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ABSTRACT

The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (South Africa 1999) was promulgated in the efforts of establishing effective conservation principles that would meet the needs of all South Africans. The Act makes provision for each level of government to have authority over its respective heritage resources. Donaldson (2005) anticipated that the acting authority, Heritage Western Cape (HWC), was likely to come under pressure in the near future owing to the fact of increasing heritage resources (phenomenon of aging) and that the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA) was in charge of both Grade II and III heritage resources due to the fact that no local municipality (LM) was deemed fully competent regarding local heritage resources. However, Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana (2019) found that only two local governments (City of Cape Town and Drakenstein Municipality) had been granted partial competency of their respective built heritage resources.

This research aimed to assess the capacity and competency of local government in the field of built heritage conservation of non-metropolitan municipalities in the Western Cape, South Africa. The several research objectives were identified; first, to devise or modify existing methods of assessment of capability and competency; second, to assess urban heritage conservation capability and competency of each LM in the Western Cape (excluding City of Cape Town); third, by doing this create a comprehensive matrix of the elements included in heritage conservation capabilities of local government, cities and towns selected, present an idea of the challenges faced by local governments in future heritage conservation, and more importantly produce a model with which any future research can assess such capabilities for any South African LM, city or town; last, it was necessary to investigate to see if identified local municipalities meet criteria set out by Heritage Western Cape, who may grant such an authority competency to perform functions in terms of the NHRA (1999).

The research entails a literature review pertaining to cultural heritage conservation, the focus was on tangible heritage, primarily that of the built and urban environment and the compilation of data collected from questionnaires as well as municipal documents found in the public realm. A questionnaire survey was used as the primarily data collection tool. Questions were grouped according to categories. Due to the explorative nature of the research, open-ended questions allowed for themes to emerge.

Considering only two of a potential 24 local municipalities showed evidence to be heritage competent, several recommendations would provide a variety of opportunities for progress towards competency. Given their varying circumstances, local municipalities could find suitable modes to gain authority of their respective local heritage resources. However, while the focus of these recommendations is primarily for local municipalities and their potential partners, they are not limited to these entities.
Furthermore, the PHRA should put into motion efforts to either decentralise its current heritage conservation and management operations or allow for a devolution of power to local municipalities to take place.

Additionally, the establishment of partnerships between constituents and the sharing of resources would greatly assist all parties involved. It is also recommended that heritage-focused volunteer organisations take a strong positioning in heritage conservation and that local municipalities make use of this resource as it is readily available. By forming lasting partnerships with organisations local municipalities can make a stronger presence in the public eye and make heritage more inclusive, as in line with the intentions as set out in the NHRA (South Africa 1999).

Fulfilling the requirements as set out by the NHRA in sections 30(11) and 31(7) and the further conditions as made mandatory by the PHRA, several benefits would be realised for all parties involved. First, local municipalities would gain control over their Grade III built heritage resources. Second, HWC would have pressure reduced as they would have a decreased workload and could refocus resources. And last, if not most importantly, communities to which these resources belong, would have direct access to and benefit from them.

Keywords: heritage conservation, local heritage resource, local municipality, competency. Heritage Western Cape.
**OPSOMMING**

Die Wet op Nasionale Erfenishulpbronne (NEHB) (Suid Afrika 1999) afgekondig in die poging om doeltreffende bewaringsbeginsels daar te stel wat aan die behoeftes van alle Suid-Afrikaners sal voorsien. Die wet maak voorsiening daarvoor dat elke regeringsvlak gesag het oor sy onderskeie erfenishulpbronne. Donaldson (2005) antisipeer dat die waarnemende owerheid, Erfenis Wes Kaap (EWK), waarskynlik in die nabye toekoms onder druk sou verkeer as gevolg van twee redes: eerstens, weens die toenemende erfenishulpbronne (die natuurlike verskynsel van veroudering), tweedens as gevolg van die Provinsiale Erfenis hulpbronowerheid (PEHO) wat in beheer van beide Graad II en III erfenishulpbronne was. Die beheer is van wee die feit dat geen plaaslike munisipaliteit ten volle bekwaam geag word rakende plaaslike erfenishulpbronne nie. Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana (2019) het bevind dat slegs twee plaaslike regerings naamlik Die Stad Kaapstad en Drakenstein Munisipaliteit het hul bevoegde erfenishulpbronne gedeeltelik bygevoeg.

Die navorsing het ten doel om die kapasiteit en bekwaamheid van die plaaslike regering op die gebied van bewaarde erfenisbewaring van nie-metropolitaanse munisipaliteite in die Wes-Kaap, Suid-Afrika, te bepaal. Die insamelings metodiek is deur middel van kwantitatiewe en kwalitatiewe navorsing. Die verskillende navorsingsdoelstellings is eerstens geïdentifiseer om bestaande metodes vir die assessering van vermoë en bekwaamheid te ontwerp of aan te pas. Tweedens, om die vermoë en bekwaamheid van stedelijke erfenisbewaring en -bevoegdheid van elke plaaslike munisipaliteit in die Wes-Kaap te beoordeel (uitgesluit Stad Kaapstad). Die gevolg van die beoordeling is die skep van'n omvattende erfenis-matriks. Die elemente wat ingesluit word in die matriks is die erfenisbewaring vermoës van die plaaslike regering, geselecteerde stede en dorpe. Dit is ten doel dat die matriks sal benadruk die uitdagings waarmee plaaslike regerings in die toekoms gekonfronteer kan word ten opsigte van erfenisbewaring. Die doelstelling is om 'n model te produseer waarmee enige toekomstige navorsing sulke vermoës vir enige Suid-Afrikaanse plaaslike munisipaliteit, stad of dorp kan beoordeel. Laastens was dit nodig om te ondersoek of geïdentifiseerde plaaslike munisipaliteite voldoen aan die kriteria soos uiteengesit deur Erfenis Wes-Kaap, om sodoende plaaslike munisipaliteite wat erfgoedgebiede goedgekeur of voorgestel het, te identifiseer met die nodige beskermende bepalings ingevolge artikel 31(7) van die NEHB wet.

Die navorsing het hoofsaaklik gefokus op die kapasiteit en bekwaamheid van plaaslike regerings in die Wes-Kaap en het rekening gehou met enige erfenisgerigte vrywilligersorganisasies wat in die omgewing werk. Die navorsing behels 'n literatuurstudie met betrekking tot die bewaring van kulturele erfenisse. Die fokus was op tasbare erfenis, hoofsaaklik dié van die beboude en stedelike omgewing en die samestelling van gegewens wat uit vraelyste versamel is, sowel as munisipale
dokumente wat in die openbare publiek gevind is. 'n Vraelys met kwantitatiewe en kwalitatiewe vrae is gebruik as die eerste data insameling. Vrae is volgens temas gegroepeer, met kwantitatiewe vrae wat opgevolg is met kwalitatiewe vrae. Vanweë die ondersoekende aard van die navorsing, het die kwalitatiewe vrae dit moontlik gemaak om temas na vore te bring.

In ag genome dat slegs twee van die potensiële 24 plaaslike munisipaliteite bewys kon lewer dat hulle erfenisbevoeg is, sal die navorsings aanbevelings geleenthede bied om bevoegdheid te bevorder. Gegewe wisselende omstandighede, moes plaaslike munisipaliteite gesikte maniere vind om gesag te kry oor hul onderskeie plaaslike erfenishulpbronne. Alhoewel die fokus van hierdie aanbevelings hoofsaaklik op plaaslike munisipaliteite en hul potensiële vennotes val, is dit nie eksklusief aan die entiteite nie. Vervolgens moet pogings aangewend word deur die (PEHO) om sy huidige erfenisbewaring en bestuursbedrywighede te desentraliseer of om toe te laat dat die mag aan plaaslike munisipaliteite oorgedra word.

Die stigting van vennootskappe tussen kiesers, asook, deel van erfenis hulpbron, onder andere, sal tot groot voordeel wees van alle betrokke partye. Daar word ook voorgestel dat erfenisgerigte vrywilligersorganisasies n meer prominente rol moet speel in die bewaring van erfenis dit het die gevolg dat plaaslike munisipaliteite vrywilligersorganisasies kan dan as hulpbron gebruik word en het die voordeel dat dit reeds beskikbaar en bekwaam is. Deur middel van volhoubare vennootskappe met organisasies, kan plaaslike munisipaliteite 'n sterker teenwoordigheid in die publieke opinie hê,erfenis kan gevolglik meer inklusief wees. Dit is dan ook in ooreenstemming met die bedoelings soos uiteengesit in die Wet op Nasionale Erfenishulpbronne (Suid Afrika 1999).

'n Aantal voordele, vir alle betrokke partye, kan realiseer as daar aan die vereistes voldoen word soos uiteengesit deur die NEHB wet, met spesifieke verwysing na artikels 30 (11) en 31 (7), asook die verdere voorwaardessos voorgeskryf deur die PEHO. Ten eerste, sal plaaslike munisipaliteite beheer kry oor hul Graad III - geboude erfenishulpbronne. Tweedens sal die druk op Erfenis Wes-Kaap verminder aangesien daar n vermindere werkslading op Erfenis Wes-Kaap sal wees. Die gevolg is dat Erfenis Wes-Kaap hulle aandag op meer sensitiewe erfenis gebiede kan vestig. Laastens en heel moontlik die belangrikste voordeel, wat voorsien word, is dat gemeenskappe, waaraan die erfenis hulpbronne behoort, direkte toegang tot hulpbronne sal hê en daarby baat vind om inklusief betrokke te wees.

Trefwoorde: erfenisbewaring, plaaslike erfenishulpbron, plaaslike munisipaliteit, bevoegdheid, Erfenis Wes-Kaap.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
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<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-WWAP</td>
<td>United Nations World Water Assessment Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1 HERITAGE CONSERVATION: FROM CULTURAL LANDSCAPES TO LOCAL RESOURCES

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The initial, simplistic acts of heritage, of transmitting an idea, a culture, a way of life from one generation to the next is an inevitable part of life. Heritage conservation has made strides from the pastime of a few enthusiasts to a formalised concept and practice promulgated by the public sector and of late, to a profession and dedicated area of study. Harvey (2008) maintains that heritage is a constantly developing process of power relations, with an endless struggle as to how heritage is consumed in contemporary society. Although the concept of heritage is described as a present action shaped by the past (Tunbridge & Ashworth 1996), Smith (2006) builds on this idea by describing heritage as a process, informed by the past and being context driven. Harvey (2008) contends that the very definition of heritage changes continually, as it is context specific, not just in physical place but also in time. Consequently, the definition of heritage is conditional to context.

In the global context of the modern world, Lowenthal (2005) posits that inherited practices and assets come from two areas of an immediate environment, namely the natural environment and that which is man-made and so referred to as cultural heritage. The concept of cultural heritage is derived from the ways of living, developed by communities, including all physical assets and knowledge systems (ICOMOS 2002) with the fundamental theme of information (Feather 2006). Cultural heritage is part of the broader concept of the cultural landscape and it is a multifaceted social phenomenon consisting of both tangible and intangible components. Bouchenaki (2003) and Tweed & Sutherland (2007) argued that one of these components cannot exist without the other and are therefore, inextricably linked. Smith (2006), however, holds that tangible heritage does not exist and is merely a tangible product of an intangible action.

Notwithstanding these contentions, currently, the practice and policy of heritage conservation is regularly categorised into these two major components. Tangible components comprise movable assets such as objects and artefacts as well as immovable assets such as buildings and structures. By contrast intangible heritage, also known as living heritage, comprises oral traditions, performing arts, social practices, knowledge systems, traditional craftsmanship (UNESCO 2003), popular memory and the holistic approach to nature, society and social relationships (South Africa 1999).

Given the progressive movement away from the preservation of individual monuments towards the recognition and conservation of entire landscapes, there has been an increasing inclusion of the heritage that is important to local communities. These “small heritages”, a term coined by Harvey (2008), promote the inclusion of this larger group of heritage resources, compared to those
categorised to be of national importance, a smaller group by volume but greater in stature. The former form part of a localised heritage, part of the everyday, on which much attention, policy and application are focused (Harvey 2008). Furthermore, these local heritage resources should be managed by the lowest level of government as they have the potential for the closest contact with immediate communities, also referred to as shareholders (Deacon 2015).

The history of heritage, a narrative, often told in chronological order (Harvey 2008), is subjective and therefore liable to be different from every point of view. Heritage has been subjected to a formalisation of conservation principles at the international level starting in the mid-20th century with the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964). This charter provided principles that protect architectural heritage buildings and sites by aiding in their conservation and restoration. The growth in scope is evident in international documents and national policies which are now more inclusive than ever before, now involving the protection of not only buildings and sites, but landscapes, environments, social factors and intangible aspects too. The importance of a cultural landscape as described by Todeschini (2011) highlighting the inter-relationship between that of the man-made and the natural landscape. Todeschini (2011) makes correlations to that of Smith (2006) that a cultural landscape, reflecting of social, economic, technical and aesthetics values, is present, and that it “is never finished and always remains in a ‘state of becoming’.”

1.2 RESEARCH PROBLEM: THE UNCERTAINTY OF COMPETENCY OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGARDING HERITAGE CONSERVATION

The National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) makes provision for the conservation of South Africa’s heritage resources to occur at all levels of government (South Africa 1999). The framework in which the governmental structure works is one of overlapping spheres, so allowing interrelationships to develop between these various levels of government. The fundamental premise is that heritage conservation occurs at the lowest level of governance in a country, that is at the local municipal level.

In South Africa however, in the spheres of local government (metropolitan, district and local municipalities) only two of 278 municipalities have been granted partial jurisdiction over their Grade III or local heritage resources (Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana 2019). The nature of Grade III or local heritage resources are that they are the most abundant and less scarce but possesses cultural value for a small select community. Furthermore, these two municipalities, namely City of Cape Town (metropolitan) and Drakenstein (local), are both located in the Western Cape province. This begs the question why only two?
The situation in the Western Cape that hardly any local municipalities have authority over their Grade III heritage resources means that the onus falls on the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PHRA), Heritage Western Cape (HWC), to maintain these resources. However, as pointed out by Donaldson (2005) the PHRA is likely to come under strain soon due to increased workload and insufficient capacity. Furthermore, insights gained by the author from participation as a volunteer for the Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation (SHF) and the Heritage Association of South Africa (HASA), as well as attendance of various meetings held by HWC confirmed this sentiment. A meeting with the PHRA (Heritage Western Cape 2019 Pers com) reinforced this observation when it became clear, that the PHRA is overwhelmed by the large volumes of heritage resource applications the authority has received.

As the NHRA makes provision for the devolution of power to the lowest level of government, Deacon (2015) points out that this is where the closest contact with communities takes place, therefore justifying their inclusion at a local government level. Thus, one can expect that a wide range of capabilities and capacities of local municipalities in the Western Cape regarding heritage conservation of Grade III resources are present. But there is genuine uncertainty about the status of urban heritage conservation at local municipal level as well as the capability, capacity and competency of local municipalities regarding the conservation of built heritage. Ultimately, the problem presented to this research is to get an understanding of the competency of local authorities to conserve built heritage in the Western Cape.

Some general remarks made at a regional meeting held at Stellenbosch in 2019 (Heritage Western Cape Pers com 2019) the rational for this research. The NHRA was promulgated 20 years ago and one of the Act’s most noted benchmarks is that buildings aged of 60 or older would enjoy the protection of the Act. Donaldson (2005) pointed out a fundamental problem with this standard, now two decades after the establishment of the Act there is likely to be an overwhelming increase in the number of buildings eligible for heritage status. This raises two new issues that have to be resolved, namely first, the dynamic nature of society and therefore the need for an updating a dynamism in policy making and second what will the new benchmark be by which we measure built heritage. More recently HWC, held a regional meeting (June 2019) with various stakeholder bodies (Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation, Stellenbosch Interest Group, Paarl 360 and others of the Cape Winelands District) it was announced that part of the progress in legislation was to give more power to the local authorities. This would have two benefits as it would alleviate the overwhelming burden placed on the provincial government and allow local communities to have more say in heritage conservation.

A suitable aim and corresponding objectives were devised to investigate this challenge.
1.3 RESEARCH AIM AND OBJECTIVES

The aim of this research is to assess the capability and competency of local government regarding the conservation of built heritage by non-metropolitan municipalities in the Western Cape, South Africa. The study has five objectives, namely

1. Undertake an extensive literature search and provide a review of current policy and themes in the discourse on urban heritage conservation.
2. Devise or modify existing methods of assessment of municipal capability and competency.
3. Assess the capabilities and competencies of each local municipality (LM) in the Western Cape (excluding the City of Cape Town) regarding the conservation of urban heritage.
4. Create a comprehensive matrix of the elements comprising the heritage conservation capabilities of selected local governments, cities and towns, determine the challenges facing local governments in the field of urban heritage conservation: and produce a model with which to assess these capabilities of any South African LM, city or town.
5. Investigate whether local municipalities meet the criteria set by Heritage Western Cape (HWC), for the granting of such an authority competency to perform functions in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) of 1999.

The PHRA has the authority to deem a subordinate authority competent should they meet predetermined criteria. This will involve the identification of (i) local municipalities have approved or proposed heritage areas with the necessary protective provisions in terms of section 31(7) of the NHRA in place; (ii) local municipalities have approved inventories (which in the case of local authorities may be partially approved) which may be used by HWC to select sites to be protected as Grade III on the Register (the official document pertaining to local heritage resources and their respective gradings, as per section 30(11) of the Act); (iii) local municipalities have administrative staff, (considering the size of each local authority) who will be responsible for processing applications for permits under the NHRA. In the case of small local authorities it may not be possible to have a dedicated heritage officer, a role probably performed by another official; and (iv) local municipalities have a committee which may comprise officials and persons sourced from outside the local authority with the requisite expertise to assess and decide on applications (this should be in compliance with section 10 of the Act).

Considering the above-mentioned aim and subsequent objectives, it would be necessary to collect information available in the public domain as well as essential to contact local and provincial government in the Western Cape for supplementary information. It will be necessary to identify other
parties involved in the conservation of heritage resources in the province. The following methods were used in the effort of reaching the above objectives.

1.4 METHODS

In absence of any similar study conducted elsewhere the designing of the research procedures proved to be challenging, especially in having to conduct the research during the COVID-19 pandemic and national lockdown. Heritage conservation of the built environment at a local government in South Africa has received little attention in the literature. Because this study attempted to better understand the practices implemented and efforts made by local municipalities and their communities to protect their built urban heritage resources a suitable tool was needed. As the investigation aimed to assess first the capabilities of local government to then determine their competency regarding conservation of built heritage, therefore, a wide variation of capabilities and competencies was anticipated. As the nature of this investigation was exploratory, a questionnaire survey provided an appropriate method to obtain information from each municipality, as a respondent from each municipality was asked a series of questions with the option of either yes or no. Further detailed explanations were asked in follow up questions depending on the previously selected answer.

The electronic questionnaire survey proved useful for several reasons and in addition, considerations needed to be made due to the current COVID-19 protocol. First, the electronic questionnaire survey allowed the researcher to reach each municipality respondent without physically having to go to each municipality throughout the province. Second, it was necessary to limit physical contact with respondents and an electronic tool satisfied this. Third, each municipality respondent was able to answer the questionnaire survey at a time that suited them best. Fourth, many municipalities were either working remotely or on a shift-type basis to limit in person contact at their respective municipalities. Therefore, an electronic questionnaire survey proved useful again, as they were not always available at their office for a phone call and an email address was their other form of contact. And last, this method of data collection was also the least costly to the researcher.

The data collection, research processes and data analysis are discussed in the following subsections.

1.4.1 Data collection

A useful model questionnaire was found in a survey conducted by the Australian Department of Planning and Development (Heritage Victoria 2012) and it was adapted for the South African context. The purpose of the adapted questionnaire was to elicit information about the capacity of a LM regarding the management of heritage conservation within its area. In the realm of cultural heritage conservation, the focus was on tangible heritage, primarily that of the built and urban environment.
The questionnaire was structured to collect qualitative data (see Appendix A for an example of the questionnaire). Questions were initiated with a compulsory closed-ended question followed by one or more explanatory questions depending on the previous answer. The explanatory questions allowed for the municipal respondent to give more information on their previous answer. Some parts of the questionnaire had closed-ended questions to differentiate between municipalities. In these sections of the questionnaire, if a municipality respondent selected yes as an answer, subsequent questions were asked which required municipality respondents to provide supplementary information. If a municipality respondent selected no, the municipality respondent was directed to the next section of the questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire was divided into four parts and each part distributed was separately, so as not to overwhelm the participants. Each part addressed a specific theme, namely knowledge (knowing), protection (protecting), support and communication (supporting and communicating) and promotion (promoting). The number of questions per part ranged between 11 and 25 questions, all with one or two follow-up questions. The entire questionnaire survey consisted of 187 questions. Because the study was explorative, the qualitative questions allowed for new themes, categories and relationships to emerge for investigation. The questionnaire was administered by using Google Forms.1 The link to each of the four parts of the questionnaire was sent to all respondents via email. Consent was required at the beginning of each part of the questionnaire and was given by the participant answering a closed-ended question. The participant was only able to continue with the questionnaire if they gave consent. Upon the participant submitting the questionnaire all the responses were automatically located on the Google Drive cloud service and answers were then tabulated in online spreadsheets, Google Sheets.

As municipality respondents agreed to participate voluntarily, they were assured anonymity to protect their privacy. Each municipality respondent was only required to identify which LM they represented.

1.4.2 The research processes

Twenty-four local municipalities in the Western Cape were identified and contact details obtained from the respective municipality websites. A spreadsheet was created to categorise and store all relevant contact information. Each LM was contacted, and a suitable prospective respondent was

1 The Google Forms questionnaire survey links are: https://forms.gle/DgT7V6FLE9tv7GtH8; https://forms.gle/DTbMXLtifek3niXg6; https://forms.gle/x3SqmrrqaHoDqguX6 and https://forms.gle/GAftsn4iAH121Aht5.
identified, and the person’s email address was confirmed. The nature of the study, survey and questionnaire was briefly explained, and any queries were answered. During the initial phone call a good rapport was established with each respondent. This allowed for informal interviewing to occur in follow-up phone calls. All 24 local municipalities committed to participate in the survey by answering the questionnaire. An email was sent to each identified respondent confirming the initial contact phone call and their willingness to participate.

Data collection occurred over a period of six months, from August 2020 to January 2021. Following the emailing of the first part and its submission, subsequent parts were only sent when the previous part had been completed. Follow-up phone calls were made and emails sent to check on the progress made by the respondents and to encourage them to submit their questionnaire parts. During the follow-up phone calls informal interviewing was done and guidance was given (see Appendix B for the interview guide). Notes were made during these phone calls, transcribed later and pseudonyms assigned to assure anonymity. The transcribed interviews served as information for further assessing a LM’s competency regarding the conservation of Grade III resources. Phone calls lasted from five minutes to one hour. A total of seven hours was spent speaking to municipality respondents. Some respondents were very prompt in responding to the survey and did so in a matter of hours while others needed more time due to their work commitments. An exception was made for one municipality, Drakenstein, where the respondent was not able to give explanatory information but was able to answer all closed-ended questions. Data collection continued until the themes, categories and relationships became saturated as no new information was revealed and municipality respondents were no longer willing to respond. All closed-ended questions had a 100% response rate (this was inevitable as these were required for the participant to proceed to the following question). Any subsequent questions to closed-ended questions were not required fields therefore the completion rate varied. In the first half of the survey, parts one and two received 22 and 20 of 24 responses, respectively. In part one of the questionnaire survey, the completion rate of open-ended questions was 91% (187/205). In part two of the questionnaire survey, the completion rate of open-ended questions was 80% (256/321). In second half of the questionnaire survey, parts three and four only received 14 and 15 responses, respectively. In part three of the questionnaire survey, the completion rate of open-ended questions was 81% (101/126). And in part four of the questionnaire survey, the completion rate of open-ended questions was 73% (183/250).

**1.4.3 Data analysis**

As suggested by Veldpaus, Pereira Roders & Colenbrander (2013), content analyses of current legislation in each LM, including integrated development plan (IDPs), spatial development framework (SDFs) and any regulations pertaining to heritage conservation, was also performed.
Words and phrases pertaining to heritage conservation were searched for in both IDP and SDP documents. Various themes, categories and relationships emerged throughout the data collection process. Themes such as budget or finances, skills or expertise, insufficient data or outdated information and a lack of knowledge often presented themselves in the form of constraints or restrictions identified by municipality respondents. Regarding relationships between entities, these varied from non-existent to established. Similarities and differences were found among municipality responses, themes, categories and relationships were tabulated and these were categorised accordingly. The characteristics observed were then described to help understand the nature of the conservation of built heritage Grade III resources at local government level. Figure 1.1 shows the location and extent of local municipalities in the Western Cape. Some of the research findings are tabulated and mapped in Table 4.1 and Figure 4.8, respectively.

1.4.4 Research limitations

There are a few standard limitations related to the study that could affect the validity of its findings, including its small sample size, the location of respondents and only a single a province was considered. South Africa has a total of 278 local municipalities in nine provinces, therefore due to the scope of the study it was not possible or viable for the researcher to investigate all local municipalities. As only one province was considered, other provinces may yield different results due to their context, provincial legislation and local policies. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and national state of disaster, many municipal respondents were not always available at their municipal offices as they were working remotely or on a shift-type basis. Therefore, in some instances, it was found to be difficult to contact a suitable municipal respondent.

The questionnaire survey was divided into four parts and responses diminished as the investigation went on. Part one received 22/24 responses, part two received 20/24 responses. Parts three and four only saw 14/24 and 15/24 responses, respectively. Therefore, the survey administered was not complete. The questionnaire consisted of 187 questions in total. However, all closed-ended questions received a 100% response rate as they were compulsory. Within each part of the questionnaire survey, there was also a decline in response rate to open-ended questions. Part one saw the response rate of open-ended questions at 90.73% (187/205). Part two saw a response rate of open-ended questions at 79.76% (256/321). Part three a response rate of open-ended questions at 80.16% (101/126). And part four saw a response rate of open-ended questions at 73.2% (183/250). Therefore, it could be concluded that the survey tool was too elaborate and that this could have impacted the non- or partial-participation of some municipality respondents. Furthermore, and despite efforts to collect valid data, the development and characterisation of the identified themes sourced from local municipalities may not be accurate. The same or similar results may not be reflected in other local municipalities or
heritage conservation activities at local government level, as the assessment does not consider all local municipalities in all provinces in the country. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, national lockdown and measures taken to limit person-to-person contact, this research was conducted entirely from a remote location, as physical investigation of each municipality was not permitted.

1.5 STUDY AREA

South Africa has three spheres of government, namely national, provincial and local, which are all distinct but interrelated. The structure of local government has three categories of municipality, metropolitan, district and local municipalities. Metropolitan municipalities cover large urban areas, often including a city, while district and local municipalities work in partnership and have jurisdiction of urban areas, towns and rural areas (CLGF 2021). Due to the scope of the study, the researcher living in the Western Cape and HWC being identified as one of three competent PHRAs as assessed by the South African Heritage Resources Authority (SAHRA) in South Africa (Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana 2019), it was reasonable that the Western Cape province was selected as a suitable study area in which to investigate this research problem. There other two identified competent PHRAs are in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and the Eastern Cape.

The Western Cape comprises five district municipalities all having between three to seven local municipalities and there is only one metropolitan municipality in the province. Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana (2019) have identified that only the City of Cape Town (metropolitan) and Drakenstein (local) municipalities have gained partial jurisdiction over their respective Grade III heritage resources. Within the district municipalities local municipalities are second-tier authorities that provide a range of functions, depending on their size (area covered and urban areas included). There is a total of 24 local municipalities in the Western Cape. Only local municipalities were selected for this study, so to enable fair and lateral comparisons. Drakenstein municipality allowed for a potential benchmark to be set for other local municipalities within the province having gained partial competency from the PHRA.
Figure 1.1: Local sphere municipalities in the Western Cape and their distinction among district municipalities.
1.6 RESEARCH DESIGN

Considering the described research problem of the uncertainty of local government competency regarding heritage conservation in South Africa, a suitable research design was sort out. The NHRA stipulates that conservation of heritage resources should take at the lowest possible level of governance in the country, that of local municipal level. Therefore, literature pertaining to urban heritage conservation was surveyed as well as policies and practices implemented by governing authorities. The structure and understanding of municipal governments and their position in the governance system of South Africa was also studied.

As there was uncertainty of local government competency, an exploratory investigation was necessary to better gauge the status of each LM regarding the conservation of Grade III heritage resources in their jurisdiction. An initial research design was created for this study, however, due to changes in data collection owing to the COVID-19 pandemic and national lockdown, some elements of the research design were adapted accordingly, the updated research design is seen in Figure 1.2. From the survey of literature and government policies and taking the research problem into consideration an aim was produced. During this stage, the scope of the study was further defined to the Western Cape province and to only consider local municipalities. Five research objectives were identified to assist in satisfying the exploratory nature of this investigation.

Data collection was initiated and proceeded during a time when the country was moving between various alert levels for the COVID-19 pandemic, therefore, certain protocols needed to be adhered to. As no in person contact could be made, all forms of contact with potential participants were made via phone call and email. From the initial research design, a suitable model questionnaire survey was adapted to the South African context and distributed electronically to all local municipalities in the Western Cape. As in person interviews could not take place, these were handled via phone call.

During the final phase, the information gathered was tabulated and categorised by themes that emerged. Relationships between different parties related to the conservation of Grade III heritage resources were also analysed. Information from the questionnaire survey, interviews and public realm were merged to produce a findings table and map. The findings were discussed in chapter four with recommendations made for provincial and local municipalities and heritage-focused volunteer organisations.

Recommendations were made for future research for progress of conservation of heritage resources at a local municipal level. The research limitations were discussed, and the research design and data collection were critiqued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Literature study</th>
<th>Literature Review: Heritage at a global scale, South African context &amp; relevant policy</th>
<th>Research problem formulation: identified problems in topic, formulate aim and define scope of topic and study area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|         | Research objectives | Formulate research objectives:  
a) Provide an extensive literature review on current policy and themes in urban heritage conservation discourse.  
b) Devise or modify existing methods of assessment of capability and competency.  
c) Assess the urban heritage conservation capability and competency of each local municipality in the Western Cape (excluding City of Cape Town).  
d) Create a comprehensive matrix of the elements included in heritage conservation capabilities of local government, cities and towns selected, present an idea of the challenges faced by local governments in future heritage conservation, and more importantly, produce a model with which any future research can assess such capabilities for any South African local municipality, city or town.  
e) Investigate to see if identified local municipalities meet criteria set out by Heritage Western Cape, who may grant such an authority competency to perform functions in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (1999). |

**Chapter 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Observation and data collection</th>
<th>Confirm scope of study area, local municipalities in the Western Cape, South Africa.</th>
<th>Make contact with all 24 local municipalities in the Western Cape. Confirm participation and confirm contact information.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data collection, via a questionnaire survey. Start processing and categorizing information.</td>
<td>Follow-up on questionnaire survey progress. Follow-up interviews with municipality respondents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description and interpretation</th>
<th>Data analysis, find similarities and differences in information. Categorize themes and relationships and discuss findings.</th>
<th>Themes and relationships tabulated. Description of characteristics observed. Follow-up interviews if necessary. Conclude findings section.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapters 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>Tabulate and map findings, from the discussion and make suitable recommendations for all entities involved in urban heritage conservation.</td>
<td>Link findings back to aim and objectives to establish if these were satisfied. Conclude study and make recommendations for future research. Discuss limitations of the study and critique data collection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 4**

---

**Figure 1.2** Research design for investigating the competency of local government for urban heritage conservation.

The first objective of this study is to search and review literature pertaining to heritage conservation, specifically the conservation and management of local heritage resources, this is done in the following chapter.
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW

Given the ever-changing global situation, it is necessary to understand the position of heritage in this global context and the position of South Africa and its heritage in global context. Urban sprawl and its effects on finite resources (natural and manmade) have captured the attention of researchers in multiple fields. Research contributions on the urban environment comprising economic, social, environmental and heritage aspects all advance the addressing of issues related to resource utilisation and conservation. The purpose of this chapter is to direct attention to the study’s first objective, namely to provide an extensive literature review of current policy and themes in the discourse on urban heritage conservation. A brief outline of what will be covered in the five sections that follow will start off with an overview of a global situation regarding populations in the urban environment and its impact on heritage resources, the ever-changing definition of heritage conservation and the overarching framework of cultural heritage and attributed values. Lastly the conservation of heritage resources in South Africa is looked at, including government policy right down to a local level.

2.1 AN OVERVIEW OF A GLOBAL SITUATION

The United Nations World Water Assessment Programme (UN-WWAP 2015) projects that by the year 2050 the global human population will surpass nine billion people. Considering the current trends in industrialisation, urbanisation, exponential population growth and fluctuating migrant patterns, UN-WWAP (2015) estimates that 70% of the global population will live in urban areas at that time. The report advises that smart development, protection and maintenance resources be implemented to avoid depletion of already strained resources.

The preservation natural of resources on planet Earth has come into the spotlight as humans continue to decimate non-renewable resources and, in the process, contaminate the surrounding environments. Of late, man-made resources, such as cultural heritage, are increasingly being recognised as significant contributors to our environment. The importance of heritage resources is constantly being re-evaluated as it forms part of societal identity and creates a sense of belonging (Ferreira 2007; Ujang & Zakariya 2015). Cultural heritage is considered to be non-renewable resources and therefore worthy of conservation (Kotze & Jansen van Rensburg 2003). Rapid urbanisation, urban development (Western Cape Government 2006) and redevelopment in Africa, and other developing nations have put massive pressure on heritage conservation (Logan 2012; Zhang & Li 2016). In the following subsections the current trends in expansion of urban environments is discussed as well as how South Africa compares to other nations. In subsection 2.1.3 the expansion of heritage conservation is discussed.
2.1.1 Current trends in the expansion of urban environments

According to Maslow’s hierarchy of human needs, it is a fundamental human necessity to find or create shelter to protect oneself. The global population has seen rapid increasing rural-to-urban migration ever since the start of industrialisation in the late 18th century, leading in turn to accelerated urbanisation (Agostini & Cairoli 2008). These urban environments have seen much development of buildings, spreading settlement patterns and the establishments of new communities (Tweed & Sutherland 2007; Throsby 2016).

The world’s population in 2018 was 55% was urbanised, whereas in that year, over 66% of South Africa’s population lived in urban areas (South Africa 2011). The United Nations organisation (UN 2018) estimates that by 2030, 71% of South Africa’s population will live in urban areas, but by comparison, only 54% of Africa’s population will be urbanised by then (UN 2008). Therefore, South Africa will likely see a heightened pressure on heritage resources when compared to other African nations and the world over.

2.1.2 South Africa in the global urban heritage conservation context

Literature on the urban heritage conservation (UHC) discourse identifies a progressive movement from the singular to collective, with a decrease in the proclamation of individual heritage sites and simultaneous increase of heritage landscapes (Rössler 2000; UNESCO 2011). Likewise, the literature confirms that for a nation to formulate successful policy on heritage that fit contemporary society, it is necessary to acknowledge both natural and built environments and not to look at each in isolation (Bandarin 2011). Concerning the context South Africa, Donaldson (2005) identifies three main areas of concern regarding UHC: first, spatial polarisation, second cultural polarisation and third, an increased workload on authorities due to the phenomenon of aging of the built environment.

Furthermore, Donaldson (2005) explains that this problem is likely to increase exponentially in the coming years, so aggravating the currently strained local authorities.

In addition, owing to the increasing diversity and dynamism of migrating populations, a broader understanding or interpretation of cultural heritage is required. Heritage should not be exclusively determined by professionals and experts, but also include input from everyday citizens too. The literature and policies alike reflect a polarisation of Western societies towards a culture of identified tangible resources (Foster et al. 2019), the NHRA was promulgated with this in mind and is slowly trying to rectify this imbalance (South Africa 1999). In South Africa, the conservation of built heritage has been biased to sharply focus on one culture while neglecting all others in the country (Haswell 1986; Donaldson 2005).
This introduces a second theme in the literature and consequent legislation, namely of increased public involvement (Parkinson, Scott & Redmond 2016). This is evident in recent acts and the amendments to national and provincial legislation, the laws of South Africa now requiring the inclusion of citizens as part of legislative procedures (South Africa 2000; Province of the Western Cape 2018; Stellenbosch Municipality 2017). Parkinson, Scott & Redmond (2016) state that the experience of the population is the majority is disproportionate when compared to that of the expert minority, and that the top-down approach of experts writing laws often lack empirical knowledge and is outdated. Ashworth (2011) earlier pointed out the obvious gap between the experts and users of an environment. Furthermore, Wang (2012) observed that in developing nations, there is often a lack of skills and experience in the expert minority when implementing UHC models borrowed from other developed nations.

2.1.3 The evolution of heritage conservation
Ahmad (2006) maintains that the definition of heritage and its significant constituent elements, had greatly changed over the years. A history of the development of the definition of heritage is described, beginning with the benchmark Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964), and more recently including intangible assets (Bouchenaki 2003). International organisations such as UNESCO and ICOMOS have all contributed systematically to a revised definition of heritage and its associated contexts and these, in turn, have influenced and directed national legislation.

However, there was a notable lack of standardisation between nations (Ahmad 2006), but Fredheim & Khalaf (2016) disagree that this is problematic, because the goal is not to find a universal solution but rather to find a better understanding of the conservation of heritage resources in their respective contexts. If the understandings are formalised, it is quite likely that better managed heritage conservation will be achieved (Mason 2002; Verboom & Arora 2013). Bakri et al. (2015) chart various types of values coming from different fields, knowledge and disciplines. What is seen here is that progressively, over more than a century, is a broad range of value attributors, which also show gradual change over time. However, much of these value systems stem from a Western-dominant discourse, as described by Hall (1992), that the idea that societies are developed, industrialised and urbanised, as well as operate in a capitalist system that is secular and modern. Therefore, by creating this value system, allowed for all other societies to be measured against it. Hall (1992) goes on to explain that those who are producing the discourse invariably have power over those who are being represented. Furthermore, it was found that while a Western-dominant discourse had been established inevitable to suit those societal norms, the framework was not necessarily suitable for other societies.

As the case with heritage, an ongoing practice, Authorised Heritage Discourse (AHD) as defined by Smith (2006), is a Western-dominant discourse, or a Eurocentric approach to heritage, has seen
strengthening support from UNESCO from the middle of the previous century, with many
international treaties and frameworks established to better understand the debates of the nature and
value of heritage. This includes its identification, ascribed value, significance, conservation and
therefore, assumed suitable management. AHD has led to a natural range of assumptions about the
nature and meaning of heritage. Even though this has only been articulated this century, this way of
practice has existed for much longer.

As described by Roberts & Cohen (2014), authorising heritage in an official capacity often comes
from governing bodies and that the value of built cultural heritage is assessed by experts pertaining
to explicit criteria (Bakri et al. 2015). As is commonplace with heritage conservation of the built
environment in a Westernised society is that identified resources are put onto an official register. This
authorisation can go further by placing a plaque on the building giving it a grading and even a
statement of significance. Likewise, this gives a built resource official status which also allows it
access to special protective measures, including legal implications. Furthermore, this has the potential
to promote a building’s value (variety of values here).

However, these values, as explained by Smith (2006) are often values from AHD, or that of Western
ideas, and that these values in affect in countries such as, but not limited to, the UK, the USA and
Australia, and by inflicting these values on what is perceived to be valued as heritage, often presents
many conflicting points of view. Tunbridge & Ashworth (1996) echo this sentiment, stating that
dissonance is likely when imposing AHD on all societies. Another type of heritage discourse as
discussed by Roberts & Cohen (2014), in the context of cultural heritage, is self-authorised heritage.
In this mode, heritage is recognised by non-government entities. Again, criteria may be used to
qualify these resources, but it is seen as a democratised heritage.

2.2 UNPACKING THE DEFINITION OF HERITAGE

Smith (2006) and Tweed & Sutherland (2007) agree that the heritage environment has become
progressively complex and they concur that heritage not only includes built structures of increasing
age, but other tangible objects (natural or man-made) too. Therefore, the growth of heritage as a field
of research and practice, as a relevant concept, its range of definitions and the applicable policies is
inevitable. In the following subsections the growing inclusivity of the definition and the broadening
of context is discussed.

2.2.1 Inclusivity of the definition

Although not the focus of this review, it is important to acknowledge the significance of intangible
heritage and its place in the field of heritage conservation. There are varying avenues of thought on
heritage, its importance and its focus (Mason & Avrami 2002; Pendlebury 2013). While heritage is
divided (presumably for ease of categorisation) into tangible and intangible parts, many commentators have made the point that the one part cannot exist without the other. Contrarily, Smith (2006) has unequivocally stated (even noted that many will disagree) that there is no such thing as tangible heritage, only the intangible as heritage is an action not an item.

In the South African context, intangible heritage is also known as living heritage as defined by the NHRA (South Africa 1999). This includes, but not limited to, cultural tradition, oral history, performance, ritual, popular memory, skills, techniques and indigenous knowledge systems (South Africa 1999). Living heritage also includes the holistic approach to nature, societies and societal relationships. Ndlovu (2011) acknowledges that while the NHRA represents and protects the heritage of democratic South Africa, it is more inclusive than previous legislation but considers intangible heritage to be marginalised regarding recognition and rightful conservation.

2.2.2 Incorporating the broader context

While the definition of heritage is continually evolving, so are the concept (see ICOMOS 1964; 2013) and practice (Veldpaus, Pereira Roders & Colenbrander 2013; Poulios 2014). There has been a progressive approach from the preservation and conservation of individual buildings, or singular and isolated monuments and objects to a more collective and holistic approach that promotes the overall conservation of landscape. Cleere (1995) claimed that the term cultural landscape was used to better understand how we perceived and interacted with heritage in surrounding contexts.

Heritage is conventionally divided into two categories, cultural and natural environments. Cultural heritage takes all aspects of heritage that are man-made, such as buildings, structures and objects as well as the processes or actions that are associated or determined by them (Blake 2000; Todeschini 2011). The natural aspect of heritage includes the natural environment which humans did not make, but use in their settlements, agriculture and livelihoods (Lowenthal 2005; Smith 2006). The term landscape creates room for a larger context, therefore allowing heritage not to be limited to a single building or site or piece of land (Aplin 2007). The concept of cultural landscape in human geography was introduced in the early part of the 20th century by Carl Sauer. The concept of historic urban landscapes (HUL) was introduced by the World Heritage Committee (UNESCO 1992) as a framework to better manage and conserve all aspects of heritage and its various environments. The framework challenged how cultural and natural values are viewed and evaluated (Jacques 1995), because the concept of cultural landscape allows for the inclusion of context, both cultural and natural components as well as tangible and intangible aspects.

The integration of heritage conservation with urban growth and development is significant as these previously competing fields are now no longer seen to be in opposition to one another but as working
towards the same goal, merging heritage conservation with sustainable development (Snowball & Courtney 2010). As suggested by Veldpaus, Pereira Roders & Colenbrander (2013), heritage conservation is likely to follow a landscape-based approach in the future and this is already seen in policies introduced at all levels.

The history of heritage in developing countries often follows the precedent set by the colonising nation(s). This has been disputed of late by many researchers questioning if practices from colonisers are effective in true heritage conservation because very little of the native or indigenous techniques or local knowledge systems regarding heritage conservation is taken into consideration (Harvey 2008). This is echoed by Bakri et al. (2015), where their analysis of the multicultural society of Malaysia suggested a re-examination to establish contextual needs and emphasise that this is part of cultural heritage, because it is part of both historical and contemporary ways of life. It is necessary to assess heritage in its context, to better establish its importance and value, which would therefore highlight the importance of its conservation.

2.3 AN OVERARCHING FRAMEWORK OF CULTURAL HERITAGE AND ITS ATTRIBUTED VALUES

Cultural heritage promotes inclusivity of the broader context. In the following subsections cultural landscapes and ascribed values are discussed, including two modes of values-based heritage and living heritage.

2.3.1 Cultural heritage landscapes

Vakhitova (2015) has distinguished cultural heritage as part of the broader concept of cultural landscape and as a multifaceted social phenomenon considering both tangible and intangible components. These two components are closely interwoven and cannot exist in isolation. Lindblom (2007) noted that the European Landscape Convention supports a balanced approach to landscape conservation and development (as these two aspects are often seen as opposites), which is cohesive and multidisciplinary approach. Wider stakeholder participation is required in the process of heritage management owing to the complexities and processes that contribute to the production and shaping of landscapes. These processes include man-made environments and natural environments, and a variety of socio-economic aspects.

Cultural heritage should ideally be incorporated into urban planning. Vakhitova (2015) advocates a cultural landscape approach to the conservation and management of heritage, particularly in the urban environments. Cultural heritage is a developing concept that is continuously being recreated by social processes. Hence, it is dynamic and has countless interpretations. Bouchenaki (2003) notes that local communities are the carriers of traditions and practices which are the intangible aspects of cultural
heritage that inform the physical aspects. Consequently, local communities should have access to the instruments (such as policy) that guard their heritage and they should participate in the processes that formulate the policies. Waterton & Smith (2010) emphasise the importance of the recognition of the informing narrative of a community and connect it to the intangible aspects and physical manifestations that should be given consideration. The intangible aspects of heritage provide a framework in which to place the tangible resources and understand and managed them (Bouchenaki 2003).

Smith (2006) insists that in mapping a landscape all stakeholders should be included, such as individuals (residents) and economic drivers (industry), as well as those who make use of the landscape but not permanently, such as tourists (individuals but also economic drivers). The involvement of communities which are stakeholders of the landscape is of great importance because they can best identify their cultural heritage values. It is noteworthy that even the process of stakeholder participation can contribute to the cultural heritage, as this is a formulation of new rituals and possibly even new physical aspects (Smith 2006).

2.3.2 Varying significance, values and valuation of cultural heritage resources

The values attributed to heritage and heritage valuations have changed over time. A comparison of heritage values and uses shows that they have been structured differently over the years. Although Ahmad (2006) notes a lack of standardisation and lack of continuity in heritage legislation between nations, this could simply be due to uniqueness of place and context. The increase in the value of heritage and the movement towards values-based thinking have made cultural heritage more complex but they have led to a broader participant base in the decision-making processes concerning heritage conservation and management.

The term cultural significance has diverse definitions but is most often defined as the various values associated with a place and helps in the understanding of the importance of a place (Worthing & Bond 2008). Often, comparisons are made between the points of view of Burra Charter (ICOMOS 1999) and the Getty Conservation Institute (Avrami, Mason & De la Torre 2000) when defining cultural significance. The former uses a values-based approach to cultural significance, wherein value is established on the basis of aesthetic, historic, scientific, social or spiritual criteria. The definition used by the Getty Conservation Institute (Avrami, Mason & De la Torre 2000) is premised on the viewpoint that values are found in the activities when using a tangible resource and not on the tangible resource itself. Therefore, the tangible only holds value because of the activities (Vakhitova 2015).

Swanwick (2002) evaluates a person’s or community’s interaction with a place by creating landscape values based on natural, cultural (social), perceptual and aesthetic factors. The natural contributions
come from soil, air, climate, landform and geology. Cultural contributions constitute land use, settlement patterns and enclosures; and perceptual and aesthetic contributions are memories, associations, preferences, touch, feel and sound. In each of these there are also contributions specifically from sight based on colour, texture, pattern and form. All of these are partly responsible for the make-up of landscapes and how they are interpreted. These contributors are not perceived in isolation but rather as being interrelated.

Values also have a temporal scale that Mason (2006) describes as the historic values associated with conservation that give a sense of place associated with artistic, historical, scientific and archaeological factors. These are compared with contemporary values which have economic benefits, recreation opportunities and health benefits. Economic values are measured in monetary terms and which have quantitative values, while cultural values are understood in narrative terms and therefore have qualitative values. Mason (2006) maintains that cultural conservation should be a political engagement of planning and design and must be a combined effort of conservation and development. Ultimately, conservation is to embrace economic valuation. This merging together of traditional and contemporary values is complex and compounds the difficulty in assessing the total value of the historic built environment. In addition, this complexity is heightened as the varying values of stakeholders also come to the fore.

It is evident that concept of cultural heritage is a remarkable and complex concept. Ismail, Masron & Ahmad (2014), for example define three parts, namely natural environment, built environment and artefacts. It is also understood that cultural heritage is not made up only of the tangible but also of intangible components such as societal structures, traditions, values and religious practices and belief systems. Its values have been identified and variously defined over time, in research, international charters and national policy documents.

**2.3.3 Values-based heritage**

The Burra Charter (ICOMOS 1999) has, since 1979, been promoted by international organisations and adopted in many national policies as a value-based approach to heritage conservation, especially in the present century. The values attributed to heritage conservation are determined by time, place and people. The ascribed heritage values hold much significance and therefore the values-based approach aims to identify, sustain and enhance the importance of these heritage values (Fredheim & Khalaf 2016). However, these values are not fixed as they are influenced by time, place and people, which are dynamic in nature (Mason 2006) and require constant re-evaluation to best fit a particular society. This is confirmed by Bakri et al. (2015) who show that over time there are changes in applied values resulting in a suitable change in legislation.
Recall, Ahmad’s (2006) remarks noted in 2.1.3 that when comparing international charters and national policies a lack of standardisation is evident, even when the standard of a values-based approach is used. However, Fredheim & Khalaf (2016) do not see this as being a problem, because the goal is a universal solution but a better understanding of each individual case. If the understandings are formalised, it is quite likely that better managed heritage conservation will be achieved.

While Mason (2006) defined the temporal scales of heritage values as historic and contemporary, he later described these historic values as being traditional (Mason 2008). The traditional values are created over long periods and they characteristically have value in artistic, historical, scientific and archaeological components. Contemporary values have emerged more recently and the value resides in economic, social and natural environmental factors, where one is not more important than another. The values-based approach promotes equity of values and the associated communities regarding heritage resources, therefore there is fairness and no hierarchy. This can become an issue because values and stakeholders cannot be prioritised one above another. The appropriate management of heritage resources according to a values-based management of heritage as defined by Worthing & Bond (2008), requires the identification, measurement and protection of heritage resources as well as the enhancement of cultural significance.

2.3.4 Living heritage sites

The first two decades of the 21st century has seen the proposals (Poulios 2010) of the concept of living heritage sites because the values-based approach is held to be unsuited to sites that are deemed living heritage. The concept of a living heritage site, as defined by Poulios (2010), requires a site to maintain its original function. This is achieved if spatial definition and arrangement of the site are maintained and respond to changes in the surrounding society. The concept embodies other essential requirements, like continuity, change and a core community, to be met for a site to be deemed a living heritage. This approach to heritage conservation centres on actions, activities and practices on, around and associated with the site in question. Poulios (2010) advocated the concept to attend to weaknesses of the values-based approach.

The concept of living heritage sites identifies a community as having the closest relationship with a site and makes them the priority stakeholder. The concept also suggests that the management of a site follows traditional methods and not necessarily those of Western or Eurocentric views (Poulios 2011). An important additional value, but one that has a questionable definition as a contested concept is authenticity. The Western definition of authenticity is rooted in the past and associated with the tangible fabric of the site. Authenticity in respect to living heritage sites requires a present action
(intangible heritage) that has continuously been with the site and refers to the community’s association with the site.

2.4 HERITAGE CONSERVATION AT LOCAL LEVEL

The reality in South Africa, and many other previously colonised nations, is that the culture and the operations of heritage conservation have often and most likely still are, those of the colonising power and tainted with Eurocentric subjectivity. This has often led to entire cultures being disregarded as the artefacts of minority cultures were not conserved because their value was regarded as negligible. Moreover, heritage in minority cultures was, and still is, intangible by nature, something the Eurocentric culture did not observe or find any value in it (Deacon 2020). Consequently, such heritage was more likely to be disregard.

The democratic government of South Africa aimed to rectify such wrongs by implementing national legislation that allows for a seamless integration of national, provincial and local governments, and for inclusive practices in heritage conservation. The devolution of power goes right down to the lowest level of government, namely local municipalities, which have the closest contact with communities so enabling inclusion and interaction in the conservation of their heritage resources (Deacon 2015). It is assumed that heritage conservation is best accomplished at a local level. This is in line with the definition offered by the Council of Europe (2006) whereby heritage is described as a resource that a community identifies with, although not necessarily owning it, and has some form of stakeholder value. The heritage is part of the public realm and because it contributes to the greater context, it is an essential part of the landscape.

2.4.1 International influences

There is a multitude of international documents and standardisations for nations to draw from to create, amend and update their policies on heritage conservation. Albeit that the concept of heritage conservation was first mooted in the late 18th century, the more noticeable and landmark international policies appeared after the advent of the Athens Charter in 1931 that created a standardisation for the restoration of historic monuments (ICOMOS 1931). The Hague Convention in 1954 generated procedures to safeguard cultural resources for nations in armed conflict (UNESCO 1954), and the Venice Charter (ICOMOS 1964) ten years later, established a set of principles that standardised the restoration and conservation of monuments. Nearly a decade later in 1972 at their General Conference held in Paris, UNESCO defined both cultural and natural heritage resources and proclaimed that they be conserved as such, noting here that their conservation was to be done separately (UNESCO 1972). The Burra Charter was first adopted (1979) on the premise that places of cultural significance should be conserved with due consideration given to the tangible and intangible features of a place. The
charter is updated periodically in line with current theory and cultural heritage management practices that are applicable to contemporary environments (ICOMOS 2013).

Considering the steady progression toward a more inclusive approach seen in theoretical developments, the World Heritage Convention (UNESCO 1992) released the first international legal instrument with the purpose of identifying and protecting cultural landscapes, and with an emphasis on the idea that there are many aspects that contribute to heritage and its conservation. UNESCO (2011) advanced the concept of historic urban landscape (HUL) so creating an instrument in which heritage resources are regarded as contributors to a greater landscape that is dynamic owing to the economic, cultural and social forces that impact on it. The HUL framework was implemented to allow for a cohesive and symbiotic relationship between heritage conservation and socio-economic development, hence moving away from the notion that these two parts of the urban landscape are in opposition to one another.

In the development of theory regarding heritage resources and the identification, grading, management and framework in which heritage conservation is implemented, much of which was done in a Eurocentric manner. Many countries that were colonised, still have strong colonial influences in the procedures concerning heritage conservation. South Africa is no exception. In 1994 when South Africa entered democracy, the World Heritage Committee released the Nara Document on Authenticity (ICOMOS 1994). One of the prominent criteria for a heritage resource to be listed on the World Heritage List is authenticity. The Nara Document on Authenticity created a new approach to authenticity and tested the assessment of authenticity. It concluded that deep and full respect must be given to the context in which a heritage resource is found, including the social and cultural values in the resource’s location. The charter acknowledged that due to the nature of a globalising world, values had become homogenised and this was an increasingly unfair practice that impinges on the value of minority, non-Western or non-Eurocentric cultures. Ultimately, the responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of cultural resources should be done by the community from which they originate (ICOMOS 1994).

2.4.2 Conservation of built heritage conservation

In the many discussions and debates on the definition of heritage, much is remarked about the concept’s inclusivity, but one attribute stands out, that is the utmost importance of the surrounding context. Thus, when assessing the built heritage of South Africa, it is imperative to discuss and consider the values associated with the heritage and how these are measured. First and foremost is reference to the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), which defines all values but even with these definitions close at hand ascertaining the value of a heritage resource remains a complex, lengthy and delicate task.
Because built heritage is often given a quantitative value, particularly age, the NHRA stipulates that any building, structure or site over the age of 60 years is eligible for protection (South Africa 1999). The Act was promulgated over 20 years ago and, as Donaldson (2005) notes, this will become an issue as vast numbers of buildings, even entire suburbs, gain this protective status solely based on age. Therefore, it is possible that what was suitable then is not the best solution now.

2.4.3 National government and policies
South Africa has an exceptional collective heritage made up of a multitude of nations and cultures coming together to form the so-called Rainbow Nation. The NHRA (South Africa 1999) declares that the safeguarding of this heritage is given immense value in society, in that national policy stipulates that heritage should be conserved for current and future generations. The protection of heritage is important not only for those who wish to visit and experience the country, but more so for all who live in and call South Africa home. The NHRA and its management organisation, the South Africa Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA), oversee all national heritage resources and give directives to all subordinate (provincial and local) heritage policy and management organisations.

The NHRA was written to create and make useful a management system for the national heritage resources of the Republic of South Africa. This Act is preceded by many acts from previous governments. In alignment with the Constitution of the country, the Act promotes the inclusion of all the cultures of the country as well as the restoration of imbalances and unfairness that were previously prevalent. The NHRA recognises that the heritage resources of South Africa are unique and finite. Hence, it is imperative that these resources are conserved for the use by and enjoyment of current and future generations. Heritage is conceived as being part of the nation’s identity and a contributor to its overall character and unity. The Act not only validates and conserves heritage of a tangible nature, but also recognises the rich intangible heritages that were previously overlooked. SAHRA was established as part of the mandate of NHRA to manage the national heritage resources of South Africa.

The country’s history over the past century has seen a progressive development in South African law with respect to the conservation of built heritage. Some of these developments run parallel to developments reported in the international literature on the same topic. The body of law has moved away from the exclusive conservation for the minority of people to the inclusive conservation for everyone. There is a movement away from individual monuments towards landscapes and entire areas that are important to communities and cultures. Most recently there has been an increased need to include the public in a participatory method when deciding on how to conserve and use heritage resources. The public participatory process (PPP) is now embodied in many legislative processes and is not limited to those of heritage conservation.
The NHRA is bound to standardise norms of protection and conservation of the nation’s heritage. A quantitative measure used by the NHRA to include buildings or the built environment as part of the heritage register requires these buildings to be over the age of 60 years. Other qualitative measures used to categorise buildings, places and landscapes are historical settlements, townscapes, architectural significance, rarity, aesthetic characteristics, degree of creativity, technical achievement and association to a cultural group.

The three spheres of government, national, provincial and local, are mandated to make sure that these practices are carried out and are of benefit all South Africans. The NHRA and SAHRA oversee all national heritage resources, collectively categorised as Grade I heritage. The provincial heritage resource authorities recognised by NHRA and SAHRA oversee all provincial heritage resources which are categorised as Grade II heritage resources. Local or district municipalities are liable for all Grade III heritage resources. Local and district municipalities need to be certified competent by the provincial minister to be allowed jurisdiction over their own local heritage resources. The NHRA specifies that if a metropolitan, local or district municipality is not authorised to maintain its heritage resources, the responsibility falls on the superior authority.

The Municipal Systems Act (South Africa 2000) promotes the involvement of communities in the conservation of their heritage and makes provision for local municipalities to take ownership of and the responsibility for managing their local heritage resources. Again, this aligns closely with the international literature that attests to an increase in public participation, reported for example by Parkinson, Scott & Redmond (2016). This Act makes provision for local municipalities to gain capacity and take control of their own heritage resources.

2.4.4 Provincial government operations

Each of the nine provinces in South Africa has its own PHRA and these are set up in accordance with the NHRA. Two provinces, namely KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) and Northern Cape, have their provincial heritage authority established differently to the other seven provinces. These two have chosen to have a provincial act to govern the heritage resources of their respective provinces. A Member of Executive Council (MEC) may establish a PHRA in a province and the agency is responsible for the heritage resources in that province. This may, but not necessarily, include immovable heritage, movable heritage (tangible heritage such as objects), living heritage (intangible heritage), museums and interpretation centres, as each authority declares its own sphere of jurisdiction.

Heritage Western Cape (HWC) and six other provincial heritage bodies from other provinces carry out conservation of heritage resources at a provincial level, whereby each provincial authority executes the requirements of the NHRA in its jurisdiction. KZN and Northern Cape have their own
provincial legislation. According to the 1996 Constitution of the South Africa (South Africa 1996), the powers given to provincial authorities allow each one to pass a constitution and subsequent acts for a province. This empowers each province, if they so choose, to pass a provincial act for heritage resources (or any other), provided it is in keeping with the national Constitution. The Constitution also allows provincial authorities to bestow legislative powers on municipal councils. The NHRA makes provision whereby local authorities are encouraged to take responsibility for their local heritage.

2.4.4.1 Provincial legislation for heritage resources

KZN has a provincial heritage act which predates the NHRA by two years. As stipulated in the provincial KZN Heritage Act of 1997 a council was appointed, namely the Amafa aKwaZulu Natali (Amafa). The 1997 provincial act was repealed by the provincial heritage act in 2008 (Province of KwaZulu-Natal 2008). The agency responsible for maintaining KZN’s databases of heritage sites, artefacts and living heritage in the province is Amafa, and is also responsible for conveying this information to the national agency, SAHRA. KZN’s database is included in the national database South African Heritage Resources Information Systems (SAHRIS). Although Amafa can award a site heritage status, there is a subtle difference in the heritage status given to sites in the province. If a site is not owned by the provincial or local government it is given what is termed heritage landmark status (HLS), and if a site is owned by the provincial or local government it is given provincial landmark status (PLS). These are listed as sections 38 and 39 respectively in the Provincial Heritage Act and both receive the same special protection as required by the provincial act.

The KZN provincial government stipulates that the identification of provincial heritage must be done by local authorities. The provincial act also stipulates that the district municipalities of KZN are responsible for the heritage resources in their areas. Municipalities are required to engage with their local communities to identify and nominate heritage sites to the Amafa council. The council and communities work closely together to erect identification markers at each of these heritage sites.

PHRA like that of KZN is the Northern Cape Heritage Resources Authority Act (NCHRAA) of 2013 as passed by the Northern Cape Provincial Legislature. This council, in accordance with the PRHA, governs heritage resources of the Northern Cape, including their protection, conservation and uses, as well as the operation of the council.

Currently, of the nine provinces in South Africa only three PHRA have full competency over their heritage resources, the remaining six all having only partial competency. HWC is one of the three competent provincial authorities. Two local authorities within HWC’s jurisdiction have applied for competency at a local level, namely City of Cape Town, a metropolitan municipality and Drakenstein Municipality, a local authority (Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana 2019).
2.4.4.2 Heritage conservation in the Western Cape

In 2003 the Western Cape province (Western Cape Government 2019a) established its PHRA, Heritage Western Cape, in accordance with the NHRA. HWC is responsible for the protection, conservation and management of heritage resources of the province, and is overseen by the provincial Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport. The council of HWC has established committees to better fulfil the mandate set out by national legislation. One of several committees is the Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom) that specifically concentrates on permit applications made for buildings older than 60 years. These applications include additions to, alterations and demolitions of built heritage resources. Other areas of expertise are used to evaluate activities affecting provincial heritage sites (PHS), heritage areas, public monuments and memorials, as well as proposals regarding heritage resource management with the use of the National Environment Management Act (NEMA) (South Africa 1998).

As noted by the Western Cape’s Minister of Culture Affairs and Sport, the department has with the help of HWC, made considerable efforts and progressed to systematically improve the rate at which heritage resources are identified, conserved, protected and promoted throughout the Western Cape (Western Cape Government 2019b). It is noteworthy that this shows that attention has been given only to the resources themselves and not to the bodies that handle these, such as local municipalities which could ably assist the provincial authority in its cause.

HWC held a public meeting in February 2018 with the intention to further define a newly passed bill that promotes greater public participation. It transpired that it was easier for HWC to add definitions to the bill rather than to redo legislation as the latter is a lengthy process. The official HWC statement reads that:

This public entity seeks to identify, protect and conserve the rich and diverse heritage resources of the Western Cape. There are landscapes, sites, artefacts, buildings and structures that are of significance to the people of the Western Cape. Identifying, protecting and conserving these heritage resources will ensure that they are promoted and conserved for generations to come.

(Heritage Western Cape Pers com 2018)

2.4.5 Local authorities

According to the Western Cape government’s website, local authorities are responsible for heritage resource management of Grade III resources (Western Cape Government 2019b). The NHRA stipulates that a local municipality (LM) is required to compile an inventory of heritage resources within its jurisdiction. This is emphasised by HWC and it requires that each municipality submit their
inventory to the PHRA for approval and grading (Heritage Western Cape 2016). In addition to the municipality submitting an inventory, any person is permitted to submit a request to have a heritage resource included on the heritage register. However, if a local authority cannot compile a heritage resource register, the responsibility falls on the provincial authority (South Africa 1999).

Heritage resources can receive protection in a number of ways, such as identification and listing of a resource on a register, a resource falling inside a declared heritage conservation zone or a resource falling inside a heritage overlay zone as per the local municipal by-laws. At the regional meeting held in Stellenbosch, 21 June 2019 (Heritage Western Cape 2019 Pers com) it was said that HWC gives preference to designated heritage areas compared to overlay zones

2.4.5.1 Protected areas

Previously, conservation areas were established in accordance with the NHRA (South Africa 1999) but these were changed to heritage areas aligned with the Land Use and Planning Ordinance (LUPO) of 1985. LUPO was only applicable in the Cape Province and was subsequently repealed in the Western Cape and replaced with the Western Cape Land Use Planning Act (LUPA) of 2014. NHRA stipulates that the local authority must provide protection of a heritage area in accordance with section 31 of the Act. Parts of the formal protections offered by NHRA pertaining specifically to the built environment are heritage registers, heritage areas and graded significance values.

2.4.5.2 Planning authorities

The inclusion of a heritage resource in a heritage area is explained under section 31 of NHRA. A heritage area is established by the local planning authority, often the municipality, where a demarcated place of cultural value interest enjoys protection. The provincial authority may instruct a local planning authority to provide a heritage area if it deems it necessary. The provincial authority must assist the local planning authority in the designation of the heritage area. If the local planning authority is unable to do this, the onus falls on the provincial authority and this is then published in the provincial gazette. According to the NHRA, whichever authority establishes the heritage area, the owners of properties within the area need to be informed accordingly. If the heritage area is established by the local planning authority this is then done under the municipality’s planning scheme or by-laws, therefore forming a heritage overlay zone.

2.4.5.3 Zoning schemes

LUPA was promulgated to consolidate provincial legislation pertaining to planning, development, regulation, monitoring and the coordination of all of these. LUPA operates at provincial and regional levels, but also gives directives to a LM regarding its spatial development framework (SDF). This may assist the local and provincial SDF’s to aligning with one another. The strategies employed by
an SDF regarding heritage resources are to identify and map heritage areas, to provide better management and planning strategies for heritage resources. A municipality may approve an area or demarcated land and specify its use, such as heritage resource conservation.

Local municipalities produce integrated zoning schemes (IZS) as to consolidate all zoning schemes into a single standard. An IZS is a legal document that registers all the land use rights of a property. The NHRA requires that a heritage area be established under the provincial authority or the local authority in a zoning scheme or a by-law. Local municipalities in the Western Cape have changed their heritage areas to either a heritage protection overlay zone (HPOZ) or an urban heritage conservation area (UHCA) (there are a variety of names, each municipality seems to choose its own). The zoning scheme is drawn up to comply with section 31 of the NHRA.

2.4.5.4 Communities as stakeholders

Active conservation is described as part of an integrated framework of urban heritage and the inclusion of the rest of the urban environment to involve a community in its long-term conservation strategies (Dupagne 2004). The principles on which active conservation rests are context of environmental control, public participation, knowledge (acquired from previous generations, locals, experiences, effectiveness of evaluation tools and decision-making procedures), promotion of improvement of social, economic, cultural and ecological performance through the development of an intervention plan. Deacon (2015) has asserted that if power were devolved to a LM there would be closer connection with communities, thereby promoting inclusion and interaction in heritage conservation.

As seen internationally, and similarly in South Africa, there is a movement of self-authorised heritage initiatives, whereby a non-government entity recognises a heritage resource. Even though Blue Plaques are officially awarded in the UK by a government body, Historic England (2008) (previously English Heritage), they in turn have been popularised the world over. These iconic plaques draw attention as they are synonymous with history, heritage and allow for engagement with the public.

Avrami, Mason & De la Torre (2000) refer to this type of participatory conservation as being a social activity in which the process of participation becomes part of heritage. Therefore, this type of conservation is likely to enhance the quality of life for residents and should therefore be incorporated into wider city planning. Community participation is a method of granting access to heritage management at a local level (Li et al. 2020). Furthermore, such inclusion is anticipated to strengthen the community and give credibility to policies (Dupagne 2004).
2.5 CONCLUSION

The concept of cultural landscape includes of context and promotes diversity in the conservation of a heritage resource. The framework of cultural heritage that allows for the consideration of both the intangible and the tangible aspects of a place and is also embraces man-made and natural environments. There is an interconnectedness between all these factors and they are not necessarily equal. The framework of cultural landscape is the preferred method of management of cultural heritage in that it supports an inclusive approach yet is not without its complexities. Cultural heritage, as supported by the framework of the cultural landscape, is a multifaceted social phenomenon, encompassing intangible and tangible aspects, specific to time and place, and most importantly, people.

This poses the question whether we are trying to manage heritage conservation in a contemporary urban environment? More recent concepts introduced for heritage conservation in the urban environment have become increasingly broader. Such a concept is cultural landscape which involves tangible, intangible, man-made and natural elements. Moreover, there is the concept of active conservation where the community is required to participate as they are a stakeholder in their surrounding context and are therefore rightful active participants. The concept of cultural landscape also allows additional concepts and values to be introduced into the definition and practice of urban heritage conservation by providing a space for these different aspects to be complementary and form some sort of co-operation. The nature of cultural landscapes requires each heritage resource (of varying scale) to be evaluated as each is context specific and has spatial and temporal scales. The cultural landscape is everything to do with the human experience of a landscape, and consequently there is an emphasis on social interactions with a place.

The literature suggests that while most of the international documentation and national policies have followed a values-based approach, there is still room for change and development in the realm of heritage conservation. Mason (2006, 2008) claims that heritage conservation must include contemporary values that are relevant to today’s society. Approaches to heritage conservation are already reflecting noticeable changes and movements towards a landscape-based style (Veldpaus, Pereira Roders & Colenbrander 2013) which allow for a broader and more inclusive method of conservation. As the weaknesses of the values-based approach become more evident (Poulios 2010) the tide is turning towards living heritage sites where the actions in the present are noted as the most important and relevant. Therefore, heritage conservation is likely to see a movement of decentralisation and devolution of power to allow for identification, management and conservation done by local communities (Deacon 2015).
After cold-calling all 24 local municipalities in the Western Cape, all agreed to participate in questionnaire survey on the heritage conservation and the competency of local government. A follow-up email was sent with the first part of the questionnaire confirming with each participant what had been explained and agreed in the phone call.

Only 14 (58%) municipalities completed the entire questionnaire. Part one has 22/24 (92%) completed, part two has 20/24 (83%) completed, part three has 14/24 (58%) completed and part four has 15/24 (63%) completed. Data was collected over a period of six months, with follow-up emails and phone calls to monitor the progress of each outstanding municipality. The questionnaire data was grouped into four categories as were determined by the questions asked.

The questionnaire was structured in four parts each related to a topic, namely knowing, protecting, supporting and communicating and promoting heritage conservation. The initial phase of the survey aimed to determine the status of each LM’s capabilities. Phase two sought to identify the methods employed by local municipalities to protect and conserve local heritage resources. The third phase to determine the type of support received by local municipalities in conserving Grade III heritage resources. The final phase of the survey investigated how local municipalities communicate with their constituents and the methods used to promote heritage conservation and management of local heritage resources.
CHAPTER 3 FINDINGS AS DETERMINED BY A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY, INFORMAL INTERVIEWS AND SECONDARY DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the information collected from the questionnaire survey and information supplemented by interviews. The chapter is divided into five sections, the main body of the chapter consisting of four sections related to the topics categorised from each phase of the survey and end with a short conclusion. The objectives of the questionnaire survey were to: first, assess the capabilities and competencies of each local municipality (LM) in the Western Cape (excluding the City of Cape Town) regarding the conservation of urban heritage. Second, to create of a comprehensive matrix of the elements comprising the heritage conservation capabilities local municipalities and the challenges faced in the field of urban heritage conservation. Last to investigate whether local municipalities meet the criteria set by Heritage Western Cape (HWC), for the granting of such an authority competency to perform functions in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) of 1999.

The emerging themes from each phase of the survey were identified and categorised, to show similarities, differences and relationships in local municipalities. Subcategories in each topic will be introduced later in the chapter. Information is presented in the form of tables and then described to show similarities, differences and connections between themes offered by the information gathered. Additionally, direct quotes from the survey responses are used to give more insight on the status of urban heritage conservation at local government level. Furthermore, direct quotes from interviews supplement the information gathered.

The order of presentation will follow that of the topics categorised in each phase of the survey, namely knowledge (knowing), protection (protecting), support and communication (supporting and communicating) and promotion (promoting) of heritage conservation.

3.1 KNOWING

The objective of the first phase of the survey was to determine the current capabilities of each responding municipality regarding its operations in heritage conservation and management of respective resources. The categories the questionnaire covered were of identification, assessment and documentation of heritage places. This section reports the results. Twenty-two municipalities participated in this phase. In subsection 3.1.1 it is established whether local municipalities have a heritage study, its level of completion and other aspects that should be considered when undertaking a heritage study. Subsection 3.1.2 describes how municipal-owned and managed heritage properties are handled as well as if local municipalities are given the responsibility of national and provincial heritage resources.
3.1.1 Heritage studies at local municipal level

Twelve (55%) of the 22 responding municipalities have completed a heritage study. The purpose of a heritage study is to identify places of heritage significance within the municipal region. Witzenberg Municipality did not have a heritage study of their municipal area (Witzenberg Municipality 2019a), yet a heritage inventory of Tulbagh, a town within its jurisdiction, was submitted to the PHRA in 2018. This was discussed and critiqued in a meeting of a HWC subcommittee (Inventories, Grading and Interpretations Committee), in February 2019. The study was approved subject to conditions in August 2019. Email correspondence with the chair of the Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation, Jayson Clarke (Pers com 2020) who headed the submission of the inventory, could not establish whether the LM had accepted the heritage study or not. This was considered to be a “snag” as the documentation had lain at the local municipal offices for about a year. A similar scenario played out in Swartland Municipality, as the respondent had claimed that the municipality had completed a heritage study, but it was yet to be approved by HWC.

In the following subsections (3.1.1.1-3.1.1.6) the reasons for municipalities not having a heritage study are discussed. In addition, those municipalities that do have a heritage study, their level of completeness, the focus, access and availability to data, funding and compilers of heritage studies are discussed. Lastly, thematic environmental histories of local municipalities are discussed.

3.1.1.1 Reasons for municipalities not having a heritage study

The various reasons given why municipalities had not completed a heritage study in their area were regrouped in four types (Table 3.1). Lack of funding or insufficient budget was cited by four municipalities, namely Bitou, Breede Valley, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn. Bitou Municipality noted that specialised skills were needed to complete such a study and that these would have to be sourced from outside the municipality, therefore needing them to go through a tender process which would require a budget. Bergrivier Municipality had “no capacity”.

Table 3.1 Reasons for surveyed municipalities not having a heritage study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>No finances or budget</th>
<th>Skills and expertise lacking</th>
<th>Insufficient data</th>
<th>Reason unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergrivier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cederberg and Witzenberg municipalities did not know why a study had not been done. Kannaland Municipality had only recently appointed someone to oversee heritage matters, it was only then discovered that a heritage study had not been done. Beaufort West confirmed that they did not have a heritage study due to only having partial information. It is noteworthy that although Cape Agulhas Municipality did not have a heritage study, they were forming a heritage committee to create heritage awareness. As 10 (45%) of responding local municipalities had identified reasons for not having completed a heritage study in their respective municipal areas, the following subsection presents the level of completeness by local municipalities which do have heritage studies.

3.1.1.2 Completeness of information in heritage studies

All twelve municipalities that had completed a heritage study agreed that there were still information gaps in their studies (Table 3.2). Some studies were deemed to be outdated (Overstrand, Prince Albert and Hessequa municipalities), with Hessequa Municipality specifically noting that information needed to be updated as their heritage inventory had increased in numbers. Two municipalities agreed that it was easier to survey areas where information was readily available (Saldanha Bay Municipality) or that the survey was being done in segments (Knysna Municipality). One completed study was said to be “a baseline study” with only a preliminary inventory and no grading (Swellendam Municipality). Stellenbosch Municipality conceded that the only gaps in their heritage survey were to do with the social layering of cultural heritage that was applicable in the area. It was necessary to investigate the nature of the reasons for the incompleteness of heritage studies.

Several participants commented that their municipality only had a heritage study for a particular town or urban area (notably Hessequa, Knysna, Mossel Bay, Prince Albert and Saldanha Bay municipalities) and that rural registers were either inaccurate or non-existent (Langeberg, Prince Albert, Swartland and Swellendam municipalities). Two municipalities had completed their heritage surveys, submitted them to HWC, but these had not been approved, either because HWC required more information (Knysna Municipality) or because the document submitted was not in the correct format (Swartland Municipality). Langeberg Municipality reported that a desktop study had been executed but an “on-the-ground” study was yet to be completed as they needed to be in accordance with HWC guidelines as well as others to determine correct grading. Knysna Municipality remarked that the gradings given to the buildings in the heritage inventory were questionable. Only Langeberg and Swellendam municipalities pointed out that there was a lack of information or inventory relating to archaeology and palaeontology. Laingsburg Municipality acknowledged that local municipal policy, namely their SDF, needed to be updated, as this was the reason for gaps in their heritage study.
Table 3.2 Nature of and/or reason for incompleteness of heritage studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Limited study</th>
<th>Archaeology / palaeontology</th>
<th>Rural register</th>
<th>Not all areas identified or included</th>
<th>Information outdated</th>
<th>Knowledge constraint</th>
<th>Not approved by HWC</th>
<th>Local policy outdated</th>
<th>More information needed or anticipated</th>
<th>Questionable grading</th>
<th>Historical social layering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drakenstein Municipality did not answer this question.
3.1.1.3 Foci of heritage studies in local municipalities

The majority (83%) of the 12 municipalities focused on or included buildings and structures as part of their heritage study, whereas five municipalities included other categories (Table 3.3). Stellenbosch Municipality’s heritage inventory includes landscape units, Overstrand Municipality included landscape units and conservation areas, and Saldanha Bay Municipality included landscapes as well as scenic routes. Saldanha Bay Municipality incorporated archaeology in their heritage inventory as well as Khoisan heritage. Overstrand Municipality listed graves and shipwrecks. The inclusion of maritime artefacts in an inventory is unusual, as these naturally require a water body and SAHRA has jurisdiction over this category (South Africa 1999).

Nine (75%) of the studies were deemed to adequately cover other types of heritage places thus not only buildings, structures and sites, but also gardens, significant cultural landscapes, public art, monuments as well as gravesites are included. Respondents also expressed that their heritage studies were reflective of people of diverse backgrounds. Three municipalities, namely Langeberg, Prince Albert and Mossel Bay agreed that their heritage studies only included “single-point heritage resources”, such as individual formal buildings, structures and sites.

Seven (58%) of the 12 municipalities reported that their heritage studies did not adequately consider prehistoric, pre-colonial, colonial, previously disadvantaged and democratic heritage. Swellendam Municipality noted that while their study focused on structures additional studies would need to be done to be more inclusive of diverse backgrounds. Prince Albert Municipality recognised that although there was information available on diverse heritage, it was held by the Prince Albert Cultural Foundation and was not extensively included in their heritage records. While Mossel Bay Municipality acknowledged that there was a lack of diversity in coverage and information, they were not able to pinpoint where information was lacking. Overstrand Municipality mentioned that while their heritage study referred to other considerations, it lacked detail.
Table 3.3 Foci of heritage studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Buildings and structures</th>
<th>Protection zones</th>
<th>Landscapes</th>
<th>Scenic routes</th>
<th>Archaeology</th>
<th>Graves</th>
<th>Shipwrecks</th>
<th>Khoisan heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drakenstein Municipality did not answer this question.
Of the 12 municipalities with a heritage study, eight (67%) were unanimous in stating that there was a need to identify, assess and document places of non-colonial significance, archaeological significance and natural significance (Table 3.4). Four municipalities stated there was no such need.

Table 3.4 Further identification, assessment and documentation of places of significance required in heritage survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Non-colonial significance</th>
<th>Archaeological significance</th>
<th>Natural significance</th>
<th>Further investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mossel Bay and Swartland municipalities did not answer this question.

Eight (67%) of the twelve municipalities agreed that within their currently identified heritage study further investigation was needed which would include identification, assessment and documentation. Swellendam Municipality added that they only had a baseline study and understood that this was the bare minimum. This sentiment was shared by Langeberg Municipality as only a preliminary desktop study had been done and further investigation would allow them to identify all important heritage resources as well as allow them to produce a strategy to conserve and use these resources for socio-economic benefits. Even though Prince Albert Municipality said that no further investigation was required in their heritage study, more information on certain aspects would assist in categorising significance and future protection of heritage resources. This would also help in identifying the role of farm towns (rural towns) the heritage inventory. Hessequa Municipality indicated that they were not sure what further investigation would do for their heritage study but projected that it may lead to uncovering more resources or more suitable gradings, the latter echoed by Knysna Municipality. Further investigation would assist Overstrand Municipality with the updating of their current inventory. Saldanha Bay Municipality answered that further investigation would allow their study to comply with legislative requirements as set out by the PHRA.

3.1.4.1 Access to local heritage resource data and documents

Only five (42%) municipalities conveyed that their heritage study was available on an electronic database such as a municipal, HWC or SAHRIS website. The remaining seven municipalities gave numerous reasons why their respective databases could not be accessed immediately. Swellendam Municipality stated that their database is available on request, while Swartland Municipality said that the file was too large to have on a website. As their study was compiled by an independent
organisation, Prince Albert Municipality only had a hard copy of their study. Langeberg Municipality had their heritage study as an annexure to their SDF but the document that was available was not the correct, full document. Hessequa Municipality conceded that their study needed updating and was therefore not available. Saldanha Bay and Knysna municipalities had not had their studies approved by HWC due to incompleteness and it not being officiated respectively.

3.1.1.5 Updating and compilers of local municipalities’ heritage studies

Only two (17%) of the twelve municipalities allocated resources, either funding or personnel, on a regular basis for a growing heritage study. Any additional work would include, but was not limited to identification, assessment and documentation. Swartland Municipality stated that the additional resources were used to merge the two current databases (urban and rural) into one document. The document also needed amendments to suit the prescribed format set by HWC. Overstrand Municipality uses its resources for a local committee that assists with heritage resources.

Nine (75%) of the twelve municipalities employed consultants to compile their respective heritage studies (Table 3.5). These private organisations ranged from individuals to companies and professionals to volunteer organisations. Mossel Bay Municipality was not sure who was employed to compile their heritage study. Laingsburg Municipality was the only municipality to have their heritage study compiled by public entities, namely SAHRA and HWC (Laingsburg Municipality 2017).²

Table 3.5 Compilers of the municipal heritage studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Private entity</th>
<th>Volunteer organisation</th>
<th>Public entity</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although few municipalities allocated resources for regular updating of their heritage studies, 75% of local municipalities allocated resources to compile an initial heritage study.
3.1.1.6 Thematic environmental history of local municipalities

A thematic environmental history (TEH) shows how an area or town has developed over a period and how culture has influenced the natural and built environments. This is not necessarily a complete social history of a place nor a chronology of events. However, a TEH helps to show the major historical themes that influence and result in the physical development of an area. Stellenbosch, Swartland and Cape Agulhas municipalities are the only three to have done a TEH of their municipalities. The other 19 are yet to do so.

This subsection has investigated and described how local municipalities have made strides in the form of heritage surveys to identify, document and assess local heritage resources in their jurisdiction. However, not all local heritage resources are owned or managed by local municipalities. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate what considerations are given to local municipal-owned and managed heritage resources.

3.1.2 Local municipal heritage asset considerations

In this subsection the ownership and management of heritage assets by local municipalities are discussed in detail, by looking at how municipalities assess and document heritage properties under their ownership and management, and whether heritage registers are created specifically for these assets. In 3.1.2.1 municipal-owned heritage properties and consideration made by local municipalities are discussed. A similar process is followed in 3.1.2.2, whereby municipal-managed heritage properties’ and considerations made by local municipalities are discussed.

3.1.2.1 Municipal-owned heritage properties

Only five (23%) of the 22 municipalities confirmed that heritage properties owned by their municipality were adequately assessed and documented (Table 3.6). Six (27%) of the 22 municipalities had a register for municipal-owned heritage properties. Overstand Municipality did not have a separate register for municipal-owned heritage places as these were included in their full heritage survey. Stellenbosch Municipality reported that “Council-owned buildings were not listed separately…[but]…formed part of the heritage survey.” Swellendam Municipality was the only municipality to give a reason for not having a register for municipal-owned heritage properties, namely: “Very few historical buildings [were] owned by the municipality.”

Five (23%) municipalities indicated the year their assessment and documentation of municipal-owned heritage properties was completed, the earliest by Overstand Municipality in 2009. Only three (14%) municipalities were able to indicate the year a register was completed for municipal-owned heritage properties in their jurisdiction. The earliest was again in 2009, but by Swartland Municipality.
Table 3.6 Municipal-owned heritage places – assessment, documentation and creation of a register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Assessment and/or documentation</th>
<th>Year completed</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Year completed</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergrivier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drakenstein and Kannaland municipalities did not answer this question.
Many reasons were given by the 17 (77%) municipalities that did not have adequate assessments and/or documentation of municipal-owned and managed heritage properties, some providing multiple reasons for not having assessed and documented their assets. Four main themes emerge in the reasons, i.e. financial, data, human resources, designation and knowledge. Although only six municipalities did have registers for municipal-owned heritage properties, as only six and 16 did not, the reasons for not having a register for municipal-owned heritage places were similar to those for not having assessed and documented these same places.

Financial constraints
Five (29%) of the 17 municipalities indicated financial constraints as a reason for not having assessed and/or documented municipal-owned heritage places. Cederberg Municipality called these “budget constraints” while Hessequa Municipality stated that they had a “financial shortage.” Both Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities claimed that they had a “lack of financial resources” and “no financial resources were available” for this task respectively. Swellendam Municipality argued that they needed funding to be allocated for their assessment and documentation to be completed. Similarly, financial constraints were noted by Bitou, Hessequa, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities for not having compiled their registers of municipal-owned heritage properties. Bitou Municipality also held their lack of capacity regarding skills as a reason: “The skills required to undertake such an assessment [were] not found within the municipality and would have to be outsourced.” Hessequa Municipality stated while they did not have a register for municipal-owned heritage properties, but they had given input for the provincial (Grade II) register.

Data constraints
Eight (47%) of the 17 municipalities cited data constraints as a reason for not having assessed and documented municipal-owned heritage places. Hessequa, Oudtshoorn and Swellendam municipalities noted that a lack of financial resources directly affected their ability to collect data for assessment and documentation. Knysna Municipality declared that due to bureaucratic issues their data was not approved by the PHRA. Beaufort West Municipality confirmed that data collection was initiated ten years ago but comprised only photographs and nothing else. Other information they had was only available in “…outdated books that [comprise] 30% [of the] information [that is] bound in archives.” Saldanha Bay Municipality indicated that their data shortage relates to not all areas being covered in their heritage survey. Prince Albert Municipality was the only local government to say that they have “no records available” to assess and document municipal-owned heritage places. Langeberg Municipality remarked that this type of assessment and documentation of municipal-owned heritage places was never considered. Similarly, Hessequa, Oudtshoorn and Saldanha Bay municipalities all indicated data constraints as a reason for not having compiled a register. Saldanha
Bay Municipality conceded that their survey was incomplete as not all areas in their area had been covered yet.

**Human resource and designation constraints**

Nine (53%) of the 17 municipalities cited human resources constraints, including department designation, as the reason for not having assessed and documented municipal-owned heritage properties. Two subthemes emerged in this category. First, six municipalities revealed either a lack of or non-existence of internal skills. It was found at Bitou and Hessequa municipalities that financial constraints directly impacted human resources or skills within the municipalities, while Bergrivier, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Prince Albert had no resources at all in this regard. Bitou and Hessequa municipalities both expressed that financial constraints had also affected their abilities to outsource experts. Second, ambiguity of directorate was established in both Langeberg and Witzenberg municipalities. Langeberg Municipality claimed that all municipal properties are managed by a different directive to heritage resources, namely the Corporate Services under the Property Management portfolio. Witzenberg Municipality professed that there was no heritage directorate within its municipal structure.

Overall, a dedicated budget or additional finance would help either with building internal capacity in each municipality or with the ability to outsource to private companies for assessment, documentation and the creation of a heritage register. These same nine municipalities with the addition of Cape Agulhas Municipality, concurred that the reason for not having a register of municipal-owned heritage properties had to do with the lack of human resources in each municipality. Cape Agulhas Municipality maintained that a special committee was being assembled to assist with this.

**Knowledge constraints**

Three municipalities (Cederberg, Mossel Bay and Witzenberg) could not say why their assessments, documentations and creation of a register of municipal-owned heritage properties had not been done. Although Witzenberg Municipality did not know explicitly, it was suspected that it was due to their being no heritage directorate in the municipal structure.

As municipal-owned heritage properties have been discussed as well as the constraints identified by local municipalities, it is necessary to investigate municipal-managed heritage properties and discuss constraints identified by local municipalities.

**3.1.2.2 Municipal-managed heritage properties**

Regarding municipal-manage heritage properties, five (23%) of the 22 responding municipalities confirmed that assessments and documentation of municipal-managed heritage properties had been completed (Table 3.7). Similar reasons to those given for municipal-owned heritage properties were...
forthcoming why assessment, documentation or creation of a register of municipal-managed heritage properties had not been completed. One additional theme, jurisdiction, emerged.

Five (23%) municipalities indicated the year their assessment and documentation of municipal-managed heritage properties was completed, the earliest by Overstand and Swartland municipalities in 2009. Only one (5%) municipality was able to indicate the year a register was completed for municipal-managed heritage properties in their jurisdiction, Breede Valley, in 2018.

Financial constraints

Five municipalities voiced that they faced financial restrictions when handling the assessment and documentation of municipal-managed heritage places. Cederberg Municipality stated that it had budgetary constraints on the tasks, while Hessequa, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities all noted a lack of financial resources. Swellendam Municipality needed funding to be allocated if they were to complete the assessments and documentation. Three of the municipalities, namely Hessequa, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn agreed that financial constraints had also hindered them in being able to compile registers of municipal-managed heritage properties.

Data constraints

Again, as found in the financial constraints, five municipalities reported data constraints when tasked with the assessment and documentation of municipal-managed heritage places. Knysna Municipality argued that due to the protocol issued by the PHRA, their inventory was not approved and this impeded the assessment and documentation processes. The other four municipalities (Beaufort West, Hessequa, Oudtshoorn and Saldanha Bay) insisted that they did not have data available to them when trying to complete their assessments and documentation. Three of these municipalities also stated that due to data constraints, they were not able to compile a register of the properties. Hessequa and Oudtshoorn municipalities indicated that they had no data while Saldanha Bay Municipality held that their data set was incomplete.
### Table 3.7 Municipal-managed heritage places – assessment, documentation and creation of a register

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Assessment and documentation</th>
<th>Year completed</th>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Year completed</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergrivier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drakenstein, Kannaland and Langeberg municipalities did not answer this question.
Human resource and designation constraints

Five municipalities cited impediments regarding human resources and ability assess and document municipal-managed heritage properties. Although Cape Agulhas Municipality recognised their handicap in this regard, they were assembling a heritage committee to assist in the situation. Hessequa, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities concurred that they had no staff to assist with the assessments and documentation. Witzenberg Municipality reiterated that there was no heritage directorate in their municipal structure. Six municipalities could not compile a register of municipal-managed heritage properties due to human resource limitations. Six municipalities were in agreement that they had no capacity regarding human resources and heritage. However, like their proactivity shown regarding assessment and documentation, Cape Agulhas Municipality, disclosed that they were assembling a committee that would help compile a register of municipal-managed heritage properties.

Knowledge constraints

Mossel Bay and Witzenberg municipalities stated that to the best of their knowledge they did not know why assessments and documentation of municipal-managed heritage properties had not been done. Witzenberg Municipality did note that they had no department in the municipality dedicated to heritage. Cederberg and Witzenberg municipalities both alluded to some knowledge constraint for not having a register for municipal-managed heritage properties.

Jurisdiction

Two municipalities claimed that it was not within their jurisdiction to manage any heritage places. Bitou Municipality answered that their municipality does not manage any heritage places, while Prince Albert Municipality said: “[They] do not have heritage sites, except the municipal administrative building that is subject to normal building control and maintenance.” Three municipalities concurred that it was not within their jurisdiction to compile a register of municipal-managed heritage properties. Bitou Municipality does not manage any heritage places. Swartland Municipality replied: “[They] currently [have] no delegation from Heritage Western Cape to take any decisions on heritage grading and building matters.” Witzenberg Municipality responded that while they were not completely sure why their municipality did not have a register for municipal-managed heritage properties, it was most likely since they have no heritage directorate within their municipality.

Places of heritage significance

A related topic is the responsibility of municipalities for maintaining national and provincial places of heritage significance. Four municipalities are required to maintain places of national significance and only two must maintain places of provincial significance in their geographical areas. Most of the
responding municipalities claimed that they were not required to maintain places of national (80%) or provincial (90%) significance as these were under private ownership. Another reason was that other public entities fulfilled these functions.

Although 55% of local municipalities indicated that their entity had completed a heritage survey in their municipal area, all acknowledged that there were still information gaps in their studies. The other 45% of local municipalities indicated that they had not completed a heritage survey of local resources in their municipal area. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate how local municipalities protect local heritage resources in their area with incomplete or non-existent heritage surveys.

3.2 PROTECTING

The objective of the second phase of the survey was to establish the current methods of protection implemented by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and the management of local resources. The investigation was arranged in four categories, namely tools for heritage conservation (3.2.1) of statutory protection (3.2.2), local policy development (3.2.3) and appropriate management (3.2.4). In this phase of the survey, 20 of 24 municipalities responded. The findings are presented and discussed in this section.

3.2.1 Tools used to protect heritage properties without a heritage study

In the light of only 12 (55%) of the 22 responding municipalities having had completed a heritage study in their respective municipal areas (see Section 3.1.1), it was necessary to find out what other methods of protection were used at local level for the conservation of local heritage resources. Participants in the 10 municipalities that had no heritage study were consequently asked how their respective municipalities were then able, if at all, to protect heritage resources in their geographical area. The methods and tools they identified are summarised in table 3.8.

Table 3.8 Methods of protecting heritage properties without a heritage study of local resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Use of NHRA</th>
<th>Referral to HWC</th>
<th>Volunteer committee</th>
<th>Private management</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the NHRA, a LM may have jurisdiction over Grade III (local) heritage resources if deemed competent by its superior (South Africa 1999), the PHRA. In the Western Cape this authority is HWC. However, if a local authority is not deemed competent, the onus falls on the provincial body to protect these Grade III resources. The four methods identified by the respondents are discussed next.

Statutory protection from the National Heritage Resources Act (1999)
Four of the ten municipalities without a heritage study responded in saying that all heritage resources are protected by the NHRA, which clearly states that any building or structure older than 60 years is under statutory protection based on age. Bitou Municipality noted: “[Most] (but potentially not all) heritage places are adequately signed to indicate their importance and protection in terms of the [NHRA].” Witzenberg Municipality were not “Aware [that] legislation specifically [existed] that [placed] the duty on the [local municipality] to protect heritage properties.” Breede Valley Municipality replied that they have a database of buildings older than 60 years and they consult old SAHRA listings when protecting heritage resources in their area. Kannaland and Witzenberg municipalities rely on the NHRA to protect buildings older than 60 years. Any applications for building plans affecting a building older than 60 years are subject to protective scrutiny by the NHRA and would have to go via HWC for approval.

Referral to the provincial heritage resources authority
Five of the ten municipalities without a heritage study said that they referred all applications of heritage buildings to the PHRA. This is in line with legislation, as HWC has the authority over all Grade II and III heritage resources in the province as no LM was deemed to be a competent heritage authority. Cape Agulhas Municipality said they do a “background check” with HWC when dealing with applications on heritage properties. Cederberg Municipality added that they included HWC in all applications regarding heritage properties and Kannaland Municipality responded that they required approval from HWC for building plans on heritage properties. Oudtshoorn Municipality which indicated that applicants required a permit from HWC if they wished to make additions or alterations to a heritage property and that the municipality would not approve a building permit on a heritage property without one from HWC. Witzenberg Municipality referred all “trigger” applications to HWC.

Use of volunteer committees
Two (22%) of the nine municipalities with no heritage study made use of volunteer committees to assist with applications regarding heritage properties. Knysna Municipality has a heritage study that has not yet been approved by HWC and they were aware that their study is incomplete as it does not include the greater Knysna area. The municipality makes use of a volunteer “architectural review committee”, including “architect[s] with heritage experience”, who give advice on applications for
heritage properties. The committee consists of an architect that has heritage experience. Oudtshoorn Municipality follows a similar procedure by referring any applications on heritage properties to their local heritage committee for comment before referring the application to HWC for a permit.

*Private management*

Only Matzikama Municipality made use of a memorandum of agreement (MOA) regarding selected heritage properties in its geographical area. These MOAs refer to properties under management by private individuals, companies and councils. They are unsure whether these were Grade II or III heritage resources, because MOA cannot bypass national legislation. Hessequa Municipality is the only local authority that handles each property individually, as these were “site specific”.

The four methods discussed in 3.2.1 are those identified by local municipalities that have not completed a heritage survey in their geographical area. However, there are other methods available to local municipalities without completed heritage surveys such as a protected heritage area. Additional protective measures such as listing, grading and statements of significance can be implemented. Furthermore, local municipalities can implement these measures in the municipal planning scheme (MPS).

### 3.2.2 Additional protective measures for heritage resources

Built heritage resources receive statutory protection from the NHRA if they qualify by being at least 60 years old. Additional protective measures can be implemented at a local level by local municipalities. Ten of the 20 respondents indicated that their municipality had completed a heritage study in their area. Even though the remaining ten municipalities no studies, this did not mean that their built heritage resources were excluded from other protective measures. Such alternative protective measures are listed in Table 3.9.
Table 3.9 Additional protective measures for heritage resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Listed in municipal planning scheme</th>
<th>Heritage precinct</th>
<th>Grading</th>
<th>Statement of significance</th>
<th>Awareness of assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No heritage study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mossel Bay, Prince Albert, Saldanha Bay, Bitou, Cederberg, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer this question.

Each of the five additional protective measures are discussed separately in the following four subsections (3.2.2.1-3.2.2.4).

3.2.2.1 Listing of heritage resources in the municipal planning schemes

Among the ten municipalities that had completed heritage studies, only two (Stellenbosch and Overstrand) listed all the places recommended by their studies for statutory protection in their municipal planning scheme (MPS). Mossel Bay Municipality intended to and had finalised the first step towards completing a heritage study. Saldanha Bay and Swartland municipalities cited financial constraints as the reason for not having including places of their study into their MPS. Swartland Municipality had made budget considerations to combine both their urban and rural studies in to the HWC approved formatted document for approval in the next financial year. Saldanha Bay Municipality disclosed that they had insufficient funds as well as uncertainty regarding the level of detail needed to list heritage resources in their MPS. Prince Albert Municipality noted that they did not have the capacity to complete such a task.

3.2.2.2 Making use of designated heritage precincts

A designated heritage precinct can come about in two ways in a municipality, either under Section 31 of the NHRA (South Africa 1999) or via a municipal spatial development framework as stipulated in the Spatial Planning and Land Use Management Act (SPLUMA) (South Africa 2013). Previously municipalities could have heritage precincts that protect heritage resources within these areas, as determined by the NHRA. More recently, and in line with SPLUMA regulations, municipalities are required to create an inclusive zoning scheme as part of their municipal by-laws. Information was
found in the public domain to show which municipalities make use of either a protection area or a zoning scheme to safeguard built heritage resources.

In an interview with a representative of Drakenstein Municipality (Drakenstein Municipality respondent Pers com 2020), a different view was voiced. While the respondent did note that the benefits of a heritage protection overlay zone (HPOZ), potential difficulties were also pointed out. A HPOZ fits well within with the zoning schemes are now prevalent throughout municipalities in South Africa, they are according to the respondent an “easier way to standardise zoning and give even control over areas”. However, the respondent added that they were “a political minefield and [were] proving to be problematic”. The problem arises when the persons in charge of the HPOZ have different agendas, due to their not being part of the heritage department. Consequently, heritage conservation is not their top priority. The respondent went on to say:

Heritage is a unique field, it is not like town planning (engineering), it is not a [simple] situation, it is not binary. Therefore, it should not be run by someone in these departments. The NHRA is written for the local municipalities and somewhat for district municipalities. The Act is celebrated in being broad and inclusive but by being such it also has many grey areas that are left open for interpretation (Drakenstein Municipality respondent Pers com 2020).

It was found that despite some municipal respondents stating that they did not have some form of heritage precinct in their municipal areas, public documents indicated otherwise. In the case of Witzenberg Municipality a heritage overlay zone was proposed for the town of Tulbagh with the town’s zoning scheme (Witzenberg Municipality 2019b). A similar scenario exists in Oudtshoorn Municipality, where the towns of Oudtshoorn and De Rust both have overlay zones, dedicated to protecting the built heritage resources of the respective towns (Oudtshoorn Municipality 2020).

Five of the municipalities that have completed a heritage study do make use of heritage protection zones, while the remaining five do not. Saldanha Bay and Swartland municipalities agreed that due to their heritage studies not being complete or approved by HWC, they were unable to implement protective heritage zones within their municipalities. Swartland Municipality reported that:

The Swartland Heritage Survey 2009 (for towns) and the Rural Heritage Survey 2014 [have] not formally been approved by Heritage Western Cape. […] therefore, as the documents do not have approval from Heritage Western Cape, no heritage overlay zones [have] been approved in terms of the planning scheme. [However], …the Swartland [Municipality] Planning By-
law [made] provision for specific overlay zones [including] (heritage area, environmental protection, special management area, bioregional area, scenic route, [etc]) (Swartland Municipality respondent 2020).

Prince Albert Municipality confirmed that they were developing a new zoning scheme by-law that would include an HPOZ for built heritage resources in the area. Although Mossel Bay Municipality did not have a protective heritage area, it was a future consideration in their integrated development plan (IDP) (Mossel Bay Municipality 2020) and their Architectural design guideline manual (Mossel Bay Municipality 2015) speak of a heritage precinct and historic core in the central business district (CBD) of the town.

3.2.2.3 Appropriate grading of heritage resources in municipal planning scheme

Only three of the 20 responding municipalities that included heritage places in their MPSs had appropriately graded these identified properties (this would require municipalities to have a MPS and include heritage places). However, two municipalities (Cape Agulhas and Hessequa) stated that even though their heritage places were not included in their MPS, they were appropriately graded. The remaining 15 municipalities gave reasons why heritage places had not been graded. Four categories of constraints emerged from these responses.

First, four municipalities (Breede Valley, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Swellendam) named budget constraints as one of the reasons why this had not been done, as they had either no budget allocated for such a project or funding was not available. The second type was a lack of human resources and skills required for such a project, as these resources were not available at Bitou, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities. Bitou Municipality commented that these skills would likely need to be outsourced. Third, Cederberg and Kannaland municipalities presumed that a zoning scheme would make provision for gradings of heritage places. Kannaland Municipality admitted that while their zoning scheme was out of date, they were in the process of compiling a new scheme that would have completed within a few months.

The last, and possibly most complex, category to emerge was that of designation and responsibility within and by a LM and the responsibilities of the provincial authority. Knysna Municipality claimed that while their heritage study had not been approved by HWC they could not include appropriately graded heritage places into their MPS. Saldanha Bay Municipality shared a similar sentiment as their heritage study was not yet complete. Their responsibility regarding heritage resources was limited to documentation. Prince Albert Municipality noted that their heritage study, which they called an “audit plan”, still had to be integrated into the new planning scheme by-law. Langeberg Municipality indicated that only one town, Montagu, had an urban conservation area as identified in the Montagu
Conservation Study (Japha et al. 1990). The current heritage survey, as part of the desktop study in the 2015 SDF, proposed grading for identified heritage places. Witzenberg Municipality expressed that heritage conservation has mostly been at a provincial level, as this was the competent authority. They stated that within the municipality there is no specific [d]epartment or official that is tasked with [h]eritage, [and that they were] not aware of any small municipality that in fact do[es] have a [h]eritage [d]epartment or [h]eritage [o]fficer. [We are of the attitude that] perhaps municipal [c]ouncils are not aware of their responsibility. Also, municipalities will not give attention to the matter if [they are] not legally bound to do so. Roles need to be clarified (Witzenberg Municipality respondent 2020).

The grading of local heritage resources gives insight to the perceived value of the resource, as Grade III resources have a further breakdown in to a, b or c. The designation of a local resource will also reflect its heritage significance to its surround context (Heritage Western Cape 2016), therefore grading and statement of significance of a resource are closely related.

3.2.2.4 Statement of significance of heritage places in the municipal planning scheme

Only four (20%) of the 20 responding municipalities have statements of the significance for heritage places included in their MPSs. The reasons for not having such statements in the MPSs were similar those given for grading, as grading and significance are closely related. The reasons that emerged were related to budget constraints, human resources constraints including lack of skills and expertise, the ambiguity of designation and responsibilities of local municipalities. In the case of Bitou Municipality they “…believed that the HWC, NHRA [and] NID requirements [would] cover any potential heritage impacts.” Swellendam Municipality’s individual sites were not included in their MPS and Mossel Bay Municipality had “…no heritage content [included in the] scheme”. Cape Agulhas and Hessequa municipalities indicated that the heritage resources in their geographical areas did have statements of significance, but because neither municipality had an MPS they could not be included in the relevant scheme.

Five (25%) of the 20 responding municipalities reported that their municipal staff were aware that places were being assessed for heritage significance. Overstrand Municipality’s heritage study was completed in 2009, but it has no heritage register to date. However, it is the only LM to have completed a heritage study, listed their heritage resources in the MPS, made use of a protective zone, had grading of heritage resources and have statements of significance.
As the various tools used to protect local heritage resources have been discussed, it is necessary to investigate what policy considerations are made at local municipal level regarding conservation of heritage resources.

### 3.2.3 Policies for heritage conservation at local municipal level

In this subsection local policy development regarding heritage conservation in local municipalities was investigated. Local municipal planning policies were investigated, as well as if local municipalities had developed policies specific to conservation of local heritage resources. Considering that some local municipalities may not have developed local heritage conservation policies it was necessary to investigate what policies and tools were used to protect local heritage resources. Local municipalities reported on availability of heritage policies and national legislation to the public as well as if their LM had planning considerations for conservation and management of local resources. Last, local municipalities reported on their ability to enforce local policies and national legislation regarding the protection of local heritage resources in their jurisdiction.

#### 3.2.3.1 Heritage considerations in municipal planning policies

Fifteen (75%) municipalities do consider heritage conservation in their municipal IDPs. The remaining five gave reasons why they did not. Langeberg Municipality argued that their SDF is part of the IDP document and that:

> …[The] only reference to heritage in [the] IDP is under community input from residents of McGregor, where [the] creation of heritage overlay zone, assistance with maintenance of private historical houses and public participation in heritage matters to support tourism [are] requested. The IDP includes the SDF, which does give some consideration to heritage conservation (Langeberg Municipality respondent 2020).

Mossel Bay Municipality identified this lack of consideration as a “gap” in their current IDP document and added that it would be addressed in the annual review. A lack of resources was the reason given by the remaining three municipalities. For Bitou Municipality monetary allocation was not deemed necessary for heritage conservation in their area. Saldanha Bay Municipality noted that not enough was known, that there was a lack of information and Knysna Municipality echoed this sentiment by claiming that they were not sure, as they were never asked to have any input regarding heritage conservation in their municipal IDP. The SDFs of the 20 responding municipalities all made heritage conservation a consideration. Only Mossel Bay Municipality acknowledged that heritage conservation was not a consideration in their municipal SDF, even though it made mention of it.
As heritage conservation was a consideration in most municipalities planning documents (IDPs and SDFs), it was therefore reasonable to investigate if local municipalities had developed heritage policies for the protection of their local heritage resources.

### 3.2.3.2 Local municipality heritage policies

Only four (20%) of the 20 municipalities answered that their municipality had current and effective heritage policies. Various reasons were given why the remaining 16 local municipalities did not have heritage policies. The reasons related to financial, human resources, data and knowledge limitations as well as conflicting interests within the municipalities (Table 3.10).

Under the category that broadly pertains to human resources, subthemes emerged including lack of human resources, lack of skills and expertise in a municipality and the need to establish a heritage department or a directorate in an established department. Some municipalities appreciated the need to establish a committee of volunteers or a committee that promote a public-private partnership to assist with heritage matters.

Breede Valley Municipality made it known that funding for a project like this was made available whereas Matzikama Municipality claimed that they had a financial shortage. Cape Agulhas Municipality did not explicitly state that there was a lack of funding for the creation of heritage policies but indicated that a council of private citizens (volunteers) and professionals needed to be established to assist the LM. Three municipalities (Bitou, Matzikama and Prince Albert) agreed that there were lacking skills in their municipalities. Bitou Municipality responded that outsourcing was necessary for a project to be successful. Matzikama Municipality admitted to a human resource shortage and Prince Albert Municipality affirmed shortages of capacity and expertise. Witzenberg Municipality explained: “…[r]oles [within local municipalities] need to be clarified. Municipal councils need to take the lead and establish heritage departments if it is needed.” The respondent for Witzenberg Municipality put forward a possible solution, namely:

If a heritage department could not be established within a municipality due to its size or financial constraints, a directorate could be established within a department, of town planning or building control that has the primary function of dealing with heritage conservation of the built environment. Again, if this were not possible due to constraints, local municipalities could share resources to ease the burden. Why could the district municipality not do it? (Witzenberg Municipality respondent Pers com 2020).
Table 3.10 Reasons for not having current and effective municipal heritage policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Department or directorate</th>
<th>Tools and policies</th>
<th>Public-private partnership</th>
<th>Conflicting interests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>Data</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kannaland and Laingsburg municipalities did not answer these questions.
Three municipalities referred to the use of tools and policies instead of heritage policies. Langeberg Municipality stated that “…development of a heritage policy [has] never been an expressed priority with council and senior officials” and therefore there is no heritage policy. Oudtshoorn Municipality was in the process of identifying an HPOZ and creating accompanying by-laws to better assist with heritage conservation of their built environment. Overstrand Municipality explained that they made use of the NHRA, their heritage survey and HPOZ, rather than use heritage policy or using the option to use in conjunction with local heritage policy.

Two municipalities stated that they make use of or are currently establishing heritage committees to assist with heritage matters. Swartland Municipality’s heritage study was yet to be accepted by HWC, but they anticipated that when this happened, they would receive instructions from HWC and then most likely form an aesthetics committee to assist with the decision making. Cape Agulhas Municipality was in the process of formulating a heritage council consisting of private citizens and retired professionals that would assist with heritage matters. Saldanha Bay and Swartland municipalities reiterated that since their heritage studies had not been accepted by HWC, they were unable to go ahead and create local heritage policies. Mossel Bay Municipality advised that they were limited by lack of knowledge and they could not explain why they did not have a heritage policy and what they did in lieu of one.

Langeberg Municipality was the only municipality to make note of the potential for conflict of interest regarding the relationship between heritage conservation and economic development: “[Heritage] conservation has on occasion been regarded by some as hampering economic development, especially in historic core areas of towns.” But Drakenstein Municipality Pers com (2020) regarded heritage as an economic resource. Mason (2006) has explained that cultural conservation should be a political engagement of planning and design and that it should be a combined effort of conservation and development. The popular perception of heritage conservation only protecting old buildings fails to recognise all the other benefits of conserving and using heritage resources. Drakenstein Municipality’s respondent rightly observed that when the built heritage is seen as an economic resource it is:

…able to be degraded. If it is not used, its economic benefit is lost. [To get our] …value for money, we need the intangible [heritage], as it offers for example, a view, placemaking, experience and enjoyment (Drakenstein Municipality respondent Pers com 2020).
As only four local municipalities indicated that they have developed heritage policies, it was necessary to investigate the other 16 local municipalities to see how they protected their local heritage resources.

### 3.2.3.3 Levels of policies and tools used to protect heritage resources

If a municipality did not have local heritage policies respondents were asked what methods, if any, were used to protect heritage resources in their municipal areas. A variety of answers were given, ranging from national law to local policy to department considerations and by-laws within each LM. These are addressed next.

**Implementing national legislation to protect local heritage resources**

Several of the local municipalities use national law to protect heritage resources in their geographical areas (Table 3.11). Five municipalities indicated that they made use of the NHRA when considering heritage conservation and protection of heritage resources. Only two made use of SPLUMA when handling heritage conservation and protection of heritage resource.

Table 3.11 Government levels of legislation, policies and tools used to protect heritage resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>National</th>
<th>Provincial</th>
<th>Local</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bitou, Kannaland and Laingsburg municipalities did not answer these questions.

**Reliance on the PHRA regarding heritage conservation**

Four municipalities refer to the PHRA, to deal with heritage resources in the absence of local municipal heritage policies. Breede Valley Municipality use the legislation as it is set down and HWC is the authority for Grades II and III heritage resources in the province. Cederberg and Swartland municipalities refer applications to HWC. Swartland Municipality does the same they support the decisions of HWC. Langeberg Municipality noted that approval from HWC on applications for buildings older than 60 years is required.
Several local municipalities made use of a variety of tools and policies when protecting heritage resources in their areas. Cape Agulhas and Prince Albert municipalities said that they make use of their SDF when handling heritage conservation. Prince Albert Municipality pointed out that they also make use of other policies, such as municipal by-laws, building regulations and their heritage audit plan. Overstrand Municipality makes use of their heritage study as well as the HPOZ when dealing with applications that involve heritage resources. Matzikama Municipality disclosed that they receive comments from different departments within their municipality regarding building or zoning schemes and that these comments were guided by the “different acts the departments [had] to adhere to”. Langeberg Municipality stated that in 2005 they identified areas of aesthetic concern and that an Aesthetic Committee (AC) was established for each town [in the municipality] to assess and comment on any development proposals and intended building work in these areas, according to design guidelines that have been drawn up for each area by that AC. Unfortunately, AC’s do not function properly currently (Langeberg Municipality respondent 2020).

Hessequa and Saldanha Bay municipalities communicated that they did not use any heritage guidelines from any level of authority or policy when dealing with heritage resources in their geographical areas. The latter municipality communicated that their “…heritage survey [was] incomplete, [and that they have] no knowledge of what […] to do” (Saldanha Bay Municipality respondent 2020). Although Hessequa Municipality said that they had “none” they did elaborate that “…if buildings [were] on properties [that] are older than 60 years, a heritage comment [was] requested.”

As this section saw if local municipalities had developed heritage conservation policies, as well as if local planning policies considered heritage conservation. Some local municipalities used national and provincial legislation and tools to conserve their local heritage resources. Therefore, it was necessary to investigate the availability of local heritage policies and national legislation to local municipal staff and the public.

### 3.2.3.4 Availability and knowledge of local municipal heritage policies and national legislation

Regarding the availability and knowledge of policies and legislation, seven (35%) of the 20 responding municipalities confirmed that these documents were publicly available (Table 3.12). Nine (45%) of the municipalities agreed that they had other policies (such as signage policy) that probably relate to heritage conservation. When asked about the knowledge they had about local policies and national legislation their municipality, 16 (80%) of the 20 municipalities confirmed that their
employees were aware of the statutory requirements of cultural heritage protection stated both NEMA and NHRA.

Table 3.12 Availability and knowledge of local municipal heritage policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Publicly available</th>
<th>Use of other policies</th>
<th>Knowledge of NHRA and NEMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Hessequa and Kannaland municipalities did not answer these questions.

3.2.3.5 Planning and management of heritage resources within local municipalities

Among the 20 responding municipalities only Stellenbosch Municipality had a conservation management plan (CMP) for heritage resources in its geographical area. Various reasons were given by the other 19 municipalities for not having a CMP, all of which relate to financial, capacity, data and knowledge limitations (Table 3.13). Additional reasons emerged relating to the jurisdiction of departments and directorates, as well as the use of legal tools and policies.

Factors constraining municipalities from having conservation management plans

Five (26%) of the 19 municipalities cited financial constraints for not having a CMP for heritage resources in their municipal area. Five municipalities recognised a connection between capacity and another factor as their reason for not having a CMP. The capacity constraints involve human resources, skills and expertise within municipalities. Bitou Municipality’s respondent said that: “The skills to undertake such an assessment [were] not found within the municipality and would have to be outsourced.” Outsourcing would require a budget the municipality did not have. Cederberg Municipality echoed similar sentiments and mentioned that the municipality was constrained by budget and capacity. As Knysna Municipality had only one individual tending to heritage matters and consequently resolved to say they had a staffing shortage. Oudtshoorn Municipality declared that they had “no available resources”, while Prince Albert Municipality explained that they had a “capacity
and expertise shortage”. Saldanha Bay Municipality remarked that “there is no one at the municipality equipped for this”. Witzenberg Municipality repeated that they did not have the capacity to do this and they needed clarification on roles relating to heritage conservation within local municipalities and provincial government.

Table 3.13 Constraints identified for local municipalities not having a conservation management plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Department or directorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Kannaland, Laingsburg and Langeberg municipalities did not answer these questions.

Only two (11%) municipalities claimed that there was a data shortage regarding their reasons for not having a CMP. Matzikama Municipality required a heritage asset register to be compiled and approved which “would be one of the studies that will be proposed in line with the environmental management plan for conservation”. Only one municipality had a knowledge constraint in this regard.

Jurisdiction within municipalities that impact conservation management plans

Four municipalities stated that their reason for not having a CMP was due to jurisdiction within their municipality, as Grade III heritage resources were controlled by a different directorate, therefore the onus was not on the LM. It was confirmed that either Cape Nature or South African National Parks (SANParks) controlled these resources in the Cape Agulhas Municipality. Swartland Municipality specified that the onus was on the PHRA and that “such a plan will most likely be compiled once a delegation from Heritage Western Cape has been received regarding decision making on Grade III properties.” Saldanha Bay Municipality responded that conservation of local heritage resources was “not a legal requirement” of their municipality, and Witzenberg Municipality insisted that “…municipalities [would] not give attention to the matter if it is not legally bound to do so.” Witzenberg Municipality added that they were not aware of any small municipality having either a heritage department or officer and remarked that heritage conservation and management had mostly
been a provincial competency. Although Matzikama Municipality admitted to a data shortage, they anticipated that when the required data became available, they would be able to create a CMP suitable to protect their heritage resources. Overstrand Municipality deemed their heritage survey and HPOZ to be adequate and that a CMP was not required because these legal tools already existed.

Three (16%) municipalities said that a private organisation was hired to compile their CMP (whether the plans exist in effect is uncertain). Stellenbosch Municipality was the only one that had a CMP for heritage resources in its area. Their CMP was compiled by the Cape Winelands Association, a private company. Saldanha Bay Municipality employed Bridget O’Donoghue, a private heritage consultant and Prince Albert Municipality made use of their local volunteer organisation, Prince Albert Cultural Foundation, to compile their CMP.

By investigating and discussing various legal tools, local policies and national legislation implemented by local municipalities for the protection of local heritage resources gives rise to find out if and how local municipalities can enforce these protective measures.

3.2.3.6 Heritage asset protection enforcement

Only seven (35%) of the 20 responding municipalities were able to enforce heritage conservation laws, policies and guidelines (Table 3.14). Insights were gained into municipalities’ ability to achieve this by six means, namely authority, policy, tools, advisory, followed procedures and other. Municipalities typically used a combination of these.

Table 3.14 Methods used to enforce heritage conservation laws, policies and guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Tools</th>
<th>Advisory</th>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Breede Valley Municipality did not answer this question.

Kannaland and Swellendam municipalities indicated that they referred any applications for building alterations on buildings older than 60 years to HWC, the heritage authority in the province. This method is directly linked to national policy (NHRA) which states that any building older than 60 can benefit from protection from the Act and that only the lowest competent heritage authority would need to approve the application. Kannaland Municipality claimed that the use of the Act was part of their method of enforcing protection of built heritage resources. Mossel Bay Municipality had a similar approach stating that: “Building plan applications must comply to the Act before being considered for approval.” Swartland Municipality uses existing heritage registers to assist with
decision making on building plan and land use applications. Swellendam Municipality used the HPOZ as a tool for heritage protection and noted that any application within this zone would have to be considered for heritage sensitivity. Swellendam Municipality revealed that an advisory committee assisted in heritage matters. Oudtshoorn and Kannaland municipalities follow bureaucratic process as with any submission of applications for building plans. In this process applications, must go via the building inspector and from there applications are sent to HWC for approval. Kannaland Municipality maintains that the “Building inspector does not allow any alterations to building[s] older than 60 years without prior approval from the [W]estern [C]ape heritage committee.” Hessequa Municipality referred to a previous answer, noting that “the municipality can introduce policies, but for heritage it was not necessary yet”.

As so few local municipalities were able to enforce policies and legislation pertaining to local heritage resources it was necessary to investigate what prevented the other 13 local municipalities from enforcement.

3.2.3.7 Constraints on the enforcement of heritage asset protection

Thirteen (65%) municipalities were not able to enforce laws, policies or guidelines regarding heritage conservation in their areas. Various reasons given to explain the inability (Table 3.15). Six (46%) of the 13 respondents ascribed it to lack of human resources, skills and expertise. Stellenbosch Municipality lacked the appropriate personnel with only one heritage planner and no law-enforcement officers. The municipality did not appoint a legal representative as it “is very costly and the budget is extremely limited”. Knysna Municipality has only one staff member who deals with all heritage matters. Bitou Municipality did not have skilled staff required to enforce heritage laws and had to outsource the task. Cederberg, Prince Albert and Langeberg municipalities all had capacity shortages regarding staff members suited to the job. Langeberg Municipality had no “heritage specialist” employed by the municipality while Prince Albert’s employees lacked expertise.

Five municipalities asserted that the enforcement of heritage laws, policies and guidelines was not within their jurisdiction. Cape Agulhas Municipality indicated that their district municipality, Overberg District Municipality, “governed” this area of heritage enforcement. Cederberg Municipality confirmed that this was not in their mandate as a LM and Saldanha Bay Municipality underlined this sentiment by stating that, “the power [had] not been delegated” to them. Overstrand Municipality maintained that “all application [were] sent to Heritage Western Cape” and that the onus was on the PHRA to enforce any heritage law. Matzikama Municipality commented that “if there [were] any problems [they were] referred to SAHRA to follow up”, therefore sending all their heritage matters to the national authority. Langeberg Municipality is the only one that receives input on
applications from aesthetics committees. This is considered by the building control department to be advisable, namely:

No heritage specialists [are] employed [by the municipality]. Input from aesthetic committees is regarded by the building control department as advisory [sic] and [is] not always followed, especially if all building regulations are adhered to (Langeberg Municipality respondent 2020).

Table 3.15 Constraints regarding enforcement of heritage protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Laingsburg and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

This situation is problematic as it could lead to a conflict of interest as well as ambiguity of hierarchy of legislation and policies.

As discussed in this subsection 75% of local municipalities made heritage conservation a consideration in their municipal planning documents. While only 20% of local municipalities have current and effective heritage policies, others made use of legal tools and national legislation to protect their local heritage resources. Stellenbosch Municipality was the only one to have CMP implemented in its area. Only seven of 20 municipalities made heritage policies and national legislation pertaining to heritage conservation available to the public via their municipal websites. Local municipalities found difficulties in enforcing relevant heritage protection measures. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate what protective measure local municipalities use when handling municipal heritage assets.

3.2.4 Local municipality heritage policy considerations

In this subsection the measures implemented to protect municipal-owned heritage assets was investigated. Local municipalities gave insights to their municipal asset policies and how local municipalities went about protecting historic infrastructure in their geographical area.
3.2.4.1 Protection of municipal heritage assets

Regarding the heritage assets owned and managed by local municipalities, three out of four responding municipalities indicated that the assets were afforded protection, either under a municipal planning scheme or some other statutory instruments, such as national law (NHRA and NEMA). Five municipalities confirmed that this was not the case in their areas. Bitou and Mossel Bay municipalities cited an inadequacy of knowledge as the reason why this was not possible. Although the Prince Albert respondent said that they “…only have one building that qualifies and though it is listed in the heritage audit plan, [they] do not have the expertise to register it formally.” It was thus concluded that Prince Albert Municipality has both financial and human resource limitations.

3.2.4.2 Creation and use of conservation management plans for municipal heritage assets

The 20 responding municipalities were unanimous in saying that they did not have a CMP for each heritage asset they owned. Inevitably, no municipality was able to provide an example of a CMP for a municipal-owned heritage asset. The reasons for not having individual CMPs for municipal-owned heritage assets, are categorised in Table 3.16. Bitou, Breede Valley, Cederberg, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Swellendam municipalities all cited financial constraints. Four of these municipalities as well as Prince Albert Municipality also noted a lack of capacity and expertise. Only Oudtshoorn Municipality cited a lack of data, whereas Knysna and Mossel Bay municipalities announced a lack of knowledge. Saldanha Bay Municipality questioned whether this is a legal requirement a LM must satisfy and Hessequa Municipality pointed out that this was done “on another level (Provincial/National)”. Stellenbosch and Swartland municipalities reported that they use other legal instruments and tools to provide planning for conservation and management of heritage assets in their cases. Swartland Municipality contended that “existing heritage registers inform decision making on building plans and land use applications”. The respondent from Stellenbosch Municipality explained that:

The heritage management plan is a broad guideline used when considering and planning or building authorisation only. It is impractical and far too expensive to undertake an investigation with the aim to prepare heritage guidelines or indicators for every individual property (Stellenbosch Municipality respondent 2020).
Table 3.16 Reasons for municipalities not having conservation management plans for municipal-owned heritage assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>Human resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cape Agulhas, Drakenstein, Kannaland, Laingsburg, Langeberg, Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Overstand Municipality admitted that they had not yet done a CMP for each heritage asset yet but anticipated that this would eventually be done. Swellendam Municipality noted that CMPs for heritage assets were not a priority for them.

3.2.4.3 Management of municipal-owned heritage assets without a conservation management plan

Municipalities not having individual CMPs for municipal-owned heritage assets were investigated further, they were by asking them how they manage their respective heritage resources (Table 3.17). Mossel Bay Municipality imputed their not having CMPs for individual heritage assets to deficient knowledge. Two municipalities referred to the role of national policies when managing their heritage assets. Prince Albert Municipality said that, “…[o]ne building is maintained in terms of the National [B]uilding [R]egulations [and Building Standards Act]”, while Oudtshoorn Municipality made use of the NHRA. Matzikama Municipality relied on “comments from SAHRA and other external [g]overnment [d]epartments”. Cederberg and Stellenbosch municipalities refer to HWC for direction. Stellenbosch Municipality explained their protocol as:

[When] an application is received, the applicant is required to submit at least a heritage statement and sometimes a heritage assessment for the individual property. All applications for alterations are referred to HWC for consideration and a permit, if required. We have a heritage committee that advises council on [all] alteration[s] being planned to buildings older than 60 years (Stellenbosch Municipality respondent 2020).
Table 3.17 Protocols followed by local municipalities for municipal-owned heritage assets without conservation management plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Knowledge constraint</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Authority</th>
<th>Legal instrument / tools / protocol</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Bitou, Breede Valley, Cape Agulhas, Drakenstein, Kannaland, Knysna, Hessequa, Laingsburg, Langeberg, Overstrand, Witzenberg municipalities did not answer this question.

Swartland Municipality use their existing heritage registers to assist them in managing their municipal-owned built heritage assets. Saldanha Bay Municipality manage their municipal heritage assets “on an ad-hoc basis”, while Swellendam Municipality declared that they “own little or no heritage resources”.

Only Stellenbosch Municipality had a CMP for heritage resources in its municipal area. No LM had individual CMPs for municipal-owned heritage assets. Only Stellenbosch Municipality were able to say that all their municipal departments were aware of the CMP. However, they did concede that, “…[all] department[s] should be aware of the CMP but as [the] municipality keeps on working in silos, many officials do not know about it or consider it of no value.”

Matzikama Municipality admitted that they needed to draw up a CMP and implement it. Municipalities were also asked if all the municipal departments used the CMP to guide decision making. Only Stellenbosch Municipality could respond to this and did so by stating that “…[despite] policy being in place and approved by council, not everyone adheres to it perhaps as it is seen as “soft” issues”. Knysna Municipality reiterated that everything related to heritage matters in the municipality is sent through to one staff member.

3.2.4.4 Municipal asset policies

Nine (45%) of the responding municipalities had a redundant assets policy and that 75% had an assets transfer policy. Four municipalities indicated either insufficient knowledge of redundant assets or assets transfer policy when dealing with municipal heritage assets. Three municipalities made use of an asset management policy, which included procedures of redundancy and transfer of assets in the municipality. Stellenbosch Municipality stated that they “…work[ed] according to the [Municipal Finance Management Act] MFMA [and that] [heritage] assets [were] not or at least very seldom alienated.”
3.2.4.5 Protecting historic infrastructure

Only four (20%) of the responding municipalities have policies which protect historic infrastructure in their municipalities. Historic infrastructure includes items such as leiwater channels, kerbing, street furniture, trees and other elements that contribute to the surrounding context. Several methods of protection were provided by the municipalities. In Knysna and Stellenbosch these items are maintained by other departments or directorates within the respective municipality. Stellenbosch Municipality shed some light on how this procedure was executed.

The engineering directorate is responsible for the maintenance of all infrastructure including historical infrastructure such as the mill stream. When maintenance is done, they will approach the heritage planner for advice/support and if major alteration is required, they will appoint a heritage practitioner to prepare a statement for submission with HWC (Stellenbosch Municipality respondent 2020).

Swellendam Municipality provided insight into how historic items are maintained and protected, namely “…leiwater is an active system, which is maintained continuously as needed. Trees within…road reserve[s] may not be cut down without municipal permission. Some trees are protected in terms of national legislation.” Two municipalities (Overstrand and Prince Albert) confirmed that items were managed by volunteer organisations in their areas. Cederberg Municipality referred any interference with these items to HWC, whereas Oudtshoorn Municipality confirmed that these items are protected by the NHRA.

The objective of the second phase of the survey was to establish the current methods of protection implemented by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and the management of Grade III heritage resources. It was found that local municipalities without a heritage survey made use of various legal tools such as the NHRA, the PHRA and private management agreements. Additionally, local municipalities also used measures such as MPSs, protective areas, grading of resources and statements of significance to protect their Grade III heritage resources. Some local municipalities had developed heritage policies in addition to the considerations made in the municipal planning documents (IDPs and SDFs). However, only 35% of local municipalities made heritage policies and national legislation available on their respective municipal websites. Local municipalities identified limitations regarding their lack of CMPs for heritage assets and shortcomings with enforcing heritage policy. Last, municipal-owned heritage assets and protection of historic infrastructure were considered. As local municipalities showed many ways in which local heritage resources were protected in the respective municipalities, many inadequacies were also identified. It is necessary to
investigate methods of support given and required by local municipalities to better conservation local heritage resources.

3.3 SUPPORTING

The objective of the third phase of the questionnaire survey was to determine the methods of support given and needed by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and management of local resources. The support categories considered were personnel, planning and advisory capacities within local municipalities as well as support given by communities via volunteer organisations. Fourteen (58%) of 24 municipalities responded.

3.3.1 The role of heritage personnel in local municipalities

Heritage personnel in the local municipalities were found to not always occupy the same positions or act in similar capacities. Personnel having direct impact on heritage decisions could work in the town planning or building departments functioning as heritage officers or advisors (of a different directorate) or as members of advisory committees. The following subsections will report on the availability, use and positioning of heritage personnel in local municipalities.

3.3.1.1 Local municipality heritage advisors

Half of the 14 responding municipalities confirmed that heritage advice was received from either an individual acting as heritage advisor or from an advisory committee. Drakenstein, Stellenbosch and Oudtshoorn municipalities have individuals employed by the municipality as their heritage advisors (Table 3.18). Drakenstein Municipality has a heritage resources officer, Clive Theunissen, and Stellenbosch Municipality has a heritage officer, Kaizer Makati. Oudtshoorn Municipality has both a heritage officer, Ambrose Carelse, as well as a building control officer, Lizette Smit, who participate with heritage matters. Mossel Bay, Overstand and Prince Albert municipalities make use of volunteer organisations to assist with heritage matters. The volunteer organisation, Prince Albert Cultural Foundation of the Prince Albert Municipality, was the only one formally contracted in a heritage advisory role. Bitou Municipality did not have a heritage advisor and a different directorate as well as local volunteer organisations participate in heritage matters: “[the] Environmental Management tries to assist in heritage-related matters through consultation with local heritage societies.”

Six (43%) the 14 responding municipalities reported that their heritage advisors met the heritage demands of communities and municipal staff. While Matzikama, Swellendam and Witzenberg municipalities do not receive any form of heritage advice, but their communities’ demands were being met but the respondents did not elaborate on how this was done. Mossel Bay and Overstand municipalities do not have a heritage advisor, but they make use of volunteer heritage committees which provide input when needed and this adequately meets the demands of the communities and
municipal staff. Saldanha Bay Municipality has no heritage advisor for the municipality, only HWC. Only in the cases of three municipalities are heritage advisors encouraged to perform public education, education of staff and heritage promotional roles. The representative of the Stellenbosch Municipality stated that:

The heritage planner is required to proactively sensitise the owners of [historically] significant property of the rights and responsibilities as well a generally educate the public about local heritage attributes [and] processes (Stellenbosch Municipality respondent 2020).

Table 3.18 Heritage advisors and capacities in local municipalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Heritage advisor placement</th>
<th>Meets community demands</th>
<th>Education or promotion of heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Municipal employee</td>
<td>Volunteer organisation</td>
<td>Different department or directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Saldanha Bay Municipality did not answer this question.

Although Bitou and Mossel Bay municipalities did not have heritage advisors, they relied on either another directorate or volunteer organisation to fulfil these aspects of heritage education and promotion. It is significant that no district municipality had a heritage advisor.

3.3.1.2 Local municipalities’ planning departments

Only four (29%) municipalities had a heritage officer in their planning department (Table 3.19). Stellenbosch Municipality has had an officer in this position for at least the last 20 years. Oudtshoorn and Saldanha Bay municipalities have created and filled this position in the last decade. In Saldanha Bay Municipality an official was appointed in 2013, but it was “an addendum to the main function of the Environment[al directorate]” and that in terms of legislation the official was only required to keep and maintain a register.
Table 3.19 Heritage officers, advisory committees and limitations on creating these positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Heritage officer</th>
<th>Date position created</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Human resources</th>
<th>Organisational structure</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Another department or organisation fulfils this</th>
<th>Community heritage advisory committee</th>
<th>Date committee created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x 2017</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x UnsSure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hessequa Municipality did not answer this question.
Several reasons were identified for municipalities not having a heritage officer in their planning department (or any other department). Financial constraints were cited by three municipalities (Overstrand, Bitou and Prince Albert). However, Prince Albert Municipality also noted that: “…[w]e work well with the Prince Albert Cultural Foundation. They meet our operational needs.” Although Prince Albert Municipality cited a lack of capacity, these needs were fulfilled by the local volunteer organisation.

Bitou and Witzenberg municipalities recorded that in their municipal no place had been made for a heritage officer. Bitou Municipality said that “[no] budget [nor] space on the organogram for a Heritage Officer has been created”. Witzenberg concurred and speculated that this was “perhaps because Heritage is not seen as a core function of the municipality. Also, a town like Ceres has very little heritage applications and does not justify appointing someone.”

Five municipalities indicated that heritage positions fell under another department or directorate. Bitou and Saldanha Bay municipalities pointed that this role fell under environmental management. Matzikama Municipality indicated that “heritage [was] currently a subdivision of the tourism and environmental coordinators job”. The respondent from Drakenstein Municipality voiced opposition to such an alliance:

> Often, we see that the environment and heritage are grouped together but in reality, they have a militant relationship. The [Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning] DEA&DP is not an authority in terms of the NHRA. They tend to be autonomous instead of inclusive. They issue approval without taking in all the information or acknowledging all the comments submitted (Drakenstein Municipality Pers com 2020).

Prince Albert Municipality made use of a private volunteer organisation, Prince Albert Cultural Foundation and Kannaland Municipality argued that they “…[relied] on the [Heritage] Western Cape…committee for approvals”.

Six (43%) of the 14 municipalities had committees. These committees had been founded over time with Overstrand Municipality’s being proclaimed more than 30 years ago, Oudtshoorn Municipality’s in the last ten years and Swellendam Municipality’s in 2014. Five municipalities gave several reasons for not having a community heritage advisory committee. In the Bitou Municipality environmental management assisted in heritage-related matters through consultation with local heritage societies. Kannaland Municipality argued that because “…[Heritage] Western Cape committee has the final say the community committee is not a decision-making body”. Saldanha Bay Municipality commented that even though many people had expressed an interest, no one was willing to commit
to such an organisation. Furthermore, a lack of capacity made it unfeasible to create committee and maintain a committee. Witzenberg Municipality ascribed their not having a community heritage advisory committee there being so few heritage resources in their area. Stellenbosch Municipality previously had a planning advisory committee (PAC) that was disbanded four years ago as their terms of office had expired. Under the new zoning scheme a new PAC was to be created but the terms of reference have not yet been approved by local council.

### 3.3.2 Making use of volunteer organisations in public office

Several local municipalities indicated that they include and make use of the community through volunteer organisations regarding heritage conservation. These organisations fulfil partial responsibilities in public office as well as communicating knowledge to the broader communities. In the following five subsections, heritage-focused organisations are reported on. First, investigating the which local municipal areas have heritage-focused organisations operating in their areas (3.3.2.1), second, to look at the relationships between these organisations and local municipalities (3.3.2.2). Third, investigation of public access to policies, publications and guidelines regarding heritage conservation (3.3.2.3). Fourth, a discussion of financial assistance offered to heritage property owners (3.3.2.4) and last, to examine if local municipalities were able to assist heritage-focused organisations in their municipal areas (3.3.2.5).

#### 3.3.2.1 Heritage-focused organisations operating within municipal jurisdiction

These volunteer, heritage-focused organisations have various structural arrangements, such as community-based organisations (CBOs), non-governmental organisations (NGOs) or non-profit organisations (NPOs) as well as other structures. Nineteen (79%) of the 24 municipalities have one or more heritage-focused organisations operating in their municipal areas (Table 3.20). The information presented in the table was from answers to questions in parts one and three of the questionnaire survey, as well as from sources in the public realm like Heritage Western Cape (2020) and The Heritage Portal (2020).

Only Cederberg and Kannaland municipalities specifically stated that they did not have an organisation involved in heritage matters operating in their municipal areas. Investigations found that no organisations this nature were found in Bergrivier, Laingsburg or Langeberg municipalities. Thirteen municipalities (Bitou, Breede Valley, Hessequa, Knysna, Matzikama, Mossel Bay, Oudtshoorn, Overstrand, Prince Albert, Saldanha Bay, Stellenbosch, Swartland and Witzenberg) do partner with such organisations to various extents when handling heritage conservation and management matters. Their relationships with their respective heritage organisations were described.
Table 3.20 Heritage-focused organisations and the nature of public-private partnerships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Awareness of organisations operating within municipal area</th>
<th>Engagement with organisation</th>
<th>Name of organisation</th>
<th>Nature of engagement</th>
<th>Additional organisations found in the public realm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>The Van Plettenberg Historical Society</td>
<td>Committee no longer exists</td>
<td>Nelspoort Agency of Sustainable Development†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Breede Valley Heritage Committee</td>
<td>Comments for land-use applications</td>
<td>Hex Valley Tourism Association† McGregor Heritage Society† Touws River Heritage and Conservation Society† Worcester Heritage and Conservation Society†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Breede Valley Heritage Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Blombos Caves</td>
<td>If requested</td>
<td>Agulhas Heritage Society† Friends of Elim†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Non-existent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drakenstein Heritage Foundation† Paarl 300 Foundation†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Knysna Historical Society</td>
<td>Sometimes assists in matters</td>
<td>Simon Van Der Stel Foundation Southern Cape† The George Heritage Trust† Outeniqua Historical Society†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Griekwa Heritage Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Mossel Bay Heritage Society</td>
<td>Forms part of the Heritage and Aesthetics Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Heritage Oudtshoorn Erfenis De Rust Heritage Conservation Association</td>
<td>Required to comment of heritage resource applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Foundation Stanford Conservation Trust &amp; Stanford Heritage Committee</td>
<td>Monthly meeting and weekly screening of HPOZ plans</td>
<td>Whale Coast Conservation† Hermanus History Society† Hermanus Ratepayers Association†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality*</td>
<td>Awareness of organisations operating within municipal area</td>
<td>Engagement with organisation</td>
<td>Name of organisation</td>
<td>Nature of engagement</td>
<td>Additional organisations found in the public realm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Prince Albert Cultural Foundation</td>
<td>Serves on the building advisory committee and comments on land-use applications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Two Khoisan communities</td>
<td>Informs municipality of heritage areas</td>
<td>West Coast Aboriginal Council†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>Constant communication</td>
<td>Jamestown Erfenis / Heritage Pniel Heritage and Cultural Trust† Franschhoek Heritage and Ratepayer Association†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Local heritage consultant</td>
<td>With private consultants</td>
<td>Swartland Heritage§</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>Swellendam Heritage Association</td>
<td>Non-existent, no engagement requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theewaterskloof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greyton Conservation Society†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation</td>
<td>Very limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No information was found for the following municipalities: Bergrivier, Cederberg, Kannaland, Laingsburg and Langeberg.
†As per Heritage Western Cape (2020)
§As per Heritage Portal (2020)
The working relationships and duties fulfilled by each heritage organisation in each municipal area varied. Bitou and Prince Albert municipalities specified that their heritage organisations were involved in providing comments on land use applications. Oudtshoorn Municipality required recommendations from their local heritage organisation before approving building plans on buildings older than 60 years. Mossel Bay and Prince Albert municipalities added that their heritage organisations formed part of their advisory committees concerned with buildings, heritage and aesthetics. Stellenbosch Municipality revealed that they were in “constant communication” with organisations operating in their area and Overstrand Municipality explained that they had monthly meetings with their organisations and weekly screenings of HPOZ plans in which the organisations participated.

Witzenberg Municipality described their relationship with Tulbagh Valley Heritage Foundation as being “very limited in nature”. Drakenstein and Swellendam municipalities noted that while there were heritage-focused organisations operating in their municipal area the relationship between the public and private entities were “non-existent”. Swellendam Municipality explained that the municipality already had their own advisory committee so that input from another committee was unnecessary. Kannaland Municipality referred all heritage matters to the Heritage Western Cape committee. Swartland Municipality noted that while they did not engage with an organisation, they did communicate with a private heritage consultant. It was also made known that their department of town planning “comment[ed] on HIA for developments”.

3.3.2.2 Interaction between local municipalities and local organisations
A map (Figure 3.1) of affiliated heritage organisations that work in conjunction with the PHRA was found and examined to establish areas in which respective heritage organisations operated (Heritage Western Cape 2020). However, this does not mean that these organisations work with their local municipalities. Some organisations are not affiliated with HWC, but this does not imply that they cannot operate with heritage-focused interests. Four municipalities gave reasons for not engaging with private heritage-focused organisations in their areas.

Swellendam Municipality reported having no requests for engagement from any private organisations. They are aware of one or more organisations operating in the area but have not been proactive in connecting with them. Saldanha Bay Municipality is aware of Khoisan groups “but they are not [built] heritage focused” and they do not know of any other organisations in their area. This observation led to the question what Saldanha Bay Municipality considered to be part of heritage and worthy of conservation. In the Cape Agulhas Municipal area a heritage committee of private citizens is currently being assembled. Beaufort West Municipality reported that previously there was a committee, but due to the aging of group members it no longer existed. Hessequa Municipality cited
a lack of resources (time and personnel) for not having engaged with private organisations in the area, but an investigation confirmed that no such organisations were operating in the area.

Figure 3.1 Local municipalities with affiliated conservation bodies of Heritage Western Cape within their jurisdiction

Cederberg Municipality noted that engagement with heritage-focused organisations was part of a different department, namely the local economic development (LED). Upon inspection of the LED implementation plan (Cederberg Municipality 2017) no mention of heritage or conservation was found in the document. However, the LED strategy from the previous year does mention diverse resources in the municipal region that have potential for economic gain. Clanwilliam, the main town of the municipality, is noteworthy for being one of the top ten oldest towns in South Africa and district is known for its various heritage resources (Cederberg Municipality 2016).

3.3.2.3 Public access to publications, guidelines and heritage policies

Mossel Bay and Overstrand municipalities both have a municipal repository available for the public to access information via link on each municipality’s website. Stellenbosch Municipality’s information was not available on their municipality’s website as the “[online] library [was] managed
by the Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation” and freely available to the public on that organisation’s website. Saldanha Bay and Swellendam municipalities attributed a lack of expertise within the municipality as a reason for information not being readily available. Saldanha Bay Municipality insist that publication is not a legal requirement. Bitou and Swellendam municipalities rely on national legislation and provincial policies and guidelines when conserving heritage resources, hence the information was not available from their municipality. Bitou Municipality explained that:

The Heritage Act is a national piece of legislation and it is treated similarly to other legislation that the public should be aware of. Should the public enquire about the heritage legislation copies would be able to be sent to them (Bitou Municipality respondent 2020).

Prince Albert Municipality argued that owing to their only having a heritage survey of Prince Albert town, this information was not readily available online. Witzenberg Municipality stated that “there [are] museums in every town” and therefore information would be available in hard copy at these venues. Oudtshoorn Municipality cited a knowledge constraint as why heritage-related information was not readily available.

3.3.2.4 Financial aid and obligations for heritage property owners

The 14 municipalities were unanimous in saying that their municipality did not have its own financial assistance programme to assist owners with places listed in the MPS. These programmes are normally in the form of a grant scheme, load fund or rate incentives. Two of the 14 municipalities charged a fee for a planning application for conservation work in a HPOZ or equivalent. Stellenbosch Municipality’s fee was on a “…sliding scale depending on size of building work contemplated”. Swellendam Municipality’s wrote that:

It depended on the extent of alterations. Normal conservation work would not be charged for. Fees are charged for work done in terms of the national building regulations, which are charged per m², therefore no fixed fee (Swellendam Municipality respondent 2020).

Thus, fees were charged on building applications as per the national building regulations (NBR) and not commensurate with the nature of the alterations, additions or demolitions. According to Bitou Municipality this type of fee was not applicable as no HPOZ existed in their municipal area.

3.3.2.5 Assistance given by municipalities to local heritage organisations

Most (19 of 24) municipalities had volunteer heritage-focused organisation operating in their municipal area. So that it was surprising to find that none of the 14 responding municipalities actively
informed heritage organisations of grant programmes run by provincial or national government or other private organisations. Six of the 14 responding municipalities provide support to local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations. The support was by offering financial benefit or supplying a venue for operational purposes or in the form of information. Prince Albert and Saldanha Bay municipalities indicated that they provided buildings to house museums and the latter municipality specified that a museum was run from municipal property. Prince Albert Municipality “…provide[d] buildings to operate from [and] provide[d] a financial grant for the compilation of the Heritage Survey in Prince Albert [town]”. Oudtshoorn Municipality supply information to heritage organisations in their area. Hessequa Municipality supports heritage organisations “if [it was] requested”. Matzikama Municipality indicated that “through a [Memorandum of Understanding] MOU with Namaqua West Coast Tourism Association” their municipality were able to provide support for local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations.

Four municipalities organise events with local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations. Hessequa Municipality is willing to organise events if approached by private organisations to do so. During the Whale Festival Overstrand Municipality helps to organise exhibitions and Saldanha Bay Municipality organises events on Heritage Day for the local people who were forcefully removed from Cape Camino.

3.3.3 Local municipal heritage staff

An investigation was done if LM staff members responsible for heritage assets can access skills and knowledge in their daily tasks. The following subsections discuss if municipal staff responsible for municipal-owned and -managed heritage assets have access to a heritage advisor and if local municipalities provided ongoing training to staff responsible for heritage resources.

3.3.3.1 Day-to-day management of heritage assets

Only four (Drakenstein, Oudtshoorn, Prince Albert and Stellenbosch) of the 14 municipalities confirmed that the municipal staff responsible for the day-to-day management of heritage assets can access the heritage advisor (Table 3.21). Eight of the responding municipalities indicated that staff responsible for heritage assets were able to access other heritage experts for advice. A number of reasons were identified why municipal staff were not able to access either the heritage advisor or an external expert. Kannaland, Saldanha Bay and Swellendam municipalities just do not have any such persons employed in their municipalities. But three agreed that their municipal staff can access expertise from an external expert. Kannaland Municipality pointed out that even though they did not have a heritage advisor, their building inspector was always available. Witzenberg Municipality reported that although their municipal staff did not have access to a heritage advisor:
It is important to note that town planning/building plan staff are aware of the heritage “triggers”. Any new application that is triggered by the [National] Heritage Resources Act is referred back to the applicant for referral to Heritage Western Cape. No plan would be passed without the necessary permit from HWC (Witzenberg Municipality respondent 2020).

Table 3.21 Municipal staffs’ access to heritage expertise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Access to heritage advisor</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Access to external experts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cederberg Municipality did not answer this question.

Due to this protocol Witzenberg Municipality felt that it was not necessary for a municipality to access external expertise when dealing with the day-to-day management of heritage assets. Bitou and Overstrand municipalities recognised that heritage assets were done through different directorates or departments. Bitou Municipality maintained that no management of heritage assets was undertaken in their municipality. Bitou, Hessequa, Overstrand and Witzenberg municipalities all have neither internal capacity nor access to external experts regarding heritage conservation of built heritage assets.

3.3.3.2 Skills development within local municipalities

Five (36%) of the 14 responding municipalities indicated that their municipal staff can access skills development regarding the management of heritage assets. Stellenbosch Municipality explained that this was part of their performance agreement which makes provision for training. Other municipalities (Matzikama, Mossel Bay, Overstrand and Saldanha Bay) were unaware or unsure if this was offered at their municipality. Bitou Municipality replied that “…such skills development ha[d] not been identified as a priority or area of concern” in their LM. Witzenberg Municipality reported that “…[s]kills development on heritage has never been offered to the municipality”. Hessequa and Swellendam municipalities agreed that this was not required as they had no heritage assets to manage.
The objective of the third phase of the questionnaire survey was to determine the support given and needed by local municipalities regarding the conservation and management of local heritage resources.

The objective of the third phase of the questionnaire survey was to determine the methods of support given and needed by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and management of local resources. The support categories considered were personnel, planning and advisory capacities within local municipalities as well as support given by communities via volunteer organisations. Fourteen (58%) of 24 municipalities responded. First, municipalities were observed for availability, use and positioning of heritage personnel in local municipalities. It was found that heritage advisors could be employees of the municipality or advisory committees. Majority of local municipalities indicated that they had heritage-focused organisations operating in their municipal areas and had formed partnership with their respective entities. Regarding local municipal staff, four municipalities’ staff responsible for management of heritage assets could access a heritage advisor and only five municipalities made provision for skills development regarding heritage conservation in their municipality. In the final phase of the questionnaire survey investigation into the communications and promotion of heritage conservation was made.

3.4 COMMUNICATING AND PROMOTING

Only 15 (63%) of 24 local municipalities responded to the fourth and final phase of the questionnaire survey. No qualifying question was asked at the outset for the final part of the questionnaire. This final phase of the survey aimed to investigate how local municipalities communicate with their constituents and how they promote heritage conservation and management in their respective municipal areas. In the following subsections an investigation into local municipalities’ ability to disseminate information regarding their jurisdiction of local heritage resources and information on heritage resources was made. It was also thought to be insightful to see if local municipalities made use of National Heritage Day and Month to promote heritage and connect with their constituents. The relationships between different entities of government and community stakeholders are also discussed.

3.4.1 Heritage awareness in local municipalities

The aim of the questions in this part of the questionnaire was to ascertain if information regarding heritage conservation and management was made readily available to the public. It was also necessary to find out if and how municipalities communicate, connect and engage with their constituents. In the following four subsection information availability of statutory control of local municipalities is discussed as well as methods used for heritage resource interpretation. In addition, it was necessary to find out how local municipalities communicated with owners of heritage properties.
3.4.1.1 Information availability

Only three of the 15 responding municipalities made heritage place information available via their municipal website. The other 12 municipalities gave reasons why this was not available (Table 3.22). Three of the 15 responding municipalities had additional publications or products that provided information about places of heritage significance in their geographical areas. Reasons for the unavailability of the information were identified. Five municipalities (Kannaland, Matzikama, Mossel Bay, Saldanha Bay and Swellendam) cited data constraints, saying that information regarding heritage place significance in their area was not readily available on their respective municipal websites. This was due to shortcomings in the information on heritage place significance, namely no list available, limited information, incompleteness of information and lack of categorisation. Kannaland Municipality disclosed that no list had been compiled and in Swellendam Municipality’s case the “information had not been catalogued formally”. Furthermore, Mossel Bay Municipality “only [had an] overview and general information” and Saldanha Bay had an incomplete survey. Matzikama Municipality indicated shortcomings, and this had resulted in “a heritage place register […] not [being] finalised to be published”.

Table 3.22 Availability of heritage place information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Via municipal website</th>
<th>Via other platforms or programmes</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Human resources</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Breede Valley and Overstrand municipalities cited limitations when asked about information availability for heritage place significance via other programmes or platforms. Thus, Overstrand Municipality only had the heritage surveys on their municipal website and Breede Valley no detailed study. Bitou and Stellenbosch municipalities both indicated that information regarding heritage place significance is held by another party. In the case of Bitou municipality “no expertise exists within the Municipal staff complement” and therefore:
As the heritage resources are not actively managed by the municipality they are not included. [The] tourism [directorate] is also separate from the municipality and contains the relevant information (Bitou Municipality respondent 2020).

Stellenbosch Municipality offered an explanation about the location and custodianship of information concerning heritage place significance, namely

The inventory is available on the website of the Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation, [an] organisation [that] is hosting the Heritage Inventory on behalf of the municipality. The heritage inventory will be handed over for management to the municipality in due course at a time when the staffing component is capacitated to manage and update the inventory (Stellenbosch Municipality respondent 2020).

Stellenbosch Municipality added that “…places of significance [were] promoted though the tourism sector” and therefore they did not have additional means of distribution of material. Swellendam Municipality announced, “a private publication is available listing most significant heritage buildings [and this is] available for purchase”. Cederberg and Prince Albert municipalities acknowledged that while they did have information regarding heritage place significance in their possession, both had simply “not uploaded it” yet. Cederberg and Mossel Bay municipalities cited knowledge constraints for not having an additional platform or programme to disseminate information on heritage place significance in their respective municipalities.

3.4.1.2 Interpretation of places of heritage significance

Only one (Drakenstein) of the 15 responding municipalities has a programme of interpreting places of heritage significance in their municipal area. Such programme includes items like plaques, sign or trails. Even though Matzikama Municipality indicated that they did not have a programme in place it was shown that “some places of heritage do have plaques”. The other 14 municipalities, including Matzikama, gave reasons for this not being realised in their municipalities (Table 3.23).

Bitou, Breede Valley and Stellenbosch municipalities cited lack of a budget and of capacity as the constraint factors. Stellenbosch Municipality answered that “no official programme was planned or implemented yet due to staffing capacity problems and lack of budget”. Prince Albert Municipality stated that they simply did not have “dedicated heritage capacity” in their municipality to run a project like this and Matzikama Municipality agreed with this. Three municipalities reported that a project like this was run either by a different department or by an external organisation. Mossel Bay and Swellendam municipalities’ programmes were run by the tourism office in each municipal district.
Mossel Bay Municipality has “tourist routes” and Swellendam Municipality “have a tourism website which detailed many historic buildings”. Overstrand Municipality pointed out that the interpretation of places of heritage significance was “normally done by community projects”.

Table 3.23 Reasons for not having interpretation programmes for heritage places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Different directorate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Hessequa Municipality did not give a reason for not implementing a programme for heritage places but did indicate that “[it had] not [been] done yet”, allowing for speculation that this would likely be done in the future. Saldanha Bay Municipality explained their constraints as “there is no willingness nor is there a legal obligation”.

3.4.1.3 Availability of information regarding municipal statutory controls

Three municipalities (Overstrand, Stellenbosch and Swellendam) made information available to the public that provides explanations of their municipality’s heritage services and statutory controls. These municipalities provide either a brochure or an online portal or both to the public. Overstrand Municipality had a brochure for only one town, Stanford. Swellendam Municipality’s information is available on their municipal website under the zoning scheme which also includes statutory controls. Stellenbosch Municipality pointed out that this information was available via a third-party website, that of Stellenbosch Heritage Foundation.

The remaining municipalities referred to other constraints for not having information publicly available to explain their municipal statutory controls (Table 3.24). Bitou and Breede Valley municipalities lacked a budget and capacity, so were not able to supply information to the public. Prince Albert and Stellenbosch municipalities also lack capacity. Cederberg, Kannaland and Mossel Bay municipalities were all unsure as to why this had not been done. Swellendam Municipality explained that the “promotion of heritage [is] largely driven by [the] private sector as buildings are in private ownership”.
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Table 3.24 Constraints regarding the dissemination of a municipality’s heritage services and statutory controls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Different directorate</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drakenstein, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Hessequa and Overstrand municipalities indicated that dissemination of information was “not yet established”, thereby suggesting that this may be done in the future. Saldanha Bay Municipality again noted that they were under no legal obligation to do this and there was no proactivity to have it done otherwise. None of the nine responding municipalities used newsletters or frequent publications to promote heritage in their areas. The reasons they gave were similar to those provided for other avenues explored about publicly available information. Bitou, Prince Albert and Stellenbosch municipalities all cited a lack of capacity. With Bitou Municipality adding that they suffered a budget constraint. Overstrand Municipality stated that publications were “not yet established” in their municipality and Kannaland and Mossel Bay municipalities had knowledge constraints in that their municipality did not have a frequent publication to promote heritage matters.

3.4.1.4 Communications with owners of heritage properties

Municipalities were asked if they sent periodic reminders to owners of places listed in planning schemes. These reminders would include information such as heritage controls currently in place and any heritage services the municipality may provide to owners of built heritage resources. None of the 15 responding municipalities communicated such information to their constituents. It was therefore not surprising to find that no municipality communicated with property owners of listed and graded built heritage resources about heritage controls in place or any services offered to owners of built heritage resources.

Data, knowledge, budget and lack of capacity constraints were identified in this regard (Table 3.25). Overstrand Municipality does convey information retroactively to some owners, namely “communications [are only] sent out monthly to owners who have submitted plans [for] heritage [approval]”. Swellendam Municipality stated that they “…deal with this on a case-by-case basis as [they] receive applications”. Hessequa Municipality contended that this was unnecessary in their
municipal area and Saldanha Bay Municipality noted that “there is no such control in place, to send out reminders”.

Table 3.25 Reasons for not communicating with heritage property owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Kannaland, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Few local municipalities made proactive efforts to communicate with their constituents regarding their statutory control and interpretation of places of significance due to various limitations. In addition, only one LM was found to retroactively contact heritage property owners with information about heritage resources. As these methods of communication are formal it was reasonable to investigate a more informal approach of communicating with stakeholders in local municipalities.

3.4.2 Celebration and recognition of heritage

As South Africa has a national public holiday dedicated to the celebration of its heritage, it was appropriate to investigate if local municipalities made use of this opportunity to celebrate heritage in their area. Furthermore, it was necessary to find out if any of the municipalities presented some sort of award for those that strive to protect these resources. In the following two subsections local municipalities give insight into celebrations for National Heritage Day and if any recognition is given to those who endeavour to protect heritage resources in their respective areas.

3.4.2.1 Coordinated events to celebrate heritage

Five (36%) of the 15 responding municipalities do organise events to celebrate National Heritage Day on the 24th of September each year. Bitou Municipality noted that “the communications and [human resources] sections of the municipality usually arrange for some or other type of heritage celebration event” while in Overstrand Municipality celebrations were “coordinated by area managers”. Matzikama Municipality stated that “councillors will choose events they want to support and then arrange it within communities.” Saldanha Bay Municipality informed that:

In Saldanha [Bay], there [were] forced removals during apartheid. The people were moved to White City from Klippiesbaai/dorp. Every year, there is a
commemoration, with the descendants of that area, who are still alive (Saldanha Bay Municipality respondent 2020).

Hessequa and Stellenbosch municipalities cited capacity constraints regarding the organisation of Heritage Day celebrations. However, Stellenbosch Municipality further explained that Heritage Day celebrations were coordinated by a private organisation, E-Bosch. Swellendam Municipality reported that there was no regular event in place in their area. Cederberg and Prince Albert municipalities cited budget constraint as reasons for not being able to hold an event for Heritage Day and Mossel Bay Municipality was unsure why they did not organise Heritage Day celebrations.

Only one of the 15 responding municipalities organised events to celebrate Heritage Month (September) in their area. Matzikama Municipality indicated that their municipality showed initiative “through our tourism organisation, Namaqua West Coast Tourism, these events are organised within the private sector.” This also showed that through another directive there was engagement with the private sector regarding heritage awareness. Municipalities identified constraint factors as being either that of lack of funding or not having the capacity to do so. However, Swellendam Municipality explained that it was likely due to a lack of interest by visitors as they thought that it was “…probably not a significant attraction to visitors. Other types of events [such as] sporting, etc are focused on.” Overstrand Municipality arranges events to celebrate Heritage Month throughout the month to wit, “there are some festivals but not the whole month done by individual communities.”

3.4.2.2 Recognition of heritage conservation efforts

None of the fifteen municipalities give heritage awards or arrange recognition programmes. The reasons for not doing so relate to budget, lack of knowledge or capacity (Table 3.26). Three municipalities (Hessequa, Overstrand and Swellendam) have not yet considered this type of programme.

Table 3.26 Constraints identified for not having a rewards programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Kannaland, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.
A little over a third of municipalities organised events to celebrate National Heritage Day and only one municipality held celebrations over Heritage Month. None of the local municipalities initiated programmes of recognition or awarded individuals that strived to protect heritage resources. Therefore, it was reasonable to investigate any collaborations with other government entities and community stakeholders as well as education about heritage conservation in municipal areas.

3.4.3 Collaboration, education and community participation

The final phase of the survey also aimed to find out if local municipalities were co-operating with other departments, organs of state or independent organisations on collaborative heritage projects. As it was assumed that a heritage department, if any, in any local government would be relatively small, it was necessary to determine whether staff employed by the municipality were given opportunities to expand their skills. Because this research looked at local government and Grade III heritage resources, an examination of local communities able to participate in heritage conservation deemed a valuable venture. In the following subsections discuss local municipalities’ collaborations with other organisations, formal training of municipal staff involved with heritage assets, relationships established with the PHRA and using communities as resources in the conservation of heritage resources.

3.4.3.1 Collaborating with other organisations

Only Drakenstein, Matzikama and Oudtshoorn municipalities intimated that they undertook collaborative heritage projects with other organisations. These include neighbouring municipalities, provincial government, education institutions, tourism bodies, local historical societies and multicultural organisations. Oudtshoorn Municipality reported that “[two] officials of the Oudtshoorn Municipality serve on the local Heritage Committee and have in the past attended courses organised by the Heritage Committee”. Whereas the case in Matzikama Municipality was that they collaborated with other directives on the “heritage routes with Namaqua West Coast Tourism organisation”.

Reasons relating to finances, capacity and lack of knowledge were given by the other 12 municipalities for not making or benefiting such partnerships. Saldanha Bay municipality maintained that “the opportunity has not presented itself. No organisation reached out to the municipality to do so”, while Stellenbosch Municipality remarked that they “had never been approached by HWC [or] SAHRA to collaborate”.

Drakenstein and Hessequa municipalities co-ordinated heritage conservation programmes with aspects of the built environment such as economic development and community revitalisation. Hessequa Municipality specified that they co-ordinate “when needed and where proposed developments are in the vicinity of buildings older than 60 years”. Although Stellenbosch and
Swellendam municipalities indicated that they did not co-ordinate with other aspects of the built environment, Stellenbosch Municipality pointed out that “the heritage section sits within the planning and building development sections and function as a part of the built environment section”. Swellendam Municipality replied in similar vein:

Heritage and tourism-economic development are intertwined, and the value of the heritage assets are acknowledged in the IDP, but there [is not] a coordinated programme in place (Swellendam Municipality respondent 2020).

It is reasonable to assume that although all local municipalities make reference to heritage assets as resources in their respective areas, the value of the heritage resources are not understood and are therefore not benefited from on.

### 3.4.3.2 Training of municipal staff

Only Swellendam Municipality confirmed that they provided ongoing training opportunities for municipal staff on the management of places of heritage significance. These could include informal briefings by a heritage advisor, planning and putting staff through formal training programmes. Swellendam Municipality observed that “[they had] completed a short heritage course presented by a professor from Stellenbosch University.” Fourteen municipalities identified reasons (budget, capacity and knowledge) for their municipalities not offering training for their staff (Table 3.27). Five municipalities indicated that they had capacity constraints, for example Saldanha Bay Municipality noted that “there is no heritage advisor, [and that] HWC [has once] provided [an] information session […] to the Building Control officers”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Drakenstein, Kannaland, Matzikama, Oudtshoorn and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

It is reasonable to say that there is a shortcoming with majority of local municipalities regarding the training of staff on the management of places of heritage significance.
3.4.3.3 Connecting with the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority

More than half of the 15 responding municipalities indicated that there was an established communication network with the PHRA. The other seven municipalities identified capacity and knowledge-related constraints that prevented them from forming formal contact channels with HWC (Table 3.28).

Table 3.28 Reasons for not having an established network with the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality*</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kannaland and Witzenberg municipalities did not answer the question.

Breede Valley Municipality have “bilateral meetings with [the Provincial] Heritage Resource Agency”. Matzikama Municipality stated that they had “quarterly meetings” with the PHRA, and Overstrand and Prince Albert municipalities have “email and telephonic correspondence” with the PHRA. Stellenbosch Municipality is in “direct communication with HWC”. Constraining factors for not having an open communications network with the PHRA are either a capacity shortage or a lack of knowledge within local municipalities. Swellendam Municipality indicated that they did not have an established communications network with the PHRA this was due to “HWC [is] understaffed and [that they] deal with them through formal application processes and [their] conservation committee”.

Only four, Breede Valley, Drakenstein, Matzikama and Mossel Bay municipalities reported that staff members attend workshops held by the PHRA. Although Mossel Bay Municipality indicated that a member of staff did attend these workshops, it was conceded that this happened “not very frequently”. Matzikama Municipality reported that this occurred “maybe once a year”. The other 11 municipalities highlighted their concerns about attendance of the PHRA workshops. Bitou Municipality was “not aware of any workshops within the vicinity [and that] travel to Cape Town [was] difficult as Bitou is the [furthest] municipality [in] the Western Cape province.” Four municipalities all voiced a similar concern, namely a lack of available information pertaining to these workshops. Cederberg Municipality lamented that “no such information [was] received from HWC”, while Stellenbosch Municipality complained that they had “never been invited to such workshops”. Swellendam Municipality claimed that “[they were] not aware of such workshops”. Saldanha Bay Municipality recognised that while they did not have dedicated heritage staff at their municipality, “no such opportunity [to participate had] yet been forthcoming”.
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3.4.3.4 Making use of the community

Ten (67%) of the 15 responding municipalities relied on community members to assist with the identification of heritage assets in the compilation of the municipal heritage register. The municipalities communicate with the public by advertising or via the mandatory notification required by regulations for the public participation process (PPP). Members of the public were either private individuals, volunteer organisations or practicing professionals from the heritage realm.

Bitou Municipality’s respondent replied that “the community has been providing assistance since before my appointment and has continued to do so”, while Stellenbosch Municipality said that “extensive community participation in preparing the Heritage Inventory” took place. Oudtshoorn, Overstrand and Prince Albert municipalities all stated that they made use of local heritage-focused organisations for resource identification. Oudtshoorn Municipality explained by saying “members of the local heritage committee [assisted] the Municipality with identification of heritage assets”. Overstrand Municipality was able to identify heritage assets with assistance “through the local heritage committee” and while Prince Albert Municipality “[liaised] with the Prince Albert Cultural Foundation” in compiling their heritage inventory. Swellendam Municipality informed that “[they] have a number of qualified heritage practitioners on [their] conservation committee on who [they] rely”. Saldanha Bay Municipality noted that the compilation of their heritage inventory is ongoing and that “when the first round of public participation happened people were not aware but [it] was advertised [afterwards]. So, when people call […] a register of potential sites [is kept]”.

Municipalities were asked to describe the nature of the work done by community members. The replies covered a broad scope and reflected an inclusive nature. Community members provided input for the identification and grading of heritage resources. Community members also provided input during processes of heritage impact assessments (HIAs) and land use developments, as well as serving as advisors on building committees and building applications in heritage precincts. This type of work was not just once off, but continuous. Stellenbosch Municipality reported that community members “assisted in identifying issues of cultural and heritage significance and provided input where available”. Bitou Municipality recorded that “the community provides valuable inputs into HIAs and land use developments”. Similarly, Prince Albert Municipality asserted that their community participates in “advising on [the] building committee, liaising on land use applications [and] compilation of [the] heritage index for Prince Albert [Municipality]”. This was also the case with Swellendam Municipality where community members “[served] on the committee and [advised] on buildings plans in [their] heritage overlay zone”.

Hessequa Municipality identified a capacity constraint in their municipality and reported that community members “will assist with the whole process, due to lack of staff”. Overstrand
Municipality alluded to a similar situation by stating that “most work [is] done by committee members at monthly meetings”. Contrarily, Kannaland Municipality said that “no interest [was shown] by the community” in assisting with heritage related activities. Respondents of the Cederberg and Mossel Bay municipalities unsure why they did not make use of community members for the identification of heritage assets for their respective municipal heritage registers.

The final phase of the survey aimed to investigate how local municipalities communicated with their constituents and how they promoted heritage conservation and management in their respective municipal areas. Local municipalities reported on if information related to their heritage survey and interpretation of places of heritage significance what publicly available. Additionally, local municipalities indicated if they informed their constituents of their statutory controls of local heritage resources. Some local municipalities reported to make use of the public holiday dedicated to heritage, National Heritage Day, and what they did to celebrate this event. No LM had initiated a programme of recognition to award those who made efforts conservation of heritage in their municipal area. It was evident that community participation was a large factor of efforts made towards heritage conservation in local municipalities.

3.5 CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter was to present information collected from the questionnaire survey and supplementary information gathered from interviews. In addition, information was found in the public realm contributed to the presentation. The three objectives of this chapter were to first, assess the capability and competency of local municipalities in the Western Cape about heritage conservation; second, create a comprehensive matrix of the elements comprising the heritage conservation capabilities of local municipalities and the challenges faced in the field of urban heritage conservation; and last, to investigate whether local municipalities met the criteria set by Heritage Western Cape (HWC), for the granting of a local authority competent to perform functions in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (South Africa 1999).

The chapter was divided into the four topics categorised in each phase of the survey, namely knowledge (knowing), protection (protecting), support and communication (supporting and communicating) and promotion (promoting) of heritage conservation. The objective of the first phase of the survey was to determine the current capabilities of local municipalities regarding their respective operations in heritage conservation and management of local resources. The first phase had a response rate of 92%, with a completion rate of open-ended questions of 91%. In this phase the survey investigated identification, assessment and documentation of heritage places in local municipal areas in the Western Cape. The discussion revealed that while only 55% of local municipalities had completed heritage surveys in their respective areas, all twelve local municipalities
concurred that their heritage surveys were incomplete. In addition, the discussion also revealed that while buildings and structures were the foci of heritage surveys other heritage resources were also included in their respective heritage surveys. Other methods of conservation local heritage resource were also implemented, whether local municipalities had completed a heritage survey or not. Local municipalities identified various limitations regarding their ability to protect municipal-owned and -managed heritage properties. This led to the second phase of the survey where it was necessary to investigate how local municipalities protected local heritage resources in their area with incomplete or non-existent heritage surveys.

The objective of the second phase of the survey was to establish the current methods of protection implemented by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and the management of local resources. The second phase had a response rate of 83%, with a completion rate of open-ended questions of 80%. Local municipalities specified tools, such as national legislation, referral to the PHRA and volunteer heritage-focused organisations used for heritage conservation in their respective areas. Additionally, local municipalities gave insight to their use of other protective measures such as heritage registers, heritage precincts, grading and statements of significance of local heritage resources. Furthermore, local municipalities indicated their progress of local policy development for conservation of local heritage resources. Only one of the 20 local municipalities (Stellenbosch) indicated their use of a conservation management plan (CMP) as part of their planning efforts for protection of heritage resources. The other municipalities reported various factors constraining their ability to produce a CMP in their respective municipalities. No LM made use of CMPs for municipal-owned heritage assets. Municipalities also reported various limitations on heritage asset protection enforcement. As local municipalities indicated various limiting factors in their efforts to protect local heritage resources the following section, phase three, investigated the support required and given by local municipalities regarding conservation of heritage resources.

The objective of the third phase of the questionnaire survey was to determine the methods of support given and needed by local municipalities regarding heritage conservation and management of local resources. Fourteen (58%) of 24 municipalities responded and the completion rate of open-ended questions was 81%. The support categories considered were personnel, planning and advisory capacities within local municipalities as well as support given by communities via volunteer organisations. It was reported that half of responding municipalities’ staff had access to heritage advisors, either from a heritage officer, external advisor or advisory committee. The positioning of heritage officers was discussed, in some municipalities the heritage directorate was coupled with another department, which was voiced by some respondents to not be practical. Some respondents expressed that having a dedicated heritage officer was not viable due to various limitations found in
their respective municipalities. Nineteen of 24 municipalities had heritage-focused organisations operating in their municipal areas and 13 of these local municipalities partnered with one or more heritage-focused organisations when handling heritage resources conservation and management. None of the 14 local municipalities offered financial assistance to heritage property owners. Likewise, none of the 14 local municipalities informed local heritage organisations of funding opportunities available to them. However, six municipalities indicated that they assisted heritage-related initiatives in various ways. Local municipalities specified various ways the received and gave assistance but it was apparent that ongoing assistance was needed, therefore the last phase of the findings took to understanding communication and promotion of heritage conservation at local municipal level.

Only 15 (63%) of 24 local municipalities responded to the fourth and final phase of the questionnaire survey. The final phase had the lowest completion rate of open-ended questions at 73%. This phase of the survey aimed to investigate how local municipalities communicated with their constituents and how they promoted heritage conservation and management in their respective municipal areas. Municipalities gave insight as to how they created awareness about heritage, in both formal and informal settings. Only five of 15 municipalities reported that they made heritage place information available either by their respective municipal websites or another publication. The other ten municipalities indicated their limitations in this regard. Only one municipality (Drakenstein) had a programme for interpretation of places of heritage significance and only three of 15 municipalities disseminated information to the public on their respective statutory controls. No local municipalities were found to initiate proactive communications with heritage property owners. In South Africa, heritage has its own public holiday, National Heritage Day, however, one third of municipalities were able to capitalise on this opportunity to engage with their respective constituents on the topic of heritage. Very few local municipalities collaborated with other government entities for heritage conservation. As Heritage Western Cape (HWC) is the competent authority of Grade II and III heritage resources in the province, it was reasonable to assume that local municipalities would have established a communications network with the PHRA. However, only eight of 15 local municipalities reported doing this. The other seven local municipalities described capacity and knowledge-related constraints for not having established a communications network with the PHRA.

In the following subsections an investigation into local municipalities’ ability to disseminate information regarding their jurisdiction of local heritage resources and information on heritage resources was made. It was also thought to be insightful to see if local municipalities made use of National Heritage Day and Month to promote heritage and connect with their constituents. The relationships between different entities of government and community stakeholders is also discussed. Two thirds of local municipalities made use of community members when compiling their respective
heritage surveys. Respondents described the value that community members brought to this task and said that it was “ongoing”, therefore indicating that community members were an integral part of the compilation of the heritage matrix.

The nature of the study was exploratory and themes for answers could not be predetermined. Themes emerged over the six-month data collection period and gave invaluable insight into the individual operations of responding local municipalities. In the following chapter the information collected is discussed, highlighting themes with their successes and identified constraints. Municipalities identified shortcomings often centred around budget, capacity, knowledge, incomplete data or lack of clarity with designation. However, these identified limitations were not exclusive. Furthermore, even with all these constraints identified, municipalities were still able to show initiative and innovation regarding heritage conservation of local heritage resources. Municipalities have been successful in some regard and able conserve their heritage resources to the best of their ability despite limited available resources.

2 Endnote:

Knysna Municipality used Andre Vercueil who is an architect and heritage practitioner based in Knysna. He runs a firm of consulting architects. Langeberg Municipality used Claire Abrahamse who is an architect that specialises in heritage, conservation and sustainability. Her practice also includes urban design. Overstrand Municipality used Nicolas Baumann who is a heritage consultant and is involved in urban conservation and planning. Prince Albert made use of their private volunteer organisation, the Prince Albert Cultural Foundation. This organisation is affiliated with HWC. Saldanha Bay Municipality used Bridget O’Donoghue, a heritage consultant, an architect and a heritage specialist. Stellenbosch Municipality employed a commercial organisation, the Cape Winelands Professional Practices in Association. At the time of the commission, the organisation was directed by Fabio Todeschini and Liana Jansen. Both directors have experience in architecture, landscape architecture, academia and cultural landscapes. Swartland Municipality made use of a collective, The Swartland Heritage Survey Group, made up of four professional individuals, namely Graham Jacobs, Melanie Attwell, Sarah Winter and Nicolas Baumann. All these professionals have experience as architects and heritage consultants. Graham Jacobs is currently the chairperson for the Built Environment and Landscape Committee (BELCom) of HWC. This same collective completed similar studies for other local municipalities in the Western Cape but under other group names. In 2009 Overstrand Municipality commissioned Overstrand Heritage Landscape Group to compile a public participation document of Stanford comprising of the same four individuals (Overstrand Municipality 2009). Drakenstein Municipality commissioned the same four now operating as the Drakenstein Landscape Group/Drakenstein Heritage Survey Group, to compile volume one of their
heritage survey reports (Drakenstein Municipality 2012). Swellendam Municipality made use of Urban Dynamics, a specialist town and regional planning practice. Cindy Postlethwayt, a heritage consultant, compiled the municipality’s heritage survey.
CHAPTER 4 A SCENARIO, DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter a brief discussion is made, highlighting the findings from previous studies, as well as emphasising prominent themes found in relevant literature. The research problem, aim and objectives are revisited and the main findings are summarised. Recommendations are made to strengthen the arguments for local municipalities’ endeavours to gain competency from the PHRA and secure control over their Grade III built heritage resources. A case taken to the PHRA regarding local heritage resources sets the tone for the discussion.

4.1 A LOCAL HERITAGE RESOURCE SCENARIO

The following case is just one example of how the process of application for local heritage resources are affected. On Monday, 18 May 2020, the ruling of an appeal brought before the Independent Appeal Tribunal, as constituted by the Western Cape’s MEC of Cultural Affairs and Sport, read in favour of the respondent. Subsections 4.1.1-4.1.4 illustrate a process that two Grade III heritage resources have endured, thus creating understanding of how arduous preparations and dealings between applicant, respondent, local municipality (LM) and interested parties are.

4.1.1 The backstory

A private entity made an appeal regarding two neighbouring properties it owns in central Stellenbosch. The appeal was against the decision made by the Built Environment and Landscape Permit Committee (BELCom) of Heritage Western Cape (HWC) in October 2018. In the decision the BELCom had resolved that for several reasons it did not support of the demolition of two heritage buildings, namely numbers 38 and 40 Merriman Avenue, Stellenbosch. While this case may have gone back and forth between the applicant and the Provincial Heritage Resources Authority (PRHA) for the better part of a decade, the concept, action and conservation of heritage have a long history.

4.1.2 Setting the scene

The two properties in question, surrounded by the urban environment of the second oldest town in South Africa, are seemingly simple residential buildings, constructed in the first half of the 20th century (Stellenbosch Municipality 2018). The building style evident throughout the area, is known as Cape Dutch Revival. As per municipal records, number 38 Merriman Avenue (Figure 4.1) is protected under section 34 of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (South Africa 1999), owing to age, and it is classified as a Grade IIIc heritage resource. Although the adjacent property, number 40 (Figure 4.2), is not graded, it forms a grouping with its neighbour. As both buildings are positioned in a Grade II landscape, they contribute to something greater than themselves seen in isolation.
On stepping further back from the properties it is clear that their attributes of low walls and trees contribute to the streetscape, as well as their design which is typical of the street scale and detail. A step even further back makes it apparent that these buildings contribute to the character of an area, Die Vlakte, characterised by physical elements, the interaction and the network created in and around them. These relationships with the users give the area an identity and create its character, seen in neighbouring properties of number 15 Joubert Road (Figure 4.3) and number 5 and 7 Joubert Road (Figure 4.4). Consequently, the contextual, cultural and architectural significance of the two buildings contributes to the townscape of Stellenbosch. However, an examination of the social context reveals that these houses were built for and occupied by a community that was forcibly removed under the Group Areas Act (1950), thus highlighting their historical significance.

As the town has continued to develop and change over time, new aspects and challenges have risen, but some elements of the neighbourhood remain. Although a transformation is seen in the neighbouring area with the expansion of the university campus, the importance of these two buildings
has increased. They serve not only as contributors to their townscape, but also as buffers to their smaller-scaled context.

### 4.1.3 Leading characters and minor parts

One would think that the leading person in this story would be the property owner, this is not the case as this role is taken by community-based organisations (CBOs) and HWC. Although the two buildings are privately owned, they are located in a protected area of Stellenbosch town. This area, a designated heritage precinct, is intended to protect not only individual buildings of various gradings in the precinct, but also the surrounding space in which they all share the context. And while buildings in this area may enjoy the additional protection offered to them by the LM’s planning scheme, there is permission of sensitive development in the area.

In this case, the owner of the two properties was required by law to make an application to the PHRA on submission of proposed building plans because the properties are protected by national law and because they are in a heritage precinct of the town. The owner was obligated to make an application to the PHRA because the LM has no authority over built heritage resources in its municipal area. When applications are received by the PHRA, they are circulated to affiliated organisations in the municipal area showing the proposed building plans. Volunteer organisations (for example CBOs) make informed comments on applications, but they do not decide on behalf of the PHRA. Several CBOs operate in the Stellenbosch area. As the story unfolded, the audience could see the complexity heighten. On the one side, is the property owner, standing with town planners of the LM who are making their case for development, while on the other side, is the PHRA armed with policy and CBOs to back them up in protecting built heritage!

### 4.1.4 The audience

While the leading actors may be paid for their parts, the audience constitutes real asset, without the audience the story means nothing. The actors aim to captivate the audience as they are really hoping for a response, and ultimately, participation. The audience in the Stellenbosch drama is the community.

Merriman Avenue has fast become one of the major traffic arteries in the town, impressively sized with its double lane dual carriageway and a straddling pedestrian bridge (Figure 4.5). Physically, it divides the core campus of the university from a smaller village-like neighbouring suburb. It is expected that developers would want to build medium- to high-density student accommodation on a prime location adjacent to the university. This would be lucrative for the developers but would also bolster economic development and give students a home with easy access to campus.
Although the two sites are opportunistically positioned for development, they are also perfectly placed for heritage conservation. The two houses, although described as nothing special, form part of a larger collective. They, and so many others, give Stellenbosch a sense of place, a village-like feel and a humane scale to the area. Although characteristics like aesthetics, historic importance, functional status and social significance are all highly valued, they are difficult to quantify. As the town has developed for nearly 350 years, heritage has been intricately woven into the societal fabric. Heritage is as old as existence, even if conservation practices have only been demarcated recently. In the final scene the audience has all the information and is poised with the questions. Who is their hero? Is it heritage conservation or economic development? Or is there a compromise where both can exist symbiotically and positively contribute to the same environment?

Currently both buildings continue to exist in a worsening state, with their windows and doors boarded up limiting access. The properties are enclosed with a make-shift fence and the vegetation around each house is increasing overgrown and unruly fostering an eyesore agenda (Figures 4.6 and 4.7).
Numbers 38 and 40 Merriman Avenue are only one of many examples of neglect and misappropriation of local heritage resources. The scenario shows the legwork for all parties involved when making an application for a Grade III heritage resource where the heritage resource authority is at provincial government level. By revisiting the research problem, aim and objectives, ideas to remedy the situation are recommended, with the aim of deeming local municipalities heritage competent.

4.2 REVISITNG THE RESEARCH PROBLEM, AIM AND OBJECTIVES

A previous study (Buchanan 2018) called for an expansion of the designated heritage precinct of Stellenbosch, to ensure protection of the Grade III built heritage resources in the town. This would also prevent further loss of these resources due to lack of information and misinformation. Information acquired in the literature survey and from observations made from participation as a volunteer for Stellenbosch SHF and HASA, assisted in identifying and formulating a researchable problem for study. The formulated research problem was the uncertainty of local government competency regarding conservation of Grade III heritage resources.

Buchanan & Donaldson (2020) pointed out that Stellenbosch Municipality’s policies and practices show discrepancies, contradictions regarding, the conservation of built heritage and the development of urban space in Stellenbosch town. They argued that although the municipality was in some regard successful in conservation efforts, there are serious issues regarding the expansion of the heritage precinct, a tool designed to protect built heritage resources.

An obvious need emerged to consider the requirements set out in the NHRA and the related criteria stipulated by the PHRA (Meyer Pers com 2020) to deem a LM competent. The research problem is centred on the uncertainty about the capability, capacity and competency of the local governments in the Western Cape to conserve built heritage in the province. The research problem relates further to the situation that no local government in the Western Cape had full jurisdiction over its local built heritage resources, so calling for an in-depth investigation to be done. Hence, the aim of this research was to assess the capability and competency of local government regarding heritage conservation in non-metropolitan municipalities in the Western Cape.

Five objectives were established as per sections 30(11) and 31(7) of the Act and following criteria as required by the HWC stating that for a local authority to be deemed competent certain condition needed to be met. The PHRA required that in keeping with 31(7) of the Act, an approved or proposed heritage precinct with the necessary protective provisions be in place. In addition, each LM is required to have approved or partially approved inventories of local heritage resources. Furthermore, municipalities are required to have administrative staff responsible for processing applications for
permits under the NHRA. Likewise, municipalities are required to have a committee that assesses and determines the outcomes of applications.

In recognition of these requirements by national law and the PHRA, it was necessary to find and modify an existing method, of assessment of capability and competency. A useful model questionnaire was found in a survey conducted by the Australian Department of Planning and Development (Heritage Victoria 2012) and modified to suit the South African context. The purpose of the adapted questionnaire was to elicit information about the capacity of a LM regarding the management of heritage conservation within its area. From the information acquired a comprehensive matrix of the elements comprising the heritage conservation capabilities of local municipalities in the Western Cape was created.

4.3 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To achieve the aim, five objectives had to be fulfilled. Succinctly stated, these involved a literature search and review; finding out whether a LM has a designated heritage precinct; an inventory of built heritage resources; administrative staff to process applications; and an independent committee to assess and determine the outcomes of applications made to the authority in question. All four of these factors determine competency and capability. The following subsections will address each of the objectives. Subsection 4.3.1 revises the requirements of the NHRA and the PHRA. A table and map are produced (4.3.2) rating the competency regarding conservation of local heritage resources of all 24 local municipalities. In subsection 4.3.3 discusses the outcomes of the findings with more detail given in further subsections.

The literature on cultural heritage conservation provides evidence of a movement towards a more inclusive landscape approach. Regarding the built environment more specifically, there is increasing importance being placed on townscapes and streetscapes and all the elements that contribute to and create the overall experience for users. As suggested by Veldpaus, Pereira Roders & Colenbrander (2013), heritage conservation is likely to follow a landscape-based approach in the future and this is seen in policies on all government levels. The literature also suggests a blurring of tangible and intangible elements and that the latter, such as daily actions, are most important as opposed to the tangible aspects that are only physical manifestations of frequent practices (Smith 2006).

As there are changes to how heritage and its conservation are perceived, there are concomitant changes in policy or, at least, indications that policy should change to better suit heritage conservation that is appropriate to changing times. On closer inspection Donaldson (2005) alerts those governmental organisations, in their current approach, are likely to soon come under increased pressure soon when tasked to deal with increasing numbers of heritage-eligible buildings and
structures. The reality of this prediction is now confirmed by HWC where the PHRA has revealed that they are being overwhelmed by volumes of heritage resources applications (Heritage Western Cape Pers com 2019). An added pressure comes from increasing urbanisation (Logan 2012; Zhang & Li 2016) that put additional demands on resources and services in urban areas, so exacerbating the problem. This has been experienced by Swellendam Municipality (2020) when their communications with the PHRA were jeopardised as “HWC [was] understaffed”.

In the wider South African context there is a noticeable disconnect between the national legislation, specifically the NHRA, and the current operations of governmental authorities tasked with heritage conservation. The NHRA makes provision for each level of government to have control over their respective level of built heritage resources. In the cases of local authorities and Grade III heritage buildings, only two municipalities in the country have partially gained control of their respective built heritage resources (Jackson, Mofutsanyana & Mlungwana 2019) since promulgation of the NHRA in 1999. This posed the question of what is hindering the devolution of power to the lowest competent authority?

4.3.1 The complex reality of heritage conservation

When looking at the requirements stated by the PHRA and the status quo of local government operations regarding to built heritage conservation, many challenges are faced by each authority that inhibit their ability to successfully protect heritage or exercise any power over it. The four requirements are summarised and then dealt with individually.

First the NHRA and the PHRA both require that a competent municipality already possesses or has proposed a heritage precinct. The benefits of a heritage precinct are that it allows for protection of heritage resources and development within a demarcated area. Heritage precincts may also incorporate additional rules and regulations to promote heritage and its conservation. When a heritage precinct is established in a municipality there is a likelihood that it could be expanded, or additional areas be established resulting in multiple precincts.

The second requirement of the PHRA (Meyer Pers com 2020) is a LM have either an approved or a proposed inventory of Grade III built heritage resources. Twelve (58%) of the 22 responding local municipalities in the Western Cape had completed a heritage study that included a heritage register. All the municipalities that had a heritage register admitted shortcomings regarding the completeness of their study or the accuracy of their findings. Some municipalities were more successful as five indicated completion of grading and six indicated significance statements for local heritage resources. Eight municipalities were unanimous about their requiring further identification, assessment and documentation of Grade III heritage resources.
A third requirement of by the PHRA to deem a local authority competent is the availability of personnel for administrative tasks. Only four (17%) of the 24 local municipalities had in their employment a heritage officer or similar officer that could act on heritage decisions. This was a significant finding as majority of local municipalities had no dedicated heritage personnel to assist with heritage matters. The fourth requirement set by the PHRA is that a LM must have an independent decision-making committee that determines the outcomes of heritage applications made. Only six (25%) of the 24 local municipalities had an organisation like this at their disposal. This is a significant finding as majority of local municipalities did not have the ability to make decisions on heritage applications, therefore matters are reverted to the PHRA for decision.

4.3.2 Competency ratings of local municipalities

What first appeared to be a simple checkbox exercise turned out to be more complex, as the municipalities did not always have information readily available. Each of the four requirements identified for heritage capability and competency was allocated a weighting of 25%, therefore indicating that 100% as competence and capable for authority of local heritage resources. The exercise established that of the 24 local municipalities studied in the Western Cape, only two (Drakenstein and Prince Albert) fulfilled all the criteria set by the NHRA and the PHRA (Table 4.1). The other municipalities may be able to fulfil the requirements with a few adjustments. The goal of the research was to establish the capability and competency of each local government in the Western Cape regarding conservation and management of Grade III heritage resources in respective municipal areas. The assessment helps to better understand the future challenges (increasing volumes of local heritage assets, limitations of finances, personnel and information) faced by local government for the future of heritage conservation within the province.

As indicated in Table 4.1, only Drakenstein and Prince Albert obtain 100%, but five local municipalities (Mossel Bay, Oudtshoorn, Overstrand, Stellenbosch and Swellendam) obtain 75%. Only Oudtshoorn Municipality lacks an approved or proposed heritage inventory. Drawing on experiences from other local municipalities, Oudtshoorn Municipality could issue a call to local communities to assist with the identification, assessment and documentation of local heritage resources. Three local municipalities do not have heritage personnel, this could be remedied in various ways. First, local municipalities could call on community members with knowledge and experience in the field of heritage conservation to assist, this could be on a volunteer basis, or a budget could be made available to assist with costs. Second, Mossel Bay Municipality does not have heritage personnel, but could come to an agreement with a neighbouring LM and share resources. Overstrand and Swellendam municipalities both do not have heritage personnel, they too could call on the local community to assist them, or they could appoint a heritage officer to be shared between the two local
municipalities. Stellenbosch Municipality does not have a decision-making committee, again, the LM could make use of the community, such as existing heritage-focused organisations, to fulfil this role.

Table 4.1 Rating of municipalities for meeting the requirements for of capability and competency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Heritage precinct*</th>
<th>Heritage inventory**</th>
<th>Heritage personnel</th>
<th>Decision-making Committee</th>
<th>Total Each criterion weighted 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drakenstein</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mossel Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oudtshoorn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overstrand</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swellendam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laingsburg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langeberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saldanha Bay</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swartland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaufort West</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breede Valley</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Agulhas</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hessequa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kannaland</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knysna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theewaterskloof</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witzenberg</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergrivier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bitou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cederberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matzikama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The PHRA requires a heritage precinct to be approved or proposed.

**The PHRA requires a heritage inventory to be approved or proposed. If a heritage study has been completed it can be assumed that the municipality in question has created some form of inventory, even if rudimentary.

The tabled findings indicating rating of municipalities for meeting the requirements for capability and competency were mapped in Figure 4.8 to better demonstrate the distribution the levels of competency of local municipalities in the Western Cape to deal with built heritage resources.
Figure 4.8 Levels of competency of local municipalities in the Western Cape to deal with built heritage resources.
Four local municipalities (Laingsburg, Langeberg, Saldanha Bay and Swartland) obtain 50%, all lacking heritage personnel and decision-making committees. Similarly, these local municipalities could bolster their ability to handle the conservation of local heritage resources. The position of heritage personnel could be filled by calling on community members with knowledge and experience in the field of heritage conservation to assist. This could be on a volunteer basis or a budget could be made to assist with costs. Neighbouring local municipalities or those of the same district municipality could share heritage personnel and resources when appointing an appropriate heritage officer between the two local municipalities. All four local municipalities did not have decision-making committees. Saldanha Bay and Swartland municipalities both have heritage-focused organisations operating in their respective municipal areas and could approach these organisations to assist. No volunteer heritage-focused organisations were found to be operating in Laingsburg and Langeberg municipalities, therefore making this option not viable. However, each LM could partner with other more established local municipalities in their district municipality and share resources to solve this problem.

The above-mentioned adjustments and recommendations are ideas that local municipalities could implement, they could be used as temporary until local municipalities are able to have approved registers, fulfil personnel positions and have permanent decision-making committees. By comparison, the other 13 municipalities that scored 0-25% still have a long way to go. Ten of these local municipalities have volunteer heritage-focused organisations operating in their respective municipal areas and there is a possibility to include communities in the establishment of heritage precincts, heritage areas, heritage personnel and heritage decision-making committees for the conservation of local heritage resources.

4.3.3 Outcomes discussion

Heritage conservation at a local level (in South Africa) has received little to no attention in the literature or in practice. This research has nevertheless identified the local municipalities that are likely to be successful in gaining heritage competency. Moreover, this exercise was also able to identify municipalities that show promise for gaining competency with some outside assistance. Various challenges and constraints were identified regarding municipalities that are not able to meet the prerequisite heritage competency criteria. In subsections that follow a summary of how local municipalities fared with each requirement issued by HWC in accordance with the NHRA is presented.

According to Table 4.1 and Figure 4.8 only two local municipalities are eligible for heritage competency. They are closely followed by five local municipalities that have met three of the four requirements and four have met two. It is telling that most of the local municipalities lack either
heritage personnel or a heritage decision-making committee. As previously shown in Table 3.20, the majority (79%) of local municipalities have volunteer heritage-focused organisations operating in their areas. The lack of personnel and committees can be remedied by local municipalities reaching out to and/or forming public-private partnerships with heritage-focused organisations, so allowing local municipalities to potentially gain control over their local heritage resources.

In addition to the set criteria of the NHRA and PHRA, some local municipalities have gone further than required to gain the mandate of local heritage authority by relying heavily on their communities to identify, assess and document Grade III heritage resources. But in doing so information was made less readily available to the public than it could or should have been. This with other constraints hinder local municipalities in promoting heritage awareness and result in lost opportunities for communicating and connecting with their local communities on heritage matters.

4.3.3.1 Making use of a heritage precinct
Heritage precincts are also referred to as heritage areas or, more recently, as heritage protection overlay zone (HPOZs). They are established either in line with the NHRA regulations or those of SPLUMA (South Africa 2013). Eighteen (75%) of the 24 local municipalities had some or other form of designated heritage precinct in their municipal area. This is noteworthy, as heritage precincts acknowledge that there is a concentration of heritage resources in an area that require protection as a collective landscape. Heritage precincts are included in town planning and promote heritage conservation in conjunction with sensitive development in a demarcated area.

A heritage precinct offers a unique type of protection for all tangible resources found within the designated area. Heritage policy offers protection to an entire area, that is an inclusive landscape and not just individual landmarks. This promotes sensitive development in a designated heritage precinct. Despite this type of protective tool being favoured and produced positive in heritage conservation, the way the tool was derived was sometimes questioned as in the case of the technicality of the HPOZ which in the long run, is not in beneficial to heritage conservation.

4.3.3.2 Compilation of heritage inventories
Twelve (55%) of the 22 responding municipalities confirmed that they had completed a heritage study of their area although they all acknowledged that their heritage studies had deficiencies. Some even regarded their heritage study as a preliminary inventory. The deficiencies ranged from not all areas within a municipal area being identified or included; being outdated or lacking; to the focus of a study being primarily on the built environment (largely of buildings and structures) rather than intangible heritage. There was quite wide agreement about the need to identify, assess and document places of non-colonial significance.
A noteworthy difficulty with some heritage studies such as a submitted study not being recognised by HWC because the PHRA needed more information so rendering the study incomplete. Another case a heritage study submitted by an independent organisation to HWC for a town in a LM which was accepted by the PHRA, but it remained uncertain if the heritage study had been accepted by the local planning authority.

Some forty-five percent of the 22 responding municipalities had not completed a heritage study that would have typically consisted of assessment, documentation and compilation of a register of built heritage resources. Reasons for failure to complete a heritage study were financial constraints and lacking skills, knowledge and data. Significantly, one in three municipalities that did not have a heritage study did have heritage precincts. Various methods were employed to protect heritage resources in absence of a heritage register such as using national policies, referral to the lowest competent authority (HWC), volunteer committees or private management agreements.

Some municipalities, whether had either a designated heritage precinct or a heritage study, or neither used a combination of additional protective measures at their disposal, namely a municipal planning scheme (MPS), grading of resources, statements of significance or an awareness assessment. Most municipalities reported that heritage conservation was a consideration in either their municipal integrate development plan (IDP) or spatial development framework (SDF) documents. Current and effective local heritage policies were scarce (only four).

4.3.3.3 Heritage personnel in local government

The heritage personnel in local municipalities were not always similarly positioned nor had the same capacities in the organisational structures. They were typically in the town planning or in the building control departments. In some municipalities personnel drawn from other departments or directorates sometimes assisted with heritage conservation tasks. Unfortunately, heritage conservation and management of heritage resources were likely to suffer if the officers were in different directorates. An independent organisation was sometimes used in this capacity.

4.3.3.4 Independent heritage decision-making committees

In the process of an applicant requesting to construct, alter, demolish, remove or change a place of heritage value, the applicant is required to submit documents to the lowest competent authority. Currently, in the case of local municipalities in the province, that authority is HWC. The PHRA makes use of registered volunteer committees that comment on applications before HWC makes the final decisions. Some local municipalities have decision-making committees at their disposal which are equipped with appropriate expertise to give comment on applications regarding heritage resources.
Other local municipalities in the province have volunteer heritage-focused organisations operating in their local areas, some of which fulfil this role, but in liaison to HWC.

4.4 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROMOTING HERITAGE COMPETENCY

Considering that only two local municipalities showed clear evidence of being heritage competent, recommendations for fostering opportunities to progress towards competency are in order. Given their disparate circumstances, local municipalities need suitable modes to gain authority of their respective local heritage resources. While the focus of these recommendations is primarily on local municipalities and their potential partners, they are not limited to these entities. Furthermore, the PHRA should put into motion efforts to either decentralise its current heritage conservation and management operations or allow for a devolution of power to local municipalities to take place. Five recommendations are made

4.4.1 Establishment of partnerships between entities

It would be beneficial if lateral partnerships were established between local municipalities in the Western Cape. These partnerships and communication channels would aid the sharing of resources. Through such partnerships successfully competent local municipalities could assist other local municipalities to hasten toward competency in heritage conservation and management. It is also possible that local municipalities could come together to form coalitions under their district municipalities and received similar types of benefits. It was suggested that smaller local municipalities with little heritage resources could benefit from the sharing of resources in district municipal areas.

Moreover, the establishment of vertical partnerships between local, district and provincial government in the Western Cape will assist local municipalities and the formation of effective communication channels would promote the sharing of resources. Sharing of costs would substantially remove a burden from local municipalities which experience budget constraints. Likewise, the sharing of resources such as knowledge, practice methods, data, information and personnel will assist local municipalities.

Although many of the local municipalities (15/20) made mention of heritage conservation and the use of resources in their IDP and SDF documents, few claimed to have heritage-related policies. Therefore, it would be prudent for municipalities to come together when drafting policy regarding heritage conservation at a local level, as this would promote the establishment of policies within a standardised framework.

Deacon (2015) and the NHRA (South Africa 1999) stipulated that conservation and management of heritage resources should be completed at the lowest level of government, so allowing for connection
with the communities that are the direct shareholders in these collective resources. Local municipalities are advised to form spherical partnerships between local government and communities, including organisations, individuals and businesses. Local municipalities should work at establishing transparent communication channels with stakeholders and by doing so, include stakeholders in matters pertaining to their collective heritage resources. Furthermore, established partnerships enable local municipalities to capitalise on community resources, either through funding, volunteer work or knowledge. A notable finding and worthy example were local municipalities in which community members helped to establish of heritage precincts, collect data for heritage registers, grade inventories and write statements of significance.

It is significant that many heritage-focused organisations operate within various areas of local municipalities throughout the Western Cape, sometimes overlapping in geographical areas but with varying objectives. There are benefits for all stakeholders where such partnerships and communication channels exist between organisations. A good example is the national organisation, Heritage Association of South Africa (HASA), that invites smaller, regional heritage-focused organisations to join their collective as associates. HASA is an umbrella organisation that holds annual conferences hosted by a different town each year. At these gatherings the information, knowledge and experience are shared to the benefit of each regional organisation.

4.4.2 Sharing of resources

Given that all the local municipalities cited various constraints regarding the conservation of the heritage resources in their municipal areas, a sharing of resources between public entities should prove helpful. These constraints relate to knowledge, practice, budgets, finances, data, information and personnel. Regarding the latter, if municipalities were able to form coalitions or groupings under their district municipality they could, for example, appoint a heritage officer to oversee all heritage applications within a designated area. This would promote a decentralised move away from the PHRA to the district municipality so allowing more localised attention to and control over Grade III heritage resources in the area. Local municipalities could share the budget of employing such a person.

The creation of communication channels between local municipalities would also assist the sharing of knowledge and best practices for conservation of Grade III heritage resources. This will support aspiring local municipalities to gain competency more easily. Furthermore, the sharing of data and information regarding conservation of Grade III heritage resources with shareholders will contribute to validating heritage conservation practices and allow for the inclusion of local communities.
4.4.3 Stronger positioning of volunteer heritage-focused organisations

Many volunteer heritage-focused organisations were found to be operating throughout the Western Cape. Most of these organisations have an established relationship either with the PHRA or with local municipalities, some even with both. It is therefore strongly recommended that local municipalities take the opportunity and make use of these volunteer heritage-focused organisations and strengthen relations with them. Likewise, these organisations must be encouraged to take stronger stands with local government, recognise the local municipalities’ underperformance and help make up for shortfalls. Volunteer heritage-focused organisations have proven records of being invaluable in heritage conservation by helping financially and/or volunteering their knowledge and time for the cause. The organisations should reach out to their networks to foster more involvement by private citizens.

The NHRA stipulates that heritage is part of a collective identity as well as a resource. This resource can be used to economically benefit a community if maintained as such. Therefore, local government needs to actively work towards setting standards and monitoring the expectations of its constituents. The institution of an organised budget will facilitate a fair distributed of finances throughout a municipality so advancing progress in conservation. Organisations must be given the opportunity to influence the formation of policies for heritage conservation at local municipal level. The enforcing of heritage policies must come from the public sector but the assistance of the private sector in the form of passive surveillance is essential too.

4.4.4 Creating a presence

South Africa celebrates National Heritage Day every year on 24 September. The month is also recognised as heritage month dedicated to creating awareness for heritage and the part it plays in society. Unfortunately, there are many missed opportunities to capitalise on these national occasions, as local municipalities do not readily take part. Local municipalities need to show more enthusiasm about heritage, its conservation and its importance in society.

Heritage conservation and its enforcement are regularly perceived as a reactive approach, often leading to their not finding favour with constituents. Ideally, local governments must endeavour to change their approach from reactive to pro-active. This could be done in different ways. For example, improved and regular communication with communities and stakeholders about heritage conservation are vital to build a value perception of heritage. Information regarding heritage resources and their inherent values should be readily and generously available. Education and the development of increased skills should also be priorities, not only in formalised settings just for employed staff, but also for community members. Information must be distributed publicly via websites, apps, signs, newsletters and social media pages. It is also advisable for local municipalities to partner with local
heritage-focused organisations and make use of their social media platforms to disseminate information about heritage conservation.

Local municipalities must also prioritise the reaching out to stakeholders in their jurisdiction. Outreaches can be in the form of education, promotion and assistance to engage and increase the inclusion of communities in the conservation and management of local heritage resources. An advantage of including private organisations or individuals are the possibilities of getting assistance with funding and encouraging volunteering.

4.4.5 Making heritage conservation an all-inclusive venture

Heritage resources at a local level link directly to the communities from which they come. These linkages need to be recognised. The practice of heritage conservation must no longer be seen as the preservation of an isolated monument but as concerted action. It is in the living and using of heritage that its value is found and displayed. Local municipalities, in conjunction with volunteer heritage-focused organisations must aim to get communities involved in all forms of heritage conservation. Communities have proven records of being resources in themselves as they have local knowledge sets and skills to maintain local resources.

A valuable lesson can be drawn from the literature is the recorded movement away from preservation of individual monuments to an inclusive conservation of landscapes. This must become practice in heritage conservation. Conservation should not be solely initiated and protected by public statutory procedures, but by traditional knowledge systems too. Short courses, at various institutional levels, that focus on the management of heritage resources at local government level must be set up.

4.5 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Due to various limiting factors this research only studied local municipalities in the Western Cape. Evaluations of local municipalities in other provinces are attractive avenues. The rate at which local municipalities being coming heritage competent could also be assessed. The participation, capacity and efficacy of CBOs in fulfilling tasks allocated by either provincial or local government call for evaluation. The clear lack of communication of information on heritage conservation and inadequate connection with communities by local municipalities offer tillable fields to researchers.

4.6 CONCLUSION

The status quo in the Western Cape is that the PHRA has power over all Grade III heritage resources as no LM has yet been deemed competent, with the exceptions of City of Cape Town (metropolitan municipality) and Drakenstein Municipality. But it is noteworthy that these authorities have only been granted partial competency. For South Africans to fully benefit from and enjoy their heritage resources it is unquestionably necessary to implement that which the NHRA set out to achieve over
two decades ago. This research has indicated that the PHRA must either decentralise its current operations to successfully conserve heritage resources or devolve its power. The latter opinion is what the Act stipulates and is strongly supported by the findings of this research. However, the Act does state that anybody can be designated, provided they fulfil the requirements. This would allow this function to either be outsourced to a private entity (such as an individual, company or organisation) or an established LM can partner with another to share resources. It is possible for district municipalities to take on some of these roles, especially for smaller local municipalities which cannot justify spending resources in this field.

By meeting the requirements set by the NHRA sections 30(11) and 31(7) of the Act as well as further conditions made mandatory by the PHRA, three substantial benefits will be realised for all parties involved. First, local municipalities gain control over their Grade III built heritage resources. Second, HWC’s have pressure lifted off them through reduced workloads and the option to focus resources elsewhere. And third, but probably most important, the communities to which these resources belong, would have direct access to them and reap benefits from them. This brings this study back to the point of departure, that heritage conservation as part of the cultural landscape, is present, never finished and “always remains in a state of becoming” (Todeschini 2011).
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APPENDIX A. HERITAGE QUESTIONNAIRE – BUILT ENVIRONMENT

The purpose of this questionnaire is to establish the capacity of each local municipality in the Western Cape regarding heritage conservation management within its area. In the matrix of cultural heritage conservation this is focused on tangible heritage, primarily of the built and urban environment.

A CHECKLIST FOR HERITAGE READINESS AT LOCAL MUNICIPAL LEVEL.

The checklist is to assist in the assessment of local municipalities by evaluating their status and situation regarding cultural heritage conservation:

Please answer each question with either “yes” or “no”. Some questions will need further explanation, if you would kindly give us more detail on your answer.

KNOWING:

Identification, assessment and documentation of heritage places.

1.1. Has a heritage study/audit/plan to identify places of heritage significance across your municipality been completed?
   1.1.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

1.2. If a heritage study has been completed,
   1.2.1. Are there still gaps in the information base?
      1.2.1.1. If yes, please explain in detail the information gaps that should still be filled?
   1.2.2. Are there geographical gaps in your heritage study (are there parts of the municipality which have not been surveyed yet)?
      1.2.2.1. If yes, please explain in detail the geographical gaps that should still be covered?
   1.2.3. Are there gaps in the types of places which your heritage study covers?
      1.2.3.1. If yes, please explain in detail the gaps of types of places that should still be covered?
   1.2.4. Does your heritage study primarily focus on buildings?
      1.2.4.1. If no, please explain in detail what the focus of your heritage study is?
   1.2.5. Does your heritage study address other types of heritage places such as: structures, sites, gardens, significant cultural landscapes, public art, monuments, gravesites and places that are significant to people of diverse backgrounds?
      1.2.5.1. If no, please explain in detail the types of heritage places your study covers?
   1.2.6. Does your heritage study adequately consider prehistoric, pre-colonial, colonial, previously disadvantaged and democratic heritage?
      1.2.6.1. If no, please explain in detail what your heritage study does consider?
1.2.7. Is there a need to identify, assess and document places of non-colonial significance?
1.2.8. Is there a need to identify, assess and document places of archaeological significance?
1.2.9. Is there a need to identify, assess and document places of natural significance?
1.2.10. Are there places identified in your heritage study that require further investigation?
   1.2.10.1. If yes, please explain in detail why further investigation is needed?
1.3. Has a thematic environmental history been completed for your municipality?
1.4. Is the data collected on your heritage study available from a database (such as HWC, SAHRIS or your local municipality website)?
   1.4.1. If yes, please supply us with an electronic link to your database?
   1.4.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
1.5. Does your municipality allocate resources (funding, personnel) on a regular basis for the identification, assessment and documentation of additional emerging heritage places?
   1.5.1. If yes, please explain in detail how this is implemented?
1.6. Was a private organisation hired to compile your municipal heritage study?
   1.6.1. If yes, who was hired?
1.7. Does your municipality engage with private heritage focused organisations (such as NGO’s, NPO’s, CBO’s or other groups)?
   1.7.1. If yes, please provide the names of the organisation(s)?
   1.7.2. If no, why not?

Local municipal heritage asset considerations:

1.8. Have all municipal-owned heritage places been adequately assessed and documented?
   1.8.1. If yes, when was this done? Please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
   1.8.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
1.9. Have all municipal-managed heritage places been adequately assessed and documented?
   1.9.1. If yes, when was this done? Please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
   1.9.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
1.10. Has a register of municipal-owned heritage places been compiled?
   1.10.1. If yes, when was this done? Please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
   1.10.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
1.11. Has a register of municipal-managed heritage places been compiled?
   1.11.1. If yes, when was this done? Please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
   1.11.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
PROTECTING:

Statutory protection, policy development and appropriate management

2.1. If your municipality has not undertaken a heritage study, how does your municipality protect heritage properties? Please explain in detail.

2.2. If your municipality has undertaken a heritage study,
   2.2.1. Are all places recommended in the study for statutory protection listed in the municipal planning scheme?
   2.2.1.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?
   2.2.2. Does your municipality use Heritage Protection Overlay Zones or Heritage Conservation Zones/Areas in its municipal by-laws?
   2.2.2.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.3. Are all places included in your municipal planning scheme appropriately graded?
   2.3.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.4. Do all places included in your municipal planning scheme have a statement of significance?
   2.4.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.5. Is your municipality required to maintain heritage places of national significance that fall within the geographical area of your municipality?
   2.5.1. If no, who maintains these heritage places?

2.6. Is your municipality required to maintain heritage places of provincial signification that fall within the geographical area of your municipality?
   2.6.1. If no, who maintains these heritage places?

2.7. Are municipal staff aware of places that are currently being assessed for their heritage significance?

2.8. Is heritage conservation a consideration in your municipal Integrated Development Plan (IDP)?
   2.8.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.9. Is heritage conservation a consideration in your municipal Spatial Development Framework (SDF)?
   2.9.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.10. Does your municipality have current and effective heritage policies?
   2.10.1. If yes, please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
   2.10.2. If no, please explain why not?
   2.10.3. If no, please explain in detail what policies your municipality then follows.

2.11. Has your municipality adopted effective heritage guidelines for heritage places?
2.11.1. If yes, please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
2.11.2. If no, please explain why not?
2.11.3. If no, please explain in detail what heritage guidelines your municipality follows?
2.12. Are your municipal heritage guidelines publicly available?
2.13. Does your municipality have any other policies regarding heritage conservation (such as a Signage Policy)?
2.15. Does your municipality have a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for heritage assets in its geographical area?
2.15.1. If yes, please provide us with a copy or electronic link?
2.15.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
2.16. Is your municipality able to enforce heritage conservation laws, policies and guidelines?
2.16.1. If yes, please explain in detail how your municipality goes about doing this?
2.16.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
2.17. Was a private organisation hired to compile your Conservation Management Plan?
2.17.1. If yes, who was hired?

Local municipal heritage policy considerations:
2.18. Are all municipal-owned or municipal-managed heritage assets afforded statutory protection under your municipal planning scheme or another statutory instrument (NEMA (1998), NHRA (1999))?
2.18.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?
2.19. Has your municipality prepared a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for each of the heritage assets it owns?
2.19.1. If yes, please provide us with an example of one.
2.19.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
2.19.3. If no, please explain how your municipality manages each of these resources?
2.20. Has your municipality prepared a Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for each of the heritage assets it manages?
2.20.1. If yes, please provide us with an example of one.
2.20.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
2.20.3. If no, please explain in detail how your municipality manages each of these resources?
2.21. Are all departments within your municipality aware of the CMP?
2.21.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.22. Do all departments within your municipality use the CMP to guide decision making?
   2.22.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

2.23. Does your municipality have a Redundant Assets Policy?
   2.23.1. If no, please explain in detail what your municipality does with redundant (heritage) assets?

2.24. Does your municipality have an Assets Transfer Policy?
   2.24.1. If no, please explain in detail how your municipality goes about transferring (heritage) assets?

2.25. Does your municipality have policies in place for managing and protecting historic infrastructure (such as leiwater channels, kerbing, street furniture, trees)?
   2.25.1. If no, please explain in detail how your municipality manages and protects historic infrastructure?

SUPPORTING:

Assistance, advice and incentives to help conserve heritage places in your municipality.

3.1. Does your municipality have a heritage advisor?
   3.1.1. If yes, who is your municipality’s heritage advisor?

3.2. Does the availability of the heritage advisor meet demand from the community and the municipality staff?
   3.2.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

3.3. Does your district municipality have a heritage advisor?
   3.3.1. If yes, who is your district municipality’s heritage advisor?

3.4. Is the heritage advisor of your local municipality encouraged to perform a public education/staff education/heritage promotion role?
   3.4.1. If yes, please explain in detail the role of your heritage advisor regarding education and promotion?

3.5. Does your municipality planning department have a heritage officer?
   3.5.1. If yes, when was this position created and filled?
   3.5.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

3.6. Does your municipality have a community heritage advisory committee?
   3.6.1. If yes, when was the committee created?
   3.6.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
3.7. Are there community-based heritage organisations functioning in your municipal area?
   3.7.1. If yes, please supply us with the names of these organisations?

3.8. Does your municipality work in with community-based heritage organisations regarding heritage conservation?
   3.8.1. If yes, please explain in detail how this partnership works?
   3.8.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

3.9. Does your municipality have a repository (library and/or online) of publications, guidelines, policies and other material on heritage conservation for the use of the community?
   3.9.1. If yes, please supply us with details/electronic link?
   3.9.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

3.10. Does your municipality have its own heritage financial assistance programme to assist owners of places listed in the planning scheme (such as a grant scheme, loan fund or rate incentives)?
   3.10.1. If yes, please explain in detail the operations of this programme?

3.11. Does your municipality require a fee to accompany a planning application for conservation work in the Heritage Protection Overlay Zone/Heritage Conservation Zone/Area?
   3.11.1. If yes, how much is this fee?

3.12. Does your municipality inform community-based heritage organisations of grant programmes run by provincial or national government or other organisations (such as the National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund)?
   3.12.1. If yes, how does your municipality inform community-based heritage organisations of such programmes?

3.13. Does your municipality provide support to local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations?
   3.13.1. If yes, how does your municipality provide support for local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations?

3.14. Does your municipality organise events with local historical societies, museums and other heritage-related organisations?
   3.14.1. If yes, please explain in detail and give examples?

Local municipal heritage staff considerations:

3.15. Are your municipal staff, who are responsible for the day-to-day management of heritage assets, able to access the heritage advisor?
   3.15.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?
3.16. Are your municipal staff, who are responsible for the day-to-day management of heritage assets able to access other heritage expertise for advice?
3.16.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

3.17. Are your municipal staff able to access skills development regarding management of heritage assets?
3.17.1. If no, please explain in detail why not?

COMMUNICATING AND PROMOTING:

Measures to raise awareness and appreciation of the heritage of the area.

4.1. Is heritage place information available to the community through your municipality website?
   4.1.1. If yes, please supply us with an electronic link?
   4.1.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.2. Does your municipality have a publication or other products that provide information about places of heritage significance within the municipality?
   4.2.1. If yes, please supply us with a copy of these?
   4.2.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.3. Does your municipality have a programme of interpreting places of heritage significance (such as plaques, signs, trails etc.)?
   4.3.1. If yes, please supply us with a copy or an electronic link?
   4.3.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.4. Does your municipality have a brochure or an online portal to provide explanation of your municipality’s heritage services and statutory controls?
   4.4.1. If yes, please supply us with a copy or an electronic link?
   4.4.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.5. Does your municipality use a newsletter or frequent publication to promote heritage?
   4.5.1. If yes, please supply us with an example or an electronic link to this?
   4.5.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.6. Does your municipality organise event(s) to celebrate National Heritage Day (24 September)?
   4.6.1. If yes, please explain in detail more about these events?
   4.6.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.7. Does your municipality organise event(s) to celebrate Heritage Month (1-30 September)?
   4.7.1. If yes, please explain in detail more about these events?
4.7.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.8. Does your municipality send periodic reminders to owners of places listed in the planning scheme about heritage controls in place and any heritage services which your municipality may provide to owners?
   4.8.1. If yes, please supply us with a copy or electronic link to this information?
   4.8.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.9. Does your municipality send periodic reminders to owners of places listed and graded on your municipal heritage register about heritage controls in place and any heritage services which your municipality may provide to owners?
   4.9.1. If yes, please supply us with a copy or electronic link to this information?
   4.9.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.10. Does your municipality have a heritage award or recognition programme?
   4.10.1. If yes, please explain in detail about the award or programme?
   4.10.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.11. Does your municipality undertake any collaborative heritage projects (either with neighbouring municipalities, provincial government, education institutions, tourism bodies, local historical societies, multicultural organisations etc.)?
   4.11.1. If yes, please explain in detail the collaborative heritage projects your municipality undertakes?
   4.11.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.12. Does your municipality co-ordinate heritage conservation programmes with other aspects of the built environment (such as economic development, community revitalisation etc)?
   4.12.1. If yes, please explain in detail these co-ordinated heritage conservation programmes?
   4.12.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

Local municipal heritage staff considerations:

4.13. Does your municipality provide on-going training opportunities for municipal staff on the management of places of heritage significance (such as informal briefings by your heritage advisor and planning staff through formal training programmes.)?
   4.13.1. If yes, please explain in detail the nature of these training opportunities?
   4.13.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.14. Has your municipal staff, responsible for identification, management and protection, established a communication network with the provincial authority, Heritage Western Cape?
   4.14.1. If yes, please explain in detail the nature of this communication network?
   4.14.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?
4.15. Does your municipality’s heritage advisor and municipal staff responsible for heritage attend workshops by the provincial authority, Heritage Western Cape?

4.15.1. If yes, please explain in detail how frequently your municipality attends these meetings?

4.15.2. If no, please explain in detail why not?

4.16. Does your municipality rely on community members to assist with identification of heritage assets for your municipal heritage register?

4.16.1. If yes, please explain in detail how your municipality made it known to your community that assistance was needed?

4.16.2. If yes, please explain in detail the nature of the work done by community members?

4.16.3. If no, please explain in detail why not?
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW GUIDE

Heritage interview - built environment - Open ended questions

This research is trying to determine the capacity and capabilities of local municipalities in the Western Cape regarding the management and conservation of heritage resources to see if they could be authorised by Heritage Western Cape as heritage competent.

The themes in the questionnaire that preceded this interview gave an overall background and better understanding of the status of your municipality regarding heritage resource conservation. The themes covered were:

- Knowing - identification, assessment and documentation of heritage places in your municipality
- Protecting - statutory protection, policy development and appropriate management of heritage resources in your municipality
- Supporting - assistance, advice and incentives to help conserve heritage places in your municipality, and
- Communicating and promoting - measures to raise awareness and appreciation of heritage places in your municipality.

Ultimately, the goal is to allow local municipalities to gain authority over their own heritage resources. By assessing each local municipality, we can determine where municipalities need assistance in fulfilling this goal.

The following questions are to assist in better understanding your municipality’s progress towards competency regarding heritage resource conservation:

1. Is your municipality actively taking steps to apply for competency from Heritage Western Cape regarding heritage resources in your jurisdiction?
   1.1. Can you give me more details of this process?
2. Do you have timeline as to when you anticipate being compliant?
   2.1. Can you give me more details of this?
3. To your knowledge, has your municipality ever previously applied or made provision to apply for authorisation of heritage resources in your jurisdiction?
   3.1. Can you give me more details of this process?
4. Do you think it was successful, even though to date no local municipality in the Western Cape has authority over its own heritage resources?
5. Has your municipality made provision for human resources that will work with these new heritage resource responsibilities?
6. Has your municipality made provision for funding for work regarding heritage resources?
7. Has your municipality made provision for financing any potentially new positions for heritage resources?

8. Is your municipality likely to seek (further) assistance from private organisations such as NPO’s, NGO’s, CBO’s or NPC’s?
   8.1 Regarding: identifying, assessing, protecting, monitoring, applications, research, knowledge, funding etc

9. If your municipality already works with private organisations, do you think that there would be an extended workload or reliance placed on these organisations?
   9.1 Could you give me more details of this?

10. Would your municipality look to getting more citizens involved in heritage conservation in your municipal area?
   10.1 How would you go about this?