



Final Comment

In terms of Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999)

Attention: City of Tshwane

Management plan

Van Vollenhoven, A. January 2013. A Cultural Heritage Management Plan For The Klapperkop Nature Reserve, City Of Tshwane

The report entails a Cultural Resources Management Plan for the Klapperkop Nature Reserve on the remainder of portions 2 and 95 of the farm Groenkloof 358 JR in the City of Tshwane.

The report lists the following heritage resources, all of which appear to be connected to the Anglo-Boer War:

Site 1: The remains of a block house dating to the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) and built by the British. The author recommends that the management of this site, as well as of the Fort Klapperkop Heritage Site and the Klapperkop Nature Reserve, should be integrated; that the existing archaeological research of this site be used to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds.

Site 2: Remains of a block house dating to the Anglo-Boer War that has been damaged by the building of a reservoir and communication infrastructure on top of it. The author recommends that the information about this blockhouse should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan and that any possible changes to the communications infrastructure here should also take what is left of this blockhouse in consideration; that the site should be left as it is; if visitors are allowed access to the site, this not include the remains itself.

Site 3: Remains of a block house dating to the Anglo-Boer War inside the boundaries of the heritage site, although the current fence places it within the nature reserve. The author recommends that the information about this blockhouse should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the two departments responsible for the entire area should reach an agreement on the possible moving of the fence, aimed at preserving the site in its present state; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 4: Two holes, possibly toilets associated with Fort Klapperkop. The author recommends that the





management of the site be integrated; that the information about this site should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the two departments responsible for the entire area should reach an agreement on the possible moving of the fence, aimed at preserving the site in its present state; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 5: A defensive wall approximately 0,80 metres high and 40 metres long, most likely built by the Boers to prevent an infantry attack from the north-east. The author recommends that the management of the site be integrated; that the information about this site should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the two departments responsible for the entire area should reach an agreement on the possible moving of the fence, aimed at preserving the site in its present state; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 6: A stone quarry north-east of the fort that may have been used during the building of the tar road through the area. The author recommends that the management of the site be integrated; that the information about this blockhouse should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 7: A defensive wall of varying height, reaching a maximum of approximately one metre. The author recommends that the management of the site be integrated; that the information about this site should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that visitor access be minimised and that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that any proposed development in the vicinity of this site should be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 8: The remains of the original road to Fort Klapperkop, represented by a section of a gravel road to the west of the fort. The author recommends that the management of the site be integrated; that the information about this site should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that the road be monitored for damage caused by cyclists; that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

Site 9: Fort Klapperkop itself, built by the Boers prior to the Anglo-Boer War. The author recommends that the management of the site be integrated; that the information about this site should be integrated to inform visitors about the historical area; that the management plan and restoration report of this site from 2005 must be adhered to; that the site should be maintained by keeping it free of weeds; that the site may never be demolished and any proposed development in the vicinity thereof should be considered with input by a heritage expert to be re-evaluated within the context of the management plan.

In addition, the author recommends that the management plan should be adapted and reassessed, giving a



The South African Heritage Resources Agency

Street Address: 111 Harrington Street, Cape Town 8000 * Postal Address: PO Box 4637, Cape Town 8000
* Tel: +27 21 462 4502 * Fax: +27 21 462 4509 * Web: <http://www.sahra.org.za>



continuation period of at least five years until 2018, but also that any developments done before the expiry of the five year period should be used to re-evaluate the impact on cultural resources and to make the necessary adaptations to the document.

The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit supports the recommendations within this Management Plan.

Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.

Yours faithfully



Andrew Salomon
Heritage Officer: Archaeology
South African Heritage Resources Agency



Colette Scheermeyer
SAHRA Head Archaeologist
South African Heritage Resources Agency

ADMIN:

Terms & Conditions:

1. This approval does not exonerate the applicant from obtaining local authority approval or any other necessary approval for proposed work.
2. If any heritage resources, including graves or human remains, are encountered they must be reported to SAHRA immediately.
3. SAHRA reserves the right to request additional information as required.

