CITY OF CAPE TOWN
ISIXEKO SASEKAPA
STAD KAAPSTAD

Case ID 1500173535

Erf 1447, 24 Hoop Street, Klipdam, Kuilsrivier

Development Management

This cover page is added by the City of Cape Town as part of our standard branding and document-management process. It does not indicate that the City authored, verified or endorses the submission. All application documents remain the responsibility of the applicant and the City assesses them as submitted. Any errors or discrepancies will be addressed through the normal land use assessment process.

All rights reserved. No part of this data may be reproduced or transmitted without written permission from the Development Management Department of the City of Cape Town. This document is available on the City of Cape Town website (**www.capetown.gov.za/LandUseNotices**) for a limited time. Please do not host the document independently; you may link to it from the City's site. Documents downloaded from any other website cannot be verified for authenticity.

October 2026

CoCT Application for the Removal of the Restrictive Title Conditions

MOTIVATION:
ERF 1447, 24 HOOP STREET, KUILS RIVER

Prepared for

Owner



Prepared by

patrimoine concepts

18 Baris Road, University Estate, Cape Town, 7925

• heritage • architecture • design

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 The application aims to obtain the right to develop the subject property in accordance with **CHAPTER 5: RESIDENTIAL ZONINGS (items 21 to 33)** permitted under the R1 zoning and permitting its development with a main, second, third and a supplementary dwelling.

1.2 The application requires the following approval, in terms of section 42 of the City of Cape Town Municipal Planning By-law, 2015 **(the MPBL'**):

1.2.1. Section 42(g): amendment, suspension or deletion of a restrictive condition.

1.2.2 Section 42(j): Deletion of the corresponding deemed conditions of approval relating to the number of dwellings and building lines.

2. OWNERSHIP & SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

The Property is owned by and the following documents are attached in support of this application:

- Application form;
- Power of attorney;
- SG diagram;
- Certified copies of the title deed; and
- Conveyancer's certificate
- SDP
- Landscaping plan

3. PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

3.1 General information

Property Details	
Deeds Registry	Kuilsriver
Property Type	Residential Erf
Erf No.	1447
Extent	1031m^2
Province	Western Cape
Administrative District	Tygerberg District
Local Authority	City of Cape Town
Title Deed No.	
Registered Owner	
Current Zoning	R1



Figure 1: Aerial view of the property concerned Erf 1447, 24 Hoop Street Kuilsriver (Source: City Map Viewer, 2025)

3.2 Location and Accessibility

The physical address of the Property is 24 Hoop Street, Kuilsriver and vehicular access to the subject property is taken there along.

3.3 Site Characteristics

The property is currently developed with a double-storey, single dwelling house approved under application reference 1700560517 and dated 22 January 2025. During the construction process, unauthorized internal alterations were done prior to approval, resulting in an admin penalty (Case ID 1500153077). The admin penalty was subsequently paid in December 2025.

3.4 Existing Land Use and Zoning

The Property is currently being used for residential purposes and is zoned as Conventional Housing (R1). The SR1 zoning provides the following uses:

"The following use restrictions apply to properties in this zoning—

(a) Primary uses are dwelling house, private road, micro wind turbine, structure-mounted energy system and additional use rights as specified in paragraph (b).

(b) Additional use rights which may be exercised by the occupant of a property are home occupation, bed and breakfast establishment, second dwelling, third dwelling, filming (items 21(b)(iii) and (vi) does not apply), affordable rental flat, supplementary dwelling unit, small-scale wind turbine (only for land unit areas of equal or greater than 650m2), place of instruction (with not more than 34 children) and home childcare."

4. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks to amend the title conditions to permit 3 dwelling units and a supplementary dwelling, as depicted in the table below and the attached Site Development Plan.

Dwelling	Extent
Main Dwelling	178m^2
Second Dwelling	168m^2
Third Dwelling	85m^2
Supplementary Dwelling	48m^2

4.1 Parking and Circulation

Sufficient space for parking compliant with Chapter 15 of the MPBL,

4.2 Bulk Services

There is no envisaged impact on the existing sewer and drainage systems, which currently service the property.

4.3 Legal Requirements

Applications are hereby made in terms of sections 42(G) and (J) of the Municipal Planning By-law 2015, to facility the removal of restrictive title conditions relating to the number of dwellings permitted on the property and the distance development is permitted to the boundaries.

The purpose of the activity does not constitute a listed activity in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, and no authorization is required in this regard.

4.4 Title Deeds and Ownership

The subject properties ownership is reflected in the attached Title Deed's and rates invoice's (see attached).

4.5 Motivation to permit the amendment of the title condition.

These applications accord with the required provisions of City of Cape Town Municipal Bylaw, 2015 (Chapter 7), which stipulates the nature of the information that is required, and the procedures to be followed. The proposed development of the subject property creates additional residential opportunity within the subject area of Kuilsriver, an area situated close to various public amenities and transport routes.

4.6 Consistency with Applicable Planning Legislation and Policies

4.6.1 Municipal Spatial Development Framework

The MSDF promotes the creation of an efficient urban structure, through encouraging high densities, mixed uses and development in appropriate areas. The subject property is located in the Urban Inner Core and partly in the Incremental Growth and Consolidation Areas which supports the densification and intensification.

The proposal can therefore be seen to be broadly in line with the principles and the Municipal Spatial Development Framework.

4.6.2 The City of Cape Town's Densification Policy

One of the principles of the densification strategy for the City of Cape Town is to provide for a more efficient city by encouraging marginal densification. The following is an extract from the policy, which reads:

> "*All residential areas are suitable for incremental densification through second dwellings or subdivisions, as long as they do not damage the character of the area, and the city engineers are satisfied that the infrastructure will cope with the increased densities*"

Considering the above, the proposal aligns with the principles of the densification strategy for the City of Cape Town.

4.6.3 The Tygerberg District Plan (2023)

Subdistrict 8: Greater Kuilsriver, Bottelary and Polkadraai Area, Zevenwacht, Stellenbosch Farms local objective a):

> *"Promote opportunities or business activities and higher-density residential development in close proximity to public transport routes, transport interchange precincts and services".*

The general guideline response to the objective is……

> *"Promote high-intensity development with mixed land uses, including higher-density residential development along high-accessibility routes such as Van Riebeeck Road, the area south of New Nooiensfontein Road between Van Riebeeck Road and the Strand railway line as well as around Kuils River Station"*

Kuilsriver as a district node …….

> *"Encourage a mix of land uses, including office, retail, medium- to high-density residential with a range of housing typologies, including affordable housing and levels 2 and 3 civic clusters community and recreational facilities".*

The proposal further aligns with the Tygerberg District Plan as the development respects its surrounding character, has a good design and limited visual impact with a positive interface with the street. This has been achieved by maintaining one vehicular access point, no reduction of the existing erf size, no increase of the permitted floor space of 1500m^2. Thus, appearing unchanged along the streetscape.

The 3 dwellings will share the existing vehicular access point along Hoop Street.

The floor space of 1500sqm applicable to the parent erf has been split between the 3 dwellings (Main dwelling 178m^2, second dwelling 168m^2, third dwelling 85m^2 and the supplementary dwelling 48m^2)

The design approach respects the provisions and guidelines of the MBPL 2015, thus ensuring no significant impact on the character of the area, the streetscape and the rights of the adjoining residents.

4.6.4 The City of Cape Town Municipal Bylaw,2015.

The by-law gives effect to the Municipal Planning function allocated to Municipalities in terms of Schedule 4 of the Constitution. Therefore, the proposed application accords with the provisions of the law.

5. DESIRABILITY

5.1 Socio-economic impact

The development will have positive socio-economic impacts on the community. The proposed removal of title conditions will increase densities, which will broaden the rates base and provide additional municipal income. Additionally, the construction of structures has generated short-term employment for local builders and workers.

5.2 Compatibility with surrounding uses

The proposed development supports the existing and surrounding land uses along with development footprints. The proposed development involves the utilization of an existing property with minor internal alterations for residential use, in line with the land use in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, the level of densification is considered context sensitive and incremental, in that the property will be developed within the bounds of its existing zoning category and in accordance with what all R1 properties in Cape Town are afforded, absent title deed restrictions. The owner is also introducing landscaping to help the property seamlessly blend in with the existing streetscape, which is characterized by gardens and greenery.

5.3 Impact on the safety, wellbeing and of the surrounding community

The proposed removal of the restrictive title condition permitting the development of the property with additional dwellings does not trigger a significant increase in the on-site parking requirements, more so than normally permitted in residential areas developed with a main, second and third dwelling.

The surrounding uses comprise of low to medium-density residential uses, which are seldom linked to large numbers of private vehicle ownership. As such the proposed ROR would have little to no impact on the safety and wellbeing of the surrounding community.

5.4 Impact on heritage

The Property is not located within a Heritage Protective Overlay Zone (HPOZ), the building is not older than sixty years and appears to have no heritage significance.

The proposed removal of title deed restrictions is therefore not anticipated to adversely affect any heritage resources or properties in the surrounding area.

5.5 impact on the biophysical environment

No protected flora and forna will be affected by the proposal and as such there are no biophysical impacts resulting from the proposal.

5.6 Impact on traffic, parking, access and other transport related considerations

The proposed development will add value to a more viable transport system specifically along Van Riebeeck Road, which can accommodate various modes of transport. The proposed development will not have a negative impact on the existing transport movement patterns of the area, as it will utilize the existing transport routes that connect to the major routes, located to the south, east and west of the subject property.

5.7 Impact on the engineering services

There are no engineering services across the subject property that will be affected by the proposed development. The owner is however willing to comply with any requirements deemed necessary to render the subject property compliant.

5.8 Impact on existing rights

The 4.5m street and 3m street and common boundary-building lines and the 9 and 11m-height limitation will remain unchanged. Similarly, the primary uses permitted under the R1 base zoning will not be deviated from, therefore limiting the impact on the existing property rights of the surrounding erven. Additionally, the proposal does not include the rezoning of the subject property, thus maintaining its residential character.

The permitted 1500m^2 floor space for the parent erf will also remain unchanged which will further limit the developments impact on the adjoining neighbours.

6. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES CONTEMPLATED IN SPLUMA & LUPA

It is considered that the development principles contemplated in SPLUMA and LUPA are not applicable are addressed as follows:

(i) Principle of Spatial Justice- *contextually appropriate densification, as is the case with this proposal as it would cumulatively contribute to spatial justice in terms of diminishing pressure for development elsewhere which drives the poor to the periphery of the city. Low densities close to areas with good opportunities displace other people to worse located land.*

(ii) Principle of Spatial Sustainability- *contextually appropriate densification, as is the case with this proposal as this proposal will contribute to environmental sustainability by reducing pressure on valuable natural land. Applications such as this effectively act to reduce urban sprawl in the long run, which results in the better use of developed land and existing municipal services.*

(iii) Principle of Efficiency *- contextually appropriate densification, as is the case with this proposal as it results in a more efficient use of land, municipal services and infrastructure*

(iv) Principle of Spatial Resilience– *contextually appropriate densification, as is the case with this proposal as it facilitates spatial resilience in that it allows for better residential options to citizens.*

(v) Principle of good administration - *the application has been processed in accordance with current applicable laws and legislation.*

7. TITLE DEED RESTRICTIONS

7.1 The Property is held by title deed which restricts the number of dwellings permitted on the property.

Clause B(4).b.

"It shall be used only for the purpose of erecting thereon one dwelling together with such outbuildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith" & .B.4.(d) "No building or structure or any portion thereof, except boundary walls and fences shall be erected nearer than 4.72 metres to the street line which forms a boundary of this erf, nor within 3.15m of the rear ir 1.57 metres of the lateral boundary common to any adjoining erf provided with the consent of the of the local authority, an outbuilding not exceeding 3.05 metres in height, measured from the floor to the wall plate and no portion of which will be used for human habitation, may be erected within the above prescribed rear space.

On consolidation of any two or more erven this condition shall apply to the consolidated area as one erf".

7.2 The application before you, seeks to remove the condition unduly prohibiting the number of dwellings and associated outbuildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith on the subject property and the distance development may occur to the street and common boundaries.

7.3 The City of Cape Town has the discretion to suspend, delete or relax the restrictive conditions to the extent that it is deemed necessary and impose conditions to protect its interests. In this instance, the restrictive condition cannot be suspended or relaxed due to the nature of the restrictions imposed and therefore can only be removed.

8. APPLICABLE POLICY GUIDELINES

8.1 A number of planning and policy documents have been produced by both the provincial and local authorities in response to the continued pressure for development of well-located land and a need to increase especially residential densities in existing urban areas.

8.2. The granting of the applications contained herein will fulfil the objectives of the planning and policy documents produced by the aforementioned authorities.

8.3 This proposal has been considered, and it is submitted that it complies with the following approved planning documents:

a) **The Provincial Spatial Development Framework ('PSDF')** this planning document supports densification which is to be achieved by using a range of urban development tools

including subdivisions and development of a larger scale building footprint on erven;

b) **The Metropolitan Spatial Development Framework, adopted in April 2018 ('MSDF')**, promotes a greater mix of diversification and densification within existing areas which needs to be given effect to assist the objectives of the City of Cape Town.

c) **The updated Tygerberg District Plan adopted in 2023**, promotes land use intensification, which implies a greater mix of residential and non-residential land uses (diversification)through the increased use of space, both vertically and horizontally (densification). This could include a combination of residential and non-residential uses or a combination non-residential use (i.e. industrial or commercial or institutional). This can be achieved within existing areas or new developments with an increased number of residential dwelling units or gross leasable areas. These should be encouraged in locations with good public transport access, concentrations of employment, commercial development and other amenities, or where such accessibility and concentration are planned.

d) **The Cape Town Densification Policy, 2012 ('CTDP')** sets out generic, non-area specific guidelines encouraging more efficient usage of space within the city; thus, it promotes intensification of economic activities and residential densification within the pre-existing urban core.

8.4. Benefits of densification Residential densification within established urban areas is desirable for the following reasons:

- More efficient use is made of land which is a scarce resource.
- More efficient use is made of existing municipal infrastructure.
- Urban sprawl is contained which contributes hugely toward environmental sustainability.
- Densification facilitates the gradual restructuring of the city which is vital in terms of social, economic, and environmental sustainability.
- Residential densification is in the interest of the public and the development of townships throughout the City of Cape Town

9. APPLICATION & MOTIVATION FOR THE DELETION AND REMOVAL OF CONDITIONS

9.1 Application is hereby made in terms of section 42(g) and (j) for the removal, of a restrictive condition that does not permit more than one dwelling unit together with the such out-buildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith.

9.2 The application in terms of section 42(g) and (J) of the MPBL concerns the restrictive conditions contained in the Deed of Transfer No which reads as follows:

"B. Subject further to the following special conditions contained in said Deed of Transfer No. and imposed by the Administrator of the Cape of the Cape of Good Hope by virtue of the Townships Ordnance No. 33 of 1934 against approval of KUILS RIVER TOWNSHIP EXTENSION 7:

4. This erf shall be subject to the following further conditions, provided that where, in the opinion of the Administrator after consultation with the Township Board and the Local Authority, it is expedient that the restriction in any such condition should at any time be suspended or relaxed he may authorised the necessary suspension subject to compliance with such conditions as he may impose: -

b *"It shall be used only for the purpose of erecting thereon one dwelling together with such outbuildings as are ordinarily required to be used therewith".*

d. *"No building or structure or any portion thereof, except boundary walls and fences shall be erected nearer than 4.72 metres to the street line which forms a boundary of this erf, nor within 3.15m of the rear ir 1.57 metres of the lateral boundary common to any adjoining erf provided with the consent of the of the local authority, an outbuilding not exceeding 3.05 metres in height, measured from the floor to the wall plate and no portion of which will be used for human habitation, may be erected within the above prescribed rear space. On consolidation of any two or more erven this condition shall apply to the consolidated area as one erf".*

9.3 The preamble to the restrictive condition in question does confer discretion upon the Administrator of the Province of the Cape of Good Hope to suspend or relax the operation of the restrictive conditions contained in the title deed. Therefore, the conditions still exist and are enforceable and ultimately still restrict the number of dwellings and prescribe building setbacks on the subject property.

Accordingly, an application for the removal of the restrictive conditions contained in the title deed is applied for.

9.4 The restrictive conditions that appear in the holding title is required to be amended and so the owner seeks to have the condition B.4.b in the deed removed.

9.5 Section 48 read with section 99 of the MPBL deals with the removal, suspension or amendments of restrictive conditions; the pertinent portion of section 48 is subsection (4), which reads as follows:

> *"The City **must** have regard to **section 39(5)** of the **Land Use Planning Act** and **section 47** of **SPLUMA** when considering whether to remove, suspend or amend a restrictive condition."*

9.6 Section 39(5) of the Land Use Planning Act, 2014 (LUPA') reads as follows:

"(5) When a municipality considers the removal, suspension or amendment of a restrictive condition, the municipality must have regard to at least the following:

*(a) the financial or other value of the rights in terms of the restrictive condition enjoyed by a person or entity, irrespective of whether these rights are personal or vest in the person as the **owner of a dominant tenement**;*

*(b) the **personal benefits** which accrue to the **holder of rights** in terms of the restrictive condition;*

*(c) the **personal benefits which will accrue** to the person seeking the removal, suspension or amendment of the restrictive condition if it is removed, suspended or amended;*

*(d) the **social benefit** of the restrictive condition **remaining in place***

in its existing form;

*(e) the **social benefit** of the **removal, suspension or amendment** of the restrictive condition; and*

*(f) **whether** the removal, suspension or amendment of the restrictive condition will **completely remove all rights** enjoyed by the beneficiary **or only some** of those rights."*

9.7 Section 47(1) – (3) of SPLUMA read as follows:

"47. Restrictive Conditions

(1) A restrictive condition may, with the approval of a Municipal Planning Tribunal and in the prescribed manner, be removed, amended or suspended.

(2) A removal, amendment or suspension of a restrictive condition contemplated in subsection (1) must, in the absence of the contemplated written consent, be effected—

*(a) in **accordance with section 25 of the Constitution** and this Act;*

*(b) with due regard to the **respective rights of all those affected**, and to the public interest; and in the prescribed manner, if such removal, amendment or suspension will **deprive any person of property** as contemplated in section 25 of the Constitution*

(3) *A Municipal Planning Tribunal considering an application to remove, amend or suspend a restrictive condition is not liable to compensate any person for any loss arising from or related to a decision made in good faith and in terms of this Act to remove, amend or suspend a restrictive condition.*

9.8 Motivation envisaged by section 48(4) read with sections 39 and 42(g) of the MPBL, section 39(5) of LUPA and section 47 of SPLUMA.

9.8.1 Factors in terms of section 39(5) of LUPA:

9.8.1.1 Section 39(5)(a):

The limitation of the number of dwellings and associated outbuildings permitted on the subject property, has no value to owners of property within the township given that precedent exists for similar conditions being relaxed/suspended/amended/removed as well as the diversification of the zoning of properties within the township. Moreover, the removal of the restrictive conditions will enable residential densification.

This, coupled with the expectation of property owners in the area to enhance the value of their homes through the re-development of their properties free from restriction, it can be concluded that the title deed restrictions rather have a negative impact on the rights of surrounding property owners and that the removal of the restrictions as applied for will have a positive impact for homeowners within the township.

9.8.1.2 Section 39(5)(b):

The owners of the immovable property adjacent to the Property to not hold rights of servitude over same, therefore no real rights will be affected by the relaxation or suspension of the restrictive conditions.

9.8.1.3 Section 39(5)(c):

The removal of the restrictive condition will enable the applicant to develop the property in a manner that would maximize financial and social benefit.

Furthermore, the removal of the restrictive conditions will enable a more efficient use of land which has become a very scarce and expensive resource within Cape Town.

Unlocking the potential of the Property through the removal of the restrictive title deed condition that will allow for potential development will not only benefit the Applicant, but the surrounding area and the public as well.

9.8.1.4 Section 39(5)(d):

There will be no social benefits, should the restrictions remain in place. If not removed, the area, a residential area, will lose the opportunity of being densified as encouraged by all the approved planning documents and policies.

9.8.1.5 Section 39(5)(e):

The amendment of the restrictive title deed condition will have a positive social benefit given that it will result in residential densification within an existing urban area. The proposal is in line with and gives effect on approved Provincial and Municipal policies.

9.8.1.6 Section 39(5)(f):

The removal of the restrictive title deed conditions will not result in the complete or even partial loss of rights by the City of Cape Town as it retains a discretion to impose conditions to counteract any negative implications. As such the removal of the restrictive title deed conditions dealt with herein will not negatively impact the City of Cape Town as the envisaged consequences is the accommodation of additional dwellings on the existing erf that will generate income through municipal rate and achieve densification in-line with the local and provincial spatial policies.

9.8.2 Factors in terms of section 47(2) of the SPLUMA:

9.8.2.1 Restrictive title deed conditions do not vest neighbouring homeowners with rights to property as contemplated by Section 25 of the Constitution.

9.8.2.2 The removal of restrictions does not constitute an expropriation because the state does not acquire any property rights via this process.

9.8.2.3 The conditions to be amendment do not constitute servitudes or contractual rights. They are limitations on the use of land imposed on the public interest.

9.8.2.4 Neighbouring owners may have an interest in the restrictions, but it does not vest them with any private rights to property as contemplated by section 25 of the Constitution.

10. CONCLUSION

Approval is sought in terms of sections 42(g) and 42(j) of the MPBL for removal of restrictive title deed conditions B.4(b) and B.4(d) in the Deed of Transfer and deletion of the corresponding deemed conditions of approval.

The proposal accommodates three dwellings and one supplementary dwelling within the existing building, without rezoning or subdivision. Shared vehicular access, on-site parking and landscaping are provided as illustrated on the submitted plans.

The applications contained herein meet the requirements set out in the various pieces of legislation and the policies of both the provincial and local authorities.

Moreover, there will be no negative impact on the public or existing rights. Having regard to all the legislation applicable as well as the ancillary yet critical Acts and our Constitution, it is submitted that the applicant's application for the removal of the specified restrictive condition as reflected in the title deed be removed as applied for.

TP
GENERAL PLAN 1351 LD
OF
KUILS RIVER TOWNSHIP EXTENSION NO. 7

C.D.R.

comprising 166 erven numbered 1 to 166, Public Places numbered 167 & 168 and the thoroughfares, situate on x Portion 3 of Klipdam, in the Municipality of Kuils River, Stellenbosch Division, Province of the Cape of Good Hope. Vide Dgm. 10891/55 annexed to D/T. 1956 8404

Scale : 1/1250.

x Now Erf 1427 Kuils River

Approved

Surveyor-General

B

In terms of Section 16 of Ordinance No. 27 of 1934

TP. 75/A/3/1

25 May 1955 PA. 75/1/3/1-13

10848/11 51

C.D.R. 1351



Erf No.	Area Sq. Ft.	Diagram No.	Sq. Metres
1	3956	7431/1964	367
2	13885	8709/67	1376
3	11378	8710/67	1128
4	11373	8711/67	
5	11372	8712/67	
6	11371	8713/67	
7	11370	8714/67	
8	11374	8715/67	1038
9	10039	7743/1964	935
10	10940	10916/1963	1031
11	10944	7011/1957	
12	10945	2547/1958	
13	10946	7434/1954	
14	10947	6442/61	
15	10948	5827/1962	
16	10949	1726/62	
17	10950	7647/1965	
18	10951	7647/1965	
19	10952	8626/1964	
20	10953	8626/1964	
21	10954	9232/1959	1199
22	10955	9530/1959	974
23	10956	6919/61	1031
24	10957	6946/61	
25	10958	831/1961	
26	10959	4553/1965	
27	10960	6872/1960	
28	10961	7042/62	
29	10962	7042/62	
30	10963	846/62	
31	10964	1380/1961	
32	10965	8909/1960	
33	10966	597/1961	
34	10967	3470/1965	1026
35	10968	10023/1964	1059
36	10969	6713/61	935
37	10970	780/62	1031
38	10971	511/62	
39	10972	9314/1961	
40	10973	2536/1962	
41	10974	2535/1962	
42	10975	3058/1962	
43	10976	1158/1961	
44	10977	1445/65	
45	10978	3835/65	
46	10979	6810/61	
47	10980	1039/61	1318
48	10981	6810/61	1205
49	10982	4052/60	1031
50	10983	1370/1964	
51	10984	6752/1964	
52	10985	2813/1962	
53	10986	2132/1962	
54	10987	2133/1962	
55	10988	6903/1965	
56	10989	376/1964	
57	10990	660/1964	
58	10991	4051/62	
59	10992	3839/63	1024
60	10993	1744/1964	1059
61	10994	146/1964	1091
62	10995	379/1964	1031
63	10996	1113/1962	
64	10997	451/63	
65	10998	4795/1965	
66	10999	1746/1964	
67	11000	1747/1964	
68	11001	2893/1964	
69	11002	1748/1964	
70	11003	1749/1964	
71	11004	6747/1964	420
72	11005	3350/63	1209
73	11006	5439/64	1252
74	11007	2774/63	1031
75	11008	342/1966	
76	11009	677/1965	
77	11010	678/1965	
78	11011	6463/1963	
79	11012	6463/1963	
80	11013	4327/1963	
81	11014	765/1964	1977
82	11015	7872/1966	1426
83	11016	7872/1966	
84	11017	7872/1966	
85	11018	7872/1966	
86	11019	7872/1966	
87	11020	7872/1966	
88	11021	7872/1966	
89	11022	7872/1966	
90	11023	7872/1966	
91	11024	7872/1966	
92	11025	7872/1966	
93	11026	7872/1966	
94	11027	7872/1966	
95	11028	7872/1966	
96	11029	7872/1966	
97	11030	7872/1966	
98	11031	7872/1966	
99	11032	7872/1966	
100	11033	7872/1966	
101	11034	7872/1966	
102	11035	7872/1966	
103	11036	7872/1966	
104	11037	7872/1966	
105	11038	7872/1966	
106	11039	7872/1966	
107	11040	7872/1966	
108	11041	7872/1966	
109	11042	7872/1966	
110	11043	7872/1966	
111	11044	7872/1966	
112	11045	7872/1966	
113	11046	7872/1966	
114	11047	7872/1966	
115	11048	7872/1966	
116	11049	7872/1966	
117	11050	7872/1966	
118	11051	7872/1966	
119	11052	7872/1966	
120	11053	7872/1966	
121	11054	7872/1966	
122	11055	7872/1966	
123	11056	7872/1966	
124	11057	7872/1966	
125	11058	7872/1966	
126	11059	7872/1966	
127	11060	7872/1966	
128	11061	7872/1966	
129	11062	7872/1966	
130	11063	7872/1966	
131	11064	7872/1966	
132	11065	7872/1966	
133	11066	7872/1966	
134	11067	7872/1966	
135	11068	7872/1966	
136	11069	7872/1966	
137	11070	7872/1966	
138	11071	7872/1966	
139	11072	7872/1966	
140	11073	7872/1966	
141	11074	7872/1966	
142	11075	7872/1966	
143	11076	7872/1966	
144	11077	7872/1966	
145	11078	7872/1966	
146	11079	7872/1966	
147	11080	7872/1966	
148	11081	7872/1966	
149	11082	7872/1966	
150	11083	7872/1966	
151	11084	7872/1966	
152	11085	7872/1966	
153	11086	7872/1966	
154	11087	7872/1966	
155	11088	7872/1966	
156	11089	7872/1966	
157	11090	7872/1966	
158	11091	7872/1966	
159	11092	7872/1966	
160	11093	7872/1966	
161	11094	7872/1966	
162	11095	7872/1966	
163	11096	7872/1966	
164	11097	7872/1966	
165	11098	7872/1966	
166	11099	7872/1966	
167	11100	7872/1966	
168	571352		

Erf No.	Area Sq. Ft.	Diagram No.	Sq. Metres
85	152219	7148/1965	2114
86	23505 Marg	7435/1964	1-9962 Ha.
87	11496	3119/1965	1106
88	10400	284/1965	991
89	10000	8422/1966	
90	10000	436/1964	1188
91	10787	436/1964	1069
92	10788	581/1965	1063
93	10628	7482/76	1054
94	10286	7483/1964	1020
95	9744	4235/64	971
96	9633	4235/64	947
97	10795	3635/66	1060
98	10800	7873/1966	1201
99	13124	7874/1966	1301
100	134319	7875/1966	1332
101	10393	7246/64	1027
102	10715	3364/1966	1062
103	10445	6778/1965	1034
104	10000	8483/1965	991
105	10000	8483/1965	
106	10000	8483/1965	
107	10000	3653/66	
108	10000	3075/1966	
109	10000	3818/1966	
110	9650	11472/1965	957
111	9797	11423/1965	971
112	9452	11424/1965	937
113	10000	787/1966	991
114	10000	7878/1966	
115	10000	7877/1966	
116	10042	7880/1966	1006
117	10167	6413/65	1011
118	10787	7249/65	1281
119	10508	7250/65	1008
120	11444	2281/63	1135
121	10688	3330/1965	1179
122	11925	1134/1965	1184
123	10000	1134/1965	1011
124	10000	1134/1965	991
125	10000	1134/1965	
126	10000	2321/65	
127	10000	2321/65	
128	10000	10204/1965	
129	10000	10845/1965	
130	10000	10858/1965	
131	9847	7436/1965	915
132	9959	7437/1965	925
133	9880	788/1966	918
134	10000	10355/1965	991
135	10000	10356/1965	
136	10000	10360/1965	
137	10000	4836/66	
138	10000	7882/1966	
139	10000	7883/1966	
140	10000	7884/1966	
141	10000	7885/1966	111
142	12937	7886/1966	1233
143	11725	3341/66	1108
144	12200	4328/1965	1011
145	13023	7110/1965	1220
146	12167	608/1966	1209
147	10895	2056/1964	1098
148	11174	3634/66	1158
149	10852	607/1966	1076
150	10980	1947/66	1040
151	11288	3041/66	1119
152	10376	4011/1966	1029
153	12791	4012/1966	1283
154	11733	7887/1966	1098
155	11733	7888/1966	1107
156	10300	7889/1966	1021
157	10679	7890/1966	1056
158	10996	7891/1966	1039
159	10670	7892/1966	1057
160	12877	1283/1966	1157
161	11756	9790/62	1165
162	11378	4257/63	1128
163	11378	8372/1961	
164	11378	8373/1961	
165	11378	8374/1964	
166	11378	8375/1964	
167	1799 Marg	5853/1961	14836 Ha.
168	571352	1964/1991	5664

	Sides Cape Feet	Angles of Direction	Co-ordinates Y Lo. 19°		X
			Constant +	90000·0 +	11925000·0
AB	1196·40	309° 23' 0"	A	+ 202789	+ 2269·75
BC	936·21	18° 35' 0	B	+ 1103·18	+ 3023·87
CD	77·59	108° 15' 10	C	+ 1901·53	+ 3911·26
DE	386·20	17° 19' 40	D	+ 1975·22	+ 3886·96
EF	849·00	77° 24' 50	E	+ 1589·70	+ 9255·80
FG	34·90	151° 18' 40	F	+ 2418·30	+ 4490·80
GH	1985·84	151° 15' 30	G	+ 2435·05	+ 4910·18
HA	1902·93	233° 05' 0	H	+ 3199·55	+ 3107·92

	Co-ordinates of Beacons Constant +	90000·0		11925000·0
a	+ 3139·83	+ 3125·14	h_1	+ 2072·62 + 3624·10
b	+ 3038·87	+ 3099·29	j_1	+ 2159·18 + 3610·68
c	+ 2698·13	+ 3670·62	k_1	+ 2207·61 + 3607·39
d	+ 2817·50	+ 3712·87	l_1	+ 2620·93 + 3728·14
e	+ 2990·40	+ 3012·68	m_1	+ 2459·67 + 3496·22
f	+ 2118·93	+ 2594·97	n_1	+ 2360·09 + 3685·08
g	+ 2001·29	+ 2594·97	o_1	+ 2250·09 + 3689·69
h	+ 2869·10	+ 3243·19	p_1	+ 2168·06 + 3690·26
j	+ 2894·67	+ 3278·62	q_1	+ 2089·74 + 3702·69
k	+ 1983·19	+ 2631·90	r_1	+ 2010·07 + 3721·09
l	+ 1906·53	+ 2781·68	s_1	+ 1781·57 + 3799·51
m	+ 1851·97	+ 2857·63	t_1	+ 1516·10 + 3883·76
n	+ 2718·37	+ 3508·93	u_1	+ 1590·21 + 4122·53
o	+ 2698·94	+ 3544·36	v_1	+ 1855·68 + 4033·28
p	+ 1837·49	+ 2689·61	w_1	+ 2089·18 + 3959·81
q	+ 1658·55	+ 3087·93	x_1	+ 2162·25 + 3941·96
r	+ 2242·21	+ 3526·92	y_1	+ 2242·16 + 3929·03
s	+ 2247·58	+ 3604·65	z_1	+ 2433·26 + 3955·96
t	+ 2369·30	+ 3606·09	a_2	+ 2481·98 + 3982·41
u	+ 2477·65	+ 3616·09	b_2	+ 2462·25 + 4017·48
v	+ 2477·65	+ 3655·63	c_2	+ 2420·94 + 3994·55
w	+ 1911·98	+ 3328·36	d_2	+ 2242·45 + 3969·97
x	+ 1632·57	+ 3118·45	e_2	+ 2169·91 + 3980·74
y	+ 1249·69	+ 3325·91	f_2	+ 2094·90 + 3998·38
z	+ 1324·86	+ 3557·72	g_2	+ 1868·18 + 4071·23
a	+ 1879·87	+ 3371·12	h_2	+ 1602·07 + 4160·73
b	+ 2203·64	+ 3547·90	j_2	+ 1634·70 + 4265·85
c	+ 1993·96	+ 3352·39	k_2	+ 1862·49 + 4316·71
d	+ 1904·39	+ 3405·07	l_2	+ 2356·46 + 4210·37
e	+ 1337·61	+ 3595·63	m_2	+ 2778·62 + 3783·95
f	+ 1911·28	+ 3832·59	n_2	+ 2659·13 + 3579·67
g	+ 1756·58	+ 3718·51	o_2	+ 2382·75 + 9246·63
h	+ 1988·64	+ 3643·90	p_2	+ 1955·79 + 9337·56

	Co-ordinates of Reference Marks Constant +	90000·0		11925000·0
RM1	+ 1961·49	+ 9390·07	RM6	+ 3030·70 + 3069·20
RM2	+ 1202·92	+ 3308·54	RM6	+ 2489·65 + 3967·58
RM3	+ 1798·53	+ 2866·48	RM7	+ 2190·65 + 3608·54
RM4	+ 2109·14	+ 2377·67		

Description of Beacons.
A.C.E.G.H. = Section of fence standard.
B. = 9"x9" Solid stone beacon.
D. = 5' Rail corner fence post.
RM1-RM7 = ½" round iron peg in concrete 6" below ground.
All other beacons are ½" x 18" iron pegs.

The beacons of each erf represented on this plan are in accordance with regulations, and have been placed by me.

Surveyed in Sept-Oct., 1955.

W. L. Bentley
Land Surveyor.

Original Dgm.	10891/55 - K.R. 1427/1945
F/file	5/10849/11
Survey Records	E 2797/55.
Noting Plans :	BH-BCB, BH-BCB

S.G. OFFICE NOTES

Erven 1517+1518 consolidated, vide dgm of Erf 5041 Kuilsrivier
Beacons of erf 1572 replaced. E.1222/75.
Erf 1594 - Dgm 1964/91.
Erf 1588. Inc. in Consol. Dgm: 6677/77. (Erf 14208)
Erf 1589. Framed. Dummy Dgm: 4257/63.
Erf 1590. Framed. vide Dgm: 8572/65.
Erf 1591. Framed. vide Dgm 8573/65
Erf 1592 + 1593. Inc. in Consol. Dgm: 6348/88
Erf 1429 + 1430. Inc. in Consol. Dgm: 11444/79
Erf 1433, 1434, 1435. Inc. in Consol. Dgm: 4930/84

479/1956 C-7-1956
2821/1956 C-7-1956

BHSV-14-61 / 6768
BHSV - 14-61/6769
" - 1424 (6768)

BHSV-1433 / 6761

B S