

**Heritage impact survey report for the
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT MATA MATA REST CAMP,
KGALAGADI TRANSFRONTIER PARK,
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE**

THE PROJECT:

Expansion of existing accommodation facilities at the Mata Mata rest camp

THIS REPORT:

HERITAGE IMPACT SURVEY REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT
AT MATA MATA REST CAMP, KGALAGADI TRANSFRONTIER PARK,
NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

Report No: 2008/JvS/084
Status: Final
Revision No: 0
Date: September 2008

Prepared for:

TRIVIRON Environmental Assessment Practitioners

Representative: Mr. N Arnott

Postal Address: P O Box 177, Woodlands, 0072

Tel: 012 367 0625

E-mail: nicholas@triviron.co.za

Prepared by:

J van Schalkwyk (D Litt et Phil), Heritage Consultant

ASAPA Registration No.: 168

Principal Investigator: Iron Age, Colonial Period, Industrial Heritage

Postal Address: 62 Coetzer Avenue, Monument Park, 0181

Mobile: 076 790 6777

Fax: 012 347 7270

E-mail: jvschalkwyk@mweb.co.za

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

HERITAGE IMPACT SURVEY REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT MATA MATA REST CAMP, KGALAGADI TRANSFRONTIER PARK, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and features of cultural significance found within the boundaries of the area in which it is proposed to expand the accommodation facilities at the Mata Mata rest camp.

Temporary accommodation was erected in the area some 40 years ago and is viewed to have some historic significance. These will now be replaced with modern chalets, in addition to others that will be erected in an area that is currently still vacant.

Therefore, based on what was found, it is recommended that the proposed development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- It is recommended that the various parkhomes that is to be removed, is recorded photographically (inside and outside) and that this material is retained as part of the Parks ongoing programme of documentation.
- If archaeological sites are exposed during construction work, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.



J A van Schalkwyk
Heritage Consultant

TECHNICAL SUMMARY

Property details						
Province	Northern Cape					
Magisterial district	Gordonia					
Topo-cadastral map	2520CC, 2520CA					
Closest town	Upington					
Farm name & no.	Mata Mata SAMR Reserve 51					
Portions/Holdings						
Coordinates	Polygon					
	No	Latitude	Longitude	No	Latitude	Longitude
	1	S 25.76622	E 20.00008	2	S 25.76822	S 20.00179

Development criteria in terms of Section 38(1) of the NHR Act	Yes/No
Construction of road, wall, power line, pipeline, canal or other linear form of development or barrier exceeding 300m in length	
Construction of bridge or similar structure exceeding 50m in length	
Development exceeding 5000 sq m	Yes
Development involving three or more existing erven or subdivisions	
Development involving three or more erven or divisions that have been consolidated within past five years	
Rezoning of site exceeding 10 000 sq m	
Any other development category, public open space, squares, parks, recreation grounds	

Development	
Description	Expansion of existing accommodation facilities
Project name	Mata Mata

Land use	
Previous land use	Border post
Current land use	Rest camp

Heritage sites assessment		
<i>Site type</i>	<i>Site significance</i>	<i>Site grading (Section 7 of NHRA)</i>
Historic	Medium	III
Impact assessment		
<i>Impact</i>	<i>Mitigation</i>	<i>Permits required</i>
High	Document	None

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
TECHNICAL SUMMARY	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	IV
GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	V
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE	1
3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS	1
4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	2
5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3
6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT	4
7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES	5
8. RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT MEASURES.....	5
9. RECOMMENDATIONS.....	6
10. REFERENCES.....	8
APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES.....	9
APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION	11
APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS	13
APPENDIX 4: ILLUSTRATIONS.....	14

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Fig. 1. Location of the study area (green dot) in regional context.	3
Fig. 2. The study area outlined in red.	13
Fig. 3. Map of the farm MataMata dating to 1910.....	14
Fig. 4. Location of the proposed development, indicated by the black outline.	15
Fig. 5. The proposed development is indicated by the green squares.	15
Fig. 6. The main entrance to the camp.	16
Fig. 7. The area in front of the parkhomes.....	16
Fig. 8 & 9. Front and rear view of one of the parkhomes.....	17
Fig. 10 & 11. Views across the open area where the development is to take place.	18
Fig. 12 & 13. More views across the open areas.....	19

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**STONE AGE**

Early Stone Age	2 000 000 - 150 000 Before Present (BP)
Middle Stone Age	150 000 - 30 000 BP
Late Stone Age	30 000 - until c. AD 200

IRON AGE

Early Iron Age	AD 200 - AD 900
Middle Iron Age	AD 900 - AD 1300
Late Iron Age	AD 1300 - AD 1830

HISTORIC PERIOD

Since the arrival of the white settlers - c. AD 1840 in this part of the country

ASAPA	Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists
EIA	Early Iron Age
ESA	Early Stone Age
LIA	Late Iron Age
LSA	Late Stone Age
MSA	Middle Stone Age
NHRA	National Heritage Resources Act
PHRA	Provincial Heritage Resources Agency
SAHRA	South African Heritage Resources Agency

HERITAGE IMPACT SURVEY REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AT MATA MATA REST CAMP, KGALAGADI TRANSFRONTIER PARK, NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE

1. INTRODUCTION

Increased tourism, resulting largely from the developing of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, necessitates the construction of additional tourism accommodation. Mata Mata is one of the rest camps that have been identified for expansion.

An independent heritage consultant was appointed by **Triviron Environmental Assessment Practitioners** to conduct a survey to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and structures of cultural importance found within the boundaries of the area where the development is to take place.

This HIA report forms part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) as required by the EIA Regulations in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) and was done in accordance with Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act, No. 25 of 1999 and is intended for submission to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA).

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The scope of work consisted of conducting a Phase 1 archaeological survey of the site in accordance with the requirements of Section 38(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999).

This include:

- Conducting a desk-top investigation of the area
- A visit to the proposed development site

The objectives were to

- Identify possible archaeological, cultural and historic sites within the proposed development areas;
- Evaluate the potential impacts of construction, operation and maintenance of the proposed development on archaeological, cultural and historical resources;
- Recommend mitigation measures to ameliorate any negative impacts on areas of archaeological, cultural or historical importance.

3. DEFINITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

The following aspects have a direct bearing on the survey and the resulting report:

- *Cultural resources* are all non-physical and physical human-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences that are associated with human activity. These include all sites, structures and artefacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development.

- The *significance* of the sites and artefacts are determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.
- Sites regarded as having low significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium to high significance require further mitigation.
- The latitude and longitude of archaeological sites are to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.

4. STUDY APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

4.1 Extent of the Study

This survey and impact assessment covers the area as presented in Section 5 and as illustrated in Figure 1 - 3.

4.2 Methodology

4.2.1 Preliminary investigation

4.2.1.1 Survey of the literature

A survey of the relevant literature was conducted with the aim of reviewing the previous research done and determining the potential of the area. In this regard, various anthropological, archaeological and historical sources were consulted - see the list of references below.

4.2.1.2 Data bases

The *Heritage Atlas Database*, the *Environmental Potential Atlas* and the *National Archives of South Africa* were consulted.

4.2.1.3 Other sources

Aerial photographs and topocadastral and other maps were also studied - see the list of references below.

4.2.2 Field survey

The field survey was done according to generally accepted archaeological practices, and was aimed at locating all possible sites, objects and structures. The area that had to be investigated, was identified by Mr M Reinhardt, Regional Project Manager, SAN Parks, by means of maps. The area was investigated by walking across it in a number of transects. Special attention was given to topographical occurrences such as trenches, holes, outcrops and clusters of trees were investigated.

4.2.3 Documentation

All sites, objects and structures that are identified are documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Coordinates of individual

localities are determined by means of the *Global Positioning System (GPS)*¹ and plotted on a map. This information is added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).

4.3 Limitations

None at present.

5. DESCRIPTION OF THE AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

5.1 Site location

The study area is located on a portion of the farm Mata Mata, located in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (formerly the Kalahari Gemsbok Park). For more detail, see the Technical Summary presented above, as well as Fig. 1 – 3.




Fig. 1. Location of the study area (green dot) in regional context.

¹ According to the manufacturer a certain deviation may be expected for each reading. Care was, however, taken to obtain as accurate a reading as possible, and then to correlate it with reference to the physical environment before plotting it on the map.

5.2 Site description

The geology of the area is made up of sand and the original vegetation is classified as Kalahari Thornveld. The area where the development is to take place is located inside the current Mata Mata rest camp (Fig. 2 - 5). This area has partially been used for the building of existing visitor accommodation, whereas the biggest section is still open veld.

5.3 Regional overview

The region was originally inhabited mostly by roaming groups of San people. During the early 1600s, the Kgalagadi (Tswana-speakers) entered the area, although in a very limited numbers. They were later followed by white farmers. In all cases, settlement usually occurred in the vicinity of watercourses, especially the larger rivers such as the Nossob and the Auob rivers. The Kalahari Gemsbok National Park was established in 1931, with the Botswana equivalent following in 1938.

Mata Mata camp used to be a border post, allowing access between South Africa and Namibia. Most of the infrastructure therefore dates to this period and functioned in this regard. After the border post was closed down, the camp was converted into a rest camp for tourists.

5.4 Identified sites

5.4.1 Stone Age

Although the area is located on a small sand dune, no sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Stone Age were identified in the study area.

5.4.2 Iron Age

No sites, features or objects of cultural significance dating to the Iron Age were identified in the study area.

5.4.3 Historic period

In order to accommodate more visitors, three 'temporary' parkhomes were erected during the 1960s (Fig. 7 – 9). These are, in essence, portable homes that were fixed on poles to lift them from the ground, sunroof were added to make them cooler and ablution facilities were formalised.

6. SITE SIGNIFICANCE AND ASSESSMENT

6.1 Statement of significance

According to the NHR Act, Section 2(vi), the **significance** of heritage sites and artefacts is determined by its aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technical value in relation to the uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

Sites regarded as having low significance are viewed as been recorded in full after identification and would require no further mitigation. Sites with a medium to high significance would require mitigation. Mitigation, in most cases the excavation of a site, is in essence destructive and therefore the impact can be viewed as high and as permanent.

- Although the 'temporary' parkhomes are not very old, nor of any architectural significance, they did form an integral part of the landscape for many years and therefore have some historical significance. They are viewed to have a medium significance on a local level.

6.2 Impact assessment

Impact analysis of cultural heritage resources under threat of the proposed development, are based on the present understanding of the development.

- It is the intension to remove the parkhomes and replace them with more modern chalets. The impact of the proposed development would therefore be high.

7. IDENTIFICATION OF RISK SOURCES

A Heritage Impact Assessment is focused on two phases of a proposed development: **the construction** and **operation phases**. The following project actions may impact negatively on archaeological sites and other features of cultural importance. The actions are most likely to occur during the construction phase of a project.

Construction phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Construction work
Anticipated risks	
- looting of sites	Curious workers

Operation phase:

Possible Risks	Source of the risk
Actually identified risks	
- damage to sites	Not keeping to management plans
Anticipated risks	
- damage to sites	Unscheduled construction/developments
- looting of sites	Visitors removing objects as keepsakes

8. RECOMMENDED MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Heritage sites are fixed features in the environment, occurring within specific spatial confines. Any impact upon them is permanent and non-reversible. Those resources that cannot be avoided and that are directly impacted by the development can be excavated/recorded and a management plan can be developed for future action. Those sites that are not impacted on

can be written into the management plan, whence they can be avoided or cared for in the future.

8.1 Objectives

- Protection of archaeological, historical and any other site or land considered being of cultural value within the project boundary against vandalism, destruction and theft.
- The preservation and appropriate management of new discoveries in accordance with the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), should these be discovered during construction.

8.2.1 Construction phase

General management objectives and commitments:

- To avoid disturbing sites of heritage importance; and
- To avoid disturbing burial sites.

The following shall apply:

- Known sites should be clearly marked in order that they can be avoided during construction activities.
- The contractors and workers should be notified that archaeological sites might be exposed during the construction work.
- Should any heritage artefacts be exposed during excavation, work on the area where the artefacts were discovered, shall cease immediately and the Environmental Control Officer shall be notified as soon as possible;
- All discoveries shall be reported immediately to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made. Acting upon advice from these specialists, the Environmental Control Officer will advise the necessary actions to be taken;
- Under no circumstances shall any artefacts be removed, destroyed or interfered with by anyone on the site; and
- Contractors and workers shall be advised of the penalties associated with the unlawful removal of cultural, historical, archaeological or palaeontological artefacts, as set out in the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999), Section 51. (1).

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

The aim of the survey was to locate, identify, evaluate and document sites, objects and features of cultural significance found within the boundaries of the area in which it is proposed to expand the accommodation facilities at the Mata Mata rest camp.

Temporary accommodation was erected in the area some 40 years ago and is viewed to have some historic significance. These will now be replaced with modern chalets, in addition to others that will be erected in an area that is currently still vacant.

Therefore, based on what was found, it is recommended that the proposed development can continue in the area, on condition of acceptance of the following recommendations:

- It is recommended that the various parkhomes that is to be removed, is recorded photographically (inside and outside) and that this material is retained as part of the Parks ongoing programme of documentation.

- If archaeological sites are exposed during construction work, it should immediately be reported to a museum, preferably one at which an archaeologist is available, so that an investigation and evaluation of the finds can be made.

10. REFERENCES

10.1 Data bases

Chief Surveyor General

Environmental Potential Atlas, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.

Heritage Atlas Database, Pretoria.

National Archives of South Africa

10.2 Literature

Acocks, J.P.H. 1975. *Veld Types of South Africa*. Memoirs of the Botanical Survey of South Africa, No. 40. Pretoria: Botanical Research Institute.

South African National Parks. 2007. *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park*. Official Information Guide.

10.3 Maps

1: 50 000 Topocadastral maps – 2520CC

APPENDIX 1: CONVENTIONS USED TO ASSESS THE IMPACT OF PROJECTS ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

Significance

According to the NHRA, Section 2(vi) the **significance** of a heritage sites and artefacts is determined by it aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technical value in relation to the uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. It must be kept in mind that the various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and that the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these.

Matrix used for assessing the significance of each identified site/feature

1. Historic value				
Is it important in the community, or pattern of history				
Does it have strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organisation of importance in history				
Does it have significance relating to the history of slavery				
2. Aesthetic value				
It is important in exhibiting particular aesthetic characteristics valued by a community or cultural group				
3. Scientific value				
Does it have potential to yield information that will contribute to an understanding of natural or cultural heritage				
Is it important in demonstrating a high degree of creative or technical achievement at a particular period				
4. Social value				
Does it have strong or special association with a particular community or cultural group for social, cultural or spiritual reasons				
5. Rarity				
Does it possess uncommon, rare or endangered aspects of natural or cultural heritage				
6. Representivity				
Is it important in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a particular class of natural or cultural places or objects				
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of a range of landscapes or environments, the attributes of which identify it as being characteristic of its class				
Importance in demonstrating the principal characteristics of human activities (including way of life, philosophy, custom, process, land-use, function, design or technique) in the environment of the nation, province, region or locality.				
7. Sphere of Significance		High	Medium	Low
International				
National				
Provincial				
Regional				
Local				
Specific community				
8. Significance rating of feature				
1.	Low			
2.	Medium			
3.	High			

Significance of impact:

- low where the impact will not have an influence on or require to be significantly accommodated in the project design
- medium where the impact could have an influence which will require modification of the project design or alternative mitigation
- high where it would have a “no-go” implication on the project regardless of any mitigation

Certainty of prediction:

- Definite: More than 90% sure of a particular fact. Substantial supportive data to verify assessment
- Probable: More than 70% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of that impact occurring
- Possible: Only more than 40% sure of a particular fact, or of the likelihood of an impact occurring
- Unsure: Less than 40% sure of a particular fact, or the likelihood of an impact occurring

Recommended management action:

For each impact, the recommended practically attainable mitigation actions which would result in a measurable reduction of the impact, must be identified. This is expressed according to the following:

- 1 = no further investigation/action necessary
- 2 = controlled sampling and/or mapping of the site necessary
- 3 = preserve site if possible, otherwise extensive salvage excavation and/or mapping necessary
- 4 = preserve site at all costs

Legal requirements:

Identify and list the specific legislation and permit requirements which potentially could be infringed upon by the proposed project, if mitigation is necessary.

APPENDIX 2. RELEVANT LEGISLATION

All archaeological and palaeontological sites, and meteorites are protected by the National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) as stated in Section 35:

(1) Subject to the provisions of section 8, the protection of archaeological and palaeontological sites and material and meteorites is the responsibility of a provincial heritage resources authority: Provided that the protection of any wreck in the territorial waters and the maritime cultural zone shall be the responsibility of SAHRA.

(2) Subject to the provisions of subsection (8)(a), all archaeological objects, palaeontological material and meteorites are the property of the State. The responsible heritage authority must, on behalf of the State, at its discretion ensure that such objects are lodged with a museum or other public institution that has a collection policy acceptable to the heritage resources authority and may in so doing establish such terms and conditions as it sees fit for the conservation of such objects.

(3) Any person who discovers archaeological or palaeontological objects or material or a meteorite in the course of development or agricultural activity must immediately report the find to the responsible heritage resources authority, or to the nearest local authority offices or museum, which must immediately notify such heritage resources authority.

(4) No person may, without a permit issued by the responsible heritage resources authority-

- (a) destroy, damage, excavate, alter, deface or otherwise disturb any archaeological or palaeontological site or any meteorite;
- (b) destroy, damage, excavate, remove from its original position, collect or own any archaeological or palaeontological material or object or any meteorite;
- (c) trade in, sell for private gain, export or attempt to export from the Republic any category of archaeological or palaeontological material or object, or any meteorite; or
- (d) bring onto or use at an archaeological or palaeontological site any excavation equipment or any equipment which assist in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.

In terms of cemeteries and graves the following (Section 36):

(1) Where it is not the responsibility of any other authority, SAHRA must conserve and generally care for burial grounds and graves protected in terms of this section, and it may make such arrangements for their conservation as it sees fit.

(2) SAHRA must identify and record the graves of victims of conflict and any other graves which it deems to be of cultural significance and may erect memorials associated with the grave referred to in subsection (1), and must maintain such memorials.

(3) No person may, without a permit issued by SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority-

- (a) destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position or otherwise disturb the grave of a victim of conflict, or any burial ground or part thereof which contains such graves;
- (b) destroy, damage, alter, exhume, remove from its original position or otherwise disturb any grave or burial ground older than 60 years which is situated outside a formal cemetery administered by a local authority; or
- (c) bring onto or use at a burial ground or grave referred to in paragraph (a) or (b) any excavation equipment, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

(4) SAHRA or a provincial heritage resources authority may not issue a permit for the destruction or damage of any burial ground or grave referred to in subsection (3)(a) unless it is satisfied that the applicant has made satisfactory arrangements for the exhumation and re-interment of the contents of such graves, at the cost of the applicant and in accordance with any regulations made by the responsible heritage resources authority.

The National Heritage Resources Act (Act no 25 of 1999) stipulates the assessment criteria and grading of archaeological sites. The following categories are distinguished in Section 7 of the Act:

- **Grade I:** Heritage resources with qualities so exceptional that they are of special national significance;
- **Grade II:** Heritage resources which, although forming part of the national estate, can be considered to have special qualities which make them significant within the context of a province or a region; and
- **Grade III:** Other heritage resources worthy of conservation, and which prescribes heritage resources assessment criteria, consistent with the criteria set out in section 3(3), which must be used by a heritage resources authority or a local authority to assess the intrinsic, comparative and contextual significance of a heritage resource and the relative benefits and costs of its protection, so that the appropriate level of grading of the resource and the consequent responsibility for its management may be allocated in terms of section 8.

Presenting archaeological sites as part of tourism attraction requires, in terms 44 of the Act, a Conservation Management Plan as well as a permit from SAHRA.

(1) Heritage resources authorities and local authorities must, wherever appropriate, co-ordinate and promote the presentation and use of places of cultural significance and heritage resources which form part of the national estate and for which they are responsible in terms of section 5 for public enjoyment, education, research and tourism, including-

- (a) the erection of explanatory plaques and interpretive facilities, including interpretive centres and visitor facilities;
- (b) the training and provision of guides;
- (c) the mounting of exhibitions;
- (d) the erection of memorials; and
- (e) any other means necessary for the effective presentation of the national estate.

(2) Where a heritage resource which is formally protected in terms of Part I of this Chapter is to be presented, the person wishing to undertake such presentation must, at least 60 days prior to the institution of interpretive measures or manufacture of associated material, consult with the heritage resources authority which is responsible for the protection of such heritage resource regarding the contents of interpretive material or programmes.

(3) A person may only erect a plaque or other permanent display or structure associated with such presentation in the vicinity of a place protected in terms of this Act in consultation with the heritage resources authority responsible for the protection of the place.

APPENDIX 3: SURVEY RESULTS

See Appendix 1 for an explanation of the conventions used in assessing the cultural remains.

Map datum used: Hartebeeshoek 94 (WGS84).




Fig. 2. The study area outlined in red.

(Map 2520CC: Chief Directorate Survey and Mapping. Namibian maps not available.)

Sites identified: Nil

APPENDIX 4: ILLUSTRATIONS




Fig. 3. Map of the farm MataMata dating to 1910.

(Map: Courtesy of the Chief Surveyor General)



Fig. 4. Location of the proposed development, indicated by the black outline.
(Photo: Courtesy Mr. M Reinhardt)




Fig. 5. The proposed development is indicated by the green squares.
(Photo: Courtesy Mr. M Reinhardt)



Fig. 6. The main entrance to the camp.



Fig. 7. The area in front of the parkhomes.




Fig. 8 & 9. Front and rear view of one of the parkhomes.




Fig. 10 & 11. Views across the open area where the development is to take place.



Fig. 12 & 13. More views across the open areas.