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Abstract

...every Prince should have ... a Draught of his Country and Dominions, to see how the ground lies in the several parts of them, which highest, which lowest; ... Such a Map or Survey would be useful both in time of War and Peace, and many good observations might be made by it, not only as to Natural History and Philosophy, but also in order to the perfect improvement of a Country.

Thomas Burnet, The theory of the Earth (1684)
cited in Andrews and Harley (1980:1)

The intention to 'map for the perfect improvement' of the Cape in the expansion of the British Empire is central to this study. The rapid hegemonic shifts that transformed the Cape from VOC outpost to British colony and their confluence at the level of the microcosm (the early beginnings of the suburb of Claremont) are the concern of this research project. The reflection of these shifts lies in both the architecture and spatial arrangements of the expansion of Cape Town into its surrounding residential areas. British architectural and spatial influence is still evident.

A critical analysis of the constructions of power that became inscribed in the surveying system used to monitor land ownership under the British is undertaken. It has been the aim of this project to explore the history and application of the system of land surveying used by the British at the Cape. In doing so the aim has been to render explicit and therefore readable the inscriptions of power (and therefore inclusion and exclusion) embedded in this system, using a pocket of upper Claremont as case study.

Hermeneutic interpretations of the documentary evidence present a number of possible narratives, all of which are underwritten by the silence produced in main stream readings of the histories of the dispossessed. The pressing need to address the heritage value of the architecture and spatial organisation of ‘the ordinary’ acts as leitmotif to the discussion.
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ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

ABBREVIATIONS

A/S/A  African Studies Archive housed at the Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town
C/A  Cape Archives Depot
CTCC  Cape Town City Council
D/O  Deeds Office
HARG  Historical Archaeology Research Group, University of Cape Town
MSD  The Directorate of Maps and Survey, office of the Surveyor General, Mowbray
NatLib  National Library of South Africa
SAL  South African Library (previously South African Public Library)
S/G  Surveyor General and the office of the Surveyor General
S/G's diagram  Property surveying diagrams of the Surveyor General's Office
SAHRA  South African Heritage Resources Agency
VASSA  Vernacular Architecture Society of South Africa
VOC  Dutch East India Company

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

BISHOPLEA POCKET
This refers to the area constituting the focus of this study. It refers to the transitional zone between Cavendish Square (a well known Southern Suburbs Shopping Mall) on the East and Newlands Road to the West, bordered by Protea Road to the North and Bishoplea Rd to the South. See also Claremont, and pocket.

Source: Map Studio, 2000/2001

CADASTRAL SURVEY
A Cadastre is "a public register of the quantity, value, and ownership of the real property of a region or country, used as a basis for taxation" (World Book, 2001: 277), whilst a cadastral survey is described as a survey of lands to determine ownership of every field and other plot for the purposes of the cadastre, and a cadastral map as indicating the extent and ownership of land.

CAPE COLONY
Term used by the British to refer to the Colony of the Cape of Good Hope after 1806 and preceding 1910 when South Africa, having been granted responsible government by the British agreed to form a Union incorporating the Northern Provinces.

COMPANY, THE COMPANY
The VOC - the Dutch East India Company

CRITICAL HISTORY
Critical History refers to a rendering of historical material in a manner that questions the interpretations of historical events. Critical history has at its core the understanding that certain trajectories are favoured over others, as a reflection of the beliefs and interpretations of the ruling classes at any one time. It seeks not to favour one interpretation of events over another, and in so doing questions the rendering of the historical interpretation of the ruling classes of the time as the history of record.

CLAREMONT
A suburb of Cape Town that forms part of the group referred to as the Southern Suburbs that extend towards and into the peninsula from the city.
UPPER CLAREMONT
This refers to part of what is a large suburb on the Southern Slopes of the ‘back’ of Table Mountain in Cape Town. Upper Claremont is the term used to refer to that part of the suburb of Claremont which falls on the mountain side of the Southern Suburbs railway line. Upper Claremont is seen to contain more valuable property than its counterpart on the other side of the railway line.

DISCOURSE
This is a term used to group texts thematically and through which societal relationships can be examined. Discourse takes into account ‘voices’ and ‘silences’, methods of challenge (contestation) and the means by which voices are silenced.

DUTCH AND BRITISH PERIODS
These terms are used to refer to those periods in the colonial history of South Africa during which Dutch and subsequently British East India Companies, and thereafter their governments, were rulers at the Cape. The Dutch ruled from 1652 to 1795 through the VOC – a commercial company with primarily commercial interests, and again from 1803 to 1806 represented as the Batavian Republic. At this time the Batavian Republic referred to Holland or the Netherlands and not to Indonesia as was the case earlier. The British ruled from 1795 to 1803 through military occupation and under a governor appointed by the British Government, and from 1806 to 1910 as a colonial power. It is this latter period of rule as a colonial power to which this study refers directly.

EVIDENCE
According to Murray this refers to a term used by historians such as Carr to describe the “material basis for historiography” (2001: iii). Murray states that this term is largely rejected in the strictness of Carr’s generation of Historians, but that it is still used to refer to documentary sources. It is possible that in the field of Historical Archaeology the term is being reclaimed without its traditional attachment of impunity for objectivity and is being used reflexively by some authors in this field such as Murray and Mayne (2001).

FREEHOLD, LOANHOLD AND QUITRENT LAND
These refer to methods of tenure exercised over land at the Cape – freehold title refers to privately owned land, loanhold title refers to land held under a Dutch system implemented after 1714 whereby land could be ‘acquired’ on semi-permanent loan, on the payment of an annual rental. The title holder had rights over the land but the state collected taxes upon its ‘loan’. Quitrent land was state owned land that could be rented from the state or bought from the state if they were willing to sell it to freehold. It essentially referred to state land available for use upon payment of a ‘quitrent’ – an annual payment to the state for use of their land. See Chapter 4.

HISTORICAL ARCHAEOLOGY
This is a sub discipline of archaeology. Its practice is characterised by lack of rigid disciplinary borders which allows it to be receptive to developments in other fields. Its reliance on an extensive variety of source material is coupled with its emphasis on the use of as much primary material as possible. This combination allows interpretations of the past that may produce readings of the non-documentary, or un-literate (in English) lived experience of those people who were not important enough to stand in the forefront of history alone in their time. (Erlank, 1993:1).

IMPERIALISM
According to the World Book Dictionary (2002) ‘the policy of extending the rule or authority of one country over other countries or colonies’. The active project of Imperialism was to extend the colonies of a few European nations in order to ensure that their position in the grids of world power be (at the time under discussion) unequivocally established.

INSCRIPTION/S
To inscribe is literally ‘the writing in or folding into written form’. For the purpose of this study, inscriptions refer to the practices that embed meanings and understandings regarding the importance of land implicitly rather than explicitly. The practices of inscription being studied in the project are the British practices of mapping and surveying. The inscriptions constitute the mechanisms whereby power is distributed without it being mentioned.

LAND TENURE AND LAND SURVEYING
Land tenure refers to the manner in which individuals were granted and held rights to land, and land surveying refers to the measurement and mapping of the land as a means of formally recording the extent of those rights (Fisher, 1984:55).
METHOD AND METHODOLOGY
Method is defined by the World Book Dictionary (2001:1307) as a “way of doing something especially according to plan”, and methodology as “the system of methods or procedures used in any field” (2001:1308) and as “a branch of logic dealing with the application of its principles in any field”. At issue in the field of interdisciplinary (as opposed to multi-disciplinary) inquiry is the development of a ‘fit’ between method and methodology in application to the study at hand.

MATERIAL CULTURE
This constitutes both a construct and a research method used in historical archaeology. The method enfolds and questions the material facets of how people construct their world, and the reflection of these constructions as an expression of their thoughts, beliefs, and their position in society. The research method associated with material culture incorporates the use of material evidence to reconstruct understandings of lived experience.

PALIMPSEST
The World Book (2001:1498) defines this as 1 parchment or other writing material from which one or more previous writings have been erased to make room for another. 2 a manuscript with one text written over another. 3 an oil painting that has lost its original intent by overpainting by another artist. For the purposes of this paper the term is used to refer to the ground as parchment.

POCKET
Defined by the World Book (2001:1607) as a small bag sewed into clothing for carrying money or small articles, and figuratively as an isolated group or collection of things. There are many other stated possible meanings, but for the purpose of this study these most clearly convey the reference in the use of the term. More literally, ‘pocket’ is used to euphemistically refer to the areas of mixed race living that were tucked into the suburbs of Cape Town through the apartheid years. The origin of this meaning of the term is uncertain.

QUITRENT LAND
See above - freehold, loanhold and quitrent land

SURVEYING, MAPPING AND CARTOGRAPHY
Surveying refers to the practice of measuring land, marking its borders and edges, and recording its details for the purposes of establishing ownership thereof and the possible financial transactions that could ensue. Mapping and Cartography refer to larger scale surveys, but incorporate similar practices and instruments of measurement. The ideological underpinnings of surveying are being explored in this study.

A NOTE ABOUT SCALE:
Reproducing maps, diagrams and plans with reference to a standardised scale of representation has not been possible. S/G’s diagrams do not have a recognised and standardised scale, although they almost always have a representation of scale present on the drawing. Maps have been largely reproduced from digital photographs, and scale is not standardised. I have endeavoured to produce wherever possible, the representation of the scale of the particular item as part of that item. This allows the use of digital representation of different units of scale without the associated concern for ‘tampering’ with the images.
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

History begins at ground level, with footsteps... the motions of walking are spatial creations. They link sites to one another. Pedestrian motor functions thus create one of those "true systems whose existence makes the city", but which have "no physical receivability". (de Certeau, 1988:105)

De Certeau's insights about the experiences of walking in a city were to radically redefine the differentiations between views of the city held by planners and the experience of the city held by those whose ordinary living on the ground incorporated moving about in those spaces. These ideas in conjunction with events (the redevelopment of a site involving demolishing old houses and erecting upmarket townhouses) on the ground in the suburbs of Cape Town catalysed thinking about suburban spatial arrangements and their origins. Architectural observation is the basis of the research initiative.

Figure 1 - Map of Cape Town and Southern Suburbs, indicating location of Claremont, 2004

Claremont is an elite residential suburb and major sub-urban commercial node in relation to the central city of Cape Town. Ease of vehicular access to the area by arterial routes designed for this purpose is illustrative of its importance. Centrally located in Claremont is a fashionable shopping
mall catering to upper middle class internationally exposed consumer tastes. Walking up a side-
street (Bishoplea Rd) from this shopping mall (Cavendish Square) I was struck by the immediate
proximity of residential housing to business interests as well as by a marked change in scale of
properties - from small semi detached cottages to single free standing houses on large properties,
within five blocks. This is the pocket that forms the base of exploration in this study.

Questions arose as to how the land was originally organised, how habitation was arranged, and
how it is that in the heart of what is now some of the most expensive property in South Africa, were
nested rows of minute semi-detached houses quite out of character with the rest. Questions of
vernacular concern combine with the de Certeau'n focus on the ordinary and that which is 'below
marking upon'. The cottages are largely Victorian in style, like those houses around them, but
are smaller and closer together. There is no distinguishing physical feature in the landscape that
may explain this change, nor does there seem from the outside to be any other obvious reason.

Questions regarding the possible influences in original development of the area in the 19th century
were systematically refined. The possibility that this was the locality of the Upper Claremont Group
Areas Removals arose. The pockets of mixed race living (referred to by commentators of social
history) enfolded within suburban existence came into focus. The development of this land into a
suburb appears from the physical aspects of its architecture to have occurred at a time of British
influence. The fact that the properties were set out on a grid further influenced the notion of
planned settlement.

... the variety of buildings of different scales and styles ...narrower
streets and closely packed semi-detached houses (Todeschini & Japha,
1994:12)

The ambiguities, contradictions and possibilities became temporal as well as real. What was it
that contributed to one set of properties being semi-detached verging on tenement houses right
next to the others, when there is no land based physical nor created feature that would
necessitate such a change? This thesis developed in response to these questions of disjuncture.
This study is based in the difficulties of attempting to traverse disciplinary boundaries where those
constitute the operational understandings and underpinnings of the individual disciplines
concerned.

---

1 Anecdotal comment has it that this was a mixed race living area in the 20th century, but that it was 'really' built for whites,
and makes no reference to its earlier history. There are layers of fantasies and appropriations of both aggrandisement and
derogation associated with and surrounding such 'pockets'.
2 Victorian style in South Africa is not attune to what is referred to as Victorian in England, but is far closer to the
adaptations to Victorian architecture systematically developed by the British in India and Australia and adapted to the
geographical and climatic conditions of those continents.
3 Removals which took place under the legislative allowances made by the Group Areas Act (1950), which was one of the
cornerstones of apartheid implementation.
4 For residents of Cape Town mixed race living was accepted as normative prior to the implementation of social engineering
designed to change that and implement apartheid living. Commentators of social history frequently refer to the areas that
were directly affected by this 'cleansing' as the pockets of mixed race living. The suggestion enfolded in this phrase that
these were areas-within-areas that were not quite the same as the wider areas in which they occurred is possible.
CHAPTER 2 PARAMETERS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this research project was to seek out the factors that influenced the development of spatial disjunctures in the built fabric in close proximity to one another. This was operationalised as the exploration of the transformation of this pocket of land from rural estate to suburb during the time that the Cape was a British Colony (1806-1910). The aim Documentary evidence of the changes taking place was studied both for the redefinition of boundaries contained therein and for the possible meanings of these changes at that time⁶.

There have been few writers in the area of overlap between the spatial, cultural and socio-political histories of localised area. In early attempts to explore the possible responses to the research questions, I became increasingly aware of the need for comprehensive critical evaluations of the places in which history, architecture, archaeology, geography, planning and the aspects of lived experience in a given social and cultural framework, coincide. The lack of studies of local precedent cutting across disciplinary lines to locate the underlying influences and hegemonic forces at play across these conceptual areas in that period of time became apparent. The need for thorough localised interdisciplinary work is clear.

Transformations can be studied in various ways. A full review of local literature and the interpretations being made in these studies revealed that these questions had not been construed in these precise ways in previous studies. Architecturally tradition tends towards use of documentary evidence in the form of plans, photographs and design drawings in the exploration of

⁶ Studies focussing on the making of meaning and of the interpretations of meaning are primarily located in hermeneutics - the theory or methodology of interpretation (Brink, 1999:3)
design detail and deviation. It was considered unlikely that architecturally insignificant dwellings would have been designed, and the reliance therefore fell on those forms of research practice traditionally associated with vernacular architecture or archaeology. The most reliable sources to explore to determine the questions of influence and early development were valid would therefore be primary sources. The means used was documentary evidence in the form of surveyor’s diagrams, plans and maps, and those forms of archival documentary evidence which can lend insight (meaning) into governance practices.

THE FORMULATION IS INTENDED AS FOLLOWS:
Chapter 1 provides the beginnings of context for the reader. The physical and temporal locations are described in broad terms, as are the reasons that the research was undertaken.

In Chapter 2 the study itself is introduced. The scope of the study is outlined and the intellectual concerns and aims of the project are described. Methodological concerns and their application to the project are introduced in conjunction with the diversity of disciplines requiring inclusion. The particular interest of the researcher in marginalisation is described.

In Chapter 3 a review of available literature and theory is undertaken. Previous studies have been grouped discursively with other studies of similar thematic or geographical location. A note on the complexities of the fit between method and methodology in postmodern interdisciplinary research is made. A detailed description of the Imperial aims of mapping is undertaken as critical interpretation in a study based in documentary evidence.

Chapter 4 provides historical background relevant to settlement and to surveying at the Cape. A functional overview of the period of Dutch rule in relation to land and property as a precursor to the rule of the British is provided.

In Chapter 5 the method of the study and the sources of data are described. The use of critical theory in application to documentary evidence is outlined. The challenges inherent in working in an interdisciplinary manner without an accepted interdisciplinary method are described.

In Chapter 6 the findings of the project are presented and discussed. The chapter includes both verbal and visual material and describes the findings in relation to their fit as well as their uncertainties and contradictions. The link between slavery and property in the Cape and the inability of uncovering the excluded histories beyond the physical using mainstream documentary evidence is illustrated. The individual British men (whose stories we know because they were recorded) who owned and traded this land are included briefly. Links to theoretical and temporal concerns outlined in chapters 3 and 4 are made.

---

6 Interdisciplinary studies imply that the disciplines can be incorporated and work together in a manner easily readable by both the researcher and the reader. Multi-disciplinary implies that more than one discipline has been included, but that these are not necessarily compatible nor are the differences integrated in a way that renders the research methodologically rigorous.

What’s in the pocket? 4
In Chapter 7 reflection on the repetitive themes (narratives) and absences of the research process are presented. The interpretations of meaning gathered through the project are described in groups: the need to conserve complexity; the inseparability of slaves and land as property for most of the 19th century; the uses of mapping tools to imperial ends in the colony; boundaries and integration – issues of inclusion and exclusion; and architecture and free blacks.

In Chapter 8 conclusions are drawn and recommendations for further studies are made. Conclusions are drawn directly – in relation to this study and this pocket in accordance with the findings of the current study, methodologically and generally. The limits of this study are described and suggestions made for the possible usefulness of further inquiry.

**My interests in undertaking this work:**

In endeavouring to make sense of the architectural and spatial representations of events that took place some 200 years previously, most architects are interested in the details of design of individual buildings. I am more interested in the processes by which human beings project outward and create architecture of environment, as well as individual and group dwelling in the world outside of themselves. I am interested in what human and intellectual forces created the spatial layout and the form of architecture (vernacular architecture as described by Walton in 1952) more than in analytical detail of the design.

The study of folk architecture is new but in recent years it has grown into an important science, for the ordinary homesteads and villages reflect far more than majestic halls, castles and cathedrals the everyday life of the people. ... but elsewhere in SA the old homes are tumbling into ruin or being modernised beyond recognition without a single record. Walton, cited by Malan (2004a: 19).

I am interested in marginalisation (social inclusion and exclusion) and the ways in which human beings construct and reconstruct meaning and interpretation. The link with vernacular architecture is to be found in the fact that the ordinary was generally excluded ‘beneath notice’, and therefore unremarkable. In this sense part of what I hope for in completing this work is being able to articulate some of the myriad of possible meanings and understandings that became available. I hope to put across my findings in ways that include more than they exclude and show that an interdisciplinary gaze produces more than the sum of its parts in academic worth.

I hope to challenge a purely material assessment of conservation-worthiness applied to individual buildings, and to return rich historiography to the heritage assessment equation.

What surprised me was the repetitive experience of the significance of the practices of slavery and emancipation ‘intruding’ into my research. A decision had been made to exclude the social aspects of inquiry for the sake of establishing whether there was evidence of anything other than social interest to inquire into, on the level of land occupation and use. This decision was reviewed and it quickly became clear that it was essential to first establish evidence of land dealings before the social considerations would have any grounded meaning. This is the bias of the project.
There is reference throughout this study to slaves and the means by which they were managed and later released. Value judgements on the humanitarian or otherwise practice of slavery have been withheld. The practices of slavery in this colony have attracted comment where it is directly relevant to this project. I wish to state at the outset that my concern with slavery is not a dallying with some romantic and exotic notion. The concern with slavery in this study is pragmatic and centres on a number of issues. The social and economic transformation of slaves from accommodated property to people without property is one element. Another is the processes and practices of marginalisation – the means by which inclusion and exclusion are practiced. Slaves constituted the majority of the population in the colony at the turn of the 19th century. They occupied land both in their status as slaves and thereafter in their positions as ‘free blacks’ (which they became), and the interests of this project are in the lack of acknowledgement that this may have been so and the ‘pocketing’ of their experience while denying that the pocket had meaning.
CHAPTER 3 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND PREVIOUS STUDIES

The previous work of a number of authors, from a variety of academic disciplines has been consulted. The breadth of material covered is seen as a reflection of the need for cross-disciplinary methodology and practice. This section describes the multiplicity of studies vital to a dynamic understanding of the historical influences and interpretive discourses available for consideration. The epistemological bases of knowledge and questioning are overviewed.

Previous studies of Claremont and surrounds are described first as a broad base upon which theoretical notions and the temporal discernments of epistemological analysis may begin to rest in relation to this particular land.

In direct relation to theoretical considerations, the need for method which reflects multiplicity of discipline coherently is addressed first; secondly the intellectual process of thinking and the epistemology of theory development; thirdly the hegemonic aims of imperialism and their mechanistic uses of geographic technology in furthering these aims.

STUDIES OF CLAREMON T AND SURROUN DS

The Todeschini and Japha Conservation Study Report on Newlands, Claremont, Kenilworth and Wynberg (1994) is an analytical work assessing the age and historical relevance of buildings across four suburbs for the purposes of informing heritage conservation decisions in the CTCC.

The report reflects analyses of a large area, the suburbs of which all contain numerous grand architectural homesteads as markers of both the architectural style of their time, and the opulence with which life in these suburbs was lived by some. Their report provides useful analyses dating homesteads and houses, particularly in the broader Claremont area. It makes note of the Bishoplea pocket in recommending that a special area be established incorporating this section of Claremont village. The area proposed by this report is bounded by Newlands, Protea, Bishoplea and Osborne Roads and Cavendish Street. The report describes the pocket:

'It includes a variety of buildings of different scales and styles: the sub-area above Feldhausen Road includes a concentration of free-standing "villas", whilst the sub-area to the east is characterised by narrower streets and closely packed semi-detached houses. The streets in the denser part of the area bear a strong likeness to Newlands village. The houses in the upper area tend to be more historically intact. (Todeschini & Japha, 1994:9,12)'

The awareness of the differences between these housing typologies is well portrayed. It is not within the scope of their project to assess the possible reasons for the development of these differences beyond the superficial, and it is thus a spatial study with a specific focus on the

---

7 This report is very difficult to find, and is missing from both the UCT library and from the Japha papers in the African Studies Archive. I wish to extend my thanks to Fabio Todeschini for lending me his copy of the report. The fact that I did not have access to this report until a month from the end of the project has meant that the findings of this project were not based on the conservation report, and were virtually uninfluenced by the report due to its absence.
material aspects of individual housing in this area. It is noted that the turn of the century saw the change from Dutch to English control with the elite of the British Administration choosing to live in Newlands, Claremont and Wynberg (1994:30). Slave emancipation is reflected in the report as having brought massive changes to the area, with ex-slaves being free to choose where to live. It is the (unfortunately unreferenced) assertion of this report that

Capitalists responded to this new need for cheap rented accommodation and complexes of small houses were built at Protea, on the banks of the various streams in Newlands, and in Claremont. (Todeschini & Japha, 1994:30)

The Todeschini and Japha report is the only work related to architecture and heritage that is local to this area of Claremont. Its disciplinary focus on the material manifestations of architecture and planning is clear but limits its use in developing understandings of the processes of architectural evolution locally.

Taliep (2001) and Daniels (2001) have studied memory, more specifically popular memory of Claremont before the Group Areas Act (1950) removals which took place in the 1960's and '70's. Taliep's study is broad and Daniels' constitutes depth interviewing with a single person. Daniels reveals subtleties which are lost as indicators in Taliep's paper, perhaps allowing insights into more direct lived experience from the time. Both studies focus on life in the early 20th century, and therefore contribute no direct reflection on the focus of the current study.

Western's (1996) Outcast Cape Town provides a thorough analysis of the factors in action at the forefront of and embedded in the ideological cornerstones of the Group Areas Act as the central mechanism of social engineering utilised by the Apartheid State to dictate the use and racial
identity of space. Whilst none of these are relevant in time to the current study, Western differentiates the formulations and their mechanisms of implementation in 'manipulating a particular spatial organisation'. He addresses the relationship between the manifest form of space and society in a manner that facilitates locating some of the factors that influenced implementation of the Group Areas Act (1950) in Mowbray in the 1960’s and 1970’s.

In his discussion on "the dialectic of person and place" Western (1996:3-8) argues that recognition of this dialectic is central to appreciation of the texture of life in contemporary Cape Town. He notes that "to a greater or lesser degree, human intent, past and present, permeates every city's constructed form", an assertion paralleled by the theory and research method of historical archaeology. Western argues that South African cities clearly reflect and operationalise the intentions of those in power, and cites Cape Town as being of particular interest as it was "by far the least racially segregated city in southern Africa, and perhaps even in all of sub-Saharan Africa" (Western, 1996:3). Bickford-Smith (1989 & 1995) argues that this perception is incorrect, and that it is a romanticisation of what had become, by the early 20th century a city racially segregated and where discrimination by race was common despite the universal franchise.

The first half of Western's dialectic is the familiar notion that people create places, that the "structure of society is inevitably mirrored in the form of the city, although probably with a time lag because social relations can metamorphose more quickly than concrete and clay" (Western, 1996:4). The second half of the dialectic is based in the work of Gans (1972) and Marris (1977) cited by him, and which raise the question of whether society is the mirror of space. Western argues that human social relations can be both space forming and space contingent; that space can be and is used to manipulate social aspects of life, to which he relates later in his study the use of Group Areas legislation.

Malan and van Heyningen (2001) explore the confluence of two disciplines in excavating a site of historical significance. They explore understandings of the meanings of creating and destroying spaces. It is asserted that mythologizing is used to 'fill in' that which is complex and ambiguous, and they expand on the uses of 'myth' to cover over that which is uncomfortable. The need for complexity to be incorporated in both academic and lived experience in the explorations of the links between the land and its uses are emphasised.

Pinnock (1984) in his paper to the Carnegie Commission on the effects of the removals on the community and those removed, covers many wide reaching strands of analytical evidence of social

---

8 Western's book is a second edition of his work on forced removals in Mowbray. The contents are similar but the second edition includes updates with regards the apartheid state.
9 Western also used the commonly referred to phrase 'pockets', referring to 'the pockets' of mixed race living that had existed in the Southern Suburbs of Cape Town prior to the Group Areas removals. He does not explore the origins of the pockets, but their obliteration under the Group Areas Act (1950).
10 Bickford-Smith and other social historians explore the concept of the universal franchise and its distribution of political power such that all citizens were equal before the law. This does not imply social liberalism, and Bickford-Smith has extensively researched the incremental accrual of racial discrimination across the latter part of the 19th century and into the 20th.
11 The minimising of the experience of discomfort - 'emotional dissonance' and the uses to which enchantment is put by human beings to this end is dealt with in depth in Bettleheim's 'The Uses of Enchantment'. He explores myth and fairytales from the point of view of sociological analysis of the 'human' mechanisms of managing discomfort.
dislocation for the Lower Claremont community up to the mid 20th century, and his sources of triangulation are very thorough.

Pama (1979) traces superficial aspects of both major estates in this area of Claremont (Feldhausen and Sans Souci) and his work is generally of a more genealogical nature than related to the critical aspects of the early beginnings of the suburb. His architectural references are to the grand and elite architectural achievements of the Cape gentry, and have relevance to concerns with those reflections.

Henshilwood (1972), in her autobiographical work describing life in Claremont in the first half of the 20th century describes this area as being a Malay12 slum early in the 20th century. She provides useful tools for understanding the layout of the area at the beginning of the 20th century, and her work includes a useful map drawn from her memory of the area at the time. Her descriptions of the Malay field and the slum are useful in alerting the reader to the existence of disjunction in the genteel world being described, and in communicating her distinct discomfort at the association. The evidence base or lack thereof for this comment is not provided by her, and the reason is very possible that the work is autobiographical and not intended as evidence.

Robinson (1994) researched the original history of Wynberg, which is relevant as geographical border to the area covered by this study. Veldhuijzen is referred to in autobiographical work as being 'near Wynberg', but the two studies do not coincide. In her later (2001) study the history of Wynberg post-1900 is explored, and the Claremont area is not referred to except as border to Wynberg at the time.

Fagan's (1996) work covers an extraordinarily expansive area of South Africa, and she makes direct reference to some of the early estates in the area. She excludes Sans Souci (possibly because it had neither the age nor the architectural stature of the others) and includes the Dutch as well as British periods, so that the direct impact of her work does not coincide with the current study.

Henshilwood's (1972) autobiography and the diaries of Sir John Herschel (Evans, et.al., 1969) and Lady Margaret Herschel (Warner, 1991) have been enormously informative of the social aspects of life for the merchant and upper classes at the time periods that they represent. None of these are however academic works, and their relevance to critical thinking is thus limited by the strength inherent in oral historiography - their being direct representations of the particular experiences of individual people.

---

12 A term commonly and loosely used for those Muslims who owed their religious origins to slaves and political prisoners imported by the Dutch from Batavia (Worden, et.al., 1998: 55). The term decontextualises as the people thus referred to did not come from Malaysia for the most part, and share religious not geographical commonality.
A NOTE ON THE FIT BETWEEN METHOD AND METHODOLOGY

Quantitative Inquiry as both a possible set of methods and a methodological framework is defined by Denzin & Lincoln (2000:2) as a "field of inquiry in its own right. It crosscuts disciplines, fields, and subject matters".

The method of a study is the representation of the plan of activities to be undertaken in operationalising a thorough 'ploughing' of the identified area of study. The arrays of available methods are historically associated with particular disciplines and those disciplines with particular research paradigms (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). It would be unusual, for example for an anthropologist to be in a laboratory, as would it for an architect to be engaging in participant observation.

Methodology, with its concern for reliability in the ontological and epistemological bases of the development of knowledge constitutes a field of study and analysis in its own right13. It requires a 'proper fit' between the methodological research practices of the individual disciplines and the method of inquiry selected for specific studies in order to ensure that reliability of the empirical base of the study is not in contradiction to its own intents.

Parallel to the development of methodology as a field of its own in the last two decades has developed the need for understanding paradigm applications in research practice (i.e. the methods used) (Lincoln & Guba, 2000).

The multi-disciplinary14 has begun to give way to the interdisciplinary15, necessitating another series of shifts in the ways in which the fit between method and methodology require adaptation to the field of study, which now has no 'disciplinary home'. The traditional ability of disciplines to deal with the 'rough patches' of contradiction and ambiguity by aligning the boundary of the discipline in a similar place to the rough has begun to become exposed. Interdisciplinary research necessitates a questioning of all assumptions traditions and protocols, both implicit and explicit. In seeking a new location of knowledge that traverses disciplines, it becomes imperative that method and methodology and their commonality be considered.

Awareness of and sensitivity to the conjunctions of class, race and gender with lived experience is expected in postmodern research practice. The discourses within which historical research has

---

13 Ontology is the branch of philosophy that concerns itself with the nature of reality and epistemology is that branch that is concerned with the bases of knowledge. Together, ontology and epistemology function to interrogate the world view and its assumptions that constitute the factors behind the scenes in the production of knowledge.

14 Multi-disciplinary inquiry, as is implied by its name, is made up of a combination of the methods of more than one discipline in application to research practice. It would combine the methods traditional to the disciplines, without necessarily reflecting on the fit between the method, the combination and the disciplines.

15 Interdisciplinary inquiry has paralleled the growth in paradigmatic understandings and challenges in that it questions the fit between method and intent as well as selecting methods appropriate to the disciplinary base of the intended core point of disciplinary location. In other words, interdisciplinary studies have attempted to shake off the disciplinary constraints of traditional methods by selecting methods that best match the kind of questions being asked in a research study. In places where more than two disciplines are involved, this becomes potentially complicated by issues of ownership, location, and thoroughness as these tend to be attached to disciplinary understandings of HOW to do research and grapple with evidence.
been reframed and is able to begin to articulate the complexity of competing perspectives on events and their influences are essential to this process. At the position of confluence lies an invitation to attempt readings of influential factors, whilst not dismissing those possible pieces of evidence that just do not present themselves familiarly enough.

Critical theory has traditionally been applied to the deconstruction – the critique of, discourses in the social sciences. The contemporary use of critical theory to reconstruct as well as deconstruct allows its consideration as valid methodology in the use of hermeneutics (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000). The use of constructivism as the fundamental base for critical hermeneutic interpretation restores the relevance of critical theory as a strategy of inquiry useful in situations where hidden meanings may be found and require ‘reading’ within their own context.

Beaudry (1988:43) renders explicit the need to treat historical documents sensitively, and to beware of using them simply as corroborative evidence for the archaeological record. Documents are conceptualised as ‘being of and representing’ in their immediate meanings the human agency allocated to them by the conservers of the particular documentation. The question of documentary neutrality is highlighted, and the uncritical acceptance of documents as ‘authorities of previous times’ is cautioned against. Hamilton et.al. (2002) explore the distributions of power underpinning the collecting and collating of documents, and cautions against uncritical use of documentation. Hayes (in the same volume) includes visual representations and photographs as documentary sources more than capable of communicating ethnographically laden representations in less than obvious ways.

Whether documents are trustworthy, authentic and reliable remain the pressing questions, but a turn to the social and political conditions that produced those documents, what Carl Ginsburg has called their ‘evidentiary paradigms’, has altered the sense of what trust and reliability might signal and politically entail. (Stoler, 2002:85)

In seeking a convergence between valid method and sensitive methodology in an interdisciplinary inquiry, autobiographical work is useful descriptively; architectural discussion is relevant to assessment of the vernacular form and spatial layout of specific buildings; archaeological and historical research are useful to understandings of the development of social phenomena; social geography illuminates the relations between lived space and its socio-political contributors - all of these have relevance but none hold a theoretical or methodological framework that is immediately applicable.

**THEORY AND THINKING**

In beginning to consider the theoretical perspectives that may be relevant to the current study, it seems imperative that one begins with thinking about theory. What I am intending is that theory is momentarily surrendered, for the sake of thinking and questioning our own relations to those epistemological practices which can render useful answers or academic rhetoric.
Within de Certeau’s (1988) seminal writing describing the importance of the experiences of the ordinary, the description of descending from the (now obliterated) Twin Towers and walking in the city is an immediately applicable metaphor for the process of focussing in closely from the ground and the sensorial perspective of human existence, and then from the perspective of distance/discipline/research. De Certeau (1988:102) argues that the desire to see the city preceded the means of fulfilling that desire - that medieval and renaissance painting showed the city “seen in perspective by an eye that did not yet exist”. In re-focusing the architectural gaze to include the vision of the ordinary or mundane, de Certeau provides a metaphor for the practice of planning as well as for the process of research. Examining from the point of the microcosm (the mundane/detailed), then the macrocosm (the view from above) and returning (to the detail) in an iterative process of exploration and examining describes the practices of both processes. The need to explore both expansively and deeply in this study is evident.

The thinking of Foucault - his analytic sense of questioning the underpinnings of society’s ability to maintain a homeostasis using inherent social mechanisms to do so- is enfolded into this inquiry. Foucault’s understandings of the uses of social control and ‘vigilant observation as means of social control’ directly inform the need to develop a critical understanding by working interrogatively with politic. To endeavour to rich interpretations (i.e. those that include more than they exclude) is as illustrated by the quote below, is a different but not incompatible project with that of interrogating the authority of the material used.

The leper and his separation; the plague and its segmentations. The first is marked; the second analysed and distributed. The exile of the leper and the arrest of the plague do not bring with them same political dream. The first is that of the pure community, the second that of a disciplined society. Two ways of exercising power over men, of controlling their relations, of separating out their dangerous mixtures ... They are different projects, then, but not incompatible ones. (Foucault, 1977:198-9).

Le Febvre (1974) and his presentation of ‘representation’ raises awareness that spatial arrangements may be informed by the active endeavour to present (foreground) certain aspects of an object or the ‘situation as object’, and to represent by shadow (to background) others. That this represents agency in the creation of space and introduces these concepts into the critical thinking process is important. Tschumi (1996) argues further that the contemporary challenge to architecture is to engage in politically relevant work where the inherent disjunctions are incorporated into the complexity of the work. He bases this on the assessment that historical analysis generally supports the view that architecture is a tool of the ruling classes, and has been used to adapt space to existing socioeconomic structures. The combination of these notions with studies exploring the ‘truth’ of the representation of archival material are critical in uncovering the possible biases in material. Exploring beyond the biases in order to begin to engage the complexities in contemporary architectural challenge begins to address the disjunctures inherent in hidden distributions of professional power. Edney (1997), as part of his study of imperialism and mapping explores the archive as a representation of ‘truth’ and raises questions as to the ideological assumptions that underlie such notions within culture.
IMPERIALISM AND MAPPING

Exploring the ideological and epistemological bases of mapping is imperative in a study which relies on maps and the recordings of the practices of cartography as its method of making readings for interpretive use. This section explores Edney's (1997) study of the British mapping of India which occurred between 1765 and 1843 (while their rule of the Cape Colony began in 1806 and ended in 1910), as the basis for beginning to develop an understanding of their possible intents in the Cape Colony.

Edney (1997) conducted a study tracing British imperial intents in the history of cartographic practice in India, another British colony at the time16. In regard to this, he describes his work:

My fundamental topic is the multilayered conflict between the desire and the ability to implement the perfect panopticist survey, between what the British persistently thought they had accomplished and the hybrid cartographic image of India which they actually constructed, and between the ideals and practices of knowledge creation in the later Enlightenment. (Edney, 1997:xiv)

The book consists of four parts, and it is Edney's major assertion throughout that "Imperialism and mapmaking intersect in the most basic manner. Both are fundamentally concerned with territory and knowledge". (Edney, 1997:1). Concern with 'knowledge of the territory', he argues, places the imperial aim firmly in the lap of the geographers - Geography and empire are thus intimately and thoroughly interwoven ... to govern territories one must know them (1997:1)

This argument is paralleled by Andrews & Harley et.al. (1980) study of the history of the Ordinance survey, in which they explore the development of the interstices of the technical mechanisms of measurement upon which the ordinance survey was based, with the aims and intentions that drove these technical developments. Both studies make extensive use of Foucaultian application of concepts in their analyses of the driving ideology behind the British development of surveying.

Edney argues that the intellectual process of creating, communicating, and accepting geographical conceptions, whether at individual or communal level is what is often referred to as mapping. By exploring the notions that 'the empire exists because it can be mapped', Edney reinforces his thesis that there was considerable fantasy mixed with 'fact' in attempting to re-present what the British perceived to be 'India' by mapping it. The question of whose India was represented on these maps and how this was achieved is explored in depth (Edney, 1997).

When exploring the history of the British imperialism of India, he notes that it was during the same period of time that both the English and the French started to 'meddle seriously' in South Asian politics - in other words, these two nations held a distinct vested interest in influencing the political sway and stability of a large region at a similar time, not only for the gain of power but also

16 India was the 'jewel of the crown' and was incredibly important to the British in their expansion aims, as well as in their bid for power in the globe at that time. The Cape was strategic to the Indian ends, not necessarily as an end in itself, but the timing of the two sets of expansion were similar.
for longer term economic gain. In this discussion (Edney, 1997:8-15) he notes that the possible conceptions of their interventions made available were conflated in the aim of the imperial, such that

The triumph of the British empire, from the imperialist perspective, was its replacement of the multitude of political and cultural components of India with a single all-India state coincident with a cartographically defined geographical whole. Edney, 1997:15.

Edney (1997:16) argues that India is not unique in this respect; that other colonies are acknowledged as having inherited the imaginings of coherent geographical entities that are supposed to predate the colonial era, and that are contingent to political power.

The British concern with surveying and mapping in the Cape colony is reflected in the fact that they took over in 1806 and by 1812 a decree had been passed appointing a surveyor in each district (Baker, 1958) despite the fact that the Cape was only declared a Colony in 1814. The aim is further evidenced by de Smidt’s (1895) reassurance near the end of the century to an entire meeting of British geographers that the aim of surveying and recording northwardly extending lands from the Cape was achievable...

...confident forecast of HM Astronomer at the Cape that at no distant date the Geodetic survey of South Africa will be extended northwards through the continent, crossing Mashonaland and Matabeleland, and carried on through the great lake districts along the Nile Valley to the Mediterranean. I firmly believe in the fulfilment of this anticipation. (de Smidt, 1895:28).

The physical tools and the intellectual mechanisms used to achieve these aims are explored by Edney (1997) at length. “The cadastral surveys and mapping practices, in conjunction with the epistemological mechanisms granted by the enlightenment philosophies are the truth reflected in the Archive” (Edney, 1997:16). The cartographic processes and the ongoing development of the British cartographic ideal across the empire is conceptualised as having consisted of two stages.

First, he argues (1997:17) the Enlightenment philosophies developed an epistemological ideal; certain archives of knowledge could be constructed (they believed) by following the development of the rational processes of mapmaking. That maps could not produce the ideal in this manner was understood to be a function of a flaw in the technologies of mapmaking. This flaw was corrected on cartographic level by the discovery of 'triangulation', a complicated mathematically corrective solution to errors in cartographic mis-placement of physical phenomena.

Reflecting on this from a South African point of view, de Smidt (1895) in his presentation to the International Geographical Congress, notes that the errors in cartographic representation placed some towns at least 60 miles away from where they actually stood. The role played in attempts to correct errors of measurement by the Astronomer Royal in the Cape Colony (Maclear) is briefly outlined by him. It may be significant beyond simply indicating commonality of (imperial...
cartographic) aim, that the astronomer at the Cape played a role in seeking solution to the cartographic measurement inaccuracies. The further possible significance lies outside of the scope of this paper. De Smidt explains at length how frustrating this erroneous measurement was to the aim of Cape surveyors to producing good accurate representations of their territories (de Smidt, 1895:27).

Edney (1997:21) describes the mathematical calculations that constitute the checks on accuracy as complex, and comments that they had “made geodetic triangulations into acts of high science comprehensible by only a select few. He notes that the kind of history produced has been simple, stirring and romanticised.

The imperial power thus recreates the empire in its maps, subsuming all individuals and places within the maps totalising image. Military conquest, geographical conquest, and cultural conquest are functionally equivalent. (Edney, 1997:24).

He argues (1997:32) that surveys are rooted, like all other modes of cartographic practice, in cultural conceptions of space and in the politics of manipulating spatial representations, and raises deep inquiry into the arena of overlap being the ideology of mapping and the ideology of empire.

In short, the triangulation based systematic surveys are rooted, like all other modes of cartographic practice, in cultural conceptions of space and in the politics of manipulating spatial representations. (Edney, 1997:32).

Bayly, in Edney, asserts that the British representations of India were enshrined in myths of coherence, order and rigour. They punctuated a society hierarchically organised by degree of purity and pollution, which they then mediated through their own “Christian/evangelical, deistic, and rationalistic/utilitarian beliefs.” (Bayly, in Edney, 1997:33-4). These form direct parallels with Foucault’s (1977) concepts of panopticism and the management of the plague, which inform but are (in detailed analysis) tangential to the current study.

Edney (1997:35) notes that the British surveys in India were more European than Colonial in their conception and that with the exceptions of the Irish Ordinance survey and the mapping associated with Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt, there were no other systematic drives to establish a triangulation based topographical survey for any European colony until the height of economic imperialism after 1870.

Comparatively, the surveying intents of British Imperialism may be reflected very early on:

The first five years of the 19th century may rightly be said to have seen the beginnings of cadastral survey in South Africa. (Baker, 1981:9)

This focuses the comparative exploration of the position of surveying and the management of land and property in the Cape, which first became a British colony in 1806, some 50 years after the Survey in India had been begun.
CHAPTER 4  HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AT THE CAPE

SETTLEMENT AND SURVEYING

The focus of this study is land and property in the 19th century. It is, however, imperative that an understanding is gained of what the situation regarding land tenure and management was under the Dutch. The possible influences that were then carried across to the period of British rule may begin to be understood. An overview of the rules of law regarding land tenure in the early Cape follows and is followed by a brief outline of the underlying ideological frameworks that had major impact on land and property dealings.

Fisher in his (1984) paper outlining the changes in surveyors at the Cape and tracing the evolution of surveying practices under Dutch rule notes that the year 1657 marked the transformation of the settlement into a colony - that formalising land tenure marks the parameters of societal development, and that by granting land to ownership the Company marked its intent to create a society rather than simply functioning as a victualing station. Fisher argues that the method still used “for the recording of rights in land” was established by Potter in 1657 (1984:58). That the position was a combination of ratifying what was already ‘on the ground’ and planning what should be becomes clear from Fisher’s discussion.

Every modern title deed has its surveyors diagram of the land parcel to which it relates, each land parcel is defined by measurement and each one has a numerical designation. (Fisher, 1984:61)

Fisher traces the evolution of the recording of survey practices over time and notes that there was a shift in the amount of detail provided on individual survey diagrams from the time that military engineers were given the task of surveying. From approximately 1700 it became accepted practice for the diagrams drawn to be accompanied by detailed verbal description (Fisher, 1984:66-69). Baker notes that the duties of the surveyor over time were “meting, verdeeling, karteering and kopieering” (1958:5-6), or
- measurement
- dividing of the land and marking such on the ground, including cutting off that portion which is being transferred,
- charting or drawing/framing of the diagram of such reflecting the measurements of the remainder as well as of that which is transferred, and
- copying these for transfer purposes.

17 The Dutch landed at the Cape and claimed it in 1652. The Company began granting land to individual ownership as early as 1657. Dutch rule of the Cape ended with the bankruptcy of the VOC in 1795.
18 The British had been in charge of the Cape from the time of VOC bankruptcy in 1795 until the Dutch government (functioning under the name of the Batavian Republic) took over in 1803. The intention of the British at the time of the first occupation was not as rulers of the colony, but rather that they were taking care of the colony under a Governor while VOC affairs were finalised. The British then took the Cape by military invasion in 1806 in order to prevent the French from taking over as the French and the Dutch were struggling for power. The accepted opinion is that the interests of all of these parties were, however, in India, and the Cape was merely a strategic piece in the larger struggle for ‘world power’, the key to which was possession of India. After the British had gained the Cape in 1806, they remained apparently ambivalent about the acquisition until a full assessment of what it could offer them had been established. The Cape was only incorporated into the British empire by becoming a colony in 1814.
Three distinct forms of land tenure were practiced at the Cape by the Dutch - freehold land, loan farms and quitrent land were available in different ways across time as well as across the town/country divide. In short freehold land was what is now referred to as individual title - the persons being granted the land were freed from Company service and granted land to farm, but a concerning factor for the Dutch was how few people were interested in receiving land freedom in this way.

Loan tenure land is possibly the most complex of the three systems, and according to Fisher (1984) arose 'inauspiciously as a casual permission to use land for domestic purposes'. The method of tenure allowed power to be wielded by the occupants of the land, and the system was changed and transformed many times across its practice and prior to its demise under force from the British. The balance between security of tenure and payment for land and its use was complex. It is not dealt with in detail in the text of this report as it was largely a rural practice - in other words practiced in areas at great distance from the Town. Quitrent was another form of loan tenure using government land ‘rented’ to the occupier for use.

The manner in which the Dutch and the British held land and its importance was completely different. Guelke (1984) explores the philosophies that informed these methods of land tenure and the changes in land practice over time. Baker (1958:5) notes that in the early days of settlement, the surveyor was an employee of the Company who had some knowledge of mensuration and measurement instruments. One of the earliest surveyors was Pieter Potter, and Johannes Mulder's diagrams (thumbnail sketches) were attached to the earliest grants of land.

It must be borne in mind that the concerns of the VOC were commercial and not governance. The concerns with governance and the related issues are the subject of debate. There are opposing views as to the rights of the Dutch, contradicted by those opinions that hold that history has had its way, and that the debate is pointless. Whichever position one holds to, this was a commercial company taking on governance issues and colonization (Fisher, 1984).

In rural areas after the invention of the 'loan farm' and "in the absence of any kind of formal surveying" the walking method was used to measure the distances of owned land from one another (Guelke, 1984:22). This refers to the practice used of measuring land by marking a central position and walking for half an hour in any direction. The diameter created by such distance covered was then deemed to be the extent of the land measured.

Access to the early VOC grants requires special permission. The precise locations referred to are also not easy to identify, even if one reads Dutch. One of these grants for instance grants land "up to the end of Africa" C/A. VOC1, p 259.
The conditions of the granting of the first lands in freehold title were reviewed barely a month after their original grant (Baker, 1958). They were initially granted as representing land the size of which would be decided after three years of cultivation determined the necessary extent of land. Lack of local experience (Fisher, 1984) and what some authors refer to as the comparatively poor arable quality of the soil (Baker, 1958) necessitated the realisation that much larger tracts of land would be required. This was overturned when a senior (Pro-colonisation) VOC official inspected the Cape and instructed that regular land parcels be administered. Each person requesting freedom from the Company, and willing to commit themselves to agricultural labour outside of the protection of the castle (fort) was referred to as a free burgher and was granted a piece of land (Leibrandt, 1900). By 1659, in response to boundary disputes arising, commands were being issued that the posts indicating the boundaries of owned property must be protected on pain of a fine (Bank, 1991).

In 1672, with Pieter Hakius as Governor, a resolution was passed making it compulsory to register all transfers of property and bonds (at this time loaned by the Company itself) relating thereto. In 1686 van der Stel introduced a tax that was to be paid on transfer of a property – noted by Baker (1958) as the earliest reference to transfer duty on record in the Colony, followed shortly thereafter by the resolution that any property not properly registered would be forfeited by the occupants. From 1687 a record of all land transactions was kept, although Baker (1958) argues that the methods chosen could not have been especially efficient as in 1691 a different person was appointed to propose better recording and control of the collection of revenue for land. It is interesting to note that despite that not being the primarily stated intention, the motions of cadastral control had already been set in motion by these events.

---

23 CIA VOC1, P 93. This is a digital image which I have used and adjusted colour to allow easier reading.
24 Inventory 1/4/1-1/4/10 gives clear and precise descriptions of the controls and payments around land implemented by the Dutch, and provides records of all abandoned and reclaimed lands.
In 1794 a set of building regulations was published (Baker, 1958:6), whereby it was decreed that wooden houses were no longer acceptable to the Company, and that bricks must be used (Fagan, 1994).

Between 1700 and 1800 the system of measuring and recording land tenure stabilised. No changes occurred during the first British occupation (1796-1803) regarding land distribution and tenure (Baker, 1958). Meltzer (1994) notes that the first British occupation of the Cape was essentially a ‘baby sitting operation’, as the British East India Company was brought in to take care of the belongings of the bankrupt Dutch East India Company whilst their affairs were finalised.

The Dutch and British surveying systems are distinctly different. These are based in different understandings and appear to be formulated with entirely different bases. The literature deals with either one or the other method.

What was vital to the future of the cadastral system was the adoption of the principle that the measurement of the land should be the responsibility of a man or group of men appointed for that purpose. From the beginning the land surveyor enjoyed status within his community and the land title deed was a respected and valued document. (Fisher, 1984:80).

One of the visually striking differences in representation between the Dutch and British systems of cartography was the Dutch tendency to ‘show the land from the sea’ (illustrated by figure 5) compared with the British who practiced a more architecturally attuned ‘plan of the ground’ manner of representing.

Figure 5 - Map of the Settlements around the lion mountain.

When the British landed at the Cape and took over by virtue of military power in 1806, it was this that they were able to use to begin their process of assessing whether or not they wanted to keep and colonise the acquisition that they had made. Between 1806 and 1814 entirely renewed efforts to establish the land wealth, or the possibility of land wealth at the Cape relied upon the

---

25 The new Dutch regime (The Batavian Republic) was heavily influenced by concepts from the French Revolution and Commissioner de Mist reviewed most Cape governance systems. The systems used were virtually all changed by him, and for the first time the Cape was subject to the rule of a government instead of a merchant Company. Issues of Colonial wealth and expansion instead of Company Assets became important quickly. One example of the systems review was the granting of religious freedom in 1804. The result was that Muslims were allowed to worship openly for the first time.

26 CIA Leupe Collection, 807.
renewed efforts at cadastral recording as the bases of assessment. Thus, the need for things to be ‘mapped’ in accordance with the British ways meant that a whole new system of surveying and control began to be put in place.

“This fact, as also the revolutionary changes in the general civil administration of the Colony since 1806, brought about a state of affairs in land transactions both Governmental and private which demanded the creation of some controlling post or body with powers of supervision over all cadastral surveys” (Baker, 1958:12)

In 1811 all loan titles were dissolved and the land granted in ownership, once its extent had been clearly established by survey. This meant that land was now owned by whomever occupied it, and that the holder could “dissolve, alienate or do whatever he pleases with the land” (Baker, 1958:11).

After 1812 it became mandatory for privately owned land to be surveyed (at the cost of the owner of the land) and the surveyor was required for the first time to make surveys of the whole colony. This led to the appointment of a surveyor in each district (Baker, 1958:9), which reinforces Edney’s (1997) proposition that mapping was an important empire building process whereby the territories become well known in order to facilitate their management. Baker (1958) argues that this was to introduce an important extension to the role of surveyor – that of re-surveying, with new survey diagrams cancelling the validity of the old diagrams, in other words replacing an earlier diagram, as an enforced accompaniment to title deeds and upon which the resolution of disputes could be based.

In Cape Town the British had begun to survey land as soon as they could, so as to establish what land was ‘crown land’, and so that taxes could be applied to improve the financial situation of the state. Thibault was given the task of re-surveying all lands on the mountain side of the road between Woodstock and Wynberg on behalf of the crown. The High Street (or Main Road) from Cape Town to Simonstown needed to be improved and what land was actually occupied and owned and by whom needed to be ascertained. Harris (personal communication) described three land concerns that informed the re-surveying of land in the surroundings of Cape Town:

- The British were in the process of assessing the wealth of the Cape as a colonial acquisition, and as the VOC had become bankrupt it was imperative that they assess the worth or cost of the Cape to their Empire,
- Farmers had moved their boundaries from those on the title deeds, and had appropriated more land for their own use than necessarily belonged to them, and the extent of these

22 Thibault was a French Architect, Engineer and Surveyor who had been in the employ of the Dutch. He was appointed Government Surveyor by the British in 1811 (Baker, 1958) after the retirement of the previous surveyor. De Puyfontein's book on Thibault's work at the Cape is for the most part a comprehensive guide to his work under more than one master. 23 The High Street had previously run from one farm to another and therefore made its winding way across the occupied land in a manner not necessarily the most efficient for high mobility, and the concern of the British was that a straight road, or more or less straight, be constructed to improve mobility.
24 Most sincere thanks are due to Stewart Harris for his patient explanation of the founding reasons for the re-surveying of this land, it clarified a point of deliberation held for some time.
appropriations needed to be established. One of the reasons for Thibault being given the task was that he had surveyed for title deeds many of these lands himself, and would therefore make accurate summations of what was proper.

- The British wanted to make money from the land, either by selling it or by renting it out to farmers who had appropriated it.

By 1828 the post of Surveyor General had been created to ensure that more control was exercised over land ownership and over the Surveyors who were mapping ownership in various districts. The cadastral survey was well under way, and the ability of the British to use surveying to monitor both knowledge of and control over land affairs was reinforced by their use of land controls to monitor land through the expansion of the Colony. Baker (1958:14) notes that the number of surveys being conducted had risen exponentially by the mid 19th century. The use of surveys to map the Empire and to control fiscal elements of land ownership at the Cape was well established.

**The Ideology of Land Ownership at the Cape**

Land was first granted to individual ownership ostensibly to produce farmers to supply Company needs. Land was granted in conjunction with the granting of ‘letters of freedom’ at the Cape in 1657. The granting of land was an act of economic expansion (van Staden, 1999) and began the possibility of individual capitalist enterprise and the accumulation of capital at the Cape. Guelke (1984) notes that the manner in which land was dealt with at the Cape influenced the ways in which European ideas underwent modification and change hereafter, which in turn resulted in particular ways of seeking to solve problems facing the development of settlement and society in this environment. His most interesting proposal is the notion that “the essential commitment of the new Europe was a commitment to individualism” (1984:8), and of which he asserts the Cape to have been the essential experiment. The tension between this and the need to produce for the Company under guidelines of the company runs throughout the early Dutch period. The notion of this experimentation in individual land ownership is developed and the mechanisms by which the constitution of the ‘marriage of individualism and land’ were practiced is reasserted in the conclusion of his paper.

Guelke argues that these modern notions of individualism profoundly influenced the society founded at the Cape and established it as an experiment in individual land ownership and the

30 Baker (1958) quotes 31 ordinances and Acts used over the century by the British to control the ways in which property in the form of land was dealt with as commodity.

31 Literally a letter granting to a certain individual the right to freedom within the colony on certain conditions, one of which was commonly the agricultural production of certain pieces of land deemed fit for the purpose (Leibrandt, 1900 includes but does not really explain these).

32 Among the early grants were the Coornhoop, Rondebosch and Bosheuvel grants. Bosheuvel (whose significance rests in its being close to the land being explored in this study), was granted to Jan van Riebeek at this time although this was against company policy – in other words it was not legal. The house and crops were destroyed by invading indigenous people in 1659, in an act of rebellion when they rose in battle against the encroaching white settlement. Never the less, Fagan (1996:356) notes that there was a list of some 1244 fruit trees and thousands of vines flourishing when van Riebeek left the Cape in 1662. A hedge of wild almond was planted along the boundaries for security against further attack, and is still standing in some places, particularly in Kirstenbosch Botanic gardens. This was probably the first marked boundary the Cape had ever seen, and introduced to the local people the intent of the white settlers to enforce the ideas of individual land ownership. Fagan (1996:358) notes that in 1665 this property was sold by public auction.
development of capital. He explores the meanings and understandings embedded in use of land, and begins to point out how very different these meanings were to the available meanings in other settler contexts at the time. In conclusion he states

Although society at the Cape differed from any in Holland (or in Northern Europe) it was an unmistakable product of Dutch individualistic commercial thinking. Even though many European practices had not worked well at the Cape the underlying ideas had not been abandoned...

Had the VOC directors not been wedded to the principle of private land ownership (with farmers residing on their own land) a system of shifting or open field cultivation operated from communal villages might have been adopted...

Had the Cape settlement occurred under more conservative elements in the Netherlands alternative systems of land allocation might well have been adopted.

CHAPTER 5 CRITICAL USE OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

This chapter explores the applications of methods used to collect, critique and interpret both documentary written and visual data. The empirical base of the study rests in its use of documentary evidence. The ways in which this was sought, collected and arranged; the thinking behind these, is presented.

Malan, (2004) in a draft preparation of a paper for oral presentation “The Question of Slave Accommodation at the Cape: Issues of Space, Time and Mind” discusses ideas about space and spatial organisation and how the ways in which we arrange our built environment reflect the relationships between ourselves and others. Malan (2004:2) addresses the need for developing a trans-disciplinary research approach and method as the most fruitful way to begin to formulate understandings of material culture. She proposes that the lack of an approach able to traverse disciplinary differences without suffering blows to its own credibility in this process makes it necessary to focus on the development of a set of methods with this capacity.

The current research study is interdisciplinary. The approach is architectural in that it has attempted to use surveyor’s diagrams (as the architectural markers of spatial arrangements and planning) to read the formulations of spatial arrangements at their points of transformation. It becomes generally archaeological in its use of layers of documentary evidence, both visual and written, and the iterative process of triangulating the material and seeking gaps and contradictions.

The study attempts to read the palimpsest. It tries to see that which is between the lines, both the inscribed and the shadow of the inscriptions – the history of those who were not considered worthy of their own recorded history. It seeks neither to elevate nor denigrate, but to explore the layers of historical evidence that could provide clues to the original pattern and its spatial application, architectural notations and the transformations of these. The study seeks the layers of the ordinary - the people who only took up a little space – those who did not have the villas. The project has attempted to read between the grand histories and architectures, even the grand histories of the underclasses, in search of clues to the possible understandings of this particular case (pocket).

Both archival and contemporary documents and information were collected. Three forms of primary evidence have been used throughout, viz. Surveyor General’s Diagrams, Maps and Deeds Office Records. As a fourth form of primary evidence I have used autobiographical work from people who directly lived in the area under study between 1806 and 191033. Visual records in the

33 Autobiographical work as primary evidence is contentious. It records the particular memories of individuals or self identified groups, but despite its contentiousness in scientific terms is considered a reliable source of oral historiography where critique of the biases of the individual stories is contained within the metaphor and understood as 'one voice' rather than 'the voice' in discursive undertakings.
A form of photographs have been used with caution as the camera was at this time a distinctly elite item of individual ownership, and I have been careful of this.

Secondary sources have been used where contextual accounts not immediately linked to the detail of the study at the outset have been necessary. One example of this is that extensive previous work on social context during the 19th century has been done and presented by numerous authors. This work has been relied upon both to seek coincidence with the findings of this study and to seek insight into layers that have fallen outside of the scope of this study.

The sources I have used are:

**SURVEYOR GENERAL'S DIAGRAMS (S/G'S DIAGRAMS)**

The diagrams of the surveyor/s and the office of the Surveyor General (S/G) and the roles of these in the legal and social demarcation of ownership, title and responsibility both to State and neighbour is the inscription being studied. These diagrams have therefore formed the basis of working documentation. Both archival and contemporary documentation have been used. These diagrams have been sought in two ways. First, a Surveyor Generals search by contemporary erf and tracing the erf backwards in time, at the S/G's offices was undertaken. Second, those S/G diagrams associated with the deeds of transfer for the sample of properties below was sought. It is interesting to note that there was more diversity than expected, and that running the search only one of these two ways would have limited the possible view of association between properties. A full list of the maps, plans and diagrams of the Surveyor General's office that have been used, both archival and contemporary, can be found in Appendix 1.

**MAPS**

Maps and mapping practices provide some evidence of what existed 200 years ago. Maps record what was deemed important to record, and have particular focus on the aspects of the land that relate to their reason for being drawn. They also provide a lens through which the representations being made may begin to be critically evaluated. It is possible to begin to ascertain which spatial and physical arrangements in the environment have remained in place over time and which have become historically layered and replaced by other forms. Taking into account the possibly inaccurate location of one or more aspects of early maps and the possibility that bias on behalf of the surveyor may have crept into the mapping task, more than one set of maps have been consistently used through this project.

---

34 I am aware that it is customary for research at the level of the Master's Degree to be based largely, if not exclusively, on secondary sources. It has been essential in this situation to reach beyond this to reliance virtually exclusively on primary material. This is partly because there is so little directly usable work in the overlay of study areas, and partly because of the quagmire of fundamental contradictions between existing works. I am aware that a downfall of this study is that it repeats that pattern, but it does so with the intention of reliably referencing its own sources so that they can be thoroughly checked where contradictions may arise with other work.

35 Differentiation of the differences between what is called a surveyors diagram, a surveyors plan and a surveyors map have been difficult in some instances. Besides maps having accepted and standardised scales of representation, it would be difficult to categorise these on their visual characteristics.
DEEDS OFFICE RECORDS OF LAND TRANSFERS

Deeds of transfer and ownership as markers of both the exchange of property, and the exchange confirming subdivision thereof have been consulted for a sample of properties in the study area. The sample was not random. It was drawn with more intense focus on the area of denser housing specifically. From this area a random sample on each street was selected and the property traced. Where a subdivision had occurred, this was traced back in time to the property identified in the deeds register as the original erf.

The name ‘Feldhausen’ is attached to two streets in the vicinity of the study area. Two properties which lie outside of the study area were included in the sample. The Feldhausen 'house lot' and 'cottage lot' as identified from a combination of contemporary street map36 and archival subdivision plans were included as they were originally part of one larger piece of land.

The reasons for their inclusion are: First, the question of the location of original houses and buildings and that the possibility of locating where they may have stood in relation to the pocket bore significance. Second, including the Feldhausen house lot provided one possible means of triangulating information, as it was possibly the original homestead. Any ‘remainders’37 were assumed at the outset to be possibly attached to this piece, or to the erf number38 allocated to this piece of land at the time of subdivision.

The summary of Deeds Office Transfers (D/O T), located for clarity by street addresses as well as Erf numbers can be found in Appendix 2.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL WORK

Despite this being a primary source in its own right, it serves as a secondary source of ‘fact’ concerning evidence of the time. There are three series of autobiographical works that have been referred to for both a (time and context bound) commentary of the issues effecting the social context, and a set of checks and balances for other land based data and context. For instance one may provide a descriptive location for something which would otherwise have to be surmised to have been in a certain location. These are the published diaries and correspondence of Sir John Herschel (Evans, et.al. 1969) and Lady Margaret Herschel (Warner, 1991), who kept their own personal records of their stay in the Cape from 1834-1838, and the autobiographical work of Norah Henshilwood (Henshilwood, 1972), who lived in the area from the early 1900’s for half a century.

37 Remainders were referred to as those pieces of land remaining and attached to the original piece of land at the time of subdivision or transfer. In reading deeds office records, it is the remainder that continues to be referred to as the original property although in the case of division the size of the original piece may be shrinking with each subdivision.
38 The unique number allocated to each piece of property in a geographical area used as an identifying characteristic is referred to as the erf number of that piece of land. Subdivision and the expansion of the city create the need for new and larger numbers.
ARCHIVAL DATA

Access to archival data was relatively freely available, and was limited by the quality of the condition of the original documents rather than by unavailability. None of the archival maps that were consulted for ongoing reference, for instance, could be copied, and needed to be photographed instead. Archival data pertaining particularly to mapping and land concerns were sought. A full list of sources and collections consulted can be found in the references and sources to this document.

The details of social history and the lived experience of the persons in this area constitute another, much deeper study. I have attempted to assess the palimpsest not to reconstruct its original form and the development of its layers of replacement over time – that is not possible from a study of this nature. There was evidence that some of the land owners were resident on their properties through the time of subdivision, and the 'absentee landlord' did not appear to be the guiding principle in this pocket at that time. The exploration of social experience and the comparisons between land ownership and occupation in the pocket is another study.

Visual depictions by means of photographs are rare during this time, and it is with knowledge of the elite bias that they reflect that these images are considered. The man, Sir John Herschel, who invented the Camera Lucida (an early form of recording device for visual representation) was a member of the British scientific and social elite who owned an estate in this area during the period under exploration. Camera Lucida pictures are considered to be representative in those early days of the elite intelligentsia.

---

39 The Cape Archive Depot retains all government information from the time period in which the Cape was a Colony, and therefore the period in which Cape Town was its major city. After 1910 when the Cape amalgamated with the Northern Provinces to form the Union of South Africa, the capital city moved to Pretoria. National records from this time are stored in the National Archives Depot in Pretoria.

40 This raises the questions of reliability of representation with the onset of digital photography, and of whether materials could have been digitally tampered with. I would like to state that I have attempted to render these images easily readable and easy to make sense of but have changed no further detail belonging to the originals.
CHAPTER 6 THE TOWN AND THIS POCKET IN THE 19TH CENTURY

This chapter describes and discusses the findings of this study. It highlights links between concepts raised in previous chapters and the evidence gathered during this research process. Contradiction and uncertainty (disjunctions) are illuminated and the possible interpretations that may be made are described, with links to previous studies where relevant. The chapter is written in a more personal manner than the rest of this study, partly in reflection of the work being my own original research and partly in reflection of the fact that the discursive choices made or bypassed reflect my own interpretations and analyses of the data at hand.

Many references are made to slavery and to the management of slaves as property in parallel to the management of land as property. The transformations that took place in the local management practices and the status of the slaves during the rule of the British are described. The links between slavery and land in the colony was a distinguishing feature of the first half of the 19th century. In brief, the management of slaves as property included managing how and where they occupied land both before and after emancipation, as well as enfolding their presence on the land in a manner which renders evidence of it difficult to gather.

The layouts of major estates in the colony at the time of the first British occupation (1796) are illustrated by Smart in a drawing depicting a combination of ownership and layout.

The figure overleaf is reconstructed from digital photographs of the original map, as it is in poor condition. I have inserted place names from the key of the map. Places are not immediately recognisable as the names given are the names of the owners at that time. This is illustrative of one of the underlying differences between the British and Dutch methods of surveying. The Dutch used owners’ names to locate detail as well as in identification of places. They were more concerned with who was to be located that with the location itself. The British tended to name places and the ability therefore to locate ‘place’ over time is reflective of this. Further illustrative of this is the location of the main road which wound its way across the occupied lands in the general direction of more Southern Settlements (being located in a downward direction on this presentation) until this time. The task of Thibault in surveying the lands around this road centres on both straightening (moving) and improving the road.

---

41 Slavery and the regulation thereof were major aspects of economic transaction in the colony prior to the emancipation of slaves, which constituted a major economic activity in its own right. The ‘slaves as property’ and ‘land as property’, the relations of these two forms of property to one another is a leitmotif throughout the first half of the 19th century. In the earlier VOC years slave transactions were filed with property transactions and are therefore in the deeds office records. This strengthens the observation that these two forms of property were related.

42 C/A KAB M3/19 Smart’s map is reproduced A4 in the appendix. It can no longer be reproduced by the archive depot as a result of its now poor quality. A great deal of detail is lost in reproductions to A4 of AO maps, and for this reason a piece of the map showing the area under study is reproduced within the body of the text.
The Cape when the British took over - After 1806

The general state of legislative and local affairs and the historical events that occurred in the 19th century constitute a large body of historiography. The social history and lives of inhabitants is not the concern of this study. Some important aspects of the imperial intent to map the empire and the local implications of this conceptual project are presented in association with the history of the Colony in chapters 3 and 4. It is nevertheless important to link to the town and the pocket those strands that made up the multifaceted 'nature of life' in the Colony when the British took over. These include elite landed gentry (with delineation of both people and estates as gentry), with the majority of the population being owned property in the form of slaves. Literacy was rare and life for the majority was hard and had been harshly controlled and deviance punished by the rules of the VOC.

At the turn of the 19th century the Cape Colony was explicitly a slave society (Shell, 2001). Guelke (1984) points out that the particular manner of land ownership at the Cape required increasing numbers of slaves or servants to maintain. Shell (2001) observes that slaves at the Cape were given some rights and peculiarly (in comparison with other slave societies) deprived of

---

43 Shell is amongst other writers (Worden, Ross, Meltzer, Bank, Bickford-Smith, Malan) who have traced the ideology and practices of slavery and family during the time that slavery was in place. See list of references for those used in this study.
In the existing body of knowledge concerning slavery, it is commonly accepted that the life of slaves in the city were generally far less harsh than the conditions endured by slaves held on farmland in the hinterland. The relative ease of access (in terms of distance) to facility and to a possible community of people in similar circumstances may have provided circumstances around both the latter experiences of slavery and of emancipation that were particular to the slaves who inhabited the general area around Cape Town.

The oceanic slave trade was legislatively abolished by the British in 1806 and the abolition implemented in 1807/8. Slaves in the Cape Colony were emancipated in 1834. The complex meanings of ownership and emancipation are the focus of an existing body of knowledge. There are numerous instances cited in the studies of social history of slaves being traded by Cape residents after abolition of the trade. The emancipation of slaves was complex as illustrated by the arrangements set out for the slaves. It was deemed necessary (supposedly in the best interests of the slaves themselves) for slaves to remain with their previous owners as apprentices to learn a self supporting trade from the time of their emancipation in 1834 until 1838. The difference was that they could begin to command wages for their labour, and the beginnings of market related wages for labour was envisaged. The British Government paid to those owners who were 'losing' their property by virtue of the emancipation of that property, a sum of money in compensation for this loss. The slaves were not compensated in any way upon their emancipation.

The colonial concern with record keeping that had been begun by the Dutch continued under the British. Census data was regularly collected, diligently cared for, and often referred to in decision making. The method used in the ‘opgaafrolle’ of Dutch rule was not repeated by the British but they held regular census collections as well as recording goods and chattels belonging to individual land owners upon their land.

One of the misnomers about the Cape is the idea that the colony and the city were the heartland of social liberalism and lack of prejudice (Bickford-Smith, 1995). Bickford-Smith (1995) explores the ideology of liberalism at that time, and the universal municipal franchise implemented at the Cape after 1853 that lends credence to the claims of lack of prejudice. Bickford-Smith traces the

---

44 Shell (2001:xxxiii) explains that at the Cape slaves had certain rights; they could inherit, bear witness, earn money, and initiate legal cases. They were simultaneously denied certain rights: until 1823 a female slave could not marry in established Christian churches, and they could never have free offspring – children were bought to freedom. Offspring of free men and slave women were slaves. Male slaves could not marry in the church till 1823 but they could have free offspring from free women. Offspring of slave men and free women were free but termed ‘bastards’ – i.e. persons without religious or civic identity. People who identified themselves as Muslim likewise had no colonial civic status. Shell does not state directly whether they were allowed to own property themselves.

45 See Shell, Bickford-Smith, Metzler, and Bank (listed in the references) who have completed complex and thorough research into the experiences and meanings of slavery in urban and rural settings, both locally and in comparison with other slave societies globally.

46 Tennant, for example, is cited by Bank (1991) as having continued to trade in slaves and ‘prize negroes’ from Mozambique until after emancipation, when his considerable accumulated wealth dwindled to bankruptcy very quickly. Bank states that he was just one such example.

47 Oppaafrolle were the Dutch ‘citizen rolls’ which performed both census and inventory functions and were kept for record purposes but gathered for the purpose of taxation. C/A KAB A2250 is the inventory holding the record of the project that summarised all the oppaaf data into a database, now held in the Netherlands.

48 The method was to record information by listing each free individual (free-burgher) in the colony and recording their possessions at the time of the census, by category and quantity.
incremental accrual of racial prejudice and its development into segregation across the 19th century.

**MANAGING PROPERTY IN THE COLONY - LAND AND SLAVES**

From 1806 to 1827 the registration of deeds was attached to the office of the Colonial Secretary. In April 1816 the registration of slaves was decreed by a proclamation necessitated by the numerous manumissions which take place, and the large class of Negro Apprentices (which has of late years been, by decisions of the court of vice Admiralty, greatly increased) and the expediency that the most minute precautions should be taken to prevent the possibility of such free persons, or their offspring, merging into a state of slavery, or being confounded with the domestic or other slaves, the property of individuals in this Settlement.

In 1828 the position of Registrar of Deeds was established, and until 1837 the Registrar of Deeds was also the Registrar of Slaves. The reason for this shared position may have been aimed at simplifying the property ownership dealings. It is the first direct record that indicates the strength of the association between slave ownership and land ownership under the British.

The registrar of Slaves and Deeds was to keep exact registers of all slaves in the colony, inspect the "enregisterment" of slaves by their owners, and in 1826 was jointly appointed Guardian to these slaves as well. By this same decree requiring the registration of all slaves, the manner utilised to record the names of the slaves was that of their owners. The double-bind of having abolished the oceanic trade in slaves across the British Empire and yet still running a slave society locally must have been complex and its future open to speculation and abuse.

In 1837 the positions of Registrar of Deeds and Registrar of Slaves were separated, and the position of Registrar of Slaves was disbanded in October 1839.

Bank (1991:236) provides a breakdown in table form (Table 1 below) of the demographic composition of Cape Town from 1806 to 1827. The table shows that the total population of the Town was under 20,000 people. The distribution illustrates that there were more slaves than 'Europeans' in 1806, and that Cape Town, despite being ruled by the Europeans contained more people 'not European' than of the ruling group. The reduction in number of slaves is directly proportional to the rise in number of free blacks. The significance of this to the current study is that those who were the majority occupied land both as slaves and then as free blacks and they
were responsible (in action) for creating the architectural fabric as well as in maintaining the built form of the large homesteads and the more densely structured houses. They too would have been the labour force that moved the main road, and provided services of numerous kinds that first required accommodating and second created accommodation for the ruling classes.

Table 1 - Demographic distribution of Cape Town from 1806 - 1827

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Slaves</th>
<th>Europeans</th>
<th>Free Blacks</th>
<th>Khoi</th>
<th>Prize Negroes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>9367</td>
<td>6321</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>624</td>
<td></td>
<td>17446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>8451</td>
<td>7312</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>439</td>
<td></td>
<td>17336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>7498</td>
<td>7719</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>553</td>
<td></td>
<td>17570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1822</td>
<td>7160</td>
<td>8124</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>18498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1827</td>
<td>6222</td>
<td>8805</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td>485</td>
<td></td>
<td>18781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"As a direct result of high manumission rates," (Bank, 1991:24) the number of free blacks in Cape Town increased substantially, from 1134 in 1806 to 4000 by 1834. Bank notes that there were numerous schemes for the introduction of European immigrant labour introduced around the time of emancipation because the need of labour was so great. In addition there were schemes developed at different times in the 19th century to 'encourage' immigration in order to boost the number of whites in the Colony and the skilled labour force. One such scheme was to land convicts en route to Australia from Britain in 1846/7, which aroused massive public protest and caused the resignation of at least one member of the Legislative Council (Hamilton Ross). In addition, Bank notes that in the seven years of the 'children's friend scheme' no fewer than 700 children "mostly boys of 14 years and younger who had committed crimes in England" (1991:25) boosted the apprenticed labour force in the Cape.

That Cape society, agriculture and economic functioning were completely reliant on the captive labour of the slaves is highlighted by the continual planning of such instances. The economic changes wrought by first the promise of massive payouts in compensation to their owners for the loss of property in the emancipation of slaves, and the (less than expected) payouts that occurred doubled the available sum of money in the colony at the time (Meltzer, 1994).

Emancipation and the money that came into the Cape in the form of compensation gave an injection to the economy which... stimulated a great spending spree, enriching old and new layers of the commercial bourgeoisie. Meltzer (1989:176)

Meltzer (1989) traces the economic boom created in the ruling class by emancipation payouts, and enumerates the exponential rise in number of registered businesses, the registration of the first bank, and the prosperity of the Cape economy as a result. He traces very convincingly the use of emancipation payouts to buy land and create housing tenements for rental to the poor by a few of the previous slave owners. The establishment of District Six and Bokaap as 'poor accommodation' by absentee landlords whose interests were driven by economic gain is illustrated.

---

54 Natlib MSB 569, 1 (3), p1.
CLAREMONT AND THE BISHOPLEA POCKET

Some disagreement and contradiction exists between scholars as to the early history of the broader Claremont area, as well as in relation to the two major estates under scrutiny (Feldhausen and Sans Souci). Addressing the contradictions would constitute a study in its own right, and it is not the purpose of this project to explore or address these in any way. The presentation is therefore of the findings and interpretations of direct relevance to this study. The number of different ways that estate names are referred to by different surveyors is indicative of actual changes of estate names at times, and of different emphases applied to names by different surveyors at other times. In addition accuracy in written form was not of great importance at the time with literacy levels very low. I have tried to use the names by which the actual cartographer referred to the piece of land, which may appear to represent inconsistency in writing, but maintains consistency with the source.

At the time of the Thibault Survey

De Puyfontein (1970) within a description of another matter, notes that by 1811 the British had begun giving lands in this area to its officials, and cites among these the Barnards at the Vineyard; Newlands as one of the oldest official residences; and Boscheuvel /Protea/ Bishopscourt as an elite estate at that time.

Thibault's survey of the land on the right side of the Main Road (referred to at times as the High Street, and in this study these terms are interchangeably used) in 1812/13 provides a sound spatial orientation to the area at that time.

There are four estates in what is currently identifiable as the vicinity of the study area, viz.

- The Vineyard - referred to as S on the Map,
- Veldhuijzen/ Velthuisen (sic)/ Feldhausen - referred to as T on the Map
- Sans Souci - referred to as R on the Map, and
- Quistenberg/ Questenberg - referred to as Q on the Map

55 By 1875 only 9% of non Europeans (literally, those resident who did not come from Europe) could read or write English, and barely half of the European population were capable of this (Worden, 1998).
56 While a determined effort has been made not to foreground the elite in this study, there are places where no explanation seems careless. The Barnards were British officials of high rank. Andrew Barnard stood in for the Governor until he arrived at the Cape, and Lady Anne was both an aristocrat in her own right and maintained social standing as the wife of a high ranking official, while behaving in very risqué ways at times. There are numerous volumes to which they are central.
57 CIA KAB M3/41. Pama (1979:31-32) states that Thibault was tasked to survey this land as a direct result of his observation that people were appropriating state land for their own, and that the government was so short of money, and could sell this land to gain money, but in order to do so needed to know what belonged to individuals and what belonged to the government. His statements are unfortunately not referenced, and have no means of being traced for accuracy. For an A4 copy of this Map consult Appendix 1. The Thibault Map is no longer allowed to be copied within the Cape Archives Depot as it is in very poor condition. It has had to be photographed and the digital images re-compiled to produce a representation of the total and of the scale with which the map was constructed at the time of the survey.
58 The Estate is variously referred to across time and by different authors. It is spelt in many different ways, the most common being Veldhuijzen, Veldhuysen and Feldhausen. The Estate became "The Grove" during the 1800's, and at the time of subdivision is partly referred to as the Grove and Paradise, and partly as Feldhausen.
59 Is referred to as Sans Soucy and Sans Souci.

What's in the pocket?
As can be seen from this map there are a few major estates in the area at that time. Feldhausen and Sans Souci are the two major Estates with which this study is concerned. These two estates will be communally and separately dealt with where appropriate to clarity.

**BRIEF HISTORY OF FELDHAUSEN**

The Estate was one of the very early VOC grants (Wagener, 1957), although there is considerable uncertainty as to when exactly it was granted. The estate changed hands numerous times, and appears to have been used for largely light agricultural production in its early years. The highest number of slaves that belonged to one of the owners of the estate prior to 1751 was 51 in 1741 and over 60 ten years later. The significance of these numbers at this time is that these slaves

---

60 Despite the addition of the Place names, no other additions have been made to this representation of the Map, and the shading apparent on it is on the original.

61 This is one of the areas of contradiction between various scholars, and would be worthwhile resolving as the nature of the early years of the estate become important. Wagener (1957) cites Veldhuijzen as having first been granted in 1660 - three years after the original grants. C/A VOC 1 contains the first 41 land grants, and this piece of land is referred to by Guelke and Shell (1990) as no 7. My access to grant 7 in this series did not immediately resolve the issue, and it would require a study with much broader parameters than the current one to resolve.

62 In the opgaafrolle (citizen rolls) for 1682 to 1751 (C/A KAB A2250) there is reference in the ownership details most commonly to 'wingertstoike' - grape vines.

63 C/A KAB A2250 for the year of 1741 in the name of Stephen Tenholder
must have been housed somewhere on the estate. Company slaves were housed at the slave lodge. Privately owned slaves were accommodated by their owners nearby their workplaces as it would have taken too long to travel from Cape Town to the Estate by wagon road daily. Accommodating a few slaves in a room of the house may have been possible, but it would not have been possible to house such large numbers of slaves without nearby buildings of a sort capable of accommodating this capacity daily.

In 1806 Veldhuysen belonged to Jan Frederick Kirsten\textsuperscript{64}, who also owned the ground that is now Kirstenbosch and according to Fagan (1996:351) did not live at Veldhuijzen. He was the owner at the time of the Thibault survey, and if he was not living there it was not discovered who may have been.

The apparent boundaries of each property are marked in the Thibault Survey. The process of the Thibault survey had involved a collation of the title deeds with the extent of land occupied by the owners, and a negotiated settlement regarding the considered boundaries of each property.

What is interesting is that Velthuisen, Stellenberg, Nuweland and other such estates have the positioning of architectural features such as buildings, and the spatial layout around the buildings clearly drawn onto the survey map. Neither Sans Souci nor the Vineyard has the same, and as far as can be seen from the map there is no geographical or physical reason why some detail is included and some excluded.

There are a number of possible reasons for consideration. One is the status of the property. If we consider this to be the reason - that the Vineyard and Sans Souci were lower status properties than those around them then the inclusion of less detail illustrates this. Newlands, Velthuisen and Stellenberg were old properties, granted before 1700, and the other two were newer grants. The three older properties have detail illustrated on the representation of the property on the survey map. The Vineyard was a high social status property (having belonged to the Barnards). The age of the property may, thus, illustrate its survey status.

Another possibility is that Thibault's concern with the design of the layout - the aesthetic aspects of his task (see for example the detail provided at 'V' on the previous presentation of the map) - may reflect his architectural concerns with the visuality of spatial arrangements and may not refer to the details of the task required of him. The presence or absence of detail provided by Thibault in this survey may or may not be significant. It becomes useful to explore the individual estates and their spatial layout more closely.

\textsuperscript{64} D/O Transfer in June 1796
What can be deduced from the representations made by this map are:

**VELTHUISEN**
That in 1812/3 Velthuisen had two distinct access routes – one from the North (the RHS of the sheet of paper in this presentation) and the other from the East, both of which appear to be tree-lined. The route to the North is represented as wider than the other, and joins up to what appears to be the road to Protea, while the Eastern route houses a parterre in the centre of its destination where it meets with the access route entering the property from the North. According to this map, Velthuisen does not extend down as far as the High Street, except in one corner of the property, where it borders Sans Soucy and where a corner touches the high street. As mapping the relationship of properties to this road was the central task of this survey, it would seem reasonable to assume that this was an accurate representation.

Velthuisen appears to have two major buildings on it at the time of this survey, both holding fairly central positions and in close proximity to one another. One of these falls at the position of the fulcrum of the access roads which may suggest that this was the main house. The second building on the map – visually to the left of the opening up of the access route from the east – appears to have four distinct paths running to or away from it and away from what appears to be the back of the first building (house?). These paths are not tree-lined and seem to meander more
than those that appear to be directly planned as entrances. Perhaps these were work exits more usually used by pedestrians than the front entrances?

The lands around the house and the other building appear to be set out in grid formation, perhaps for agricultural use, although Thibault does not portray them in quite the same way that he portrays, for instance, the land at the very top right corner of the figure which is shaded in a manner suggesting equidistant planting of perhaps vines or trees, and suggests orchard use. This suggests that perhaps there was cultivation of what appear to be relatively large plants, but that perhaps the cultivation was not engaged in on quite the same scale as some of the surrounding estates.

Sans Soucy
Sans Soucy has an odd shape, and appears to have been wedged between other existing properties. It has a ‘dog’s leg’ shape extension, which from this representation appears to extend across the existing main road. The eastern boundary of the land that constituted Sans Soucy is not represented here. The land extended up to the Liesbeek River along one portion to the North, where it was bounded by the Vineyard Estate. It is bounded by Velthuisen along a portion of two of its other borders, and except for the extension is bounded by Quistenberg along the bottom section.

There appears to be no cultivated grid pattern or representation of orchards, nor is there a real representation of buildings. There existed on the Sans Soucy site, extending from the northern side of the road to Protea to the Liesbeek River, three access routes which all come together in a central circular area differentiated from the rest on the map. In the centre of this circle is a block drawn, but no additional detail to clarify what this block may represent. There are two small blocks drawn onto the map, which look as if they could be of significance but we have no means of establishing what they might have been. Of further interest is that the Sans Soucy Estate appears to be dissected by the road to Protea, which I imagine to have been a fairly important route at that time.

Of interest by its presence rather than its absence, (and particularly its comparative relevance considering the absences and overall lack of detail) may be the depiction of a pathway running upwards (in the current orientation) alongside what appears to be the border of Sans Soucy and Velthuisen, which then curves across the top and echoes the Velthuisen northern access route to the road to Protea.

Comparative detail
What may have provided more comparative detail and a procedure of triangulation would have been exploring the individual surveyor’s diagrams of these two properties at this time. There is an existing S/G’s diagram of Sans Souci from 1817 (reproduced below for clarity of reference), but no further S/G’s diagram of Velthuisen until 1869, which is curious as the property changed hands a few times during this time, and as of 1812 it was legislatively required that a survey of the land be
conducted if there had been any changes during one ownership (Baker, 1958). At risk of appearing self-contradictory, there is an S/G’s diagram drawn in 1824 which is discussed below\textsuperscript{65}, but which forms part of a separate discussion from this comparison, as there are two of them available and they contradict each other in their difference as to whether the land they are representing was Velthuisen or not. In addition they represent a portion of land not central to this particular aspect of discussion.

\textbf{Figure 9 - Sans Souci from the Surveyor General’s Diagram of 1817}\textsuperscript{66}

From the Surveyor General’s diagram of 1817 (above) which is not presented with explanation (notably it is not described as a plan of subdivision), drawn some 5 years later than the Thibault survey was conducted, it appears that there is far more to the Sans Souci Estate at this time than shown by the detail provided by Thibault. None of the paths or access routes shown by Thibault are depicted on this drawing, and virtually none of what is on this drawing appears on the Thibault survey.

Both this drawing and the Thibault map (figures 7 and 8) are official representations of the land from the same time frame. A question of clarity of representation is raised by the fact that this diagram is captured on computer and all its accompanying details are computerised (some of which reflect subdivisions that took place up to eighty years later along lines extant in this diagram hand drawn in 1817). The computerised version does actually represent a diagram drawn in 1817, whose original could not be found for perusal. The diagram is not stored or presented by the office of the surveyor general as a plan of projected subdivision at the time of being drawn.

\textsuperscript{65} The issues surrounding this diagram will be explored in detail under the section referring directly to the diagram.

\textsuperscript{66} S/G 234/1871, full diagram and attachments in Appendix 1.
have taken a decision to use it based on my assessment that there must have been good enough similarity to cause it be accepted rather than rejected as representation in both instances.

Of note from this drawing at first intake are:

- the location of the Estate along the Liesbeek River,
- the 'road to the Vineyard' marked as cutting across it from bottom left to top right in this depiction,
- The 'lots' for which in the drawing there is no explanation, but which are seen in the early depictions of the Protea Estate in reference to agricultural production ,
- The apparent 'road' at c-d without further label, lined on the left in this representation by the 'lots' facing a different direction, i.e. lining to face the road,
- The lines of 'lots' closer towards the Liesbeek river than the road to the Vineyard

A note on the diagram states that 'the rest' of the grant was cancelled in 1879 and became crown land. The meaning of this suggests that certain subdivisions occurred and the remainder of the ground reverted to being crown land for some reason.

It would then be useful to view these two (the S/G's diagrams of Feldhausen and of Sans Souci) in relation to one another, for the possibility of gaining further clarity, and to begin to assess whether the lines on the 1817 Sans Souci diagram indicates that it was subdivided at this point. Before embarking on this process it is useful to explore diagrams of the area on the Thibault survey map between Velthuisen and Stellenberg, in other words along the opposite boundary of the Velthuisen Estate.

**The Surveyor's Diagrams of 1824**

There are two versions of this diagram. The first (the hand drawn and written) version was found in a box of 'assorted' surveying diagrams in the Cape Archives. The S/G's computerised version of this diagram differs from the hand drawn diagram in the amount of detail contained in both the drawing and the accompanying explanation.

---

67 The Protea Project completed by the District Six Museum has similar visual representations of that estate from this approximate time period which show similar lines that had represented the manner in which the agricultural production was divided and allocated across land.

68 S/G 67/1824, see appendix for full detail.

69 C/A DOC 5/4/1 – this reference is unfortunately used more than once as it refers to an entire box of documents, which have no page numbers as they are 'assorted'. The document I am referring to consisted of a number of sheets of paper, and a copy reproduced from digital photograph can be found in the appendix.
For the purposes of clarity of discussion here they will be referred to as the S/G's diagram and the archive diagram, despite their referring to what visually appears to be the same piece of land, raising the possibility that they are in fact two representations of the same diagram. The piece of land being represented in both fits visually into the gap between Velthuisen and Stellenberg on the Thibault survey, illustrated as figure 7. Please note that in exploring the discrepancies the names

10 C/A DOC 5/4/1
and discussion of owners and reference becomes dense. The owners and their social status or lack thereof have no bearing on this particular discussion, and are mentioned for the purpose of clarity of illustration only.

The S/G’s diagram is quite self explanatory. It shows a piece of land which was Quitrent land\(^1\) (i.e. crown land available for perpetual rent, with the rental being rendered to the state) referred to as erf 54075 that had been or was planned for subdivision in the manner indicated on the diagram in 1824. It does not appear that the ownership or representation of the land is in any doubt at all. The computerised S/G’s diagram is neat and ‘clear’ and appears to have no crisis of representation.

In contrast, Page 1 of the archive diagram states:

This diagram represents a piece of land, situated in the Cape District near Wineberg, containing twenty eight morgen and a half. Extending north and West to the place Veldhuysen now the Grove Estate, to the place Stellenberg, and the land of Francis Dashwood esq. Copied from the General plan made by the late L.M. Thibault, Esq. (C/A KAB 2250:1)

It does not state that the land is crown land which would be the usual manner of representing quitrent land (land available for perpetual rent). It does not in fact state to whom the land belongs, but does identify the owners of the surrounding lands.

It goes on to list deductions from the above piece of land (my numbering):

1. Land granted (10 morgen 184 ¾ sqr) to Charles Blair, then in possession of SV Cloete,
2. Section A (3 morgen, 403 sqr) on the Diagram does not state to whom it goes,
3. “Vide Deed of Gift from VA Schonberg in favour of V.A. Schonberg on 27th May 1835”\(^2\)
4. One morgen sold to Watson in 1836
5. Lot S (378sqr 49sqf) transferred to the free black Samay 13th June 1837

The remaining deductions are listed on page 2 of the archive drawing and the land is noted as being part of Feldhausen. Table 2 contains the list.

\[\begin{array}{|l|l|l|}
\hline
\text{date} & \text{In favour of} & \text{Lot number} & \text{extent} \\
\hline
6. & 22 October 1839 & John Lander & C & 19sqr 39sqf \\
7. & 15 November 1839 & Joseph Turner & B & 27sqr 37sqf \\
8. & 2nd July 1840 & Slamodien & 23 & 41sqr 96sqf \\
9. & 2nd July 1840 & January & 22 & 42sqr 48sqf \\
10. & 23rd August 1844 & Akildien & 2&3 & Unclear \\
11. & 23rd August 1844 & Widow D. Salom & 25 & 40sqr 40sqf \\
12. & 23rd August 1844 & (? ? ?) Livie(?) & 20 & 77 sqr 40sqf \\
\hline
\end{array}\]

\(^1\) This can be seen from the fact that on the title of the diagram it states that the title deed number is a C.Q. number. This was the manner used to refer to government land for quitrent; i.e. “Cape Quitrent”.
\(^2\) This is the day that transfer of Feldhausen was passed from Schonberg to Herschel, and Hershel had agreed to divide a piece of the estate for Schonberg to live on.
There are a few possible explanations for the apparent contradictions in ownership, both those internal to the archive document, and those between the archive and the S/G document. It does appear that this land had been separate from the Feldhausen Estate, and was possibly dealt with separately all along. This would be highly unusual as land once incorporated became part of the larger tract and was consolidated. It also does appear from the archive drawing that it became a part of Feldhausen. There are a few pieces of evidence supporting this argument:

Reference 3 on the list above shows Schonberg giving land to what appears to be either himself or a son of the same initials; coincidentally at the same time that Herschel bought the estate from him. Herschel recorded in his diary on Tuesday the 18th November 1834 that Schonberg - “half stipulated for, half begged for himself [a certain piece of land] to build and reside on- and enquired if three months would be too long for himself & family to remain on the premises while the house was building” (Evans, et.al. 1969:107). This is footnoted confirming that Herschel allowed him to take for his family a piece of the Feldhausen land (called ‘the Grove’ by Schonberg) and that the house built there was called ‘Herschel’ after his departure from the Cape.

Reference 5 above is confirmed by the Herschel diaries “went to town and completed transfers of allotments of land to Wilhelmina Walker & Samhaai the free Black” (Evans, et.al., 1969:310). Some contradiction exists as Wilhelmina Walker is not recorded here as having received land, and that he states a different day in June as the day of transfer - 30th instead of 13th. Erlank notes that Herschel manumitted and gave land to Zoomai (his groom) before leaving the Cape.

It is clear from the above discussion that the land represented in both the S/G and archive diagrams was privately owned, and was part and parcel of the Feldhausen Estate before Herschel rented and later purchased this land from Schonberg in 1834. What is not clear is why these diagrams treat this tract of land separately.

Herschel also refers in his diaries to the places in which his land crosses the high street. Thibault’s survey does not convey this, but the land given to Samhaai (in reference 5 above) is on the other side of the main road. If the piece of land depicted in both of these drawings is fitted to the bottom of Feldhausen on Thibault’s 1812 map, it does extend Feldhausen over the main road. The S/G’s diagram of 1869 showing the major subdivisions depicts Feldhausen as incorporating this piece of land extending over the main road (see Figure 14). The most curious aspect of this is that the land does not at any point until its final subdivision become incorporated into the land of the Feldhausen estate, although it is referred to and dealt with as such in the archive diagram.

\[13\] It is accepted practice to re-use S/G’s diagrams, and to base future diagrams on those from the past. The issues here are that selective use has been made of what remains recorded in the re-use of the diagram. The illustration is of sanitising - cleaning up the information and in so doing, loosing the injunctions into the everyday of a marginalised portion of society.
Finally, the S/G's diagram dated 1824 cannot possibly be regarded as a reliable representation of what could be found on the ground at the time of the survey being recorded. This is because the archive diagram indicates that it was begun in 1824, but records more than a moment in time with the final written recordings on it being 1847. It is not possible that projection of the subdivisions depicted could have been completed by 1824. The reason for this is that Herschel and other individuals involved in the later subdivisions were not present in 1824, and it can be reasonably argued that at least some of the subdivisions happened to meet the personal circumstantial and material needs of these individuals.

The questions raised here are those of the portrayal of complexity, coupled by questions regarding the reliability of documents that are not primary sources themselves. The computer document (obviously captured on computer long after the completion of the original drawing) does not portray the lack of clarity or the 'uneven edges' portrayed by the original drawing. It simply states that this is quitrent land, perhaps unwittingly sanitising all manner of 'messiness', and uses the same subdivisions drawn onto the archived diagram.

Sans Souci and Feldhausen in the 19th century - Fitting it together

Aligning Sans Souci in relation to Velthuisen is not possible using diagrams from the same time frame as they appear not to exist. I have therefore used the 1869 diagram (a plan of subdivision, despite the fact that the subdivisions had begun in the 1840's) of Feldhausen and the 1817 diagram of Sans Souci.74

![Figure 12 - Fusion of two Surveyors Diagrams](image)

74 It is interesting to note that the detail lost in the computer capture of the 1824 diagram is repeated with the 1869 map. The original is two A0 sheets and can therefore not be included in the appendix, but the detail and lack of sanitisation for clarity is notable.
There are a number of themes that are apparent from the aligning of these two diagrams. Immediately striking is the continued use and formalisation of paths from the older maps. The access avenues to Feldhausen have become roads. The one extending South from the "back entrance" is marked by 1869; the one extending down to Main road (which in the older maps had a parterre at the end) is a road here; and the second avenue of trees extending northwards has also remained marked. The boundary markings have also remained in places. The boundary extending eastward between Feldhausen and Sans Souci which had been a footpath appears to have been formalised as an access route. The road to Protea has remained in place, and two branches forming off this road towards the Main road are formed into access routes. The place where the Vineyard estate had met the other two is the fulcrum of these routes.

It is not possible to establish from these diagrams what parts of this land were occupied and by whom. Nor is it possible to establish the extent of the actual implementation of subdivision from the maps alone. The incorporation of deeds records and the particular owners of the land, and with that the links to the human elements of land distribution is necessary to gain further insight into the spatial arrangements.

**Ownership**

The Social and ownership histories of these two estates through the beginning of the 19th century are relatively uneventful. Feldhausen was transferred from Kirsten to James Fichart in 1819\(^75\), and to V.A. Schonberg\(^76\) in 1825, after Fichart's death.

Fichart had advertised the estate for sale in the Cape Advertiser (noted by Erlank (1993) to be an advertiser of people's social mobility) on the 17th November 1821\(^77\). This advertisement gives full details of the estate, its buildings at that time, and the extent of the cultivation under way by 1821. It may be possible that some of the cultivation described here was underway 9 years previous at the time of the Thibault survey. For full size advertisement see Appendix 2.

In 1834 Herschel came to the Cape and went to live at Feldhausen (Evans, et.al, 1969). In the negotiations around transfer of the Estate, Schonberg was given a piece of the estate upon which to live and his son was given land to build on. It is possible that these are the same piece of land.

---

\(^{75}\) D/O Transfer 118 on 23.4.1819.

\(^{76}\) D/O Transfer 209 on 19.8.1825.

\(^{77}\) Natlib Cape Advertiser 17 November 1821.
Herschel's departure from the Cape. It may be the reason that his presence in the Cape at that time is relatively well known, although he had nothing to do with Herschel house or the school. When Herschel left the Cape in 1837, he subdivided as shown above, reserved a piece of land for himself which corresponds with where his telescope had stood, and is now a national monument - 'the Obelisk' referred to in all maps thereafter, and sold the rest to Rice Jones (Evans, 1969).

The estate did not change hands in its original form again. It was subdivided as referred to below, with some of the first divisions being the selling of and then giving of land to Bishop Gray who had arrived at the Cape and was seeking both church property and a place to live. Jones was able to assist with land for a church in Claremont and for a stately residence he located the land that is now Bishopscourt. The appearance of the Anglican Church at the time of emancipation with a conversion mission towards the slaves is a different discussion, but one that is well located in a slightly broader area of Claremont.

Sans Souci being in relation to Veldhuijzen a relatively young piece of land constituted as it was in 1817. In 1823 permission was requested from the public by the then owner (Martha Delpratt) to begin a girls seminary on the premises as a result of misfortunes experienced by her. The next recorded transfer is that in 1835 the estate was purchased from Judge Menzies by Hamilton Ross. The first subdivision according to the S/G's diagram was 1831. The first recorded subdivision found recorded in this study was in 1844. The Estate was not passed on undivided again.

Both Estates, then were last owned as single entities by the owners that purchased the properties in the 1830's. Sans Souci was divided sooner than was Feldhausen, and the difference was that Hamilton Ross purchased Sans Souci in 1835, as did Herschel of Feldhausen, but Herschel sold to Jones in 1838, and the major subdivisions happened thereafter. The parallel timing of slave emancipation in the 1830's may have been linked to a different attitude to land coming into practice in the next decades. What does become important is to briefly overview the people involved.

**THE OWNERS**

Part of the complexity is that the individual owners at this time become important, and were both important men in their own right.

**Hamilton Ross**

There is archival material which tells the stories of Ross' life at "the extensive and park-like seat of my grandfather the Hon. Hamilton Ross of Sans Souci" as recorded by his grandson. One of the stories commonly relayed about him is of his elopement with a young Cape girl with the assistance

---

78 Le Measurier, A/S/A 8CS 424, p3
79 Natlib Government Gazette 21 June 1823
80 D/O Transfer on 3.7.1835
81 Natlib MSB 569, 1 (3) (4) and (5) record detail of social circumstances in the life of Hamilton Ross.
of Lady Anne Barnard\(^{82}\), making a success overseas and then returning to the Colony to 'win her parents approval', and begin life at the Cape. He became, in short, an extremely successful merchant, who was also a member of the Legislative Council at the Cape, until his resignation over the importation of convicts\(^{83}\) to boost the labour force in 1846. He lived at the Mount Nelson, and Sans Souci was his residence away from town, and was clearly part of the Cape Elite.

It appears from the writing of his grandson that he owned more land in the area than just Sans Souci - "Mr Ross believed in land and bought up the open flat country"\(^{84}\) followed by a lengthy description of much more extensive land than this. Ross is said to have kept no slaves at Sans Souci\(^{85}\), despite there being many references to a large 'slave lodge' on the premises.

...on the flats he built six decent thatched cottages for his garden labourers with a good slice of garden ground well fenced in, attached - this little village was called Roscommon ...The landlord exacted no rental - he paid no wages but in return he secured the services of his tenants for two days in the week keeping Sans Souci - its avenues, hedges, (something) etc. in proper trim (Natlib MSB 569,1 (4) p2.

A full description of extensive grown goods - strawberries, oranges, fruit and vegetables provides the descriptive background to illustrate that there was considerable high quality production from the land at Sans Souci at that time. It is not clear whether or not Ross’ labour dealings were simply fitting (he bought Sans Souci in 1835) at a time when slaves were in a process of having been emancipated and were at the time apprenticed to training, or whether he was being generous. What is clear is that his labour dealings here were unusual. Ross began to sell off and distribute parts of the land himself and after his death it was then divided.

Herschel

Sir John Herschel was a British astronomer, philosopher and scientist sent to the Cape to study the southern skies\(^{86}\). He arrived with his wife and 3 children in 1834, and left again in 1837, having completed the task. Three more children were born in this time, and his place of home and work was Feldhausen. Herschel was Jewish but this is not referred to by himself or anyone else in reference to him, and there was no open Jewish community in the Cape at the time. He was not openly Jewish, but I do not mean that he was necessarily trying to hide being Jewish. He and his wife socialised on the outskirts of the Cape elite, were somewhat critical of the central positions, and seemingly did not wish to be socially central themselves. When Herschel left the Cape the land was sold to Rice Jones, an auctioneer. They knew that it would be divided, and Lady commented in her diary that she would rather have left it to the Indians, but her meaning is unclear. It is perhaps interesting to note that a synagogue now stands on the site that was occupied by the Feldhausen Homestead at that time. It is interesting to note that Zoomai was given land far away from the homestead, and we can only surmise as to whether this was for reasons of his or the landowners – for convenience or distance.

---

\(^{82}\) Lady Anne was wife of the Colonial secretary at the time, but she herself was first Lady of the Colony as the wife of the Governor was not at the Cape (Pama, 1979). They owned and built on the Vineyard Estate prior to 1800.

\(^{83}\) CIA KAB 535.

\(^{84}\) Natlib MSB 569,1 (4), p2.

\(^{85}\) Natlib MSB 569, 1 (4) p 3-5

\(^{86}\) He was knighted after he had been at the Cape, but is referred to by his title throughout this document.
SUBDIVISION AFTER 1840

S/G 107/1844 shows the allocation of lot 2 of Sans Souci to Ago87 of the Cape88. This block borders onto Feldhausen estate and is directly in the area of denser housing being studied. The boundary of this parcel of land formulates the boundary of the denser housing in the pocket. The surveyors diagram shows this land to contain two streets, and be bordered by a third (now Protea Road) – one of them named Frederick on the 1844 drawing, (still Frederick) and shows that the land was planned for division into 28 lots. From the dates of actual division, these reflected by the deeds of transfer and by the diagram, the division of this land may have occurred on the ground before 1902, but all further division of ownership of the land only occurred after Ago (by then holding the surname Ajouhaar) had died, when it was divided into 23 lots, many of which were inherited by people with the surname Ajouhaar, some others being women born Ajouhaar and having married. Many of these properties were then owned by people with Muslim or Hindu names.

On a comparative level what is interesting is that the subdivision of the land follows the basic lines extant in the surveyor general’s diagram of 1817. It is unclear what these lines had indicated in 1817, but that they had made a mark on the land which was then adhered to in other ways seems possible.

In 1847 Ross sold land to David in the nearby vicinity, now on Quiet St89. The S/G’s diagram for this is not available. The Deeds Office transfers show that by 1877 this had been divided into 4 lots. Fakier acquired the adjoining land, which had been divided by 187790.

In 1848 Ross sold land to Wilhelmina Patten (four large lots) closer to the bottom of the study area, which the S/G’s diagram refers to as ‘next to Fakir’s lot’, and illustrates the subdivision of the ground acquired by her. The S/G’s diagram of 1877 shows this land divided into 12 lots with three already existing cottages, a wooden structure, and a well91. The location of this property would correspond with that beginning at Memel Street and extending through to Cavendish Street.

In 1850 a mosque was already being built along the main road, one lot from the corner of the road to Protea, perhaps corresponding with lot 14 of Sans Souci’s ground in the 1817 map. Although the depth of its history has not been explored, it is possible that firstly there were enough practicing Muslims in the surrounding area that the need for an established place of worship had been considered and followed through to this point.

87 D/O Transfer 139, dated 26-08-1844.
88 ‘Of the Cape’ or records showing just a first name, or ‘of’ another place, for example Bengal, indicates that this person is a slave or a free black. Usually free blacks acquired surnames after a time of freedom, so that a free black person referred to without a surname may indicate that they have been relatively recently freed.
89 D/O Transfer 54, dated 4-11-1847.
90 S/G’s plan 533 drawn in 1877.
91 S/G’s plan 533, drawn in 1877.
In 1848 Bishop Gray and his wife Sophie (a skilled architect) arrived at the Cape as the first Bishop of the Anglican Church. They quickly set about mission work and acquired three properties in the nearby suburbs for establishing the Church hierarchy locally\(^2\). The Anglican Church opened in Claremont in 1854, the money having been raised in England for the building thereof. The religious rivalry between the mosque and the church across the town at this time is documented, and the application to this pocket may require further research.

Hamilton Ross died in 1851 and the distribution of this land may have been effected by the fact that it was not his primary residence. It may have been considered less important than the Mount Nelson may have been. Sans Souci was divided and distributed according to what appears a combination of Ross’s wishes and his family’s decisions after his death.

Claremont became a separate municipality in 1865. There were by this time shops along the length of the Main Road, and the major routes had service outlets lined along them. The setting down of municipal boundaries and the development of internal infrastructure indicates that there were enough people living in the surrounding area to warrant a separate municipal service application, as well as that there were sufficient services and economic activity in the area to establish municipal infrastructures within the area. The Combination sketch plan\(^3\) shows clearly the streets as they were at that time. Proposed streets were marked with dotted lines. There is a contradiction inherent in that the S/G’s subdivision plan (S33 or plan 3258) of 1877 shows both ‘private road’ above and Ingle Road as proposed roads, but this map shows them as existing roads.

It is possible that the roads were paths already in use but not yet named or covered in a way that would have been recognisable to the surveyors department as existing streets\(^4\). Important to these questions is Hart’s (1999) work on the origins of Street names. Hart has dated the streets as being ‘created’ at the time that the city referred to them as created – in other words tarred. These roads would only come to be officially noted as roads by this method in 1919.

On the Feldhausen Estate, Jones first divided the Estate into three parts, one of which went to Arderne and is now Claremont Gardens and the land on the South of Bowwood Road, another part of which is the land extending from Newlands Road up to Bishopscourt, the third portion is a

---


\(^3\) Natlib sc 124 “original map”, was retraced by White in 1977.

\(^4\) Important to these questions is Hart’s work on Street names. He has dated the streets as being ‘created’ at the time that the city referred to them as created – in other words tarred. These roads would only come to be officially noted as roads in 1919.
transitional area. The 1869 plans show the subdivisions of this parcel of ‘the Grove Estate’ into plots of far larger size than the division of those on Sans Souci.

It also shows that the North facing access avenue emphasised in the 1812 map and in Herschel’s diaries (figure 14 below) is not emphasised in the same way. In fact what appears from the map is that it has fallen into disuse or is no longer important for some other reason.

The South facing lane which was present but not emphasised in Thibault’s map (the back entrance or exit) is now emphasised as extending past ‘the cottage’. The 2 buildings present in the original map are still present. I had assumed one to be a slave lodge, but by 1869 it is recorded as a cottage lot. It is not possible from this evidence to determine whether the slave lodge had become translated as a ‘cottage’ – whether they may be the same thing or not. There are existing photographs of both the architecturally magnificent Feldhausen homestead, and ‘The Grove Cottage’. They have not been included as they are not directly relevant. There are no visual depictions of the ordinary small houses of the area.

Figure 15 - S/G's Plan of Subdivision of Feldhausen "The Grove" 1869

Today there is a synagogue that stands on the site that was the Feldhausen House. Feldhausen Avenue is that lane which led North in the 1812 map. Grove Avenue is the entrance leading towards the main road in this map. Herschel (Evans 1969: Plate 13) depicts the Northern access route, which is de-emphasised by the time of the subdivision plan (1869) to the homestead as preferable because of the view from this angle.
Curiously Herschel 'photographed' and described many aspects of the estate in detail, but there is no mention in his diaries of the second building on the estate.

The location of the accommodation of slaves remains unanswered except for the description of a slave lodge in Ficharts (1821) advertisement, and a drawing of the floor plan of the house in Herschel's diary showing a wing in the house where the servants slept (Evans, et.al. 1969:21).

The Herschel's were not utilising the estate for agricultural production at the time that they occupied it, and according to Erlank (1993) had between six and nine servants including their own personal assistants at any one time. They were not accommodating the large number of labourers that had previously been accommodated on this land.

**OTHER INFLUENCES:**

**THE RAILWAY LINE**

Burman's (1984) study of the development of the Railways claims that in October of 1845 the Cape of Good Hope Western Railway Company was formed in London. The registering of this Company fell through because there was lukewarm support and the people registering the Company had not sought the permission of the Cape counterparts being named (1984:15). The Company was re-formed eight years later as 'The Cape Town Railway and Dock Company'. In 1859 the railway line connecting Cape Town to her hinterland was begun. The Railway Act was passed in 1861, and the railway line to Simonstown was begun in 1863. On 19th December 1864 the line was opened with Claremont being one of the original stations.

Mobility in and out of the area would have been transformed by the opening of the railway line, which would have had major geographical impact on all the areas the line traversed. Commuting may have become possible for the elite, and access to public transport from Cape Town to Simonstown, as well as increasing the attractiveness of the Claremont shopping area by making it more accessible.

---

95 C/A Elliott collection
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL COMMENT:

Norah Henshilwood’s description of this area in the early 20th century:

About a couple of hundred yards east of ‘Overslade’ was the area known to us as ‘the Malay Field’. During the depression after the Anglo-Boer war, houses built originally for white people had been let or sold to Coloured Folk, mostly Malays, who had established their own community there. The roads and the empty space of the field were neglected, with many open drains and consequent untidiness, though the houses were solid enough and occupied by some of the most respected and worthy of the local Malay and Indian families. On the corner was a ‘Coolie’ shop, run by an Indian (Henshilwood, 1972:17, emphasis added).

Her telling of the story is powerful in more than one sense. The undesirable coexistence with ‘Malays’ who by her tone did not belong here is evident. So is her ambivalence, for in the next sentence she describes the people as ‘of the best’. That her information may be incorrect and based in something other than fact is not obvious. The work of this project shows clearly that this land was bought by free blacks as early as 1844. Her ‘imaginative map’ of the area is representative of some of the features already discussed. There is evidence suggesting that her location of spatial details was relatively accurate. Her reference to ‘the Malay field’ and the ‘slum’, coupled with the evident distaste at the close proximity raise questions about what the experiences of living in the area would have been. It draws attention to the ‘pocketing’ of the “Malay” living area by the other occupants of the burgeoning suburb at that time, and the erasing of the information that this community belonged here.

**Figure 18** - Henshilwood’s reconstruction of Claremont in the early twentieth century.

---

96 Overslade was her family home, and was located in the pocket being studied. It was on Feldhausen Avenue and Bishoplea Road and extended through to Selbourne Road. Overslade was by her description and visual records a large single story villa neatly nestled in this area.
CHAPTER 7 REFLECTION ON LINKS AND ABSENCES

This section explores repetitive themes (narratives) in both the process and the findings of the research project. It describes the temporal reflections that have characterised working with data in a critical and interpretive process, and as such represents my interpretations of some of the meanings that became available.

THE NEED TO CONSERVE COMPLEXITY

The clearest theme of this work has been the need (and difficulties with) keeping and articulating complexity of interpretation and meaning. The difficult and the 'messy' cannot afford to be lost or overwritten. This includes the complexity that is reflected in method and interdisciplinary study.

Coherence is measured by finding an explanation that makes sense of most of the data, and that uses the hermeneutic process of creating narratives to tuck in those loose ends. (Yamin, 2001:167)

Between 1800 and 1900 communities across the globe were transformed physically, socially and in the ways in which people considered life (philosophically). There was a global transformation of power, and some of the issues as to the nations who conducted and controlled this power began to be settled. The century was marked by expansion. Slums and suburbs appeared across the world. Philosophies and their practices were being transformed by new scientific discoveries and the development of new worldviews catalysed by the expansion of empires.

Locally, the century rendered the colony British rather than Dutch or French, heralding a change in rulers and therefore rules, influences and emphases. The ruling culture was changing, and the specific nature of the lives of the underclasses was transformed from slavery to freedom and frequently to extreme poverty. All of these address massive change which was occurring, but would not have been experienced in this way on the ground. The de Certeau conceptualisation relocates 'the eye' to ground level. For the pedestrians (read - ordinary folk), change may have accrued incrementally but slowly across lifetimes. It is too easy looking back to see big motions and movements in hindsight, and it is very much more difficult to explore the mundane when it is couched in the massive. One of the recurring underlying themes of this study was to question(s) the assumption that the only viable history is grand history, whether for the elite or the underclasses, and that any other approach to history writing is both empirically unsound and politically incorrect. (Eriank, 1993:7)

On a practical level the need for complexity is illustrated by the metaphor of the palimpsest. The parchment (the land) has been dealt with in different ways and with different meanings across time. That one set of markers and meanings has been lost to record is of concern as it limits our ability to focus a full picture. In the South African history record (both popular and academic), data has been actively erased in the name of social engineering, which creates a different kind of need for complexity, and the losses are of greater concern. The need to restore the complex histories in their complexities is recognised. The reasons for restoration are varied, but from the point of this
study it is precisely the act of marginalising the already dispossessed that leaves them not even their own stories to relate to. That history cannot be undone is accepted, but one of the characteristics that have allowed the beginnings of the transformation of society away from apartheid practices is the restoration of diversity.97

ARCHITECTURE AND THE FREED SLAVES

The most significant theme of this study is that of inclusion and exclusion. Tschumi's (2001:5) observation that “architecture was, first and foremost, the adaptation of space to the existing socioeconomic structure” illustrates the place of design architecture as included, and of vernacular architecture as excluded. What had begun in the study as an observation of marked disjuncture in architectural form and spatial layout became narrated by the history of the dispossessed. That these living areas are referred to as pockets is the first clue to this. The hints are of ‘a clump’ ‘allowed’ within the more integrated whole of the surrounding suburbs. The term pocket (as described in the Glossary) is merely ‘an isolated collection of things’, and indicates a boundedness from the ‘rest’. The exclusion of this pocket has been compounded by the Group Areas Removals in the 1960’s and 70’s when people were literally excluded. The narration of the history of the dispossessed produces silence when tested by ‘mainstream’ markers; silence is the narration of absence.

Until the Todeschini and Japha report (1994) the exclusion of the Claremont pocket (Bishoplea pocket in this study) meant that it had escaped the gaze of even the conservation planners. That there is no immediate evidence of the original buildings (from the 19th century) may indicate another absence – it is possible that they have been ‘erased’ and replaced, or modernised beyond recognition. The Todeschini & Japha findings (1994:30) that the area is very similar to Newlands village (another pocket, geographically quite close, but larger) may be accurate, but it is the assertion of this study that the Claremont pocket was originally largely owned and built by free blacks and not by ‘capitalists’. My inference is that Todeschini and Japha refer to ‘capitalists’ as absentee landlords, and if that inference is correct the findings in this study do not support theirs.

A notable aspect of the ‘original’ use of space that seems to have endured and not been markedly erased or overwritten, is paths and access routes. These have tended to stay. There are numerous examples where what was the original route of access has in total or in part remained and become a formal route of access. One of the obscure examples of this is Protea Road. It is a major arterial route into a sub-urban business centre. The road is central to a large grid pattern of roads, but it curves back on itself in a rather obtuse way, that can be traced back to the boundaries between three estates (Feldhausen, Sans Souci and the Vineyard). The path of Protea Road actually appears to follow the route of footpaths along the estate boundaries that were noticeable on the Thibault map of 1812.

97 I am referring here to those philosophies practiced and operationalised by legislation under the Nationalist Government (from 1948 to 1994) as well as to the kinds of class and racial segregation (Bickford-Smith, 1995) that were forerunners to the legislative developments of the Nationalist Government.
A question raised by this study is 'which access routes have remained and in what forms across the suburban framework?' ; a question requiring dense mapping collation over time.

An observation on absences within this study is that the study focuses on ownership of property and the inscriptions that mark ownership. Any dealings with property below ownership level (i.e. rental and bartering of space for skill etc.) were not recorded by surveying and are not studied here.

**Trade in Property - Land and Slaves**

This study has intended to gather and collate information that could reveal meanings of land use, ownership, and the built environment created thereon. It is the assertion of this thesis that by the turn of the 19th century the commodification of land in the colony was well established. Maximizing the use of this commodity and the fiscal and social gain to be made through its trade was the part of the equation emphasised by the British. Who was eligible for land ownership and who was not was clear, at least in the fact that the majority of the population were property themselves, had no access to capital, and were thereby not eligible for land ownership – they were property-less property.98

Land was owned in large tracts at the turn of the 19th century and required access to use of a labour force, which further clarified who was eligible and for which positions in this hierarchy. The ways in which people had access to the commodity (land), and upon what conditions, in the changing circumstances of the century are central to understanding the distributions of power. Slaves must have lived on the land in these (then) rural parts. It is not possible that they commuted – that was the strict reserve of the elite. Where they were physically located and how they related to the land both before and after emancipation could have meant a change in this set of circumstances. After emancipation they were no longer property. They were free blacks.99 They could theoretically own property, but whether they became property owners or not they continued to occupy property. In other words the possible positions in the equation changed but the general location within the social hierarchy did not. The need to explore the uses and misuses, the creative uses and resistance uses to which the commodity-as-need (land) was related is raised.

---

98 I thank Antonia Malan for this phrase. A question which has arisen and to which there did not seem to be an accepted answer at this time was whether slaves could actually own property (land) or not. This is a possible further area of study. Nigel Worden (pers.comm.) commented that as slaves did not have a legal persona, they could not enter into legal contract, it might be interpreted that they could therefore not enter into a contract of property ownership. He added that this may be confounded by the fact that they could inherit other kinds of property and were often bequeathed goods, and that it would be unusual for land and other property to be dealt with differently. Whether or not slaves could own land while still being slaves remains unclear as a theoretical question, although there is no obvious evidence that they did.

99 In VOC times Company employees were granted 'letters of freedom' to allow them to leave the castle and to own land and to 'make their own way', hampered by arduous conditions placed upon them by the Company. It is interesting that almost 200 years later the slaves were 'granted freedom' with conditions lasting another four years, and that one of the advantages of freedom was that property could be owned. Some 170 years later freedom has again become a recurrent motif with particular relations to the 'freedom to own land'.

---
The estates constituting the core of the Bishoplea pocket last changed ownership as predominantly historically coherent single entities at a parallel time to the emancipation of slaves. It is possible that the injection of capital into the Cape referred to by Meltzer (1994) and Bank (1991) as having shaped the Cape economy and the building boom across the rest of Cape Town, also had massive impact for the trade in property (the commodity above) in this pocket at that time. What the consequences were for those who acquired land at that time cannot be traced by a study of this nature, except to note subdivisions and length of ownership. What the consequences may have been for those who sold the land to subdivision raises an interesting set of complexities in the Bishoplea pocket.

It appears from the documentation gathered in this study that none of the men who last owned the land as single entities were effected by the manner of subdivision and development of the land. Although Ross began the process of subdivision at Sans Souci, the final subdivisions of his land occurred after his death. Even had this not been the case, this was not his primary property, and “he believed in land” and was a merchant himself, which could mean that his attachment to the land was largely commercial or investment. Ross was not present to experience the consequences of the choices he had made. Herschel left the Cape and returned to England, selling his property to an auctioneer. He had (we must assume for a man of intellect) made an informed fiscal decision in selling Feldhausen to an auctioneer, Jones. He knew that Jones would subdivide and auction the property. The outcome bore no direct consequence for him and there was no vested interest on his part.

Jones divided the land for financial gain although did not immediately auction it. The divisions happened over many years (although bulk selling was focussed around 1869) and Jones was possibly unconcerned about who bought the properties. There are areas of remaining uncertainty about the longer term subdivisions of Feldhausen. One contradiction concerning Jones is that he lived at the house for a while, and then moved to the Stellenberg (‘smarter’) end of the estate. He seemed to have a concern that the land was ‘decently’ divided into larger properties, thereby maintaining its elite status. It may be coincidental that this type of subdivision excluded those with less means to purchase, which happened to coincide in some part with racial identity. It appears, however that Jones purchased the property for financial gain and subdivision.

**USE OF MAPS AND MAPPING TOOLS TO IMPERIAL ENDS**

Maps are so naturalised within modern culture that their construction and use are rarely remarked upon...despite the time, labour, money, and general effort invested by the British in mapping .... Edney (1997:31)

The naturalisation of maps and their uses may indeed be paradoxically dependant upon the amount of time and energy extended by the British in mapping their empire. The importance of the Cape to the British was in part because it assured them access to the ‘jewel of the British crown’ - India. Edney (1997) noted how the application of imperial aims had guided the mapping
of India. The findings of this study draw concurring parallels to their dealings in the Cape. The application of imperial intent using the geographic tools of mapping practices were used to guide and enhance British governance and fiscal control over the Cape once they had begun assessing its colonial worth to them. Thibault was given the task of surveying to establish what land belonged to the crown in order that it could be distributed – some to the officials and some to be sold for financial gain (Harris). Their concern with place and planning (grid structures and roads as straight lines) along rectangular lines expanded the uses of surveying and surveyors to impose a reality on the land that is unlikely to have occurred organically.

The critical use of maps and their representations allows the identification of possible biases within a map or with a particular surveyor. This enables the use of maps as interpretive text, which in turn facilitates the search for other images or alternate records for clarification. The inconsistencies between representations of the same ‘map’ or diagram in several circumstances in this study is illustrative of this point. The need to use primary evidence and read the complexity inscribed rather than the sanitised inscriptions is essential to gaining understandings of the complexities that were being played out historically.

It is perhaps paradoxical that it is precisely the British concern with surveying and ‘figuring out what belonged to the crown’ that provides the material required to explore historiographic representation and the imperial intent with land. The ways in which the meaning and identity of property has been changed and shifted by means of the representations and inscriptions made of it becomes clearer in the shadow of the inscription. In other words, the British concerns with control and recording thereof allow research into their means of control.

An illustration of the inscription of biases into some maps are those whose purpose has been irrelevant to the study. The most obvious of these is the sewage planning map of the 1890’s, and the map of principle residences for the southern suburbs. The first is totally inaccurate in locations and the second only presents the most socially elite residences of its time. The concern of this study is not with extensive inaccuracy but with the sanitisation of information as illustrated in the findings in order to present a ‘neater’ picture of events and circumstances. The pocket as parchment for palimpsest is again highlighted in these issues.

In two of the S/G’s diagrams used, it became clear that the capture on computer of data may be expedient and allow for quick access and easy representation, but what is lost or excluded is precisely the loose ends and richness of the original drawings. The originals may have and show their biases, but they contain representations made by the cartographer who actually saw what was on the ground, and the self-contradiction and quirks present on these are irreplaceable in providing clues to broader bands of information.

Edney (1997: 25) notes that “Moreover, like all instruments of state power, the surveys were exercises in negotiation, mediation, and contestation between the surveyors and their native contacts, so that the knowledge which they generated was a representation more of the power
relations between the conquerors and the conquered than of some topographical reality. The contestations which are hidden by the recording of a ‘solution’ are illustrated in this study and illuminate the gaps that reflect the process of negotiation referred to above. The ability of maps to record boundaries and inscribe the meanings of these boundaries is another recurring theme.

**BOUNDARIES AND THE QUESTION OF INTEGRATION**

One of the most frequent experiences throughout this project was of discovering that the possible explanation for something that was being explored was that ‘things were like this because they lay against a boundary’. Sans Souci was in Rondebosch: Feldhausen in ‘Wineberg’. The density of living was developed along a boundary between one estate and another. The cultural, social, race and class boundaries between people meant that there was financial gain to be made by selling land to those individuals who had previously not had access to land, and meant that they were still described as outsiders to their own community in the 20th century. The boundaries and the existence of ‘the pocket’ generally, and the Bishoplea pocket specifically, are reciprocally reinforcing. The commonality of the experience of boundedness belies the consistency, though. The boundaries of the location of slaves while they were still slaves is absent, even from the elite estates. Whose stories are told and recorded and the lack of those stories belonging to people/property not integrated into the acceptable ‘whole’ is thematic yet elusive.

The boundaries and their locations and meanings are complex and have shifted over time with different hegemonic influences. The inscriptions of boundary have at times represented a series of very confusing contradictions and mis-meetings of formal sets of information. I believe that drawing conclusions as to which set of information is the overriding truth in a study as exploratory as this is misplaced at best, and serves to cover up complexities which may, when looked at differently, provide other information and possible meanings and interpretations about what was actually going on.

One of the difficulties of this study was that attempting to ‘read’ inscriptions is tantamount to interpreting subtlety in binaries. What is inscribed and accepted as the definitive ‘marker’ of location and ownership reflects the binaries of those concepts and the very influences and subtleties being sought are lost. For instance the evidence that we have is that Sans Souci was not divided, with land being transferred to ex slaves until 1844. We can read from that many possible meanings. We have on the other hand a written recording of oral evidence that land was being ‘let’ to slaves during the course of apprenticeship (1835) in exchange for labour and without wages. This land was divided and given to those who occupied it after Ross’s death. We have

100 Sans Souci High School has photographs of the ‘slave lodge’ on the estate, but Ross, at least did not keep slaves in a lodge, they occupied “thatched cottages”. Feldhausen’s slave lodge disappears from record after Fichart’s advertisement.
101 The conflations and separations of issues post colonial are thoroughly interrogated in Peter Hallward’s ‘absolutely post colonial’ (2001).
102 I use the term transferred because for the purpose of this question it makes no difference whether the land was given, bought, traded, or acquired by any other means. It is not the means of acquisition but the act of acquisition that is of concern.
103 Natlib MSB 569,1 (4), p2.
one set of meanings that can be drawn from the record and another that can be drawn from oral history. This is a reflection of the situation that what actually happened with the land while in the possession of one owner (Hamilton Ross) was not reflected to the outside world until that owner changed, i.e. after his death some 15 years later. In other words the very certainty which is sought by reading inscription is reflected in its shadow - is confounded by the “evidenced method” to pin it down.

One final boundary concern is that post emancipation the issue of ‘service’ and the accommodation of those ‘in service’ would have been required to keep up lifestyle standards. The complex issue of ‘close but not too close’ and its location in the socio-political and socio-spatial climate of the late 19th century deserves attention, but has not been the focus of this study. As a beginning illustration is the location of centre to margins in the manner in which Ross and Herschel granted land to free blacks on the ‘other border’ of their land. Herschel gave away his bottom land whilst he lived near the top and Ross gave away the top land whilst he occupied the land near the bottom.

Commentators of women’s positions in social history have recorded the high standards and high expectations of women in Victorian Cape Town and have explained in their defence that servants were entirely necessary to keeping house at the Cape in light of the amount of work required.
CHAPTER 8 CONCLUSIONS AND UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Architecture focuses on spatial arrangements and their built form and includes both designed and vernacular forms. This study has explored the spatial history of one pocket of mixed race living (now obliterated) in upper Claremont, Cape Town. The method of this case study was to explore the transformations of this pocket of land from rural estate to pocket-in-suburb using documentary evidence, in the form of surveyors' diagrams and maps, of land distribution and ownership. The methodology has focussed on exploring the interpretations of meaning and the hidden distributions of power in the processes that were followed (the method). This section of the paper outlines the conclusions that may be drawn from the study, as well as outlining the areas where further study is required to ensure coherent understandings of the influences and how they coalesced to create the spatial arrangement and form observed. Conclusions are drawn first directly - from this study and in direct relation to its intents and process directly. Second, the implications for conservation and heritage planning are outlined and third, the conclusions relating to methodology and the representation of complexity is discussed.

DIRECT CONCLUSIONS

The strengths and limitations of this study are directly interdependent. A research decision based on the need for the establishment of an empirical base regarding land ownership and subdivision was made to exclude explorations of lived experience. The study has presented social aspects where they have been essential to the understandings of property and spatial arrangements. The strength of the decision is clarity of focus; the limitation is that the study could be seen as biased. It can be concluded that this study is only one part of the beginning of what needs to be a much broader study aimed at the development of a full socio-spatial history and its temporal parallels.

What can be concluded in direct relation to this pocket of land is:

- This land was divided and developed over a similar period of time to the other large tracts of land around it.
- The estates concerned with the pocket last changed hands as single entities in the 1830's.
- The parallel timing of slave emancipation and the social and societal aspects of the lives of the freed slaves is significant. The complexities of layers of meaning and their implications for determining the significance have not been primarily studied and are unknown. Studies of marginalisation and of the means of inclusion and exclusion inform this.
- A significant portion of this particular pocket of land was transferred directly to free blacks at its first subdivision.
- Enough of the owners lived on their own land that it can be said that the absentee landlord was not the economic principle of land occupation at work in this area at that time.
Formal markers of inscription tended to lag behind the procedures on the ground in the places where the histories of the dispossessed or illiterate are being explored.

A full socio-spatial history of this pocket is required. Research work on the Protea estate pockets has been undertaken and recently reached the point of public dissemination. This work may serve both as a possible guide and comparison in further work on the socio-spatial history of the Claremont pocket. A further question which requires exploration is what the legal status of slaves was in relation to land ownership as opposed to ownership of any other sort of property.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR CONSERVATION AND PLANNING**

In can be concluded even from the limited nature of this study, that the Bishoplea pocket has previously escaped the gaze of conservation practitioners, and that the original history of the area (in addition to its racial identity at the time of Group Areas removals) renders the area worthy of serious and urgent heritage consideration. It is the conclusion of this study that it is precisely the vernacular form of the buildings in this area that leaves them vulnerable to demolition and 'development'.

On the evidence of this study it is not possible to reconstruct the architectural fabric of the Bishoplea pocket in the 19th century. It is possible only to begin to construe the erasures and reconstructions of the palimpsest of architectural fabric. A few areas of further study are required for the beginning of reconstructing the architectural fabric and spatial arrangement in the 19th century to become viable. First, the social history of this land should be explored and disseminated as a counter to the silencing of exclusion and dispossession. That this was land developed early in suburban development by black landowners is significant. An assessment of the existing architectural fabric should be made, both of individual buildings and of the pocket as a single artefact of architectural fabric. The existing architectural forms date to the late 19th century at the earliest. The continuing cycle of erasure and overwriting should be informed and guided by further study of the socio-spatial history of the land.

**METHOD AND METHODOLOGICAL CONCLUSIONS**

This study cannot 'tie up the loose ends' coherently or ethically without sanitising some of the complexity rendered explicit in the study. This would be tantamount to re-coding back to two dimensions that which occupies three full dimensions. What this study has unexpectedly uncovered is the location of some of the difficulties between the disciplines and their methodology. This requires for its resolution a far larger study incorporating the academic disciplines concerned. The development of a trans-disciplinary method (Malan, 2004b) which is recognised as having validity is needed for work of this nature.
The links between land, land ownership, power and status are very tightly woven. In order to establish a reliable socio-spatial history of the development of suburbs and their sub-areas, it is imperative that methods and methodology capable of traversing disciplinary boundaries be utilised.

This study has exposed contradiction and complexity within the system of record keeping and surveying undertaken by the British at the Cape in the 19th century. The reflection of some of the complexities faced in the area of governance at that time, and therefore rendered open to interpretation and critique, is appropriate to interpretative strategies of inquiry, but requires accepted principles of interpretation and critique across disciplines.

What is required is a different way of beginning to undo the closeness of the weave of power and status using methods and understandings from across disciplines. The need to be able to apply method across various 'case study' situations where the circumstances refer to the particularity of that individual situation is necessary. The difficulties which require resolution are in part the very definitions of the boundaries of disciplines. In the words of Malan

"I suspect the explanation lies in our expectations and the questions we are asking: we expect ... but cannot find them. So we need to re-phrase the question: what sort of ... and how might we 'see' it? (Malan, 2004b:7)."

It must be said in conclusion that using two dimensional means to attempt to assess the lived processes of the development of a suburb is not possible if viewed in isolation from studies capable of providing depth. The physical, economic, political, social, religious, and cultural aspects that coalesce to create a living environment requires a research approach able to explore all of these aspects and their relations to one another in order to recreate the understanding.

There is a pressing need to find the overarching questions and the proper fit between method and methodology across disciplines to begin to transcend the quagmire of multidisciplinary inquiry. The need to find coherent answers, inclusive of complexity, and to traverse disciplines in the best interests of the development of understandings that can inform architectural, planning and heritage practice is clear. Spatial practices have and will always differ with class, race, gender and culture, and to honour those differences with informed practice is imperative.
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A number of institutions were consulted and their collections utilised in the research for this study. The following is a list of these, adapted from the work of Murray (2001):

The Cape Archives Depot in Roeland Street:

The Cape Archives house primary material, such as documentation, maps, historic plans and photographs.

Map Collection: (CA/M)

Photographic Collections - Elliott and Jeffries Collections

Receiver of Land Revenue,

The Historical Archaeology Research Unit at UCT

HARG has an informal collection of papers, maps and other miscellaneous source material.

HARG Library – contains Monographs and papers relating to Cape history and heritage

Papers and publications of the Vernacular Architecture Society
HARG Publication Series

The National Library of South Africa (formerly the South African Library)
This is a legal deposit reference library – all books with an ISBN number, ie. Any book published in SA will be lodged there. The library also houses a sizeable collection of images – maps, drawings and photographs – and a newspaper clipper collection.
Map collections
Photo collections
Street Directory Collections - these only list suburbs from the late 19th century, and then list the occupants by name not by street address.

The Deeds Office and the Office of the Surveyor General in Plein Street
Contains all the records of formal land tenure, ie, Title Deeds and survey diagrams. In early transfers the slaves that were exchanged as part of the property transaction are included.
Individual Transfers are followed in the transfer Volumes

The Maps and Survey Department of the Office of the Surveyor General in Mowbray
There are aerial photographs of the Cape Town Metropolitan area from the time that these were first taken – 1926
Topographical maps
Contains a historic survey collection – this is a miscellaneous collection of maps and surveys, primarily form the twentieth century, with some earlier material.
Library of the Surveys Department – this houses both books and papers of a technical nature and of conceptual analyses of those issues affecting surveying and its methods of recording.

The University of Cape Town Libraries at UCT Campuses
Various types of material are housed in different sections of the Library, and the only material referred to here is that material not kept on the open shelves.
The Built Environment Library – Rare Books Collection includes many (but not all) of the out-of-print copies of monographs pertaining to Cape Architectural History.
Department of Manuscripts and Archives – this houses architectural collections.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Diagram or ref#</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Erf # if available</th>
<th>Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1817</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>Land between Feldhausen and Stellenberg, registered here as Quitrent land and in C/A DOC 5/4/1 as Freehold land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>54075</td>
<td>Wilhelmina Patten's land, now on Ingle Road. Described as being at Rondebosch, subdivision next to Quiet Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>55439</td>
<td>Ago of the Cape's land, Sans Souci subdivision on boundary with Feldhausen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1844</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>David's land, subdivision of Sans Souci, now on Quiet Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td>Wilhelm Patten's land, now on Ingle Road. Described as being at Rondebosch, subdivision next to Fakir's lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major plan, fits with plan 3163, is representative of Sheet 2 of the 1816 plan 2276.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>55968</td>
<td>Portion of Feldhausen above Newlands Rd, detail is in plan 3163.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>55768</td>
<td>6 morgen, lots 108 - 119 of divided Estate Feldhausen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>The Cottage Lot of divided Estate Feldhausen, next to House Lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td>Lot 2A and 2B is the modern remainder of erf 55332, divided Estate Fakir Damonse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>55001</td>
<td>Subdivision of Estate Feldhausen, lots 97 - 100 of Watson's 1870 land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/A</td>
<td>DOC 5/4/1</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveyors Diagrams of the subdivision of the Vineyard Estate into 78 lots sold by Public auction on 29th October 1888, in the file of unmarked S/G's diagrams in the Archive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>55786</td>
<td>3 sides undefined road, 3 plots division by quarters of the middle one, further subdivision of Estate Feldhausen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55376</td>
<td>Cancelled - became erf 55413.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55382</td>
<td>Subdivision on boundary of Estate Feldhausen, corner of what is now Bishoplea and Frederick, in opposite direction to original subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2911</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55377</td>
<td>Existing house, transferred. Remainder of erf 55413.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td>Now Mark &amp; Protea Rd, subdivision of Lot 2, existing buildings on Lot 2 and Lot 1 (corner to Protea).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2890</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>Deanie's land on Mark Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2891</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55339</td>
<td>Mark Road, subdivision of Lot 5 of Ago's land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2892</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td>Now corner of Mark Road and Bishoplea, subdivision, existing semi-detached houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55350</td>
<td>J.F. Dreyer's land. Subdivision into 3 lots, corners of Frederick, Mark and Protea Roads. Existing semi-detached house on two of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>6269</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>55353</td>
<td>Mark Road, subdivision of Ago's land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>55787</td>
<td>Subdivision of Lot between Selbourne and Feldhausen Roads, existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2833</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>55385</td>
<td>Subdivision of existing erf, creating new erf 55344, existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2675</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>Subdivision of land on Feldhausen Ave, existing house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>1060</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>55906</td>
<td>Feldhausen House Lot with existing houses on Grove Avenue, Grove Estate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>2117</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>55386</td>
<td>Feldhausen Avenue, lots transferred to Caruthers in 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>A1364</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>54980</td>
<td>Subdivision into 10 lots on Carbrooke Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>A1381</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>54979</td>
<td>Subdivision into 4 lots on Carbrooke Avenue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>A4896</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>55334</td>
<td>Subdivision on Mark Road, existing semi-detached house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>A4897</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>55337</td>
<td>Subdivision on Mark Road, existing semi-detached house, new erf 58071.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>PLAN OR MAP #</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>DETAIL OF PLAN OR MAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M3/9</td>
<td>1657</td>
<td>Potter</td>
<td>lands given in newlands district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M3/19</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>H Smart</td>
<td>settlements around the peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M3/41</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Thibault</td>
<td>properties RHS of main road from cape to Simonstown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2276 sheet 1</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>erf 54332</td>
<td>Grove Estate for subdivision (Feldhausen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2276 sheet 2</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grove Estate for subdivision (Feldhausen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D1991/2134</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Morshead/Caplen, Surveyor General's Dept</td>
<td>Traverse of the Roads Mowbray to Wynberg showing principle residences and occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Municipal Compilation Sketch Plan Combined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3259</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td></td>
<td>Subdivision of a block of Sans Souci</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M3/195</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td>proposed sewage plan late 1800's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Henshilwood, 1972</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Henshilwood</td>
<td>Imagined map from memory of the area during her childhood. Source in Bibliography.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TP. 15m</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
<td>Plan of Herschel Township, Subdivision in 1870 of Feldhausen House lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>m3213</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
<td>Kenilworth, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Sheet L15</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>land use based on SG's map of 1936. Southern Suburbs, Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>M3/113</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
<td>CT &amp; surrounding suburbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sheet M15</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>land use based on SG's map of 1936. Southern Suburbs, Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sheet m16</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>SG/G</td>
<td>land use based on SG's map of 1936. Southern Suburbs, Claremont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>BHXS 3414</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>noting sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>BHXS 3423</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>noting sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>BHXS 3451</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>SG</td>
<td>noting sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>m251</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>surveyor</td>
<td>part of research area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>3163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>S/G</td>
<td>4646</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Estate Feldhausen
lots 108-119 of divided Feldhausen Estate became 55768

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Erf</th>
<th>from</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>TD ref</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Notes in ERF Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>55768</td>
<td>large tract of land unidentifiable by current streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>from 4273/S4332 81/1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55768</td>
<td>above</td>
<td>22-2-1870</td>
<td>254 6m 104sr 72sf</td>
<td>Estate late R.J. Jones</td>
<td>Henry Mathew Ardene</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>55768</td>
<td>19-9-1896</td>
<td>6m 104sr 72sf</td>
<td>D.J. Rossouw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>26-10-1896</td>
<td>7031 1m 7sr 20sf</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td>Diedrick Christopher Ferrandi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>1-2-1897</td>
<td>608 see note</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>James Dance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frank H. Larne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Fisher/ Fester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Catta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>24-11-1896</td>
<td>7962 438sr 35sf</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Lenmann Thomas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>24-8-1897</td>
<td>7143 227sr 112sf</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harry Hands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>20-2-1897</td>
<td>1191 471sr 100sf</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Beniet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>10-3-1897</td>
<td>535sr</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Johan Frederick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>55768 55768</td>
<td>8-4-1897</td>
<td>2832 141sr 40sf</td>
<td>H. Donnan</td>
<td></td>
<td>George Arthur Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder became roads somewhere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>17 Feldhausen Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>55386</td>
<td>first registration, formerly lot B &amp; H of lots 102, 103, 104, 105, 106 &amp; 107 of Grove Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2117/1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>55386:55393</td>
<td>22-10-1919</td>
<td>11873 72sr 110sf J F Dreyer</td>
<td>Clifford John Newbury Kettley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>15 Feldhausen Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>55393 formerly lots A, H of lots 102 to 107, Grove Estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2675/1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Notes in ERF Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>19-08-1920</td>
<td>11815 184sr19sr</td>
<td>J.F Dreyer</td>
<td>Percival Rowley Templier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gap from previous MOCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>55387</td>
<td>13-01-1926</td>
<td>192 184sr19sr</td>
<td>A.L. Charles</td>
<td>Amy Gladys Brydone, bn Delbridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55786 was 20 Feldhausen Ave, now 4 townhouses with separate access on Feldhausen Ave and Selbourne Road

23. 55786 20 Feldhausen Ave Avenue, traverses both streets

24. 55786 55768 24-8-1897 7143 277sr112sf  H. Donnan  Harry Hands

25. 55786 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 3sf  Harry Hands  Peter Paton

26. 55786 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 140sf  Harry Hands  Walter Pyric Stevens

27. 55786 same 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 113sf  Harry Hands  J L F Jeffers, bn Jonker on 30-3-1896

28. 55786 01-11-1944 15313 92sr 113sf  J L F Jeffers, bn Jonker  Kenneth Christopher Lomburg, bn 1901

55786 was 20 Feldhausen Ave, now 4 townhouses with separate access on Feldhausen Ave and Selbourne Road

23. 55786 20 Feldhausen Ave Avenue, traverses both streets

24. 55786 55768 24-8-1897 7143 277sr112sf  H. Donnan  Harry Hands

25. 55786 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 3sf  Harry Hands  Peter Paton

26. 55786 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 140sf  Harry Hands  Walter Pyric Stevens

27. 55786 same 17-02-1902 7193 92sr 113sf  Harry Hands  J L F Jeffers, bn Jonker on 30-3-1896

28. 55786 01-11-1944 15313 92sr 113sf  J L F Jeffers, bn Jonker  Kenneth Christopher Lomburg, bn 1901

29. 55787 22 Feldhausen Avenue, traverses both streets

30. 55787 55786 3-3-1903 2588 92sr 140sf  Harry Hands  Walter Pyric Stevens

31. 55787 17-8-1932 5087 92sr 140sf  MJ Moldenhauer, bn Burgskes  John Heath Edwards

32. 58315 Selbourne Road, house next to house on cnr of Bishoplea, address is in Feldhausen Ave although it is subdivided from this property

33. 58315 55786 02-02-1982 3919 759m2 1947  H M Collard, bn 18-4-  John Johan Rauch, bn 24-1-1936

34. 58315 31-03-1982 ???? ????  John Johan Rauch  Jennifer Ann Gibello, bn 12.1.1943

35. 58316 3 Properties on Bishoplea Road between Selbourne Avenue in the West and Feldhausen Avenue in the East

36. 58316 55788 02-06-1982 19561 1230m2 1947  H M Collard, bn 18-4-  Dion Tromp, bn 16-6-1926

37. 55788 now just a corner belonging to council on cnr Bishoplea & Selbourne, was the Henshilwood property - Overslade

38. 55788 55769 8-4-1897 27832 141sr 40sf  H. Donnan  George Arthur Wright

39. 55788 18-09-1901 141sr 40sf  G.A.Wright  Thomas Henshilwood

40. 55788 25-11-1950 18398 141sr 40sf  Estate late T. Bertha Kerr Knight, bn Henshilwood on 12-10-1893

41. 58315 as at number 32, repeated here as a subdivision of above
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Erf</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Notes in ERF Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>58315</td>
<td>02-02-1982</td>
<td>3919.759m²</td>
<td>H M Collard, bn 18-4-1947</td>
<td>John Johan Rauch, bn 24-1-1936</td>
<td>subdivision, became 58315</td>
<td>white group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>58315</td>
<td>31-03-1982</td>
<td>??? ?? ??</td>
<td>John Johan Rauch</td>
<td>Jennifer Ann Gibello, bn 12.1 1943</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCP to E.B.L. Gibello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>30-06-1970</td>
<td>467.2M 433sr 113sf</td>
<td>Estate late R J Jones</td>
<td>Thomas Edwin Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formerly 'The Cottage Lot' of divided Estate Feldhausen 316/1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>23-01-1929</td>
<td>487.2M 433sr 113sf</td>
<td>Estate late T E. Jones</td>
<td>Frank Melville White</td>
<td></td>
<td>Remainder of Herschel Township (being roads) still held under this deed 316/1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>27-12-1932</td>
<td>372 1912sf</td>
<td>F M White</td>
<td>The Council of the City of Cape Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>Road Lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>13-12-1933</td>
<td>8370 5135sf</td>
<td>F M White</td>
<td>Elizabeth Garth Poole, bn Macalister</td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCP, Lot 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>13-12-1933</td>
<td>8371 9133sf</td>
<td>F M. White</td>
<td>Joseph Gardener Barrow</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>13-12-1933</td>
<td>8372 10075sf</td>
<td>F. M. White</td>
<td>Pierre Francois Theron</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>14-09-1934</td>
<td>8099.5357sf</td>
<td>F M. White</td>
<td>Henry Hodgkiss</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>55907</td>
<td>14-09-1934</td>
<td>The extent of 2 morgen 1399sf has been laid out as a township called &quot;Herschel Township&quot; Vide Township file 78/398 see trf 487/1929 with Diagram No A1722/1929. Annexed leaving the remaining extent of 26538sqf which has now been transferred Vide trf No 8222/1946 (NOW NUMBERED ERVEN 55931 TO 55948 CAPE TOWN AT CLAREMONT IN HERACHEL TOWNSHIP)</td>
<td>F. M. White, bn 8-12-1922</td>
<td>Max Gorfinkel, bn 9-12-1899</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estate Sans Souci**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Erf</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Notes in ERF Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>03-07-1835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Menzies</td>
<td>Hon H. Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TO ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>20/3/1846</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>203 5sr</td>
<td>Hon. H. Ross</td>
<td>Wilhelmina Patten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>26-08-1844</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2M 106sr</td>
<td>H. Ross</td>
<td>Ajo of the Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>55314</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>4-11-1847</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48inch</td>
<td>The Hon. Hamilton Ross</td>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>54344</td>
<td>26-08-1844</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2M 106sr</td>
<td>H. Ross</td>
<td>Ajo of the Cape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>03-07-1902</td>
<td>6533</td>
<td>30sr 85sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Mohammed Abduragheim</td>
<td>became 55341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>03-07-1902</td>
<td>6534</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Ebrahim Enderoos Behardien</td>
<td>became 55376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-07-1902</td>
<td>6679</td>
<td>83sr 83sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>William Lewis Edwards</td>
<td>became 55377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>25-08-1902</td>
<td>8820</td>
<td>28sr 59sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Harry Church</td>
<td>became 55364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>01-09-1902</td>
<td>9079</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Abdol Giadien</td>
<td>became 55355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>16-09-1902</td>
<td>9748</td>
<td>28sr 59sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Mogamat Harries</td>
<td>became 55363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>16-09-1902</td>
<td>9749</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Mogamat Harries</td>
<td>became 55353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>16-09-1902</td>
<td>9750</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Mogamat Harries</td>
<td>became 55380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>25-09-1902</td>
<td>10144</td>
<td>65sr 34sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Hesham Neaatollah Effendi</td>
<td>became 55340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>13-10-1902</td>
<td>10831</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Abas Adams</td>
<td>became 55357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>20-10-1902</td>
<td>11081</td>
<td>57sr 32sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo. otherwise Ajo, Ajouhar</td>
<td>Hendrick Deenik</td>
<td>became 55336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>20-10-1902</td>
<td>11079</td>
<td>86sf</td>
<td>114sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Martin Ella Smith and Hector Mackenzie Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>20-10-1902</td>
<td>11080</td>
<td>27sr</td>
<td>112sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Albert Edward Leggo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>29-10-1902</td>
<td>11465</td>
<td>28sr</td>
<td>59sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Isaac William Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11790</td>
<td>27sr</td>
<td>112sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>The South African Mohammedan Building Company Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11787</td>
<td>82sr</td>
<td>50sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11788</td>
<td>69sr</td>
<td>55sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11789</td>
<td>73sr</td>
<td>94sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>13-02-1903</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>33sr</td>
<td>62sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>The South African Mohammedan Building Company Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>16-03-1903</td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>84sr</td>
<td>87sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Isaac Benjamin Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-04-1903</td>
<td>4727</td>
<td>28sr</td>
<td>59sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Walter Charles Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-04-1903</td>
<td>4726</td>
<td>30sr</td>
<td>103sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Thomas Kemm Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>10-02-1915</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>58sr</td>
<td>120sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Ali Ajouhaar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55314 is now only Quiet Street.

89 55314 54344 04-11-1847 343sf 131sf 343sf 131sf 291/1847

90 55314 18/5/1853 254 48inch 343sf 131sf

91 55314 18/5/1853 255 whole

92 55314 14-6-1877 277 65sr 16.2sf Estate late T Bradshaw Charles Bradshaw

93 55314 21-6-1877 392 65sr 16.2sf Estate late T Bradshaw Magmoet Abdol

94 55314 26/5/1877 491 65sr 16.2sf Estate late T Bradshaw Thomas Watson

95 55314 19-10-1877 357 65sr 16.2sf 4sr 44sf Estate late T Bradshaw William Boone remainder left for roads Quiet St

96 55314 25/10-1877 535 65sr 16.2sf

subdivision, became 55321 lot 3

subdivision became 55332 lot 2

became 55322, cnr Quiet & Bishoplea lot 4

subdivision, became 55315 lot 1 remainder
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Erf</th>
<th>from</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>TD ref</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>In favour of</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
<th>Notes in ERF Register</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td>now Ingle Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. H. Ross</td>
<td>Wilhelmina Patten</td>
<td></td>
<td>137/1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td>55444</td>
<td>20-03-1848</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>203.5sr</td>
<td>50sr 82sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-03-1856</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>365inc</td>
<td>W Patten</td>
<td>Thomas Bradshaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td></td>
<td>18/3/1896</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>54sr 93sf</td>
<td>C Ingle</td>
<td>Isaac Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-07-1906</td>
<td>6435</td>
<td>11sr 52sf</td>
<td>C Ingle</td>
<td>Claremont Municipality,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td></td>
<td>15-06-1920</td>
<td>8312</td>
<td>50sr 35sf</td>
<td>H.M. Grodzinski</td>
<td>Blanche Caroline McGaw, bn Eyles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>55306</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-08-1925</td>
<td>7634</td>
<td>19sr 68sf</td>
<td>H.M. Grodzinski</td>
<td>Isaac Solomon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>55320</td>
<td></td>
<td>now a portion of Quiet St</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>55320</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td>16-02-1891</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>31sr 56sf</td>
<td>Estate late M Abdol</td>
<td>Akiba Abdol, widow</td>
<td>subdivision, became 55320</td>
<td>also styled Akeeba, lot 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>55352</td>
<td>Half way down Quiet Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate late T Bradshaw</td>
<td>Magmoet Abdol</td>
<td>subdivision, became 55320</td>
<td>declared white in 1961 509/1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td>55314</td>
<td>21-06-1877</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>65sr 116.2sf</td>
<td>Estate late M Abdol</td>
<td>Akiba Abdol, widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td></td>
<td>16-02-1891</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>31sr 56sf</td>
<td>Estate late M Abdol</td>
<td>Akiba Abdol, widow</td>
<td>subdivision, became 55320</td>
<td>also styled Akeeba, lot 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-12-1923</td>
<td>17263</td>
<td>17sr 132sf</td>
<td>Estate late E.G. Skues</td>
<td>Alfred Rance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>55332</td>
<td></td>
<td>31-10-1933</td>
<td>7018</td>
<td>15sr 116.2sf</td>
<td>Estate late E.G. Skues</td>
<td>Alfred Rance</td>
<td></td>
<td>remainder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>55343</td>
<td>property on cnr Mark &amp; Protea Rds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo,</td>
<td></td>
<td>subdivision of 55349</td>
<td>lots 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td>85349</td>
<td>10-02-1915</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>58sr 120sf</td>
<td>otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Ali Ajouhar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12788</td>
<td>1480sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhar</td>
<td>Jabada Ajouhar (spinster)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td></td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12789</td>
<td>1482sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhar</td>
<td>Saphia Ajouhar (spinster)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td></td>
<td>rem</td>
<td>04-06-1947</td>
<td>9844</td>
<td>Estate late S Ajouhar</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/8ths to each - first three on list married by Mohammedan law,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Notes in ERF Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td>04-06-1947</td>
<td>9845 5530sf</td>
<td>J Ajouhaar and 5 others</td>
<td>Achmat Sulliman Jaffer, bn 25/1/1923</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hereafter to microfilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>55334</td>
<td>Mark Road, one house away from the cnr of Mark and Protea Rds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>55334</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12788 1480sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Jabada Ajouhaar (spinster)</td>
<td>subdivision</td>
<td>lot2b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>55334</td>
<td>17-11-1958</td>
<td>16856 1480sf</td>
<td>Estate late Jabada Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Omar Ajouhaar, bn 9/5/1921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>coloured group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>55335</td>
<td>Mark Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>55335</td>
<td>55333</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12789 1462sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Saphia Ajouhaar (spinster)</td>
<td>subdivision</td>
<td>Lot 2a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>55335</td>
<td>24-11-1967</td>
<td>27197 1462sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Cornelis Anthony Scheltema, bn 16/3/1931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>Mark Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>20-10-1902</td>
<td>11081 57sr 32sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Hendrick Deenik</td>
<td>subdivision</td>
<td>2890/1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>17-10-1919</td>
<td>11627 57sr 32sf</td>
<td>Colonial Orphan</td>
<td>Chambers &amp; Trust Co</td>
<td>Ali Ajouhaar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>22-06-1929</td>
<td>6031 57sr 32sf</td>
<td>Estate late A. Ajouhaar &amp; another</td>
<td>Sanea Ajouhaar bn Saban, widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12786 3917sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Achmat Ajouhaar</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td>55337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12787 4221sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Gazant Ajouhaar</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td>55338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12789 102sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Saphia Ajouhaar, spinster</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>declared white in 1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>55337</td>
<td>Mark Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>55337</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12786 3917sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Achmat Ajouhaar</td>
<td>lot 3A of lot 3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>4897/1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>55337</td>
<td>13-08-1943</td>
<td>9827 3917sf</td>
<td>A. Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Trustees: The Moslem Dassweli Educational and Water welfare Society of Cape Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>declared white in 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Notes in ERF Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>55338</td>
<td>55336</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12787</td>
<td>4221sf</td>
<td>S Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Gazart Ajouhaar</td>
<td>subdivision, portion of 55336</td>
<td>A1767/1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>55338</td>
<td></td>
<td>29-05-1944</td>
<td>7158</td>
<td>4221sf</td>
<td>E Collins, bn 29-12-1896</td>
<td>Argrios Kostens, bn 6-1-1900</td>
<td>gap from previous owner</td>
<td>declared white in 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>55339</td>
<td>Mark Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>55339</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-04-1903</td>
<td>4726</td>
<td>30sr 103sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Thomas Kemm Taylor</td>
<td>portion of 55349</td>
<td>lot 5 2891/1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>55339</td>
<td></td>
<td>22-02-1929</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>30sr 103sf</td>
<td>H S. Gibson</td>
<td>Mahomed Hassan</td>
<td>gap from previous owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td>Mark Road, close to Bishoplea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>25-09-1902</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>65sr 34sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, alias Ajo</td>
<td>Hesham Neaatollah Effendi</td>
<td>lot 6 &amp; 8 of previous erf 55349</td>
<td>2894/1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td></td>
<td>28-05-1929</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>2922sf</td>
<td>S.M. Kasber &amp; S. Aliie</td>
<td>Omar Salehi</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td>55342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td></td>
<td>06-06-1936</td>
<td>4482</td>
<td>1848sf</td>
<td>Insolvent estates S.M. Kasber &amp; another</td>
<td>Suiliman Adroes Jaffer</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td>55343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td></td>
<td>09-09-1938</td>
<td>9481</td>
<td>4626sf</td>
<td>A Hollagee</td>
<td>Torval Helmg Thorsen, bn 17-11-1902</td>
<td>remainder, 4626sf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>55341</td>
<td>Bishoplea Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>55341</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>03-07-1902</td>
<td>6533</td>
<td>30sr 85sf</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Mohammed Abduragheim</td>
<td>portion, lot 7 of Ajo's land</td>
<td>2872/1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>55341</td>
<td></td>
<td>07-03-1928</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>30sr 85sf</td>
<td>Estate late M Hidding</td>
<td>Joseph Louis Zadik &amp; Louis Goedburg</td>
<td>bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>55341</td>
<td></td>
<td>03-12-1928</td>
<td>12412</td>
<td>30sr 85sf</td>
<td>L Goedburg</td>
<td>Joseph Louis Zadik</td>
<td>bond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>55342</td>
<td>Bishoplea Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>55342</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td>28-05-1929</td>
<td>5225</td>
<td>2922sf</td>
<td>S.M. Kasber &amp; S. Aliie</td>
<td>Omar Salehi</td>
<td>condit;</td>
<td>A1176/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>55342</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-12-1970</td>
<td>35235</td>
<td>290m2</td>
<td>O. Saleh</td>
<td>Julie Ann Scholtz, bn Rhodes on 24-5-1942</td>
<td>divorcee, white group</td>
<td>29??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>55343</td>
<td>Mark Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Notes in ERF Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>55343</td>
<td>55340</td>
<td>06-06-1935</td>
<td></td>
<td>4482 1848sf</td>
<td>Insolvent estates S.M. Kasber &amp; another</td>
<td>Suuliman Adroes Jaffer</td>
<td>portion of 55340</td>
<td>787/1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>55350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo:haar, Colonial Orphan</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
<td>previously lots 24 to 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber and Trust Co</td>
<td></td>
<td>of Ajo's land, Dreyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>55350</td>
<td></td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11787</td>
<td>82sr 50sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>received 3 separate pieces</td>
<td>2905/1902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>55350</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>27sr 48sf</td>
<td>J F Dreyer</td>
<td>William Thomas Sharp</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>55350</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>28sr 26sf</td>
<td>P Reynolds</td>
<td>May Magdalene Harding, bn Kennedy</td>
<td>subdivision, became</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>55351</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCP to James Harding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>55351</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td>P Reynolds</td>
<td>May Magdalene Harding, bn Kennedy</td>
<td>conglomerated piece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>55351</td>
<td></td>
<td>09-08-1938</td>
<td>8167</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td>M M Harding</td>
<td>John Adam Timm</td>
<td>portion of 55350, 55368 &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>55351</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MOCP to James Harding at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>white group 1961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>55352</td>
<td></td>
<td>04-03-1926</td>
<td>1815</td>
<td>27sr 48sf</td>
<td>J F Dreyer</td>
<td>William Thomas Sharp</td>
<td>formerly lot 24a of lots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>55352</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>27sr 48sf</td>
<td>W T Sharp</td>
<td>William Louis Roberts, bn 6/2/1886</td>
<td>portion of 55350</td>
<td>24,25,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>55352</td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td>P Reynolds</td>
<td>May Magdalene Harding, bn Kennedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>02-02-1921</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>56sr 84sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>55353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate Ajouhaar, alias AJO</td>
<td>Mogamat Harries</td>
<td>became 55353</td>
<td>lot 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>55353</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>16-09-1902</td>
<td>9749</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6269/1902</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>55353</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-08-1904</td>
<td>9325</td>
<td>27sr112sf</td>
<td>W A Currey</td>
<td>Albert William Bowers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>55353</td>
<td></td>
<td>18-04-1922</td>
<td>3189</td>
<td>27sr112sf</td>
<td>A W Bowers</td>
<td>Simon Scher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>55354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>The South African Mohammedan Building Company Limited</td>
<td>became 55354</td>
<td>lot 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>55354</td>
<td>55349</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11790</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Erf</td>
<td>from</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>TD ref</td>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>In favour of</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Notes in ERF Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>55354</td>
<td></td>
<td>10-09-1923</td>
<td>7481</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td>E.E. Behardien</td>
<td>Mohamed Hassan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>55354</td>
<td>20-12-1955</td>
<td>21200</td>
<td>27sr 112sf</td>
<td>Estate late M. Hassan</td>
<td>Amina Hassan, spinster, bn 24/8/1924. &amp; Ahmed Hassan, bn 16/6/1932</td>
<td>equal shares</td>
<td>Amina married according to Mohammedan rites to Mohamed Sale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>55379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Road, Free standing house midway down Frederick, next to block of flats. Last row of houses on boundary of Sans Souci Estate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>55379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>previous registration as '329, formerly lot 30 of Sans Souci Estate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>55379 55349</td>
<td>13-02-1903</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>The South African Mohammedan Building</td>
<td>became 55379</td>
<td>lot 30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>55379</td>
<td>22-06-1932</td>
<td>3767</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>N Fakier</td>
<td>Pauline Berchowitz (spinster)</td>
<td>gap from previous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>55380</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Road, Free standing house next to set of semi-detached houses on cnr of Frederick and Bishoplea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>55380</td>
<td>16-09-1902</td>
<td>9750</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>otherwise Ajouhar</td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, The South African Mohammedan Building</td>
<td>became 55380</td>
<td>lot 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>55380</td>
<td>26-10-1945</td>
<td>14809</td>
<td>33sr 62sf</td>
<td>M Barelowitz, bn</td>
<td>Eva Francis Kannemeyer, bn Pren on</td>
<td>17/10/1885</td>
<td>14/9/1881, widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>55381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cnr Frederick and Bishoplea Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>55381 55382</td>
<td>formerly lot 27a of lot 27 &amp; 28, Estate Sans Souci</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estate Late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhaar</td>
<td>became 55381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>55381</td>
<td>27-10-1948</td>
<td>24581</td>
<td>4787sf</td>
<td>H Gurland, bn 20/7/1887 Archibald Pagan, bn 12/5/1898</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
<td>14/5/1881, widow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>55382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Bishoplea Road next to previous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>55382</td>
<td>07-11-1902</td>
<td>11788</td>
<td>69sr 55sf</td>
<td>otherwise Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Estate late Ajo, otherwise Ajouhaar</td>
<td>Johan Frederick Dreyer</td>
<td>gap and subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>55382</td>
<td>27-10-1946</td>
<td>24581</td>
<td>4787sf</td>
<td>H Gurland</td>
<td>Pagan, became 55381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55386 Feldhausen Avenue, backing onto the Sans Souci estate, feldhausen estate
Appendix 3 - Brief Summary of Influential History in the 19th Century

1804 Granting of Religious Freedom by the Dutch was to have profound consequences for the settlement to the present day (da Costa & Davids, 1994)
1806 Second British occupation
Early Economic networks were vastly extended and led to the rise of merchant strata (Bank, 19th century)
1808 Abolition of the oceanic slave trade in British Colonies (Shell, 2001)
1807-17 Value of cape exports multiplied more than ten fold (Bank, 1994)
After Preferential rates for S.A. wine in the UK. S.A. started to benefit from the economic power wielded by the British (Meltzer, 1994)
1813 Ordinance 50 granted freedom to the Khoi, and entrenched religious freedom (da Costa & Davids, 1994)
1828 Herschel arrived at the Cape and settled at Feldhausen to conduct his survey of the Southern Skies (Evans, et.al., 1969)
1834 An Act was passed rescinding all remaining British East India Company privileges
1834 Emancipation of slaves to apprenticeship
1835 Amount of money for slave compensation announced (Meltzer, 1994)
Late Property and building boom (Bank, 1994)
30’s Slave compensations beginning to be paid (Meltzer, 1994)
1836 Govt reported that land policy was to be affected by the sudden increase of available capital (Meltzer, 1994)
1837 Herschel gave a slave land and manumitted him before he left the colony (Erlank, 1993)
1838 Registered businesses in the Cape rise from 6 to 12 (Meltzer, 1994)
1839 Ordinance 3 granted municipal franchise (da Costa & Davids, 1994)
1840’s 100 registered and 300 unregistered canteens in the city, with many labourers being paid their wages at one of the canteens (Worden, et.al. 1998)
1848 Grays (first Bishop of the Anglican church) came to the Cape. First service in this district held by Revd H. Badnall, the Bishops Chaplain in a cottage at the corner of Protea and Main Road, shortly after their arrival in 1848 (Le Measurier)
Mid 19th Religious issues and identity were a focus of attention across the town, with many century slaves having converted to Islam before emancipation (Worden, 1998)
1849 Bishops school founded in Claremont where Grove Primary School is now. Land given by Bishop Gray, a subdivision of the Feldhausen Estate. (Worden, 1998)
1850 Mosque in Claremont is beginning to be built, is finished by 1854 (see below)
1850 Land given for Anglican Church by Mr Rice Jones. First stone laid 14 Nov 1850. (Le Measurier in paper presented commemorating the Anglican church in Claremont. A/S/A BCS 424, p1)

1 Le Measurier in paper presented commemorating the Anglican church in Claremont. A/S/A BCS 424, p1
Appendix 3  Brief Summary of Influential History in the 19th Century

Measurier, see above footnote)

1853 Building consecrated by Gray 18th April 1853. Addition to building in 1865, complete 1866. (Le Measurier)

1853 Granting of representative government to colonists (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1853 Society less segregated than in years to come (Worden, et.al. 1998)

1850’s By mid century Islam was officially recognised as a religion, if not socially accepted by the white middle classes. In 1840 there were 2 mosques in Bokaap, by 1860 there were 5 and 1 in Claremont (Worden, et.al. 1998)

1854 Mosque in Claremont complete & opened (Worden, et.al. 1998; Todeschini & Japha, 1997)

1857 Cape Argus was begun and replaced the Cape Advertiser which was ailing (Worden, et.al. 1998)

1857 More land purchased from Jones for the rectory at Claremont Anglican Church. More land purchased in 1859 and 1861 for burial ground. (A/S/A BCS 424, p4.)

1862 New Somerset Hospital opened (Worden et.al. 1998)

1863 Beginning of severe depression (Worden, et.al. 1998)

1864 Railway line to Wynberg opened (Burman, 1984)

1867 Discovery of diamonds in Kimberley (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1867-8 Epidemic of fever, causing the medical officer to say that there MUST be proper social statistics otherwise there was no way of knowing how many were dying. (Worden, et.al. 1998)

1870’s Mineral discoveries begin to affect the colony

1872 Granting of of responsible government (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1875 By this time 69% of black adult Capetonians could not read or write English, and 9% of whites could not. (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1880’s Economic depression (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1884 Dock workers strike (Bickford-Smith, 1997) (Bi

1886 Discovery of gold on the rand(Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1886 Cemetery riots – closure of Muslim cemeteries (Bickford-Smith, 1989)

1890’s Period of prosperity with the profits from rand gold flowing into the city and attracting immigration (Malan & van Heyningen, 2001)

1900’s CT had already earned a reputation among S.A. cities for the extent of it’s gang activity – some of whom were already hijacking van’s (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1902 Formation of the APO, an elite coloured political movement promoting race pride and ‘respectability’ (Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1906 Economic depression worst since 1880’s. People marched to parliament to demand govt relief for poor(Bickford-Smith, 1997)

1910 Union of South Africa formed
Appendix 4 Maps and Surveyors Diagrams

This Appendix has two sections.

The first contains those figures referred to in the text as having A4 representation in the Appendix. Please note that these maps are actually A0 and their representation even as A4 loses an enormous amount of detail. They have been used in their original size for the project, and should be used in their actual size but their inclusion in a document that size is not possible.

Section 2 contains all raw data in the form of Surveyor General’s Diagrams listed in Appendix 1. Most of these diagrams (but not all) are two pages, as their explanation is contained on a separate page from the drawing. These pages are not numbered sequentially to the document, but are numbered in reference to their representation in the summary (Appendix 1). In other words the number written on pages 1 and 2 of most documents are the same number and represent the number in Appendix 1 of the particular diagram being represented.
Thibault's survey map 1812/1813, full page representation of the piece used in the text.
This diagram represents a piece of Land situated in the Cape District near Winesburg, Containing Twenty Eight, morgen and a half, Extending North and West to the Place Field, Hygien, near the Grove Past, to the place Stellenberg and the Land, of Francis Pastwood. Copied from the General plan made by the late L. M. Schouw, Capt. by me, Lieut. W. H. Young, Swartwarme, near Cape, 5th June, 1884.
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R. J. VAN DER RIET, Sequestor. 17th Nov. 1921.

ALL Persons having Claims or Demands against the Estates, given over as Insolvent of J. C. FRYMAN, J. C. de GOEDE, and LOUIS MOSTERD, are hereby called upon to present their respective Demands, and to prove the same, to the Sequestor's Office, and of the first-mentioned, also to the Landdrost's Office, Graaff-Reinet, for purposes of distraining, and on payment of 80 per cent. thereof.

And those who may stand indebted to the above-mentioned Estates, are directed to discharge their respective Debts within the like specified period, on pain of Prosecution by Law.

The said FRYMAN declared a Graaff-Reinet, to have no Property to answer the Sequestor's Office, and of the first-mentioned, also to the Landdrost's Office, Graaff-Reinet, on payment of 80 per cent. thereof, within the like specified period, on pain of Prosecution by Law.

R. J. VAN DER RIET, Sequestor.

London Hotel.

Wm. Hollett, begs leave to inform his Friends and the Public, that he intends opening the House, which he now occupies in Hout Street, as an Hotel, on Tuesday next, the 20th instant. — From the superabundance of superior old Wines, prime Hydrogen, Blue Stout, Porter, Hams, Cheese, Hoffmann's Confectionery, &c., &c., together with moderate Charges and strict Attention, he hopes to do Justice to those who may honor him with their Favors.

Five or six Gentlemen may have Board and Lodging on reasonable Terms.

A Public Sale will be held, at the Stores of

Wm. Hollett,

In Hout Street.

On Monday Afternoon next, the 19th inst.

When will be sold, positively without Reserve, to the highest Bids:—

In close Accounts, Port, Madeira, Sherry, Cognac, Brandy, by the half Ass, Hydrogen, paus and brown Scotch Ale, in Bottles, Brown Stout and Porter, English Vinaigre, in Bottles, Boswell's Sealed Off, pickled Oysters and Beverages, various Sorts of Pickles, Sardines, Anchovies, and other Fishes, York Hams, Hoffmann's Preserves, Men's Dress and Children's Shoes, scented Soap, blue Clotibe, Kerseys, Duffles, green Baize, blue Jockey and Trowsers, red Baize Shirts, superfine Cotton, various Sorts of Bridal, old-fashioned Dolls and Brides, Curry Combs and Mastic, Spoons, Shoe and Clothes' Brushes, a Case of Coffee Furniture, an excellent Iron Safe, Glass and China Billiards, Silver Spectacles and Thimbles, Razor Blades, Knives, Coffee Mills, Telescopes, Cinnamon Gunpowder, Mushroom Flutes, Lily Powders, Sealing Wax and Wafers, Sperm and Olive Oils, Smith's Awl and Vices, Graters and Hooks and Thimbles, and New and Old Canvass.
Section 2 – The S/G’s Plans.

Refer to Appendix 1 For order and references.
The diagram represents the place Sana Sound, containing 32 Morgen & 210 Square Roods situated in the Cape District at Rondebosch.

Bounded to the N.E. by the place Quistenburg,
S.W. the place Vineyard &
S.W. the Place Veldbusen,

Copied from the General Plan made by
the late L. M. Thibault Eng. Govt. Survey by me

(Sgd.) John Melville,
Govt. Surveyor.

Title
16.6.1817.

O.C.F.6-178

21.2.1861

ERF 54344
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>12/1831</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>570</th>
<th>1832-5-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1824-6-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1827-2-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1827-5-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1827-6-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1824-7-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1827-3-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 8</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1827-3-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 9</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1820-3-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1829-3-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 11</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1834-5-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 12</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1853-5-25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1852-8-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 14</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1856-10-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 15</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1850-3-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 16</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1852-9-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 17</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1851-2-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 18</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1851-2-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 19</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1853-5-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 20</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1852-8-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 21</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1856-10-29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 22</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1850-3-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 23</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1852-9-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 24</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1851-2-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 25</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1851-2-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagram 1**

- **ERF 54260**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55260**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55261**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55262**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55263**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55264**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55265**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55266**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55267**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55268**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.
- **ERF 55269**: Lot P, 0 ft. broad at a.b.

---

**Note:** The table contains historical data and coordinates, possibly related to land measurements or surveying, with dates ranging from 1830 to 1853.
This Diagram represents a piece of land situated in the Cape District near Wineberg, containing twenty-eight Morgen and a half.

Extending North and West to the place Veldhuysen now the Grove.

East - the place Stellenberg and the land of Francis Daubwood Bagree.

Copied from the general plan made by the late L.X. Thibault

by me,

(Sgd.) M. Ruyach,

Surveyor.

C.T. Sheet No. 15

M.1417

Unit: 1 X 1

Scale of 100 Ryneland Rods.

Diagram 2

1 page
The above diagram represents 2 square rods and 106 square feet of land, situate at Rondebosch, being part of the estate lands therein transferred to the Bank of Cape Town on the 3 July 1835.

Bounded North by a further road and partly by the Vredekloof estate, West and South by the estate Heldhausen and East by the

Surveyed by Mr.    

For deductions see opposite page.

BH 109 15414

COPIED.

C

ERF 55349 CAPE TOWN
at Clearmont
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Material A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Material B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Material C</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Material D</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Material E</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Material A is used in the assembly of Product X.
- Material B is used in the assembly of Product Y.
- Material C is used in the assembly of both Product X and Product Y.

Total usage:
- Product X: 150 Kg
- Product Y: 120 Kg
The annexed diagram represents 343 Square Roods
131 Sqr. feet and 48 Inches of Ground, Situate in the Cape Division at Rondebosch being part of the Estate Sans Soucis transferred in favor of the Honble Hamilton Ross on the 3d July 1835
This lot is bounded on the N.W. by the public Road leading to Protea on the S.W by a lot bought by the Malay man Fakir on the S.E. by a narrow slip of land formerly part of Sans Soucis and now in possession of J. Letterstedt Esq and N.E. to the remaining ground of the said Estate Sans Soucis Laid down from Actual Survey
(Sgd) M. Ruysch
S. Surv.

S.G. Dgm No. 291/1847

Erf 55314 CAPE TOWN at Claremont

Copied from diagram relating to SH-7DD/Y421 (1126)
for Surveyor General

Date... F. J. A. D.
The above diagram represents 203½ square rods of land situate in the Cape District at Rondebosch, being part of the Estate Sans Soucis, the Property of the Honble Hamilton Ross.

This lot is bounded North by a newly projected Road
South by a narrow slip of land formerly part of Sans Soucis now in Possession of J. Lettermann, Esq.
West to Davids Lot and
East to the remainder of the Property

Laid down from actual Survey
(Sgd) N. Buysch
S. Sur.

Copied from diagram relating to
D/T 1848-9-242

\[ \text{MH-7DD/Y414 (1123) /Y423 (1126)} \]

Date \[ \text{28-2-1919} \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Records</th>
<th>Diag. No.</th>
<th>Subdivision.</th>
<th>Sqr</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>SqFt</th>
<th>Deed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Erf 55310 (Lot A)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.3.1856-183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 55307 (Lot B)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>18.3.1896-1370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 55313 (Lot C)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>19.7.1906-8435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 55308 (Lots No. 10 &amp; 11)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6.1920-8312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erf 55309 (Lot No. 9)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>11.8.1925-7657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 50018</td>
<td>465/1867, lots 20 to 25</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>1869-37-254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 50067</td>
<td>466/1867, lots 94, 95</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1870-5-189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 50065</td>
<td>467/1867, lots 120, 121, 122</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1870-5-191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55408</td>
<td>488/1869, house lot 4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1870-5-192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55094</td>
<td>490/1869, lot 96</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1870-5-196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55078</td>
<td>495/1871, lots 97, 98, 99, 100</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1870-5-196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55938</td>
<td>483/1870, (bordered yellow) 272</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1870-6-252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55277</td>
<td>511/1871, lots 109 to 119</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1870-6-252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54787</td>
<td>501/1871, lot 129</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1870-6-253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55197</td>
<td>59/1876, lot 88</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1870-11-461</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55158</td>
<td>169/1876, lots 86, 87, 91, 92, 93</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1870-8-136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55115</td>
<td>128/1876, lots 11, 12, 13, 14 to 19</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1870-11-406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55233</td>
<td>129/1876, lots 102 to 107</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1870-11-407</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55077</td>
<td>139/1876, lots 13 to 16 &amp; 60 - 71</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1870-14-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55204</td>
<td>138/1876, lots 27, 28, 29, 72 - 85</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1870-14-273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55056</td>
<td>137/1876, lots 56, 57, 58, 59</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1870-14-272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55039</td>
<td>136/1876, lots 1, 2, 3, 4</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1870-14-271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55023</td>
<td>135/1876, lots 126</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1870-14-271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54670</td>
<td>140/1876, lots 1 to 15</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1870-11-465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54797</td>
<td>158/1876, lots 146, 147</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>1870-12-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54774</td>
<td>151/1876, lot 148</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1870-12-53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54797</td>
<td>160/1876, lots 127, 128</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1870-12-46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55291</td>
<td>158/1876, lots 130, 131</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1870-12-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54733</td>
<td>166/1876, lot 183</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1870-13-107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54535</td>
<td>165/1876, lots 175 to 182</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1870-3-198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55063</td>
<td>164/1876, lots 10, 10, 10, 10</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1870-20-121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 56000</td>
<td>163/1876, lots 140 to 144</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1870-20-236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54777</td>
<td>162/1876, lot 145</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1870-20-103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54179</td>
<td>161/1876, lot 149</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1870-19-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55116</td>
<td>167/1876, lots 132 to 137</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1870-12-399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55131</td>
<td>213/1876, lot 99</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1870-12-269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55178</td>
<td>99/1876, lot 90</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1870-12-267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55281</td>
<td>221/1876, lot 124</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1870-12-268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55198</td>
<td>137/1876, lot 125</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1870-12-194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55107</td>
<td>316/1876, cottage lot 2</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1870-23-467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54331</td>
<td>111/1890, lots 184 A</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>29.5.1905 4938</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54477</td>
<td>A101/1929 C.B.S.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>5.6.1929 5017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54412</td>
<td>81260/35 512/1935 Lot 22 Annex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>12.1936 660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54193</td>
<td>109/1944 lot 20.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1844-08-145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54279</td>
<td>97/1950 lot 21.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1849-05-189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54379</td>
<td>107/1940 lot 22.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1840-01-301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54202</td>
<td>106/1940 lot 23.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1840-01-265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54248</td>
<td>77/1956 lots 26.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>1856-06-269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54120</td>
<td>106/1944 lot 25.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1844-08-311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54123</td>
<td>105/1944 lots 2 &amp; 3.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1844-08-111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 55426</td>
<td>407/1937 lot 1.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1837-04-267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54445</td>
<td>127/1888 lot 5.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1852-3-82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54426</td>
<td>127/1888 lot 6.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1852-3-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERF 54261</td>
<td>156/1866 lot 4.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>1866-02-203</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The annexed diagram A B C D E F along the road to A represents 53 Morgen 272 Square Roods & 48 do. feet of Ground being a portion of the divided Estate Feldhausen now called the Grove situate at Claremont in the Cape Division transferred to the late R.J. Jones Esqre. on the 2nd March 1838 -

Bounded Northwards by Land of Mr. J.M. Maynard

Eastwards by a Road from Wynberg to Newlands and to Main Road to Cape Town.

Southwards by portion of Stellenberg and land of Mr. G. van Breda and

Westwards by land of the said Breda -

Surveyed by
(Sgd.) H. Kuys & J. Geo Muller
13th Dec. 1869 Sworn Govt. Surveyors

Memo: The Roads to Protea marked in the annexed diagram are to remain open to the public as heretofore -

Rectilinear area 471.101 Sq. R. 120 do. ft.

Copied from Diagram relating to D/T 1870-6-252

Scale (60 to the inch)

The whole of this diagram is included in Gen'l Plan P.34 (363)
The numerical data of this diagram are sufficiently consistent.

(Sgd.) L. Marquard.

Ex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES</th>
<th>ANGLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>572.287 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>149.508 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>149.502 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>149.621 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>150.087 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>211.757 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>624.256 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HA</td>
<td>930.000 H</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above diagram A.B.C.D.E.F.G.H. represents 6 Morgen 104 Sq. Roods and 72 do. feet of Ground being Lots Nos. 108 to 119 on the General Plan of the divided Estate Feldhausen now called the Grove situate at Claremont in the Cape Division transferred to the late R.J. Jones Esq. on the 2nd March 1838.

Bounded North and West by a Road from Wynberg to Newlands and to the Main Road to Cape Town, East " a projected Road and South " the House Lot and by Lot No. 120.

Surveyed by

(Sgd.) H. Kuys, & J. Geo. Muller.
Sworn Govt. Surveyors.
December 1869.
The annex-diagram A B C D E F represents 2 Morgen 433 Square Roods and 113 do. feet of Ground being the Cottage Lot on the General Plan of the divided Estate Feldhausen now called the Grove situate at Claremont in the Cape Division transferred to the late R.J. Jones Esq' on the 2nd March 1838.

Bounded North by the House Lot,
East by a projected Road,
South by Lots 144 & 145 and
West by Lots Nos. 124, 125 & 126.

Surveyed by
(Sgd.) H. Kuys
(Sgd.) J.Geo. Muller
Nov 1869
Swm Surveyors

Copied from Diagram relating to D/T 1870-23-467
for Surveyor-General

Date: 8-2-1979
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sq. Feet</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1313/31</td>
<td>Lot 55190</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>27.1.1932/372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do,</td>
<td>Lot 55099</td>
<td>5135</td>
<td>13.12.1933/8370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1933</td>
<td>Lot 55911</td>
<td>9133</td>
<td>do. /8371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do,</td>
<td>Lot 55912</td>
<td>10075</td>
<td>do. /8372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925-1934</td>
<td>Lot 55908</td>
<td>5355</td>
<td>14.9.1934/8099</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lot No. 4

Ref 52547
4444/84
Ref 1274/
4444/84

5255m 67265/09 UK
The above rectangular figure 875 by 60 represents 0.5 square rods and 16.2 square feet of land marked Lot No. 2 on the general plan being a portion of the divided Lot of ground formerly part of the Estate of H. D. Wyke, resident at Claremont, amount of the Cape Division transferred to J. Bradshaw on the 16th July 1853. Measured N by Lot 174, E by S Street, S by Lot 3, and W by divided Estate of Father Danaou. Surveys by myself.

April 1877

[Signature]

Deducted from 55320:
1. Part Colored green  31 1/2 Sqr. yds. 52 Sqr. feet for Aliq. Abdul  10.12.70

BH - 700.94.4

[Signature]

65332
The above Figure A B C D represents 252 square rods and 85 square feet of land in the Division of the Cape at Claremont. Being Lot 100, part of the block containing Lots 97, 98, 99, and 100 of the divided Estate Feldhausen, now called "The Grove," transferred to Thomas Watson on 16th February 1870.

Sides:
- A-B = 100 ft
- B-C = 100 ft
- C-D = 100 ft
- D-A = 100 ft

Angles:
- A = 90° 00' 00"
- B = 90° 00' 00"
- C = 90° 00' 00"
- D = 90° 00' 00"

Beacons X, Y, Z, and a replaced with E 254/60

M. 14.17

Government Land Surveyor.

I do hereby certify that this diagram belongs to the deed of transfer made in favour of Charles Henry Perceval.

Copied: Cape Town Sheet M:13

BH-100/441 55001
The numerical data of this diagram are mutually consistent.

(Sgd) J.J. Bosman.
Examiner.

**Angles.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sides.**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>250.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Figure, lettered a b c d represents 277 Square Roods 112 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont in the Cape Division, being lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, block E, part of original lots 108 to 119 Feldhausen Estate, transferred to H.M. Arderne, 22nd Feb., 1870, lastly to H. Donnan on 19th Sept., 1896.

Bounded NE by Road 26',
NW by Road 30',
SE by Portion deducted lots 4, 10,
SW by Road 30'.

Framed from actual Survey by me,

(Sgd) J.J. Bisset.
Govt. Surveyor.
October, 1897.

---

**ERF 55786**
CAPE TOWN
at Claremont

Scale: 80 Cape Feet - 1 Inch.

Transfer dated 24th August, 1897.

Harry. Sands.

C.T.Sht. M.15

---

Ref. ERF 55786
Comp. M.15

For List of
Subscribers.

13

Y432

N.B.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sq.Rds.</th>
<th>0148/1902</th>
<th>Portion A</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>17:7:1902</th>
<th>7193</th>
<th>Erf 55785</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>277/1903</td>
<td>Portion B</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>13:3:1903</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>Erf 55787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E,32/15/30</th>
<th>9684/1900</th>
<th>Erf 18349/91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325m.</td>
<td>18349/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E,32/15/30</th>
<th>9684/1900</th>
<th>Erf 18349/91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325m.</td>
<td>18349/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E,32/15/30</th>
<th>9684/1900</th>
<th>Erf 18349/91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>325m.</td>
<td>18349/91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above Figure lettered a.b,c,d,e represents 32 Square Roods 62 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division, being Lot 33 of the land transferred to A Jo of the Cape, on 26th August 1844, originally part of the Estate Jerr Fouc.

Bounded NW by Lot 34
SE " Lot 32
NE " Road 36
SW " The Feldhausen Estate

Passed upon actual Survey by us.
(Sgd.) Martin E. Bruta
H.M. Shaw,
Government Surveyor.
April, 1902.

Copied from the...in regard to
Transfer...Title Deed No. ...55376...
dated...3rd July, 1902...in favour of...
Brithish Edacres, Kajolien.

Cape Town Sheet No 15.
The numerical data of this diagram are sufficiently consistent.
(Sgd) J.J. Bonman.
Examiner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sides</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>96.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>107.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>96.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Angles</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>90.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>90.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>85.31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>94.29.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure lettered a, b, c, d represents 69 Square Roods
55 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division,
being Lots 27 & 28 of the land transferred to Ajo of the Cape,
on 26th August, 1844, originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Rounded NW by Lot 29.
SE = Road 30'
NE = Road 30'
SW = The Feldhausen Estate.

Framed from actual Survey by,
(Sgd) Martin E. Smuts.
H.M. Shaw.
Government Surveyors.
April, 1902.

Copyed from the
Transfer...Ref. Sheet No. 11782
dated...7th November 1902.
Johan F. Breyer.
The Numerical Data of this Diagram are mutually consistent.
(Sgd.) J.J. Bosman,
Examiner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab 96.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc 125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd 96.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da 125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 90.0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 90.0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 90.0:0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 90.0:0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure lettered a, b, c, d represents 83 Square Roods, 83 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division, being Lots 31 & 32 of the land transferred to Afo of the Cape, on 26th August, 1844, originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded NW by Lot 33
SE " Lot 30
NE " Road 30'
S. " The Feldhausen Estate

Drawn from Actual Survey by us.
(Sgd.) Martin E. Smuts.
" H.M. Shaw.
Government Surveyors,
April, 1902.
The above Figure, lettered a.b.c.d.e. represents 58 Square Rods 120
Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division being
Lots 1 & 2 of the land transferred to J.C. van der Cap, on 26 August 1844,
originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded by
1. Protea Road.
2. Lot 3.
3. Remainder of Sans Souci.
4. Road 30

Surveyed from actual Survey by:
(Sgd.) Martin C. Smuts
Government Surveyors
April 1902

The Preliminary Data of this Diagram are sufficiently consistent

(Sgd.) I.L. Bosman
Examiner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES</th>
<th>ANGLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a'b</td>
<td>69.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'c</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c'd</td>
<td>113.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d'a</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>59 SR 97 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following deductions have been taken from this diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Orig. No.</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th>Trf. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 4895/29</td>
<td>Lot 2A</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>24.12.1929</td>
<td>12789</td>
<td>ERF 55335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4896/29</td>
<td>Lot 2B</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td></td>
<td>12788</td>
<td>ERF 55334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2838/95</td>
<td>8861/95</td>
<td>ERF 156 993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Numerical Data of this Diagram are sufficiently consistent.
(Sgd.) J.J. Bosman.
Examiner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>78 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>100 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>86 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>100 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>94 37 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>90 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>90 00 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>85 23 00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Figure lettered a b c d represents 57 Square Rooods 12 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division, being Lots 3 & 4 of the land transferred to Ajo of the Cape, on 26th August 1844, originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded NW by Lot 2
SE " Lot 5
NE " Remainder of Sans Souci
SW " Road 30'

Framed from Actual Survey by,
(Sgd.) Martin E. Smuts,
" H.M. Shaw,
Government Surveyors.
April, 1902.

Copied from the diagram relating to
Transfer...TITN Deed No....1320....
dated 20th October 1902...in favour of
Hendrik Beinik.

Cape Town Sheet M 15.

For list of
deductions and
back of diagram

ERF 55336
Comp. M15
Ref.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Area, Sq. Morgen.</th>
<th>Area, Sq. Feet.</th>
<th>Transfer Date</th>
<th>T.F. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44897/1929</td>
<td>Lot No. 3A</td>
<td>3917</td>
<td>4221</td>
<td>24-12-1929</td>
<td>12786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44898/1929</td>
<td>Lot No. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Numerical Data of this Diagram are sufficiently consistent.

(Sgd) J.J. Bosman.
Examiner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES</th>
<th>ANGLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>86.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>90.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>50.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>94.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>85.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Figure lettered a b c d represents 30 Square Roods 103 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division, being Lot 5 of the land transferred to Ajo of the Cape, on 26th August 1844 originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded N.W. by Lot 4
S.E. " 6
N.E. " Remdr. of Sans Souci
S.W. " Road 30'

Framed from actual Survey by

(Sgd) Martin E.Smuts.

Government Surveyor.

Transfer 4726
7th April 1903.

Thomas Kemp Taylor.

Cape Town Sheet M. 15.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY RECORD</th>
<th>INITIALS</th>
<th>REMOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1243/78</td>
<td>4640/78</td>
<td>Erf 58028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>11662/84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numerical data of this Diagram are sufficiently consistent.

(Sgd) J.J. Bosman, Examiner.

**SIDES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>90.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>147.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>50.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>93.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ef</td>
<td>44.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa</td>
<td>50.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANGLES**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>94.37.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>90.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>85.31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>94.29.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>270.00.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>85.29.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Figure lettered a b c d e f represents 65 Square Rooods 34 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division being Lots 6 & 8 of the land transferred to Ajo of the Cape, on 26th August 1844 originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded NW by Lots 5.
SE " Road 30 & Lot 7.
NE " Lot 7 & Remd of Sans Souci.
 SW " Road 301.

Framed from actual Survey by us.
(Sgd) Martin E. Sauts.
H.M. Shaw.
Government Surveyors.
April 1902.

Copied from the Esq's relating to Transfer...Deed No....10144
dated...25th September 1902...in favour of
Heshan Nematollah Effendi.

for SURVEYOR-GENERAL,
CAPE TOWN.
The following deductions have been made from this diagram.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tfr. No.</th>
<th>Erf No.</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Area, Sq. Feet</th>
<th>Transfer Date</th>
<th>Trf. No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exp 55342</td>
<td>E.3160/1997</td>
<td>Erf 199255</td>
<td>2922 sq. feet</td>
<td>28/5/1990</td>
<td>5225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp 55343</td>
<td>E.3050/1997</td>
<td>Erf 199255</td>
<td>1866 sq. feet</td>
<td>26/6/1990</td>
<td>4482</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Lot No. 8A, Jan 1935

Morgen: E.2920/1997

Square Feet: E.2920/1997
The numerical data of this diagram are sufficiently consistent.

(Sgd) J.J. Bosman,
Examiner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sides</th>
<th>Angles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ab</td>
<td>103.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bc</td>
<td>65.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cd</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de</td>
<td>161.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ea</td>
<td>53.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>102.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>67.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cape Feet.

The above figure lettered a, b, c, d, e represents 82 Square Rods
59 Square Feet of Ground, situated at Claremont, Cape Division,
being Lots 24, 25, 26 of the land transferred to Ajo of the Cape
on the 26th August, 1844, originally part of the Estate Sans Souci.

Bounded NW by Protea Road,
SE # Lots 23 & 22,
NE # Road 30',
SW # Road 30'.

Framed from actual Survey by,

(Sgd) Martin E. Smuts.
H.M. Shaw,
Govt. Surveyors.
April, 1902.

Copied from the diagram relating to
Transfer 
Dated 7th November, 1903, in favour of
Johan F. Broederm.

Cape Town Sheet F.15

ERF 55350
Comp. 5915
Ref. C

s.d. Dgm. No.2905/1902.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>So. Feet</th>
<th>Transfer Date</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1353/1919</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2/2/1921</td>
<td>820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887/1920</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2/2/1921</td>
<td>822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numerical data of this diagram are mutually consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIDES</th>
<th>ANGLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above figure lettered abcd represents 27.89 Rds 112.83 feet of ground situated at Claremont Cape Division being Lot 22 of the land transferred to YJo of the Cape on 26th August 1814 originally part of the estate Sans Souci.

Bounded NW by lots 24, 25, SE Lot 20, NE Road 30, SW Lot 23.

framed from actual survey by us.

(Sgd) Martin E. Smuts
(Sgd) H. T. Shaw
Government Surveyors
April 1902
The following projections have been made from this diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Record</th>
<th>Division No.</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Area HA.</th>
<th>Transfer No.</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Remar.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.170/14</td>
<td>473/14</td>
<td>14A 57500</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>776/75</td>
<td>ENB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Numerical Data of this Diagram are sufficiently consistent.
(Sgd.) H.C. Yea.
Examiner.

The above Figure, lettered a.b.c.d., represents 92 Square Roods, 140 Sq. feet of Ground, situated at Claremont in the Cape Division, being Portion B of Lots 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, Block E transferred to H. Hands 26th Aug., 1897.

Bounded Nos. by Remaining Extent
NEXts " Road 25'
SExts " Lots 4 & 10
SEXts " Road 30'

Framed from actual Survey by me.
(Sgd.) J.J. Bissett.
Government Surveyor.
January, 1903.

Transfer
3rd March 1903
Walter T. Stevens.
The Numerical Data of this Diagram are consistent
2833, 1918

Examiner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANGLES</th>
<th>SIDES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 70  22 5°  ad  45°  22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 72  44  5°  bc  47°  00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 75  52  30°  cd  153°  85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 90  0  0  da  69°  44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above Figure, lettered a. b. c. d represents a Morgen, 74 Square Roods, 90 Square feet of Ground, situated at Claremont in the Cape Town Municipal Division, being Lot CH of Lots Nos. 102, 103, 104, 105, 106 and 107 of the Groote Estate, transferred to F. Caruthers on the 25th March 1870.

Bounded NW by Remainder
SE
NE
SW by Feldhausen Avenue

This diagram belongs to the transfer of this estate to favour of J. Mackill.
4th July, 1918.

Surveyed and beaconed by me according to regulations.

Government Surveyor.

ERF 55385 CAPE TOWN
at Claremont

ERF 55385
Comp. M 35
Ref.

[Diagram and measurements]