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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GLOSSARY OF TERMS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffer zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buitenverblijven</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Dutch architecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Floral Region Protected Areas World Heritage Site:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cape Revival architecture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Impact Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groot Constantia Estate</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2744, Erf 2755, Erf 2623, Erf 2761, Erf 6599, Erf 7395, Erf 10860, Erf 10861, Erf 10862 and Erf 10779 in Constantia.

**Heritage Impact Assessment**
Heritage assessment under the provisions of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) to determine impacts of development on heritage resources and whether or not development should proceed on heritage grounds.

**Hallenhuis**
Dutch word for a three aisled barn based on a northern European vernacular design, otherwise known as a loshuis.

**Historic core**
Farmsteads of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen including their respective homesteads, outbuildings, landscape elements and spaces.

**Hofstede**
Dutch word for a homestead.

**Homestead**
Primary dwelling within a farmstead.

**Jonkershuis**
Dutch word, similar in meaning to a dowager house. Traditionally a jonkershuis was either used by the widow or dowager of the estate-owner or by the elder son after his marriage.

**Landhuizen**
Dutch word referring to the country houses in Curaçao built in the 18th and 19th centuries.

**Quinquennial inspections**
Inspection regimes applied in the UK based on a 5-year cycle to ensure the sustainability of historic fabric.

**Vergelegen Estate**
Total extent of landholdings comprising Vergelegen measuring 3020 hectares and including Farm Rem 744, measuring 1284,3508 hectares, Farm 744/1, measuring 19,3398 hectares and Farm 744/2, measuring 1712,3697 hectares.

**Werf**
Dutch word for a farm homestead and farmyard. Translated literally as a ‘raised ground on which a house is built’.

### ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BWI</td>
<td>Biodiversity &amp; Wine Initiative (WWF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA&amp;DP</td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIC</td>
<td>Dutch East India Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCAS</td>
<td>Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIA</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIA</td>
<td>Heritage Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HWC</td>
<td>Heritage Western Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICMP</td>
<td>Integrated Conservation Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICOMOS</td>
<td>International Council on Monuments and Sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iziko</td>
<td>Iziko Muzeums of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEC</td>
<td>Member of the Executive Committee in the Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOI</td>
<td>Memorandum of Incorporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHRA</td>
<td>National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMA</td>
<td>National Environment Management Act (Act 107 of 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEMPAA</td>
<td>National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (Act 57 of 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTSS</td>
<td>National Tourism Sector Strategy 2016 – 2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OG</td>
<td>Operational Guidelines to the World Heritage Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUV</td>
<td>Outstanding Universal Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Republic of South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAHRA</td>
<td>South African Heritage Resources Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANParks</td>
<td>South African National Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMNP</td>
<td>Table Mountain National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Heritage Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>World Heritage Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHCA</td>
<td>World Heritage Convention Act (Act 49 of 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wildlife Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

Sarah Winter (Archaeo-Adventures cc) was appointed by Heritage Western Cape (HWC) and the Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport (DCAS) to draft an Integrated Conservation Management Plan (ICMP) to accompany the World Heritage Site (WHS) nomination of the Early Cape Farmsteads, Groot Constantia and Vergelegen situated in the Western Cape Province of the Republic of South Africa. The ICMP is prepared in accordance with the provisions of the World Heritage Convention Act (Act 49 of 1999; WHCA) and the Schedule published in the Government Gazette 39347 dated October 2015 for the Format and Procedure for the Nomination of World Heritage Sites in the Republic of South Africa, the Convention for the Protection of the World’s Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention; WHC) and its Operational Guidelines, and the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999; NHRA).

Sarah Winter is a heritage practitioner and has drafted this ICMP in association with the input of a team of heritage specialists:

Nicolas Baumann   Urban and conservation planner
Marianne Gertenbach   Historian and curator
Graham Jacobs   Architectural and spatial heritage specialist
Antonia Malan    Historical archaeologist
Laura Robinson   Heritage specialist
Richard Summers   Environmental and heritage attorney
Johan van Papendorp   Landscape architect

Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are included in the properties for the proposed WHS nomination of the Early Farmsteads of the Cape of Good Hope, currently on the WHS Tentative List of the Republic of South Africa. The Tentative List nomination was originally formally accepted by the WHC in 2004 under the title of the “Cape Winelands Cultural Landscape”. Following a review of the Tentative List by the South African World Heritage Convention Committee, the proposed nomination was renamed Early Farmsteads of the Cape of Good Hope. This renamed proposed nomination on the South African Tentative List was accepted by the World Heritage Committee in 2015.

1.1 Methodology statement

The drafting of the ICMP involves four phases. The completed Status Quo Phase (Phase 1) reported on the outcome of a high level assessment of issues and factors relating to the protection, conservation and management of the two estates. This phase primarily involved the gathering of baseline information, holding a series of workshops and discussions with site managers, drafting a preliminary heritage inventory, reviewing the applicable institutional framework and legislative requirements pertaining to the WHS nomination and draft ICMP, and undertaking a performance risk assessment of each estate. This draft ICMP (first draft) concludes Phase 2 of the ICMP process and is to be submitted to HWC for interim comment prior to the public consultation process to be undertaken in Phase 3. Phase 4 will be the finalisation of the draft ICMP and its submission to HWC for final endorsement.

Section 2 of the report includes the justification for WHS inscription. This is drawn from the initial draft nomination dossier with input from the consultants involved in drafting the ICMP. This section also includes an expanded statement of significance to assist with the drafting of the ICMP, particularly in terms of the principles of authenticity and integrity. Section 3 identifies the boundaries of the WHS; core and buffer areas. A description of the properties is included in Section 4 including physical qualities, property ownership, management structure, heritage protection status, zoning and applicable municipal planning policy frameworks. Section 5 provides an overview of the preliminary heritage inventory.
As a means of structuring the ICMP process, a series of tables were prepared, the format and method of which is explained below.

**Performance risk indicators** have been developed to assess the state of conservation and management of the primary heritage layers at each of the sites in relation to the following:

- Historic built environment
- Landscape elements and character
- Archaeological record
- Natural and cultural landscape setting
- Public associations and values

Indicators have also been developed for **internal and external factors/risks** affecting core and buffer areas including:

- Development pressures
- Environmental pressures; natural disasters and risk preparedness
- Visitor and tourism pressures
- Economic and agricultural activity pressures

Assessment indicators and outcomes of the assessment (status, description and consequences) including proposed mitigation strategies and opportunities for improving performance have been tabulated for each of the above components. A grading system for assessing the status of performance and risk indicators and determining heritage management implications is tabulated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFORMANCE RISK STATUS</th>
<th>GUIDELINES FOR MANAGEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good condition</td>
<td>Monitor and manage as appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very positive impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good condition</td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor condition</td>
<td>Implement specific action plans/procedures to manage and monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above format and method informed and structured the Status Quo Phase and was used as the basis for further analysis to address information gaps and the identification of management, monitoring and mitigation strategies during Phase 2. Detailed outcomes for Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are included in Annexures B.1 and B.2, respectively and summarised in Sections 6 and 7 for each estate.

Section 8 provides overall guiding conservation principles as well as more specific principles for core and buffer areas based on relevant international charters. Following on from these conservation principles and emerging from the performance risk assessment, a set of strategic objectives and a catalogue of performance risks, strategies and priorities are identified in Sections 9 and 10, respectively. The WHS protection and management of core and buffer areas including protective mechanisms, management structures and institutional arrangements are discussed in Section 11. Requirements for monitoring and review are identified in Section 12. The ICMP is concluded with an outline for an Implementation/Action Plan in Section 13.
2 JUSTIFICATION FOR WORLD HERITAGE SITE INSCRIPTION

2.1 Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

Brief synopsis

As the earliest examples of an idealised farmstead established at the Cape of Good Hope in the late 17th and early 18th century during the onset of globalisation, the Early Cape Farmsteads, with their physical assets relating to the exchange of ideas between various continents pertaining to agrarian settlement practices, and architectural and landscape design, became the grand set pieces which were later replicated and reinterpreted by other settlers at the Cape. The development of the Early Cape Farmsteads illustrates the evolution of human society, land-use and settlement at the Cape over time, shaped by the dramatic natural environment and the interchange between successive economic, cultural and social influences.

The sites comprising the Early Cape Farmsteads have “Outstanding Universal Value” (OUV) in terms of the following WHS criteria:

Criterion (ii): exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design.

Criterion (v): be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change.

The OUV of the Early Cape Farmsteads in terms of these two criteria are unpacked in Section 2.2 below.

2.2 Proposed criteria for inscription

Criterion (ii): exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design.

The key phrase in this criterion is ‘interchange of human values’. What ICOMOS evaluates is whether the physical assets of a property, in terms of architecture, technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design can be said to relate to an interchange of ideas—and this can be interpreted in several different ways:

- the property may be the embodiment of an idea or concept imported from another region or area and which transformed subsequent creativity in the original region, the recipient region or otherwise;
- alternatively, the property may itself have prompted the interchange of human values through inspiring ideas that influenced other areas; and
- thirdly, there could have been a two-way flow of ideas, with the property displaying some sort of cultural fusion or local adaptation that could be deemed to be emblematic in some way.

In all cases the interchange of human ideas or influences needs to have prompted a response, which can be said to be outstanding in terms of the influence it had at the time and/or subsequently on people or society.

In many properties, the influences or interchanges refer to the tangible dissemination of ideas important in the history of art, architecture or urban design, or the history of technology, all as embodied in the attributes of the property.

As interchange in and between human societies and cultures is commonplace, this criterion requires that the interchange and the values / influence are substantial and important in their impact on the recipient culture. The transfer of a minor cultural aspect, or the transfer of a value which had little impact, are insufficient.

The Early Cape Farmsteads are the earliest examples of an idealised farmstead established at the Cape of Good Hope and at the southern point of Africa in the late 17th and early 18th century during the onset of globalisation associated with international trade between Europe, Africa and East Asia (Dutch and British) when the Cape of Good Hope was a victualling station of the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie (VOC) or Dutch East India Company (DEIC), one of the most powerful instruments of the Dutch commercial empire. Against the backdrop of VOC officialdom and allegiance that governed Company trading interests across various continents, the origins of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are exemplary in reflecting a colonial project and the ambitions of two of its highest ranking officials through the stages of exploring, pioneering and settling the land.

From the onset, these farmsteads developed iconic status, which they have retained, and became grand set pieces which were later replicated, albeit generally at a smaller scale. Their physical assets relate to the global exchange of ideas during the 17th and 18th centuries pertaining to agrarian settlement practices, and architectural and landscape design between Europe (especially the buitenverblijven or hofstede of Dutch patricians) and those developed by officials of the trading company and wealthy freemen at the Cape of Good Hope in southern Africa, the Dutch East Indies (e.g. on the outskirts of Batavia) and the Dutch West Indies (e.g. the landhuizen on Curaçao) and some plantations in North America.

As the two earliest examples of an idealised farmstead envisaged and contextualised within their dramatic natural and agricultural setting, both have evolved since their establishment in the late 17th and early 18th century over a period of more than 300 years, but still retain elements that typified their origins.

Based on the model of the grand country estate of the European elite, Groot Constantia and Vergelegen were conceived under the ownership and aspirations of high ranking VOC officials and existed in strong contrast to the typically modest farmsteads of free burghers at the Cape of Good Hope during the late 17th and early 18th century. Both were potent early symbols of colonial power within the southern African context. With emphasis on the value of property as status markers, they served as likely models for aspiring freemen and the emergence of the “Cape Dutch” farmstead during the later 18th century and into the early 19th century. Strongly influenced by classical Western architectural and landscape design principles, yet within the context of a growing expression of an independent identity by Cape freemen against VOC control and dominance, the idealised Cape Dutch farmstead found exceptional expression at Groot Constantia in its extensive remodelling during this period under the ownership of a wealthy and influential free burgher lineage.

The exceptional walled octagonal structure at Vergelegen emulated Classical and Renaissance architectural ideas in a Dutch colonial context at a time when the Dutch elite introduced the concept in the Netherlands. Equally rare within the early Cape colonial context are the archaeological remains of three-aisled barns at Vergelegen based on the northern European vernacular design known as a loshuis/hallehuis, a type of building which did not last into the later (post-1740) Cape Dutch period.

The evolution of Cape architecture reflected in these farmsteads was influenced by construction methods, available resources - both imported and local building materials, skills and craftsmanship, stylistic inspirations, economic aspirations and cultural interaction between people of diverse cultural backgrounds, such as European settlers, slaves from the East Indies, the Indian subcontinent and Africa, as well as the indigenous Khoekhoe.

At the beginning of the 20th century Cape architecture, interacting with the international Arts and Craft movement inspired the typology of a Cape Revival architectural style that is very apparent on both estates in terms of their substantial restoration and rehabilitation during this period. There are strong linkages between the promotion of a social cohesion strategy following the South African (Anglo-Boer) Wars and the establishment of the Union of South
Africa in 1910, and the development of a preservation ethos towards traditional vernacular architecture and shared heritage. Through the actions of the then owners of these properties as well as other influential cultural and political leaders, a conservation and preservation system was established in South Africa.

Criterion (v): be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change.

The Early Cape Farmsteads represent a diverse tapestry and trajectory of agricultural settlement and land use at the Cape of Good Hope spanning over 300 years of agricultural production and rural settlement. As a coherent ensemble, Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are outstanding examples of the concept of grandeur and power in rural settlement-making within the Cape Winelands context, as well as the fusion of settlement form and place, with the location of each farm adjacent to a dramatic mountain setting, some of which now form part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

The land grants of the early Cape farms illustrated the evolution of a human society, land-use and settlement over time at the Cape of Good Hope, under the influence of an interaction with the physical constraints and opportunities presented by the natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces from four continents moulded together at the southern tip of Africa.

At the beginning of globalisation and enriched by cultural influences accumulated from various continents, surrounded by natural elements suited for agriculture and more specifically viticulture, and situated in a dramatic natural environment, the Early Cape Farmsteads are the original idealised farm settlements established at the southern point of Africa. Since their establishment - Constantia in the late 17th century and Vergelegen at the beginning of the 18th century - these farmsteads have evolved as traditional agricultural settlements, but retain the elements that underlie their origins. With their vineyards, orchards, gardens, fields, homesteads and outbuildings nestling on the slopes of the Cape’s mountains and along water courses, these early farmsteads illustrate the irrevocable impact of human settlement, labour practices, including slavery, and agrarian culture since colonialisation in the mid-17th century on the natural landscape and environment. In their layout, each farmstead responds to the remarkable landscape, the limitations and opportunities that the natural environment provided and the diverse and multi-cultural society that inhabited it. The resulting landscape of each farmstead contains characteristics that have contributed to the unique quality of the environment both built and cultivated.
These estates were developed during the onset of globalisation as a consequence of the international colonial trade between Europe (mainly the Dutch and British East India trading companies), Africa and East Asia. They embody the associations and symbiotic relationships between people and place: they exemplify, in physical form and layout, the characteristics of a dominant European culture brought to the Cape by administrators and pioneers, which was also reflected in other parts of the world under Dutch control. However, underlying cultural influences from the East (brought to the Cape by slaves, political exiles and settlers who lived in the East) are also present together with indigenous practices, embodied in both tangible and intangible cultural expressions.

Enslaved people from the East Indies, Madagascar, Mozambique, India and elsewhere also contributed substantially to the growth and development of the Early Cape homesteads and agricultural prosperity.

Constantia has been an icon since it was first laid out and developed in the late 17th century and reflects elements in its layout of the country estates created by the gardeners and designers for the Dutch patricians and merchants in the Netherlands, but also for royalty and wealthy estate owners in other countries. Virtually every visitor to the Cape recorded their visits to Constantia (Groot Constantia and De Hoop op Constantia), providing a constant narrative through the ages. Qualities that made them so prominent were an intermingling of the famous wines produced on the estates, abundant produce, the remarkable culture of the owners, inhabitants, labourers and slaves, expressed through the hospitality extended to visitors and clients, and the splendour of the agrarian landscape.

Vergelegen, with its central octagonal plan, represents a rare interaction between formal and natural elements in terms of its Classicist origins and the Lourens River valley floor on which it was laid out. The octagonal plan may have been deliberately designed and located for solar alignment to ensure the optimum environment within its walled garden in which to conduct experiments to grow and acclimatise exotic plants and flowers. The outbuildings, many with multi-functional uses, reflected the idealised, self-sufficient agricultural estate promoted in late 17th century European publications.

The two estates set the benchmark for the development of traditional rural agrarian land-use and settlements of Cape colonial farmers and the basis for a region-specific vernacular architecture on which other farms at the Cape and beyond were later modelled. Although large numbers of farms were established and developed during the 18th and 19th centuries, many of these have become either rare due to incorporation in the ever-expanding urban areas of Cape Town and surrounding towns, or have been partly or totally demolished.

2.3 Expanded statement of significance

The two estates represent the diverse tapestry of the Cape cultural heritage in a coherent ensemble comprising themes related to the role of the VOC at the onset of globalisation and international trade, farming and wine-making from the mid-17th century, the emergence of a Cape Dutch rural architectural tradition, slavery, relations with indigenous people and the fusion of a settlement form and place, with the location of both farms adjacent to a dramatic mountain setting and on the urban periphery. This unique landscape is characterised by the following:

- The landscape was occupied from pre-colonial times by hunter-gatherers and Khoekhoe herders who used the coastline, the fertile plains and the more mountainous areas, and their associated biomes, for herding, hunting and foraging which resulted in a pattern of on-going contestation with colonial settlers and the assimilation or displacement of the original inhabitants.
• The cultural landscape within which the estates are embedded give expression to a cross-section linking the mountains to the sea, a wilderness landscape associated with the higher lying areas, an agrarian landscape at the mid-level and urban settlement at the low-lying level adjacent to the coastline. A harmonious relationship is thus evident between the three components of the Cape cultural landscape; the settlement structure/built-form, the agrarian landscape and the natural/wilderness setting.

• There are unique and high botanical and horticultural values set within an agricultural and wilderness landscape as reflected in adjacent portions of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

• The estates reflect a colonial project, primarily related to the VOC dating from the 17th and 18th centuries, linking Africa, Europe and East Asia.

• The two estates represent a continuing enduring and constantly evolving landscape which exhibits significant material evidence of international influences that affected the role of viticulture in the early development of the Cape and the evolution of Cape vernacular architecture. The estates demonstrate the innovative, pioneering, experimental and productive nature of importing vines from Europe from the mid-17th century and their adaptation to local conditions.

• These historical, social and symbolic values are reinforced by the dramatic nature of the scenic context within which the estates are embedded and the interaction between human intervention and the natural environment has resulted in a unique landscape. The fusion of cultures from different continents resulting from the Cape’s strategic location at the southern tip of Africa, and the trade routes thus established, contribute to this diverse cultural landscape of outstanding universal value.

• Successive social cultural forces from different continents have moulded and shaped a particular settlement pattern and architectural form of which the two sites are prime examples. The network and symbiotic relationship between people and place has endured through the centuries and expresses a model of survival and prosperity in the ‘New World’.

• A unique landscape, which comprises of agricultural landscapes, historic settlements and farms, thus reveals a particular style of vernacular that evolved from the mix of immigrant colonial influences upon a landscape that had previously been inhabited by the indigenous hunter-gatherers and herders of the Cape. This diverse mix of culture, race, ethnicity and language has impacted on a natural environment of outstanding scenic value resulting in a unique cultural landscape.

• The two estates thus reflect broader patterns of history, the interplay of trade routes and the transference of skills from a core centred in Western Europe to the periphery, in this instance the southern tip of Africa. Patterns of power and influence are thus expressed at global, national, regional/metropolitan and local level.

• The estates and their immediate contexts reveal changing labour practices, from unfree labour (slaves), to freed slaves and convicts, to wage labour. Slavery performed a significant role in the transformation of a small refreshment station in the mid-17th century to a significant agricultural economy during the 19th century.

• Spatial relationships related to the changing status of labour are evident, with an increasing distance between owner, domestic servants and farm workers emerging after the abolition of slavery in the mid-19th century. Slaves were originally located within or in relatively close proximity to the homestead. Labourers were relocated in cottages at a greater distance. Current attitudes reveal an intention to move labour off the farm to
enable security of tenure. An increasing literal and metaphorical distance between owners and labourers is thus evident.

- There is a high archaeological value and potential of both estates, particularly related to the history of slavery and architectural history

- There is the significant role of Islam as a unifying factor for slaves, free blacks and political exiles.

- The estates reflect the power and privilege of the South African landed gentry and the process of aggrandisement and gentrification of the rural landscape; and the acquisition of prestige and status which is an enduring feature of the Cape Winelands.

- The significance of the rehabilitation of Vergelegen and Groot Constantia in the 1920s in order to promote social cohesion by creating a common heritage (e.g. the Cape Dutch Revival architectural style) following the divisive South African (Anglo Boer) War and the formation of the Union of South Africa. The promotion of social cohesion, however, tended to foreground one particular group and the contribution of indigenous knowledge systems in the evolution of the Cape Dutch Revival architectural style (for example the use of roof thatching) has been under emphasized.

- The protected nature of the sites, formalised in the form of a Trust to manage Groot Constantia in 1993 in order to promote and preserve it as a cultural historical monument and as an educational asset on behalf the people of South Africa, and at Vergelegen in the form of corporate investment to present an idealised idea of place at a certain period. It is acknowledged that the motivations for the formation of the Trust is contested with some believing that the transfer was to ensure the preservation of a colonial monument, primarily for the benefit of predominantly white South Africans at a time of transition and uncertainty.

- The role of Groot Constantia immediately prior to the process of political transition in 1994, in maintaining the state-generated configuration of national memory and identity by means of a Trust. Significance resides in the use of cultural heritage and memory, as determined at that time, to forge nation building during the process of the transfer of ownership and control of Groot Constantia from the state to the Trust in 1993.

- In spatial and architectural terms the estates have considerable significance in terms of the following:
  - Early unique and seminal examples of a planned settlement within the agrarian setting of the Cape Winelands.
  - Model examples of the adaptation of an 18th century European tradition of order and symmetry which informed the evolution of the Cape farm werf, and the use of gateways, gables, symmetry and visual axes as symbols of dominance and power in society.
  - The structure of the place and the relationship between the component parts and the visual spatial relationship with the mountain backdrop are clearly legible and easily understood. The extent of the long visual axes: at Groot Constantia from the historic gateway, through the homestead and wine cellar to the river to the south; at Vergelegen through the homestead and octagonal garden to the Hottentots Holland Mountain range to the east.
The rare use of the octagonal form in Cape architectural and landscaping history at Vergelegen, and the asymmetrical layout of the werf to exploit visual linkages to False Bay at Groot Constantia.

2.4 Statement of authenticity and integrity

Authenticity as a heritage term generally refers to genuineness or truthfulness; the lack of conjecture or distortion in the presentation and interpretation of the heritage resource related to its historicity or the proven origins of the material fabric, including evidence of workmanship and use, and in the design and layout of the place and its relationship with its setting.

However, in the South African context, this understanding of the term may seem exclusive and elitist. It may be perceived to symbolically reflect an uncritical approach towards an oppressive past experienced by historically disadvantaged groups. What might be regarded as genuine by one group may be regarded as ambiguous or deceptive by another. Authenticity in South African heritage practice thus needs to be accompanied by recognition of a multiplicity and diversity of historical perspectives and values.

These attitudes are analysed here in relation to the Groot Constantia and Vergelegen estates. A range of heritage values is evident at both estates and these are described in the expanded statement of heritage significance.

Authenticity in relation to the estates needs to respond to a physical ‘truthfulness’ of historical layering. More specifically, it should reflect the ability of each space to respond meaningfully to the various, often conflicting, ideological demands of the various groups who have shaped and been shaped by them. The ‘authentic’ historical space should also respond to the needs of the present.

Authenticity in the South African context needs to relate to the ability of both estates to survive and transcend the various reincarnations and reinterpretations that have occurred over time and in the present.

The interplay between symbolic, associational, historical and educational values and their relationship to the settlement pattern is evident at both estates. They are embedded in the relationship of different parts to the whole and their relationship to their natural setting on the metropolitan urban periphery, and their nature as enduring productive landscapes over the last three hundred and thirty years. These values have varied over time.

The challenge today is to acknowledge and integrate the various, often competing and fractured, cultural histories associated with the estates.

In the case of Groot Constantia in particular, there is possible evidence of material fabric related to slavery, the role of which has traditionally been marginalized and silenced in favour of a ‘dominant discourse’ that is linked to European identity and privilege. The unearthing of narratives and voices associated with such remnants (for example the possibility of the passageway under the homestead, the ‘vuurherds’ in the Jonkershuis complex and the pool behind the wine cellar) could contribute to a more inclusive, and authentic, version of the past to emerge and the affirmation and promotion of a site of memory where all South Africans could identify with the diverse cultural heritage of the estate.
The paragraphs below analyse the concept of authenticity in terms of the Operational Guidelines to the World Heritage Convention, the Nara document on Authenticity and Nara +20 which explores authenticity in the African context.

2.4.1 Operational Guidelines (OG) and the Nara Documents on authenticity

In the OG to the World Heritage Convention the concepts of authenticity and integrity are addressed in sections 79 – 95. Properties that are nominated under criteria (i) to (vi) must meet the conditions of authenticity (the Early Cape Farmsteads are nominated as a cultural property). The revised OG expand on the requirements relating to integrity and require that all properties nominated for inscription shall satisfy the conditions of integrity.

The Nara Document on Authenticity (to which the OG make reference) as well as Nara +20 on heritage practices, cultural values and the concept of authenticity are used here to establish the authenticity of the properties. The principles contained in the two documents are used to inform the concept of authenticity as it relates to the Early Cape Farmsteads.

Nara +20 interprets authenticity as: “A culturally contingent quality associated with a heritage place, practice or object that conveys cultural value. It is recognized as a meaningful expression of an evolving cultural tradition; and/or evokes among individuals the social and emotional resonance of group identity.”

It goes on to define cultural values: “The meanings, functions or benefits ascribed by various communities to something they designate as heritage, and which creates the cultural significance of a place or object.”

Section (13) of the Nara document refers to the nature of cultural heritage, its cultural context, and its evolution through time.

In order to prove authenticity, the cultural values, as recognized in the nomination dossier, need to be truthfully and credibly expressed through a variety of attributes including:

- Form and design
- Materials and substance
- Use and function
- Traditions, techniques and management systems
- Location and setting
- Language and other forms of intangible heritage
- Spirit and feeling, and
- Other internal and external factors.

Both Nara texts make reference to the following concepts:

(1) Diversity of heritage processes

Authenticity varies according to the cultural context; the concept of cultural heritage itself assumes diverse forms and processes. There are a wide variety of social processes by which cultural heritage is produced, used, interpreted and safeguarded. These processes and the perceptions of authenticity have been affected by emerging technologies for accessing and experiencing heritage. As recognized by Nara + 20, there is a dynamic interrelationship between tangible and intangible heritage (particularly within the African context). At both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen there are opportunities to explore this interplay, for example in the making of symbolic and literal spaces for telling of different histories.
(2) Implications of the evolution of cultural values

Cultural heritage undergoes a continuous process of evolution. In addition to this, engagement with communities in the heritage processes has given rise to the acceptance of new or previously unacknowledged values. The identification of values and the determination of authenticity should be based on periodic reviews that accommodate changes over time in both attitudes and perceptions, rather than a single assessment.

(3) Involvement of multiple stakeholders

The need to acknowledge that cultural heritage may be significant in different ways to a broader range of communities and interest groups than have traditionally been considered.

(4) Conflicting claims and interpretations

Respect for cultural diversity in cases where cultural values appear to be in conflict is increasingly important. Issues of elitism versus multi-vocality are relevant. Large rural estates such as Groot Constantia and Vergelegen have cultural value for certain individuals and communities in the past and present and also at different times. The farm worker community have traditional and generational ties to the place that have become subservient to those of the property owners.

The challenge of how to establish the nature and extent to which a group value is attached to the two estates arises. A public participation process is vital. Group value is likely to depend on location within the socio-economic and class hierarchy and the period that is being assessed. Owners, occupants, artisans, workers (permanent, seasonal) and neighbours are all likely to assign different values at different times.

(5) Sustainable development

While not specifically addressing issues of culture and sustainable development, Nara +20 acknowledges the need to consider cultural heritage in sustainable development and poverty-reduction strategies. The use of cultural heritage in development strategies must take into account cultural values, processes, community concerns and administrative practices while ensuring equitable participation in socio-economic benefits. The balance between cultural heritage and economic development must be seen as part of the notion of sustainability.

(6) Historic layering

In terms of the properties to be included in the nomination of the Early Cape Farmsteads, the argument for authenticity of the properties is based upon the concept of ‘layering’, both in terms of the physical fabric and landscape layout. Historical layering has to consider later significant developments which extend well beyond the ‘early’ colonial period.

It is thus problematic to confine the analysis to the ‘early’ Cape Farmsteads — i.e. the Dutch East India Company period. What remains and can be seen and experienced on both estates is a layering of precolonial and 17th, 18th, 19th and 20th century periods. The Groot Constantia homestead burnt down in 1925 and was restored to ‘at best’ period shortly thereafter. Similarly, the Vergelegen homestead and its associated gardens were substantially remodelled during the Phillips period in the early 20th century. Embedded within both structures however, is earlier fabric.

Layering in the South African ‘Cape’ context follows broad time frames and related built form manifestations:
• The precolonial period, characterised after 2000 years ago by Khoekhoe pastoralists, whose cyclical patterns of mobility were related to seasonal variations in grazing and water resources.
• The 17th century colonial project, characterized by aspirations to landhuizen in the Netherlands and Asia, and other Dutch colonies, with strategic nodes established on the Cape Peninsula and in its hinterland.
• The later 18th century period, characterised by an emerging rural gentry in wheat/wine/cattle belts, with the central role of slavery and indigenous labour in farm production, and unique Cape vernacular and later classic Cape Dutch makeovers in the 1780s to 1820s which extended into the British period.
• The 19th century (first half) period, characterized by a rising rural gentry, syncretic Cape Dutch and British trade and farming practices, slave emancipation, segregation and labour management. The 19th century (second half) period, characterized by mineral exploitation, the South African (Anglo Boer) War, vine disease resulting in shifts from wine to fruit production, and rising corporatism.
• The 20th century period, characterized by the Union of South Africa, Cape Revival architecture, increasing industrial/mining interests largely emanating from the Witwatersrand, nationalist projects, Afrikaner identity, apartheid and the migrant labour system.
• The 21st century period, characterized by democracy, restitution and post-colonial identity, increased awareness and complexities surrounding heritage conservation and increasing corporate branding and tourism related to the wine industry.

(7) The integration of culture and nature

The dynamic integration of both cultural and natural assets is rooted within the statement of OUV for both the sites. This concept is an intrinsic part of the qualities of the sites and contributes to their significance and OUV.

(8) Public accessibility and the appreciation and interpretation of cultural heritage

This principle, and the educational value attached, is a key contributor to the vision for both sites. It is noted, however, that public accessibility is not a requirement for World Heritage Site status.

2.4.2 Authenticity in terms of the World Heritage Convention

The arguments for authenticity of the Early Cape Farmsteads are based on the attributes set out within the draft statement of OUV, most particularly those which are related to the criteria (ii) and (v) under which the nomination has been proposed; these criteria are the two that are considered to be the most appropriate for the property.

The resource under consideration must:

(ii) exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture, technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design; and

(v) be an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change.
Criterion (ii)

The two rural estates represent the interchange of human values evidenced in the evolution of the cultural heritage of the Cape and comprising themes relating to the role of the VOC in international trade and colonial place-making from the mid-17th century, the development of a specific and unique vernacular architecture, a slave-based economy, and the fusion of a settlement form and place.

The two estates represent the earliest examples of idealised landscapes established at the Cape from the late-17th century during the onset of globalization associated with international trade between Europe, Africa and east Asia (Dutch and British) when the Cape functioned as a victualling station for the VOC. Both estates are exemplary examples of a colonial project and are potent early symbols of colonial power within the southern African context.

Criterion (v)

Cape rural estates are the result of an international colonial trading project linking Europe, Africa and East Asia, under the most influential trading nations in existence in the 17th to early 19th centuries (Dutch and British). It is evident that the two estates embody the networks and symbiotic relationships between people and place and that they exemplify, in physical form and layout, the characteristics of a dominant European culture that impacted on the various parts of the world under their rule. Their OUV rests, for the most part, in the very particular response to the remarkable landscape, the limitations and opportunities of the natural environment, and the diverse and multi-cultural society that inhabited it.

The estates represent a diverse tapestry and trajectory of agricultural settlement and land use spanning over 300 years of agricultural production and rural settlement. As coherent ensembles the two estates are outstanding examples of the expression of power in rural settlement making within the Cape Winelands context and the fusion of settlement form and place, with the location of each farm adjacent to a dramatic mountain setting, parts of which are a component of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

The resulting landscape contains a number of characteristics that have contributed to the unique quality of the environment both built and cultivated. The estates are embedded within landscapes that transect mountain ranges to the coastline. Each section contains within it a wilderness area associated with the higher mountainous area, a historic agrarian landscape at the mid-level which contains the historic farms and vineyard plantings, and the lower section adjacent to the coastline which contains the developed urban environment. There is a variety of unique vegetation types of high botanical horticultural.

In summary, the authenticity of both estates is high in terms of use and function, form and design, and the location and setting within the broader cultural landscape of the Cape Winelands. Retention of the layering of history and cultural values is accorded great importance and the intangible heritage of tradition and cultural continuity (which has its origins in the diverse group of people who contributed to the making of the place) is respected. Both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are situated within a larger productive working landscape and retain agriculture (vineyards and winemaking) as their core activity and the traditional planting of vines has been continued and developed over time. New areas of cultivation maintain the historic traditional approach to the landscape, although other activities relating to tourism and interpretation have been introduced. They are both also located adjacent to the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

With regard to the specific estates:
Groot Constantia

Groot Constantia is one of the earliest wine producing farms in the country, having been established in 1685 shortly after the first colonial settlement of the then Cape of Good Hope. Constantia wine reached Europe in the 1690s and by the mid-18th century was world famous. Groot Constantia and Klein Constantia, which were subdivisions of the original grant in 1712 (Klein Constantia was renamed Hoop op Constantia in 1776) supplied the VOC and later the British government with wine until the end of the 1820s and continued to produce famous Constantia wine well into 19th century with both farms falling into decline from the mid-19th century. The estate continues to produce award winning wines to this day.

The homestead at Groot Constantia was rebuilt to its previous late 18th century state after a fire in 1925 and the process was systematically recorded by prominent architect, RK Kendall. The documentation provides valuable information about the much earlier structures on the site. The werf between the homestead and the Cloete cellar and the forecourt to the homestead at Groot Constantia was re-landscaped during the 1990s.

The estate is one of the Cape’s most popular tourist destinations. The buildings within the historic core remain authentic in terms of their fabric, plan and form, while new uses are sympathetic to the original functions. The dwelling house is a period house museum, the Cloete wine cellar is used as a wine tasting facility, and interpretation centre, and the jonkershuis serves as a restaurant. Other outbuildings serve as offices and a conference room.

The authenticity of Groot Constantia is reinforced by its setting within a productive agricultural landscape and adjacent to the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

It is also reinforced by its ownership by the Groot Constantia Trust that was established by statute to keep the estate in trust for the South African nation and for public benefit purposes.

Vergelegen

One of the earliest farms in the Cape, granted in 1700, Vergelegen has been producing multi-award winning wines for many years. The heritage of the estate has been carefully conserved and serves as the foundation of the owner’s approach to the activities and development of the farm. The rich layered history of the many owners, occupants, workers and slaves who lived on the estate has contributed to the unique character of the place and this has been extensively researched and interpreted for visitors.

Several phases of restoration work to both properties have taken place during the course of the 20th century. Recent work has been undertaken in accordance with international best practice and done by experts in the field of heritage architecture, historical archaeology and building restoration, and has been approved by the relevant heritage authorities. Extensive documentation is available on all work carried out.

The late 18th century homestead at Vergelegen was also restored in the early 20th century by prominent SA architect, Percy Waigate, new wings were added and the gardens re-landscaped. Much of the fabric dates to this period. The homestead is furnished with period furniture and other artefacts owned by Vergelegen Wines (Pty) Ltd. Some artefacts are on loan from the collection of Iziko Museums of South Africa (Iziko).

Earlier historical fabric remains embedded in both homesteads and in the immediate werf, and the octagonal garden at Vergelegen is a carefully researched reinstatement of the early Dutch period configuration. Extensive archaeological research of the outbuildings contributes
to an understanding of the site during the early 18th century, with particular emphasis on its history of slavery, agricultural activities, settlement form and architectural expression.

The authenticity of Vergelegen is reinforced by its setting within a productive agricultural landscape and Private Nature Reserve and adjacent to the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

It is concluded that both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen, both individually and jointly have satisfied the conditions required for authenticity.

2.4.3 Integrity in terms of the World Heritage Convention

Integrity means the measure of wholeness and intactness of the cultural heritage and its attributes (Operational Guidelines S 88).

The Operational Guidelines indicate that the conditions of integrity require the assessment of the extent to which the property:

a) includes all elements necessary to express its OUV;
b) is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the property’s significance; and
c) suffers from adverse effects of development and/or neglect.

(This last aspect relates specifically to issues around the management and sustainability of the property).

In order to establish the conditions of integrity for the Early Cape Farmsteads WHS nomination it is necessary to ensure that:

- the physical fabric of the property together with its significant features is in good condition;
- the impact of any deterioration process is controlled;
- a large proportion of elements that define the values of the property are included; and
- the relationship and dynamic functions present in the property and its associated cultural landscape that is essential to its distinctive character, must be maintained.

Groot Constantia

The estate is situated within the Constantia-Tokai Farmlands Grade I Landscape and is located adjacent to the Table Mountain National Park (TMNP) which forms part of Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

The total extent of the estate is 148,580 hectares and it is one of the core components of a productive agricultural and natural landscape located to the west of the suburbs of Constantia. It forms part of a band of historical farmsteads (their historical associations, architecture, built form and spatial configuration including access arrangements) and productive agricultural lands nestled on the eastern slope of the Table Mountain National Park (one of the properties included in the Floral Region Protected Areas WHS) in the Constantia-Tokai Valley with a focus on farming and wine-making; its history as the first home of wine-making in South Africa. Of particular significance are the historical and visual spatial linkages between Groot Constantia, Klein Constantia, Nova Constantia and Hoop op Constantia, Buitenverwatching and Constantia Uitsig and their sense of rootedness in agriculture-forestry-viticulture which are worthy of Grade I heritage and thus formal protection as national heritage sites. Also of significance is the historical spatial linkage between Groot Constantia and Mount Prospect which is worthy of Grade IIIA heritage status. Of particular significance is the landscape pattern of mountainous streams, riverine corridors, greenbelts, cultivated lands and fields, axial tree lined routes and paths, old trees
around homesteads as well as mountainous backdrops, peaks and forests that the unify the area at the broader landscape scale. The agricultural landscape comprising the Constantia-Tokai Valley has undergone a gradual reduction in the size of farms and the ever tightening of the density of the subdivisions and suburbanisation around what became known as the “farm anchors” and “riverine corridors” of the Valley is a central theme in the more recent history of the broader landscape and its gradual transformation.

Groot Constantia is a fully operational farm of which 90 hectares remain under vineyards and producing award winning wines. The historic core of the property contains the homestead, jonkershuis, cellar, coach house and stables arranged along forecourt and courtyard between the homestead and cellar. The layout and configuration of these elements and the retention and enhancement of their spatial relationships and the design principles of axiality, symmetry, the dominance of the homestead with the extensive use of gables and its exceptionally tall front gable, tree lined avenues and werf walling all reflect planning and design principles associated with a Cape Dutch rural architectural tradition.

The property also contains later 20th century buildings, including an additional wine cellar (Bertrams Cellar) (early 20th century) and a 1980s wine cellar. It is one of the region’s top tourist destinations.

The property is zoned primary agriculture in terms of the Southern District Plan (2014) Spatial Development Framework and the landowner has confirmed that the long-term vision for the property will remain focused on agricultural activity with no change from the cultivation of vines and wine-making. The agricultural activities are self-sustaining and the farming operation is operating at almost full capacity.

The entire estate is a declared Grade II Provincial Heritage Site.

The value and significance of Groot Constantia is reinforced by the dramatic nature of its scenic context and the interaction between the natural environment (the TMNP), and urban environment as well as the distant views down to the sea (False Bay) with a backdrop of the mountains situated in the Boland Mountain Complex of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS. This relationship between wilderness and cultivated landscapes forms a key attribute of the site and is a fundamental attribute contributing to the value and the integrity of the property.

Development pressures affecting Groot Constantia that could impact on integrity arise mostly from continuing residential development within a suburban environment of Constantia. In terms of the landscape qualities, the estate shares a boundary with the TMNP, and there are a number of historic wine farms in the immediate context. Development pressures on the estate itself are very limited.

Vergelegen

The estate is situated adjacent to the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS (Boland Mountain Complex). The total extent of the estate is 3020 hectares and it forms an integral component of an agricultural and natural landscape located to the east of the suburbs of Somerset West. The property is currently zoned primarily for agriculture. In terms of the Helderberg District Plan (2011) it is designated as Intensive Agriculture and core conservation.

Vergelegen is a fully operational farm producing award winning wines and is a major tourist destination. The farm is divided into three zones. The upper zone is dedicated to the conservation of the natural environment (this borders onto the Hottentots Holland Nature Reserve which forms part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS, the central zone is dedicated to agricultural production with 159 hectares under vines, and the lower zone comprises the built environment heritage core and the wine and hospitality facilities.
Vergelegen currently contains an avenue of significant camphor trees of great age which are a Grade II Provincial Heritage Site.

The relationship between the historic core of the estate and both the natural and cultural settings surrounding it is highly positive. This relationship has been enhanced by the creation of carefully designed vistas which heighten the visual connectivity between the various built elements on the historic werf and the mountain setting that frames the estate. As is the case with Groot Constantia, the value of the property is augmented by the dramatic nature of its scenic context and the interaction between a ‘wilderness’ area (the Boland Mountain complex WHS), and the urban environment, as well as the views and proximity to the sea (False Bay).

Vergelegen is extremely well managed and sets the benchmark for the sustainable management and conservation of similar properties in the Province, and the country as a whole. Development pressures surrounding the estate are low and those opportunities that still exist will have little or no impact on the heritage qualities of the property.

For both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen the conditions of integrity as interpreted in the Operational Guidelines are therefore considered to have been addressed.

2.4.4 Summary

The design and layout of both estates are considered to be the result of an ongoing process associated with the cultural, social and physical conditions of a particular time, and changes over time. As cultural values are not permanent but are continuously being generated by communities and powerful elites, they necessarily vary over time. Structures built or laid out at a particular time embody the values of that period, which may be different from contemporary conceptions of value. Consequently, the authenticity of a heritage resource is related to several processes that have generated it: the design and physical construction, the spatial relationships of the component parts, the relationship to the setting, and so on. Retaining authenticity means the ability to identify and convey these shifts in value and meaning (Article 13).

Authenticity extends beyond being a matter of architecture and material culture. It is also a matter of spirit: a search for meaning which “accords full respect to the social and cultural values of all societies” (Article 2). Respect in this sense is a process whereby the authenticity of the heritage resource manifests as the true essence of a place.

A constant process of critical awareness of meanings and the way in which material culture is used and interpreted is evident at both sites (such as the slavery exhibit at Vergelegen and the proposed new tourism strategy at Groot Constantia). The strategy is to uncover a previously excluded history, to situate both estates in a range of contexts including colonialism, slavery, the Apartheid era and the post 1994 democratic society, to address a difficult, divided past, to provide a connection to a shared and inclusive past, and to establish opportunities for the integration of the diversity of cultural heritage.

As they stand, both estates express the concept of authenticity and integrity in material culture, encapsulating the history of the Cape from the Van der Stel period, through powerful individual landowners into commercial production and up to the democratic period. The acknowledgement of the diversity of heritage values and their changing nature over time is still in the process of being revealed.
3. BOUNDARIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE

The properties included in the proposed Early Farmsteads of the Cape of Good Hope WHS are identified as the entire landholdings of Groot Constantia measuring 148,5802 hectares and the historical precinct of Vergelegen measuring 75.912 hectares. Both estates share numerous boundaries with adjacent properties (see Figures 3.2 and 5.0).

For the purposes of protecting the outstanding universal value of the world heritage site the following buffer areas are proposed in this draft ICMP:

- The properties immediately abutting Groot Constantia.
- The remainder of Vergelegen comprising 2940.1483 hectares.

The designation of a buffer zone around Groot Constantia is complex for the following reasons:

- There are a variety of conditions on the boundaries of Groot Constantia, including the TMNP, numerous residential properties and farms, which would imply a range of conservation objectives for their inclusion in a buffer zone.
- The appropriate mechanism for the protection of a buffer zone would need to be subject to a consultation process and require the support and consent of the numerous affected property owners.

The implications arising for the designation of buffer zones around the WHS are discussed in Section 11.

Possible extension of the core area:

It is understood that the WHS inscription of the Early Cape Farmsteads could be extended in the future to include other representative farmsteads that contribute to outstanding universal value. In the instance of Groot Constantia, the WHS could be extended to include adjacent farmsteads that formed part of the 1685 Constantia grant, in particular Klein Constantia, and the strong historical spatial linkages between Groot Constantia and Klein Constantia and the landscape pattern of mountain streams, cultivated landscapes, farmsteads, axial tree lined roadways and paths, and mountainous forests that unify the area at this larger scale.
4. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPERTIES

4.1 Groot Constantia

4.1.1 Physical qualities

Groot Constantia estate is located within Municipal Ward 71, Constantia, of the City of Cape Town, which falls within the Western Cape Province of the Republic of South Africa. It forms an integral component of an agricultural and a natural landscape located to the west of the suburb of Constantia and adjacent to the TMNP with distant views towards False Bay to the south. The TMNP forms part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

The total extent of the landholdings comprising the estate is 148,5802 hectares. The State acquired various landholdings comprising the Groot Constantia Estate since 1885. The public were provided access to the homestead after the homestead was restored in 1926 and opened as a museum in 1927. Significant investments in viticulture and the restoration of the historic core were undertaken in 1993 and the ownership of the estate transferred to the Groot Constantia Trust with the specific intention of managing and protecting the historic core and farm as a public national heritage asset including public access.

Groot Constantia is a fully operational farm with approximately 90 hectares under vineyards and where a wide range of award winning estate wines are produced and sold. With a long history of wine production within the Constantia Valley, Groot Constantia wines have been the recipient of international wine awards since the 19th century.

The historic core incorporates a period house museum, wine tasting and interpretation centre and restaurant facilities. Historical buildings of significance include the homestead, cellar, jonkershuis, coach house and stables. Later 20th century buildings to the north-east of the core include a 1920s Betrams wine cellar with late 20th additions (now a staff training venue) and a 1980s wine cellar. Wine Sales and offices are situated at the entrance to the property and the periphery of the core in order to limit traffic for wine sales and deliveries from intruding into the historic core.

Furniture, paintings, textiles, ceramics, brass and copperware exhibited in the house provide an insight into the life of a successful Cape farmer from the late 18th century. A collection of carriages is exhibited in the coach house in the jonkershuis complex. In the Cloete cellar, where the Constantia wines were made since 1791, wine storage and drinking vessels, dating from antiquity to the early twentieth century, are on display. Panels, artefacts and archaeological displays also provide an overview of the history of Groot Constantia, including its owners, slavery on the estate and visitors to the estate.

(1) Groot Constantia settlement and landscape

Groot Constantia is located within the Constantia-Tokai Valley regarded as highly representative of the Cape Winelands cultural landscape in term of the dynamic mountain-valley setting, the visual dominance of a productive agricultural landscape, riverine corridors and the collection of significant historic farms and associated farmsteads. The Constantia-Tokai Farmlands have been graded by the national heritage authority (South African Heritage Resources Agency; SAHRA) as a Grade 1 (national) heritage resource.

Groot Constantia is a product of interaction between natural systems, a bio-diverse natural landscape of great scenic beauty and human intervention extending over its documented history of 330 years. The resulting landscape contains a number of characteristics that have contributed to the unique quality of the environment both built and cultivated.
The estate is embedded within a landscape context that transects mountain to the coastline. This transection contains within it a wilderness area of high biodiversity and scenic value associated with the higher mountainous area, a historic agrarian landscape at the mid-level which contains the historic farms and associated homesteads, and the lower section with distant views to the coastline which contains the urban environment.

Located on the periphery of an expanding metropolitan urban development footprint, Groot Constantia and its surrounding farmlands have been under threat since the 1970s and have been reduced to an “agricultural island” within the Cape Winelands regional context. Groot Constantia and its surrounding farms form a major agricultural anchor of the Constantia-Tokai Valley and green “environmental room” on the urban periphery within this broader cultural landscape context.

Groot Constantia is situated on the lower to middle slopes of the Vlakkenberg Mountain, a portion of the crescent-shaped Constantiaberg Mountain that form a dramatic arched backdrop to the estate and whose upper slopes and ridges rise to the west of the farm as part of the TMNP, one of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS. The gentle foothills and middle slopes support the Agricultural Zone of the estate, while the middle to upper slopes are set aside for conservation as part of the Biodiversity and Wine Initiative. Alien vegetation is actively being removed from the upper reaches of the rivers that traverse the estate.

The historic core is nestled within a shallow valley in the centre of the Agricultural Zone and is surrounded on all sides by vineyards. Panoramic views provide a tangible experience of the farm’s raison d’etre. Dominant views are towards the backdrop of rolling slopes and mountains of TMNP and surrounding vineyards, foregrounded by the landmark qualities of the gabled homestead, and to the south-east opening up to a magnificent panorama of False Bay, the Cape Flats and Cape Fold Mountains.

The homestead faces north-east. The main approach to the homestead rises up a small embankment until one reaches the old gates. From here the approach road cuts through the embankment channelling views along the tree lined avenue towards the homestead.

The historic core typifies an exemplary 18th century Cape Dutch farmstead embedded within 17th century origins and a 20th century conservation ethos. Striking in its simplicity, its grandeur comes from applying classic principles of proportion, axial relationships, orthogonal form, symmetry, hierarchical structure, human scale and modulation of built structures. The linear row of the jonkershuis, coach house and former living quarters to the north-west is offset with a parallel ring wall (werf wall) on the south-east to form a level, longitudinal werf punctuated by an oak lined avenue to further accentuate the axial structure.

The layout, form and tectonic language of the farmstead was derived from practical logistics, functional necessity and available materials, yet evolved over time to receive detailed embellishment as economic prosperity permitted. The lavish remodelling and additions during the late 18th century expanded upon the geometric and proportional rules of the time and also strengthened and extended the formal axis through the homestead to the late 18th century wine cellar on the opposite side of a new courtyard. The main axis extends through and beyond the wine cellar in the form of a long, narrow and steep flight of steps (known as the slave steps) leading to the river and towards the surrounding cultivated and natural landscape.

The landscaping concept that informed the 1993 landscaping interventions core is influenced by the simple geometric lines that relate to the avenues, werfs and boundaries, with the minimal use of mixed plant and hard material.
Groot Constantia was granted Conservation Champion status by the World Wildlife Fund’s (WWF) Biodiversity & Wine Initiative (BWI) in 2017.

4.1.2 Property ownership

The properties comprising 148,5802 hectares are held by the Groot Constantia Trust. The Groot Constantia State Estate Control Act, 1975 (Act 24 of 1975) was promulgated to provide for the establishment of the Groot Constantia Control Board, who would act as custodian of Groot Constantia in future. The members of the Board consisted of experts in the wine industry and agriculture. In 1993 the estate passed into the ownership of the Groot Constantia Trust that was established by statute to keep the estate in trust for the South African nation. Groot Constantia Trust is a non-profit company incorporated in terms of the Groot Constantia Trust Act (Act No 1958 of 1993; GCTA) and registered in terms of the Companies Act, 2008 (Act 71 of 2008) for public benefit purposes. The properties comprising the estate include the following:

- Erf 1064 Constantia, held under Title deed T9830/1944, T62949/1999 and T22925/1975, measuring 2,0456 hectares.
- Erf 2744, Constantia, held under Title deed T62949 and T29294/1976, measuring 12,6594 hectares.
- Erf 2755 Constantia held under Title deed T13296/1961 and T62949/1999 measuring 1,3268 hectares.
- Erf 2623 Constantia held under Title deed T14559/1967 and T62949/1999, measuring 2,9164 hectares.
- Erf 2761 Constantia, held under Title deed T62949/1999 and T16978/1984, measuring 16,1069 hectares.
- Erf 6599 Constantia, held under Title deed T20780/1976 and T78384/1999, measuring 0,1459 hectares.
- Erf 7395 Constantia held under Title deed T20780/1976 and T62949/1999, measuring 11,1492 hectares.
- Erf 10860 Constantia held under T62949/1999 and T217/1885, measuring 9,5668 hectares.
- Erf 10861 Constantia held under Title deed T62949/1999 and T217/1885, measuring 76,6067 hectares.
- Erf 10862 Constantia held Title deed T62949/1999 and T217/1885, measuring 16,4547 hectares.
- Erf 10779 Constantia held unregistered measuring 5,8210 hectares.

In 1929, 32,5910 hectares of Groot Constantia estate comprising Remainder Farm 910 was demarcated as part of the Tokai Forest Reserve known as Groot Constantia Sub-reserve. In 1978 22,1725 hectares was withdrawn from demarcation effectively confirming its re-incorporation into Groot Constantia State estate, an area closely equivalent to the aggregate unregistered areas of Erf 10779 and Portion 3 of Farm 910. The description of Groot Constantia estate in the GCTA includes unregistered areas Erf 10779 and Portion 3 of Farm 910. However, in a Deed of Application dated 1999 Remainder Farm 910 was excluded from the list of Groot Constantia properties vested in the Groot Constantia Trust. Further clarity is required on the ownership of unregistered portions comprising Remainder Farm 910.

In 1994 the Surveyor-General approved a Consolidation Diagram No. 132/94 for the as yet unregistered Erf 10780, measuring 137, 2851 hectares.

The Memorandum of Incorporation (MOI) for the Groot Constantia Trust as a non-profit company dated 2013 includes the following objectives:

1. “To promote communal interests within the South African wine culture by funding the Groot Constantia Estate by way of donations, contributions, other fundraising and the
commercial production and sale of products of the vine and other agricultural products in order to render the said Estate accessible to the people of South Africa and to tourism and to preserve it in Trust and to manage it as a living museum for the cultural-historical legacy of the wine industry and the people of the Republic of South Africa in consideration of the fact that this marks the origin of the South African wine industry, achieving a pinnacle of international recognition during the nineteenth century.

2. To take the Estate into Trust, to fund it and commercially manage it in all its facets in order to promote and preserve it as a cultural historical heritage site, as an educational asset and as a wine-producing estate."

The Groot Constantia Manor House Museum forms part of Iziko. It is a flagship agency of the national Department of Arts and Culture in terms of the Cultural Institutions Act, 1998 (Act 119 of 1998) and the Public Finance Management Act, 1999 (Act 1 of 1999).

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Groot Constantia Trust and the South African Cultural History Museum (now Iziko) dated 1993 include the following terms:

- Iziko is responsible for museum activities within the historical core comprising the historical gates, homestead, wine cellar, steps to the slave bath, jonkershuis, coach house, Interpretation Centre, historical bath and associated gardens and spaces.
- Iziko pays no rent for the use of this area. Electricity and water charges are paid by the Department of Public Works & Transport (DPW&T).
- The Trust is responsible for the maintenance of buildings within the historic core but any changes to landscaping are to the cost of Iziko (DPW&T).
- Iziko is not responsible for the maintenance of buildings in the historic core and the Trust is not responsible for the insurance of movable objects within the historic buildings. Any income generated within the historic core is to the benefit of Iziko, e.g. lease of the jonkershuis for restaurant purposes.

A MOU between Iziko and the Trust dated 2015 has been compiled defining their respective roles with respect to the new Visitor Route.

Existing lease agreements include the following:

- The Jonkershuis Restaurant is leased out by Iziko.
- Simon’s Restaurant is leased out by the Trust.
- Offices at Bertram’s are leased out by the Trust.
- The Wine Society leases the ‘White Building’ from the Trust.
- Residential properties are also leased from the Trust.

4.1.3 Management structure

The MOI of the Groot Constantia Trust requires that the Board consists of knowledgeable persons with proven experience in the fields of finance, conservation/restoration, corporate governance, tourism/marketing and community development in the wine industry, and be representative of at least the following interest groups:

- Estate wine producers
- Co-operative wine producers
- Wine and spirits wholesale sector
- Residents of Constantia
- One representative nominated by Iziko Museums of South Africa
- Three representatives nominated by the National Department of Agriculture
- One representative nominated by the Western Cape Provincial department responsible for culture.
The Board is required to create a provident account to be used exclusively for the restoration and maintenance of historic fabric and the Company is required to annually transfer sufficient funds from the profits of the Company to this account.

The Groot Constantia management team includes:

- Chief Executive Officer
- Cellar Master
- Viticulturist/Estate Manager
- Sales and Marketing Manager
- Human Resources Manager
- Chief Financial Officer

Iziko management includes an overall curator as well as 8 to 10 staff members who are based at Groot Constantia. Other Iziko branches involved at Groot Constantia include the Collections Management Team, Research Team and Educational Team.

Coordination meetings between the management teams of Groot Constantia and Iziko Museums of South Africa are held regularly to ensure coordination.

**Vision statement:**

In addition to the objectives outlined in the MOI for the Groot Constantia Trust, a vision for Groot Constantia was formulated as part the new Visitor Route and the MOU between Iziko and the Trust (2015):

“To be a World Class Attraction enabling Groot Constantia to deliver its unique South African cultural, social and historical experience positioning its world class wines.”

### 4.1.4 Heritage protection status

#### 4.1.4.1 Provincial heritage site status

The historic core of Groot Constantia was declared a national monument in 1936. The consolidated area comprising Groot Constantia State estate and Hoop op Constantia was declared a national monument in 1984 (Gazette Notice No. 817 in *Government Gazette* 9193 of 27 April 1984). The estate is described in the Gazette Notice as: “The historic Groot Constantia State Estate, including the Groot Constantia manor house and the Hoop op Constantia manor house, the other outbuildings thereon, together with Portion 2 of Tokai State Forest 129 as detailed on the Government Notice 267 of 1978, dated 20th October 1978, situate at the Constantia, Cape Town Division, in extent 185, 5519 hectares”. Deeds of Transfer include:

- 217/1885, dated October 1885
- 13125/1962, dated 24 May 1962
- 22925/1976, dated 5 August 1975
- 29294/1976, dated 20 September 1976

A number of properties embedded within Groot Constantia Trust estate are excluded from the area originally declared as a national monument, namely erven 6603, 6604 and 6643. These were sold off by the State in the 1970s. Nova Constantia situated on erf 5179 is also privately owned and does not form part of the Groot Constantia Trust estate. It was declared a national monument in 1973 (Notice No. 1861 in *Government Gazette* No. 4047 of 12 October 1973). The property is described in the Gazette Notice as: “The property known as Nova Constantia, with the historic homestead therein and described as certain piece of land,
being Erf 5179, portion of Erf 2607 Constantia Estate in the local area of Constantia, Division of the Cape and measuring 9019 square metres.” The Deed of transfer is 790/1973, dated 16th January 1973.

The extent of the declared areas forming part of Groot Constantia estate and Nova Constantia is highlighted in Figure 3.2. This information is based on a report and cadastral survey map prepared by Marten & Associates Chartered Surveyors for the Groot Constantia Trust dated May 2006. The primary purpose of this report was to investigate property ownership specifically with respect to Groot Constantia estate landholdings demarcated as Forest Reserve known as the Groot Constantia Sub-reserve in 1929. However, it also clarifies the extent of the declared area as measuring 181,5694 hectares and not 185,5519 hectares as mentioned in the Gazette notice.

In terms of section 58(11)(a) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA), any immovable national monument declared under Section 10 of the former National Monuments Act, 1969 (Act 28 of 1969) is deemed to be a provincial heritage site. This was confirmed by Heritage Western Cape, the provincial heritage resources authority of the Western Cape Province, in Provincial Notice No. 106/2005 published in the Provincial Gazette No. 6239 on 31 March 2005.

In terms of Section 7 (1) and 8(2) of the NHRA, Groot Constantia has been graded by the SAHRA as forming part of a Grade I cultural landscape.

Provisions of Section 27 of the NHRA

In accordance with Section 27 (18) of the NHRA, “No person may destroy, damage, deface, excavate, later, 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 a site”.

4.1.4.2 Constantia-Tokai Historic Farmlands Grade I Landscape

Groot Constantia forms part of the Constantia-Tokai Historic Farmlands which have been graded by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) to be of national or Grade I heritage value as per a SAHRA Council decision dated September 2006 (Todeschini & Blanckenberg 2007). In July 2015 SAHRA issued a notification of intent to provisionally protect the Constantia-Tokai Historic Farmlands in terms of Section 29 (1) (a) (ii) and (iii) of the NHRA. Provisional protection was not implemented by SAHRA and the properties demarcated for provisional protection have no current formal protection status in terms of the NHRA. The properties included in the Grade I landscape and intended for provisional protection by SAHRA as national heritage site are described in the table below and are indicated in Figure 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM ERF NO</th>
<th>FARM NAME</th>
<th>REGISTERED OWNER</th>
<th>TITLE DEED</th>
<th>EXTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8559</td>
<td>Buitenverwachting</td>
<td>Buitenverwachting Farm Trust</td>
<td>T1479/1990</td>
<td>53,9301 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2774</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T13296/1961</td>
<td>1.3268 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2755</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T14559/1967</td>
<td>2.9164 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2623</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T16978/1984</td>
<td>16.1069 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T20780/1976</td>
<td>1459 m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6599</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T20670/1976</td>
<td>11,1494 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7395</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T217/1885</td>
<td>9,5668 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10860</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T217/1888</td>
<td>76,6067 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10862</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T217/1885</td>
<td>16,4547 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1064</td>
<td>Groot Constantia</td>
<td>Groot Constantia Farm Trust</td>
<td>T22925/1975</td>
<td>2.0456 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5179</td>
<td>Nova Constantia</td>
<td>Richard Edward Garratt</td>
<td>T68039/1993</td>
<td>9019 m2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9795</td>
<td>Constantia Uitsig</td>
<td>Meerenhof Properties (Pty) Ltd</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>59,7291 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10373</td>
<td>Glendirk Farm</td>
<td>Glendirk Estate</td>
<td>T309962/1991</td>
<td>54,9094 ha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.4.3 Cape Floral Region Protected Areas World Heritage Site

Groot Constantia is situated adjacent to a section of the TMNP which forms part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

4.1.5 Land use zoning of the property

The zoning information provided below is obtained via the City of Cape Town Zoning Map Viewer and will need to be verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unregistered Erf 10780</td>
<td>Utility/Agricultural/Community 1 Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rem 910</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portion 3 Farm 910</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10799</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2755</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10860</td>
<td>Utility/Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10861</td>
<td>Utility/Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10862</td>
<td>Utility/Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 1064</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2623</td>
<td>Community 1 Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2761</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 7395</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6599</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rem Farm 2744</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.5.1 Land use zoning of adjacent properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6602</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2699</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6603</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2714 RE</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6243</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 13782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6604</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2607 RE</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2750</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2612</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2751 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2694 RE</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 13640</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2683</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2752 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2622 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10372</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 8848</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 10363</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 7297 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2748 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 8125 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2759</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 10117</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1121-6</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Erf 2641</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 4779</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2644</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 8557</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Erf 2645</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 9795 RE</td>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>Erf 2646</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 8306</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2647</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 8307</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2608 RE</td>
<td>Transport 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 8308</td>
<td>General Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 2364 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 8305 RE</td>
<td>Open Space 3</td>
<td>Erf 2354 RE</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 5179</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
<td>Erf 13585</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 6674</td>
<td>Open Space 2</td>
<td>Erf 1063</td>
<td>Single Residential I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.6 Applicable municipal planning policy frameworks

The City of Cape Town Southern District Plan is the most relevant planning policy framework at a municipal level. In terms of this planning framework Groot Constantia is located outside of the urban edge and is designated as Intensive Agriculture.

4.1.7 Land claims

The suburb of Constantia was the subject of forced removals during the Apartheid period and is subject to a number of land claims against the state. Groot Constantia however is not subject to any land claims.

4.2 Vergelegen

4.2.1 Physical qualities

Vergelegen is located within Municipal Ward 100, Helderberg, of the City of Cape Town which falls within the Western Cape Province of the Republic of South Africa. It is situated in the Helderberg Basin ranging from the banks of the Lourens River to the Hottentots Holland Mountains, and forms an integral component of an agricultural and a natural landscape located to the east of the suburbs of Somerset West and adjacent to the Boland Mountain Complex which forms part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS.

The total extent of landholdings comprising the estate is 3020 hectares. When Anglo American purchased the property in 1987, extensive investments were made in viticulture and in restoring the estate’s historical precinct with the specific intention of providing public access to a national heritage asset.

Vergelegen is a fully operational farm and is one of Cape Town’s and South Africa’s leading tourist attractions, where a wide range of award winning estate wines are produced. The estate is divided into three zones. The upper zone of 1100 hectares is designated for nature conservation. The central zone comprising 1200 hectares is the main productive farmland of the estate with 159.11 hectares under vineyards. The lower zone of 720 hectares comprises the wine, hospitality and cultural heritage activities of the estate.

The main historical buildings and structures within the historical precinct include the homestead, octagonal structure and library (the former 1816 wine cellar), and the sites of the slave lodge, mill and earlier wine cellar. The historic core incorporates ancient tree specimens, gardens and lawns, plantations, forests and open pastures. The homestead and library include a display and collection of antiques, ceramics, books and important artworks.
from various historical periods. Its layered history is also reflected in the exhibition corridor of the homestead. The visitors centre is located to the periphery of the historic core and incorporates visitors’ parking, and a wine tasting centre and restaurant.

(1) Vergelegen settlement and landscape

Vergelegen has a significant variety of distinct landscape types of a high quality and is arguably one of the best maintained viticultural landscapes within Southern Africa. The estate is set within a natural amphitheatre formed by the Helderberg and Hottentots Holland Mountain Ranges to the north, east and south. The historic precinct is set within the amphitheatre’s plains. An oak lined entrance way, crosses the Lourens River with views across open pastures serving as a foreground to the vineyard covered slopes and mountains beyond. These mountains reach steeply to 1000 meters above sea level providing a dramatic natural setting of seasonal interest – often revealing snow-capped peaks during winter.

The upper reaches of the estate sit adjacent to the Kogelberg Biosphere Reserve, partly situated within the Boland Mountains Complex WHS. Within the boundaries of the estate, many endangered plant species occur in localised pockets of unique vegetation including ‘Swartland Shale Renosterveld’; ‘Lourensford Alluvium Fynbos’; ‘Boland Granite Fynbos, and wetland habitats. Over half of the estate’s land has been dedicated to conservation and a process has been initiated to have this land declared as a private nature reserve. Due to Vergelegen’s extensive clearing programme of invasive alien vegetation and commitment to ongoing environmental management, Vergelegen was the first wine farm to receive champion status in the World Wildlife Fund’s (WWF) Biodiversity & Wine Initiative.

Agricultural lands act as a buffer between the natural wilderness of the estate’s upper reaches and the formal gardens of the historical precinct. Viticulture is the primary form of agricultural production at Vergelegen. The vine covered hills contribute strongly to the spirit of place and visually integrate the estate within the broader cultural landscape of neighbouring wine farms.

While there are many similarities between Vergelegen and Groot Constantia in terms of rural settlement principles and in their uniquely ‘Cape’ setting against dramatic mountain amphitheatres, Vergelegen’s historic precinct is of a greater scale and its placement reveals an attitude to the landscape that is distinct from that of Groot Constantia. Where Groot Constantia is built alongside a ravine on the lower mountain slopes and surrounded by vineyards, Vergelegen’s homestead is situated on the lower plains and set apart from the wilderness of the mountain slopes beyond with a strong sense of creating ‘order’ in the landscape.

The Lourens River flows along Vergelegen’s northern boundary and is the only river in the country thus far to be declared a Protected Natural Environment. The river was a key influence to the location of the homestead and its outbuildings. A pedestrian network and bridge links the river to the formal manicured gardens.

The Vergelegen farmstead is embedded in the early 18th century with the octagonal structure, parts of the homestead and archaeological remains of three outbuildings (slave lodge, wine cellar and stables) dating to this period. These outbuildings were based on the European three-aisled structure and are exclusive to Vergelegen and Meerlust, near Stellenbosch. The present later homestead is smaller than the original Herenhuis, but in style and proportion it is more typically Cape. Significant interventions were undertaken in the late 18th century including the demolition of the slave-lodge and wine cellar and the building of a new wine cellar. The farmstead is also embedded in a conservation ethos of the 20th century, with renovations and new side wings add to the homestead in 1925 and the restoration work undertaken in 1992.
Buildings and gardens have been purposefully positioned to maintain a clear symmetry and order within the landscape. Movement routes and view axes run parallel or perpendicular to the central axis, and are further enhanced by tree avenues, hedge planting, and focal points and framed vistas. A series of formal gardens and landscape elements are linked along these routes.

The gardens of Vergelegen are set out in a series of landscaped rooms. There are 19 unique gardens that make up the landscape of the historic core. The gardens are distinct from one another yet are united by the use of strong geometry and bold, simple forms. During the Ian Ford landscape interventions of the 1990s, a decision was made to remove the visitor parking from the historic core and locate it on the periphery. This has greatly aided the visitor experience as the gardens are never visible at once, but are revealed and concealed by layers of vegetation as the visitor traverses the estate by foot. The slower pace and absence of vehicle traffic facilitates a deeper appreciation of the tranquillity and historical and cultural value of the estate.

Vergelegen’s homestead was built on a strong symmetrical line with intersecting and concentric geometric forms. It intersected with the octagonal walled layout of the werf to form one defensible homestead. The werf was set out with two concentric octagons. The outer octagon was non-regular in form and housed the main entrances to the werf on its shortest sides. The sheepfolds, animal and milking pens as well as the Boerenhuis were situated within its enclosure. The inner octagon consisted of eight equal sides which are still visible today as the tall octagonal garden walls. The werf that was formed by the inner octagon is believed to have originally housed an orangerie.

A bold vista was established along the homestead’s line of symmetry. The start of the vista was flanked on both sides by the camphor plantation and lead to the doorway at the centre of the homestead’s front facade. This line passed through the central hallway and extended through the werf and Boerenhuis to an almond tree-lined vista which focused one’s sights on the mountain peaks above the farm.

While the underlying landscape principles established in the original layout and form of the settlement, the extensive formal gardens and park-like setting are strongly associated with 20th and 21st century landscape interventions.

Vergelegen’s historic core has some of the oldest planted trees in Southern Africa. These include a 17th century English Oak and the impressive row of early 18th century Camphor trees that line the front façade of the homestead. These camphors are remnants from William Adriaan van der Stel’s original plantation and were declared national monuments in 1942 and are now a Provincial Heritage Site.

Along the southern bank of the Lourens River, the historic oak forest, known as a Hutewald in German or bosweide in Dutch) served as wood pastures for pigs to be fattened before being slaughtered and to supplement fodder or cereal stubble for animals. These landscape elements are now extremely scarce (the example to the east of the dovecot at Meerlust contains trees planted in the late 20th century).

Vergelegen has adopted the principle of ‘layered history’ to inform all developments on the estate. The use of vistas, symmetry and the octagonal form has repeatedly provided the basis of design for the limited range of new buildings and gardens that have been created. New interventions seek to blend the old with the new in a manner that recognises the varying cultural influences on the estate. The result is an estate that is composed of many unique landscaped rooms and historical buildings, yet remains cohesive and rooted in context. The octagonal shape is repeated in subtle ways in most of the formal gardens: in pathways; garden furniture; planted beds and water features.
A rich array of plant collections, including the award-winning Camellia Walk and the East Garden Agapanthus collection, reflect the passion and pride that Vergelegen has for its gardens. The landscape plays a vital role to the overall experience of Vergelegen and is maintained, protected and continually enhanced to a high degree.

An Arboretum is currently being developed above the historic core on land previously used for orchards. It is envisioned as an educational, recreational and inspirational public environment, to be developed over three to five decades. Extending over more than fifty hectares, the Arboretum is structured on a triangular geometry with wide, bold axes formed by avenues of trees. The dominant axis aligns the herb garden, stables restaurant and east Garden, opening a view line to the Helderberg Mountains beyond. Secondary vertices intercept with other cultural and natural landscapes of significance: the banks of the Lourens River to the north-east and the Nguni cattle pastures to the east.

The Arboretum will be portioned into north, west, east and south to reference the cultural landscapes and nationalities that have contributed to the layered historicism of the estate. The northern portion will reference the bold axial geometries of the French landscapes and the agricultural hedgerows and bulb gardens of the Dutch. The eastern portion will consist of undulating meadows and informal copses of trees which lead down to the banks of the river reflecting the stylised English Landscapes of Capability Brown. The eastern portion will celebrate seasonal change with many species of Asian trees that are chosen for their autumn colour or spring blossoms. The central portion will provide a display of South African annuals, thereby acknowledging the impact of agrarian practices on Southern African landscapes. The Southern portion will present Southern African trees with important roles in cultural rites and practices, and which are celebrated for their provision of food and medicine and their use in construction and craft.

The Arboretum is designed to reinforce the estate’s geometric structure, the connectivity between the historic core and its natural and agricultural setting, and horticultural values.

### 4.2.2 Property ownership

Vergelegen is owned by Vergelegen Wines (Pty) Ltd which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Anglo American plc and reports to Anglo American South Africa, Johannesburg Corporate. The estate comprises the following land portions:

- Farm Rem 744, measuring 1284.3508 hectares
- Farm 744/1, measuring 19.3398 hectares
- Farm 744/2, measuring 1712.3697 hectares

### 4.2.3 Management structure

The Vergelegen Board of Directors consists of:

- Chairman
- Managing Director
- Three Directors
- Company Secretary

The management team consists of:

- Managing Director/Chief Executive Officer
- Hospitality and Human Resources Manager
- Commercial and Risk Manager
- Finance Manager
- Cellar Master
- National Sales Manager
- Events Manager

The cultural heritage assets of the estate are overseen in an advisory capacity by the Vergelegen Cape Cultural Heritage Trust comprising experts in the field of landscape architecture, horticulture, heritage objects and architecture. These heritage assets include:

- The exhibited collection of furniture, pictures, antiques and art objects.
- The historic core comprising the homesteads and ancillary buildings, archaeological sites, gardens and grounds, access routes and associated visitor infrastructure.

The estate is subject to various external evaluations and assurances. For instance, its environmental management system is subject to evaluation in terms of ISO 14001 standards and an annual Vineyard Virus Evaluation.

Vergelegen employs 100 permanent employees. Forty three houses on the estate are occupied by employees. Members of senior management with one exception live on the estate.

Vision statement:

The Vergelegen vision is to:

- Compete with the top 100 wines in the world.
- Be internationally recognised as a leading conserver of Cape cultural heritage.
- Be internationally recognised as a leading conserver of Cape natural heritage.

4.2.4 Heritage protection status

4.2.4.1 Provincial heritage site

Only the five camphor trees in front the homestead have formal protection status in terms of the NHRA. They were declared a national monument in 1942 (Notice No. 1470 in Government Gazette 3080 of 14 July 1942). The area declared is described as “The figure lettered a.b.c.d., representing 5,757 square feet of land called Portion No. 1 (Camphor Wood Trees reserve) of the farm Vergelegen, which is situated at Somerset, Division of Stellenbosch, Province of the Cape of the Cape of Good Hope, on S.G. Diagram No. 709/42 (original Diagram No. 6214/1937, annexed to Deed No. 9526, dated 27th September, 1940).

In terms of section 20(2) of the National Monuments Act 28 of 1969, any national monument proclaimed under the National and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act 4 of 1934 shall be deemed to be a national monument under the National Monuments Act. In terms of section 58(11)(a) of the NHRA, any national monument declared under Section 10 of the National Monuments Act is deemed to be a provincial heritage site.

The camphor trees and the immediate area on which they stand are now a Provincial Heritage Site. In terms of section 58(11)(a) of the National Heritage Resources Act, 1999 (Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA), any immovable national monument declared under Section 10 of the former National Monuments Act, 1969 (Act 28 of 1969) is deemed to be a provincial heritage site. This was confirmed by Heritage Western Cape in Provincial Notice No. 106/2005 published in the Provincial Gazette No. 6239 on 31 March 2005.

The camphor trees also have special protection status in terms Section 12 of the National Forests Act of 1998 (Act 84 of 1999).
It is proposed to expand the area of formal protection in terms of the NHRA to include the historic core and agricultural buffer of Vergelegen as a provincial heritage site in order to provide for adequate protection for the Vergelegen component of the Early Cape Farmsteads WHS.

4.2.4.2 Cape Floral Region Protected Areas World Heritage Site

To the east Vergelegen is situated adjacent to the Hottentots Holland Nature Reserve which forms part of the Boland Mountain Complex Cape Floristic Region WHS.

4.2.5 Land use zoning of the property

The zoning information provided below is obtained via the City of Cape Town Zoning Map Viewer and will need to be verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm Rem 744</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 744/1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 744/2</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.5.1 Land use zoning of adjacent properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
<th>FARM/ERF NUMBER</th>
<th>ZONING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1319</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Erf 14303</td>
<td>Single Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 820</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Erf 14295</td>
<td>Single Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1380-4</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-33</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1089</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-32</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1089-6</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-31</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1549</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-30</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 830-RE</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-83</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 155</td>
<td>Open Space 1</td>
<td>Farm 1089-82</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 731</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-81</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 741-5</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-80</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 741-4</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-69</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 737-2</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-24</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 737-3</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-22</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 722-1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-21</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 7306-RE</td>
<td>Agriculture, Servitude registered in favour of Vergelegen restricting development to 5 estates.</td>
<td>Farm 1089-20</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1319-1</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farm 1089-19</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 2601</td>
<td>Single Residential Vergelegen Road</td>
<td>Farm 1089-17</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 7310</td>
<td>Single Residential Vergelegen Road</td>
<td>Farm 1089-16</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 14319</td>
<td>Single Residential Vergelegen Road</td>
<td>Farm 1089-15</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 14297</td>
<td>Single Residential Vergelegen Road</td>
<td>Farm 1089-14</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 16821</td>
<td>Single Residential</td>
<td>Farm 1089-13</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1089-18</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Farm 1089-12</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm 1089-11</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.6 Applicable municipal planning policy frameworks

The City of Cape Town Helderberg District Plan is the most relevant planning policy framework at a municipal level. In terms of this plan Vergelegen is located outside of the urban edge and is designated as Intensive Agriculture and Core Conservation.

4.2.7 Lourens River Protected Natural Environment

The Lourens River is the only river in the country to be declared a Protected Natural Environment, as published in the Provincial Gazette No. 5135 of 9 May 1997. No development may be located within 45 m of the river.
5. PRELIMINARY HERITAGE INVENTORY

As part of the draft ICMP a preliminary inventory of structures and landscape elements has been prepared for each estate and is attached as Annexure A. The inventory is divided into various sections for each estate, separating the historic core of Groot Constantia and historical precinct of Vergelegen from the remainder of the estates. The inventory identifies the name, description, age and significance of individual structures and elements and is accompanied by thumbnail images and series of maps.
6. CURRENT STATE OF CONSERVATION

6.1. Groot Constantia

6.1.1. Historical built environment

6.1.1.1 Inventory of buildings and structures

An inventory of buildings, structures and landscape elements on the estate, and buildings and structures on immediately adjacent properties that are not part of the WHS nomination area has been prepared. The inventory includes the following:

i) A general description of each item highlighting the principal elements underpinning significance;

ii) A brief description outlining historical context, where applicable;

iii) References to known key documentation underpinning historical morphology and significance, where relevant;

iv) A summary of criteria underpinning significance based on the definition of cultural significance set out in the Schedule 2(vi) of the NHRA but expanded as follows: aesthetic (A); architectural (Ar); artistic (Art); historical (H); scientific (Sc); social (S); spiritual (Sp); linguistic (L) technological (T); landmark/focal element (Lm); and/or contribution to a fine built group, landscape or space (Cx);

v) Status of significance and rated as High, Medium, Low or No significance; and

vi) Thumbnail image or images underpinning significance or lack thereof.

Mitigation Strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate, preferably with an updating of the heritage inventory every 5 years.

6.1.1.2 Fabric condition

The built fabric within the estate appears well maintained and in good condition supported by regular and ongoing maintenance. This includes not only structures within the historic core and the historic bath precinct, but also sites beyond the historic core covering the Hoop of Constantia werf, the historic Cloete family cemetery and the Colijn vaults.

Although proactive maintenance interventions occur in the ongoing consolidation of the river bank behind and below the historic wine cellar, other maintenance measures appear to be reactive, probably in response to budgetary constraints and to reliance on income generation from within the estate itself. More specifically, maintenance is reliant on wine sales and, therefore, the successes of annual harvests which can vary, resulting in unpredictability in the estate’s income stream. 2008 was, for example, a particularly bad year which led to certain maintenance projects (e.g. lime-washing of buildings) having to be postponed for a year.

While it may be a good idea to adjust, where necessary, current maintenance programs to prioritize sites and structures with heritage significance (refer to the inventory of buildings and structures), this may not always be feasible within the context of Groot Constantia. Favouring maintenance programs that prioritize only sites of heritage significance could for example be problematic where visitor experiences are not necessarily heritage-related but where appearances are nonetheless important for drawing visitors.
Mitigation strategies:

Model maintenance specifications linked to clear intervention policies for each of the significant structures on the estate will be useful for informing a heritage agreement with the appropriate heritage/statutory authority and thereby facilitate permit exemptions. Groot Constantia’s databases do not currently hold records of specifications. These are held by external consultants.

An area of short term concern is a leaning portion of retaining wall and gate pillar adjacent to, and on the southeast side of the homestead. A structural engineer with experience in consolidating historic structures should be engaged as a matter of urgency to inspect the situation and recommend remedial action.

6.1.1.3 Monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements

There is currently no integrated system for monitoring and reviewing maintenance requirements. There is also no centralized system for recording and archiving fabric status reports and intervention methodologies.

The monitoring systems that are in place include the scrutiny of bank records and monitoring of past payments to contractors, together with at least annual physical site inspections with less formal ‘walkabouts’ in between.

Groot Constantia states that all work is outsourced, with the appointed outside contractors carrying out work in accordance with their own specifications. There are no external checks other than periodically by other externally appointed professionals. The latter includes a widely respected architectural firm that has been consulting to Groot Constantia since 1985 but which does not have a continuous presence on the estate. Communication between various consultants with potentially overlapping concerns (e.g. between building maintenance and landscape maintenance) is not always clear, nor is there a clear policy for distinguishing ‘smaller jobs’ from ‘larger jobs’ requiring a specific specialist input. This situation is at least partly caused by Groot Constantia staff having to fill multiple roles due to limited budgets. For example, a viticulturist fulfills the role of maintenance manager.

Given the above factors, the institutional knowledge within the estate on appropriate fabric interventions and maintenance methodologies could be improved. Divisions of responsibility between Groot Constantia and Iziko with regard to the homestead are also not always clear.

Mitigation strategies:

Given that Groot Constantia’s limited budget does not allow for the training and maintaining of in-house skills, the use of externally sourced specialists will probably need to continue. However, it is equally important that monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements be co-ordinated, possibly through a single hands-on ‘authority’, much in the way in which a ‘surveyor of the fabric’ would be appointed to co-ordinate heritage-related works across disciplines and clarify responsibilities. Such arrangements are in place on certain important ecclesiastical sites in countries such as the United Kingdom (UK). Functions would include annual inspection reports and the introduction of a monitoring regime that would allow for the identification of both current and ‘over the horizon’ maintenance issues along the lines of quinquennial surveys as conducted on conformist churches within the UK. (Refer to Annexure C)

6.1.1.4 Frequency of routine repair and maintenance and logging system

Routine maintenance and repairs are carried out annually apart from lime-washing, which is carried out every two years alternating annually between two designated halves of the
Maintenance of the historic fabric is budgeted for annually. Large maintenance or repair work is referred to the appropriate outsourced architect prior to the awarding of tenders.

Maintenance is carried out in direct response to issues identified in the annual inspections. This means that maintenance is essentially reactive (refer also to 2: Fabric Condition). Exclusively applied reactive maintenance regimes are generally associated with lower cost benefit efficiencies as they are not conducive to the formalized identification of ‘over the horizon’ maintenance issues. However, the current maintenance regime must be seen against an income stream that can vary from year to year depending on harvest successes and consequent wine sales.

The historically significant wine cellar of Hoop op Constantia, where the famed wines of "Lesser Constantia" were produced during the 18th and 19th centuries by the Colijn family, and which predates the 1791 Cloete cellar at Groot Constantia, should be regularly inspected to ensure that it remains in good condition. It has the potential to, in future, be an important relic in the interpretation of the wine history of the estate.

Mitigation strategies:

There is potential for a centralized maintenance logging system to improve efficiencies, particularly if linked to a maintenance regime that accommodates forward thinking while drawing off incrementally improving institutional knowledge resulting from a centralized database that continues to grow and consolidate as time passes.

6.1.1.5 Specialist Input

All maintenance is outsourced given that the estate does not have the resources, including in-house skills, to undertake the work itself.

Maintenance is divided into ‘small’ and ‘large’ projects. The former is currently managed by a local restoration company which has been undertaking work on the estate for a number of years.

‘Large’ projects are managed by the nationally respected architectural firm Revel Fox and Partners. This firm has a proven record in heritage conservation and has been involved in heritage management on the estate since 1985 when it was directly involved in extensive conservation works and development upgrades. There is consequently a high degree of institutional knowledge of the estate within this firm, even though this knowledge base resides outside the property. There are no related records held at Groot Constantia itself.

No formal criteria exist for defining ‘large’ and ‘small’ projects, nor for determining which projects are assigned to the abovementioned parties. It has also been noted that while Groot Constantia has a policy of outsourcing all maintenance work, some work is nonetheless undertaken by Groot Constantia staff on occasions including maintenance and decoration of some secondary elements.

Mitigation strategies:

It is important that Groot Constantia develop formal policies for assigning its outsourced maintenance work to appropriate parties based on a clear understanding of significance and sensitivities, and not necessarily on project size. This may be required as part of a heritage agreement with the appropriate heritage authority.
6.1.1.6 Building maintenance manual

There is no maintenance manual addressing methodologies and key specifications. Knowledge regarding both routine and specialist maintenance resides with external contractors rather than with Groot Constantia. The nature and extent to which this knowledge has been recorded is unknown and no doubt varies from contractor to contractor.

Mitigation strategies:

A centralized co-ordinated maintenance logging and recording regime across disciplines, including landscaping and archaeology, will help to build institutional knowledge and make it easier for obtaining exemptions from permitting requirements.

Groot Constantia should therefore consider introducing, in phases, a centralized system for logging all maintenance work across disciplines. This system should include dedicated heritage-related maintenance and intervention policies for each building identified as significant in the building inventory.

Investigations towards introducing a centralized logging system could be initiated by a series of workshops in which contractors, representatives of the Groot Constantia Trust and the appropriate heritage/statutory authority participate jointly towards this objective.

6.1.1.7 Attitude towards historical layering

There does not appear to be a specific articulated policy around architectural layering. While there are some reasonably successful contemporary interventions in the former earlier 20th century production cellars to the northwest of the historic Cloete cellar, such interventions do not appear to have been the result of a clearly articulated policy on historical layering.

The current nature of interpretation on the estate, including interpretative displays, does feature certain periods more than others. This may partly be the consequence of a basic lack of information on some periods and possibly also an intentional emphasis on certain colonial periods as a legacy of state ownership prior to democracy. The lack of interpretative material regarding the strong Arts and Crafts/Cape Revival stamp on the homestead after its restoration by Kendall in 1927 is particularly noticeable considering that this work is well documented and could therefore expand current site interpretations.

Mitigation strategies:

The preparation of a policy statement clarifying attitudes towards historical layering based on an updated heritage statement for the historic core in particular, would assist in informing a clear maintenance strategy, policy for future interventions on the estate and interpretation plan. A co-ordinated interpretation policy should be developed that provides guidance to both Iziko and the Groot Constantia Trust.

6.1.1.8 Attitude towards relationships between old and new

There is a blurring of the line between old and new responding to commercial pressures around the edges of the werf spilling into the werf forecourt in places, particularly in the vicinity of the Jonkershuis restaurant.

Although there are various clear architectural distinctions between old and new, particularly within the precinct to the northwest of the historic Cloete wine cellar (see also 7), there is no formally articulated philosophy underpinning the contemporary alterations and insertions on the estate to guide future development.
Commercial forces are particularly strong given that the estate is reliant on income from visitors together with heavy reliance on its vineyards and wine production to ensure sustainability. This commercial imperative has had some controversial outcomes including the siting and size of the 1980’s styled wine cellar to the northwest of the homestead. This cellar building is visually obtrusive from certain parts of the estate in terms of its overall massing and scale.

The accommodation of public needs is another strong force stemming from the time when Groot Constantia was under state ownership and therefore public land at that time. A strong feeling of public ownership has consequently developed over the years with the estate continuing to be regarded and used by surrounding residents as a public park despite now being privately owned.

Striking an appropriate balance between retaining historical authenticity and accommodating public needs has therefore become one of the single biggest challenges facing the management and maintenance of the estate.

Mitigation strategies:

Groot Constantia would benefit from a clearly articulated mission statement reflecting its attitude towards historical layering within the estate and relationship between old and new. A clearer idea of public expectations and what users of the estate value most highly also needs to be obtained. This could possibly be achieved by conducting a user poll. Feedback could then be measured against sustaining the experience of the estate as a major heritage resource, and management strategies adjusted accordingly.

6.1.1.9 Past interventions impacting significance

Groot Constantia 1980s wine production cellar is a past intervention now viewed as having negative visual impacts, yet playing an undeniably crucial role in the estate’s revenue stream. The tractor shed behind the jonkerhuis complex also has a negative visual impact and is planned to be relocated.

In order to derive clearer attitudes to past interventions and their mitigation where necessary, a multi-disciplinary approach is required including both architectural and landscaping design inputs based on an understanding of the historical morphology of the estate. The building and structures inventory (refer to 1) provides some clarity in this regard and will assist in decision-making around future developments and interventions.

Mitigation strategies:

A future landscape management strategy for the estate will need to take into consideration the mitigation of negative visual impacts from the production cellar at the larger scale, and impacts from neighbouring development on historic precincts such as the Cloete graveyard at a smaller scale. Strategically placed planting can go a long way towards mitigating such negative visual impacts, including in instances where the source of such impacts is located beyond the boundaries of the estate.

The relocation of the tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex.

6.1.1.10 Documentation and archiving of historical research and heritage reports

There is currently no system or venue in place on the property for accommodating historical research material and heritage reports. Such documentation is held by the various specialist contractors and consultants off the estate. For example, the architects hold copies of all
heritage and building plans submissions. The limited documentation that exists on the property is held by Iziko and forms part of their on-site interpretative displays.

A situation where important historical and other heritage-related documentation is held at various locations off site, and where Groot Constantia consequently has no direct control over safekeeping and archiving, is potentially highly problematic. This is particularly relevant when such material may be required at some future stage for informing fabric maintenance and management.

**Mitigation strategies:**

An important priority must be establishing of at least a centralized electronic database maintained and managed on the estate even if source material is held/backed up off the estate in an agreed secure place or places. This will require the identification of an appropriate location and knowledge of the various needs involved in managing and maintaining such an archive.

### 6.1.2 Landscape elements and character

#### 6.1.2.1 Landscape inventory

A preliminary inventory of landscape elements has been prepared for the purposes of this draft ICMP. Each element has been briefly described, assessed in terms of age and significance, mapped and photographed.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

#### 6.1.2.2 Condition of significant trees

The English Oak trees along the central axis avenue are all showing signs of age with hollow trunks and many broken bows that have been removed. As a result, many of the significant trees are reaching maturity and some have been felled, leaving gaps in the central axis avenue.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Where gaps in the central avenue occur, new planting of the same or appropriate specimen trees, at equal spacing should be undertaken. A specialist arborist could provide on-ongoing care and treatment for aging trees.

#### 6.1.2.3 Tree maintenance and replacement programme

Tree inspection and maintenance takes place as needed, particularly when showing signs of duress and after storm events. There is active replacement of trees along the entrance avenue and within the werf, but oak trees along boundaries are not actively replaced. While English Oaks are preferred as replacements from a historical perspective, these are not sustainable due to dry rot. Felled Oak trees are replaced with *Quercus nigra*, the Water Oak.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Consider replanting the boundary lines, especially with more evergreen oak species that will provide screening of neighbouring houses impacting the agricultural setting of the estate.
6.1.2.4 Specialist input

Revel Fox & Partners have been involved at Groot Constantia since the 1990s and are consulted on regular basis on buildings and landscape elements. A Landscape Master Plan was prepared by Ian Ford & Associates (1993). This includes a plan for a kitchen garden to the east of the kitchen. Thus far, Iziko and its predecessor, responsible for the interpretation of the homestead, has not implemented this proposal. There appears to be no on-going specialist input of a landscape architect to provide advice on planting and overall landscape character.

There is an opportunity to build a sense of continuity within the landscape and to develop the experiences of transition between the different precincts. There is also opportunity to establish a planting strategy for areas of existing ornamental planting.

Recent research into historical sources has also identified certain plant species that formed part of the historical landscape of Groot Constantia. This should be taken into account in the preparation of future planting strategies.

Mitigation strategies:

It is recommended that a landscape architect be consulted on matters that effect outdoor spaces, specifically within the historic core. Consultation with a specialist arborist on an annual basis is also recommended.

6.1.2.5 Landscape plan

A Landscape Master Plan was prepared by Ian Ford & Associates (1993). The concept for the overall hard and soft landscape is influenced by the simple geometric lines that relate to the avenues, *werfs* and boundaries of the historic core. The use of mixed plant and hard material is minimal.

Some recent interventions are not sympathetic to the simple and understated geometries of the adjacent *werf* including the design and layout of the "play area" and tables next to the Simon’s restaurant and at the *Jonkerhuis* restaurant.

Mitigation strategies:

The Landscape Master Plan should be updated to take into consideration recent changes within the historic core. This will assist with identifying current conflicting elements and provide guidelines for restoration or upgrades to the landscape.

6.1.2.6 Commercial activities and heritage

Restaurant activities are currently operating under two lease agreements. The *jonkershuis* is leased out by Iziko and Simon’s is leased out by the Groot Constantia Trust. The manner in which trading is set up from a visual–spatial perspective detracts from the cultural character of the historical core. Trading is currently permitted along the edge of *jonkershuis* overlooking the historic *werf* and adjacent to Simon’s overlooking the Cloete Cellar and reflection pond. Ad hoc use of small garden elements e.g. wine barrels and the juxtaposition of chair and table types results in clutter and loss of landscape character. The tables, chairs and umbrellas associated with the *Jonkershuis* restaurant have increased their spatial footprint since the 1990s and clear spatial boundaries need to be established to reduce visual clutter.
Mitigation strategies:

Develop a strategy for the placement and type of outdoor furniture that is permitted for the restaurant establishments. Ensure that signage is per the current typology. This should be developed in accordance with an updated landscaping plan for the historic core and should form part of any formal lease agreement entered into between Iziko, Groot Constantia and the lessee.

6.1.2.7 Activities impacting the agricultural and natural setting

Broader landscape character issues are discussed under Section 6.1.4.

6.1.3 Archaeological record

6.1.3.1 Demarcation of archaeological significant and sensitive areas

No archaeological significant and sensitive areas have been previously formally identified. For the purposes of this draft ICMP, the entire historical precinct core area is deemed to be of archaeological sensitivity. Areas of high sensitivity include the homestead and the werf and adjoining buildings and the shaft of space from the gateway to the pond behind the wine cellar. It also includes the burial sites located on the estate. Archaeologically significant Stone Age sites are usually associated with natural features such as rivers, rock formations, etc. and are unlikely to be found undisturbed in exposed or cultivated farmland. However, artefacts may be encountered, and even Early Stone Age tools are commonly found scattered in Cape vineyards.

Mitigation strategies:

Any historic built fabric or ground disturbance within these sensitive areas must be subject to prior archaeological assessment, investigation if necessary, and subsequent monitoring.

6.1.3.2 Archaeological research and investigation

Archaeological investigations at Groot Constantia have been limited and largely focused on rescue archaeology.

In 1992 the steps and watercourse behind the wine cellar, in oral tradition the “slave pool”, were the subject of excavations, which revealed a series of adaptations to the 18th century fabric in the late 19th century.

The restoration and landscaping project of 1993 was largely an architectural process with no evidence of an integrated archaeological research programme. Rescue archaeological work included the exposure of a brick channel and chamber at the sides of the homestead and investigations in the “cottages” in the Jonkerhuis complex. The most interesting architectural finds were the hearths and ovens in the caretaker’s dwelling and material dumped on a cobbled (possibly stable) floor, which included tableware and faunal remains (evidence of foodways). These artefacts have the potential for interpretation and display. Although it was speculated at the time that the two large hearths at either end of one room indicated that the room was used for and by slaves, and that two hearths were probably built to meet the different dietary requirements of many slaves at Groot Constantia, no conclusive evidence could be found. Although it was not established with certainty what the jonkershuis buildings were used for, their possible use as slave quarters and stables was not ruled out.

In 1996, the burial sites on the estate were examined – the Cloete cemetery and the Colijn vault. The approach was to clear the area enough to map the graves, without disturbing their contents if possible, and to gather evidence of built features so that they could be properly
recorded and restored. There were quantities of brick rubble in the vineyard surrounding the Colijn vault, indicating that it is quite likely that there are other graves beneath the top soil.

The area of the proposed extension to the farm dam was inspected for archaeological material in 2008. Only occasional fragments of ceramics were located amongst the vines. Given the exposed location on open farmland, this was to be expected.

Since the 1990s, archaeological work at Groot Constantia has resulted from cultural resource management processes. This assessment, mitigation and monitoring programme will be ongoing as alterations and developments are proposed and implemented. Academic research projects of the 1990s focused on slavery, and since then Groot Constantia has not been the subject of archaeological study, though pertinent questions may well arise in the future that can be explored there. For instance, the exploration of the time before Simon van der Stel and the cultural heritage of indigenous people and others at the site.

Mitigation strategies:

Assessment, mitigation and monitoring to be ongoing as alterations and developments are proposed and implemented.

6.1.3.3 Procedures for monitoring and reporting archaeological finds

Given the potential for the archaeological record to contribute to a greater understanding of the heritage significance of the estate, there is a need for procedures for proactive assessment, monitoring and reporting archaeological finds on the estate. Annexure D provides guidelines for property managers and owners on how to safeguard archaeological heritage. It explains the types of evidence which indicate the presence of an archaeological site, artefact and feature. It also provides procedures for archaeological assessments prior to any interventions / development and monitoring excavation works and what to do when archaeological material is found. It is also advisable that these guidelines be work-shopped with site managers.

Mitigation strategies:

Archaeological impact assessment must take place before any other interventions in either the built fabric or the below-surface components of the core areas of the property.

It is recommended that an awareness session be held with site managers and staff to explain the types of evidence which indicate the presence of archaeological material and what to do when archaeological material is found. This must include photographing and recording the location of the artefact and contacting an archaeologist to assess its significance. If there are artefacts in a dense cluster or associated with a feature, then excavation work must stop, the artefacts must be left in place and an archaeologist and/or the heritage authority contacted to advise on the appropriate course of action.

In the case of human remains being uncovered, work must immediately stop and the site sealed off. First, the police and HWC / an archaeologist must be contacted. If the remains are confirmed to be archaeological, which is most likely, then the heritage authority will determine the appropriate course of action.
6.1.4 Natural and cultural setting

6.1.4.1 Natural setting

The relationship between the historic core and its setting is very positive in terms of the creation of vistas to enhance visual connectivity between historic core and its natural setting, e.g. the sweep of space linking the historic core to the mountain backdrop to the west and views from the werf towards False Bay.

Groot Constantia shares part of a boundary with the TMNP (part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS) and is part of the World Wildlife Fund’s (WWF) Biodiversity and Wine Initiative (BWI). As part of this Initiative there is a commitment to enhancing biodiversity through providing green corridors of Fynbos vegetation, clearing of alien vegetation, a shift towards biological pest control in agricultural practices as well as the protection of wildlife. In January 2018, Groot Constantia was officially declared a WWF Conservation Champion.

Regular coordinating meetings between Groot Constantia management and the management of the TMNP takes place, including fire and management of fauna and flora.

Mitigation strategies:
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

6.1.4.2 Agricultural setting

The setting is also very positive in terms of strong agricultural edges that frame the historic core and a variety of visual experiences of a productive agricultural landscape setting.

The intention not to increase vine coverage is due in part to the typography, the high infrastructure investments required and also due to the estate's commitment to protect areas of Fynbos on the Estate.

The 1980s wine cellar severs the visual link between the historic core and agricultural setting and mountain backdrop to the north. The tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex has a negative visual impact on the werf and should be relocated.

Maintaining and enhancing perimeter planting on the estate is very important in terms of screening residential development on its boundaries.

Development pressures on the boundaries of Groot Constantia and its location within the Constantia Tokai Farmlands Grade I cultural landscape are discussed in Section 7.1.1.

Mitigation strategies:
There is a need for perimeter planting to screen residential development on the boundaries of the estate.

Possible planting measures should be considered to mitigate visual impacts on the northern and western facades of the 1980s cellar.

The relocation of the tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex should be prioritised.

6.1.4.3 Riverine setting

There are opportunities to strengthen the connection to the river including the reconfiguration of the parking area behind the wine cellar. There are plans to establish a nature walk along
the river as part of the visitor experience and interpretive route. Cleaning up the river and establishing formal pathways will enhance this experience.

Mitigation strategies:

Develop a Landscape Plan for the parking area behind Simon’s restaurant with appropriate hard and soft landscaping features to soften the visual impact of the existing hard asphalt.

6.1.5 Public associations and values

6.1.5.1 Visitor access and facilities

The public were given access to the homestead after the house was restored in 1926 and opened as a museum in 1927 and the entire estate was opened to the public in the 1990s. It has become a major visitor destination within the Cape Winelands; a green ‘environmental room’ located on the periphery of the city.

As part of the Big Six tourism initiative in Cape Town, Groot Constantia has benefitted from the exposure provided by the joint marketing strategies. The Red Bus Company provides access to many visitors with the Mini Peninsula and Constantia wine farms bus route terminating at Groot Constantia.

In 2017 Groot Constantia won the Destination of the Year Award.

Access to the estate is free with a small entrance fee to the museum and new exhibit in the wine cellar and a fee for the new Visitor’s Route that provides access to the museum and includes a wine tasting experience. A wide range of activities are available including the museum and new visitor’s route, wine tasting, cellar tours, restaurants, and walking and bike trails. International, national, regional, city wide tourists and visitors are accommodated, approximately 400 000 per annum.

The open, free nature of access including walking and horse riding contributes substantially to the sense of attachment that communities, both local and at a city-wide scale, attach to the estate. It is evident that any restrictions to such access, whether in the form of an entrance fee or the control of dog walking, could have severely negative impacts on the perceptions of such communities on the sense of belonging and shared ownership.

The decision to restrict vehicular traffic and parking to the outskirts of the historic core has a significant effect on the visitor experience. Walking through the historic core and the visual and audible absence of cars facilitates greater appreciation of its unique character and sense of place.

As the integral component of the wine industry in South Africa, Groot Constantia hosts the 1659 Medal ceremony to honor contributions towards the history, development and promotion of the South African wine industry.

Groot Constantia is regularly the venue of significant events, such as official receptions by national and provincial government agencies. Its facilities are also utilised for receptions by the private sector. Groot Constantia also continues to receive high profile national and international visitors.

Mitigation strategies:

The imposition of an entry fee should be resisted and only considered as a very last resort. The lack of “exclusiveness” is regarded as a major attribute and contributes substantially to the positive public perceptions of the estate. Similarly restrictions on dog walking need to be
carefully considered. Every attempt should be made to engage with the local communities to ensure adherence to the existing rules.

6.1.5.2 Interpretation

The heritage values displayed relate largely to a construct of stately, gracious homestead within a spectacular natural and cultivated setting in what could be considered an idealized misconception of a romantic past.

The positioning of the estate in a range of contexts including colonialism, slavery, the apartheid era and the post 1994 democratic period is not made explicit. The foregrounding of these different contexts which reflect a more diverse cultural heritage, could impart a more inclusive connection to a shared past and could provide a deeper meaning to a broader South African community.

The different means of interpretation of heritage values including audio tours and a new visitor’s route are currently being implemented to increase and deepen the visitor experience.

The interpretation centre has been relocated from the point of entry to the historic werf to the Cloete wine cellar where it is integrated with a wine museum and wine tasting. The intention of Iziko is to use the former interpretation centre and associated courtyard space as an educational facility.

The Groot Constantia brand focuses on the strong connection between heritage and wine with emphasis on Constantia being the ‘oldest wine estate in the country and Constantia wine being world famous. The fusion of these aspects is one of the major objectives of the newly implemented visitor’s route.

While the wine-making and related marketing components and the need to conserve and interpret the cultural historical significance of the estate are not necessarily in conflict and could be compatible, there is the need to ensure appropriate integration. In other words, there is a need ensure an authenticity in the presentation of the history of Groot Constantia and its associations with wine-making, and to ensure a balance between the wine-making component and other cultural heritage values of the estate.

While officials of Iziko, in a series of interviews, have identified the need for displays to reflect a wider, more diverse interpretation of the estate’s heritage, and to reveal and enhance what could be considered to be a previously excluded heritage, for example slavery, the farm workers, the role of women and the role of religion including the Malay heritage, this is not immediately apparent in the current exhibition on display in the Cloete cellar. The exhibit appears to be an appendage to the other functions in the space including the wine tasting.. There appears to still be an overemphasis of foreign travelers and famous personalities and an underemphasis on how ordinary people might experience and interpret the heritage value and significance of the estate.

The significant historical role of Hoop op Constantia and linkages with the history of Groot Constantia is underplayed. However, it is acknowledged that the Hoop op Constantia precinct does not form part of the publicly accessible components of the estate.

Mitigation strategies:

While it is acknowledged that the current display is still work in progress, it is suggested that the interpretation strategies as communicated by Iziko officials, be made explicit and be incorporated into an Interpretation Policy and Plan to be formally adopted by the Trust and Iziko and the appropriate heritage agencies. This should also include strategies for the
integration of wine-making and the cultural components of the estate as opposed to conceptualization of the wine industry being a separate component of the historical cultural context of Groot Constantia.

6.1.5.3 Universal access

While it is evident that most components of the historic core are accessible to the physically disabled, the extent of compliance with national legislation needs to be established. Physical interventions which could impact negatively on the nature of heritage significance need to be resisted and alternative measures explored to be determined by the relevant agencies, including heritage authorities.

Mitigation strategies:

Explore opportunities to facilitate universal access in an appropriate manner, particularly to the restaurants and toilet facilities, and by ensuring that heritage significance is not impacted.

6.1.5.4 Community outreach

Through the very active Iziko schools program aimed specifically at disadvantaged state schools, there is high exposure of Groot Constantia to learners. Groot Constantia is also part of the Grade 3 curriculum. The intention is to use the current Interpretation Centre and associated courtyard space as an educational facility.

While it is evident that there is a community outreach programme and that Groot Constantia is on the school curriculum, the nature and content of these programmes should be clarified to ensure that the range of heritage values is addressed, in particular issues related to cultural diversity, and the need to address what might be considered to be previously excluded histories.

Mitigation strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

School visitor numbers and demographics need to be monitored and disseminated through Iziko’s visitor information system. The curriculum should be made explicit and incorporated into a formal structure/plan.

6.2. Vergelegen

6.2.1. Historical built environment

6.2.1.1 Inventory of buildings and structures

An inventory of buildings, structures and landscape elements on the estate, including buildings and structures forming a buffer area around the historic core has been prepared. The inventory includes the following:

i) A general description of each item highlighting the principal elements underpinning significance;
ii) A brief description outlining historical context, where applicable;
iii) References to known key documentation underpinning historical morphology and significance, where relevant;
iv) A summary of criteria underpinning significance based on the definition of cultural significance set out in the Schedule 2(vi) of the NHRA but expanded as follows:
aesthetic (A); architectural (Ar); artistic (Art); historical (H); scientific (Sc); social (S); 
spiritual (Sp); linguistic (L) technological (T); landmark/focal element (Lm); and/or 
contribution to a fine built group, landscape or space (Cx).

v) Status of significance informed by iv) and rated as High, Medium, Low or No 
significance.

vi) Thumbnail image or images underpinning significance or lack thereof.

Mitigation strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate, preferably with the updating of the heritage inventory 
every 5 years.

6.2.1.2 Fabric condition

The built fabric within the estate appears well maintained and on the whole in very good 
condition supported by regular and ongoing maintenance. The buildings within the Harmonie 
werf, which are in moderate condition, are an exception while the buildings in the Altona werf 
could not be inspected properly. Both these properties are situated in the proposed buffer 
zone area.

The buildings within the historic core area are in showpiece condition. Regular lime-washing 
and thatching maintenance is clearly evident. All day to day maintenance is done in-house. 
Appropriately experienced heritage professionals who are trusted in their fields after years of 
relationship building, are engaged to do the rest, including all specialist specifications and 
interventions.

There is currently no need for immediate/short term urgent repair work to be done.

Mitigation strategies:

Notwithstanding that external contractors enjoy the trust of Vergelegen, a skills audit will be 
required to ensure that work meets HWC’s minimum standards with regard to permitting 
exemptions.

6.2.1.3 Monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements

A system that meets ISO standards is in place for quality and environmental management. 
This includes a 2, 5 and 10-year review system that is not just reactive but allows for ‘over 
the horizon’ issues to be identified. Annual routine maintenance schedules are documented, 
budgeted for and implemented with historic fabric reviewed quarterly. Maintenance and 
payment records help staff to understand maintenance cycles and therefore identify 
abnormal occurrences and trends.

Ongoing documentation is recognized as an important part of maintenance best practice. No 
specific fabric condition checklists are in use. Constant checking by staff from custodians 
(‘house guides’) to housekeepers to general maintenance staff and managers in the course 
of carrying out their normal work is deemed to make this unnecessary. Potential overlaps 
and underlaps between disciplines during monitoring (e.g. between building maintenance 
and landscape maintenance) is not deemed to be a problem because appropriate experts 
are called in as soon as an issue is identified, an interdisciplinary team formed, and the 
matter dealt with accordingly.

Mitigation strategies:

A heritage agreement with HWC that addresses maintenance may include model 
specifications as minimum standards for obtaining permitting exemptions. Longer term
proven maintenance regimes such as the UK’s quinquennial inspection regimes should be investigated with particular attention to the requirements of ISO 9001 and ISO 14001, and the manner in which Vergelegen’s current 2, 5 and 10-year review system is implemented. (Refer to Appendix C).

6.2.1.4 Frequency of routine repair and maintenance and logging systems

Routine repairs are undertaken daily. Larger contracts are budgeted for annually. Daily repairs get outsourced to a specific contractor. Larger issues get referred to the appropriate outsourced architect or engineer. Vergelegen’s underlying ethos is that the historic werf must always look ‘pristine’. ‘Untidiness’ is not favoured, including the English idea of ‘benign decay’ given the nature of the structures involved and the consequent risk that such an approach would pose to the built fabric. The maintenance front line currently consists of 4 custodians, 9 cleaning staff and 10 general maintenance staff members.

Other than invoice payment records, there appears to be no dedicated record of maintenance logging linked specifically to individual buildings/structures.

Outside contractors are trusted to bring in what is appropriate and necessary for a particular job. There is consequently no monitoring of core material preparation (e.g. lime mortars, renders and limewash) and no stockpiles of such materials are kept on the estate.

A high degree of institutional knowledge around maintenance (amongst others) has been built up over the years given Vergelegen’s low staff turnover. Nonetheless it is the estate’s policy not to risk any staff members conducting unsupervised interventions on historic fabric including minor crack filling. Such work is undertaken only by external specialist contractors.

Mitigation strategies:

It would be highly beneficial to formalize record keeping of maintenance and repair work according to each significant building and/or structure as identified in the buildings inventory. This will better inform the performance of buildings as individual dynamic entities over time.

Notwithstanding that external contractors enjoy the trust of Vergelegen, checks need to be conducted to ensure that specifications entrusted to external contractors meet HWC minimum standards – in particular preparation and use of traditional mortars, renders, limewash and thatching.

6.2.1.5 Specialist input

All specialist interventions are outsourced. Only Vergelegen approved heritage professionals are used on areas and items of significance. Such approvals follow a rigorous review process for which the Vergelegen Heritage Trust is kept informed.

Outsourcing of heritage skills is preferred as heritage maintenance forms only a small portion of the annual maintenance activity. According to the estate’s management, specialists in permanent employ would find themselves in non-heritage work for most of the year given the size of the estate and the extent of its management responsibilities.

The experience of some of the contractors is not widely known, while others such as the architects, landscape architects and structural engineers are widely recognized and respected.
Mitigation strategies:

Consideration should be given to a heritage maintenance skills audit to ensure that the work meets the minimum standards with regard to permitting exemptions.

6.2.1.6 Building maintenance manual

There is no formal maintenance manual in place. However, records of all contractor project briefs are maintained, including those of outside experts. These records are held in a central archive.

Mitigation strategies:

Model briefs and specifications are advised as minimum standards for fabric interventions to heritage structures in order to conclude a workable heritage agreement with HWC. It would therefore be beneficial to prepare dedicated heritage-related maintenance and intervention policies for each building identified as significant in the buildings inventory.

6.2.1.7 Attitude towards historical layering

Vergelegen has a specific articulated policy of ‘layered historicism’. There are a number of successful contemporary buildings and a successful contemporary garden layout immediately adjacent to the historic octagon. Attitudes to architectural layering appear to focus on the 17th – 19th centuries, yet acknowledge the early 20th century Arts and Crafts period layering within the historic core. The latter is significant as Arts and Crafts/Cape Revival stylistic reconstructions and good Arts and Crafts period architecture contribute significantly to the contemporary character of the precinct.

On a broader scale, the historical role of Altona and Harmonie and linkages with the main estate’s history is underplayed. However, it is acknowledged that this precinct does not form part of the publicly accessible components of the estate.

Mitigation strategies:

None.

6.2.1.8 Attitude towards relationships between old and new

There is generally a clear distinction expressed between old and new. New buildings adhere to a philosophy of harmony (not contrast) and are clearly dated.

Mitigation strategies:

It has been agreed internally and with the Vergelegen Heritage Trust that an approach to ‘harmonise rather than clearly contrast’ would be followed. In practice, the new buildings on the estate – particularly those adjacent to the Octagon - are successful architectural combinations of old and new and clearly not replicas (e.g. the Stables Bistro and wine tasting centre).

6.2.1.9 Past interventions impacting significance

Vergelegen has an excellent track record for ensuring heritage integrity on the estate. Consequently, there are no past interventions that can currently be regarded as negatively impacting significance. This is, for example, demonstrated by the location of the estate’s contemporary production cellar well away from the historic core and partly sunken into the hillside.
The inventory (see 1) will provide a degree of additional clarity regarding age and chronology of the estate’s various built and landscape components, thereby helping to inform future built and landscaping interventions and addressing permitting requirements.

Vergelegen promotes excellence on all levels including with regard to its landscaping, gardens and being the largest private conservancy in the country. These multiple levels of significance are all addressed by management. The estate is, according to Vergelegen, highly valued by visitors for its total experience of which heritage is one aspect. This must be achieved through a range of means if visitors are to be drawn to the estate.

**Mitigation strategies:**

None.

**6.2.1.10 Documentation and archiving of historical research**

The estate has a comprehensive facility for the archiving of historical research material and reports, and includes copies of all research projects undertaken on the estate, which amount to a considerable body of work. The facility is located in the library building (formerly wine cellar) within the historic core. Hard copies of other records are securely contained in a comprehensive maintenance archive with electronic backups kept off site. This includes copies of all permit applications done by outside specialist heritage practitioners.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

**6.2.2 Landscape elements and character**

**6.2.2.1 Landscape inventory**

A preliminary inventory of landscape elements has been prepared for the purposes of this draft ICMP. Each element has been briefly described, assessed in terms of age and significance, mapped and photographed.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

**6.2.2.2 Condition of significant trees**

The trees within the historic core are in very good condition. Trees of significance are identified and documented. Early detection and prevention systems are in place to ensure best longevity for trees of significance.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

Best practice procedures, programs and protocols need to be documented as part of the institutional knowledge of the estate.

**6.2.2.3 Tree maintenance and replacement programme**
Tree maintenance is undertaken on a regular basis. Planting programs and landscaping protocols are documented and revisited regularly. Documents are kept in the records room on the estate. A planting strategy is in place to replace the historic camphors for when they start dying. Care should be taken to maintain the historic Hutewald and prevent camphor and other inappropriate trees to infest it.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Manage and monitor as appropriate.

### 6.2.2.4 Specialist input

A tree pathologist is retained on an annual basis for inspection and treatment/maintenance guidelines. The Heritage Trust Gardens Sub-Committee is retained to monitor and provide expertise including guidance on replacement plans. OvP landscape architects are retained to provide on-going support and expertise.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Manage and monitor as appropriate.

### 6.2.2.5 Landscape plan

There is a Landscape Master Plan for the historic core that was prepared by Ian Ford Landscape Architects in the 1990s. The overarching landscape concept for the historic core is based on the principle of continuity of materiality with historic reference

The new Arboretum to the east of the historic core is being designed to reinforce the estate’s geometric structure, the connectivity between the historic core and its natural and agricultural setting, and horticultural values. The design concept is evolving.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Manage and monitor as appropriate.

### 6.2.2.6 Commercial activities and landscape character

A tourist activity zone including restaurant, wine tasting and parking is located in one area to the periphery of the historic core, a principle which was clearly established in the overall planning of the historical precinct in the 1990s. This has minimised impacts associated with visitor traffic and the commercial facilities. The central spaces of the historic core are free of commercial facilities.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Manage and monitor as appropriate.

### 6.2.2.7 Activities impacting the agricultural and natural setting

Broader landscape character issues are discussed under Section 6.2.4.
6.2.3 Archaeological record

6.2.3.1 Demarcation of archaeological significant and sensitive areas

No archaeological significant and sensitive areas have been previously formally identified. For the purposes of this draft ICMP, the entire historical precinct core area is deemed to be of archaeological sensitivity. Areas of high significance/sensitivity include the homestead and octagonal precinct, and buried remains of the old slave lodge, mill and wine cellar. While the mill, slave lodge and winery are easy to identify, locations of the remains of other buildings are not confirmed as they have never been excavated. They are marked to the east of the slave lodge on a plan of 1712. No large scale trenching or earthmoving can occur here without an impact assessment first being conducted.

Mitigation strategies:

Any historical built fabric or ground disturbance within these sensitive areas must be subject to prior archaeological assessment, investigation if necessary and monitoring.

6.2.3.2 Archaeological research and investigation

Archaeological research at Vergelegen in the 1990s was undertaken as a privately funded research project aimed to address a number of questions about the nature of colonial settlement. Primary among these were questions about slavery and about the interrelationships between slaves, colonists, and the indigenous inhabitants of the Cape of Good Hope. However, while the full architectural imprint of the slave lodge was unearthed, the archaeological samples were frustratingly insubstantial. The archival research conducted in parallel to the excavations produced substantial information about the people who lived and worked on the property.

The original main dwelling house at Vergelegen has not been archaeologically excavated, but foundations of three of the outbuildings showed evidence of three-aisled barns: slave lodge, stable / mill and wine cellar are versions of a type of building commonly found in northern Europe known as a *loshuis/hallehuis*). These findings are very significant. The only other recorded example of this type of building was found at Meerlust, near Stellenbosch.

During excavations at Vergelegen, a grave was uncovered under the floor of the ruined slave lodge. The grave is that of a woman who died in her 50s. Isotopic analyses of the skeleton indicated that she was a slave originating from a tropical region. The farm workers at Vergelegen named her ‘Flora’ and participated in her reburial in April 1991.

An exhibition was designed and set up to display the archaeological research at Vergelegen. It included a model of the actual dig at the slave lodge and some of the artefacts found there. The now revised exhibit in the homestead includes a detailed scale model of the slave lodge as well as reference to a wider range of people, such as the KhoeSan descendants who lived and worked on the estate. The issue of herder history has particular pertinence in the Western Cape - the area inhabited by the herders for about two thousand years prior to the arrival of colonial settlers and the area in which contact between herders and European settlers first took place.

Since the 1990s, archaeological work at Vergelegen has taken place as a result of cultural resource management processes..

Additional archaeological investigations since the 1990s include parts of the octagonal feature which were excavated during rebuilding work in 2008, test excavations at the new wine tasting facility in 2007 and at the Harmonie farmstead in 2009.
This proactive assessment, mitigation and monitoring programme will be ongoing as alterations and developments are proposed and implemented. Academic research projects may well arise in the future that can be explored.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Mitigation and monitoring to be ongoing as alterations and developments are proposed and implemented.

### 6.2.3.3 Procedures for monitoring and reporting archaeological finds

Given the potential for the archaeological record to contribute to a greater understanding of the heritage significance of the estate, there is a need for procedures for proactive assessment, monitoring and reporting archaeological finds on the estate. Annexure D provides guidelines for property managers and owners on how to safeguard archaeological heritage. It explains the types of evidence which indicate the presence of an archaeological site, artefact and feature. It also provides procedures for archaeological assessments prior to any interventions / development and monitoring excavation works and what to do when archaeological material is found. It is also advisable that these guidelines be work-shopped with site managers.

**Mitigation strategies:**

It is recommended that an awareness session be held with site managers and staff to explain the types of evidence which indicate the presence of archaeological material and what to do when archaeological material is found. This must include photographing and recording the location of the artefact and contacting an archaeologist to assess its significance. If there are artefacts in a dense cluster or associated with a feature, then excavation work must stop, the artefacts must be left in place and an archaeologist and/or the heritage authority contacted to advise on an appropriate course of action.

In the case of human remains being uncovered, work must immediately stop and the site sealed off. First, the police and HWC / an archaeologist must be contacted. If the remains are confirmed to be archaeological, which is most likely, then the heritage authority will determine the appropriate course of action.

### 6.2.4 Natural and cultural setting

#### 6.2.4.1 Natural setting

The relationship between the historic core and its natural setting is exceptional. This relationship has been enhanced by the creation of vistas to accentuate visual connectivity between the historic core and mountain setting, e.g. tree lined avenue linking the octagonal garden and mountain backdrop and the axes set up by the new Arboretum.

In 2004 a 10 year environmental rehabilitation programme was implemented for the restoration of 2000 hectares of pristine Fynbos. It is the largest private alien clearing and land rehabilitation project undertaken in South Africa. Over 60% of the land has been rehabilitated and is under an environmental management plan. This includes the protection of many Red Data species in localised pockets of unique vegetation including Swartland shale renosterveld; Lourensford Alluvium Fynbos and Boland Granite Fynbos, and 80ha of rehabilitated wetlands. The area has been the subject of numerous post graduate and undergraduate studies.
A process has been initiated to have the upper reaches of the estate declared as a private nature reserve with a stewardship agreement with Cape Nature. Vergelegen was the first wine farm to receive champion status in the WWF’s Biodiversity & Wine Initiative.

Significant reduction in alien invader vegetation in the upper reaches of the estate contributes to its outstanding natural beauty, its interface with the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS and a sense of balance between wilderness, agricultural and settlement domains.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

### 6.2.4.2 Agricultural setting

Views from the approach road and within the historic core provide a variety of visual experiences of the working farm; meadow settings, vineyard covered slopes with the absence of visual intrusions.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

### 6.2.4.3 Riverine setting

The relationship between the core and the Lourens River is strongly evident in terms of the approach to the historic core. The river forms a very positive landscape element and is integrated into the pedestrian network. The Lourens River which passes through the estate is the only river in the country to be declared a Protected Natural Environment.

**Mitigation strategies:**
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

### 6.2.5 Public associations and values

#### 6.2.5.1 Visitor access and facilities

A small entrance fee is charged by Vergelegen.

Vergelegen has been open to visitors since 1992 and has become a major visitor destination within the Cape Winelands. The historic core, 60 hectares in size, consists of various areas that are accessible to visitors.

- Homestead
- Library
- Gardens
- Wine Tasting Centre
- Restaurants

Vergelegen was South Africa’s winner in the Great Wine Capital Global Network Best of Wine Tourism Awards for three successive years and the first property to be added to the Hall of Fame. It won it again in 2014 and was a finalist in 2015.
The role of the historic core as a visitor destination with a range of visitor facilities, specialist audiences and events contributes significantly to the public appreciation of the heritage value of the site.

The estate receives 100 000 visitors per annum; 45 000 wine tastings and 70 000 meals. Inclusive of functions and events it receives 120 000 visitors per annum; 50 000 wine tasting and 90 000 meals. There is a small entrance fee; R10 for adults and R5 for children. A Loyalty Programme for regular visitors provides complimentary access. The Camphors restaurant accommodates a maximum of 60 guests and the Stables restaurant a maximum of 100 guests. There are guided tours of the production cellar and historic core. The estate also hosts a number of private events. Access to the estate does not permit dog-walking, horse riding and mountain biking.

Vergelegen has hosted a number of high profile national and international visitors. For instance, in 1990 the first meeting of the caucus of the unbanned ANC took place in the seclusion of Vergelegen before it was opened to the public. It has also hosted a number of significant events. Examples include the Mining Indaba Gala Dinner hosted annually since 2006 (1000 people), Carols by Candlelight hosted annually (4000 people), the Rand Merchant Bank Starlight Classics hosted annually since 2000 (8000 people), the Opening of Parliament Gala Dinner between 2000 and 2012 (800 people), the major concert in 2008 (35 000 people) and the Cape Classics concerts between 2005 and 2009 which included numerous international artists who performed to raise funds for charity.

The decision to restrict visitor vehicular access and parking to the outskirts of the historic core has a significant effect on the visitor experience. Walking through the historic core and the visual and audible absence of cars facilitates greater appreciation of its unique character and sense of place.

6.2.5.2 Interpretation

A visitors pamphlet distributed at the public relations entrance gate, the strategic placement of illustrated interpretation boards, e.g. at the entrance to the octagonal garden, and the exhibition corridor in the homestead facilitate appreciation of the origins, layering and significance of the estate. The homestead and library include a display and collection of antiques, ceramics, books and artworks reflecting various historical periods. The level of curation of this collection is of a high standard. The recently established exhibition corridor in the homestead provides a narrative of the farm’s layered history with a strong emphasis on its history of slavery.

Mitigation strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

6.2.5.3 Universal access

Discussions have been held with experts regarding universal access. All indoor and outdoor amenities are accessible. Additional accessible routes have been provided and clearly mapped where main pedestrian routes and entrances to buildings are not sufficient.

Mitigation strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

6.2.5.4 Community outreach

There are various community outreach programmes and projects that contribute to the public appreciation and enjoyment of the place. These include:
• Carols by Candlelight in aid of Helderberg Hospice.
• Concert event in aid of the Round Table charity organisation.
• A recycling project involving various schools and local communities.
• The leasing of the fruit orchards to Embala which is a Black Economic Empowerment company.
• The training of formerly unemployed men and women in the alien vegetation clearing programme which is setting new standards for productivity in environmental work.
• The future involvement of various school groups in the planting of the new Arboretum.

Mitigation strategies:
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

6.3. Composite assessments for both estates

6.3.1 Historical built environment

1) The influence of available resources on maintenance regimes: The fabric within the built environments of both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen is generally in very good condition and well maintained. However, whereas Vergelegen benefits from being under the ownership of a multinational company which has developed the estate along model lines, Groot Constantia is fully reliant on income generated from the estate for conservation and sustainability. Consequently, Vergelegen benefits from having more resources at its disposal for managing and maintaining its resources (although this is also much more extensive than that of Groot Constantia), whereas Groot Constantia is more reliant on visitor input and the quality of its wines to ensure a steady income stream. This has therefore inevitably resulted in differences in the manner in which fabric maintenance within these two estates is identified, implemented and monitored.

2) Monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements: Given Groot Constantia’s budgetary constraints fabric maintenance is based on a more reactive regime in which the monitoring of past payments to contractors together with at least annual physical site inspections is central. While Vergelegen also uses payment and maintenance records to help understand maintenance cycles and identify abnormal occurrences, it has also set up management systems meeting ISO standards that include a 2, 5 and 10-year review process allowing for ‘over the horizon’ issues to be identified.

3) Human resource efficiencies: Staff at Vergelegen have focused roles at management level, whereas managers at Groot Constantia have to fulfil multiple functions given tighter budgets associated with greater reliance on annual harvests. One typical example of the multiple roles performed by staff is the maintenance manager, who while a viticulturist by training, has to deal with all maintenance matters on the estate often including when and under what circumstances the outsourcing of maintenance functions is required. Whereas Vergelegen engages specialist task teams across disciplines to deal with specific problems where necessary, specialist teams at Groot Constantia appear to work more independently of one another with the result that there is potential for project overlaps and underlaps to occur.

4) Specialist input and standards: Both Vergelegen and Groot Constantia outsource their specialist maintenance although Vergelegen also employs staff conducting day to day maintenance. At least some maintenance work is conducted by in-house staff at Groot Constantia. Both estates rely on contractors to bring in what they need for a job and remove it afterwards. Groot Constantia in particular would not want to stockpile heritage-related materials (e.g. wet lime mortars and lime putties) as they do not have the space to accommodate such supplies. Both estates trust the expertise of their specialists
implicitly, including with regard to the off-site preparation of traditional and heritage-related materials. Consequently, it is not always clear as to what overarching standards are being met by specialist contractors, and no external checks are applied other than by the contractors themselves. The professional services of architects, landscape architects and structural engineers with considerable heritage expertise have been involved in larger projects at both estates since the 1990s including architectural interventions to historic fabric, new building development, landscaping proposals and structural engineering interventions, and both estates continue to engage with a range of heritage professionals on a project-by-project basis.

5) Institutional knowledge: Vergelegen has built up a high degree of institutional knowledge around maintenance over the years notwithstanding the outsourcing of its specialist work. This is because there is an in-house maintenance staff complement capable of conducting work (done only under outsourced specialist supervision where involving significant fabric) with staff turnover being very low. Some of Vergelegen’s staff are approaching 25 years of service with the estate. In the case of Groot Constantia, institutional knowledge around specialist building interventions resides with the outsourced architects who have been servicing Groot Constantia since 1985. The degree to which institutional knowledge has been built up around heritage maintenance within Groot Constantia itself is unknown.

6) Building-specific maintenance logging: Neither estate employs a maintenance and repair logging system nor maintenance manual linked specifically to buildings or structures as full entities in their own right. This means that monitoring systems are focused on remediating elements and components rather than integrated structural entities subject to the dynamics of wear and tear with interrelated consequences over time. This is therefore identified as an area for performance improvement for both estates.

7) Interpretation of historical layering: The early 20th century Arts and Crafts historical layering as represented in the Cape Revival stylistic reconstructions of the homesteads and other buildings of both estates should be emphasised at both estates, particularly in the case of the Groot Constantia homestead which represented a ground-breaking restoration of its time.

8) Interface between old and new: While both estates display contemporary interventions that are clearly expressed as such (sometimes to the detriment of historic context in the case of the 1980’s Groot Constantia production cellar and the tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex), the line between old and new is very clearly defined within and adjacent to the Vergelegen historic core. At Groot Constantia on the one hand, that line is blurred in places where aspects of commercial activity do spill over into its historic core. This is no doubt a consequence of Groot Constantia historically having had a very permeable public/private interface dating from the time when it was still state owned and including regular public activities and events. Vergelegen on the other hand has a much more controlled public interface and only hosts functions very selectively, and on rare high profile occasions.

9) Research archival facilities: Vergelegen has a comprehensive facility for archiving historical research material, reports and heritage permit applications, whereas Groot Constantia relies on its outsourced specialists to maintain such records. Consequently, Groot Constantia has no direct control over the safekeeping of what is effectively its heritage-related archive, trusting its outsourced specialists to do so in their various locations off site.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation, remediation and improvement of current performance risks are made:
Groot Constantia

1) Investigate as a high priority the state of the leaning pillar and portion of wall adjacent to, and on the southeast side of the homestead. A structural engineer with experience in consolidating historic structures should be engaged as a matter of urgency to inspect the situation and recommend remedial action if required.

2) Investigate the appointment of a single hands-on ‘authority’ operating along similar lines to a ‘surveyor of the fabric’ in countries such as the UK. This authority/individual should either be an architect or architectural firm with proven experience in heritage work and based on the quinquennial maintenance regime attached as Annexure C would be responsible for reporting to the estate’s CEO through the maintenance manager. Responsibilities would include:

- Developing a monitoring system for the estate’s historic fabric in accordance with international best practice and updating it where necessary from time to time;
- Monitoring and reviewing all heritage maintenance requirements;
- Co-ordinating all heritage-related works to the built environment across disciplines including landscaping; and
- Liaising regularly with Vergelegen and the managements of other similar historic sites of WHS status (potential or established) on the basis of information sharing and broadening institutional knowledge around their sustainability.

3) Establish a centralized archive holding all heritage related documentation including historical research, heritage assessments, architectural drawings, permits and maintenance and repair records. This should include at least copies of all previous documentation recovered from various previously appointed contractors where possible. This archive should preferably be established on the estate. However, should this not be possible, then a suitable remote site agreed to with the appropriate heritage/statutory authority would suffice, provided that all records are digitally accessible from the estate, and backed up to a secure server held elsewhere by agreement with the statutory authority.

4) Prepare a model maintenance specification document to cover at least all routine maintenance work on significant structures (such structures to be named). The purpose is to set up agreed minimum standards as a basis for a heritage agreement with the appropriate heritage/statutory authority in order to facilitate relevant permit exemptions for work on the estate.

5) Assign and archive maintenance and repair records according to their buildings of origin, the purpose being to build up an incremental record of issues for each significant building in order to more effectively monitor trends and anomalies for these buildings, each therefore being treated as a holistic, dynamic and discrete structural entity.

6) Iziko and Groot Constantia to prepare a coordinated policy statement to clarify attitudes towards historical layering and interpretation informed by an updated heritage statement and including inter alia the estate’s early 20th century layering.

7) A planning strategy to mitigate the visual impact of the production cellar and the relocation of the tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex which has a negative visual impact.
Vergelegen

1) Investigate the appointment of a single hands-on ‘authority’ operating along similar lines to ‘surveyor of the fabric’ in countries such as the UK. This authority/individual should either be an architect or architectural firm with proven experience in heritage work. This appointment would be seen as complimentary to heritage monitoring regimes already in place and based on the quinquennial maintenance regime attached as Annexure C the appointee would be responsible for reporting to the estate’s CEO through the maintenance manager. Responsibilities would include:

- Reviewing the current monitoring system for the estate’s historic fabric and if/where necessary updating it from time to time in accordance with international best practice;
- Monitoring and reviewing all architectural heritage maintenance requirements on the estate;
- Co-ordinating all heritage-related works to the built environment across disciplines including landscaping; and
- Liaising regularly with Groot Constantia and the managements of other similar historic sites of WHS (potential or established) on the basis of information sharing and broadening institutional knowledge around the sustainability.

2) Prepare a model maintenance specification document to cover at least all routine maintenance work on significant structures (such structures to be named). The purpose is to set up agreed minimum standards as a basis for a heritage agreement with the appropriate heritage/statutory authority in order to facilitate relevant permit exemptions for work on the estate.

3) Assign and archive maintenance and repair records according to their buildings of origin, the purpose being to build up an incremental record of issues for each significant building in order to more effectively monitor trends and anomalies for these buildings, each as a holistic, dynamic and discrete structural entity.

6.3.2 Landscape elements and character

1) Condition assessment: At Groot Constantia many of the significant trees along the central axis are reaching maturity and some have been felled, leaving gaps in the avenue. At Vergelegen trees of significance are in a good condition, with early detection and prevention measures in place to ensure best longevity for trees of significance.

2) Tree maintenance and replacement programme: At Groot Constantia, tree maintenance takes place when needed and there is an active replacement of trees in the avenue. This should be extended to the property boundaries to screen residential properties. At Vergelegen planting programs and landscaping protocols are documented and revisited regularly.

3) Specialist input: At Vergelegen a tree pathologist is retained on an annual basis for inspection and treatment/maintenance guidelines. There is also a Heritage Trust Gardens Sub-Committee and landscape architects to provide on-going support and expertise. Groot Constantia would benefit from annual inspection by a tree pathologist. It is recommended that a landscape architect be consulted on matters that effect outdoor spaces, specifically within the historic core.
4) Landscape plan: Both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen have landscape plans prepared in the 1990s. In the case of Groot Constantia this should be revisited, particularly with respect to recent changes in the historic core.

5) Commercial activities and landscape character: At Groot Constantia the manner in which trading is set up from a visual-spatial perspective detracts from the cultural character of the historical core. Trading is currently permitted along the edge of the jonkershuis overlooking the historic werf and adjacent to Simon’s overlooking the Cloete Cellar and reflection pond. At Vergelegen commercial activities are located outside the central spaces of the historical precinct minimising impacts on landscape character.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation, remediation and improvement of current performance risks are made:

**Groot Constantia**

1) Revisit the Ian Ford Landscape Plan with respect to the recent changes in the historic core to address ornamental planting and garden elements and a strategy for the placement and type of outdoor furniture that is permitted for the restaurant establishments and to ensure that signage is per the current typology.

2) Develop a planting strategy to screen the surrounding residential properties and visual impact of the production cellar.

3) Annual inspection with a tree pathologist re the condition of trees within the central avenue.

**Vergelegen**

1) There are no mitigation strategies required given the best practice procedures, programs and protocols already in place. These should be documented as part of the institutional knowledge of the estate.

6.3.3 Archaeological record

1) Demarcation of archaeological significant and sensitive areas: For the purposes of this ICMP archaeological significant and sensitive areas have been identified. Any major historic fabric or ground disturbance within these areas should be subject to archaeological assessment, investigation and monitoring.

2) Archaeological research and investigation: While limited archaeological work has been done at Groot Constantia, fairly extensive work has been done at Vergelegen. Assessment, mitigation and monitoring is to be on-going as alterations and developments are proposed and implemented.

3) Procedures for monitoring and reporting archaeological finds: For the purposes of this ICMP a document has been prepared outlining procedures for monitoring and reporting archaeological finds (Annexure D).

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation, remediation and improvement of current performance risks are made:
**Groot Constantia and Vergelegen**

(1) It is recommended that an awareness session be held with site managers to explain the types of evidence which indicate the presence of archaeological material and what to do when archaeological material is found, with a regular programme to share information.

**6.3.4 Natural and cultural setting**

1) **Relationship with natural setting:** Both historic cores of both estates have a highly positive natural setting with strong vistas of surrounding mountains forming part of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS. Both estates have alien eradication programmes in place, particularly in the case of Vergelegen with its extensive rehabilitation of over 2000 hectares of pristine Fynbos adjacent to the Hottentots Holland Nature Reserve and proposed to become a Private Nature Reserve. Both Vergelegen and Groot Constantia have champion status in the WWF BWI.

2) **Relationship with agricultural setting:** The historic cores of both estates have positive agricultural setting surrounded by productive farmland. At Groot Constantia, perimeter planting on the estate is very important in terms of screening residential development on the estate boundaries. The 1980s production cellar has impacted visual linkages between the historic core and agricultural setting and mountain backdrop to the north. The tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex has a negative visual impact on the werf and should be relocated.

3) **Relationship with riverine setting:** The riverine setting of Vergelegen is more pronounced with strong visual spatial linkages with the Lourens River. The relationship between Groot Constantia and its riverine setting has been impacted on by the parking area behind Simon’s restaurant.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation, remediation and improvement of current performance risks are made:

**Groot Constantia**

(1) Actively and proactively manage and monitor perimeter planting on the estate.

(2) Possible planting measures to mitigate visual impacts on the northern and western facades of the 1980s cellar.

(3) Develop a Landscape Plan for the parking area behind the Cloete cellar with appropriate hard and soft landscaping features to soften the visual impact of the existing hard, asphalt surfacing adjacent to the river course.

(4) Relocation of tractor shed behind the jonkershuis complex to a more appropriate location on the estate.

**Vergelegen**

(1) Ongoing management and monitoring.

**6.3.5 Public associations and values**

1) **Visitor access and facilities:** Both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are major visitor destinations offering a wide range of facilities. The decisions to restrict visitor vehicular access and parking to the outskirts of the historic cores has a significant positive effect on the visitor experience. At Groot Constantia, the open free access to the estate
contributes to positive public perceptions of the estate, although it is acknowledged open access is associated with a number of management challenges.

2) *Interpretation:* At Groot Constantia the new interpretative display in the wine cellar is work in progress. Achieving a balance between wine-making and a range of heritage values needs to be actively monitored. At Vergelegen the issue of interpretation is addressed very well, particularly in terms of the exhibition corridor in the homestead which provides a narrative of the farm’s layered history including its history of slavery.

3) *Universal access:* Some of the buildings at Groot Constantia do not satisfy the criteria for universal access. All indoor and outdoor amenities are accessible at Vergelegen.

4) *Community outreach:* Both estates perform well in terms of community outreach, particularly in terms of Iziko’s very active schools programme.

It should be noted that the National Tourism Sector Strategy 2016-2026 includes proposals to enhance the visitor experience and specifically mentions the improvement of and upgrading of experiences at World Heritage Sites with respect to infrastructure, tourism skills and levels of service.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation, remediation and improvement of current performance risks are made:

**Groot Constantia**

(1) Actively and pro-actively manage issues around interpretation. It is suggested that the interpretation strategies be incorporated into an Interpretation Policy and Plan to be formally adopted by Iziko and the Trust. This should also include strategies for the integration of wine and other cultural historical components of the estate, and the revealing of the historical layering and diverse narratives of the estate.

(2) Explore opportunities to facilitate universal access in an appropriate manner, particularly to the restaurants and toilet facilities.

(3) The imposition of an entry fee to the estate should be resisted and only considered as a very last resort. The lack of “exclusiveness” is regarded as a major attribute and contributes substantially to the positive public perceptions of the estate. Similarly restrictions on dog walking need to be carefully considered. Every attempt should be made to engage with the local communities to ensure adherence to the existing rule that dogs may not run free must be under the direct control of dog-walkers.

**Vergelegen**

(1) The need for on-going monitoring and management, as appropriate.
7. FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTIES (INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL)

7.1 Groot Constantia

7.1.1 Development pressure

7.1.1. Consistency with municipal planning frameworks and status of adjacent properties

Groot Constantia is bounded by the TMNP to the west and mostly single residential zoned properties to the north, south and east, and forms part of the Constantia-Tokai farmlands. The farm is zoned Primary Agriculture with a consent use for Tourism Purposes. It is located outside the urban edge. The agricultural and tourism base of the estate is consistent with municipal planning frameworks.

The agricultural landscape comprising the Constantia-Tokai Valley has undergone a gradual erosion, fragmentation and reduction in the size of farms with an ever tightening of the density of the subdivisions and suburbanisation around what became known as the “farm anchors” and “riverine corridors” of the Valley. Other development pressures relate to potentially inappropriate edge treatments of the zoned single residential properties or rezoning of these properties adjacent to Groot Constantia.

Mitigation strategies:

The encroachment of residential development into the agricultural context of Groot Constantia needs to be actively and pro-actively managed by the relevant authorities, particularly in terms of the rezoning of agricultural properties and shifting of the urban edge. It is recommended that appropriate mechanisms be developed by the City of Cape Town and/or Heritage Western Cape to ensure appropriate development immediately adjacent to the site. This relates particularly to densification and boundary treatments (e.g. high impermeable boundary walls), which would impact negatively on the agricultural character of the site, specifically on views from the farmstead to the east and in maintaining treed buffers between Groot Constantia and surrounding residential properties. The appropriate mechanisms for the protection of a buffer zone to the WHS are discussed in Sections 11 and 12.

7.1.1.2 Site development opportunities and constraints including future planned projects

There has been no analysis of the estate in terms of development opportunities due to its acknowledged heritage value. There have however, been suggestions by estate management that the tourism potential of the estate could be enhanced by the development of guest accommodation, preferably in existing structures. No spatial analysis to this end has been initiated.

Mitigation measures:

The location of guest accommodation on the estate could have potential heritage impacts, particularly in terms of views from the werf and the interface between the estate and TMNP, and could impact on the sense of agriculture and wilderness which predominate at present.

The utilization of existing structures for guest house accommodation would be regarded as a preferable alternative to the development of any green field sites.
Any interventions involving new structures or adaptive reuse of existing structures would require detailed heritage and visual impact assessment including a public participation process.

7.1.1.3 Development proposals adjacent to the site

Plans to develop a residential retirement estate on Mount Prospect, Erven 2641 and 2643, Constantia located on the southern boundary of Groot Constantia were approved by the Western Cape Provincial Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning (DEA&DP) in October 2017 and is now subject to an appeal period. The proposals were subject to a Heritage Impact Assessment as part of an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under the provisions of the National Environment Management Act (Act 107 of 1998; NEMA) EIA Regulations and Section 38 (8) of the NHRA. The initial proposal was for 63 units which were reduced to 37 units in the final layout approved by DEA&DP.

A number of objections to the proposals were raised on heritage grounds, particularly in terms of impacts on Groot Constantia Estate. HWC does not support the amended proposals and has lodged an appeal against DEA&DP’s decision to approve the development.

The Groot Constantia Trust objected to the initial proposals due its negative impacts of densification on the cultural landscape context particularly its interface with Groot Constantia and its significance as being included in the properties for the proposed WHS nomination of the Early Cape Farmsteads.

Mitigation measures:

Actively and pro-actively monitor appeal process as appropriate. Negative impacts could be reduced by ensuring an adequate setback from the Groot Constantia boundary and a planted buffer with appropriate tree types between the proposed development and Groot Constantia.

7.1.1.4 Inhabitants on the property

There are currently twenty two families occupying housing on the estate and five houses are occupied by management. Three houses are rented out. The long term intention of management is to provide off site security of tenure for farm workers currently living on site and to only retain staff accommodation required for all hours of operational requirements.

Mitigation measures:

The contribution of labour, past and present to the heritage of Groot Constantia is a factor which is considered to have been underemphasized in terms of the current interpretation of the heritage significance of the estate as a whole. The role of labour over time needs to be incorporated into an Integrated Interpretation Strategy.

The adaptive re-use of farm workers’ cottages for guest house accommodation could be considered but perceptions of the ‘sanitization’ of the landscape need to be addressed.

7.1.2 Environmental pressure including natural disasters and risk preparedness

7.1.2.1 Risks associated with drought conditions

The estate falls within a high rainfall area and no water shortages have been experienced. However, the current severe drought in the Western Cape is likely to have an impact.
An alien vegetation eradication programme is in place to increase water run-off to supply the on-site irrigation dam.

**Mitigation strategies**

The long and short-term water supply issues needs to be actively and pro-actively monitored and managed.

### 7.1.2.2 Risks associated with flooding

The placement of the historic werf has responded positively to the topographical conditions. It is located on higher ground and is thus considered as being naturally protected from flood inundation.

The erosion of river embankments, particularly directly behind the Cloete wine cellar, after a large storm with high rainfall is, however, considered to be a potential risk factor. Risks associated with erosion are regularly monitored by the estate management and measures are in place to stabilise river embankments. Refer to 7.1.1.4 below.

**Mitigation strategies:**

The status of the river embankments needs to be carefully monitored and managed. Refer to 7.1.1.4 below.

### 7.1.2.3 Risks associated with fire

Major fires have occurred on the site and a fire management program is in place. A fire break has been established on the boundary with the TMNP and Groot Constantia partners with the TMNP in ensuring fire protection and management measures. A Fire Management and Evacuation Plan was put in place after the fire that swept through the Cape Peninsula Mountains in 2015. The historic buildings have smoke detection and preventative devices in place.

**Mitigation strategies**

The efficacy of the fire management and evacuation program should be actively and pro-actively carefully managed and monitored.

### 7.1.2.4 Risks associated with the riverine system

Some of the river courses and embankments are infested with alien vegetation. A program is being implemented for their eradication as part of a larger biodiversity initiative being undertaken by the wine industry.

A degree of erosion is evident on some of the embankments and some of the existing gabions indicate signs of subsidence.

**Mitigation strategies**

The status of all natural embankments and gabion structures need to be carefully monitored and managed. ‘Soft engineering’ measures need to be implemented to prevent further deepening of stream channels and the undercutting of embankments.
7.1.2.6 Other environmental risks

Baboons which damage the thatch roofs of historic buildings and damage crops are a constant threat. The estate shares the problem with baboons with the rest of the inhabitants of the southern Peninsula, being problematic for farming, buildings and people.

A baboon control fence has been erected around the western periphery of the property but the threat has not been fully resolved.

Mitigation strategies

The constant monitoring of the fence and the exploration of alternative measures for baboon protection needs to be considered in collaboration with adjacent landowners, Cape Nature and the TMNP authorities.

7.1.3 Visitor and tourism pressure

7.1.3.1 Risks associated with commercial activities

The intention of the 1990s framework plan was, inter alia, to limit the intrusion of commercial activities into the historic core and to deflect such pressures to the point of entry into the estate. Since that time the spatial footprint of the two restaurants within and immediately adjacent to the historic core has increased with potential threats to the character and ambience of the werf.

Mitigation strategies:

The impact and effectiveness of the recently implemented Visitor Route needs to be carefully monitored in terms of heritage impacts and the need to achieve an appropriate balance between heritage significance and commercial viability.

The extent of commercial activities, in particular outdoor tables, chairs and umbrellas, needs to be re-assessed in terms of impacts on the historic werf, both in front of the homestead and the area between the homestead and the Cloete wine cellar.

Develop a strategy for the placement and type of outdoor furniture that is permitted for the restaurant establishments. (Refer to Landscape Plan)

7.1.3.2 Impact of visitor traffic and events

Visitor traffic, including tourist busses, is confined to the periphery of the historic core which is pedestrian dominated. The central spaces of the historic core are excluded from vehicular traffic. The main tourist activity zone including a wine tasting and sales centre is located at the Bertrams Cellar near the entrance to the estate at some distance from the historic core. This was a principle of the overall planning of the estate in the 1990s which intended to limit the impact of commercial activities on the historic core. However, over the years it became clear that most visitors to the Betrams Cellar facilities do not visit the historic core of Groot Constantia. It therefore became necessary to develop other visitor experience opportunities that would attract visitors to the historic core.

The existing restaurants and associated spaces are also used for special events, including weddings and film shoots, and are subject to an existing Events Policy. Permits and agreements between estate management, and where applicable, Iziko, and event organizers are framed to minimize negative impact on heritage fabric.
It is evident from discussions with the estate management that consideration is being given to increase the provision of parking.

**Mitigation strategies**

The proposals to increase parking need to be carefully assessed. It is evident that the estate has a limit to its absorption capacity in terms of the heritage experience and this limit needs to be established in order to ascertain the amount of parking that should be permitted. (Refer to Visitor Management Plan and Landscape Plan)

**7.1.3.3 Impact of visitor traffic on building fabric and heritage spaces**

It is evident that visitor pedestrian traffic is having some impact, in particular on the lawns on the central axis in front of the homestead. The area is often used as a play-ground for children utilizing the *jonkershuis* facilities and damage to the lawns is occurring. As indicated above, the carrying or absorption capacity of critical areas within and adjacent to the historic core needs to be established to determine the amount of parking and restaurant capacity that can be accommodated.

The Events Policy needs to be examined to ensure the appropriate management and the responsible agencies need to be identified for activities that could impact on the heritage fabric.

**Mitigation strategies**

While it is understood that there is a Visitor Management Plan (including dog-walking) it is evident that new challenges/threats occur on an ongoing basis, and should be regularly updated and care should be taken to ensure the participation of regular users of the estate. Particularly with regard to dog-walking every effort should be made to ensure the cooperation of users before any possible policy change, including the possible banning of dog-walking, is implemented.

A new tourist route is in the process of being implemented but the overall aims and objectives of the route have not been made explicit.

A Visitor Management Plan needs to address the following:

- Ensure unrestricted access to the public, access to the site via different points of entry and rules relating to dog walking. However, measures should also take into account measures to secure and minimize risks to visitors.

- Achieving the appropriate balance between the nature and experiential qualities of the heritage resource and the volume of visitors and parking that can be accommodated and their spatial distribution across the site. There is a need to determine the absorption and carrying capacity of the site, especially over the peak holiday season. (Refer to Landscape Plan)

- Ensure the appropriate range of interpretative material to enable a range of different heritage values to be transmitted, different stories to be narrated and different heritage themes to be explored. (Refer to Interpretation Plan)

**7.1.3.4 Authenticity of the visitor experience and impacts on heritage**

The reality is that the historic core is no longer used as a farm *werf* but as a tourism destination, restaurant and museum, and this inevitably impacts on historical character and the perception of authenticity. However, this impact is outweighed by the public heritage
benefits derived from public access and educational role of the site and this is not impacting the working farm component of the estate. The respective requirements of the wine industry, and the related activity of wine-tasting, and the needs for appropriate heritage interpretation, are not necessarily in conflict but the appropriate balance needs to be achieved.

**Mitigation strategies:**

A new Visitor Route is being implemented and will need to be carefully monitored. Discussions with Iziko officials have indicated the need for a broader interpretation of the heritage of the estate, and the foregrounding of a range of heritage issues, including slavery, which have not sufficiently been acknowledged. The elaboration and articulation of these previously underemphasized histories and narratives need to be incorporated into an Integrated Interpretation and Visitor Management Plan.

While it is acknowledged that the current display is still work in progress, it is suggested that the interpretation strategies as communicated by Iziko officials, be made explicit and be incorporated into an Interpretation Policy and Plan to be formally adopted by the Trust and Iziko and the appropriate heritage agencies.

**7.1.3.5 Other risks associated with visitor access**

The unfettered nature of public access is considered to be a major benefit. There are, however, some negative impacts associated with anti-social behaviour and the tendency of people to walk their dogs off leashes which is contrary to existing policy. Security concerns have also been highlighted in recent years with a number of incidents that occurred on the estate.

**Mitigation strategies:**

While many of these impacts are not solely heritage related, they can impact on the experiential qualities of the heritage core and need to be carefully monitored and managed.

Security issues related to the collection of valuable moveable objects displayed in the homestead and other buildings need to be regularly and carefully monitored and assessed by Iziko.

The option of considering an entrance fee should only be considered as a last resort. All options that could be considered to mitigate any negative impacts resulting from the current open access policy must be explored.

**7.1.4 Economic and agricultural activity pressure**

**7.1.4.1 Risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability of core income-generating activities**

Financial resources are derived primarily from wine sales. Other income generating resources include rentals, restaurant leases, special events and film shoots.

The Trust is responsible for all maintenance costs within the historic core. Iziko is responsible for the funding of museum staff, the maintenance of the interior of the homestead, educational activities and interpretative material and displays.

The farm activities are self-sustaining and supporting at this time and wine production is expected to increase slightly. There is little opportunity for further vineyard planting. Unless there is a dramatic change in foreign exchange rates or vineyard production is adversely affected by disease or climatic conditions, the current situation should continue.
There is an active marketing strategy to ensure the promotion of the estate and the integration and fusion of the wine-making and cultural historical components.

**Mitigation strategies:**

The financial and economic integration of the wine making and cultural historical components needs ongoing monitoring, evaluation and management on an annual basis.

### 7.1.4.2 Possible impacts of agricultural changes on landscape character

Management does not envisage any substantial change in crop type (vineyards) but the possible impacts of climate change and shifts in market prices and economic viability are acknowledged.

Poly-tunnels and shade cloth for certain crops are becoming an increasingly evident component of the Western Cape agricultural landscape and often have a negative visual impact. However, it is not envisaged that such structures will be required on the estate should the impact of climate change be mitigated.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor to ensure that any agricultural changes do not have a negative visual impact on the agrarian landscape of the estate and that any new planting is similar in nature and character to the existing (preferably deciduous) nature of the existing landscape.

Although it is not envisaged that poly-tunnels and shade-cloth will be required on the estate, should it ever be considered it should be subject to a visual assessment to identify mitigation measures wherever possible.

### 7.2 Vergelegen

#### 7.2.1 Development pressure

##### 7.2.1.1 Consistency with municipal planning frameworks and status of adjacent properties

In terms of the City of Cape Town Helderberg District SDF, Vergelegen is located outside of the urban edge and is designated as Intensive Agriculture and Core Conservation. The agriculture and tourism base on the property is consistent with municipal planning frameworks. The properties adjacent to Vergelegen landholdings are currently being used for residential purposes, or agriculture, or nature conservation (Vergelegen flanks the Hottentots-Holland Nature Reserve, which forms part of the Boland Mountain Complex Cape Floristic Region WHS).

**Mitigation measures:**

The encroachment of residential development into the agricultural context of Vergelegen needs to be actively and pro-actively managed, particularly in terms of the rezoning of agricultural properties and shifting of the urban edge. Inappropriate rezoning applications of adjacent properties should not be approved by the relevant authorities. As is the case with Groot Constantia, it is recommended that appropriate mechanisms be developed and implemented to ensure appropriate development immediately adjacent to the site.
7.2.1.2 Site development opportunities and constraints including future planned projects

In 2008 Chittenden Nicks & de Villiers (CNdV) was appointed to assess the development potential of the estate across a broad spectrum of alternatives taking into account environmental, agricultural, cultural assets and constraints and existing planning policies. This study informed a decision by Anglo American plc that major development alternatives would not be undesirable in terms of retaining the role of Vergelegen as a flagship estate and that investment options would focus on the historic cores of Vergelegen and Harmonie.

In 2012 proposals for an Anglo American Executive Training Centre at Harmonie werf were subject to an Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessment which was endorsed by HWC. The HIA, including a visual impact assessment, concluded that the impact of the Training Centre on the significance of the estate as a whole, historic core and Harmonie werf will be low, subject to archaeological monitoring, implementation of landscaping proposals and further detailed assessment of interventions to historic structures at building plan submission stage. The project has not been implemented.

There are no other development plans for the estate. The new wine tasting centre and restaurant is located within a visitor activity zone on the periphery of the historic core, a principle which was clearly established in the overall planning of the precinct in the 1990s. There are no plans to expand the footprint or scale of activities within this zone.

Mitigation measures

None

7.2.1.3 Development proposals adjacent to the site

Development pressures adjacent to the site are not considered an immediate threat. A large scale development proposal on Lourensford estate was turned down by the authorities in 2010. Suburban development on Wederwil estate located adjacent to the southern boundary of Vergelegen has a negative visual impact in terms of houses protruding above the ridgeline that defines this edge. While visual impacts are very localised, any future expansion of development along this ridgeline would be a concern.

Vergelegen owns the entrance road off Lourensford Road. Tweede Rivers situated immediately to the west of the entrance road to Vergelegen has a servitude registered in favour of Vergelegen Wines (Pty) Ltd restricting any future development on the site to 5 houses. Furthermore, no development may be located within 25m from the centre of the road.

The ‘protected natural environment’ status of the Lourens River prohibits the location of any development within 45m of the river.

Mitigation strategies:

No immediate strategies

7.2.1.4 Inhabitants on the property

Vergelegen is in the process of compiling a census to establish how many people are living on the estate. The number of occupied units (43) does not have heritage implications. There are no plans to expand the number of houses on the estate.
Mitigation strategies:

None

7.2.2 Environmental pressure including natural disasters and risk preparedness

7.2.2.1 Risks associated with drought conditions

The recent severe drought experienced across the country has impacted agricultural activities within the Cape Winelands.

Vergelegen’s water supply is provided from a 26 hectare dam located on the estate. Water levels are currently low. The estate has never been faced with insufficient water to manage agricultural needs. The heritage core is linked to municipal water supply and farm supply so can switch over as required. Long term drought may impact on agricultural production and gardens requiring a possible change in conservation methods. However, the extensive removal of alien vegetation in the upper reaches of the estate has enormous benefits in terms of securing the estate’s water supply. As alien vegetation uses up to 60% more water than endemic fynbos, its clearing has boosted the quality and quantity of water on the farm. The resultant 80 hectares of restored wetlands further offer a thriving habitat for numerous fauna.

Mitigation strategies:

Actively and proactively manage.

7.2.2.2 Risks associated with flooding

The historic core is situated below the 1:100 flood line of the Lourens River. No flooding of the historic core has occurred due to site specific drainage patterns. Attenuation and retention ponds have also been constructed to reduce peak flows and also reduce possible pollution of Lourens River from release of water from dams. All dams are subject to regular inspections by outside expert consultants.

Mitigation strategies:

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

7.2.2.3 Risks associated with fire

Major fires have occurred on the estate and in the neighbourhood vicinity. Vergelegen has developed a working relationship with relevant authorities, such as Cape Nature, the provincial nature conservation agency which is also responsible for fire management in the adjacent Boland Mountains Complex WHS, regarding the management of fire. Mitigation measures already in place include:

- The extensive removal of alien combustible invader vegetation in the upper reaches of the estate.
- The extension of the period for monitoring of controlled burns.
- The development and maintenance of strategic fire breaks in place.
- Active membership of the Helderberg Fire Protection Association.
- A fire-fighting team is on standby.
- There are special arrangements for alert when there are indications of high fire risk conditions.
- Buildings are equipped with fire alarm systems.
Mitigation strategies
Actively and proactively manage.

7.2.2.4 Risks associated with the riverine system
The whole river corridor was declared a Protected Natural Environment in 1997 (Provincial Gazette 5135 of 9 May 1997). This required the appointment of a Management Advisory Committee. The environmental quality of upper reaches of the river is good but water quality needs to be constantly monitored.

Mitigation strategies:
Manage and monitor as appropriate.

7.2.3 Visitor and tourism pressure

7.2.3.1 Risks associated with commercial activities
A tourist activity zone including restaurant, wine tasting and parking is located in one area to the periphery of the historic core, a principle which was clearly established in the overall planning of the historical precinct in the 1990s. This has minimised impacts associated with visitor traffic and commercial facilities. The central spaces of the historic core are free of commercial facilities. Visitor numbers are restricted based on an understanding of the carrying capacity of the site. All restaurants are managed by “in house” in order to ensure control on the Vergelegen brand.

Mitigation strategies:
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

7.2.3.2 Impact of visitor traffic and events
Vehicular traffic and parking are confined to the periphery of the core with pedestrian circulation leading from this point through the historic core. The central spaces of the historic core are excluded from vehicular traffic. There is a no bus policy (with occasional special exceptions). Parking for special events/functions is accommodated on the field to the east of the approach road on the northern bank of the Lourens River, thus minimising impacts on the historic core. Special events are limited to 2 or 3 times a year.

Mitigation measures:
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

7.2.3.3 Impact of visitor traffic on building fabric and heritage spaces
The potential impacts of visitor numbers are well managed. An understanding of carrying capacity is at present governed mainly by the availability of parking and capacity of restaurants.

Mitigation measures:
Monitor and manage as appropriate.

7.2.3.4 Authenticity of the visitor experience and impacts on heritage
The historic core is no longer used as a farm *werf* and its use as a tourism destination has inevitably impacted its historical character. However, this impact is outweighed by the public heritage benefits derived from public access and educational role of the site and this is not impacting the working farm component of the estate.

**Mitigation measures:**

Monitor and manage as appropriate.

**7.2.4 Economic and agricultural activity pressures**

**7.2.4.1 Risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability of core income-generating activities**

There are minimal risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability of income generating activities within the historic core. Vergelegen is owned by Vergelegen Wines (Pty) Ltd which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Anglo American plc. The wine operation is self-sufficient. The restaurants and wine tasting centre are managed in-house and generate 1.5 to 2 times income to cover costs. The hospitality sector generates funding for most of the heritage maintenance costs, with larger projects like re-thatching being budgeted for separately.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.

**7.2.4.2 Possible impacts of agricultural changes on landscape character**

There are no immediate risks to current agricultural activities. Unless vineyard production is adversely affected by disease or climatic conditions the current situation should continue.

Although it is not envisaged that poly-tunnels and shade-cloth will be required on the estate, should it ever be considered it should be subject to a visual assessment to identify mitigation measures wherever possible.

**Mitigation strategies:**

Manage and monitor as appropriate.
7.3 Composite comments for both estates

7.3.1 Development pressures

1) **Consistency with municipal planning frameworks and status of adjacent properties:** Both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are located outside the municipal urban edge and their respective agricultural, tourism and biodiversity conservation uses are consistent with municipal planning frameworks. The agricultural and biodiversity conservation land use zoning of adjacent properties is largely supportive of the agricultural and biodiversity conservation assets of both estates. However, being located on the periphery of the urban edge with adjoining residential development, the encroachment of residential development into the agricultural context of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen needs to be actively and pro-actively managed by all the relevant authorities, particularly in terms of the rezoning of agricultural properties and shifting of the urban edge. The appropriate mechanisms for the protection of a buffer zone to the WHS including its possible designation as a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone in terms of the City of Cape Town Municipal Planning By-Law (2015) is discussed further in Sections 11 and 12.

2) **Site development opportunities and constraints including future planned projects:** In the case of Groot Constantia, no detailed analysis of site development opportunities and constraints has been undertaken. However, it is recognised that development opportunities are very limited in terms of the heritage value of property and the objectives of the Trust heritage. There are suggestions by estate management that the tourism potential of the estate could be enhanced by the development of guest accommodation in existing buildings. In 2008 the development potential of Vergelegen was assessed across a broad spectrum of alternatives taking into account environmental, agricultural and cultural assets and constraints and existing planning policies. This study informed a decision by Anglo American plc that major development alternatives would not be undesirable. In 2012 proposals for an Anglo American Executive Training Centre at Harmonie werf were subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment including a Heritage Impact Assessment. Investment options are focused on the historic cores of Vergelegen and Harmonie and there are no other future planned projects on the estate.

3) **Development proposals adjacent to the site:** There are development pressures adjacent to Groot Constantia, for example the proposed residential development on Mount Prospect located on the southern boundary of the estate. Development pressures adjacent to the Vergelegen are not considered an immediate threat, particularly in terms of the location of the area to be designated a WHS being located within an agricultural landholding of over 3000 hectares.

4) **Inhabitants on the estate** Long-term plans to provide off-site security of tenure to farm workers living on Groot Constantia have been discussed. The consideration of the adaptive reuse of farm worker’s housing as guest accommodation and possible perceptions of the ‘sanitization’ of the landscape need to be addressed.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation and remediation of current performance risks is made:

**Groot Constantia**

1) The encroachment of residential development into the agricultural context of Groot Constantia needs to be actively and pro-actively managed by all the relevant authorities, particularly in terms of the rezoning of agricultural properties, shifting of the urban edge and densification. The appropriate mechanism for the protection of a buffer zone to the WHS is discussed in Section 11 and 12.
2) Careful consideration of the guest accommodation on the estate in terms of potential heritage impacts, particularly in terms of views from the werf and the interface between the estate and TMNP. The utilization of existing structures for guest house accommodation would be regarded as a preferable alternative to the development of any green field sites. Any interventions involving new structures or adaptive reuse of existing structures would require detailed heritage and visual assessment including a public participation process.

3) Actively and pro-actively monitor development proposals adjacent to Groot Constantia such as the Mount Pleasant application process and ensuring an adequate setback from the Groot Constantia boundary and a planted buffer between the proposed development and Groot Constantia.

4) Actively and pro-actively monitor the long-term plans to provide off-site security of tenure to farm workers living on Groot Constantia. The consideration of the adaptive reuse of cottage as guest accommodation and possible perceptions of the “sanitization” of the landscape need to be addressed, particularly within the significant role of labour in the history of Groot Constantia.

Vergelegen

1) The encroachment of residential development into the agricultural context of Vergelegen needs to be actively and pro-actively managed, particularly in terms of the rezoning of agricultural properties and shifting of the urban edge.

7.3.2 Environmental pressure including natural disasters and risk preparedness

1) Risks associated with drought conditions: Neither Groot Constantia or Vergelegen have experienced water shortages. The Western Cape is currently experiencing a severe drought which is impacting agricultural activities in the Cape Winelands. Long term drought may impact on agricultural production and the gardens requiring a possible change in conservation methods. In the case of Groot Constantia and in particular Vergelegen, alien eradication has increased water run-off to supply on-site dams.

2) Risks associated with flooding: At Groot Constantia the erosion of riverine slopes, particularly behind the Cloete wine cellar, after high rainfall is considered to be a potential risk factor and needs on-going monitoring and stabilisation of embankments. At Vergelegen, the historic core is situated below the 1:100 flood line of the Lourens River. No flooding of the historic core has occurred due to site specific drainage patterns. Attenuation and retention ponds have also been constructed to reduce peak flows and also reduce possible pollution of Lourens River from release of water from dams. All dams are subject to regular inspections by outside expert consultants.

3) Risks associated with fire: Major fires have occurred on and adjacent to Groot Constantia and Vergelegen with very active fire management programs already in place including alien vegetation clearance, fire breaks, smoke detection and preventative devices in the historic buildings, fire fighting strategies and evacuation plans. The historic cores of both estates have not been at major risk.

4) Risks associated with the riverine system: The whole Lourens River forming the northern boundary of Vergelegen is declared a Protected Natural Environment which is overseen by a Management Advisory Committee. The environmental quality of river is good but water quality needs to be constantly monitored. Issues relating to the stabilisation of the river embankments at Groot Constantia are addressed in 2) above.
5) **Other risks:** A baboon fence has been erected around the periphery of the Groot Constantia property but the threat of baboons on the estate has not been fully resolved and remains an issue for farming, buildings and people.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation and remediation of current performance risks are made:

**Groot Constantia**

1) The current drought conditions in the Western Cape and impacting the Cape Winelands and associated long and short term water supply issues needs to be actively and pro-actively monitored and managed.

2) The status of the river embankment needs to be carefully monitored and managed.

3) The efficacy of fire management programs and strategies requires ongoing active and pro-active monitoring and management.

4) The status of all natural embankments and gabion structures need to be carefully monitored and managed. ‘Soft engineering’ measures need to be implemented to prevent further deepening of stream channels and the undercutting of embankments.

5) The constant monitoring of the baboon fence and the exploration of alternative measures for baboon protection needs to be considered in collaboration with adjacent landowners.

**Vergelegen**

1) The current drought conditions in the Western Cape and impacting the Cape Winelands and associated long and short term water supply issues needs to be actively and pro-actively monitored and managed.

2) Risks associated with flooding require on-going monitoring and management, including regular inspection of dams.

3) The efficacy of fire management programs and strategies require ongoing active and proactive monitoring and management.

4) The environmental status and quality of the Lourens River requires ongoing monitoring and management.

### 7.3.3 Visitor and tourism pressure

1) **Risks associated with commercial activities:** At Groot Constantia the original intention of the 1990s framework plan was to limit commercial intrusion into the historic core and to deflect such pressures to the point of entry into the estate. Since that time the spatial footprint of the two restaurants within and immediately adjacent to the historic core has increased with potential threats to the character of the werf. At Vergelegen, a tourist activity zone is located in one area to the periphery of the historic core, which has minimised impacts associated with visitor traffic and commercial facilities. The central spaces of the historic core are free of commercial facilities.

2) **Impact of visitor traffic and events:** At Groot Constantia visitor traffic, including tourism busses, is confined to the periphery of the historic core. The central spaces of the historic core are excluded from vehicular traffic with the main tourist activity zone located near the entrance to the estate at some distance from the historic core. This was a principle of the overall planning of the estate in the 1990s which intended to limit the impact of
commercial traffic on the historic core. Consideration is being given to increasing parking to accommodate the peak season and special events. Special events are subject to permits and agreements between estate management and, where appropriate, Iziko, and event organizers and are framed to minimize impact on heritage fabric. Similarly, at Vergelegen vehicular traffic and parking are confined to the periphery of the core with pedestrian circulation leading from this point through the historic core. The central spaces of the historic core are excluded from vehicular traffic. There is a no bus policy (with occasional special exceptions). Parking for special events/functions is accommodated on the field to the east of the approach road, thus minimizing impacts on the historic core. Special events are limited to 2/3 times a year.

3) Impact of visitor traffic on building fabric and heritage spaces: At Groot Constantia pedestrian traffic is having some impact, in particular on the lawns on the central axis in front of the homestead. The carrying or absorption capacity of critical areas within and adjacent to the historic core needs to be established to determine the amount of parking and restaurant capacity that can be accommodated. At Vergelegen, the potential impacts of visitor numbers are well managed. An understanding of carrying capacity is at present governed mainly by the availability of parking and capacity of restaurants.

4) Authenticity of the visitor experience and impacts on heritage: The historic cores of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen are currently tourism destinations with wine tasting facilities, restaurants, period house museums and interpretive displays. This inevitably impacts on historical character and the perception of authenticity. However, this impact is outweighed by the public heritage benefits derived from public access and educational role of the site and this is not impacted the working farm component of the estates. At Groot Constantia, the respective requirements of the wine industry and the related activity of wine-tasting, and the needs for appropriate heritage interpretation, are not necessarily in conflict but the appropriate balance needs to be achieved.

5) Other risks associated with visitor access: At Groot Constantia, the unfettered nature of public access is considered to be a major benefit. There are, however, some negative impacts associated with anti-social behaviour and the tendency of people to walk their dogs off leashes contrary to existing policy.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation and remediation of current performance risks is made:

Groot Constantia

1) The impact and effectiveness of the recently implemented Visitor Route needs to be carefully monitored in terms of heritage impact and the need to achieve an appropriate balance between heritage significance and commercial viability.

2) The extent of commercial activities, in particular outdoor tables, chairs and umbrellas needs to be re-assessed in terms of impacts on the historic werf, both in front of the homestead and the area between the homestead and the Cloete wine cellar. Develop a strategy for the placement and type of outdoor furniture that is permitted for the restaurant establishments. (Refer to Landscape Plan).

3) Proposals to increase parking need to be carefully assessed. It is evident that the estate has a limit to its absorption capacity in terms of the heritage experience and this limit needs to be established in order to ascertain the amount of parking that should be permitted. (Refer to Visitor Management Plan and Landscape Plan).

4) A Visitor Management Plan needs to address the following:
- Ensure, as far as possible, unrestricted access to the public, access to the site via different points of entry and rules relating to dog walking and other activities.

- Achieving the appropriate balance between the nature and experiential qualities of the heritage resource and the volume of visitors, and parking, that can be accommodated, and the spatial distribution across the site (Refer to Landscape Plan)

- Ensure the appropriate range of interpretative material to enable a range of different heritage values to be transmitted, different stories to be narrated and different heritage themes to be explored. (Refer to Interpretation Plan)

5) The elaboration and articulation of previously underemphasized histories and narratives need to be incorporated into an Integrated Interpretation and Visitor Plan.

6) While the unfettered nature of public access is a major benefit, some negative impacts need to be carefully monitored and managed, e.g. walking dogs off leashes.

**Vergelegen**

There are no immediate mitigation strategies required for Vergelegen with respect to tourism and visitor pressures, as these pressures are well managed. Issues relating to impacts of commercial tourism, visitor volumes and traffic and how these relate to authenticity and integrity need to be monitored and managed.

### 7.3.4 Economic and agricultural activity pressure

1) **Risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability of core income-generating activities:** At Groot Constantia, financial resources are derived primarily from wine sales. The Trust is responsible for all maintenance costs within the historic core and Iziko is responsible for the funding of museum staff, educational activities and interpretative material and displays. Farm activities are currently self-sustaining and supporting. Unless there is a dramatic change in foreign exchange rates or vineyard production is adversely affected by disease or climatic conditions, the current low risk situation should continue. At Vergelegen, there are minimal risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability of income generating activities. VG is owned by Vergelegen Wines (Pty) Ltd which is a wholly owned subsidiary of Anglo American plc. The wine operation is self-sufficient. The restaurants and wine tasting centre are managed “in house” and generate 1.5 to 2 times income to cover costs. The hospitality sector generates funding for most of the heritage costs, with larger projects like re-thatching being budgeted for separately.

2) **Possible impacts of agricultural changes on landscape character:** Management at Groot Constantia does not envisage substantial change in crop type (vineyards) but the possible impacts of climate change and shifts in market prices and economic viability are acknowledged. Poly-tunnels and shade cloth are becoming an increasingly evident component of the Western Cape agricultural landscape and often have a negative visual impact. At Vergelegen, there are no immediate risks to current agricultural activities. Unless vineyard production is adversely affected by disease or climatic conditions the current situation should continue.

Taking the aforementioned comments into account, the following interim recommendations towards mitigation and remediation of current performance risks is made:
Groot Constantia

1) The financial and economic integration of wine production and sales, and other cultural historical components needs ongoing monitoring, evaluation and management.

2) Manage and monitor agricultural activities to ensure that any changes do not have a negative visual impact on the agrarian landscape of the estate and that any new planting is similar in nature and character to the existing nature of the existing landscape. The utilization of poly-tunnels and shade-cloth should be subject to a visual assessment to identify mitigation measures wherever possible.

Vergelegen

1) Manage and monitor as appropriate potential long term risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability.

2) Manage and monitor as appropriate long terms impacts on agricultural changes on landscape character.
8. GUIDING CONSERVATION PRINCIPLES

The following principles are preliminary for the purposes of this draft ICMP. They will need to be developed further during the finalisation of the ICMP for WHS inscription purposes.

8.1 Overarching principles

The following principles and concepts are derived from an analysis of various international charters relating to heritage management.

1) Need to acknowledge a range of heritage values

- There are clearly different readings of heritage significance, over time and across class and race boundaries. Heritage places and practices are identified, used and understood from diverse cultural perspectives and may be contested.

Different readings and perceptions of heritage need to be acknowledged. Allowance should be made for cultural diversity and contestation, while seeking to present places which are meaningful to a range of cultural groups.

Heritage significance is a dynamic and fluid concept.

- The specificity of heritage values needs to be acknowledged in relation to their cultural and physical contexts.

2) Need for integrated, inclusive and holistic approaches

- The identification, protection and enhancement of heritage resources needs to be recognized as an essential and integral component of sustainable, economic, environmental and spatial planning. Heritage management should not be regarded as being separate from the planning system.

- Heritage policy development should consider all factors affecting the future of a place such as the owner’s needs, resources, external constraints and physical condition, inter alia.

2) Authenticity & integrity

- Authenticity is a key concept in heritage management. Each heritage resource reflects a unique expression resulting from a particular historical process. The original fabric of the heritage resource determines its value and can be read as an historical record reflecting its historical significance and cultural value.

Heritage resources should thus be conserved as much as possible in their authentic state to reflect their historical and cultural value. Distortion of the original fabric or other evidence the resource provides, or interventions which could detract from the interpretation and appreciation of the resource should be avoided. Change to a place should not be based on conjecture.

Authenticity can refer to the design, material, workmanship and setting of the resource. It is thus understood to cover the aesthetic, historical and social aspects of the site and its context as well as its use and function.

- A distinction should be made between the authentic fabric of a resource and later contemporary interventions. New interventions should be identifiable as such. Any new
Interventions should be considered as ‘background’ buildings and need to be sensitive to the context; a sense of rootedness in the local landscape should be clearly expressed.

- Integrity refers to an undivided or un-fragmented state, material wholeness, completeness or entirety. Interventions which could be considered to be detrimental to this sense of wholeness, including the interface with the immediate context, should be avoided.

3) **Respect for historical layering**

- All periods of history need to be respected as opposed to the emphasis on one era to the detriment of others. Keeping, and interpreting the history relating to one period, and removing the evidence of other less significant periods is not warranted. If a place is significant, the whole of its history is also of interest. The removal of later additions and accretions can only be justified when what is to be removed clearly detracts from the significance of the original.

- The acceptance of change needs to be acknowledged as an essential parameter of the heritage management process.

4) **A cautious approach of minimalist intervention**

- Conservation is based on the respect for existing fabric, use, associations and meanings. It requires a cautious approach of changing as much as is necessary but as little as possible.

5) **Taking into account all aspects of cultural and natural significance**

- Conservation of places should identify and take into consideration all aspects of cultural and natural significance without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others.

6) **Cultural landscapes**

- The broadening of heritage to include cultural landscape needs to be acknowledged, including both natural and cultural landscapes and their interaction and transformation over time.

- The identification and appropriate management of cultural landscapes is fundamental to the economy and well-being of the region and needs to form an integral component of development and environmental planning. Such landscapes provide evidence of the place’s history over time and contribute to a sense of place and identity. They provide dynamic reference points and positive instruments for growth and change.

7) **Multi-disciplinary approach**

- A multi-faceted, multi-dimensional approach and a multi-disciplinary approach needs to be adopted in heritage management to addresses all aspects of cultural and natural significance.

8) **Respect for context and scale**

- The social and landscape context of heritage sites is critical in the understanding and conservation of significance. Significance is to a large extent determined by context and scale.
The context can be both social and spatial, and both historical and contemporary perceptions of their significance need to be taken into account.

A heritage landscape may be significant by providing a context for a heritage element, while also representing a valuable heritage resource in itself.

- The definition and identification of a heritage place needs to make provision for appropriate scales of analysis e.g. national, regional, local and site-specific scales.
- The understanding of the nature of significance at different scales is fundamental to a holistic approach to heritage management.

9) Enabling development

- Growth and development are essential to the economic life of a city and its inhabitants. Economic growth and heritage management should not be considered to be inevitably adversarial. Rather heritage management should seek to work with development initiatives and shape and form development to address heritage requirements.
- The positive role of development in promoting heritage conservation needs to be acknowledged.
- Change to a place should never distort the physical or other evidence it provides.
- The amount of change to a place should be guided by the cultural significance of the place and its appropriate interpretation.

10) Education and training; knowledge skills and techniques

- The need to provide local community groups with the relevant education and training to enable effective participation in the identification and management of heritage sites.
- Conservation should make use of all knowledge, skills and disciplines which can contribute to the understanding of significance and management of heritage resources.
- Traditional techniques and materials are preferred for the conservation of significant fabric. In some circumstances modern techniques and materials which offer substantial conservation benefits may be appropriate.

11) Public consultation

- The essential role of communities for whom a place has special associations and meanings or who have social, spiritual or other attachments to a place must be acknowledged in identifying and safeguarding heritage resources. Such participation is a vital part of sustainable heritage management.
- Opportunities for increasing the community stake (job creation, skills acquisition, social transformation) in the identification and management of the historic environment should be encouraged.
12) Interpretation

- The value and significance of some heritage sites and narratives is not self-evident. They require interpretation to convey and deepen understanding of their significance. Significant associations between people and places should be respected, retained and not obscured. Appropriate processes and techniques to convey heritage significance need to be explored.

- Interpretation needs to be informed by appropriate academic research and public participation, including oral histories where appropriate.

13) Respect for intangible elements of heritage

- Heritage values reside also in intangible elements; in oral traditions, public memory, ceremonies, rituals, feelings, knowledge systems, sights and sounds.

- Living heritage is an integral component of contemporary experience and links social and individual memory to daily life.

  It is something which people inhabit, both physically and imaginatively.

14) Transformation and inclusivity

- Heritage conservation can play a meaningful role in social transformation by broadening the scope of heritage to include previously unrecognised and repressed histories, for example the role of slavery in farm labour, and enhancing the quality, integration, and associated sense of belonging within the heritage environment.

15) Documenting and recording

- The history of a place and the documents and records associated with the conservation of a place should be maintained, kept in a permanent archive and made publicly accessible subject to the requirements of security and privacy.

16) Environmental sustainability

- Heritage management needs to be sustainable to ensure effectiveness. To ensure a sustainable heritage environment the social and economic needs of the community need to be accommodated within the requirements of appropriate heritage management without reducing the capacity of the environment to provide for itself and future generations.

- There is thus the need to ensure the integration of the aims of social progress, effective protection of the historic environment, the careful use of resources and the maintenance of significant levels of economic growth and employment to ensure sustainable development.

17) Heritage, tourism and economic growth

- Heritage resources are valuable economic resources, particularly with regard to cultural tourism. The appropriate adaptive reuse of historic structures can encourage tourism opportunities and boost the local economy.

- Commercial imperatives should not be allowed to drive interventions, alterations and adaptations that would impact negatively on the heritage significance of a place.
8.2 Principles for the management of core areas

The overarching principles referred to above apply.

The central issue for the core areas is the application of the principles of authenticity and integrity.

As such a policy of minimal interventions should apply in these areas.

• Interpretation and orientation systems should preferably be located on the periphery.

• Commercial activities such as restaurants should similarly be located on the periphery.

  Outside tables, chairs and umbrellas associated with restaurant facilities should not intrude on the primary visual spatial field related to the core area.

• Signage should be standardised and kept to a minimum.

8.3 Principles related to the management of agricultural buffer areas

The overarching principles referred to above apply.

• It is not possible to control the nature of agriculture in buffer areas. Agricultural use is dependent on market fluctuations and climatic variations inter alia and cannot be subject to planning and heritage control.

• However, any proposal to rezone or alter the planning status of existing agricultural land should be resisted.

• Development on productive agricultural and fragmentation of farm land must be avoided to protect the agriculturally productive landscape and the visual integrity of core areas set within agricultural settings.

• Similarly, the experiential qualities associated with open fields of vineyards or orchards should be maintained. Interventions, such as poly-tunnels should thus be resisted, or at least, be located away from the visual spatial field associated with the core area.

• Agriculture should butt up immediately against the core area with limited intervening interventions such as ornamental lawns and gardens.

• Traditional patterns of planting must be protected. Existing tree alignments and copses must be reinforced and replaced using suitable species where necessary.

8.4 Principles related to the management of natural buffer areas

• Every attempt should be made to achieve a seamless transition between core areas and natural buffer areas. The overriding informal qualities of the natural environment adjacent to the core areas must be respected and retained.

• Where the need for boundary definition is unavoidable, for instance the need to construct baboon control fencing at the interface with the TMNP, such fencing should be as visually permeable and unobtrusive as possible. No concrete pillars should be permitted.
8.5 Principles related to the management of residential areas in residential buffer areas

The overarching principles referred to above apply.

- Every attempt should be made to establish a soft, treed landscaped zone at the interface between core areas and adjacent residential areas.
- Significant public views linking core areas to major scenic resources such as the mountain and the sea should remain as uncluttered and as visually low key as possible.
- Visually impermeable boundary fencing should not be permitted.
- Formal gardens should be avoided in favour of informal, waterwise planting using indigenous species at the natural interface zone.
- The piecemeal fragmentation of the transition zone between core and buffer areas should be avoided to retain an appropriate interface with minimal impact on views to and from the core area.
- Where development applications are submitted for planning approval, sufficient setbacks and height controls should be imposed to minimise any potential visual impacts from the core area.
9. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Based on the outcomes of the performance risk indicators and analysis in Sections 6 and 7 and informed by the conservation principles in Section 8, the following combined strategic objectives are identified for the two estates:

9.1 Historical built environment

- Establish and maintain a heritage inventory, preferably reviewing and updating the inventory at least once every 5 years.

- Maintain the good to very good condition of historic fabric including continuing existing maintenance regimes.

- Recognise opportunities for improvements to existing maintenance regimes and systems in terms of international best conservation practice. These may include the preparation of model maintenance specifications for buildings of significance, conducting quinquennial inspections and developing a maintenance and repair logging system.

- Recognise the need for specialist heritage input on the major maintenance, architectural interventions to historic fabric and new development projects within the historic core.

- Recognise the value of institutional knowledge around maintenance regimes and specifications and other heritage interventions either within the estate itself or in terms of outsourced specialist input, and the need for the recording and documentation of this knowledge.

- Respect the historical layering of the built fabric in particular the early 20th century layering of the historical architecture on both estates as represented in the Cape Revival Stylistic reconstructions of the homesteads and other buildings.

- Establish and maintain a clear attitude in the relationship between old and new, both in terms of the treatment of contemporary interventions within the historic cores and the location, nature and scale of commercial activities. This includes the mitigation of past interventions impacting heritage significance, e.g. a planting strategy to mitigate the visual impact of the production cellar at Groot Constantia.

- Establish and maintain a centralised archive of all documentation relating to the historical built environment as an effective heritage management tool.

9.2 Landscape elements and character

- Recognise the high heritage value of the treed environment on both estates, and the need for early detection and prevention measures in place to ensure longevity of trees of significance, tree maintenance and replacement programmes and specialist input from a tree pathologist.

- Establish and maintain a clear attitude to landscaping interventions including hard and soft landscaping, a planting strategy including structural planting and maintaining a treed buffer between the core and residential buffer areas, signage and the manner in which trading is set up from a visual-spatial perspective.
9.3 Archaeological record

- Recognise the value of the archaeological record in contributing to the understanding of heritage value of both estates and thus ensuring archaeological management procedures are in place. This includes the need for archaeological assessment, investigation and monitoring of development activities within the demarcated areas of heritage significance and sensitivity.

9.4 Natural and cultural setting

- Preserve the highly positive natural and cultural setting of both estates, particularly their pristine mountain backdrops and location adjacent to Cape Floral Region Protected Areas WHS, and surrounding productive agricultural landscapes. In the case of Groot Constantia, especially its location within the Grade I Constantia Tokai Cultural Landscape, and in the case of Vergelegen, especially its extensive rehabilitated natural landscape adjacent to the Hottentots Holland Nature Reserve.

9.5 Public associations and values

- Recognise the role of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen as major visitor destinations and the positive public perceptions of the estates in terms of visitor access and a range of visitor facilities. Of particular relevance to Groot Constantia is the major benefit of unfettered nature of public access and management issues associated with this nature of access.

- Recognise the importance of enhancing the public appreciation and educational role of the heritage values of the estates through the interpretation of their multi-layered histories and linkages between the estates especially within the context of the WHS nomination, as well as through community outreach initiatives. Of particular relevance to Groot Constantia is the new Visitor Route aimed at integrating Groot Constantia wine and heritage and the balance that needs to be achieved between the respective requirements of the wine industry and appropriate heritage interpretation.

9.6 Development pressure

- Monitor the sensitive location of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen on the urban periphery in terms of development pressures and the need to prevent the encroachment of residential development into the agricultural setting of the estates. This objective relates particularly to the Groot Constantia landscape context.

- Recognise the existing agricultural, tourism and biodiversity conservation uses of Groot Constantia and Vergelegen as being compatible with their heritage value, and that any future planned development projects especially involving changes in land use would need to be subject to scrutiny in terms of potential heritage impacts.

- Ensure that the heritage value of the estates including their agricultural, tourism and biodiversity conservation uses and those of surrounding agricultural properties are compatible with municipal planning frameworks, particularly in terms of the urban edge delineation, densification policies, and the possible buffer zone to the WHS being designated a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone in terms of the Municipal Planning By-Law.

9.7 Environmental pressure including natural disasters and risk preparedness

- Maintain and monitor existing well established systems and strategies to address a range of environmental pressures including drought management, flood management,
(stabilisation of river embankments and dam inspections), fire management and baboon protection measures.

### 9.8 Visitor and tourism pressure

- Maintain and monitor the principle of limiting commercial activities and major vehicular traffic to the periphery of the historic *werf* spaces, particularly in the case of Groot Constantia where the spatial footprint of the two restaurants within and immediately adjacent to the historic *werf* has increased with threats to the character of the central *werf* space. Proposals to increase commercial activities and parking need to be informed by and understanding of carrying capacity and potential impacts on the experiential qualities of key spaces within the historic core areas.

- Establish a balance between commercial tourism activities and the authenticity of the representation of heritage values of the estates especially through a range of interpretative material to enable a range of different heritage values to be transmitted, different stories to be narrated and different themes to be explored.

### 9.9 Economic and agricultural activity pressure

- Recognise that while there are no immediate or medium term risks to sustainable financial resources and economic viability, potential long term risks need to be monitored.

- Recognise that there are no immediate or medium term risks to continuing agricultural activities, potential long term risks need to be monitored especially risks associated with climate change and shifts in market prices and changes in agricultural activities on landscape character.
This section of the draft ICMP provides a preliminary catalogue of performance risks, strategies and priorities which will need to be expanded and finalised in conjunction with an Implementation and Action Plan identified in Section 13 of the draft ICMP. The grading system used for assessing the status of performance and risk indicators and determining heritage management implications is explained in the Section 1 of the report. The levels of priority assigned to the strategies to minimise risk and/or improve performance are immediate term (i.e. within the next financial year), short term (within 2 years), medium term (within 5 years), long term (within 10 years) and ongoing.

10.1 Groot Constantia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Conservation</th>
<th>Overall performance risk status</th>
<th>Strategies to minimise risk/improve performance</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical built environment</td>
<td>Good condition Well managed Medium to low risk</td>
<td>On-going updating of heritage inventory, preferably every 5 years.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structural engineer to investigate of leaning portion of retaining wall and pillar on the southeast of forecourt.</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare model maintenance specifications and intervention policies for significant buildings.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the co-ordination of monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements, e.g. appointment of single hands on ‘authority’ and use of the quinquennial maintenance regime (Annexure C).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a building specific maintenance and repair logging system.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a centralised digitised archive of historical research, heritage assessments, permits, architectural drawings, landscaping proposals, and maintenance and repair records.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a policy statement clarifying attitudes to historical layering and the relationship between old and new, including the impact of commercial activities.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a planting strategy to mitigate visual impact of production cellar.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remove tractor shed behind the jonkershuis.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape elements and character</td>
<td>Medium to high risk</td>
<td>Revisit Ian Ford Landscape Plan to address ornamental planting and garden elements and to</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological record</strong></td>
<td><strong>Medium risk</strong></td>
<td>Any major ground disturbance or major architectural interventions within demarcated areas of significance/sensitivity to be subject to archaeological investigation and monitoring.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to guidelines for property managers and owners on how to safeguard archaeological heritage (Annexure D).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines above to be work-shopped with site managers.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural and cultural setting</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very positive</strong></td>
<td>Develop a planting strategy to screen surrounding residential properties.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planting measures to minimise visual impact of the 1980s production cellar.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape plan for parking area behind Simon’s restaurant adjacent to the river course.</td>
<td>Short to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Relocation of tractor shed behind jonkershuis complex.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public associations and values</strong></td>
<td><strong>Very positive</strong></td>
<td>Interpretation strategies to be incorporated into an Interpretation Plan including the integration of wine and the broad range of cultural historical components of the estate.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Some medium risk</strong></td>
<td>Explore opportunities to facilitate universal access in an appropriate manner, particularly to restaurants and associated toilet facilities.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imposition of an entry fee should be resisted and considered as a very last resort. Restrictions on dog walking need to be carefully considered including engaging with users to ensure adherence to the existing visitor access rules.</td>
<td>Short Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors affecting the properties</td>
<td>Overall performance risk status</td>
<td>Strategies to minimise risk/improve performance</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development pressures</td>
<td>Medium to high risk</td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage consistency between heritage values of the estate and municipal policy frameworks, e.g. urban edge delineations and land use objectives.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage development pressures adjacent to Groot Constantia impacting agricultural setting of the site.</td>
<td>Immediate Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Investigate appropriate mechanisms for the protection of a buffer zone to the WHS.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Possible on-site guest accommodation subject to NHRA Section 27 permitting requirements and should include combined heritage and visual assessment, and assessment of suitable alternatives including adaptive reuse of existing structures.</td>
<td>Short to medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental pressures</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage long and short term water supply issues in terms of current drought crisis within the Western Cape.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of risk preparedness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage efficacy of fire management and evacuation program.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage status of riverine embankments.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage efficacy of baboon fence and explore alternative/additional baboon protection in collaboration with adjacent owners.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor and tourism pressures</td>
<td>Low to medium risk</td>
<td>Develop a strategy for restaurant establishments including the extent of commercial activities and placement and type of outdoor furniture.(Refer to Landscape Plan)</td>
<td>Immediate to short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposals to increase visitor parking subject to NHRA Section 27 permitting requirements and should include</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and agricultural activity pressures</td>
<td>Low to medium risk in terms of current ownership and financial structure</td>
<td>Monitor and manage financial and economic integration of wine making, tourism and the conservation of the cultural historical components of the estate.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and manage long term changes to the agricultural economy and potential impacts on the Cape Winelands including the ECF WHS.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monitor and manage potential long term risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Develop a Visitor Management Plan to address issues related to public access, balancing experiential qualities of the historic core and visitor volumes and parking, and range of interpretative material to enable diversity of heritage values to be transmitted. (Refer to Landscape Plan and Interpretation Plan)

Short

Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage new Visitor Route in terms of its intention to broaden the interpretation of the estate and previously under-represented heritage themes, and balancing the history of Constantia wine and other histories and narratives. (Integrated Interpretation and Visitor Management Plan)

Short

an understanding of carrying capacity to minimise heritage impacts on the experiential qualities of the historic core and necessary landscaping. (Refer to Visitor Management and Landscape Plan)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Conservation</th>
<th>Overall performance risk status</th>
<th>Strategies to minimise risk/improve performance</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical built environment</td>
<td>Very good condition Very well managed Low risk</td>
<td>On-going updating of heritage inventory, preferably every 5 years</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare model maintenance specifications and intervention policies for significant buildings.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the co-ordination of monitoring and reviewing of maintenance requirements, e.g. appointment of single hands on ‘authority’ and use of the quinquennial maintenance regime (Annexure C).</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a building specific maintenance and repair logging system.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a centralised digitised archive of historical research, heritage assessments, permits, architectural drawings, landscaping proposals, and maintenance and repair records.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape elements and character</td>
<td>Very positive Very well managed Low risk</td>
<td>Best practice procedures, programs and protocols should be documented as part of the institutional knowledge of the estate.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological record</td>
<td>Medium risk</td>
<td>Any major ground disturbance or major architectural interventions within demarcated areas of significance/sensitivity to be subject to archaeological investigation and monitoring.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Refer to guidelines for property managers and owners on how to safeguard archaeological heritage (Annexure D).</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines above to be work-shopped with site managers.</td>
<td>Short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and cultural setting</td>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public associations and values</td>
<td>Very positive</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors affecting the properties</td>
<td>Overall performance risk status</td>
<td>Strategies to minimise risk/improve performance</td>
<td>Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development pressures</td>
<td>Low to medium risk</td>
<td>Monitor and manage potential encroachment of residential development into the agricultural setting including urban edge</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental pressures</strong></td>
<td>Medium risk&lt;br&gt;High level of risk&lt;br&gt;preparedness</td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage long and short term water supply issues in terms of current drought crisis within the Western Cape. Ongoing</td>
<td>Monitor and manage flooding risks including regular inspection of dams. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Actively and pro-actively monitor and manage efficacy of fire management and evacuation program. Ongoing</td>
<td>Continue to monitor and manage environmental status and quality of the Lourens River. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visitor and tourism pressures</strong></td>
<td>Low risk&lt;br&gt;Well managed</td>
<td>Monitor and manage impacts associated with commercial tourism, visitor volumes and how these relate to authenticity and integrity. Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic and agricultural activity pressures</strong></td>
<td>Low risk in terms of current ownership and financial structure</td>
<td>Monitor and manage potential long term risks associated with sustainable financial resources and economic viability. Ongoing</td>
<td>Monitor and manage long term changes to the agricultural economy and potential impacts on the Cape Winelands including the ECF WHS. Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE SITE

11.1 International and legislative context

The 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention) was the product of the 1972 General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The Convention defines the types of natural or cultural sites which can be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List managed by UNESCO. The Convention also describes the duties of State parties in identifying and protecting sites which are considered as worthy of inscription on the World Heritage List.

The UNESCO Operational Guidelines are designed to guide the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and set out, in comprehensive detail, the criteria that are required to be satisfied in order for sites to qualify for inclusion on the UNESCO World Heritage List.¹

In the South African context the World Heritage Convention Act 49 of 1999 (WHC Act) was enacted with the specific purpose of incorporating the pertinent aspects of the World Heritage Convention into South African law. The WHC Act gives effect to the provisions of the Convention at a national level in South Africa, and the WHC Act is the principal statute regulating the protection and sustainable development of World Heritage Sites.

The WHC Act is not the only relevant and applicable law in this context as the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003 (the Protected Areas Act) provides for and regulates the management of protected areas in South Africa, including the management of World Heritage Sites. The precise process regarding the identification and nomination of World Heritage Sites in South Africa is regulated in terms of section 6 of the WHC Act. The detailed guidance on process is set out in regulations (see the Format and Procedure for the Nomination of World Heritage Sites in the Republic of South Africa published in GN 1033 in Government Gazette 39347 dated 30 October 2015). Importantly, there are pertinent operational aspects relevant to World Heritage Sites that are dealt with in different legislation, such as the Protected Areas Act which provides for the “protection and conservation of ecologically viable areas representative of South Africa’s biological diversity and its natural landscapes” and regulates the management of such areas. There is an overlap between the WHC Act and the Protected Areas Act with regard to the management and conservation of World Heritage Sites as chapters 1 and 2 of the Protected Areas Act are applicable to World Heritage Sites.

11.2 Management of World Heritage Sites

The management structure and institutional arrangements for a site declared as a World Heritage Site are determined primarily by the WHC Act. In terms of the current institutional and regulatory arrangements the “Authority” established for the World Heritage Site in terms of the WHC Act is effectively the management authority for the World Heritage Site. There are two alternative options for the declaration or establishment of a management authority under the WHC Act which defines “Authority” as either an existing organ of state which is declared in terms of section 8, or an Authority specifically established for that purpose in terms of section 9 of the WHC Act.

An existing organ of state can be declared by the Minister of Environmental Affairs as the management authority for a World Heritage Site (by notice in the Government Gazette) in circumstances where an existing organ of state is already lawfully managing or involved in that World Heritage Site. The term organ of state is broadly defined and could include any functionary or department within a public authority. Examples of an organ of state could include, for example, the DCAS (Western Cape) or SANParks. In terms of recent precedent

¹ Chapter II of the Operational Guidelines.
in South Africa the Authority could also be the relevant MEC in the Province. See the table below.

### Precedent examples for management authorities in SA:

The MEC responsible for Environmental Affairs in Limpopo Province was declared (by the national Minister of Environmental Affairs) as the Management Authority responsible for the **Makapan Valley Serial World Heritage Site** in terms of section 8 of the WHC Act. The MEC responsible for Environmental Affairs in North-West Province was declared the Management Authority responsible for the **Taung Skull Fossil World Heritage Site** in terms of section 8 of the WHC Act (published in GN 570 and GN 571 respectively in *Government Gazette* 37830 dated 18 July 2014). More recently, the MEC responsible for Environmental Affairs in the Northern Cape Province was declared the Management Authority responsible for the **Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscapes World Heritage Site** (published in GN 542 in *Government Gazette* 40898 dated 9 June 2017).

Alternatively, section 9 of the WHC Act allows for the Minister to establish a new management authority for a World Heritage Site. The new authority must be established by notice in the *Government Gazette*.

Before approving or declaring a management authority for a World Heritage Site in terms of the WHC Act, the Minister of Environmental Affairs is required to consult with the Minister of Arts and Culture and also with interested and affected parties. Interested parties could include the local authority with jurisdiction over the area, local conservation bodies and landowners.

#### 11.3 Functions of the Management Authority

The Management Authority declared in terms of the WHC Act is responsible for the management of the World Heritage Site and the preparation of an Integrated Management Plan for the Site in question. A Management Authority is distinct from a management committee which might play a more specific day-to-day management functions for the site. Section 13(q) of the WHC Act empowers the Minister to grant a Management Authority power to “establish committees and subcommittees and otherwise arrange its internal affairs in a manner it deems necessary”. In other words, a management committee may be established by the Management Authority where the Minister has empowered it to do so.

The aim of the ICMP is to ensure the protection and management of the World Heritage Site in a manner consistent with the objectives and principles of the WHC Act. Section 13 of the WHC Act specifies the powers and duties which the Minister may, by notice in the *Gazette*, give to the Management Authority. Depending on the powers and duties assigned by the Minister, the powers and duties of the Management Authority might vary for different sites.

As the duties and powers afforded to the Management Authority in terms of the WHC Act are potentially wide and far-reaching it is important that, in the case of privately-owned land being declared as a World Heritage Site, the consent of the landowner is obtained regarding the declaration of the Management Authority. It is also important that the precise scope of the Management Authority’s powers in connection with the World Heritage Site (which the Minister is entitled to confer in terms of section 13 of the WHC Act) is negotiated in advance with the affected landowners and other stakeholders.

As portions of the Protected Areas Act are applicable to a World Heritage Site, the Management Authority would also have to comply with the provisions of Chapters 1 and 2 of the Protected Areas Act. This includes the obligation to comply with any norms and standards which may be prescribed by the Minister in accordance with section 11 of

---

2 Section 7 of the WHC Act.
3 Sections 21-28 of the WHC Act.
Protected Areas Act. The World Heritage Site would also have to be included in the Register of Protected Areas which is kept by the Minister in accordance with section 10 of Protected Areas Act. The provisions of chapter 4 of the Protected Areas Act which are expressly applicable to World Heritage Sites include those pertaining to access to a World Heritage Site; use of aircraft in a World Heritage Site; restriction of prospecting and mining activities in a World Heritage Site; and commercial and community activities in a World Heritage Site.

11.4 Levels of protection under national legislation

Given the heritage and cultural and/or historical significance that attaches to many properties or sites earmarked for inscription on the World Heritage List, there might be other levels of protection applicable to properties nominated as World Heritage Sites. For example, the site in question may already have been declared a Provincial Heritage Site or a National Heritage Site in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act. The two layers of heritage protection can exist independently of each other and apply simultaneously to the same property as a result of the fact that different legislation might regulate the same site. The institutional and governance requirements will be slightly different depending on the statute that applies to the different categories of protected areas.

An example of a World Heritage Site with simultaneous protection under the WHC Act and the National Heritage Resources Act would be Makapansgat in Limpopo. Makapansgat was initially afforded formal statutory protection in 1976 under the National Monuments Act 28 of 1969 and, after the commencement of the National Heritage Resources Act, it was deemed a Provincial Heritage Site. The Makapans Valley and Limeworks at Makapansgat was similarly deemed to be a National Heritage Site in accordance with the formal protection afforded to the site in 1974. The Makapans Valley, which includes both the aforementioned sites, forms part of the Fossil Hominid Sites of South Africa which is a World Heritage Site. This is an example of a site where the designation of a Provincial Heritage Site or National Heritage Site in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act applies alongside the declaration of a World Heritage Site in terms of the WHC Act.

A World Heritage Site can also exist and be proclaimed by the national Minister independently of any heritage protection in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act. In other words, it is not a critical prerequisite to have heritage protection under national legislation secured before the nominated property is declared a World Heritage Site. An example of this would be the Vredefort Dome which is a listed World Heritage Site, but has not been proclaimed as a heritage site in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act.

11.5 Types of regulatory protection for Groot Constantia and Vergelegen

In the case of Groot Constantia, the entire estate is already declared a Provincial Heritage Site and, given the potential complexities with the site being required to be managed in terms of different statutes (viz the National Heritage Resources Act, the WHC Act, and the Protected Areas Act), it might be prudent to develop a bespoke institutional arrangement which describes the precise arrangement according to the specific requirements of the site and the stakeholders in question. In the case of Groot Constantia that would involve the Minister of Environmental Affairs, the Management Authority for the World Heritage Site, the national Minister of Arts and Culture (Iziko Museums of South Africa is an agency of the Department of Arts and Culture), the provincial MEC responsible for Culture, Heritage

---

4 See, for example, the Norms and Standards for the Management of Protected Areas in South Africa (GN 382 of GG 39878 dated 31 Mar 2016)
5 Section 46 of NEMPAA.
6 Section 47 of NEMPAA.
7 Section 48 of NEMPAA.
8 Section 50 of NEMPAA.
9 The inscription of the Fossil Hominid Sites of South Africa on the UNESCO World Heritage List occurred in 1999 and the World Heritage Site was proclaimed in the Government Gazette in GNR 1197 of GG 30614 dated 28 December 2007.
Western Cape (as the provincial heritage resources authority for the Western Cape responsible for Provincial Heritage Sites) and the landowner in question.

The existing heritage protection in the case of Vergelegen is different in that only the five historic camphor trees, immediately adjacent to the historic Vergelegen Homestead, are a Provincial Heritage Site (on the basis that the trees were originally declared as National Monuments in 1942). In terms of the nomination of Vergelegen on the World Heritage List only the historic core of the estate is proposed for inscription as a World Heritage Site. Several portions of Vergelegen are currently in the process of being declared as a nature reserve in terms of section 23 of the Protected Areas Act.\(^\text{10}\)

Vergelegen might consider some type of formal protection of the balance of the historic core or intended World Heritage Site as a Provincial Heritage site. It may also consider the balance of their landholdings used as an agricultural zone to be formally protected as a Provincial Heritage site to enable this act as a buffer between the World Heritage Site area and the nature reserve. The potential heritage benefit in doing so would be to recognise the significant context within which the camphor trees and the historic core are situated. From an institutional perspective, some type of formal protection of the balance of the landholdings could provide for integrated environmental management across the entire site in a manner which best safeguards the interests and qualities of that site that contribute to its outstanding universal value and heritage significance.

Formal protection of the balance of the landholdings is not a mandatory requirement but it might be prudent in the circumstances for the reasons set out above, and for the reason that the additional formal protection could serve as an effective buffer around the historic core. The precise management and institutional framework would however need to be the subject of agreement between the landowner and the regulatory authorities. One example of such an agreement is the Memorandum of Agreement entered into in relation to the Vredefort Dome. Alternatively, section 42 of the National Heritage Resources Act contains a particularly useful mechanism – a Heritage Agreement – for achieving the integrated and holistic management of heritage resources. A Heritage Agreement could operate as an effective mechanism for sites such as Vergelegen and Groot Constantia which comprise of both Provincial heritage sites and proposed World Heritage Sites.

11.5.1 Implications for the designation of a buffer zone around the World Heritage Site

Although buffer zones in or around properties inscribed on the World Heritage List are not mandatory in terms of national legislation\(^\text{11}\), or the World Heritage Convention, the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention\(^\text{12}\) (the “Operational Guidelines”), stipulate that “wherever necessary for the proper protection of the property, a buffer zone should be provided.”\(^\text{13}\)

A buffer zone is defined in the Operational Guidelines as “an area surrounding the nominated property which has complimentary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property.”\(^\text{14}\) However, the lack of detailed statutory provisions in the World Heritage Convention Act prescribing which activities are to be regulated within the buffer zone, may hinder the efficacy of buffer zones in protecting the nominated property. In analysing this, it is important to take stock of the purpose that the ICOMOS /UNESCO have assigned to the buffer zones as a conceptual mechanism.

---

\(^{10}\) See P.N. 128/2017 in Provincial Gazette 7785 dated 23 June 2017.

\(^{11}\) The World Heritage Convention Act 49 of 1999.

\(^{12}\) Published on 26 October 2016 by the UNESCO and the Intergovernmental Committee for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

\(^{13}\) Paragraph 103 of the Operational Guidelines.

\(^{14}\) Paragraph 104 of the Operational Guidelines.
Conceptually, a buffer zone is a mechanism designed to achieve the protection of the immediate setting of the nominated property.\textsuperscript{15} The features and values of a buffer zone are therefore not included in the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value (“OUV”) of the nominated property and not regarded as part of the inscribed property. However, they may be relevant to the assessment of whether the nominated property satisfies the requirements for integrity, authenticity, protection and management. Therefore, the spatial delineation and boundaries of buffer zones must be evaluated, approved and formally recorded before they are nominated by the State Party. The functions of the buffer zone should reflect the types and levels of protection, conservation and management of the property necessary to protect the attributes that sustain the OUV of the World Heritage property.\textsuperscript{16}

Practically, this requires an understanding of the type of nomination (eg: site\textsuperscript{17} or landscape), the nature of current and future land uses, development pressures, compatible uses, and existing statutory protections applicable to areas surrounding the nominated property. In the case of the proposed ICMP this also requires recognition of the local context of the sites which are both situated immediately adjacent to suburban areas of existing metropolitan areas, where encroachment of residential areas has already occurred. This is more evident with Groot Constantia rather than Vergelegen but the notional link between the buffer zone mechanism (or an alternative management and protection framework for surrounding areas) and integrity of the nominated property needs to be examined against the current context.

Based on the criteria for identifying buffer zones outlined in the Operational Guidelines as well as UNESCO’s World Heritage Resource Manual for Preparing World Heritage Nominations (Second Edition 2011) the following factors need to be considered:

- Characteristics of potential Outstanding Universal Value, e.g. agricultural and natural setting;
- Management requirements of the property, e.g. fire management;
- Character of known and foreseeable threats or impacts;
- Visual setting of the property including views to and from;
- Historical-spatial linkages with adjacent properties;
- Existing character of the buffer zone; and
- Ownership, resource use, management and protection (including legislation) within the buffer zone.

Based on the above criteria in relation to both the Groot Constantia and Vergelegen estates, the various alternative options for delineating buffer zones relating to the properties on the World Heritage Site List (“WHS List”) include:

**Option 1**

The declaration of the entire inscribed property as a WHS with no buffer zone;

**Option 2**

The declaration of the entire property as a WHS with a buffer zone over adjacent areas;

or

---


\textsuperscript{16} The WHS nomination of the Early Farmsteads of the Cape of Good Hope is being submitted under the category of ‘site’ and not ‘landscape’
**Option 3**

The declaration of only the core precinct of the inscribed property (i.e. the historic werf and core buildings) as a WHS and manage the remainder of the inscribed property as a buffer zone as part of the inscribed property.

In reference to Option 1 above, which presents the option of no buffer zone, the World Heritage Papers 25: World Heritage and Buffer Zones (“World Heritage Papers: 25”)\(^{18}\) recognised that there are exceptional circumstances where a buffer zone may not be required for the inscription of a property in the WHS List. It describes those exceptional circumstances as:

a) “The property is not subject to significant external threats or the only external threats to a property are large scale and cannot be meaningfully addressed or managed within a buffer zone (generally unlikely);

b) There are already existing landscape scale regulatory and protection measures in place that provide all of the functions that would otherwise be served by a buffer zone; or

c) The areas that could serve as a buffer zone are justifiably included in the overall World Heritage property. This situation is also relatively unusual but may occur when the property is large, or where the definition of a buffer zone might result in complex boundaries that would be difficult to manage, or in fragmentation of a World Heritage property.”\(^{19}\)

Option 2 contemplates the delineation of a buffer zone beyond the boundary of the sites over adjacent areas. In the current context, it is important to consider the effectiveness and purpose of a buffer zone in adjacent areas where such areas have already been afforded legal protection or already feature significant residential encroachment. Adjacent areas currently designated as formally protected areas (Nature Reserves or National Parks declared as such in terms of the NEMPAA) already serve as a buffer zone in terms of which the natural landscape is managed in accordance with stringent regulatory controls, therefore the delineation of a buffer zone would be rendered redundant.

The principal purpose of a buffer zone is to provide protection of the specific values for which the property is being inscribed on the WHS List.\(^{20}\) The need for an integrated management approach is also recognised as complicated in circumstances where "significant human populations are present"\(^{21}\). In the case of surrounding residential areas which have already encroached upon agricultural context of the proposed WHS, the extent to which such use or threat could be mitigated is diminished. Similarly, the extent to which surrounding residential areas could be viewed, if included within a buffer zone, as providing protection to the value of the inscribed property, is limited to tree planting buffers and boundary treatment. Therefore, where residential development has already occurred within the buffer zone, it is arguable that the delineation of a buffer zone will serve no legitimate purpose as a means of regulating the direct effects of encroachment on the WHS. Nonetheless, the inclusion of these areas within a buffer zone could be used to control inappropriate development (e.g.: inappropriate high rise structures impacting the view to or from the WHS site, or the conversion (change of land use) of adjacent properties to industrial use, inappropriate boundary treatment, loss of treed buffer zone), as one of the key recognised roles of a buffer zone relates to the adoption of “land-use policies to prevent the location of disturbing or intrusive industrial uses that would impact on the values of the protected area”.\(^{22}\)

---

18 Compiled by UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention in 2008 as a result of the International Expert Meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones in Davos, Switzerland.
Importantly, all the surrounding land is currently regulated in terms of Zoning Scheme Regulations and to this extent there is already a level of control.

Although the Operational Guidelines indicate a level of control insofar as any modifications to a buffer zone are implemented (in that this apparently requires World Heritage Committee approval) there is no such formal legal protection or recognition in terms of applicable statutory provisions in South Africa. However, the applicable environmental laws identify a category of protected areas (namely "protected environments" declared in terms of the NEM: PAA) which are specifically designed to serve several purposes, one of which is the protection of a buffer to a World Heritage Site. Any such formal protection over the single residential properties or any of the other buffer mechanisms would require a separate process to be implemented in terms of the NEM: PAA and would also require the consent of the individual owners of the landholdings involved insofar as private property is affected.

Option 3 contemplates the nomination of only the core precinct of the inscribed property as the WHS and the management of the remainder of the property as a buffer zone as part of the inscribed property. Given the fact that the total size of Groot Constantia is approximately 138 hectares, due to its size, it is arguable that the property is too small to declare a portion of the core precinct as a WHS and to declare the remainder as a buffer zone. Furthermore, it is difficult to distinguish the effectiveness and role of the buffer zone if the buffer zone is to be managed as part of the inscribed property. Option 3 is likely to have the same protection capacity as Option 1, which does not have a buffer zone at all but the entire property is nominated as the WHS. Although, on the other hand, if the buffer zone is excluded from the inscribed property, the buffer zone could be managed separately under a different protection mechanism. For example: Groot Constantia has already been declared a Provincial Heritage Site and portions of Vergelegen have been declared a nature reserve in terms of the NEM: PAA. In short, there are a myriad of alternative (and formal) legal mechanisms that could be implemented in connection with the nominated properties, all of which could serve the equivalent type of objectives as a buffer zone identified by UNESCO.

The alternative options (or legal mechanisms) for the buffer zones contemplated in Options 2 and 3 above, could include:

a) the buffer zone is managed as part of the same or equivalent management framework applicable to the inscribed property (in terms of which the management and control of the properties comprising the buffer zone is managed in terms of the WHS Regulations and the ICMP);

b) the buffer zone is declared as a ‘Protected Environment’ in terms of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act 57 of 2003 (“NEM: PAA”) (which expressly recognises that one of the purposes of a ‘Protected Environment’ as being to protect a buffer zone to a WHS);

c) the buffer zone is managed in terms of existing land use management controls in the applicable Zoning Scheme Regulations (refer to the possibility of a Heritage Protection Overlay Zone as the buffer); or

d) The buffer zone is managed as part of sections 27 and 28 of the NHRA.

The alternative options for inscription identified above raise the relevance of buffer zones to the WHS nomination. A buffer zone is a recognised mechanism for addressing threats to WHS / protected areas where those threats arise or may arise in or from areas adjacent to the inscribed property. The notion of protected area management outside the boundaries of the formally protected area is recognised as a mechanism for retaining and enhancing the integrity of the protected area. The IUCN Position Paper recognises that wherever necessary, "an adequate buffer zone should be provided to protect the nominated property from the direct effects of encroachment and the impacts of resource use outside it."23

---

23 World Heritage Papers: 25. Page 27. (Key draft excerpts from the 2004 Operation Guidelines.)
Although the consideration of an appropriate buffer mechanism and identification of the spatial delineation of any proposed buffer zone is not a prerequisite for the two sites, such consideration might go some way to providing long-term security against future uses (e.g. rezoning, subdivision and urban sprawl and insensitive development).

Consideration needs to be given to that fact that different conditions exist within the area potentially deemed to form part of a buffer zone. For instance these conditions include a range of different existing land uses, including:

- Residential properties;
- Formal protected areas (e.g. National Parks and Nature Reserves);
- Areas rooted in agricultural and viticulture; and
- Natural protected areas.

The control of interventions as part of the inscription of the nominated properties on the WHS List would need to accommodate these different conditions.

11.6 Institutional and management framework applicable to Vergelegen and Groot Constantia

Against the above-mentioned statutory background, there are several layers to understanding the applicable management framework relevant to the sites:

- The most appropriate management authority for the proposed World Heritage Sites (this is the overall Authority for a World Heritage Site which the Minister may appoint and to whom the Minister may confer powers and duties in terms of the WHC Act) needs careful consideration.

- The existing role and functions of the management body currently responsible for the day-to-day management of the site needs to be considered and respected. This management body may or may not be the Authority (declared by the Minister – as referred to above). The powers and duties conferred on the Authority by the Minister should respect existing management roles and functions.

- The current management bodies of each property (the Board in the case of the Vergelegen estate and the Board of Trustees in terms of Groot Constantia) are likely to need to maintain strong, if not exclusive, control over the day-to-day management of the properties (subject of course to the reasonable requirements of the Integrated Management Plan). Again, any powers and duties conferred on the Authority by the Minister should respect existing management roles and functions.

- The current management bodies of each property (the Board in the case of the Vergelegen estate and the Board of Trustees in terms of Groot Constantia) could be designated as the Authority responsible for the day-to-day management of each site and this would be consistent with the recognition that the subject-properties are privately owned. There is precedent for the designation of a private landowner or representative of private landowners to be identified as the World Heritage Site Authority for a particular World Heritage Site (for example the Vredefort Dome). But this would require the consent of those bodies to perform the powers and duties conferred by the Minister in terms of the WHC Act, as certain of these duties could be considered as onerous and not within their current mandates.

The ICMP is unique in the sense that there are two separate sites which are the subject of the proposed declaration. The two sites are unrelated geographically and owned privately by different entities. This poses some constraints regarding the appropriate bespoke
management structure for the proposed World Heritage Site (taking into account the statutory requirements referred to above).

The following options have been identified:

- One World Heritage Site Authority is designated by the Minister for both sites or, alternatively, two separate World Heritage Site Authorities are designated (i.e. one for each of Vergelegen and Groot Constantia. In order to avoid duplication of administrative functions and obligations in terms of the WHC Act it would be prudent for only one World Heritage Site Authority to be designated. That authority would then be responsible for both sites in terms of the ICMP. This recommendation is made for both administrative efficiency and in cognisance of the fact that only one Integrated Management Plan is being prepared in respect of both sites.

- One Management Authority for each site. The Management Authority is distinct from the “Authority” or World Heritage Site Authority which the Minister is required to designate in terms of each World Heritage Site. The reason for two discrete Management Authorities is informed by the recognition that the two sites are entirely different. Although both are privately owned, each site has a different ownership and management structures which any proposed World Heritage Site declaration would need to accommodate.

- One Joint Management Committee for both sites. Although the two sites are different in terms of their ownership structures and management requirements, the management of both sites will be regulated in terms of the Integrated Management Plan. For that reason it would be prudent that both landowners are represented on one Joint Management Committee that is responsible for the implementation of those aspects of the WHC Act and the Integrated Management Plan that are common to both sites (but that do not involve the day-to-day management of each site to be undertaken by the Management Authority for each site).

- The primary function of the Joint Management Committee would include:
  - to implement the requirements of the Integrated Management Plan;
  - to engage with the day-to-day heritage management of the site in terms of the ICMP;
  - to report on the implementation of the ICMP to the Authority (and thereby to enable the Authority to report to the Minister to satisfy WHC Act requirements).

- As both sites will to a large extent be managed separately as discrete sites, there is a limited need for joint oversight and/or joint management functions. In other words there is no need for one management committee to be responsible for both sites. However, in order to ensure the effective implementation of the ICMP it is suggested that the Joint Management Committee would meet either bi-annually or once per annum to engage on performance in terms of the ICMP in respect of both sites.

- The structure and composition of the Joint Management Committee could be determined contractually (either through a memorandum of agreement entered into with all relevant stakeholders and the national Minister of Environmental Affairs or separately in terms of a co-management agreement in terms of section 42 of the Protected Areas Act).
12. MONITORING AND REVIEW

The World Heritage Convention Act provides that an integrated management plan must cover a period of at least five years or such longer period specified by the Minister. Where new opportunities or threats arise, or in the case of changed circumstances, the plans may be reviewed and amended by the Management Authority, with the approval of the Minister. Monitoring of the implementation of this ICMP against the performance criteria is an essential component of the overall conservation and management approach to the Sites. For this reason, regular reporting and monitoring is necessary to enable adaptive heritage management and, where required, to allow corrective action to be taken timeously to address threats. Related to the monitoring of the conservation status of the Sites is the concept of Periodic Reporting which is a formal requirement of the Operational Guidelines that requires States Parties to submit a report every six years on the application of the World Heritage Convention in their jurisdictions. Periodic reporting is an important process for the effective long-term conservation of inscribed properties. The main purposes of periodic reporting include:

24 Section 26(1) of the World Heritage Convention Act.

a) to provide an assessment of the application of the World Heritage Convention by the State Party;

b) to provide an assessment as to whether the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the inscribed properties is being maintained over time;

c) to provide up-to-date and accurate information about the inscribed properties to record the changing circumstances and state of conservation of the properties;

d) to provide a mechanism for regional cooperation and exchange of information and experiences between States Parties concerning the implementation of the Convention and World Heritage conservation.

12.1 Monitoring and reporting

The monitoring required by this ICMP is aimed specifically at measuring and assessing the state of conservation of the Sites in order to satisfy the reporting requirements of the Convention and the World Heritage Convention Act. The monitoring and reporting should be undertaken in terms of the following three related stages:

a) The Joint Management Committee is responsible for reviewing annually the performance of site managers against the applicable performance indicators identified in the ICMP in order to inform the ongoing and integrated management of the Sites. The Joint Management Committee is responsible for co-ordinating and funding this annual review, as supported by experts’ reports whenever required.

b) The Joint Management Committee should prepare and submit annual monitoring reports to the Management Authority, which should be based on the outcomes of the annual performance review.

c) The Management Authority must then use this information for monitoring and evaluating performance, and must report to the Minister annually on compliance with the ICMP. This will also be relevant to fulfilling the Management Authority’s obligations in terms of section 42 of the Act (regarding Annual Reporting), which requires that the Management Authority must report annually on the following:
• compliance with the ICMP, including compliance with applicable performance indicators;
• the efficiency of the ICMP;
• possible amendments of improvements to the ICMP; and
• other matters in connection with the ICMP which the Management Authority wishes to draw to the attention of the Minister.

d) The Minister may then use this information for assessing the Management Authority’s performance and also for inputting the right level of information into the process of preparing periodic reports which should be submitted to UNESCO every 6 years in terms of Paragraphs 199-203 of the Operational Guidelines. The purpose of the periodic reports is to inform UNESCO about the review of the ICMP and to enable the World Heritage Committee to gauge progress achieved in the state of conservation of the Sites.

12.2 Performance indicators

The purpose of monitoring the performance indicators is two-fold:

1. to enable the Management Authority (in conjunction with the Joint Management Committee) to continually assess progress regarding how the values of the Sites and attributes of OUV are being protected, maintained and managed in terms of the principles and criteria identified in this Plan; and

2. to measure in general how performance of the objectives of the ICMP are being achieved.

Several performance indicators for the ECF sites flow from the objectives identified in the ICMP. Their aim is to measure progress with the protection, interpretation and management of the sites. Most indicators are common to both Groot Constantia and Vergelegen, although there are minor differences reflecting the specificity of each site.
13. IMPLEMENTATION AND ACTION PLAN

The preparation of an Implementation and Action Plan should provide the Management Authority (in conjunction with the Management Committees of each estate and Joint Management Committee) with a clear, simple and updatable template to roll out implementation activities over a 5 to 10 year period. It should identify various action categories based on the outcomes of the performance risk analysis (Sections 6 and 7), conservation principles (Section 8), strategic objectives (Section 9), the preliminary catalogue of measures and priorities (Section 10), the protection and management of the WHS (Section 11) and requirements for monitoring and review. These action categories should be populated with detailed tasks, priorities, timelines, deliverables, budgets and responsibilities. This should be prepared as part of a Final ICMP.
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