a visual green space in the neighbourhood. While the extent of the open space shall be reduced, the larger portion of land shall be retained as a bowling green, together with the club house, and therefore the significance of the wider site related to its recreational uses shall be retained.

In addition to this, the subdivision of the smaller, disused bowling green in order to create housing is consistent with the character of the environs, which exhibit contextual significance (as is also borne out by the area’s HPOZ status) as a mixed, fine-grained residential area exhibiting a variety of housing typologies on fairly small plots. The tradition of having buildings address the street edge has been considered in the layout of the proposed plots and in the design guidelines, which have been specifically developed to ensure contextual continuity.

In addition to the design guidelines, the proposed new zoning of the erven - Single Residential 1 - has sufficient height, setback, floor factor and floor space restrictions to ensure that any buildings realised on the new plots would conform to the general scale and grain of the building fabric seen on the surrounding erven.
6) ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL HERITAGE IMPACT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION - Mr. M. Scurr.

This Analysis and Conclusion has been undertaken by Mike Scurr of Rennie Scurr Adendorff Architects, as an independent heritage skilled architect and heritage practitioner. Mike Scurr has no prior involvement in the project nor interest in the development. The draft HIA has been read together with supporting documents relating to earlier archaeological investigations. The site has been visited and the surrounding context viewed as well.

1. Archaeological impact

A thorough archaeological analysis of the site was undertaken at the outset of the study, including the use of a magnetometer in order to establish whether the markings on site relate to the historic Coornhoop Redoubt. The report however notes that the findings are inconclusive. Another study investigated the possibility of the site as having been used for baseball in the mid twentieth century. This parallel investigation provides a convincing argument that the markings on site more likely relate to sporting usage in the twentieth century. Archaeological monitoring of any earthworks should however be undertaken by an archaeologist as a precaution.

2. Impact on Coornhoop

The site in question has never formed part of the declared Coormoop site but is associated with the farm. The site is physically separated from Coornhoop and the further sub-divisions will not impact on it. Furthermore, the scale and grain of the proposed development (as reflected both in the proposed sub-division plan to be approved, and in the indicative urban design and building guidelines) will not impact on the remaining historic Coornhoop buildings. The broader urban patterns, historic axes and view cone to Devil’s Peak are reflected in the urban design response to this site.

3. Impact on Strubens Road and local context

The immediate area is characterised by a fine grained mix of buildings of high heritage significance (the Grade IIIA “Baker” row on Strubens Road in particular) and other surrounding single residential early twentieth century fabric generally of at least contextual significance, though many of the houses are of higher significance in and of themselves. Most of the houses in the area have been modified over time, but the area retains a cohesiveness that should be enhanced. The area is also peppered with declared buildings of Grade II significance including Coornhoop, Westoe and Molenvliet. This is reflected in the site being part of an HPOZ. Strubens Road retains its physical link to the south side of the N2 and access to Main Road. The existing bowling green is a green open space, but is not part of a formal green public space system as it is privately owned and used for a specific purpose. Development on this site therefore will not constitute a loss of public open green space as it does not contribute to the character of the area. The sub-division is in keeping with the area and will not adversely impact on the local context given that the proposal ensures single residential usage and allows for parking to be provided on site. The proposal will enhance the existing fine-grained and small-scaled urban characteristics of the area.

Analysis of the Urban Design and Building Guidelines

The HIA has developed very detailed urban design and building control guidelines, as well as detailed guidelines relating to the proposed development that will follow the subdivision and rezoning. These detailed guidelines are developed to ensure that the fine-grained and consistently proportioned characteristics in the area at present will persist in the new development. These will ensure in particular a positive and active street interface, consistency in roof typology, fenestration, proportioning, heights etc. These guidelines are supported. Overall, these guidelines are able to be applied whether the site is developed as one development, or individually or in portions - this is considered to be a key outcome that
needs to be locked in place in order to support the proposed subdivision and rezoning.

Overall, the guidelines must also ensure that buildings with a thin veneer of “pseudo Victorian” or “vernacular” detailing are avoided since this would detract from the integrity of the area. The row of modern townhouses to the east of the site and adjacent to Coornhoop is considered to be one such example and that typology and detailing must not be repeated here.

The traffic noise emanating from the N2 will need to be considered in the design of these end units and the placing of windows, trees, sound barriers etc must be achieved within the overall guidelines.

Conclusion

Archaeological monitoring by an archaeologist is recommended as a precaution during the excavation stage(s) on site. The results of any investigation are to be written up and lodged as part of the record of this study.

The urban design and architectural guidelines proposed constitute an opportunity to stitch together an area of single residential buildings and higher order heritage structures. The proposal responds to and reinforces identified patterns and typologies in the area.

The proposed subdivision and rezoning, and the future development following the outlined Guidelines, will not impact on heritage resources in the area.

Recommendation

HWC should endorse and approve this HIA. A Permit should be issued in order to allow the sub-division and further City processes to proceed.
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