



AFRICAN HERITAGE CONSULTANTS CC

2001/077745/23

DR. UDO S KÜSEL

Tel/fax: (012) 567 6046
Cell: 082 498 0673
E-mail: udo.heritage@absamail.co.za

P. O. Box 652
Magalieskruin
0150

10 September 2004

SCOPING REPORT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES FOR THE PROPOSED NEW ROAD TO SWARTKOPFONTEIN

1. DEFINITION

The broad generic term *Cultural Heritage resources* refers to any physical and spiritual property associated with past and present human use or occupation of the environment, cultural activities and history. The term includes sites, structures, places, natural features and material of palaeontological, archaeological, historical, aesthetic, scientific, architectural, religious, symbolic or traditional importance to specific individuals or groups, traditional systems of cultural practice, belief or social interaction.

2. PROTECTED SITES IN TERMS OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE ACT, Act. NO. 25 OF 1999

The following are the most important sites and objects protected by the National Heritage Act:

- a. Structures or parts of structures older than 60 years
- b. Archaeological sites and objects
- c. Palaeontological sites
- d. Meteorites
- e. Ship wrecks
- f. Burial grounds
- g. Graves of victims of conflict
- h. Public monuments and memorials

- i. Structures, places and objects protected through the publication of notices in the Gazette and Provincial Gazette
- j. Any other places or object which are considered to be of interest or of historical or cultural significance
- k. Geological sites of scientific or cultural importance
- l. Sites of significance relating to the history of slavery in South Africa
- m. Objects to which oral traditions are attached
- n. Sites of cultural significance or other value to a community or pattern of South African history

3. METHODOLOGY

All relevant maps and documents on the site were studied. The site was visited and options one, two and three were visually inspected by vehicle and on foot.

4. RESULTS

No indication of any historical or archaeological important sites or artefacts could be found on any of the three proposed routes. On option two a number of deserted cattle posts do occur but only date back a number of years and have not been used recently. They are of no cultural value.

5. CONCLUSION

No archaeological or historical important sites could be found on the proposed development area.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no objection to the proposed development from a cultural heritage resources point of view.