

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a Building Control and Kouga SAIAT Chapter meeting will be held at **Room 4 Woltemade** on **12th September 2025, 09:00**

Date: 12th September 2025

Time: 09:00

Location: Meeting Room 4

Facilitator: Building Control and Kouga SAIAT Chapter

Attendees: **Complete attendance register**

Meeting Agenda: Enhancing Compliance and Submission Standards Among Registered Professionals (RPs)

MANAGER: N. LAPPERT

CHAIRPERSON

AGENDA

1. Opening and Welcome: Manager BCD N. LAPPERT (Building Control Manager)
2. Introductions -
3. Apologies – Shannon (Plans Examiner)

WELCOMING STARTED ON THE time

4. Items for discussion

4.1. Opening Remarks and Meeting Objectives

- Welcome and introductions
- Purpose of the meeting:
 - To address persistent and time-consuming issues related to plan submissions by Registered Professionals (RPs)
 - To reaffirm municipal expectations and legal obligations in line with the National Building Regulations and Building Standards Act, No. 103 of 1977
 - To streamline processes and improve efficiency in municipal plan examination and approvals

4.2. Ongoing Communication Challenges with RPs

Key Issues Identified:

- Time-consuming and repetitive email exchanges with RPs to clarify submission requirements
- Repeated need to re-explain basic requirements and processes which consumes significant staff time
- Submissions that fail to align with prior instructions, requiring ongoing clarification and follow-up

Proposed Solutions:

- Development and implementation of a standardized municipal communication protocol for plan submissions (Whatsapp group established by Building Control, but must not be abused by RPs for complains, “we want solutions”)
- Creation of a "Submission Guidance Document" outlining acceptable formats, key requirements, and checklists for RPs
- Consideration of automated responses or pre-screening templates for repetitive queries to reduce manual engagements between Building Control and the Architectural Professionals

4.3. Non-Compliance with Pre-Consultation Agreements

Discussion Points:

- Pre-consultation processes are designed to proactively resolve planning and technical issues prior to formal submission
- RPs frequently ignore or dispute outcomes of these meetings during formal submissions, requiring re-evaluation of previously discussed items
- Some RPs argue limited responsibility when only appointed for “minor additions” and refuse accountability for unresolved or lapsed issues on previous plans

Municipal Position:

- A pre-consultation is a formal advisory service. Failure to comply undermines the integrity of the review process
- RPs are professionally and legally accountable for ensuring all existing site conditions, including expired approvals or uninspected works, are addressed
- The municipality is not obliged to process incomplete or non-compliant submissions that contradict prior consultation outcomes

4.4. Legal Responsibility for Site Status and Existing Works

Concerns:

- RPs distancing themselves from historical work, arguing they were only appointed for new scope
- Ongoing confusion or resistance regarding penalties for uninspected or lapsed approvals which is built into Tariff schedules and available on Ovvio in the folder marked “Municipal Years” for all prior and current financial years

Clarification:

- In accordance with Act 103 of 1977, the RP takes full responsibility for the submission and must verify lawful status of the site
- Where no inspections were conducted or approvals have lapsed, penalties and enforcement actions are applied as per municipal tariff schedule
- Submissions that fail to address such discrepancies delay the approval process for all parties

4.5. Decline in Plan Quality and RP Oversight of Apprentices

Observed Issues:

- Increasing number of submissions prepared by apprentices or candidates lacking basic technical accuracy
- Plan examiners are frequently required to provide informal mentoring or redline plans extensively

- RPs are accredited CPD providers and claim points for training of their apprentices and candidates — this responsibility cannot be offloaded onto municipal staff

Municipal Stance:

- Plans must be complete, coherent, and prepared under proper professional oversight
- Plans submitted with clear signs of inexperience or technical errors must be rejected or returned
- RPs must fulfil their duty to mentor internally and ensure quality before municipal submission or pre-consultations

Recommendations:

- Reinforce accountability of RP to review and approve all submissions from apprentices under their supervision (A document can be designed where the RP signed and ensures that he/she/they have overseen their apprentice during the drafting of the plan and therefore takes full responsibility of any decision made during municipal submission process)
- Issue communication to professional councils highlighting concerns around poor mentorship and submission quality

4.6. Incomplete and Inconsistent Plan Documentation

Common Deficiencies:

- Omission of required schedules (e.g., window and door schedules)
- Inconsistent or missing XA2 (energy efficiency) information for proposed structures are always a challenge
- Discrepancies in documentation between professionals in a submission
- Indicating structures over the site boundary

Impact:

- Plan examiners must repeatedly request missing information, delaying overall processing time
- Lack of standardization causes confusion and introduces risk of approval errors

Action Items:

- Implementation of a Minimum Plan Submission Guideline Checklist to be submitted with every application
- Non-compliant applications to be returned immediately with a standard rejection template

4.7. Stamp Area and Drawing Format Challenges

Issues Noted:

- No designated space for municipal approval stamps
- Drawings submitted in 1:1 scale or formats not suited for standard A1–A0 printing
- Overly detailed or cluttered plans causing visibility issues for stamping and endorsement

Requirements to Reinforce:

- All plans must be formatted in A1 to A0 sizes—1:1 scale is not acceptable
- A clear stamp 15mm x 15mm box on the top right-hand side must be provided in a consistent location on all plans
- Plans submitted without allocated stamp space will be rejected without review

4.8. File Size and Use of Unnecessary 3D Renderings

Challenges:

- Plans including high-resolution 3D renderings that significantly increase file size
- Increased processing time for digital endorsement due to heavy graphics

Clarification:

- 3D images are not a requirement of the municipality
- They may be included for client presentations, but must be submitted separately or excluded from approval copies
- RPs should optimize all files prior to submission to prevent delays

4.9. Pressure for Plan Expeditions & Queue Jumping Requests

Current Situation:

- Increasing frequency of direct or implied requests to expedite approvals due to client pressure
- Misconceptions that agreements between RPs and clients override municipal review timelines

Municipal Response:

- The Municipality operates on a first-come, first-served basis—this policy ensures fairness and consistency
- Any prioritization outside of emergency or strategic planning contexts is unethical and must be declined
- RPs are expected to manage client expectations appropriately and refrain from attempting to bypass the system

4.10. Reinforcement of Legal Obligations

- The National Building Regulations and Building Standards Act (Act 103 of 1977) is the legal framework by which all municipalities are governed
- RPs are obligated to comply fully with its provisions—non-negotiable
- Continued disregard for legal and professional responsibilities may result in penalties, escalations to professional councils, or suspension of submissions

4.11. Proposed Measures and Next Steps

Key Recommendations:

- Distribution of an updated Submission & Compliance Guide for Registered Professionals
- Introduction of a "Quality Control Rejection Matrix" to be used by plan examiners
- Formal engagement with SACAP/SACQSP to report trends in non-compliant submissions
- Periodic workshops or CPD sessions on submission processes (optional but encouraged)

4.12. Introduction and Incorporation: Building Control Forum

Title: Terms of Reference - Building Control Forum for Streamlining Plan Approval Process

Objective:

To establish a collaborative platform for stakeholders involved in the plan approval process, aimed at streamlining, optimizing, and improving communication and procedural transparency. This initiative supports the safe, timely delivery of compliant buildings.

Scope:

a. Membership:

The forum will include representatives from:

- Local building control authorities
- Architects and design professionals
- Builders and contractors
- Developers and property owners
- Regulatory bodies and government agencies

b. Roles and Responsibilities:

- Enable collaborative problem-solving and knowledge sharing
- Members will contribute technical insight and practical recommendations
- Creation of **subcommittees** to focus on key areas:
 - Code interpretation
 - Technology integration
 - Process improvements

c. Regular Meetings:

- Held **quarterly**, both virtually and in-person as required
- Agendas and minutes will be circulated in advance and archived

d. Key Functions:

- Facilitate stakeholder coordination
- Identify and resolve persistent plan approval issues
- Recommend improvements to existing policies and procedures
- Collaborate with regulatory and professional bodies
- Promote the use of **technology and automation** in the approval process

e. Reporting and Evaluation:

- Regular reporting to relevant municipal departments and authorities
- Periodic evaluations to assess impact and refine strategies

Governance:

- A **Chairperson** will be elected by forum members
- The Chair will coordinate operations, facilitate discussions, and ensure collaboration
- Decisions will be made via **consensus-driven dialogue**

Confidentiality & Data Protection:

- All participants must adhere to strict confidentiality protocols
- Any shared data will be handled in compliance with **data protection legislation**

Duration:

- The forum will initially operate for **two years**, subject to renewal and evaluation based on performance and necessity

4.13. Open Discussion and Feedback

- Floor open to attendees for comments, concerns, or additional proposals
- Note: All feedback will be considered for integration into future policy updates or operational procedures

4.14. Summary, Action Items, and Close

- Recap of critical issues discussed
- Assignment of responsibilities for follow-up actions
- Scheduling of next review or status update meeting

5. GENERAL –

6. Way Forward: MR. N. LAPPERT (Building Control Manager)

7. Date of Next Meeting: to be confirmed

6. Closure: MR. N. LAPPERT (Building Control Manager)

Distribution list

Building Control:

- ♦ Nico Lappert
- ♦ Adrian Thorne
- ♦ Lilitha Tuswa
- ♦ Mornique Ruiters

Kouga SAIAT Chapter:

- ♦ Christjan Oelofse
- ♦ Franke Blignaut