



RICHARD SUMMERS INC.
ATTORNEYS

BOSCHENDAL (PTY) LTD

MEETING OF THE BOSCHENDAL FOUNDERS' ESTATES MASTER REVIEW COMMITTEE

HELD ONLINE VIA MS TEAMS

Minutes of Meeting held at 10h00 on 28 APRIL 2023

MRC MEMBERS PRESENT	APOLOGIES
Richard Summers (RS) Richard Summers Inc	Natasha Higgitt (NH) SAHRA
Sarah Winter (SW) Heritage Specialist	Gcobani Sipoyo (GS) SAHRA
Nicolas Baumann (NB) Heritage Specialist	Ben Mwasinga (BM) SAHRA
William George (WG) Boschendal	Keenan Africa (KA) SAHRA
Palmira de Almeida (PdA) SAHRA	Byron van Vuuran (BvV) Profica
OBSERVERS	John Wilson-Harris (JW) - Cape Institute for Architecture (CfA)
Sean Mahoney (SM) StudioMAS	Barry Phillips (BP) Franschoek Heritage and Ratepayers Association
Mike Scurr (MS) Rennie Scurr Adendorff	Len Raymond (LR) Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation
Rolf Annas (RA) Drakenstein of Heritage Foundation	Kaizer Makati (KM) Stellenbosch Municipality
Kirstin Meiring (KM) Richard Summers Inc	Katherine Robinson (KR) Stellenbosch Municipality

AGENDA:

1	Welcome	Richard Summers
2	Attendance	Richard Summers
3	Apologies	Richard Summers
4	Approval of the Minutes of MRC meeting dated 17 October 2022	Richard Summers
5	Approval of Agenda	Richard Summers
6.1	New matters: Founders Estate No. 11, Nieuwedorp Homestead (Baker House) – Proposal for the construction of new structure prepared by StudioMAS dated 18 April 2023	Sean Mahoney
7	Outcome of discussions and MRC decision	Richard Summers



RICHARD SUMMERS INC.
A T T O R N E Y S

#	Issue / Item	Discussions and Action items
1	Welcome	RS opened the meeting
2	Attendance	Attendance register was completed. RS confirmed that a quorum of MRC members is present.
3	Apologies	Apologies were communicated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In his absence, input from JW of ClfA was tabled for consideration during the meeting.
4	Approval of the Minutes dated 17 October 2023	NB raised minor amendments to the MRC meeting minutes dated 17 October 2023: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At 6.1. to amend the term “VIA” to “Visual statement” At p3 to use Franchesca Watson’s full name. NB adopted the meeting minutes and SW seconded.
5	Approval of Agenda dated 28 April 2023	The agenda was adopted without changes.
6	Matters Arising – Founders Estates No. 11	The purpose of the meeting is to review the revised design proposal for new development on Founders Estate No. 11 (Nieuwedorp Homestead).
6.1	Revised design proposal prepared by StudioMAS dated March 2023.	<p>Proposal:</p> <p>SM presented the proposal and highlighted the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal entails minor changes to the Nieuwedorp Homestead (referred to as Baker House), an existing 1930s building located next to an existing long barn. The changes are mostly internal with a few external changes. There have been historical changes to doors and windows which are not original. The Homestead is in a decent condition, but the outbuildings require significant repair. There is nothing of historical value inside of the house. The existing fireplace to be reused and replaced. There will be opening of walls between the kitchen and dining area to improve flow. The biggest architectural intervention is building a screen wall (at window head height) and installing a pergola to create a wind-free back courtyard. External outbuildings will be converted to a guest room / study. The roof is in poor condition and repair work is required. The existing stoep stays, two columns are removed and a beam. The roof remains in its original position. <p>Comments by JW:</p> <p>JW tabled comments by email and noted that ClfA will provide written comments as part of the section 27 process. JW’s comments were as</p>



	<p>follows:</p> <p>The fireplace: <i>“the fireplace is being repositioned but there is not much mention of it, or a photo. Is it a unique Victorian with tiles etc or just a platform with a chimney?”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SM responded that the fireplace is not Victorian. It is a glass faced, cast iron freestanding stove that is not more than 30 years old. It will be reused and relocated but it has no historical value. <p>Central front door: <i>“This seems to be more about gentrification than usability. It impacts quite badly on the front room as it introduces a central movement space through it. Does the gain justify the action...or on the other hand, is the significance of the house so limited that this move does not mean much in the grand scheme of things.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SM responded that the positioning of the door in the middle, as opposed to on the side is more symmetrically aligned in accordance with the two gables. <p>Extension on top of the outbuilding: <i>“The gain in height of the parapets is significant and threatens to have the outbuilding overpower the house in bulk. If they are just reroofing, does the extension need to be so high?”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• SM agreed that the concern is valid, and in order to mitigate visual impacts the parapets on outbuildings can be reduced by 300 mm – 400 mm to match the height of the other buildings. This can be done by switching from a sheet metal roof to a flat concrete slab roof with a softened height to be dropped from 3m to 2.8m. <p>Discussions by MRC members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Baker House is Grade 3A significance – while it does have architectural integrity, this is largely due to its location within a Grade 1 heritage site and landmark qualities (gables). The positioning of the door resulted from a process and discussions between SW and MS (Rennie Scurr Adendorff).• The changes to the front façade have achieved the retention of the existing two windows, which are the only period joinery remaining. Retention of these windows is a positive response.• Shifting the positioning of the window to central from asymmetrical will not change the quality of the front rooms.• The Homestead was not designed by Baker but was modelled on Champagne homestead and which was likely designed by Kendal.• The architectural detailing is not of sufficient significance to
--	---



		<p>warrant the preservation of the front façade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The members support the amendment to reduce the height of the garage parapet.• In response to a question by SW , SM confirmed that the removal of the fireplace leaves the chimney intact as there is enough space in the roof volume.• In response to NB’s question whether the front stoep is a new addition, SM responded that on the line where the existing stoep stops with the end gables, there is step down approx. 0.5m using three gentle steps. The old and new stoep will be demarcated via a marginal step down, rather than making the stoep on one plane.• SM stated that long barn will remain as is. In 2022 a couple of roof sheets on long barn were replaced to ensure that the gable end was not compromised and remains intact.• SM noted the owner intends to make changes to long barn in 2023, that plan will be tabled with the MRC in due course.• NB identified the need for the retention and maintenance of the avenue of trees and queried whether this forms part of the landscaping plan, and SM noted that there is a plan to do some minor landscaping, but the existing mature trees will be unaffected and not affected by the landscaping.• Regarding the suggestion for a maintenance plan within the landscape plan for the avenue of trees, SW noted that that the extent of FE 11 does not include the avenue of trees (and advised that the landscaping plan does not need to address existing trees. <p>Feedback from other attendees is summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• PdA (SAHRA) noted that because the changes to the building will not impact the cultural landscape and since the height to the parapet will be reduced, SAHRA will likely support the proposals .• RA (DHF) inquired about the visual impact of the pergola and requested a 3D drawing. MS responded that the pergola has been carefully considered and is satisfied that pergola is appropriate, provided the general appearance is in accordance with the current version.• SW asked SM if there is a cross-section which shows the height of the pergola, SM indicated that 3D modelling was attempted, but that it will not have value because pergola will not be easily shown.• Regarding the landscape plan, SW tabled that the tree setting of the homestead is to remain unchanged. Any additions will be addressed in terms of the landscape plan. <p>In conclusion, the MRC noted that the proposal is endorsed and the recommendations in the Heritage Statement be adopted for SAHRA’s</p>
--	--	---



RICHARD SUMMERS INC.
A T T O R N E E Y S

		consideration, with the proviso regarding parapet height reduction.
7	Outcome of discussions and MRC decision	<p>The Committee recommends the proposal for approval by SAHRA and recommends that SAHRA issue a s 27 NHRA permit subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A landscape plan to be submitted to SAHRA in accordance with the SAHRA approved overarching Founders Estate Design Guidelines and draft Landscape Guidelines; Any trenching or earth moving works outside the existing footprint of the building must be monitored by a professional archaeologist. The name and qualification of the archaeologist in question should be submitted to SAHRA for approval. A report regarding trenching or earth moving works must be submitted to SAHRA by the archaeologist monitoring the activities; and A close out report be submitted to SAHRA by a heritage specialist within 30 days of the completion of the works. <p>Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RS to circulate minutes and MRC decision in due course.• SM to furnish SAHRA with the revised plans by 3 May 2023.