



Archaetnos Culture & Cultural  
Resource Consultants  
BK 98 09854/23

---

**A REPORT ON A CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AT THE  
PROPOSED SITE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CRADLE OF  
PILANESBERG LODGE, PILANESBERG NATIONAL PARK, NORTHWEST  
PROVINCE**

For:

***K2M TECHNOLOGIES  
POSTNET SUITE 167  
PRIVATE BAG X 92329  
SAFARITUINE  
0300***

**REPORT: AE736**

by:

***A.C. van Vollenhoven & A.J. Pelsler***

***October 2007***

Archaetnos  
P.O.Box 31064  
WONDERBOOMPOORT  
0033  
Tel: **083 291 6104**/083 459 3091/082 375 3321  
Fax: 086 520 4173  
Email: antonv@archaetnos.co.za

Members: AC van Vollenhoven BA, BA (Hons), DTO, NDM, MA (Archaeology) [UP], MA (Culture History) [US], DPhil (Archaeology) [UP]  
AJ Pelsler BA (UNISA), BA (Hons) (Archaeology), MA (Archaeology) [WITS]  
FE Teichert BA, BA (Hons) (Archaeology) [UP]

## SUMMARY

Archaetnos cc was requested by K2M Technologies to conduct a cultural heritage impact assessment on the proposed site for the development of the Cradle of Pilanesberg Lodge in the Pilanesberg National Park, Northwest Province. The area was surveyed on foot after consulting with the client

The fieldwork undertaken revealed six (6) sites and other archaeological features of some cultural heritage significance on the property. Only one of these will be directly impacted upon by the development, but there will be a definite secondary impact on all the others. Mitigation measures will therefore have to be implemented.

Once these have been implemented the proposed development can continue. It is important to note that a Late Iron Age site, identified during the survey, will be directly impacted upon by the development. This site has a high cultural significance and it is therefore proposed that the development be adapted in order for it to be preserved.

# CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY .....	2
CONTENTS.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
2. TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	4
3. CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS .....	4
4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS.....	5
5. METHODOLOGY .....	7
6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA.....	7
7. DISCUSSION.....	8
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
9. REFERENCES .....	15
APPENDIX A.....	17
APPENDIX B .....	18
APPENDIX C – LIST OF FIGURES .....	19

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Archaetnos cc was requested by K2M Technologies to conduct a cultural heritage impact assessment on the proposed site where the Cradle of Pilanesberg Lodge is to be built. This is inside of the Pilanesberg National Park in the Northwest Province (Figure 1).

The client indicated the area where the proposed development is to take place, and the survey was confined to this area. The survey was done on foot in order to reach areas inaccessible by motorized vehicles.

## **2. TERMS OF REFERENCE**

The Terms of Reference for the survey were to:

1. Identify all objects, sites, occurrences and structures of an archaeological or historical nature (cultural heritage sites) located on the property (see Appendix A).
2. Assess the significance of the cultural resources in terms of their archaeological, historical, scientific, social, religious, aesthetic and tourism value (see Appendix B).
3. Describe the possible impact of the proposed development on these cultural remains, according to a standard set of conventions.
4. Propose suitable mitigation measures to minimize possible negative impacts on the cultural resources.
5. Recommend suitable mitigation measure should there be any sites of significance that might be impacted upon by the proposed development.
6. Review applicable legislative requirements.

## **3. CONDITIONS & ASSUMPTIONS**

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

1. Cultural Resources are all non-physical and physical man-made occurrences, as well as natural occurrences associated with human activity. These include all sites, structure and artifacts of importance, either individually or in groups, in the history, architecture and archaeology of human (cultural) development. Graves and cemeteries are included in this.
2. The significance of the sites, structures and artifacts is determined by means of their historical, social, aesthetic, technological and scientific value in relation to their uniqueness, condition of preservation and research potential. The various aspects are not mutually exclusive, and the evaluation of any site is done with reference to any number of these aspects.

3. Cultural significance is site-specific and relates to the content and context of the site. Sites regarded as having low cultural significance have already been recorded in full and require no further mitigation. Sites with medium cultural significance may or may not require mitigation depending on other factors such as the significance of impact on the site. Sites with a high cultural significance require further mitigation (see appendix B).
4. The latitude and longitude of any archaeological or historical site or feature, is to be treated as sensitive information by the developer and should not be disclosed to members of the public.
5. All recommendations are made with full cognizance of the relevant legislation.
6. It has to be mentioned that it is almost impossible to locate all the cultural resources in a given area, as it will be very time consuming. Developers should however note that the report should make it clear how to handle any other finds that might occur.
7. The highest areas of the mountain to the east and south of the development were not surveyed. Although these are areas where archaeological sites may be expected, it is believed that due to the slope of the mountain these will not be impacted upon. A large donga is also found in the eastern area that was surveyed. The donga was not surveyed in full as chances of finding archaeological sites here are slim. Certain parts of the donga were however scrutinized as isolated, and sometimes de-contextualised archaeological features are known to occur in dongas. In both these instances the client should be aware that archaeological features may exist and that should these be impacted on in future, it should be dealt with in accordance with the relevant legislation indicated in this report.

#### **4. LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS**

Aspects concerning the conservation of cultural resources are dealt with mainly in two acts. These are the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) and the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998).

##### **4.1 The National Heritage Resources Act**

According to the above-mentioned law the following is protected as cultural heritage resources:

- a. Archaeological artifacts, structures and sites older than 100 years
- b. Ethnographic art objects (e.g. prehistoric rock art) and ethnography
- c. Objects of decorative and visual arts
- d. Military objects, structures and sites older than 75 years
- e. Historical objects, structures and sites older than 60 years
- f. Proclaimed heritage sites
- g. Grave yards and graves older than 60 years
- h. Meteorites and fossils
- i. Objects, structures and sites of scientific or technological value.

### Archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites

Section 35(4) of this act states that 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 that assists in the detection or recovery of metals or archaeological and palaeontological material or objects, or use such equipment for the recovery of meteorites.
- e. alter or demolish any structure or part of a structure which is older than 60 years as protected.

The above mentioned may only be disturbed or moved by an archaeologist, after receiving a permit from the South African Heritage Resources Agency.

### Human remains

In terms of Section 36(3) of the National Heritage Resources Act, no person may, without a permit issued by the relevant heritage resources authority:

- a. destroy, damage, alter, exhume or remove from its original position of 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 or 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, or any equipment which assists in the detection or recovery of metals.

Human remains that are less than 60 years old are subject to provisions of the Human Tissue Act (Act 65 of 1983) and to local regulations. Exhumation of graves must conform to the standards set out in the **Ordinance on Excavations (Ordinance no. 12 of 1980)** (replacing the old Transvaal Ordinance no. 7 of 1925).

Permission must also be gained from the descendants (where known), the National Department of Health, Provincial Department of Health, Premier of the Province and local police. Furthermore, permission must also be gained from the various landowners (i.e. where the graves are located and where they are to be relocated) before exhumation can take place.

Human remains can only be handled by a registered undertaker or an institution declared under the **Human Tissues Act (Act 65 of 1983 as amended)**.

Unidentified/unknown graves are also handled as older than 60 until proven otherwise.

## **4.2 The National Environmental Management Act**

This act states that a survey and evaluation of cultural resources must be done in areas where development projects, that will change the face of the environment, will be undertaken. The impact of the development on these resources should be determined and proposals for the mitigation thereof are made.

## **5. METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1 Survey of literature**

A survey of literature was done in order to obtain background information regarding the area. Sources consulted in this regard are indicated in the bibliography.

### **4.2 Field survey**

The survey was conducted according to generally accepted HIA practices and was aimed at locating all possible objects, sites and features of cultural significance in the area of proposed development. If required, the location/position of any site was determined by means of a Global Positioning System (GPS), while photographs were also taken where needed.

The survey was undertaken on foot.

### **4.3 Documentation**

All sites, objects features and structures identified were documented according to the general minimum standards accepted by the archaeological profession. Co-ordinates of individual localities were determined by means of the Global Positioning System (GPS). The information was added to the description in order to facilitate the identification of each locality.

## **6. DESCRIPTION OF THE AREA**

The site where the Cradle of Pilanesberg Lodge will be build is situated in the southwest of the Pilanesberg National Park, Northwest Province. The lodge will be reasonably close to the Ruighoek gate and may also be reached via this gate. The Tshukudu Lodge is situated east of the proposed lodge area.

The proposed lodge area is enclosed by mountains on three sides with only the northwestern side thereof giving access thereto. The parking area and staff housing are also situated on the foot of the mountain to the south thereof (Figure 2). A gravel road running from the gate gives access to the area. Secondary roads are also found in the lodge area.

Between the said road and the foot of the mountain, the topography is reasonably flat. To the south the mountain is situated and the area is therefore very steep. However the foot of the mountain only has a slight inclination and it therefore creates a suitable living environment.

The natural vegetation still exists in the area. During the survey the signs of the current drought were clearly visible. The area also burnt down recently. Therefore the ground cover was almost non-existent. However large trees are still found in abundance, especially higher against the slopes of the mountain. Certain areas, such as the donga, also did contain an extensive ground cover. The donga is probably the result of erosion. It is therefore clear that in times of good rain water is available in the area. A non-perennial stream also runs through the area. It therefore seems as if the area would have been well-suited for animal life during the past.

Factors such as water, shelter, food and building material are therefore available in the area. These make the area suitable for human habitation.

## 7. DISCUSSION

The fieldwork undertaken revealed six (6) sites and features of some significant cultural heritage importance on the property. Only one of these will be impacted upon directly by the development. However the development will have a secondary impact on the others. Mitigation measures will have to be implemented.

Before discussing these sites in detail a background regarding the different phases of human history is needed. This will enable the reader to better understand the sites found during the survey.

### 7.1 Stone Age

The Stone Age is the period in human history when lithic material was mainly used to produce tools (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 293). In South Africa the Stone Age can be divided in three periods. It is however important to note that dates are relative and only provide a broad framework for interpretation. The division for the Stone Age according to Korsman & Meyer (1999: 93-94) is as follows:

Early Stone Age (ESA) 2 million – 150 000 years ago  
Middle Stone Age (MSA) 150 000 – 30 000 years ago  
Late Stone Age (LSA) 40 000 years ago – 1850 - A.D.

The Stone Age material has been found isolated in the surveyed area. No Early Stone Age material was found, but Middle Stone Age tools were found in the large donga mentioned above (Figure 11). A Late Stone Age core, from which flakes were hit for the purpose of making stone tools, was identified close to site no 2 (see later).

The mountain would certainly have provided ample shelter for Stone Age people. One might find a rock shelter in the mountain which may even contain rock art. However, as indicated, the highest parts of the mountain were not surveyed.

The stream running through the area would have provided sufficient water. The valley would have been as easy hunting ground for these people as migrating animals would easily have been trapped and killed here. One might expect to find more Stone Age tools in the valley, especially in the donga and perhaps even an area where stone tools were manufactured higher up the slopes of the mountain.



## 7.2 Iron Age

The Iron Age is the name given to the period of human history when metal was mainly used to produce artifacts (Coertze & Coertze 1996: 346). In South Africa it can be divided in two separate phases according to Van der Ryst & Meyer (1999: 96-98), namely:

Early Iron Age (EIA) 200 – 1000 A.D.

Late Iron Age (LIA) 1000 – 1850 A.D.

The Pilanesberg falls within a band stretching roughly from Brits in the east to Zeerust in the west where many Iron Age sites have been discovered previously (Bergh 1999: 7). It was therefore no surprise that such sites were identified during the survey.

Four sites dating to the Iron Age were found in the surveyed area (see later). The vegetation of the area is suitable for the farming communities of the Iron Age, as these people herded livestock and planted different crops. The topography is also suitable for Iron Age settlement.

## 7.3 Historical Age

The historical age started when the first people that were able to read and write moved into the area. Early travelers have moved through Northwest and may have moved through the area during the early 1800's (Bergh 1999: 12-13). After this the Missionaries came into the area, but it is not known whether a Missionary was established in the Pilanesberg. The area in which the Pilanesberg falls was inhabited by white farmers between 1841 and 1850 (Bergh 1999: 15).

Two sites found during the survey date from the Historical Age. Recent artifacts such as pieces of metal drums etc. were seen throughout the surveyed area. This clearly indicates that the area was occupied during the historical period.

## 7.4 Discussion of sites identified during the survey

### Site 1

The site was found next to and on the south side of the gravel road giving access to the area.

GPS: 25°18'15"S  
26°58'28"E

The site exists of a number of cement slabs on top a foundation of stone. Some of the slabs clearly have cement floors indicating that the structures had a residential purpose. The largest of these slabs also have cement steps leading to the top thereof (Figure 3-4).

One hole covered with corrugated iron was also found. This seems to be an old toilet.

Apparently the area was used for staff houses when the Pilanesberg National Park was started in 1979 (Personal comment: Caleb Moses).

The cultural significance of the site is **medium**. Although the site is not older than 60 years, it forms part of the history of the park and therefore it should not be demolished. The development will not have a direct impact on this site, but there will be a secondary impact.

The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping visitors from this area. The remains may not be demolished. It may even be re-used for a similar purpose than its original function, but such a possibility should be discussed further. The indicated toilet is a safety risk and will have to be made safe by filling it (but keeping the corrugated iron in situ, or fencing it off).

### Site 2

Due to the extent of the site various GPS measurements were taken. The site is situated on the foot of the mountain and on the northern slope thereof. It ends against the mountain where the slope increases rapidly. Therefore no GPS measurement was taken on the southern side of the site. The measurements taken were aimed at more or less indicating the perimeter of the site. However due to certain environmental factors, it is possible that stone walling and other features in a bad state of decay on the outskirts of the site, may not have been located. The site may therefore be even larger than indicated.

GPS: 25°18'24"S

26°58'28"E – This is at a large circular wall which might have served as a cattle byre at some stage. It seems that it was used later as a kgoro or gathering place for men.

25°18'19"S

26°58'28"E – Measured at a family unit to the east of the mentioned kgoro.

25°18'16"S

26°58'40"E

25°18'11"S

26°58'41"E – This is at the area where the first rectangular structures start.

25°18'09"S

26°58'42"E

25°18'07"S

26°58'41"E – This is more or less the furthest part of the site to the northeast.

25°18'05"S

26°58'44"E – Measured at a manmade hole for keeping water for the cattle.

25°18'04"S

26°58'48"E

25°18'03"S

26°58'53"E

It is a Late Iron Age site consisting of stone walling and other associated features (Figure 5-6). It runs all along the foot of the mountain. It starts to the south and outside of the surveyed area and ends more or less in the centre of the surveyed area at a large excavated area. This area seems to be manmade and was probably dug as a water hole for cattle.

It is a settlement complex consisting of various settlement units. A continuous surrounding boundary wall is found on the side of the mountain. This wall includes circular enclosures, typical of Late Iron Age sites. These probably indicate settlement units. Monoliths are placed infrequently in the walls.

The settlement units on the eastern side are rectangular and therefore imply contact with Europeans (Figure 7-8). This also means that the latter part of the site is younger than the rest and could be dated relatively to the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> or early 20<sup>th</sup> century.

Potshards found on the site indicate that a cultural deposit does exist. In the younger part of the site glass and ceramic shards as well as broken pieces of metal have also been identified.

The younger part of the site also contains structures made from clay as well as rondavel-shaped structures (Figure 9). Some of these also have verandahs and the clay walls seem to have been plastered. These rectangular structures are linked together in a similar way as the circular older structures are by connecting stone walls. This is a clear indication that it forms part of the main complex. Smaller loose circular structures may have been outside kitchen areas. In one of these a lower grinder was found clearly indicating such a function.

As it is known that the Pilanesberg area was populated by the Tshwana, one can regard this as being a Tshwana settlement. The park ranger, who accompanied us, indicated that it was used by the BaTlhako (Elephant) people (Personal comment: Caleb Moses). Bergh (1999: 106) indicates that the Hurutshe, Tlokwa and Kgafêla-Kgatla (of Chief Pilane) settled in the Pilanesberg area and just outside of it on different occasions during the 19<sup>th</sup> century. He also indicates that the Fokeng settled in the Pilanesberg area during the Mfecane (Bergh 1999: 156).

The cultural significance of the site is **high**. It definitely is older than 60 years. It forms part of the history of the area before the establishment of the park and may contain valuable information regarding the Late Iron Age as well as regarding the first contact in this area between the indigenous people and Europeans. Therefore it may not be demolished.

The development will have a direct impact on this site as it seems as if part of the planned staff village will cover parts of this site. The development will definitely have a secondary impact on the remainder of the site as it will be close to the staff village.

The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping staff from entering the area. Visitors to the lodge should also not visit these remains without supervision and even such visits should be managed in accordance with a management plan for the site. This will enable the sustainable preservation of the site.

It does seem as if enough space is available to alter the planned staff village so that it does not impact directly on the site. This option should be investigated.

The minimum requirements for the preservation of the site will be to document it by drawing a map thereof, doing anthropological research (oral histories) and by writing a management plan. Such a plan will indicate options for the possible utilization of the site for tourism purposes. Since the site is very close to the lodge, this is seen as a viable option. The mapping of the site should be aimed at documenting the total site as one can not only look at certain parts thereof in isolation. Mapping the site and doing oral research will assist in writing the management plan as this will indicate the function and importance of certain areas on the site.

### Site 3

The site was found to the north of site no 2. It is believed that it may even form part of the mentioned site. Should this be the case the GPS measurement can be added to the above mentioned in indicating the perimeters of site no 2.

GPS: 25°18'09"S  
26°58'38"E

This is a historical midden (Figure 10), probably linked to the later phase of occupancy of the Iron Age site (no 2). Historical artifacts such as porcelain, glass and metal were identified.

One interesting find seem to be the badge of a cricket club. A cricket ball surrounded by four bats and the word "Victory" could be made out. This indicates that the site may have been occupied very late during the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

The cultural significance of the site is **high**. It also forms part of the history of the area before the establishment of the park and may contain valuable information regarding the Late Iron Age as well as regarding the first contact in this area between the indigenous people and Europeans. Therefore it may not be demolished.

The development will definitely have a secondary impact on the site as it will be close to the staff village. The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping staff from entering the area. Visitors to the lodge should also not visit these remains without supervision and even such visits should be managed in accordance with a management plan for the site. This will enable the sustainable preservation of the site.

The site should be included in the documentation of site no 2 as well as the writing of a management plan. Archaeological excavations may be necessary, but this will be addressed in such a management plan.

### Site 4

This site is situated in the enclosure between the mountains where the lodge will be build.

GPS: 25°18'16"S  
26°59'33"E

The site consists of a few poorly defined stone walls. These are not very well articulated and do not seem to form part of a large site. It seems to be very untidy and does not have any clear form.

The cultural significance of the site is **low**. It probably is older than 60 years. It may be the outer parts of an Iron Age Site site higher up the slopes (on top of) of the mountain.

The development does not have a direct impact on this site as it is higher up the slopes of the mountain than where the development will be. It is however reasonably close thereto and therefore there will definitely be a secondary impact.

The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping staff and visitors from entering the area. This will ensure the sustainable preservation of the site. In the event of the lodge being expanded or by laying out gardens or something similar, this area may be impacted on directly. The site may be demolished, but a destruction permit will be needed from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) for this purpose. However should such developments not occur there is no reason to destruct the site and it may be left as it is.

### Site 5

This site is located on the foot of the mountain on the northeastern edge of the surveyed area. This is also just outside of the actual area where the lodge will be build, between the lodge site and the gravel road. Again it was necessary to take more than one GPS measurement to indicate the extent of this site.

GPS: 25°17'53"S

26°59'23"E – This was measured at a place where a lower grinder was identified.

25°17'51"S

26°59'25"E – Measured at one of the rectangular structures.

It is a Late Iron Age site consisting very low stone walls. This may indicate that the site is older than site no 2. Rectangular structure however seem to indicate that it may be of the same age. It is also possible that the people, who build the rectangular structures, robbed the circular ones in order to use the stone. Potshards and a lower grinder (Figure 12) were also seen on the surface of the site.

The site is not well preserved. As it clearly is older than 60 years the site should not be damaged. The cultural significance of the site is **medium**. It is probably not as important as site no 2. It however does form part of the history of the area before the establishment of the park and may contain valuable information regarding the Late Iron Age as well as regarding the first contact in this area between the indigenous people and Europeans. Therefore it should not be demolished.

The development will not have a direct impact on this site and therefore it may remain in tact. The development will definitely have a secondary impact on the site as it is close to the lodge area. The developer should therefore ensure that this impact is minimized by keeping staff and visitors from entering the area. Visitors to the lodge should also not visit these remains without supervision and even such visits should be managed in accordance with a management plan for the site. This will enable the sustainable preservation of the site. Should no such visits be planned, the site should just be left in situ.

One might decide to include this site in the documentation when going through the effort to do this with site no 2. It can also be included in the management plan. By doing this any future impact on this area will be addressed.

### Site 6

This site was located close to the gravel road and on both sides of the secondary road leading to the lodge area. Again two GPS measurement were taken.

GPS: 25°17'50"S  
26°59'07"E – Measured at a large rectangular foundation made of stone and cement.

25°17'45"S  
26°59'00"E – This is at a water trough to the west of the secondary road.

This is a historical site. It clearly is the remains of a farmyard with different outbuildings and other related features. The main feature is a large foundation made of stone and brick on the eastern side of the secondary road (Figure 13). Other remains of buildings, old farm implements, bore holes, bases for machinery, a pump house (Figure 14), water trough (Figure 15) and household objects were found spread out over a large area. One building, sometimes still used as staff housing by the park, was also located.

The cultural significance of the site is **low**. It is probably not older than 60 years. It does form part of the history of the area before the establishment of the park, but is of no particular significance. Therefore it may be demolished.

As there is no direct impact on this site, it may be left as it is. However, the site will need to be cleaned up as it really is a mess and will not create a positive impression with visitors to the area. It would be better to do this before the structures become older than 60 years as it will then require a destruction permit from SAHRA.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is concluded that the survey led to the identification of six sites as well as cultural material lying around in the area. The area of proposed development was utilized by humans since at least the Middle Stone Age and has been settled ever since.

The following is recommended:

- Site no 6 is the only one of minor cultural significance which may be destructed without requiring a destruction permit from SAHRA.
- Site no 1 may not be old enough to be protected by law, but due to it being part of the history of the park, it should be preserved. The secondary impact on this site should be minimized by keeping visitors from this area. The remains should not be demolished and may even be re-used for a similar purpose than its original function, but such a possibility should be discussed further. The indicated toilet is a safety risk

and will have to be made safe by filling it (but keeping the corrugated iron in situ, or fencing it off.

- The cultural significance of site no 4 is low. There also is no direct impact on this site. Although it is not necessary to actively protect the site, it should not be demolished without requiring a destruction permit from SAHRA. However should the site not be in the way of any developments in future, it should be left as it is.
- Site no 2 is of major cultural significance and will be impacted on directly by the proposed development. It may not be demolished or disturbed for the sake of the development. It does seem as if enough space is available to alter the planned staff village so that it does not impact directly on the site. This option should be investigated.
- The minimum requirements for the preservation of site no 2 will be to document it by drawing a map thereof, doing anthropological research (oral histories) and by writing a management plan. Such a plan will indicate options for the possible utilization of the site for tourism purposes. Since the site is very close to the lodge, this is seen as a viable option. The mapping of the site should be aimed at documenting the total site as one can not only look at certain parts thereof in isolation. Mapping the site and doing oral research will assist in writing the management plan as this will indicate the function and importance of certain areas on the site.
- Even after implementation of the mentioned mitigation measures, the development will still have a secondary impact on the site as it will be close to the staff village. It should therefore be ensured that this impact is minimized by keeping staff from entering the area. Visitors to the lodge should also not visit these remains without supervision and even such visits should be managed in accordance with the management plan for the site. This will enable the sustainable preservation of the site.
- Site no 3 is of equal importance to site no 2 and should be dealt with in a similar way. Therefore it may not be demolished. The development will have a secondary impact on the site as it will be close to the staff village. The preservation of the site will be ensured by including it in the management plan.
- Site no 5 is not of equal importance, but it may still not be damaged. As there is no direct impact on this site, it should just be left in tact. Due to a definite secondary impact on the site, the best way to manage this would be to include it in the management plan for the area. By doing this any future impact on this area will be addressed.

## 9. REFERENCES

- Bergh, J.S. (red.). 1999. **Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Coertze, P.J. & Coertze, R.D. 1996. **Verklarende vakwoordeboek vir Antropologie en Argeologie.** Pretoria: R.D. Coertze.
- Knudson, S.J. 1978. **Culture in retrospect.** Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

- Korsman, S.A. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Steentydperk en rotskuns. Bergh, J.S. (red.).  
**Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.
- Maps and photographs supplied by the client.
- Moses, Caleb. 2007.09.26. Ranger at the Pilanesberg National Park.
- Republic of South Africa. 1999. **National Heritage Resources Act** (No 25 of 1999).  
Pretoria: the Government Printer.
- Republic of South Africa. 1998. **National Environmental Management Act** (no 107 of 1998). Pretoria: The Government Printer.
- Van der Ryst, M.M. & Meyer, A. 1999. Die Ystertydperk. Bergh, J.S. (red.).  
**Geskiedenisatlas van Suid-Afrika. Die vier noordelike provinsies.** Pretoria: J.L. van Schaik.



## **Appendix A**

### **Definition of terms:**

Site: A large place with extensive structures and related cultural objects. It can also be a large assemblage of cultural artifacts, found on a single location.

Structure: A permanent building found in isolation or which forms a site in conjunction with other structures.

Feature: A coincidental find of movable cultural objects.

Object: Artifact (cultural object).

(Also see Knudson 1978: 20).

## **Appendix B**

### Cultural significance:

- Low            A cultural object being found out of context, not being part of a site or without any related feature/structure in its surroundings.
  
- Medium        Any site, structure or feature being regarded less important due to a number of factors, such as date and frequency. Also any important object found out of context.
  
- High            Any site, structure or feature regarded as important because of its age or uniqueness. Graves are always categorized as of a high importance. Also any important object found within a specific context.

## **Appendix C**

### **List of Figures:**

- 1. Map of the Pilanesberg National Park indicating the proposed site for the Cradle of Pilanesberg Lodge.**
- 2. Map indicating the proposed development.**
- 3. View of one of cement slabs on site no 1.**
- 4. This view shows the stone foundation of the above structure.**
- 5. Part of the large stone wall enclosure on site no 2.**
- 6. Another circular stone wall on site no 2.**
- 7. Rectangular stone and clay structure on site no 2.**
- 8. Another clay structure with signs of the walls being plastered.**
- 9. Circular stone and clay structure on site no 2.**
- 10. Historical midden, site no 3.**
- 11. Middle Stone Age tool found in the donga area.**
- 12. Lower grinder found at site no 5.**
- 13. Foundation of a large building on site no 6.**
- 14. Remains of a pump at site no 6.**
- 15. Water trough at site no 6.**